

NFLD
J
125
N3
1929
dup

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

DURING THE

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

Twenty-seventh General Assembly

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1929



MANNING & RABBITTS, Printers,
Prescott Street, St. John's, Newfoundland,
1929.

PROCEEDINGS

of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1929.

Tuesday, April 16th, 1929.

Upon Tuesday, the sixteenth day of April, A.D. 1929 the Members returned for the several districts with the exception of Sir William F. Coaker, K.B.E., member for Bonavista East, assembled between the hours of two and three of the clock in the afternoon in the Council Chamber and took and subscribed to the oath of allegiance before the Honourables Sir Patrick McGrath, Tasker Cook and George Shea, the Commissioners of His Excellency the Governor thereto appointed.

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

Whereupon the Members having returned to the Assembly Room the Prime Minister, the Honourable Sir Richard A. Squires, K.C., K.C.M.G.,

moved that the Member for the District of Harbor Main, Albert J. Walsh, Esq., do take the Chair as Speaker, and it was seconded by Mr. Frederick C. Alderdice, Member for the District of St. John's City (East) and no other person being proposed Mr. Walsh was unanimously called to the Chair by the House and was conducted to the Chair by the Members who proposed and seconded him.

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

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

Wednesday, April 17th, 1929.

The House met at half past two o'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 was 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 laid claim to all their ancient rights and privileges" which His Excellency had confirmed in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted or allowed by His Excellency or any of his predecessors.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance on His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to make a speech to both branches of the Legislature, a copy of which, for purposes of greater accuracy, he had obtained, and which he then read to the House.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

As I now, for the first time since assuming the Office of Governor of this Colony, enjoy the privilege of meeting this Legislature in Session, I desire to express to you my recognition of the responsibilities attaching to that Office, my resolve to adhere strictly to constitutional principles, and my desire to assist in promoting the best interests of this ancient Dependency of the Empire.

In greeting you at this the opening of the Twenty-seventh General Assembly, I trust that your labours under the guidance of Divine Providence will tend towards the prosperity and well-being of the people of Newfoundland.

It is with a feeling of deep sincerity and profound gratitude that we offer thanks to the Almighty Giver of all

good that He has graciously given to our Sovereign Lord the King the promise of recovery from the severe and trying illness from which His Majesty has suffered. We unite with all parts of the Empire in the prayer that His Majesty may shortly be restored to full health and strength. A suitable resolution will be submitted to you dealing with this matter.

The General Election held in October last was marked by good order which emphasized the law-abiding character of our people. The result was decisive and my Ministers assumed the reins of office with confidence born of the fact that the great majority of the people have approved their policy. For the first time in the history of the Colony the women exercised at a General Election the franchise which had been given them, and a very large percentage went to the Polls.

The questions of trade expansion within the Empire, the better marketing of our products, and the making of Trade Agreements beneficial to Newfoundland have received consideration. It is proposed to appoint a Trade Commissioner in London in place of a High Commissioner, the commercial interests of Newfoundland in Great Britain being of great importance. Negotiations with respect to a Trade Agreement have been opened with the Government at Ottawa, and it is hoped that these will result beneficially to the Colony.

The returns from the Fishery last year were satisfactory. There was a slight shortage in the catch in our staple industry, but enhanced prices and favourable markets more than offset the shortage in catch.

During last year the production of iron ore exceeded that for the previous year by more than 600,000 tons with an increased value of over \$1,000,000. The export of paper also has

exceeded that of the previous year by 13,700 tons, with an increased value of over \$1,000,000. Imports during the last fiscal year totalled \$27,600,000, and the exports for the same period were \$33,600,000, showing a trade balance in favour of this Colony of \$6,000,000. The total trade of the Colony for the last fiscal year was \$61,000,000, being \$5,000,000 in excess of the total trade of the previous fiscal year.

The Sealing Fleet, still engaged in their arduous work, appear to be reaping substantial success.

The International Power and Paper Company is using every means to prove the value of the coal deposits in the District of St. George; the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company and those associated with them have made considerable progress in the development of the valuable lead-zinc deposits at Buchans, while the Paper Plants operating in this Colony are increasing their output each month and developing plans that in due time will give a very material increase in paper production.

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

The Statements of Revenue and Expenditure for the fiscal year which ended on the 30th June, 1928, will be submitted to you.

The Revenue returns for the quarter ending March 31st last, show, as compared with the corresponding period of 1928, an increase of \$230,000 in spite of considerable reductions in Customs taxation.

The Estimates for the coming year will be submitted to you at an early date, and you will be invited to make the customary provision for the needs of the Public Service.

It is proposed to submit to you a Loan Bill providing for certain Capital expenditures of the Public Service,

including Fishery, Marine and Road operations, Education, Penitentiary and Poor House reorganisation and a Reformatory programme in addition to the liquidation of the large deficits which my Ministers have been called upon to assume.

It is proposed to appoint a Commission for the revision of the Tariff so that there may be an equitable distribution of the burden of taxation, and that inequalities of the Tariff may be eliminated.

A Bill will be submitted providing for a tax on incomes above a certain figure.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The question of unemployment and the consequent distress among the people have caused my Ministers to appoint a Commission to enquire into the cause of such unemployment, and to find a remedy for the same. A Commission has also been appointed to enquire into the administration of Hospital and Charitable Institutions, and also into the expenditure made by the Department of Charities. My Ministers look forward to the time when the fuller development of the resources of this Island will call for the employment of the whole male population, and during their administration every effort will be made by constructive programme, and utilization of every resource to banish the distress endured at present by our labouring people.

Questions arise from time to time affecting the economics of the people of this Colony and the necessity for some authority to deal with such questions has been felt. My Ministers propose to submit legislation for the appointment of a Public Utilities Commission which will deal with such questions as they arise, safe-guarding

all legitimate interests involved and protecting the people from unfair charges or undue imposition.

My Ministers feel that the various fisheries which constitute the greatest natural asset of this country are capable of further development to the great advantage of the fishermen as well as the fishery supplier. They consequently propose to establish a Fishery Commission representative of all fishery interests in the country to study the problems involved and to make a report to the Government thereon for the consideration of the Legislature at your next Session.

When my Prime Minister was in the City of New York during January last, he had conferences with representatives of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, of New York. The result of these conversations and subsequent negotiations is embodied in certain legislation which will be submitted to you. My Ministers hope that, as a result of these arrangements, cable telephonic connections will be established between this Country and Great Britain and Europe to the East and South and the Continents of North and South America to the West and South.

The matter of additional street-car facilities for the City of St. John's and suburbs has engaged the attention of my Ministers, who expect that legislation in this regard will be submitted for your consideration at this Session.

The matter of local municipal autonomy applicable to towns both populous and prosperous will be submitted for your deliberation.

As sparsely populated localities are greatly handicapped in the operation of their schools through the smallness of their educational grant, my Ministers propose to give substantial increased Educational Vote for expenditure in such localities.

A Bill for the more effective prevention of the illicit liquor traffic in St. John's will be submitted for your consideration.

A number of Bills regarding various matters connected with the Government Departments will be brought before you for your action.

I trust that in the discharge of your important duties you may be granted Divine wisdom and guidance.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY TO ROYAL FAMILY.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, allow me, sir, to invite you to permit precedence to be taken by the resolution which I now have the honour to read and which I have pleasure to move.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution so ably proposed by the Honourable the Prime Minister.

I think if we were to try to enumerate the characteristics of His Gracious Majesty outside of his kingliness, probably the first characteristics that would occur to us would be his manliness, his thoughtfulness, his humanity and his spirit of self-sacrifice.

I am very much afraid that when this illness came upon the King, that up to then we were apt to forget the great services that he was rendering the Empire. We know how every day of his life he committed some act of self-sacrifice, and I do not think we realized what he was doing until it was brought home to us that we might lose him altogether. Then and then only did we wake up to the fact and were able to announce our feelings of deep love and loyalty to the Throne and the King himself.

It seems to me that this illness of the King has been the means of drawing the Empire closer together. I think that we have the bringing together of

the classes. Millions from the highest to the lowest have a community of thought between them and I know of nothing more reaching or more binding, either in a household or country, than a great common sorrow.

It struck me during my visit abroad that the singing of the National Anthem had taken on a new significance. The singing had ceased to be perfunctory. I had a feeling that when the people uttered the words "God save the King" they breathed into them a spirit of sorrow, of deep heartfelt prayer for the Royal sufferer.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolution be sent to the Legislative Council with a request for their concurrence.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY ON DEATH OF HON. DR. ROBINSON.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, again, sir, I seek precedence to the regular business of the House this time for a resolution of sympathy to the family of the late Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson.

Dr. J. A. Robinson came to this country as a young man, a school teacher. Carbonear was his home—his adopted home. He raised the educational standard there from that of an insignificant and unknown school to the well known, big, educational institution, Carbonear Academy. Some time passed, and he then came to the Methodist College at St. John's and then into the newspaper activities and business world, with which he has been recently largely identified. He was a member of the Legislature for a time and a member for a time of the Legislative Council. He occupied,

under the old system when the Colonial Secretary was connected with the Department of Posts and Telegraphs, the official position of Postmaster General. He resigned from that office when he decided not to take over the responsibilities of the Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs under the new regime of 1919. He took over newspaper work and carried on successfully for he was a man known as an educationalist of value and what he knew himself he told to the country, and under his capable management devolved from nothing a newspaper in St. John's which takes a stand with the Evening Telegram, which is the product of the united and systematic efforts of the Herder family for half a century.

We grasp something of his ability when we consider his selection of the men with whom he was associated in his work and particularly as business manager of a gentleman with a large experience as accountant with the Railway and a successful businessman, Mr. J. C. Puddester, who occupies a seat in this House.

He was an effective life-long political opponent of mine and I feel I owe it to him and to his memory to refer to the work he did in connection with the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. That fund and its importance to-day is due in no small measure to the active work of Dr. J. A. Robinson, and then in connection with the publicity through the Daily News which he controlled.

When even his scholarship, even his ability are forgotten, with respect will be remembered his activities in connection with the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breath,
In feelings not in figures on a dial."

And so when the little discrepancies with which his name and mine are

associated have been forgotten, we will find that he lives still for his past acts and will be remembered as a good educationalist, a successful businessman and above all, as a man who gave his supreme efforts to develop one of our most important public charities.

I beg to move the resolution.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest feeling that I rise to second the resolution proposed by the Honourable the Prime Minister.

In the Legislative Council I had opportunity of coming into contact with the late Honourable gentleman and it was there I was confirmed in the already high opinion I had always held of him. He came to this country at the age of twenty years. For twelve years he laboured in the Carbonear Grammar School. After coming back to St. John's he took up journalistic work and made it his life's work. He went into public life in 1897, he was elected a member of this House of Assembly as representative of the District of Bonavista, but it is more in his journalistic and philanthropic work that I would remember him, and I believe that he himself would prefer to be remembered on the score of journalism and philanthropy than political life.

He will always be associated with the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. He was always the moving spirit in it and it was to his labours principally that the funds were collected for it. It was a labour of love and there is many a widow and many an orphan that for his ministrations has good cause to bless his name.

In the journalistic world he wielded a very strong pen and he fought what he thought was the good fight for the best interests of Newfoundland.

He was a fearless man in the espousal of any cause. He was a

strong temperance advocate and social reformer. He practised what he preached. He has been always advocating the best for Newfoundland. His charity was the right kind, quiet and unostentatious. At times a little steadfast in his ideas but never offensive in holding to them. He was a faithful adherent to his church, a loving husband and a deep lover of Newfoundland. He is now gone to his reward, the sure reward of every one who comforts the widow and orphan in their affliction.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY
CAPT. JOHN PARSONS.—

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving for the appointment of a Committee to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this session of the Legislature, but before doing so I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to tender to you, sir, my heartiest congratulations on your unanimous appointment as the greatest commoner in the land, and I am sure that you will fill that position with honour to the Assembly, honour to this country, and honour to the district which you represent, and I have no doubt that Hon. members on both sides of this House will give you every assistance they can in enabling you to make the duties of your position as light as possible.

I feel that it would be presumption on my part to tender congratulations to our Leader for the wonderful following that he has here behind him. When he looks around at his large following in this House and can feel that whatever happens, that crowd of men is at his back under all circumstances, and that whatever laws he may wish to make for the benefit of this country, or for the benefit of the people of this country, that these men will be at his back under all circumstances.

I notice in your reading of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and I was very agreeably surprised to hear it, that the output of ore from Bell Island for 1928 exceeded the output for 1927 by a large amount, and I sincerely hope that the company that is running that mine will see their way clear to give their employees a little better wage now that they got a greater output for their material. It is a well known fact that the greater part of the residents of Bell Island are entirely dependent on the company for their support, and there is a considerable number of men residing in the different sections of Conception Bay that are almost as much dependent on Bell Island Company for their support as the residents of Bell Island itself. They are only employed for eight months of the year and I can readily understand how hard it is for a man to make provision for the other four months with the small wages that he receives from this company.

Another paragraph that I notice in the Speech from the Throne that impressed me very forcibly as being a step in the right direction, is in connection with the intention of the Government to appoint a commission to deal with the problem of our fisheries. And I am sure that if the same success attends the appointment of the commission, as attended the efforts of the Liberal Party under Sir Robert Bond, when he made an effort to revive the herring fishery, then I am sure that it will be a great benefit to the country. As you know sir, in the early days of the Labrador Fishery, the herring fishery was a very close second to the Labrador fishery in this country, so that a great many of the men who had been making their living at the codfishery, abandoned it altogether, and went into the herring fishery entirely. At that time they used

to market most of the herring at Montreal, and from there to different parts of Canada and the United States. But the time came through careless packing and careless handling of herring, that if we sent our herring to Montreal dealers as a present, and paid the freight, they wouldn't allow them to be handled there. As I say the fishermen got so careless in handling this valuable product of the country that people of other countries refused to take them altogether, and for a great number of years there wasn't a herring shipped from the Southern Coast or the Labrador. Then as I said the Liberal Party under Sir Robert Bond made an attempt to revive it. For a good many years they were ridiculed by the opposition and their opponents in all parts of the country; and as a result of those efforts you know what the herring fishery amounts to to-day. We are not troubled with finding markets today; the only trouble today is finding herring enough to supply the people who want to buy. Consequently if the Liberal Party under the leadership of Sir Robert Bond had not taken the trouble to do something about those poor conditions existing in respect of the herring fishery it would still have been in that deplorable state.

As regards the seal fishery, I can't see any way our hardy toilers can receive any better remuneration from the industry than they are getting today. As we know through the efforts of Sir William Coaker the men are getting well fed, and are getting everything done by the merchants for their comfort that can possibly be done as far as I can see; but the unfortunate part of it is that we have got to take crews of a very large size. The crews that ships take to the seal fishery are so numerous that when you come to divide up the remuneration for the

hardship and hard work is not adequate for what they have done. If it were decided to reduce the crews it would only cause more unemployment.

I would like to refer, too, to the Labrador cod fishery. In the early days of the Labrador cod fishery when men for the Labrador went down to prosecute the fishery in the summer and caught their fish and returned to Newfoundland in the winter, there also was fish caught by the residents in the southern part. The fish was shipped to Spain and Portugal by ships that used to come for the express purpose of buying the fish on the Labrador coast. They wanted a certain quality of fish and they would buy if they could get that quality and load the vessel and pay cash and return to Spain or Portugal. The fish that was not suitable would be brought back to Newfoundland and sent to some other market. The consequence was our forefathers were in habit of making good fish on the Labrador coast. That went on for a certain number of years. Eventually the Newfoundland merchants got into the Labrador fish business and exported to those countries from which people were coming out to buy fish. When this was started every small vessel that used to go down to the coast was supplied with a culler or supercargo, and as the fish went aboard the vessel it would be superintended by those men. Consequently we were getting fairly good fish in those days shipped from the Labrador coast.

After a short time the merchants decided to pay what is called a talqual price, that is all fish shipped from the coast of Labrador would be paid for at the same rate. Men went down and took considerable trouble and made their fish as a good article of food and would get say \$3.00 a quintal. Other men would go down, and make their fish carelessly, and still get \$3.00.

That went on for a number of years and a younger generation came along, and when they went down on the Labrador and found what was happening said: "What is the good of taking the trouble to make good fish; we don't get any more for it. We don't get any more money, consequently we are losing money." The consequence was the quality of the fish cured on the Labrador became worse and worse every year; and today no one can conscientiously call it an article of food at all. I believe as I said before that this appointing a commission for looking into the Labrador fishery particularly is a step in the right direction. There is no Newfoundland merchant as far as I know that ever engaged in marketing Labrador products ever made a success of it, or ever made any money; and the whole trouble of this is on account of the talqual system and on account of the quality of fish shipped from the Labrador.

I want to tell you that from 1896 to 1916 I shipped from the Labrador coast myself for different merchants in the country and some on my own account between six and seven hundred thousand quintals of fish. As far as I know there has never been but one form of bill of lading made out for vessels taking a cargo from the Labrador. Every bill of lading is made out in the same way. Amongst that six or seven hundred thousand that I shipped from 1896 to 1916 I believe there were thousands of quintals of green fish, thousands of quintals of slimy fish, and of burnt, and of dirty fish, but the form of every single bill of lading for those cargoes described the fish as prime, dry, No. 1, Labrador codfish. That is the reason why merchants in Newfoundland have been continually losing money through the export of Labrador fish. They have been offered a price for a certain quantity of fish, have bought the fish

from the fishermen at a price leaving a good margin of profit, but when the fish went across to the other side it was on the reclamations for inferior quality fish that the merchants lost money; because as I said before I venture to state without fear of contradiction for the past twenty years there hasn't been twenty thousand quintals of fish shipped from Labrador that was prime, dry, No. 1 Labrador. So there is a great work for that commission to do; and those conditions today are a good deal of the reason why we have such a wonderful amount of unemployment on the East coast of Newfoundland. About twenty-five or thirty years ago we were shipping from the coast of Labrador every year five or six hundred thousand quintals. Last year the men down there caught practically all the fish they could handle and I think the total catch was somewhere about sixty thousand quintals.

When we consider the number of men who used to have to go down there to catch that large quantity of fish and get it ready for the market and the small quantity we are sending away today we can understand the unemployment. Lots of young men dissatisfied with the small remuneration decided not to go down any longer and consequently there is an exodus of young men from the country every year. So I say this Commission is a step in the right direction and if the men appointed carry out their duty to the country in the near future we will have the Labrador fishery on the same basis as the herring fishery, namely, we won't have trouble to find markets, our trouble will be finding fish enough to supply the markets. I have very much pleasure in moving that a committee be appointed to prepare an address in reply to His Excellency's most gracious Speech from the Throne.

MR, FUDGE.—Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second the motion made by my friend the Hon. member for the District of Bay Roberts, who has proposed an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to open this session of the Legislature.

I would like, first, Sir, to be permitted to extend to you hearty and sincere congratulations on your unanimous selection for the high and honourable position you now occupy. It is no small honor for a citizen to be elected as representative of his native district. It is an even higher mark of esteem for him to be selected by his fellow-members of this Honourable House as "First Commoner" of the land we love. You, Sir, occupy your present high position in succession to a long line of able, distinguished and fairminded Speakers. Honorable Members of this House are confident that, both as representative of the old district of Harbor Main and as heir to the ennobling traditions of Speaker-ships of the past, you will afford constant and consistent cause for pride on the part of fellow-Newfoundlanders in your conduct and your pronouncements from the Chair.

The duty that has been assigned to me presents two difficulties. I have to endeavor to live up to the high order of speech-making that ever appears to characterise occasions of this kind in this Honourable House. I trust that those who hear me now will excuse my shortcomings on the score of short connection with public matters. There is the added difficulty of equalling such an effort as that which has just been made by the honourable gentleman who has just made the motion for the Address in Reply. The member for Bay Roberts possesses a country-wide reputation as a fearless mariner, a successful fisher-

man and an able sealing captain. The presence of men of his stamp on the floor of this House augurs well for the practical benefits to this country of our proceedings during the session just opening.

Permit me next, Sir, to extend both my congratulations and my thanks to the Honourable, the Prime Minister. I congratulate him on the score of his recent tremendous success at the Polls and on the size of the majority given him by the Electorate as Leader of the Government. He is to be congratulated, too, on the character of his following. His associates, both in the Executive Government, as well as in his Party generally will, I am confident, re-establish in this country the old Liberal Policy of Progress and Prosperity with all its attendant benefits to all classes in Newfoundland but particularly to the Common People of our Beloved Land.

My feelings of thankfulness are inspired by the nature and contents of the Speech from the Throne. Its various pronouncements provide numerous and inspiring texts for an address on public matters of the day. It teems with the spirit of Liberalism. It revives old time aspirations and old time hopes regarding the beneficial effect of Liberal administration on the affairs of our Country and its People. Such practical and important subjects as Trade Expansion, Encouragements of the Fisheries, Improvement of the Status of our Workers and allied matters are dealt with in a manner calculated to inspire hope and confidence in the minds of all who hear or who read the Speech from the Throne.

Happily enough, the present Speech from the Throne strikes the Imperial note at its very opening. It forecasts efforts on the part of the present Liberal Government to increase the vol-

ume and the value of Newfoundland's trade within the Empire. It is a happy augury, too, that those efforts have had their commencement within the Old Country itself. A trade commissioner is to succeed the high commissioner. That is a change in the direction of greater benefit to this country. The efforts of the trade commissioner will be directed towards the commercial advancement of our country. That was not properly nor to such an extent the business of the high commissioner. I anticipate that the change of policy in connection with our office at London will result in outstanding economic benefits to the trade of the country particularly and, necessarily, to the people of the country generally.

It has always been the aim and the endeavour of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland to construct and to apply policies of industrial development and advancement. Through the efforts and the various regimes of that Liberal Party, Newfoundland secured its railroad development, its Grand Falls industry and its Humber development. All have had strikingly beneficial effects on the life and the living of our people. It is gratifying to learn that the most recent of all, the Humber Industry, is meeting with such a great measure of success. I understand it paid net profits on last year's operations totalling over three quarters of a million dollars. The honorable the present Prime Minister must feel immensely gratified over this proof that his business foresight was no more at fault than his plans for industrial development within Newfoundland. The gigantic industry of papermaking is employing many thousands of Newfoundlanders. We hear of plans of expansion of these plants which will result in the employment of many more of our fellowcountrymen and in the expenditure of millions of dol-

lars in our country. I trust that the day is not far distant when we will have many more industries in Newfoundland and when, too, our mineral resources will be properly and adequately developed. It is to such developments that we have to look for one of the solutions of the problem of unemployment that has faced Newfoundland during the last few years.

Liberalism is always practical in dealing with public affairs. It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that a Liberal Government that has only recently succeeded to the reins of power has already taken steps calculated to discover the cause and the remedy of unemployment in our Land. Hitherto, only palliative measures have been taken in this connection. The displayed disposition now is to face facts fairly, squarely and courageously and to devise practical methods for escaping from our major difficulties in this connection.

The Liberal Government, Sir, commences its regime with a large deficit bequeathed by its predecessors in office. That is a bit of a handicap. Most of it was created a few months previous to the general election. It does not, however, discourage the Honourable the Prime Minister and his associates from setting their faces steadfastly towards the goal of industrial development or from applying policies of material benefit to all classes of our people. I look confidently to measures in the future to obviate conduct such as has in the past made such a condition of our public finances possible, and I am confident that the policies of Liberalism will speedily result in reform of public undertakings and in redress of the grievances of the people and improvement of their condition.

The Speech from the Throne, Sir, emphasises the importance of our fisheries to an extent that justifies the

stress laid by the mover of this motion on this important subject. The Honourable the member for Bay Roberts has stressed one aspect of our great and traditional industry. I represent another portion of the country and am interested in another phase of this many sided subject. On the Southwest Coast we have the banking fishery which is prosecuted for about nine months of the year, commencing in March and ending in November. The banking fleet consists of splendid vessels that reflects great credit on the enterprising men who spare no effort and no expenditure to ensure the comfort of our brave toilers of the sea, and to give them every possible chance of securing profitable voyages. The shore fishery conducted by our men is also of immense importance, both because of the number of fishermen engaged and the size and value of the annual voyage.

Last year, I speak now particularly of the Southwest Coast shore fishery, that total catch for the season was reduced by thousands of quintals because of failures of bait supplies. I strongly advocate the establishment of Cold Storage Bait Depots which will facilitate the important undertaking of providing adequate bait supplies, available to the fishermen whenever and wherever required. I need scarcely stress the fact, Sir, that such provision ensuring such results will be beneficial not only to the fishermen particularly concerned but to the country as a whole.

The Southwest Coast has also a particular interest in the fresh fish industry. Other sections of the coast have identical interests. We, however, were really pioneers in the practical effort to establish this industry on a large scale. Our particular interests are now concerned with the preparation and marketing of fresh salmon and fresh halibut. A ready

market can be found for all the fresh salmon we can produce and this year should see greater and more profitable activities than ever in this connection. During the present season a large quantity of heavy halibut has been caught and it is very much of a problem to find a market. For the past fifteen years I have been actively engaged in this industry and know something of its conditions and of its prospects. I have a great deal of faith in its future.

Associated with all the phases of the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker, are many insistent problems calling for an immediate effort at a solution. It is encouraging to note that the Liberal Party returns to power with its plans made for such an effort at finding the necessary solution. The Speech from the Throne announces that in the near future a Commission charged with the proper investigation of our fishing industry will commence to function. A properly balanced commission of earnest, practical and courageous men can discover many lessons from our past mistakes and from the activities of competing countries who have developed their fisheries to greater general advantage than have we.

Personally, I admit to being old fashioned enough to believe that the solution of much of our unemployment problem is to be found in the adoption of the principle of "Back to the Fisheries." When the return movement does take place, there will, of course, have been radical changes made from the old order of things that forced these men out of their traditional employment. And the prospects for remunerative employment will be far greater and far more certain than was formerly the case. The policy of the present Liberal Government will be designed to ensure

just such a desirable and beneficial change.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note the reference to Education made in the Speech from the Throne. The present Liberal Government, Sir, are heirs to the policy and the achievements in this field shared in particularly by the present Prime Minister and some of his associates present in this House today. To them we owe the present highly efficient system of educational administration which they reorganized during a previous term in office. The country generally is debtor to them for the Normal School and Memorial University College that has proved and is proving of such immense benefit to people of moderate means. It is fitting that such public men and the rest of us associated with them should enter on a new regime with an undertaking to advance the cause of Education further and to such a material extent as in the announcement with which I am dealing today. No section needs educational encouragement and assistance to such a great extent as that composed of sparsely settled localities. Such settlements cannot be satisfactorily handled out of the present educational grants. The increase will ensure them advantages they have craved for their children for years but have hitherto been unable to secure. In making this possible the Liberal Party are not only proving their faithfulness to their traditions from the past, they are also giving proof of their practical adherence to the principle that the children of today must be properly equipped to become the efficient citizens of tomorrow, and that the country owes its little ones such educational equipment as will fit them to play their part in life efficiently in competition with those of all other countries soever. Of course, further advancement must still be made along educational lines

before we can rest content in this connection. I am confident, however, that all unprejudiced observers will admit that the Liberal Government has made haste to take a long stride in the right direction.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must condole with members of the other Chamber in the recent loss of an outstanding member in the person of the late Hon. John Alexander Robinson.

I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for the appointment of a committee to draft and Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency the Governor has been graciously pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

MR. ALDERDICE.—Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate you both officially as Speaker and also as the representative for the District of Harbor Main. You are starting in where a great many men leave off. I wish that you will go on to other and greater honour. As Leader of the Opposition I wish to say that you will always find us, the members of the Opposition, myself included, ready to help you out in your undertaking. You will always find us amenable to your jurisdiction on this side of the House. I hope that you will be very successful. I should also like to congratulate the honourable member for Bay Roberts and the honourable member for Hermitage on their speeches in moving and seconding the vote of thanks to the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne. These men are the type of men that we like to see in this House. They are in close relation with the producers and have large interests in our fisheries and have also great stakes in the country.

I also desire to show that there is no ill feeling between the two parties. It is a pleasure to see the Prime Min-

ister sitting in the chair accompanied by his devoted followers. He is like the proud mother of a very large family, but he has a lot of mouths to feed. In the Speech from the Throne concerning the question of unemployment we are promised a solution in the shape of a Commission. Prior to the election we were told that as soon as the present Government got into power the day of unemployment would be over. The land would be flowing with milk and honey. All that the unemployed would have to do would be to ask for a job and they would be given it. The Liberal Party do not seem to know what is the cause of all the unemployment since they have appointed a commission to investigate it. They do not know the state of affairs it seems; that being so how are they going to effect a remedy when the cause is not known. If they do not know or cannot find out the cause they should not be in the positions they now occupy.

I would suggest to the Leader of the Government that if he were to ask any policeman he would be able to tell what to do without having to go so high up in the ranks as the Inspector General of Constabulary. If the Government were not desirous of passing the buck they could solve the problem for themselves. They are afraid to take on the responsibility. As for the appointment of a Commission so as to get second hand information the amiable gentlemen appointed have no knowledge of conditions of working men at all. Another disappointing feature in the Speech from the Throne is that there is no real promise of starting any employment. There were rumours about the Gander for months before the election. Now there is nothing being done about it. The Government does not know at all what to do about unemployment and does not seem to be able to cure it.

Another item that is missing and to which reference should be made is about this temperance business. I expected to see something about the abolition of the bottle a day. I know that some of the candidates especially the member for Trinity South when contesting the election canvassed with tears regarding the bottle a day. Still nothing is done about it. The Liberal Press brags about the fact that the revenue collected a quarter of a million dollars on the sale of liquor. If it was such a sin to have a law giving a bottle a day before the election surely it is a sin to have one now. A lady said to one of our lady canvassers that she would have to choose between the abolition of the bottle a day and Mr. Alderdice's honesty. Well we did not get prohibition.

There is one item that I welcome in the Speech from the Throne and will say a few words about it when I have the opportunity to do so, that is regarding doing something towards the encouragement of the fisheries. I know of no industry in the world where methods are so slack in the marketing and distribution as in the fishery. It is the same with supplies and raw materials. We must have some sort of standardization, we must have some means for the regulation of shipments. It is useless to attempt to fix prices. I hope the Commission will receive better consideration than the very same type of commission that was formed under Mr. Monroe. When that commission was formed all the members were willing to serve except the members of the opposition. They refused to serve and the consequence was that the commission never functioned properly. The members of the opposition will now help in any way that is for the good of the country.

The financial situation appears to have improved thanks to the great work of the Minister of Finance and

Customs in collecting every dollar possible and holding every dollar that he gets and so reducing the deficit. I wish to point out that the deficit was not created during my administration but during the time of my predecessors. It is very excellent for the Minister of Finance and Customs to attempt to balance his budget. If I were in his place I would be very happy if I could reach it in 1931. The figures quoted from the Speech from the Throne in connection with the production of iron ore from Bell Island has nothing to do with the present Government, but it is an indication that if any industry is let alone and receives fair play it is going to expand. That is the reason why the Bell Island people were able to increase the output of ore. Unless the people have confidence in the Government that they will be let alone it is just as well to close up business. By far the greatest thing in business is stability and tranquility. The same applies to Corner Brook and Grand Falls as well as Bell Island or for that matter any other industry.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as far as the members of the opposition go all criticism will be of a constructive nature. We were sent here by the people to help in the making of laws for the good of the country and that will be my attitude and the attitude of my followers during the coming session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in extending to you hearty congratulations upon your appointment as Speaker of this House.

With an eminent scholastic career behind you, a high standing in your profession, representing a constituency which was won in spite of overwhelming odds, I feel that you have a career before you of which this

may be a worthy step as a beginning. Newfoundland has had many distinguished men occupying the speakership of this House—Political leaders, Supreme Court judges, men who have taken high rank in finance, men outside of Newfoundland and leaders here, doing honour to themselves and to us, have been identified with the Speaker's Chair of this House. Then we only hope, Sir, that not only will you maintain the traditions of this House with much credit to yourself, but will have such honourable successes in your career as have been handed down to you as examples.

I wish to join with the Leader of the Opposition and would say that I want to heartily congratulate Capt. Parsons the member for Bay Roberts on his capable speech and also Mr. Fudge, the member for Hermitage. They come to this House as new men—new men to politics certainly, but able men from the standpoint of knowledge of the country's affairs and particularly of that branch to which considerable attention must be paid—the fisheries. Both have proved their ability as fish producers and have considerable knowledge of all fishery matters. In the common everyday duties of human life, the codfishery or the herring fishery, in connection with the supply business these two gentlemen are not only a strength to the Government party but to the Legislature, because of their wide and mature experience and ability which they have displayed this afternoon to put their thoughts into words in the hearing of their fellows so that we may reap benefit of their wisdom by their speeches.

I would like to extend a word of congratulation to the Leader of the Opposition.

I think this is the first time that the Honourable gentleman has had a seat in this Chamber and we wel-

come him as he takes over his onerous duties in the Council of the country, in the House of Representatives, in the formal and official capacity as leader of the party which he represents. Those of us who can look back upon more than twenty years in and out of this Chamber and in and out of the Legislative Council, realize the difficulty which a new-comer has in getting into the swing of public affairs.

It would be just as difficult for me to successfully take a sealing steamer to the ice in the place of, say, Capt. Parsons, as it would be for a new-comer to take charge of the affairs of this colony, as has been done during recent years and I feel sure that the training which my Honourable friend received in the Upper House for dealing with departmental matters, will be admired and as the years go on day by day he will be given a further training so that if by chance the people choose again to select his party in this country, he will be there to form the party and to be leader of it.

I want to thank Capt. Parsons of Bay Roberts for his reference to the desirability to so handle the Bell Island situation that the labourers on Bell Island may get fair wages.

We must remember that the producers of the world go first. The capitalists of the world come second both in time and fact. While the producer should be first the producer needs the help of the capitalist, for without him no venture would go on. No venture will be undertaken, however adventurous the producer may be, without the aid of the capitalist; so, neither can move anywhere without the support of labour behind the venture. Labour is becoming more and more partner of capital and in Newfoundland the revenue in many cases would be larger if there was a partnership between capital and

labour in connection with our fishing industries.

I do not intend to make reference on this occasion to the political remarks with which the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was itemised, other than to say that when referring to the Speech from the Throne he omitted to say something which on every other occasion has been stated—that this is the worst Speech with which a session of the Legislature has been opened. This is the only occasion that it has ever been omitted during my twenty years experience.

One thing in the Speech from the Throne which, I think, is above all others, is, I think, worth while. I must sincerely tell you that I think the Speech from the Throne is a first class public document and as the debate goes ahead within the next few weeks I think members of the Chamber will recognize it. But there is one thing that I took occasion to mention at a very distinguished gathering last evening—the banquet of the Benevolent Irish Society—that should do much to revolutionize Newfoundland, industrially and commercially and to some extent socially. The proposed arrangements with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company under a provisional contract, which will be submitted to you on Monday. There will be a connection from Ireland to the bottom of Conception Bay and from the bottom of Conception Bay to Nova Scotia.

Certainly not only will we have the opportunity of large development, not only will our boys and girls have a chance to get a world touch and a chance to obtain employment, just as through the Cable Companies, but we will have the opportunity of being in direct touch with trade telephonic conversations of the world. Just as Newfoundland has already through the Anglo-American Telegraph Co.

and the Commercial Cable Co., been brought into closer touch with the markets, through those services and the telephone intercourse direct business will be carried on, and we hope in years to come to communicate with our various markets without difficulty and to have a system whereby a gentleman sitting in his office at the Ropewalk will have an opportunity of speaking to his suppliers in some markets in New York or London.

I do feel that idea coupled with the long distance telephones in Newfoundland will be one great thing which will help keep the country on the map and put it on the map, that is well worthy of the position that we hold geographically, of being the stepping-stone between the Old World and the New.

I do not propose to enter on the debate on the Speech from the Throne which is before the House, but I do want to feel as we approach the various problems day by day during the next few weeks there will be a close earnest co-operation between the Opposition and the Government, so that we may get the very best that there is out of every mind, so that the best can be obtained for the development, advancement, upbuilding and upkeep in this our common cause, the country in which we live.

The motion being put, was then carried, and it was ordered that Messrs Parsons, Fudge, Greene, Winter and Puddester be the Committee to draft an Address in Reply.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills:

A Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Air Navigation."

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 9, entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors."

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 6, entitled "An Act to Regulate Traffic in Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon."

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 12 George V., Chapter 13, entitled 'An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's.'"

A Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Resolutions:

To move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions Respecting an agreement between the Government and the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., Ltd.

To move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to an Amendment to the Act 19 George V., Chapter 18, entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow move that Supply be granted His Majesty.

Hon. Dr. Mosdell gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmacuetical Society and Sale of

Drugs.'"

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, April 22nd, 1929.

The House met at 3 o'clock pursuant to adjournment.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTION

MR. GRIMES.—I ask leave to present a copy of Resolutions to this House, Resolutions that were passed at a public meeting that was held in the Pitts Memorial Hall on March 20th, I will read to the House what these Resolutions contain:

Reads:

I may say that I was present at that meeting which was largely attended, in fact there was a very big crowd, mostly women, and the Resolutions were adopted unanimously. Since then endorsement has been given to these Resolutions by the President of the Presbyterian Ladies' Aid Society, by the Wesley Ladies' Aid Society, by the Cochrane Street W.M.S. Ladies' College Aid Society, by the St. Thomas Women's Association, by the Cochrane Street Women's Association and the George's Street Women's Association. In reference to these Resolutions, I would say this that it is quite true what they state, that in 1924, when the Bill was considered by this Legislature, representatives of the people,

not only of St. John's, but of the outports as well, presented themselves to a select committee that was appointed to consider the Bill. Despite the fact, that they had asked for time for consideration, the Bill was rushed through in eight or ten days, and such is the fate of all hasty legislation what we have had the experience of the last four years. The result has been anything but creditable to the Legislature who passed the Bill, or to the city itself or the country. Instead of, as was intended that there should be decreased drunkenness by the passing of this Bill, we have it increasing on a larger scale than ever, and the Court records have shown that the number of arrests for drunkenness increased from 700 the last year that the Prohibition Act was in force to 900 last year. Does not that tell the whole story. I venture to make this assertion to the House that if accommodation had been large enough at the penitentiary, there would be at least two or three hundred more down there, but the police do their best in dealing with those that they find the worse for liquor. They try to get their families to take them home or they take them home themselves. Now as to the poverty mentioned in the resolutions. There is no question whatever in the minds of right thinking people that poverty has increased in the city, during the last four years and while I do not state that all the poverty is due to increased drinking, I do say that the large portion is due to that. I know that by experience myself, and I know that those interested in the different organisations that have to do with relief in the city will bear out the statement made in the resolutions.

Now I am very glad to say here that the Government have for some time been considering legislation that will improve the conditions in the city so

far as the sale of alcoholic liquor is concerned. And I think that it is proposed at this session to introduce a bill that will reduce the number of days in each week on which liquor will be sold. So far as the principle of the resolutions is concerned the reduction of the number of days thereby decreasing the excessive drinking that has been going on will in part meet the request of the resolutions. I do not propose at the present moment to say anything further on this. There will be ample opportunity for me to say what I have to say when the bill has been brought forward to deal with these matters. I therefore ask that these resolutions be referred to the department to which they relate.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the resolutions now before the House. I may say that the Government has anticipated the petition and for some months have been considering certain amendments to the Alcoholic Liquors Act. We realize, as any reasonable minded person must, having in mind the excessive conditions prevailing, that there is too much liquor being consumed and has been consumed in this city. There is a notice of motion on the order paper to-day asking for amendment to the Alcoholic Liquor Act, which I think in some measure at least will meet the requests of the petitioners. It may not meet the requests of ardent prohibitionists, but it will meet the requests of reasonable ones. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the prayer of the petitioners, as expressed in these resolutions now before the House. There is not a member in this Legislature, nor any person present this afternoon but knows that the amount of strong liquor consumed by

some people is neither to their own advantage nor to the advantage of the people who happen to be associated with them. It is a question that is difficult to solve, but I hope that whatever will be done by this legislature will be of a material nature. I hope that when the bill is presented that it will meet with the support of all the members of this House, whether on this side or on the opposite side, and that those working for the cause of temperance will have their request met to a certain degree. I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

PETITIONS.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Winterton, Trinity Bay South on the subject of a road. The road referred to is one which it is very necessary should be repaired and improved for the petitioners, leading as it does not only to the agricultural part of Winterton, but it also serves two cemeteries. This road has been terribly neglected during the past few years although numerous petitions have been presented on the matter, and it is now my privilege to request for my constituents at Winterton that this time they be given consideration and not have their petition relegated to the waste paper basket. The sum required for this road is in the vicinity of \$500.00 and I beg leave to refer the matter to the Department to which it relates, with the hope that it will receive the support of the Government.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to present a petition from the fishermen of St. Phillip's, Conception Bay relative to section 12, in particular of the new regulations brought in force by the Marine and Fisheries Department in reference to salmon fishing. It is signed by sixty-six names which I think is the whole fishing population there. I also understand that in a few other sections

petitions are being formulated to be sent for the urgent consideration of the House. Salmon fishing is a very important industry, only emphasised by the fact of its short duration. I have been assured by the Sports Organisations who made the recommendation to the Marine and Fisheries Department that their recommendation has either been misconstrued or else that it was more or less ambiguous. But it certainly was not their intention to have a clause such as Clause twelve inserted in the regulations which made the lifting of salmon nets from midnight on Saturday to Midnight on Sunday, general throughout the Island.

Everybody knows that there are many stretches of shore where salmon abound for a time and no river whatever in the vicinity.

But the idea that the Sports Organisations had in mind was in connection with the nets placed in the estuaries or mouths of rivers. That they should be lifted during certain periods to allow the salmon free access to the rivers during that period.

The salmon nets to which I refer are well out to sea and it is with great difficulty, in fact sometimes, owing to the inclement weather it is almost impossible to raise them. People therefore have taken cognizance of the fact that the act is too stringent. It had been argued that salmon remaining in the nets after a particular time are unsuitable for fresh fish consumption. But it is a fact that this fish is very easily cured and can be made marketable in that way. Smoked or salted it would be a very nice source of income to the fishermen engaged in this industry.

I think it is the duty of every government to boost an industry as far as it is intelligently possible, and I think that in this particular case that too strigent regulations have

been made. I think, to bear out the Sports recommendations that if the nets were raised in the mouths of the rivers it would be something to start with, and if that was found not conducive to the good of the industry and if the salmon were not propagating as it was hoped then more stringent regulations could be brought in. I think it is going to affect the salmon fishing this year to a great extent and it will react on the people interested. I therefore recommend it to the very close consideration of the Government.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the petition just presented by the member for St. John's West, extern. One of the reasons why I think that this law should be amended is because laws should be carefully made and strictly enforced, and from my experience I know that it is impossible to enforce the law under section twelve of this act. Suppose a fisherman sets his net and one or two hours afterwards these nets are from two to five fathoms under the water with tide, how can that fisherman take his net up, following circumstances of that nature. Then you have the diminished earnings of the fisherman to take into consideration. The argument that if there is any salmon in the nets before Saturday, it cannot be exported in a fresh form, does not hold because the fisherman has means whereby that fish can be preserved and marketed as pickled or tinned salmon. I believe that protection is quite in order, as far as that is concerned. I believe that the people had this in mind in the beginning and they felt that there was need for some sort of protection but do not see why the Government should see fit either through carelessness on the part of themselves or through lack of knowledge of conditions, to permit these regulations to pass and be imposed on

the fishermen who are powerless to act under existing conditions.

I have a telegram here now from my district, Bonavista South, which supplies a large proportion of the fresh salmon which we export. It is signed by sixty names, and it says: "The whole district is against such a law. We want it cancelled."

If the question of protection for salmon is under consideration we would do well to take a leaf out of the book of other countries that have had this matter under consideration for a considerable number of years. They have gone so far in the Territory of Alaska as to construct weirs on a number of rivers and they have men there checking the number of salmon going through. We have a number of streams in this country where obstructions are found to the detriment of the salmon entering the rivers. It is time that the Marine and Fisheries Department in this Government or in some other government took some cognizance of the fact that Newfoundlanders ought to know more about the products of their country than they have known in the past. I trust that the Department of Marine Fisheries and the Government will see their way clear to have this section twelve amended and suitably amended, so that these unfair restrictions so obviously apparent in possible enforcement will not react upon the men who are the mainstay of the country the fishermen.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the petition presented by the honourable member for St. John's West extern. There are two places in my district, Old Perlican and Daniel's Cove that these regulations hit very hard. I give the department of Marine and Fisheries credit for acting in good faith and I give them credit also for trying to protect the salmon fishing, but I

think that they have gone a little bit too far in this instance. I do not think that it is humanly possible for people who have salmon nets in the water, to remove these nets before twelve o'clock on Saturday night and put them out again after twelve on Sunday night, and secure a catch of salmon between that and nine o'clock on Monday morning when the train leaves for the city.

Up in Old Perlican last week where people are quite used to having their nets out early in the spring, they had their nets out there last week, and they were supposed to take their nets out of the water before twelve o'clock on Saturday night. It was a bad evening to have to go out on the water. They sent in word to the responsible persons and told them that it was a great hardship to have to take up the nets that evening. I understand that they got word that according to the law and the regulations, the nets had to come out of the water, before twelve o'clock on Saturday night. The fishermen of Old Perlican and Daniel's Cove take their salmon out of their nets on Monday morning, and some of the salmon are on the train at nine o'clock coming in for the market. And if they do not catch the train on Monday morning, they cannot get in their salmon before next Wednesday morning. On account of the putting down of the nets in the water after twelve o'clock on Sunday night or early Monday morning, they will not have any salmon to send in on Monday morning, and the people of that vicinity at any rate will be out of pocket. They get little enough for the fish when they catch it, but if they are deprived of the Monday morning catch during the months of May and June and a part of July, then it will be very bad for those people, and I think that these regulations have gone a little bit too far. You will be de-

priving these people of at least one fifth of their earning power because it is absolutely impossible to get their salmon nets in the water on Monday morning early enough to catch salmon and catch the train that goes out to bring the fish into St. John's.

Because of these reasons and for a number of other reasons that I am not going to relate, I beg to give this petition my hearty support.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Following the notice we have just received from the Legislative Council on the address of congratulation to His Majesty the King, passed at the opening Session on Wednesday last, I beg to move that the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

Reads.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I beg to second that motion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to move that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting their concurrence.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I beg to second that motion.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions Respecting "An agreement between the Government and the American Telegraph and Telephone Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this contract will be entered upon along the same lines as previous contracts with the Anglo and Commercial Cables Companies. They will undertake to land cables in the foot of Conception Bay and take them

out again in St. Mary's or Placentia Bay and connect them up in some part of Nova Scotia, thus establishing telephone connections across the Atlantic. Whether there will be one or a half dozen cables will depend, of course, on business and costs, and such things as will go to make it a successful enterprise. They will undertake to pay a landing tax of four thousand dollars per cable, each end of the cable will be taxed so as not to conflict with the previous decisions of the Courts as to whether each end of the cable could be considered a separate cable. The company undertakes this special provision because it may mean that a special cable will have to be laid from Nova Scotia to Newfoundland if it is found that the cable cannot be broken here. If so they undertake to lay another cable in order that Newfoundland may have telephonic connection. There are no special provisions regarding the entry duty free of any materials except the cable themselves and the special bulbs used in connection with the operation of the service. I may say that the Government considers it advisable to have the cable imported duty free rather than have the cable come in in bond as it will obviate the necessity of the company being bothered with customs invoices, etc. The cables will in all probability be landed in the bottom of either Conception, St. Mary's or Placentia Bay.

MR. ALDERDICE—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Prime Minister to postpone further debate regarding this Bill until the members of the Opposition have had opportunity to consider its provisions.

The Committee rose reported having considered the matter to them referred reported progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I wish to direct the attention of Honourable Members to a statement by my predecessor of certain general propositions for guidance in framing questions. You will find the statement to which I refer on Page 69 of 1926 Hansard.

Under Rule 92 of the Rules of the House questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned. This rule, if strictly construed, is narrow and would greatly limit the class of question which may be asked. There is, however, an inherent right in members to ask questions of Ministers of the Crown and rule 92 is declaratory of a right already existing and it is not exclusive, that is it does not limit that right.

However, there are certain definite limitations upon the right of members to ask questions and I wish to refer you to the page of 1926 Hansard above referred to, and to May's Parliamentary procedure of 12th Edition Pages 223-5. Because of the limitations laid down by the authorities it is necessary for the Speaker to examine the notices of questions with a view to disallowing improper questions. The practice has been since 1926 to submit questions in duplicate to the Clerk at the table, the Clerk retaining one copy and forwarding the other to the Speaker for his consideration.

I wish to say that very often comprehensive questions are asked intended to illicit quite an amount of information and quite a number of facts. Such comprehensive questions are sometimes irregular because some of the facts are not properly demandable. I may suggest that a certain amount of information may generally be had by asking suitable questions.

Attention should be directed particularly to 1926 Hansard page 70 where the statement is made "No question can be asked which reflects upon the character or conduct of a member, or which implies charges of a personal character and no question should be asked which tends to prejudice a pending trial." In May's Parliamentary procedure at page 224 it is stated that a question which might prejudice a pending trial should not be asked.

QUESTIONS.

MR. SULLIVAN—1. To ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence between his Department and any other Department, or person or persons in connection with the removal of the Fog Alarm from Jude Island.

2. And to furnish this House with a copy of report made by Police Officer in charge of the contingent that went to Jude Island in connection with the dismantling of the Fog Alarm.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I think the second part of that question must be disallowed.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Might I be permitted to ask the Minister of Justice if he would have any objection to giving the Members of the House that information confidentially?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You have disallowed the question, Mr. Speaker?

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I take it on myself to disallow the question. The report of a police officer is a privileged document, and I think the making of it public is contrary to public policy.

MR. SULLIVAN—I fully appreciate that certain matters may not be made public as contrary to public policy, but I would like to have the information

given in confidence outside the House by the Prime Minister if he would do that. I do not see that there could be any objection to that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The matter is a little awkward in this way. The police are investigating reports of certain inflammatory messages sent by persons in St. John's to other persons up there. If those reports be true, which I may say I very much doubt, and it be found that messages of the character intimated were sent, the persons responsible would have to be sent before a Magistrate for his preliminary hearing on a very serious charge. I do not believe that the reports are true, but they are being investigated, and so of course we would rather not enter into any controversy on the matter until we have had an opportunity of considering the cases and deciding whether they should be submitted to a Magistrate or not. There is another matter; there were certain ringleaders in connection with the affair and it might be necessary to have those ringleaders proceeded against in the due course of the administration of justice. It would be prejudicial to the interests of those parties to have police reports discussed in the House. I would be glad to discuss the matter personally with Mr. Sullivan, but would do so only on the clear understanding that the matter would not be debated here and the information would not be used by him in any way not in accordance with our duty of protecting the interests of those men that might be proceeded against on the one hand and the administration of justice by the Department on the other. The Honorable Member will understand that a police report is an entirely confidential document on which the freedom of the subject depends. The matter is very serious and the decision whether there should or should not be prosecutions

rests with the Department of Justice. I might say the decision will be made with all due regard to the unfortunate circumstances of the case and the political agitation arising in connection with the matter and there will be no step taken of a harsh nature. Any violation of the law will be looked at in view of the circumstances in the most lenient manner possible, but there are certain bounds beyond which leniency cannot go and there may possibly be arrests made. I would be glad to give the information privately to Mr. Sullivan.

As to the first part of the question no correspondence whatever passed to my personal knowledge, but I have asked my secretary to go through the files to see if there should be anything. I received personally a large number of telegraph messages addressed to me as Prime Minister in connection with the matter. When I found so many messages coming in I drafted this reply and gave it to my secretary and told him to send it as a stereotyped reply to all messages.

(Reads reply and it is tabled.)

I do not know who sent messages as I did not see the greater part of them but my secretary may be able to obtain a list of parties sending those messages.

MR. SULLIVAN—I quite appreciate that it may not be in the best interests of all parties in certain cases to make such matters public and I accept the Speaker's ruling. I thank the Prime Minister for an opportunity of reading the report privately.

MR. EMERSON.—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs whether any party or parties who have heretofore acted as agents for the sale of Alcoholic Liquors to the Board of Liquor Control have recently interviewed him in connection with the loss of their agencies and the causes of such loss and if so, to lay

on the table of the House a statement in connection with such interviews, and to table all correspondence in connection therewith.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am unable to give very exact information as to people coming to see me in reference to their losing their agencies. There were several interviews. Various persons called to see me. I distinctly remember two or three. Mr. Bennett, the Honorable Member for St. John's West (Extern) called to see me, and Mr. Tobin, Member for St. John's East (Extern) I didn't take down any of the particulars of their interviews consequently I haven't any statement to table in connection with them; neither have I any correspondence except that they showed me some copies of messages they had from firms on the other side.

MR. EMERSON.—1. To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a complete statement in relation to 200 cases of Teachers Whiskey recently landed ex S.S. incemore, and confiscated by the Hon. Minister, stating the reasons for such confiscation and to give an account of interviews held with him by any party or parties who owned or represented or purported to represent the owners of the consignment, and to accompany such statement with all correspondence and other documents relative thereto.

2. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Minister against the owners or others in relation thereto.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I feel that this question should be disallowed. It is a very comprehensive question; and it may prejudice persons not Members of this House and who may be proceeded against by the Customs or Justice Department. Besides I understand under the Customs Act there is a quasi judicial proceeding for

about thirty days subsequent to the seizure, from which there may be an appeal to the Supreme Court. I suggest that some information be obtained, all cannot be obtained and I am prepared to rule against the question in the interests of other parties not here in the House who may be prejudiced. I disallow the first part of the question. The second part may be asked.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Deputy Minister of Customs has given notification in the ordinary way; has given thirty days notice in connection with the matter.

MR. EMERSON—How soon will it be before we know whether it is going into Court?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—When the thirty days expire; thirty days from the time of notification.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—These people have a right to demand the reasons for the seizure of the goods. That demand is made on the Deputy Minister of Customs, who refers it back to the Department of Justice for his advice as to the legal points involved. When all the evidence has been collected a report is made to the Minister of Customs, who refers the matter to a Select Committee.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General and the Minister of Finance have confined themselves entirely to question of procedure under the Customs Act. But what about the procedure under the Prohibition Act, of which the Minister of Customs is the legal head. May I ask what steps have been taken against the owners of the liquor, steps which could be taken under the Prohibition Act.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Honourable Member,

I may say in connection with this matter that no steps have been taken to my knowledge by this department under the Liquor Act. The steps have been taken under the Customs Act. The Liquor Department did not know anything about it until the Customs had taken the necessary steps.

MR. EMERSON.—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to make a statement of all information which he or the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control, has in connection with the proposal recently on foot to establish a Bottling Plant in St. John's for the bottling of Alcoholic Liquors to be sold to and by the Board of Liquor Control.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, neither myself or the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board have any information officially or otherwise in connection with the alleged project on foot for the establishment of a bottling plant in St. John's.

Question No. 14, Tabled.

Question No. 15, Tabled.

Question No. 16, Tabled.

MR. WINTER.—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs whether the Board of Liquor Control has, since the 13th day of November, 1928 purchased any Alcoholic Liquor out of stocks of liquor imported for storage in transit, and if so whether it has been called to the attention of the Hon. the Attorney General, as such sale is contrary to the provisions of the Alcoholic Liquors Act, and whether any steps have been taken to prosecute the Vendors.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is "yes." I may say that prior to my assumption of the office of Finance Minister there was a standing order by my predecessors in office that they could allow the

Liquor Department to purchase, from certain people who had liquor in bond, out of that bonded warehouse. When I took charge of that office I knew nothing about it. And the first intimation that I had was when one hundred cases of loquor were purchased by Mr. Mifflin out of that bonded warehouse. It was drawn to my attention. I sent for the officer and asked by whose instructions he had allowed the delivery of that liquor and he told me that certain of my predecessors and particularly Sir John Crosbie had given him instructions to allow liquor to be sold out of bond and to the Liquor Controller's Department, and I immediately gave instructions that he was not to allow it any more and these instructions are on file in the Custom House at the present time.

Question No. 18, Deferred.

Question No. 19, Deferred.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bills entitled:

"An Act respecting Air Navigation."

"An Act to Amend Cap 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act respecting Alcoholic Liquors.'"

"An Act to Amend Act 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

"An Act to Amend Act 12, George V., Chapter 13, entitled 'An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal affairs of the town of St. John's.'"

"An Act relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment," were introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order 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 in relation to

an amendment to the Act 19, George V., Chapter 18, entitled "An Act relating to the raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

The Committee rose reported having considered the matter to them referred and passed same without amendment.

On motion this report was adopted and it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs,'" was introduced, read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs Supply was granted His Majesty.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs,'" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Skeans gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 24th, 1929.

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

MR. K. BROWN—I beg leave to present a Petition from the residents of Twillingate in the District of Twillingate, asking that a light be placed on Smart's Island, Bonavista District, as an aid to navigation. With your permission I would ask the Clerk to read the Petition.

Clerks Reads:

MR. BROWN.—I am very reluctant to present a Petition from the people of Twillingate asking that a light be placed somewhere in Bonavista District, but that is owing to the fact many Mariners in the District of Twillingate have to travel that route in all seasons of the year, particularly in the late season of the year around about December and during January month, and as a rule when vessels leave St. John's in the morning their first port is Catalina, and the next day they leave and get around Grant's Point to Sheldon Cove. It has often been the case, that vessels running on the land on the North Side of Bonavista Bay find it advisable to pick up the land, consequently they have to heave to and they often have to take quite a drubbing, and in some cases the vessel is lost and all hands. These in all good faith are petitioning the Government that a Light be placed on Smart's Island, Bonavista Bay for the safety of Mariners who have to travel that coast, particularly during the late season of the year. I trust that this Petition will receive the consideration it deserves. During the past four and half years, I presented something like sixty-four Petitions in this House, all of these have been consigned to the wastepaper basket, and not one of these saw light of day in passing from this House to the Department to which it relates. I ask that

the Government see their way clear to grant the request of the petitioners and that the Petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Stephenville Crossing in the District of Port au Port. The petition is signed by over two hundred residents of that place. When the railway went through there some years ago the Government in charge of the country at the time gave away a parcel of land to the Reid Newfoundland Company. It is hard to understand why any Government would be so short sighted as to give away land. At the present time it is badly needed there by the people for there is a dearth of a wood supply there. The people need wood for their houses, fences, boats and most of all for firewood. This is the largest settlement in the District of Port au Port. The people there are most industrious and earn their livelihood by fishing and farming. I would like to draw this to the attention of the Honourable Member for St. George's who represented this District and did quite a lot to relieve the situation.

I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Agriculture and Mines and that it be given full consideration.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, in connection with this petition I would say that unfortunately when the Railway contract was being signed Port au Port was very badly treated by the then Government. The Reid blocks were given continuous to high water mark. The timber remaining beyond what was covered by the Reid blocks was very scant and was all cut out during the time I was representing the District.

I succeeded in making arrangement whereby they could cut over the Reid block for a time, but I think that ar-

rangement has been rescinded. From what I know of the District the people there are very badly placed in respect of wood. At the present time there is an absolute dearth of fire-wood. Owing to the increased demand for wood the far sighted ones during the last few years are seeking grants of woodlands in many localities and are endeavouring to take up all the wood possible to make provision for the shortage that must come in the near future, it is becoming more and more difficult for people so placed as those in Port au Port to get a supply for their wants.

I don't know what remediable measure it might be possible to take, but certainly the people there are in need of some assistance in this respect.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Committee appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's most gracious Speech from the Throne.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would postpone the Debate on the Address in Reply until the other matters on the Order Paper have gone through.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Certainly we will postpone it until the Order Paper generally has been disposed of.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Laid on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1928. And in doing so begged to call the attention of the House to a clause there submitted by Professor Sleggs.

Reads:

During the last few days we have had several petitions with regard to the new salmon regulations. Since the country seems so much opposed to

them as they are at the present time, I propose to make some amendments which are now before the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Laid on the table of the House the public accounts of the Colony for the year ending last June.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Laid on the table of the House the report of the Superintendent of the Poor Asylum.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order 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 respecting "An Agreement between the Government and the American Telegraph and Telephone Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

I wish to point out the outstanding strength of the company and to give a brief outline as published in the report issued by the company in January last. In this connection I would like to call the attention of the House to the high financial standing as set out in the Financial Section of the New York Times of the issue of April 14th last.

Reads:

I also have here the annual report of the company for the year ending 1927 which was kindly lent me by my friend the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia. I will lay it on the table for the benefit of the members of the House. I may say that for the year ending December 31st, 1928 the assets of the company amounted to two

thousand two hundred and thirteen million dollars. In dealing with such a corporation I think we may be safe in saying that it will be able to carry out its undertakings.

MR. ALDERDICE—Mr. Chairman, I have not the slightest doubt about what the Honourable the Prime Minister has been so strongly advocating with regard to the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, but he has not said one word about what Newfoundland will get as a result of these resolutions. As far as I can see the only use they have been, has been to enable him to make two very fine after dinner speeches. He says that the company is still in the experimental stage now and therefore I do not see why we should tie ourselves to it. We should have something definite before we committ ourselves. We are exactly in the same position as when the cable companies came to the country. We came out the wrong end of that transaction. We are expending over \$16,000.00 a year in keeping up a line for them. They paid the \$60,000.00 for the marine cable and we are paying them back at the rate of \$4,000.00 per year for fifteen years. I think that from experience we should go extremely slow in tying ourselves up with this cmopany. We can see nothing in it for ourselves but there may be a very great deal in it for the American Telephone Company. For that reason I do not think the time opportune.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman why is the honourable the leader of the Opposition so strong in his criticism as to the resolutions put before the House in connection with the wisdom of making arrangements with a cable company. With regard to what he has just quoted he is absolutely in error. It was only this afternoon that I tabled a reply to Question numbered 19 asked by Mr. Sullivan, the Hon-

ourable Member for Placentia (West) giving the amount received from the Commercial Cable Company. The reply is—

Reads:

For the fiscal year ending 1928 the amount of \$35,220.10 was received by the Government.

MR. ALDERDICE—What about our having to keep the line up at our own cost? Who will have to keep up the line for them?

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, we have to keep seven or eight of our own wires and we permit them to put a line on our poles. Yes, we have to keep up our own lines.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw attention to section three of the resolutions and section eight—

Reads:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
The cables come in and will be ditched across from one bay to another. It will probably come in at Conception Bay entry and go out in Placentia Bay or St. Mary's Bay, the location being chosen by the company's engineers. It will come across the ocean from Ireland and from America and then will be ditched across the land. There will be erected here the branch offices at the ends of the line. Only the machinery will come in duty free. The life of the special X-ray bulbs depends like the radio tubes upon the electric current whether they will be burnt out in a few hours or days. The company will have to erect at one of these places, to be chosen by the engineers, a huge water tank in which will be kept the spare cable that comes in and is put in that tank. This comes in duty free. It is just the same arrangements as are in use with the telephone accessories and strictly along the lines of of the Avalon Telephone Company and the Commercial and all companies doing business here.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the resolutions now before the chair, the benefit to be derived from this agreement is negligible. Even if the company operates in Newfoundland I yet fail to see how there is to be any benefit in it for Newfoundland. We will have to take that with a grain of salt. As far as I can see there will be nothing outside the \$4,000.00 paid on every cable, that is \$20,000.00. Of course we all know that the company is trying to get in here owing to the geographical position of Newfoundland. It is the landing place of all cable connections with the old and the new world.

Personally, I do not see very much harm in the bill now before the Chair, provided, a few safe guards are added. Certain exemptions should be made in duty clauses, such as all hand tools, picks, shovels, axes, wheel barrows, etc., should not be admitted duty free.

Within the last four or five years all new Companies starting had to pay duty on hand tools and coal. In some cases there is a duty of 50c. per ton on coal plus the sales tax, manufacturing concerns have tried to get in without paying the sales tax, in view of the fact, that they could not compete with similar industries in Canada unless they had the sales tax removed.

I was rather surprised at the Prime Minister a few days ago when he was referring to the Speech from the Throne. He told the House that the getting of this Company in to Newfoundland was a great thing. We would like to be convinced of that, and let him explain in what way it is going to be such a tremendous benefit. He did hint, that there would be employment for a large number of our young men and women with the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, if they were established in Newfoundland. I am afraid he is an Optimist. I do not think the fishermen

of this country are likely to go in raptures over this wonderful telephonic cable we are expecting to get. Not many of our fishermen will be in a position to pay probably \$5.00 a minute to telephone to Canada or the States, very few of them will telephone to Glouster captains to ask if there is any chance of a job.

No doubt it would be a very good thing for the American Telegraph & Telephone Company, if their experiments are successful and they are able to provide telephonic cable connecting up the old and new world. They are not building this cable for any business they may get in Newfoundland as that would not be worth considering, they are using Newfoundland simply as a landing stage for their cables. The Geographical position of Newfoundland makes it very important for the landing of cables. Up to the present time no Company has been successful in making cables that will suit for telephonic communication between the old world and the new. The Western Union Cable Company laid a cable last year to the Azores, this cable I understand cost \$1,000,000 and to lay a similar cable from the coast of Newfoundland to Ireland would cost \$2,000,000. The cables mentioned would not do for telephonic communication. It is quite probable, that a cable—if the experiments the Company are making prove successful—would cost, at least, \$5,000,000, and probably more, so it looks as if the cost of cables for telephonic communication is bound to be very expensive for many years to come.

In a way, it will be a certain benefit to Newfoundland if they are successful in their experiments and they are able to provide a cable to do the work expected.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—They are making them now.

MR. SULLIVAN—As I said before the cost of telephonic communication

is going to be high. I propose to vote for the bill provided a few amendments are made.

The Prime Minister told us about two large stations that were to be built, one in Conception Bay and one at the bottom of St. Mary's or Placentia Bay, I do not think there will be a station built at each place, it will probably be the same as Bay Roberts, where the Western Union Cable Co. cable landed. It is true they will probably establish one cable office, but the men employed will have to be skilled men. How so many young men and women are to be employed I am at a loss to know.

MR. Chairman, with reference to the clause in this bill which provides for the building of Internal Telephone Line. I feel that the cost of building this line for the business it would be likely to secure would be excessive. I take it, that the Avalon Telephone Company, are not prepared to connect a long distance telephone from the Avalon Peninsula to Grand Falls, and even if they did we have no reason to suppose that the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, and the International Power & Paper Co. of Newfoundland, Ltd., would be prepared to link up their telephone line at their own expense. As the amount of local telephone business that the American Telegraph and Telephone Company would secure in Newfoundland would be very small at the rates they would have to charge, I do not think it would be worth considering. Then, again, I would like to point out that if the Government built a Telephone line across country to secure this local business, they will be competing with their own telegraph system. It seems to me unfair to build lines or subsidize companies to compete with our own Postal Telegraph system.

Mr. Chairman, personally, I want to go on record and want it to be un-

derstood that I am not here to play politics, and I want to help the Government, and any legislation that I believe is for the interest of the country I am going to support, and anything I believe is injurious I am going to vote against it. There are members sitting on the Government side of the House that know my record in other Governments. When I was in the Opposition I voted for measures that the present Prime Minister supported because I believed in them, I also voted against measures when I believed they were injurious. That is the kind of criticism I gave in the past; and that is the kind of criticism I intend to give in the future. Constructive criticism not destructive. I regret exceedingly that Doctor Campbell, should be so unfortunate as to bring party politics into this discussion. It does not matter what the Squires Government, or the Monroe Government or the Alderdice Government or any other Government did in the past, and perhaps they all made mistakes, as everyone makes mistakes once in a while, but from now on let us be more or less united and be big and broad enough and let us do the best we can in the best interest of this country, to get the best legislation we can. So far the criticism that has been given by this side of the House has not been harsh, we have only endeavoured to protect the country from something that may happen in years to come.

In the past, Government's have been criticized for rushing legislation through. We are not going to hold you up, then again, we are not going to rush legislation through, we want a reasonable time to study and understand the meaning of the different clauses of the different bills. Let us in future, cut out politics, it is going to do no good, and it is something I have always kept clear of during the

period I have been in the House. I have given decent and fair criticism and I have not been vindictive, and that is the policy I intend to pursue, and I trust that the Members on the Government side of the House will do the same and not show a bad example to the number of new Members who have taken their seats for the first time in the House of Assembly this session. I know it is hard for some of the old timers to show a good example to the new men who are taking their seats in this House for the first time this Session. You are calling us on the Opposition side of the House Tories. Many men who are to-day on the Government side of the House have been Tories in the past when it suited them and they are now Liberals—as a matter of fact, there are only two of the old Liberals in this House; namely Dr. Barnes and myself, we stood by Sir Robert Bond, until he was driven out of politics by the men who now call themselves Liberals. As far as I can see there is little or no difference between the Liberal and Tory in this country to-day, instead of Liberal and Tory of to-day it is the ins and outs.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I have no private motive in bringing up this matter of the importation of goods similar to those manufactured in this country and coming in under free entry; we must all recognize the fact that local industries ought to get fair and reasonable protection if the manufacturing industry is to survive. I know of the benefits local manufacturers give and in the main their ambitions are to get no more than sufficient protection to enable them to pay their employees fair and decent wages in order that they and their families may live in comfort and contentment and that the enterprise may pay a fair profit.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I do not see very much harm in this proposed bill, provided a few little safeguards are put in it. All the companies for whom legislation was passed in the last few years had to pay a duty on all coal imported. That was one thing that they were not allowed to get in duty free.

I was rather surprised at the Prime Minister the other day, when referring to the Speech from the Throne, he told the House that this is one of the greatest things for Newfoundland, the getting of this company here. I would like the Prime Minister to convince us of that. Then he told us about the number of people that were going to be employed. In fact none of our girls and boys will be going away any more. The fishermen of the country will be delighted when they hear about the wonderful telephonic cable that we are going to have. When they are out jigging squids they will be able to go ashore to a pay station and pay probably five dollars a minute, and ask a Gloucester captain if there is any chance of giving them a job. We can see the number of people that are going to get employment by that telephonic cable. It will be a nice thing for the company provided that the experiment is successful. At the present time they are not able to make a cable that will carry telephonic communication. I think that the cable that was laid last year by the Western Union and the Anglo American cost one million dollars and to construct a similar cable to go to Ireland will cost two millions. And it is not possible to send telephonic communication over one of those. They have not been able to make that kind of a cable yet.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—They are making them now.

MR. SULLIVAN—Then the cost is going to be pretty high. It will cost

probably five or six million dollars, to make a cable that will be able to send telephonic messages between Newfoundland and Ireland. And they won't be able to send the message very cheap. I am not saying that I will not vote for this bill. I propose to vote for it if two or three small amendments are made. The Prime Minister told us again about two big stations one in Conception Bay and the other at the other end of St. Mary's Bay or Placentia Bay. Why do they want one at both places. As far as the employment that is going to give it will be something like the Commercial Cable Company probably, or the Anglo American Company. They will establish good offices, and employ skilled men. How the ordinary people are going to get employment, I am at a loss to understand. If we could get the assurance that only material for the cable for the original construction, and for the extension of the same would be brought in that would be satisfactory. But we should not leave a loophole in this bill so that they could get anything they like in duty free. Hand tools should be dutiable, and there should be no possibility of their bringing in their coal supplies duty free. I don't think that those telegraph companies are going to use very much coal, but it is only reasonable to say that what is allowed in duty free should be mentioned in this bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Chairman, on the question of coal, it is agreed that that be inserted. On the question of hand tools, that is such as are manufactured in this country, that is also agreed.

I may say that this section is a replica of section eight of the acts of 1911, which we have on the Statute Book now, the Western Union Act of 1911, and the United States Direct Cables Act. Their section reads:—

Reads:

Our section reads:—

Reads.

The only difference between our duty clause and the free duty clause given by the Western Union of 1911 and the United States Direct Cables of 1911, is so as to make it clear that vacuum tubes are considered apparatus. The only reason why that extra clause was put in was that the questions might arise as to what was or was not apparatus in connection with the telephone.

MR. ALDERDYCE—Mr. Chairman, I would expect the Honourable the Minister of Finance and Customs to be more interested in his department than Galley 22

to let an ambiguous clause go through. He should be endeavouring to eliminate as much free entry as possible. It is not fair that these people can get their pick axes and shovels in duty free when any other man in the country has to pay duty.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is agreed if by hand tools is meant pick axes, shovels, etc.

MR. ALDERDYCE—My wording would be "Goods manufactured in the country or in common use in the country."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I could not accept that wording. Vacuum tubes are also in common use in the country. But if it means so that they cannot bring in wheel barrows, pick axes, etc., I am entirely agreeable to that.

MR. ALDERDYCE—You are dealing with a two million dollar company and they do not forget much.

MR. PUDDISTER—I would like to ask the Prime Minister, if he has figured out what the cost is going to be to the country after the two cables are in operation?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, they will be no cost to

the country at all. We have at the present time in Newfoundland three separate telephone systems. There is a rough telephone system operating by the government as the Bay of Islands Telephone System. There is the Anglo Postal operating over hundreds of miles by land. There is the system of the International Power and Paper Company operating over hundreds of miles. There is the Avalon Telephone Company in St. John's. It is the policy of the government and we have already started to secure technical information in that connection to ascertain whether it is not practically possible without substantial cost to the country to have these systems co-related, so that the merchant at Grand Falls would be able to talk over the wires to the merchant at St. John's or Corner Brook, etc. In this way also three or four separate organizations under separate ownership and control will be able by an understanding as to the rates, as between companies in Canada and the United States, make it possible to talk over a matter by long distance, so that a man in Grand Falls for instance, who wants to discuss stocks with the stock broker in Montreal or New York, the conversation will go on through the one center at St. John's which will be the trans-oceanic centre. The tolls will be divided up in accordance with the system of tolls in Canada and the United States, based on the distance which the message travels over the companies lines before entering the other people's. In Canada and the United States the whole thing is worked out on an elaborate and scientific basis. So that there is no charge on the country in this connection. We anticipate that there will be correlation between these several companies so that the proposition can be handled without a vote being passed annually in this legislature.

MR. PUDDISTER—Shall we have to build a line in Conception Bay?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, a line will have to be built, but whether it will be a private or a government venture is not a matter to be worked out until we see what progress can be made in connection with this development. Hon. Members opposite will notice that this contract is so worded that the Company will have to deal with the Government and not with the A.N.D. Co. at Grand Falls, not with the I. P. & P. Co. at Corner Brook and not with the Avalon Telephone Company at St. John's. They are three separate companies and three separate lines, but I feel there is a possibility of co-relating them and the Government will be responsible for bringing about such co-relation because, for instance the Avalon Telephone Co. may want a rate for itself over and above what they get at Grand Falls and over and above what the I. P. & P. Co. will get, so that no one person is interested in any one concern more than in any other. This is our own internal arrangement and if this thing goes through the problem of how somebody can co-relate these three companies so that one centre somewhere which would be the connecting point for long distance telephonic connection in and outside of Newfoundland would not be difficult to solve, and I felt in drafting this measure that the Government the ruling body, would be the negotiator to bring all those companies into one organization for the efficient handling of business over their own wires and the delivery of their own station messages.

MR. PUDDISTER—Have you asked these Companies if they are satisfied with your arrangement?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It has been informally and unofficially intimated to the Government that the

Companies are delighted with the arrangement. You cannot have telephonic connection unless the Companies are satisfied. For instance if I ask the Avalon Company to send a message through and they refuse to send it through I have no power to make them.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this internal line, I think that the cost of bringing this line through too excessive for the amount of business you are going to get, and I take it that the Avalon people are not prepared to connect up a telephone line with the A. N. D. Company. Furthermore, the outlay would be tremendous for the very little business to be done with the outside world by the I. P. and P. Company or the A. N. D. Company and it is not likely that their business here would attract the Avalon Company, if this Government or any future Government are going to build an internal line. Anyhow, what does it mean? You are spending more money to compete with your own telegraph line for all local business. I think this is very poor policy indeed on the part of the Government. Why should you assist in any way any Company or Corporation, much more subsidize them, to compete with your own telephone system. That you are competing with your own system enough already is a well known fact. The subsidizing of an outside Company is a retrogressive step and I trust that the matter will be looked into by the Prime Minister.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, I think a rather cramped and narrow view of this whole thing is taken by some Members opposite. We are entering upon an era of Trans-Atlantic Telephonic development. The world for the last ten years has advanced and are we prepared to let the present opportunity of advancing with the times pass by? We have here a

Company of huge capitalization, due to the policy of the Liberal Party—a policy that always stands for financial and industrial development—and are we prepared to take advantage of our geographical position half ways across the Atlantic? In this particular case business did not come to the Prime Minister; he went looking for business and Newfoundland is not giving anything, we are getting eight thousand dollars a year for two cables and here will be the amplifying centre for conversations between the Old World and the New World.

We are taking advantage then of our geographical position for making this an amplifying centre for trans-oceanic wireless telephony and it's our duty and your duty to take advantage of the opportunity that knocks at our doors, but not to be apathetic and indifferent and let the opportunity pass by, as has been done too often in the past.

I would ask Honourable Members to review with some of the enterprises and their histories of the past? In 1854 Peter Cooper and Cyrus Field started the project of laying the first trans-Atlantic cable, which was eventually connected up with Heart's Content, Newfoundland, to Valentia, Ireland, a distance of about two thousand miles. Before that project was consummated, everyone in the world almost considered it problematical, hypothetical and impossible. It was an innovation that was wrong. To-day I want to tell you, Sir, that there is enough of cables laying at the bottom of the ocean to go around the world eleven times.

My friend Mr. Sullivan cannot be convinced of the advantages to be derived by the inauguration of this new telephonic system in Newfoundland; rather is he interested in and takes the attitude, which is the attitude that all Tory Governments have taken, namely, that of opposing progress in this

country. In 1902, with the Tory Leader sitting in the Chair now occupied by the present Leader of the Opposition, the late Mr. McKay, a member of that Tory Party, was responsible for blocking the establishment of wireless communication in this country. Mr. McKay was a very fine and estimable gentleman, but the regret of my life was that he died a Tory. Now, if wireless was kept out of Newfoundland and passed us by in 1902, why should we allow this present opportunity of being linked up with the outside world by wireless telephony to pass our doors.

At the last Imperial Conference in London at which Mr. Monroe, ex Prime Minister of this country was present, Mr. Samuel Hoare endeavoured to make Newfoundland an aerial line for navigation. Montreal has it; but that opportunity was also allowed to pass us by. It seems to be the habit and the story of all Tory administrations to let anything that is worth while pass us by; but not so with Liberal administrations. The Liberals built the Railways, the Grand Falls industry, the Humber and everything else in this country that is of any account, whilst the Tories built the Hotel and the Dry Dock. However, it is not the policy of the present Liberal administration to knock down or burn down these Tory establishments because we got to feed their hungry mouths.

Now the benefit of this new telephonic system to Newfoundland is very great. It may be argued that it will cost a terrible lot of money. It may, but I want to remind the House that the first tolls by telegraph cost one hundred dollars for twenty words and five dollars for each additional word, and our present rates for Trans-Atlantic telephony do not compare with that. The advantage to Newfoundland of this new system is to give us money and to give us labour, and, on

account of our geographical position, we want to see the size of this project. I have hope in this thing, as Cyrus Field had in the laying of his first cables, and why deal in small change, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out. With this Trans-Oceanic telephony started the Leader of the Opposition can any day ring up Berlin, New York or Paris, if he has any friends at those places, because according to the ballot boxes last Fall he did not have as many friends here as he thought.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see Honourable Members opposite take a broader view of this matter. Do not follow your Tory traditions and do not knock everything that comes along that is for the country's advancement in the world of progress.

MR. PUDDSTER—Mr. Chairman, I submit, Sir, that the speech of the honourable member for St. John's West should not go unanswered, and I intend now to answer it as best I know how. Now, if other gentlemen on the Government side are going to make speeches of similar tenor until this House closes, all I can say is that we are going to have an interesting session.

The honourable member talked of the late Mr. McKay of 1902. That is about the time I first met Dr. Campbell when he came from Bonne Bay. I knew him well in 1909 and there was not a harder-shelled Tory in the country than he was. Both you and your present Leader did your level best against and succeeded in defeating Sir Robert Bond in the election of 1909 and 1913. Dr. Campbell worked with me with his coat off in the West End of St. John's to keep the late revered Leader of the Liberal Party on the other side of the House. Now, if the honourable member for St. John's West wants the history of poli-

tics from 1909 told, I can give it to him in detail. Why some of the men who are sitting around him now in the Government benches were the greatest opponents Sir Robert Bond had. They drove him out of politics and drove him out of this House. Some of these same gentlemen, including Dr. Campbell and the present Prime Minister were with the Tory Party when Sir Robert Bond was kicked over the wharf at Western Bay. I am well versed in that episode. Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister of to-day were associated with the Tory Party led by Sir Edward (now Lord) Morris from 1908 until 1919. In fact the Prime Minister was a candidate against Sir Robert Bond in three general elections in the district of Trinity and he could not oppose him any stronger than that. Now, as I have already mentioned, if we are going to have politics introduced here, then let us have it good and strong; but we are a Committee here trying to get through with this Bill before the House, and any question I asked I asked in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, does the honourable member say that we are taking a narrow view point. What kind of view point would he take if he were over here? I ask the fishermen of Newfoundland what benefit it is going to be to them? Why it is ridiculous from beginning to end. I suppose the fishermen will be coming up here from Grate's Cove and Old Perlican to speak to a man in New York to tell him to send down bait to-morrow morning to bait his lines. Is that any good. Talk about the Liberal Party building railways. The party under Sir Edward Morris built just as many railways as ever the Liberal Party built in Newfoundland. The party the present Prime Minister was associated with at one time built just as many railways as ever the Liberal Party

built. And the Party that I have been associated with for the past twenty-five years have done as much for this country as you did or the party associated with you.

Committee rose, reported having considered the matter to them referred, made progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

The following Bills were read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow:

"An Act Respecting Air Navigation."

"An Act to Amend the Act 19 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Purposes.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geogre V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 12 Geogre V., Chapter 13, entitled to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's."

"An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshments."

"An Act Further to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs.'"

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and leave being granted, second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, it was ordered that when the

House rise it adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 25th, 1929.

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

TELEPHONE RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Telephone Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On the points of discussion raised the Company has no objection to comply with the suggestions put forth. Possibly a few changes may be made here and there. These changes will be done when we are in Committee of the Whole.

MR. PUDESTER—I presume these changes will be printed in the new Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and passed the same with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister a Bill was introduced to give effect to these Resolutions which was then ordered to be read a first time and ordered to read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I suggest that the Debate on the Address in Reply be deferred until we get some business done, as the Legislative Council meets on Monday.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I agree.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting Air Navigation."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in introducing this act we are trading on all new and unknown ground. The various governments of England, United States of America, Germany, France and Canada have all passed acts regarding air navigation. By these acts some group of Ministers of the Crown made up by legislative authority, are given the responsibility. The necessity of this act arose on the application by the owners of the sealing plane to have it registered in England. But registration was refused there because it was operating in Newfoundland and they were referred back to Newfoundland for registration. The Canadian Act was passed in 1919 and may be found in the Canadian Statutes 1919, Chapter 5 and it is upon this Act that the present bill before the House is based. The Bill provides that the Colonial Secretary will be the Departmental head in charge. In Canada the Minister of National Defence is responsible. The sections are taken practically verbatim from the Canadian Act. Section three is based on Chapter 3, Section 3 A, B, C, etc. The only section expressly adopted for Newfoundland is section 12 which is not based on the Canadian Act.

Reads:

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed same without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 19 Geogre V., Chapter 18, entitled 'An Act relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed the same with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 12 George V., Chapter 13, entitled 'An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshments."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed the same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed the same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Will this Bill interfere with the Druggists in any way?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—In the first place the amendment was brought in at the request of the Pharmaceutical Society itself and secondly that in lieu of serving a year with a druggist, a candidate may present himself at the Memorial College where he can avail of greater facilities and where he can get a great deal more expert training and knowledge than he could under the present machinery; but still if he wants to take an extra year with a Druggist, he may do so. This Bill simply gives him an alternative in respect of the last year of his course.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and having passed without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,' " was deferred until to-morrow.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—We are in hopes that the Honourable Introducer of this Bill will give us an explanation of the different sections before proceeding with the second reading, so that it will

be helpful to us before going to Committee Stage.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, In rising to deal with the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne I would like first of all to join in the general chorus of congratulations offered to yourself on your election as Speaker and to express to you in a formal way what I have already done personally, my hearty congratulations.

Speaking generally, the House of Assembly is a young one. It is young in experience and it is young in actual age, and it is particularly youthful because of your own youth yourself. It must, however, be a consolation to you to know that those who will have to submit to your jurisdiction and pass their wise judgement upon it, will because of their own inexperience and because of their own youth be as merciful as they hope you will be to them. I feel sure, Sir, that you can rely upon what the Leader of the Opposition said on the opening day, namely that you will have very little trouble with members on this side of the House, and that probably the greatest trouble will be in dealing with members who come from the same political cradle as yourself. If occasions do occur when your ruling may not be what we would think satisfactory to ourselves. I think you can take it that we will bow gracefully to your ruling no matter what we may think. In the course of time it will naturally follow that you will be called upon as a result of years of public service to fill one of the highest judicial offices in the colony and you will be able to look back on the first judicial experience that you had, and think that it was one of the happiest times of your life.

I would naturally also like to refer to the speeches that were made on opening day by the honourable members of Bay Roberts and Hermitage. I do not think, even though I myself am making my maiden speech, that it is presumption on my part to congratulate them. I have had certain amount of experience in public speaking and consequently I am in some slight measure at any rate able to seize up the debating powers of the men on the other side. One of the greatest qualifications that a debater can have is to be able to make up an argument out of a bad case, and in that respect the Mover and the Seconder of the Motion for the Address in Reply displayed great qualifications. They made excellent speeches about a very bad case, and when as doubtless will happen, they become members of our party and have a good case to argue they will be very valuable additions to our efforts.

Upon opening day the Leader of the Opposition dealt in general terms with the Speech from the Throne. It is rather unfortunate that in this country the Leader of the Opposition under our dispensation is not furnished in advance with a copy of the Speech from the Throne, and consequently has on the spur of the moment to make his first speech to the House. This at the opening of the Session is a great disadvantage. But upon this occasion Mr. Alderdice was not guilty of any of the usual expressions of such as those we have heard in this House from year to year, namely that this speech was remarkable more for what it did not contain than for what it did contain. In fact the Hon. Prime Minister expressed his surprise that he did not condemn it as being the worst speech that was ever presented to the House. When a document of this kind is put suddenly into your hand for consideration it is

extremely difficult to seize up what it means and on this occasion as the Prime Minister told us, after he had given the matter close and careful consideration, he produced what he termed a "first class public document." When on the spur of the moment any man is called upon to deal with a first class document he has a very onerous task ahead of him.

Taking the document as a whole I think that the Prime Minister did not do it justice. No one can use adjectives correctly or with greater effect than himself. He is quite wrong in describing this document as a "first class public" document. It is a public document, but that is not all that can be said about it. He should have described it as being unique. And if he had said that he would be only saying what was strictly accurate.

It has to be borne in mind that a document of this kind presented to the House, after giving grave consideration to matters of policy should suggest and contain and also that it is intended to be somewhat in the nature of an enlightenment as to what the Government intends to do during the coming session. We are fortunate that in the last few days certain legislation has been before us and we have been able to consider it but had we been compelled to consider this Speech without having some of this legislation before us, we would have been in darkness as to what the Speech from the Throne meant. Our darkness has not been very much enlightened by what has happened in the last few days but at any rate we have had before us two bills of prime importance and other departmental bills which naturally would not be referred to in the Speech from the Throne. And we have not had any explanation of the bills that came before us or what are to come after. Consequently all

that we have is a speech which is definite only upon one point and that is that five commissions are to be appointed to deal with matters that should be dealt with by various ministers whose duty it is to deal with them.

The first that is referred to is the Tariff Commission. Under the so-called Liberal Government last led by the present Prime Minister and composed in some considerable measure by some of his present followers we had a Tariff Commission. What was the result of it? Has that commission made their report? Has that report been acted upon? If they made a report, a report made by a Tariff Commission appointed by a Liberal Government surely that is the report to act upon, especially as the Liberal Government was led by the present Prime Minister and that one of the Tariff Commissioners was a member of his Executive, Dr. Mosdell. I think that he was a member of the Tariff Commission and was its Chairman.

Then we have the Unemployment Commission, a commission appointed to investigate into the cause of unemployment and to provide for a remedy. Mr. Alderdice pointed out on opening day in the personnel of that commission that has been appointed, there is not a member of this House or a man that is associated with the trade of this country, either as an employer or employee. And as I understand the Secretary of the Commission is the Honourable Member for Bell Island, who is equally ill-equipped, and I hope he will pardon me saying so, for that position. I do not use the terms offensively.

Now what is the unemployment problem. Speaking from the point of view of St. John's, I would say this that owing to the fact that trade is not good in St. John's there are a

number of men who cannot get work. That I think is the essence of the problem stated in its simplest and most accurate form. What is the remedy? Elsewhere, where there are large numbers involved in what they call distressed areas we find that efforts are made to move them from distressed areas to areas of employment. For instance we all know that to-day in a large section of the country of Wales the mines have been closed down. These men are only capable of working as miners, and they are moving them in large numbers from those districts to districts that are able to absorb them. You cannot do that in St. John's. I think that every member of the House knows that you cannot. Where are you going to take them. There are no areas here of greater production to which to take them, and thus we are faced with two alternatives. The alternative is for the Government to provide work. We cannot establish industries, at least, they are not being established. Then it is either that or to find work partly of a remunerative kind or of a kind that will give partial return for the outlay, or of a kind that will give no returns at all, or else to give "the dole." Now that is the result of your commission on unemployment. The cause is obvious, the remedy, equally obvious. It is going to cost the Liberal Government twenty thousand dollars to get a report from its commission which will tell the same thing as I have just told you.

Then we have the Commission on Hospitals and Charitable Institutions. If my recollection is correct a commission on this matter was appointed by the last Government. Has it reported? Is there a report available? and has it been acted upon? And if it has reported why will not this Government act upon it. Surely we ought

to know why these reports are not being acted upon. I understand that a considerable amount of money and a considerable amount of labour has been put into the commissions to examine into charitable organizations and public services of that sort. Where is that report? Is the government going to act on it, or are they going to provide another job for somebody else. None of these things will come before the House in the way of acts, consequently they will not come up for discussion unless the Government makes a statement as to the reasons why these commissions are going to be appointed. We have had no explanation from the Prime Minister or any of his leading Ministers.

Then we have another perfectly useless commission, the Public Utilities Commission. I have yet to learn what are the economic conditions calling for the appointment of this commission. They do not appear in the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister has not told us anything about them.

It ill becomes any member of this House to say anything which will seriously interfere with an effort to deal with such fishery problems as we have, and I do not for one moment propose to say anything about this commission except this one thing: We have had governments to my recollection of twenty years. I mean twenty years that I have been able to appreciate what they were about, and in every case their newspapers or the speech from the Throne told us how they were going to deal with the fisheries, and with the exception of the statutes passed by the last Liberal government imposing fishery regulations and a standardisation of the cull of fish nothing has been done. There was a commission appointed under the Morris government before which the honourable member for Bonavista

East, Sir William Coaker, gave evidence, to deal with fishery problems. I happen to know about that because I acted as reporter on the Commission. It passed several pious resolutions, and when it came to an analysis of business done,—none. And I see no reason why it could not be done, and I cannot understand that there is sufficient pressure of work to prevent members of the executive government with men of experience in the fishery, with men of experience in the trade of the country, dealing with this without having any commission at all; and they would handle the matter here much more quickly and expertly than any commission will, and provided they would not charge along the lines of commissions it would be done much more cheaply.

MR. GRIMES—What about the example of Canada's commission?

MR. EMERSON—I am afraid the experience of members of this House in connection with taking an example of Canada has not been very happy. However, there may be something in connection with the example Mr. Grimes refers to that may be advantageous and we shall be glad to hear what he has to say about it. If they have had a commission there that has gone into fishery problems then I suggest we might take the report as far as it refers to our cod-fishery and salmon fishery, rather than appoint a commission. We can make use of their advice on similar matters. They have the advantage of great experts to give evidence before the Commission and we have not. The honourable member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester, on my left, tells me that the Canadian Commission cost \$100,000. If you want to follow that example I would like to be appointed on the Commission.

MR. GRIMES—They had much more work to do.

MR. EMERSON—If it cost a hundred thousand and they had the advantage of great experts, I think the advice contained in that report and their evidence could be applied with equal force here dealing with similar fisheries and it would save a considerable amount of time and expense rather than appoint another commission.

As I say speaking generally on the question of commissions I submit to you that it is simply and solely a matter, where in the first place in connection with unemployment problems the government has passed over its own duty because it is an unpleasant, unprofitable and unpopular one. They know perfectly well that no matter what solution is offered it will be unpopular with those who will be unsatisfied, who will be a large number of people. They have "passed the buck". In the case of the other commissions I submit it is either a matter of the government not doing its duty, or of providing remunerative employment for its followers.

On opening day we heard from the Prime Minister of the telephone contract. We have had the telephone contract before us and I do not need to go into it in any detail. This most important matter, as Mr. Alderdice, the honourable leader of the Opposition, has said, has formed the subject of at least two delightful after dinner speeches by the Prime Minister. Outside of that the country has got nothing, and never will. And we are giving away, as I said yesterday, rights which are far more valuable than the four thousand dollars per year per cable we are getting. If that is the class of first class document to be brought into the House, then all I have got to say is the speech from the Throne is far from being a first class document.

Then we are threatened with an income tax. It really is sad that death is so certain, and that there is no way of prolonging the lives of those whom we would like to see amongst us because if that were possible I suppose great efforts would have been made to keep alive Gilbert and Sullivan if only for the one purpose of having them to come to Newfoundland to write a comic opera about a Squires government introducing an income tax. I don't imagine in any opera ever seen the comedy would be so entertaining as what they would have to say about such a condition of affairs.

Then we are threatened with a Liquor Act. The history of liquor legislation in this country has been that it has been the death knell of every government that meddled with it. Without going into the act itself, it is only a further intimation of what we feel, that this is the death knell of the present government. Now, sir, the Liquor Act is of course a very important matter. On this side of the Atlantic for some reason or other it has become almost the only subject that can be dealt with in politics. Promises are made in every election and in this election promises were made chiefly by the Liberal party. There were promises made I understand by the honourable member for Trinity South. I understand on every side he told the people how strong he was for prohibition.

MR. GODDEN—That is not correct.

MR. EMERSON—Very well. If the honourable member answers me to the contrary I withdraw; I won't make any further reference to it. I have heard it on many sides; I will accept his statement and I presume he did not deal with it at all. But it was made a prominent matter by other members, and on the day after opening I think it was the honour-

able member for Lewisporte presented here a petition, which in its open phrases told us how the iniquitous "bottle a day" act was rushed through the House, ill considered and everything else, and he spoke at length on that. And today we are threatened with another Liquor Act which I presume will go through with the same speed and the same lack of consideration. But as I said liquor is always an important matter in an election. People must be judged by their actions and we have to examine the conduct of the Government to appreciate the situation. The present Government appealed to all parties, and got into power because its members were practical prohibitionists; and what do we find? We find that in spite of the history of the Liquor Control Board matters are not progressing with as much satisfaction as before. Now, I am not a pronounced supporter of the "bottle a day Act," and I would here like to interject that when I hear the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs and the Honourable Member for St. John's West debating across the House with references to this party and what was done by the Monroe Government I would like to remark that I was not a member of the Monroe Government. I was not one of its supporters, I was one of its opponents and if it comes down to what the Monroe Government did the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs was at least for a time one of its supporters.

The bottle a day act is not as I say an act that I supported, but there is one thing I will say about the Act, that Members of the Board have conducted the business strictly according to law, and so far as I know, (I was not in the councils of the party at the time,) so far at least as is apparent on the surface there was no interference in its operations by politici-

ans, and this is as it should be. Now I say that the control of the Board has been interfered with since this Government came into power; and in such a way that if it continues a very serious condition of affairs will arise that will reflect very gravely on the credit not of the "bottle a day" Act but on the Government of the country. It will be remembered that since the House opened I have asked certain questions. My Honourable friend the Member for Burin East has asked certain others, and to some we have had replies. On two occasions you have ruled questions out of order; on two other occasions the political head of the Department has refused to answer because it might interfere with some prosecutions against somebody who has apparently smuggled two hundred cases of whisky. The questions deal with this matter. I now propose to deal with it and I submit that the matter is a serious one and should be considered by every person who feels he has any obligation in connection with the Government of the country. Now, sir, there were certain agents who in the past sold liquor for their firms to the Board of Liquor Control. In some cases they might have been political supporters of one party or another, and one would not be very much shocked to find if as political parties changed these became not the most important vendors of liquor and the Board bought from different agents. It is not an ideal condition of affairs but after all it is human and the Liberal party is human; and I would not have been surprised at changes being made in the personal of agents who were sellers to the Controller; but what I object to is that a monopoly has been attempted to be created.

The Eastern Trading Company is a company Incorporated in Newfoundland with a capital of \$10,000 of which

\$300 is paid up. The shareholders are Franklin S. Blair and two members of the legal profession who have no real interest in the company. This company is a subsidiary of a firm controlled by two Jews in Montreal who control large distilling corporations which do business under the name of The Canadian General Distributors, Ltd., I am told.

Canadian General Distributors, Ltd. is a large company selling liquor to provincial boards and carry on a large bootlegging business to the United States, that is they export liquor and succeed in smuggling it into the United States. The Eastern Trading Company, which as I said before, is owned by them, and whose sole business in this country for the past two years has been bootlegging to the United States, very nearly succeeded in securing a monopoly of all liquor supplied to the Liquor Control Board and they did not stop at that. They proposed, through their own company, to establish a bottling plant here. At the present time the only bottling done here is done at the Controllers and rum is the only liquor bottled there. Whisky, gin and wines are all bottled outside, but this company proposed not only to bottle rum but all liquors as well. Thus a monopoly of all liquors passed over to the Liquor Control Board would come from the hands of Jew bootleggers. How far did this go? It went to this extent, that the Eastern Trading Company wrote the various firms and informed them that they were sole purveyors to the Controllers and demanded that they be appointed their sole agents and that they would get no business if they refused. It went further inasmuch as they imported liquors in transit which they sold to the Controllers. This was stored by Terminal Warehouse Company, Ltd., a company controlled by the honour-

able member from Trinity South, Mr. Godden.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I think I owe an explanation to the House as there are many rumours in circulation. It is true I am President of the Terminal Warehouse Company, the directors of which are the same as those of E. J. Godden Ltd. with the addition of Mr. Blair and the only reason that Mr. Blair is a director is that he had much storage facilities. I suggest that my Honourable friend the Member for Placentia East is suffering from the same complaint as the daily press especially the Evening Telegram is since last year—all they do is insinuate, they issue no statements, they are too cowardly, as a result we find that two months ago or less articles of incorporation of that Company were placed in the daily press by my enemies so that people who did not understand would draw wrong conclusions about me. The articles of incorporation were of no wider latitude than those granted to any other Company.

I don't know if I should get up and give any explanation as far as my connections with the Eastern Trading Company is concerned. I have no connection with them beyond the fact that I rented two warehouses to them. I am not interested in the import or export of liquor and I feel that I am the victim of a whispering campaign, in which members of the Opposition particularly, are actively engaged. They make out that I am making huge profits. Beyond the fact that in 1925 when I bought the Goodfellow Building the people vacating the premises asked me to sell to the best advantage some old stock lying on hand I have had absolutely no transactions with the Controllers. If I had made the \$40,000.00 as is said, I would not mind being the "goat."

MR. EMERSON—To continue, as I was saying, an attempt was made to establish a bottling plant for the benefit of Jew Bootleggers, whether directly or indirectly through the Terminal Warehouse Company or the Eastern Trading Company is of minor importance but the fact still remains that an attempt was made and is still being made, aided and abetted by the present Government—

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Can you prove that statement?

MR. EMERSON—Yes Sir, you will find it right here in the Act which your Government is introducing at the present time. I don't know if you know it or not but in Section 3 you will find a clause giving power to establish a bottling plant in this country. It is being done by some member with his eyes open over the heads of those other members who appear to be asleep.

The act of 1924 was that this board was to be absolutely free from political influence whatsoever.

HON. MR. BRADELY—They were under the control of the Governor in Council.

MR. EMERSON—Here is the Act of 1924. Now section 4 says (Reads). I contend that the arrangements for the bottling plant were organized since this Government came into power and it is now giving effect to it by a statute introduced by the Prime Minister himself. Undoubtedly the best method of dealing with liquor is for it to be dealt with by the manufacturers direct. We do not wish to add to the evils of drink, but it would enormously increase them by handing the control over to Jew Bootleggers. They would then have the opportunity to pollute the liquor sold by the Controllers. It is only in that way that the huge profits which are anticipated by those who are behind this scheme

can be made. It would have to be done by the Canadian General Distributors or the Eastern Trading Company or whoever seeks for these concessions for the mere putting of rum or whisky into bottles cannot be extremely remunerative unless a certain quantity of Windsor Lake is added. I say then that not only was an effort made by these people to get control of the liquor supply but it is also being made and is being aided and abetted by the Government, and also in getting the bottling plant so that they would have complete control. My friend the honourable member for Burgeo the Colonial Secretary, seemed rather surprised at this. I do not imagine that he was even told that it was in the act and I am perfectly certain that there are many other members who did not know it was in the act. BUT IT IS THERE. The member for Trinity South has spoken about those ugly rumours about him. In so far as the rumours concern him he is quite justified in disproving them. They were directed, however, against the principle of establishing a bottling plant. He should be awake to see that such a plot and plan is not carried through to fruition. I do not propose to deal with the matter any further and I will leave it for the reason that the Prime Minister is not in the House and he is the introducer of the Bill. He will have an opportunity to explain it and we shall have the pleasure of knowing all about it at the second reading of the Bill. I have reviewed in a general way the only important measures in the Speech from the Throne, although part of my time has been taken up by the Member for Trinity South. I submit to you that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne, except three measures that call for comment and they are bound to be criticized, namely the Income

Tax Act, the Liquor Control Act, and the Telegraph and Telephone Act. And if that is the best that can be done by a Government that was going to provide such a multitude of remedies for all our ills, then I am afraid it will do very little good for the country and, provided it does not bring in many acts like the Liquor Control Act in this session, it will not remain in power long enough to do much harm.

On motion of Mr. Puddester on behalf of Mr. Quinton the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned until to-morrow.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 26th, 1929.

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

MR. STARKES—I beg to present a petition from the people of Leading Tickle asking for telegraph communication to that place. The petition is signed by nearly all the residents, and for the information of the House I may say that there is quite a lot of fishing business carried on there and it is a regular port of call for the Coastal boats. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. GRIMES—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Lewisporte and other nearby towns in the District, to have a channel cut through Michael's Hr. Head. Quite a lot of

motor boats plying between different parts of the District and Lewisporte run ashore here and are held up for a number of hours and sustain a considerable amount of damage through running on this bar. I would ask that the dredge be sent down there to dig a channel so to eliminate the danger of running ashore in foggy weather. This District has been sadly neglected in the past and I would like very much to see a change in conditions. I suggest that when the Marine and Fisheries Department are drawing up their schedule this year they would send the dredge to Lewisporte.

MR. GREENE—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bell Island for five hundred dollars for a road from Quigley's Line to Freshwater Road. There has been no grant to this section for the past five years. This road leads to the only landing place on the back of Bell Island and is of great importance to the residents thereabouts (who by the way are very industrious people who rise early in the morning, attend to their farms, proceed to their work in the mines and in the evening return to their farms) for landing caplin and fertilizers to prepare the ground for the crops. Unfortunately more than \$500.00 was given out in personal grants during the last election, if this had been applied to the roads I feel certain that it would have been a great deal more beneficial to the people. I hope sir, that this petition will not be consigned to the waste paper basket as the people from whom this petition originates are the kind of whom this country has great need today, and if only as an act of encouragement we should see that these industrious farmers and miners get the means to obtain their fertilizers.

MR. EMERSON—I beg leave to present three petitions from the people

of Fox Hr., Ship Hr., and New Hr. East, in connection with the prohibiting by the Fish Meal plant of the use of a bar in Long Hr. for catching herring. This is the only spawning ground for herring in Placentia Bay. The fishermen should be allowed to take bait from this bar as it belongs to them and so as the same thing might not occur as did when the American bankers went there and secured herring. It is an important matter to protect this bar against misuse because it affects fishermen from all around the Bay who come long distances to secure their bait at Long Hr. Again sir, I say that the people asked me to petition the House to protect this bar against inroads made by the Fish Meal Plant.

MR. BINDON—I know the locality very well, it is about a mile and a quarter from Long Harbour. Inside the bar there is very shoal water and if large numbers of fishermen go in to secure bait the herring would soon foresake it and go elsewhere to spawn. I at once brought the matter to the attention of the Marine and Fisheries Department, but no steps were taken, however, I am only too glad to back up what the Hon. Member says.

MR. WINTER—I would like very much to support this petition, for as the Hon. Member points out it affects fishermen from all around the Bay. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition although I know very little about the place itself except what the Hon. Member has just said and I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give it the attention it deserves.

MR. WINTER—I would like very much to present a petition from the people of Marystown asking for a sum to build a Post and Telegraph Office. As the petition points out there is but one public building and that is a one story shack, sixteen feet by nineteen

feet in which all the business of the Post Office and Telegraph Office is transacted. On arrival of the mails it is impossible for more than two or three persons to get inside the building at a time, and I myself have witnessed crowds of people standing outside in a driving rainstorm waiting a chance to get inside to secure their mail. A building such as this is a disgrace to a town half the size of Marystown.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Skanes gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and leave being granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with respect to Income Tax Legislation.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In introducing these resolutions to the House it gives me very great pleasure to do so, especially considering the stand which I took when the former income tax regulations were introduced. It is common knowledge that the first income tax regulations were introduced in the year 1918 and were made retroactive to October 1917.

Reads:

I should like to point out that the bank tax was reduced in order to get better concessions in the way of interest on business loans, etc. In practice, however, this did not happen and the amount saved by the banks merely went to swell the profits of the banks and were divided amongst the shareholders.

Reads:

That means to say that on April 30th when anyone makes his returns—his personal returns—if by May 31st he pays his income tax he gets a reduction of 15 p.c. on the amount.

Mr. Chairman, whilst I realize that there will be certain utterances, possibly not within these walls but outside the walls of this House, against the measure now before the House, I feel in the general interests of this country that this legislation is an absolute necessity—not merely because it is necessary for the country to get the required funds with which to pay its bills but principally on account of the fact that if a tax of this nature was not imposed the common people of the country would have to be taxed in some other way in order that the necessary money might be found to pay the bills, and personally and I believe I speak on behalf of the Government when I say that the Government feels that a tax of this nature is the most equitable tax that can be imposed. The people that can afford to pay are bound, and should be made, to pay the most, just the same as in many other forms of business.

As we go on to read the resolutions the various clauses no doubt will come up for discussion and I shall do the best I possibly can to explain to the Honourable gentlemen opposite or to the House each and every clause if they require any explanation.

In presentation these resolutions, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I think it is only fair that the Honourable Members of the Opposition should have been given the opportunity to study them. Consequently, I move that the committee rise and report progress so that the Opposition members may have an opportunity of studying this legislation and we will be in a position to go on with business on Monday.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

In reply to question no. 1 on Order Paper asked by Mr. Puddester, Hon. the Colonial Secretary stated the answer was in course of preparation.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled reply to question no. 2 on Order Paper asked by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. the Minister of Public Works tabled reply to question no. 3 on Order Paper asked by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

In reply to question no. 4 on the Order Paper asked by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines replied as follows:

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to table a reply to the enquiries made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, but I find that many Honourable Members displayed an interest in this matter and with the Honourable member's permission, I think it would be expedient to read this reply before it is tabled so that all may benefit thereby.

The potato question at the present moment is quite an involved one.

Some 10 or 12 years back, whilst I was Commissioner of Agriculture, an agitation developed for the production of more potatoes to cut-out the necessity for importations. At that time, and repeatedly since, I told the Legislature that enough potatoes were being grown to meet all requirements of home consumption and that the lack of a sales organization debarred their being offered in the market,

hence the shortage complained of was only an apparent shortage, and this has since been abundantly proven.

In 1925 business took me to Placentia Bay for several months and whilst there I learned that immediately upon the close of the bank fishery a large number of schooners were dispatched to Prince Edward Island for cargoes of potatoes, turnips, &c. I talked the matter over with those making the importations and explained to them that it would be quite possible to have their wants supplied with the homegrown articles. They explained their willingness to buy these if good potatoes were procurable at the same price that imported potatoes cost.

On my return to St. John's I made a representation to the then government, with the result that they undertook to hear any practicable proposition I might have to submit in connection with the next year's crop.

Next year when the matter came up for consideration I suggested to them that they send an agent up the coast to endeavour to induce people there to buy local products, and this plan met with a fair measure of success. The sales made amounted to a little over 6000 barrels of potatoes, about 3500 barrels of turnips and probably in or about 70 to 80 tons of cabbage.

As these results were so satisfactory I was asked in 1927 to further continue the experiment, with the result that in that year we sold 26,000 barrels of potatoes, about 12,000 to 14,000 barrels of turnips and over 300 tons of cabbage, besides a quantity of parsnips, carrots, beets, &c. This vast volume of agricultural products displaced an equal quantity that would have been imported from Prince Edward Island, and of course materially helped local growers thereof.

In the past year there was an abnormal yield of potatoes in Canada as well as in Newfoundland and potatoes could be purchased for 50 cents a barrel of Prince Edward Island. Purchasers here were aware of this fact and local growers refused to sell to meet the prices of the imported article, with the result that very large quantities of potatoes were stored through the winter in the hope of securing better prices the present spring season.

The actual condition of things at present is that there are at least 150,000 barrels of potatoes in the country that there is no market for.

In March past the Department for Agriculture, with a view to helping out the holders of potatoes in making sales thereof, sent a circular into all the districts where potatoes were for sale, suggesting the necessity to dealers and growers to decide upon a uniform price for the coming spring, telling them that it would be necessary to meet as closely as possible the price of the imported article, but to all these enquiries we did not have more than twenty replies. The great majority wanted us to do the best we could for them, which of course was practically tying our hands so that we could do nothing. Others wanted from \$2.75 to \$3.00, which meant of course another 25c. added to this cost by the time the potatoes reached whoever would order them. We wrote a second time and told them that it was impossible to get such prices the coming year and then a few people reduced their prices, some to as low as \$2.60 and others to \$2.65 and quite recently a few lowered their prices to 2.50. So far we have succeeded in selling something over and above 500 barrels at \$2.60 and we are now trying the \$2.50 offer to other dealers.

The trouble is that I find that the South-West Coast merchants who

bought so largely in 1926 and 1927, and who could not get their orders filled satisfactorily last year, are this year again ordering from Prince Edward Island. We have had, so far, from the South Coast orders for not above 100 barrels in all.

The same difficulties in the selling of potatoes have been experienced in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia the present year that we have been experiencing here in Newfoundland, owing to the supply being above the market requirements.

We for some years have been growing about 530,000 barrels of potatoes and the 1928 crop must have been in or about 670,000 barrels, so that, after making ample provision for all home requirements, we will have to-day 200,000 barrels of potatoes that cannot be consumed as human food.

Unfortunately owing to the outbreak of canker in Newfoundland some 15 or 16 years back, our potatoes have been refused access to United States and Canadian markets, but the West Indies which furnish a large and profitable market for potatoes, and are now almost exclusively supplied by Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, are open to us. In Nova Scotia potatoes are shipped by schooners as part cargo, the balance of each cargo being made up from 500, 600 or probably a thousand quintals of fish. There is also a government subsidized line of steamers between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the West Indies, and those also take potatoes at a moderate freight rate, so that the farmers of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have the advantage of the West Indies for their surplus.

On yesterday I wrote the Board of Trade making them aware of the possibilities in the West Indies for potato sales, and that in the event of

local merchant contemplating making a small shipment of fish there he would be able to procure the balance here of potatoes at a rate that would probably command sales.

Prince Edward Island potatoes imported here are subject to a direct tax of 55 cents per barrel, as I am informed by importers and have the benefit of at least a 70c. per barrel freight discount, as the freight on local potatoes delivered to any part of the country is but 25 cents per barrel as against the rate from Prince Edward Island of, in, or about 9 cents direct to St. John's, plus any railway transportation that might be necessary for the shipment to reach destination, but even this serious handicap does not debar the Prince Edward Island potatoes from competing unfavourably at the present time with locally raised stock.

This is not the first year there has been over production. Quite frequently in the district of St. George's farmers have had to dump a considerable proportion of their previous year's stock when the time for harvesting the new stock arrived. Potatoes being a crop requiring but very little attention once they are planted, and for which there is usually a ready and favourably profitable market, is an incentive to our people to confine their agricultural effort very largely to the raising of potatoes and turnips chiefly.

I am regretfully compelled to admit that last October the Department of Agricultural unwisely issued a public notice to potato growers and dealers advising them to withhold their potatoes for a minimum price of \$2.75 per barrel, and those interested took it for granted that the government were assured they would obtain such prices, but the hope has been badly disappointed and the unfortunate result was that many people refused to sell last year at fairly remunerative

prices thinking, on the strength of the advertisement of the department, that better prices would be obtainable the present spring, whereas the very opposite has inevitably been the result, as what could have been sold last Fall are now competing with the stock that would, in any case, have been carried over to meet Spring sales. The Department is doing the best possible but it is an up-hill fight and it is my conviction that at least a couple of hundred thousand barrels will remain unsold, unless there is a possibility of effecting sales thereof in some of the West India Islands.

Another unfortunate result of the advertisement issued by the Department of Agriculture in October last with regard to the price of potatoes is, that this Department now has claims filed against it by parties who thereby lost sales of many hundreds of barrels made by them previous to the issuing of the advertisement in question upon prices then quoted to them by the growers but who, upon reading the advertisement, declined to sell unless at an advanced price. The result was that these orders could not be filled as the sources from which they came found they could import potatoes for very much less than the advanced prices asked.

Considerable agitation is afoot with regard to having an increased duty placed upon imported Canadian potatoes, as local growers think such importations an unfair competition. In this connection I would say that the average importations from Canada have not exceeded in or about 50,000 barrels a year and these come very largely to supply the winter requirements of St. John's.

The climatic conditions here make it impossible to transport potatoes over the railway in the winter season, and it would be a severe tax upon importers to import very largely in

the early part of the season and hold these stocks over through the winter. They would occupy a large amount of storage space besides the importers being out of pocket the amount of duty until the sales of the stocks were effected, and to avoid this they prefer importing in quantities to meet current requirements. This, I think however, can be gotten over by a course of action that the Department proposes to take, by which we hope to be able to ensure safe transportation for the coming year's stock during any period of the winter season with safety. This will enable local growers to meet St. John's requirements and order a carload or two per week at any time throughout the winter, and by this arrangement that the Department hopes to finalize these may be brought in at any time during the winter season with perfect safety, and it is hoped will be successful in eliminating any necessity for importations.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the honourable member for St. George's for the very exhaustive reply he has given to my question. I think that it is a reply that might be made the basis of some debate on some future suitable occasion.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

MR. ALDERDICE—Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Leader of the Government would let this matter stand over and reconsider the bill. I am of the opinion that the penalty under the amendment for driving a car by a person in state of intoxication is not sufficiently severe. I think that the offender should not be allowed the option of a fine for the first and

the Honourable Leader of the Government has termed it "a first class public document." Now I am going to be more magnanimous perhaps than some of my colleagues, and more charitable and I am going to call it a "record breaking" document, and I want to briefly say why. Now if we turn to the Speech from the Throne the first section upon which there can be any difference of opinion is the one dealing with the general election, in which it says that the great majority of the people have approved the Government "policy." Well now if the great majority of the people have approved the policy of the so called Liberal Party, then they are a little more far seeing than I claim to be. I have looked in vain for some statement of the policy of that Party before the election and ever since and the only pronouncement that I find of the policy of the Liberal Party is contained on the Phonograph Record that was used by certain of its candidates during the recent election. I was amused to hear it in my district, but I never got near enough to it to study it and see whether it did contain any policy or whether it did not. I remember a few of the high sounding phrases in it, and a few of the references to the achievements of the Liberal Party, led by the late Sir William Whiteway, and more recently by the late Sir Robert Bond, and then to my amazement I found that the present leader of the Government claimed that mantle had fallen on his shoulders and that he was the Leader of the Liberal Party. Now I have since obtained "for the purpose of greater accuracy" as you would say Sir, a copy of that speech, or as it is called "A message of inspiration" contained on that Gramophone Record, and without dealing with the past record of achievement I will turn to the last page, to see really the policy of the Liberal Party was.

"It promises within six months industrial development representing an expenditure of not less than two and a half millions, more likely three millions, within two years; an investment within a year and a half of a million and a half dollars for an entirely new industry; to breathe the breath of life into the Gander; agricultural development on the South West Coast; the building of 'utility' roads and the saving of the fisheries from ruin and making them profitable for the fishermen." Inspiring, truly, if you were credulous enough to believe one half of it.

Now that was the policy of the Liberal Government as set out on its record. Now in view of that policy, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the public of this country, of which the Leader of the Government claimed to represent a considerable majority, very reasonably would have expected that in this first session of the Legislature they would have handed down to them in the Speech from the Throne, which should contain an outline of the Government's policy, some reference to this so called policy. Surely the public when they gathered here on opening day did expect to find something outlined in that speech, something definite, something tangible. Now if there is one key note in that message of inspiration I have just read to you, it surely was "industrial development;" it fairly oozed "industrial development," and as I say the public naturally expected that there would at least be some reference to some proposed industrial development. But what do we find? In the Speech from the Throne that there is not one single reference to any new proposed industrial development; not one. And is it any wonder the Leader of the Opposition describes it as a disappointing document. It certainly is disappointing; and should be disappointing to

every member of this House, if it is not; and I submit if the truth were known it is to every member of the House a grave disappointment in view of that message of inspiration. Surely such a speech, as I say, the first speech of a newly elected Government should lay down some definite policy with regard to industrial development which it proclaims as the key note of its policy; and yet there is not a word. That is one of the reasons why I term this a record breaking speech. At any rate it is a broken record. Where is the two and a half million dollars industry that is referred to.

"I know that within six months from my resumption of office I can ensure industrial development representing an expenditure of not less than 2½ millions.

Six months have now passed, and there is no word yet of this industrial development. At least if there were there surely would have been a passing reference to it in the Speech from the Throne. Then: "I know I can breathe the breath of industrial life into the Gander." Why does not the Honourable gentleman breathe the breath of industrial life into the Gander. Is he short of breath? There certainly appears to be a shortage of "breath of industrial life" at any rate. Surely hundreds and thousands of people are waiting to-day for that development; and he says "I know I can breathe that breath." Well I say, the sooner he gets busy and breathes the promised breath the better for this country. Now in addition to this message of inspiration to which I have referred, there was one other document which outlined the Liberal Party's programme, but only one one other as far as I can find, and that was a Liberal Party programme in its application to the South West Coast districts. There is a whole lot of it here. I shall not weary the

House by reading it. In one paragraph it says: "I know that I can revolutionize the food problem by agricultural development particularly in the south and west, which territory may rightly be described as the garden of Newfoundland." Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to that. It truly may be called the garden of Newfoundland; and one of the finest spots on the whole coast is in the district that I have the honour to represent. And what has happened to the garden of Newfoundland? Tourists naturally would like to go and see the beauty spots in that garden. But what has happened. The important ports of Marystown and St. Lawrence have been cut out from the route of the "Portia;" the only decent steamer from St. John's that formerly called at both of these ports. Mortier Bay is one of the most beautiful spots in the Island. It is an attraction in itself, and has some of the finest land for farming in the country. Then why deny it this means of transportation? That has been done, Sir, and done for a reason; and a reason that must be obvious. In this message to the South West Coast the Leader of the Government appeals for the return of his five candidates for that district. Now three districts in that coast fell for this. Two others returned opposition members. One of these has disappeared; and now, sir, I only am left to carry on; and what is the result? My district is being penalised right and left for having the temerity, the audacity to return an Opposition Member to the House of Assembly. Now I ask is that fair? The other day an attempt, as you, Sir, know, was made to remove the fog alarm from Jude Island. That I take it was to penalise not only the district of the Honourable Member for Placentia West, but the district of Burin West, the constituents of which would have as much occasion

as those of any district to benefit by this fog alarm. Why was that done? Why is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries so down on his former constituents. I met many friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in my district during the late campaign. They were loud in his praises, but what are they going to say about him next time? All this has been done, as I say, for a purpose. With regard to the promises to the South West Coast some have, I will say, been carried out and for these I am duly thankful. We have had the appointment of a representative of that part of the country to the important post of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I look forward to the Honourable Member carrying out the onerous duties of that all important office to the full satisfaction of everybody. He is capable of doing it I know. But what else has been done? Nothing. None of the promises contained in the four sheets of this document have begun to be carried out as yet, so far as I am aware at any rate.

So much, Mr. Speaker, for the Liberal policy which I have tried to explain, which I have tried to comprehend myself, and which the Leader of the Government claims the majority of the people comprehended. I say they did not comprehend it. They had no more idea than the man in the moon what was the Liberal Party's policy. Let us examine the Speech from the Throne a little more minutely. It is a wonderful document, and one of the first things that will be noteworthy to most people is the fact that it contains notification of the appointment of no less than five commissions. No less than five commissions have been referred to in this document. Now, why in the name of fortune should it be necessary to appoint five commissions to carry out the work that should be done by the

different departments of the Government. There is only one reason why it should be necessary and that is that the Leader of the Government cannot have sufficient faith in his Ministers to think they can carry out the work themselves. Surely it is the duty of the Ministers to carry out that work. Are there not enough Departments to carry out the work of the Government in this country? Is it necessary for instance to appoint a commission to enquire into unemployment? Surely the reason for unemployment is obvious to everybody. Then we have a commission for the revision of the tariff. Now it was not very many years ago that a similar commission was appointed by a Government led by the present Leader of the Government. The report of that tariff commission was adopted by the late Government in 1925. Why should we so few years subsequently require an expensive commission to revise the tariff once more. Dr. Mosdell the former secretary on the Executive and Mr. LeMessurier is still at his post and available. Is this revision of the tariff to be made a hardy annual? Then there is a commission to inquire into hospitals and charitable organizations. This also has recently been the subject of an enquiry. A public utilities commission is the next thing. That, of course, would be very useful and eminently to be desired if it ever functions, but is there any likelihood that it will function? And then finally we have the appointment of a fishery commission. Now with the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the head of this Department and aided by such able men as he has with him on the other side of the House, as Sir William Coaker and the Honourable mover of the Address in Reply and other practical men, what necessity is there to go outside to get a commission to inquire into the fish-

eries and how they can be carried on for the greater benefit of the country? Surely these gentlemen have sufficient experience for that purpose? Why saddle the country with the enormous expense of this commission?

I would take it the South West Coast would be quick to resent the imputation that the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not capable of conducting that inquiry quite on his own.

Now, as I say there are at least five commissions being appointed, and if there were any evidence lacking of the inability of the present administration to carry out its work it is surely the appointing of these commissions. It is either that or they are intended to provide employment for party heelers. The present leader has so many followers that he finds it difficult to find work for them and so commissions are appointed "ad lib" and the public has to pay. What, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is the Government for if it has to pass on its work to Commissions. I submit that it is unconstitutional to appoint commissions to evade the responsibility of ministers, or to do the work of existing departments, who are directly responsible to this House. Why not, as has been suggested, appoint a sixth commission to run the Government, and be done with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from a cursory examination of the Speech we do find there is at least one bit of policy of a constructive nature contained in it, but only one. There is the reference to the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Certain definite things are said about that. The Prime Minister takes great cudos to himself for having persuaded this Company to come to Newfoundland. It has been strongly featured by him publicly on various occasions. He is possibly to be congratulated for having got this corporation interested in Newfound-

land, but now, that we have printed copies of the Resolutions before us, I fail to see what advantage after all Newfoundland is going to get. It has been said it is time to capitalize the strategic geographical position of Newfoundland. With that suggestion I am heartily in accord, but at the same time I do not see why we should give away very valuable privileges for practically nothing. According to the resolution the most that we can hope for from this wealthy corporation is \$4,000.00 per annum for every cable landed here, and not more than \$20,000.00 per annum, no matter how many cables may be landed. Against that we are allowing them to import all sorts of materials duty free, and unless we are prepared to erect branch lines to connect with the Company's stations in Conception Bay and Placentia Bay the use of this alleged valuable service to Newfoundland cannot be availed of by our people. Furthermore, we must not forget the effect which it will have should it ever come into operation, on the Postal Telegraph service, though I imagine it will be a long time before any considerable number of people in this country would be able to afford the luxury of carrying on a telephone conversation with anyone in Europe or South America. It has been said in justification of the low charge of the Company that this is merely an experiment, but should it prove successful, as I hope it will, I cannot see why we should limit the amount payable to \$20,000.00. I trust that when the bill comes up for discussion it will be possible to eliminate this maximum charge.

It is interesting to note the references in the Speech from the Throne to the proposed amendments to the Liquor Act, which it is alleged are for the purpose of more effectually checking the illicit sales of liquor. So far as it is designated to effect that pur-

pose I am heartily in accord with it, but is that the real purpose of the amendment? If it were so, I am sure it would have the hearty support of members in this House, but as it was pointed out by the member for Placentia East in dealing with this matter yesterday, there is tucked away in the proposed measure a question of very far reaching importance, which gives to the Governor in Council complete power over all matters not specifically given to the Board. Is not this significant, in view of the correspondence already tabled here. Now, why are these powers being taken by the Executive? Surely the Board is competent to deal with all matters pertaining to the sale and distribution of liquor, and should not be hampered in any way by provisions of this kind. However, it will be interesting to hear the explanation of the Hon. Prime Minister when this bill comes up for second reading, and I shall not refer to it further now.

I should like to refer, however, to some questions which have been asked recently in the House, both by myself and by the Member for Placentia East, and to some of the replies which have been tabled with regard to the seizure of 200 cases of whisky by the Minister of Finance and Customs, who is to be congratulated on his prompt action in the matter. To some of these questions we are told that a reply cannot be given because there are some legal proceedings in contemplation and to table a reply might be prejudicial to one or other of the parties. We are not told, however, who the parties are, or what is the nature of the proposed legal proceedings or when they are to be taken, and I submit that that is no reason for not answering the questions which have been asked. Apparently a breach of the law has been committed, otherwise the goods would not have been

seized. If that is so this House and the country at large are entitled to know who are the parties concerned, and why no prosecution has been begun. Surely these are matters which we in this House are entitled to know, and it appears to me, as it does of course to everybody, that an effort is being made to hush the whole matter, but I say, Sir, that the public are not satisfied. And why, if there has been a breach of the law, is the machinery not set in motion at once to punish the wrong doer. The longer this matter is allowed to drift the more suspicious will the public become.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that there is no reference whatever in the Speech from the Throne to the reduction in taxation, which took place very shortly after the present Government came into power in the fulfillment of an election pledge to the people. What has happened with regard to these duties since November last? One would have expected some reference to this great boon to the fishermen and labouring classes of this country as a result of the reduction of duty on lines and twines, tobacco, readymade clothing, butterine, etc., but there is not a single reference whatever to it. Are the people getting these articles any cheaper in consequence of the Government's action? Personally speaking, as a consumer of a moderate amount of tobacco, I cannot say that I find it any cheaper now than it was before the removal of duties, and I imagine the same applies to the other articles mentioned. If any advantage is being derived from the reduction of these duties it certainly is not by the consumer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like briefly to refer to the Income Tax Resolution, which has to-day been introduced by the Minister of Finance and Customs. Surely this is the

"piece de resistance" of the whole Speech from the Throne. Surely we have had sufficient experience in the past of the impossibility of carrying out such a measure with any degree of fairness. It is obviously designed for one section of the community, and I can only trust that the Minister will see to it that no attempts are made to evade payment as unfortunately has been the experience in the past. As was said by the member for Placentia East, this would provide a wonderful theme for a Gilbert and a Sullivan if we only had such in our midst to-day, the fact of the Squires Government having the nerve to reintroduce the Income Tax Law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House any further just now. I shall have a further opportunity of discussing some of these matters when the various bills come up later on in the session. The Speech, as I have already said, has been called "disappointing" by the Leader of the Opposition, and "unique" by the member for Placentia East. The Prime Minister, however, calls it a "first class public document." Personally I have no hesitation whatever in calling it a first class public fraud.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, the few remarks that I have to make this evening are of particular interest to the Prime Minister, and I would be greatly obliged if some member would kindly request him to come in, as I believe he has not left the House. I notice that his chauffeur is still here. Mr. Speaker, may I join with Mr. Emerson in congratulating you on your assumption to the high office of Speaker during your first term in the House. I desire to refer for a few moments to a section of the Speech from the Throne which states that it is proposed to appoint a Trade Commissioner in London in place of a High Commissioner.—

Reads:

I want it to be distinctly understood by the House that the remarks that I make in connection with the abolition of the office of High Commissioner refer solely to the manner in which this was carried out. If the Government wishes to cancel any appointment it can do so but such cancellation should be done in a decent and dignified manner. It is contrary to the dignity of any government to dismiss or cancel the appointment of any person who may be acting as an official representative of it in any other country without at least reasonable and timely notice. The dismissal I refer to was that of Sir John Bennett, as High Commissioner, which was to take effect within twenty-four hours. That was particular contemptable in view of the fact that at that particular time there was being prepared in London an official recognition of the representative for Newfoundland. This function was intended to be of a far reaching nature and was to be attended by all the representatives of the Colonies and Dominions of the British Empire. All preparations had been completed and invitations were ready to go forward when notice was sent from Newfoundland to say that Sir John was no longer to hold office in London, and consequently the representatives had to be notified that the whole thing was off. I do not suppose that anything like it ever occurred before. It never had a chance to happen before. Even if a representative was dismissed he was sent adequate notice in the usual official manner. If you should have any doubt that what I have said is incorrect I will read the cable governing the dismissal. The first is dated November 20th.

Reads:

This was a beautiful way for the Newfoundland Government to treat

its representative in another country. By doing so the Government advertised itself as politically vindictive. In this particular the Prime Minister strongly resembled King Alfred and his round table. I say that he was nothing but a political Pontius Pilate. Sir John Bennett but a few years ago elevated him to a very high office in Masonry and that was just a few months after Sir John Bennett had been defeated by Sir Richard. That was a most magnanimous act on the part of Sir John Bennett. I could go further and make a comparison of the two careers of the two men in this House. If I am not mistaken Sir Richard entertained very different views regarding this office during a recent inquiry. In fact he said that he might take it for himself. I repeat what I have already said before that the Government acted in a most contemptible manner. To prove that it is nothing but an act of political vindictiveness I may say that the High Commissioner's Office is still functioning under the control of a few irresponsible clerks. Does not that prove what I say. In fact it was advertised that this would happen long before it did. I have no reflection to cast upon the abolition of the office but the manner of dismissal is contemptible beyond all words. I will close because as I said the remarks were particularly directed to the Prime Minister. I could only refer him, when he goes home, to a poem by Kipling entitled "When a servant reigneth."

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, This is the first time that it has been my privilege to address the House and I take the opportunity Mr. Speaker of congratulating you upon the high office to which you have been elected, and I do not think I can do better than to reiterate the sentiments so aptly expressed by the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable

the Leader of the Opposition, and to wish that your appointment may be both successful and happy. I further wish to congratulate Captain Parsons, the Honourable Member for Bay Roberts and Mr. Fudge, the Honourable Member for Hermitage on the very capable manner in which they proposed and seconded the vote of thanks to the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Now Mr. Speaker it is not my intention to dwell on the Speech from the Throne, but I think that there are one or two points that I cannot let pass without commenting on them with regard to the bills mentioned there. To my mind there are none as important as the Liquor Bill and that relating to Restaurants. With regard to the Liquor business and the proposed amendment to it I can quite appreciate that it will have a country wide effect, but what its effect will be we are unable to tell. Will it have a good effect or an evil effect. That I am not prepared to say. Let us only hope that it does not drive us back to the old days of "moonshine." But while we appreciate and give credit to the introducer of this bill of the intention of putting on the Statute Books of this Colony a law that is to do some good for its countrymen, at the same time I think that we must all be aware of the fact that Section 3 Sub-section D is one that calls for very careful consideration on the part of every member of this House. There is no doubt whatever as to there being men on the Government side of this House who have for years, and rightly so, endeavoured to make adequate and well balanced regulations regarding the consumption of liquor and I have no doubt but that the framers of this Bill were of the same mind. They thought that this Bill was a Bill that in every section was for the good of their fellow countrymen.

I have no doubt but that when this Bill was brought before this House they were still of the same mind. They thought that this Bill was a Bill, and every section of it was for the good of their fellowmen.

But, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Emerson, the Honourable Member for Placentia East, pointed out to this House the present amendment means something much more, and in his opinion has a considerably wider interpretation than was at first supposed.

Now, Sir, I can only say that any measure that is introduced into this House I will have the greatest pleasure in assisting to the best of my humble capacity, but if this amendment is capable of the interpretation which is stated it is, and if the Government are allowing and permitting the particular section to now take away from the Board of Liquor Control the sole authority in the matter of distilling, bottling and labelling liquor, then, Sir, I think that there will be many men in this Assembly who will not stand for it. I think, Sir, and I feel confident that they will take the attitude that this section must be deleted or worded so as to remove beyond any doubt what the intention is or if not acceded to, then that the bill be thrown out.

The Restaurants Bill is one I have pleasure to see introduced and there is no doubt about what a splendid effect this bill will have on our city life. It is high time that it was passed, and I am sure with the authority now given to the Chief of Police and his subordinates, that many abuses that have been all too apparent in our city life and now exist will be wiped out.

As to the commissions—the several commissions named, I personally have only regarded the Public Utilities, the Fisheries and the Unemployment Com-

missions, and particularly the Employment Commission.

I hope and trust that all that is promised and intended to be done through the efforts of the Utilities Commission will be realized, and as for the Fisheries Commission I sincerely hope that having done their work thoroughly and well and made recommendations, which will be for the man who catches the fish, the man who goes forth and toils and returns with his rewards for honest labour, I sincerely hope that anything recommended for his benefit will be met. I am very young in political life, but I hold the poor fisherman is worthy of all that which helps life, and I hope now that this new deal and this Commission will do anything that can be done to bring a benefit to the men who toil and work hard to earn their money and that the recommendations will receive quick and due consideration.

There is one matter with reference to the Liquor Bill before I pass away from the subject, that is greatly to be regretted and that is the reluctancy with which requests for information from this side of the House were met. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any reason whatever for that display of reluctancy from the Honourable Minister of Finance.

The point of the whole thing is this, that the whole business from the illegal importation and seizure by the Honourable Minister has a mysterious atmosphere and the business is surrounded with suspicion and we, as well as all members of the House, ask why all the mystery about it, why was it not an illegal act, must we just let it drop and remain surrounded with mystery? The point is that the Honourable Minister did not see fit to give us this information. But, Sir, I must say that I was indeed surprised

that our Prime Minister and our Attorney General did not take advantage of the first opportunity to give reasons for the mysterious dealing with this illegal act and get up and tell the people of this country exactly what happened, if the whole thing is just a story that cannot be published or an attempt to let the thing die out, or if the thing is more considerable, if the thing is an attempt to break in on the rights of the citizens in this country, to defy the law of this country and hope to get away with it, or for financing any individual or ring, I am sorry that he did not take the opportunity of informing his fellow countrymen what it is all about, who are guilty and what is being done about it.

The Prime Minister did not take that attitude and it is certainly not for me, a junior member, to tell him whether he was wise or unwise.

Now, Sir, to get back to the Commissions. I said Sir, that I was particularly interested with the Unemployment Commission and, after all, that is only natural because it has been my part in recent years past to have a somewhat familiar connection with unemployment, and therefore, as I say I was of necessity in touch with the question, and it is something near to me. At the same time in saying that I do not wish to mean that I know the solution, but just because I am personally wrapped up in the matter.

In coming to the employment situation it is a difficult point to deal with. I do not wish you to understand that I am getting up to be critical of the question, because I know just as well as the men who have been in politics for the last decade that the Government is not to blame for the proposition they are up against in unemployment. I do not hesitate for a minute to say that because I know it is definite. I know quite well that in

the short period of ten years we have had five administrations in this country, and five administrations have had a chance of dealing with the employment situation and it has not been dealt with yet.

But where I take objection to the Government is this. In the campaign of last October before they came into power they did take advantage of the fact that they were able to mislead the voters. They did take undue advantage of the fact that there were many men and women who knew they were going to be up against it in the coming winter as they had been up against it in past winters, and promised them—and it is here that I take issue—they promised them something they knew very well they could not grant the same men and women during the past winter. When you vote, vote for no dole. They told the people they were being disgraced by being given dole. Now they were telling the people that charity was contemptible and they were telling the people of this city something that was not true. Now, in fact, there is the greatest unemployment; for years past it has meant the expenditure of large sums of public money to carry the people of this city through from December to the month of May.

Now then, Sir, I am not defending the dole system but I state here and now that if you go up and down this city to-day you will find that under the dole system of last year the families in this town—whether the children were ten in number or two—were in much better position during the months from November to May last year, when they were under the dole, than they have been during the past three months.

And, Sir, it is because of that I take opposition to the Government saying no dole, all work—but we know the work.

We have the Speech from the Throne. Now, Sir, while I give credit to the Government for announcing in the Speech from the Throne that they have appointed a Commission to go into and solve the problem of unemployment, I grant them their earnestness of needing to do something for the unemployed of the country, but, Sir, the trouble is that the electors expected something more than that. It is all very well, and I give them due credit for appointing the Commission, but what about the families in the meanwhile?

I am afraid there is one of the old sayings that may be used again "Live horse and get grass." Granted that this Commission will do its best to go into the question and that they will try and will endeavour to hand to the Government a satisfactory recommendation to try and overcome the difficulty, granted that it is all to come about in a day—the solution of the unemployment position is one that is going to prove a puzzle to any body of men or any commission that you select in this town, and that is so true, Sir, that the Prime Minister himself announced quite recently at a public dinner that he himself did not know the solution to it. He admits that he is absolutely stalled and he is quite honest, and a great many others are stalled.

You readily understand the position. I am sorry I do not wish to delay the house with this information but just want to give the outport members a little instance of what happens here each year in the town. How we are always up against the position of some eleven hundred families having to be fed here each year.

Now, Sir, so far as the duties of the Commission to ascertain the cause of unemployment are concerned. I would strongly recommend to the

Prime Minister that he inform the Commission not to waste any time about enquiring into the matter, because the cause of unemployment has been staring us in the face and ringing in our ears ever since 1919. The cause, in my opinion, of the dearth of employment in St. John's. The fact that within the past nine or ten years the fishermen of the various outports throughout the country have been pulling away from the fisheries, and I am not blaming them for so doing because they have the right to take any form of employment they choose just as well as men of any other avocation to enable them to get a livelihood—and in most cases eke out an existence for themselves and their dependents. But the point is there a reason for fisherfolk flocking to the capital city in such large numbers during the years referred to, and some of us who were in close touch with unemployment affairs have to admit the fact that, with the introduction of the policy of rock-breaking in 1920 which had such a demoralizing effect throughout the country, the fishermen, not being properly advised, gave up their calling on the sea and came to the land, because they were only too glad to take the assured daily wage and to share in the indiscriminate givings-out that was so general and so rampant from that period to the end of 1923, in preference to taking their chances on speculative returns from the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, as an humble suggestion, that one of the lines to be followed, if you want to get at the crux of the unemployment problem with a view to a satisfactory solution, is to investigate and find out what is the most that can be done to make the fishing industry sufficiently attractive for the man who has left his boat.

There is no reason at all why the man who goes out and toils on the sea should not receive a commensurate re-

turn exactly as the man who works on the land; but the great drawback and the great trouble is that, despite all the loud talk in the past on behalf of the fishermen, the producers of the country, there was no sincerity behind it, and, consequently, the fishermen of the country, to an alarming extent, drifted into that slough of dependency, and will continue to drift except something of a practical and tangible nature is evolved to make the fisheries attractive for our people to prosecute. In the past, apparently, there was virtually nothing done to safeguard the fisheries and no commissions were appointed or conferences held to protect the fishermen whereby he could go out in boat and make his wages and be assured of his winter's supplies for himself and his family, with the result that he decided to abandon fishing and came to the land and took on \$2.50 a day—the sure thing. That is the story, the underlying principle, of unemployment as we have it to-day.

With regard to the question of unemployment in St. John's, as I have already mentioned, this runs back for about ten years, and from the very outset in 1920 the situation has increased each succeeding year rather than diminished. To put the matter plainly and bluntly, the cause of the unemployment in the city every winter in St. John's is the fact that the labour market here is glutted. There are hundreds of labourers too many for the amount of labour offered. Now, Sir, this contingency was not and is not to-day brought about by the St. John's labourer, and I would ask Honourable Members for the different outport constituencies to bear with me for a moment. Prior to the war period the times were never so urgent that the St. John's labourer could not average three days out of the week, at least, during the winter months. But

during the war period the demand for labourers was abundant on every hand and good wages were offered. Many outport men pulled away from the fisheries and came to St. John's to work, which, of course, they had every right to do. They secured remunerative employment here and told scores of their outport friends how well they were doing, and the next we saw was hundreds of fishermen from different sections of the Island coming to the city. Then the pioneers got their families here and started to get homes around them. That was during the years when there was "plenty of corn in Egypt" and, apparently, there was nobody to advise them against selling their birthright for a mess of pottage. For a few years those men enjoyed good returns for their work; but what happened towards the end of 1919 when the price of labour dropped whilst the prices of food and clothing commodities soared beyond all reach of the workingman? It was no slow process either and that pinch was felt very severely in this town. The Squires Government then came into power and in the winter of 1920 started rock-breaking as an attempt to relieve the unemployed. Therefore, there are no men, or there should be no men better qualified to come into this House and tell the country what is wrong and tell us how to grapple with the unemployment problem, because fully one-half of the present Executive Government were members of the Squires Executive from 1919 to 1923 when poverty and destitution stalked throughout the land.

In 1920 this business of feeding families came and by 1921 it was really a calamity. It was very seriously felt in this town and cost the revenue of this Colony three hundred thousand dollars for rockbreaking to feed starving men, women and children in

this town. In 1922 and 1923 rock-breaking cost this country \$220,000 and afterwards we gave out dole. Now, sir, there is no excuse for the Government taking the attitude they did last Fall during the election campaign. From the platform, press, gramophone and every other channel and agency available they denounced the giving of dole. They promised the electorate that there was to be no more dole; but all work and that the "land was going to flow in milk and honey" as for as the laboring man was concerned.

This labor situation is not going to be cured overnight because of the appointment of a Commission to deal with it or by opening up a road in the suburbs and employing five hundred men thereon, and the Government realises that too. It may seem like stretching it, but I am convinced that a solution of the problem will not be accomplished within the next two years and prosperous ones at that. Then again, Mr. Speaker, what can the eleven hundred families that have been registered here since 1919 do during the month of May next. May month has always been one of the worst months of the year in this city in the way of employment. There is every indication that it is going to be as bad this year as it was before.

To get back to the statement I made regarding outport men coming to the city to seek work, I wish to say to the outport members that my remarks were not made for the purpose of disparagement or for casting aspersions, so I trust they will view the whole thing with sympathy rather than with antagonism, because when you are dealing with the questions of laborers in St. John's at the present time, it is a very composite crowd of workmen you have to deal with. Candidly I admit that this unemployment problem is a very difficult one to solve and I

would not attempt to tell the Government what they should or should not do, but I would suggest to the Government the advisability of re-habilitating a number of the fishermen who now find themselves in an unfortunate position on account of having left their homes in the outports and who are anxious to get back to them again.

To my personal knowledge there are outport men living in this town for the past five years who would be only too to get the chance to go back from whence they come and continue their independent mode of living, however arduous, and what they are used to. They have found that St. John's is a hard place to live in and bring up their families decently and independently, and they feel that they are much better able to provide for the comfort of their dependents with the returns they can get from the fisheries. Besides the outport fisherman can live more comfortably in his outport home than in St. John's. Many of these fishermen who came to St. John's to live are occupying houses so called in various sections of our city that are unfit for human habitation. Still they have got to pay rent for such hovels, and if they don't pay their belongings are put out on the sidewalk. The same applies to groceries and fuel. If a man has not the wherewithal to purchase coal, he has to do without it, whereas in the outports he can get his own fuel, without cost. But to the credit of many of the small grocers in this town they rendered a helping hand to many poor families during the winter months of the past ten years.

The city labour man has to clothe his children in a more expensive manner than in the outports. He has to pay higher rates. In fact in every way he turns it is a case of pay as he has nothing for the privilege of doing this except in many cases to get up in the

morning and go down Water Water Street and walk among the water side premises and then go back home again to face starvation. Now, Sir, I am not exaggerating the case at all. I feel quite sure that if you ask the Directors of the Dorcas Society or the Saint Vincent de Paul or any of the Charity Bureaus, or the N.I.W.A. or any such, they will tell you that what I am saying here is perfectly correct, namely that the outport man to-day is smothering in this city, in the most frightful conditions compared to what he left, the independent, healthful life in the outports. He came in here on the lure of good wages in the good days. Therefore in all sincerity I would suggest to the Government that this thing be seriously considered. It should not be hard to get in touch with the different outport men. In fact somewhere in the records during the past few years there must be absolutely personal records of some fifteen hundred men, that are registered here. But if there is no registry it would be worth the time and money to compile one. I have no doubt that it will be found that the number of those men will be around two thousand. And mind you I appreciate that this is going to cost money but first costs are the least costs. We know that for the next two or three years we are going to be faced with this proposition of caring for these families at the public expense. Let us then spend some of that money, let us allocate a substantial amount and put back those people into their homes, assist them back to the healthful happy homes that they left for hard times.

MR. LAKE—In other words you do not want them here and they better move out?

MR. BYRNE.—I endeavoured to make it perfectly clear to the honourable member that I am not attacking the outport man for being in St.

John's, but I am only saying this that he made a mistake when he came in on the lure of good times, and he has now gotten into a condition for which he is not to blame, but seeing that he is the victim of circumstances now, and living in this town under the hardest kind of conditions we should give him the chance of returning to his own home, were conditions would be much improved. I am not talking about the man that has built his own home, but the labourer that is unemployed, and up against the conditions that I name. Give him a chance to move to good conditions and an independent life that he has left.

May I make another suggestion to the Government. May I suggest that the matter of the establishment of an employment bureau be considered in this country. And when I say that I do not mean a temporary office that is half an employment office for casual jobs, and half a relief office, in times when it is necessary to give out able bodied relief. I mean the establishment of an independent bureau of labour in this country with its headquarters here in St. John's. That Bureau would start off with the registration of all the unemployed in St. John's and the outports. I have talked this thing over before now, and personally, Sir, I cannot see any great objection why men cannot be employed throughout our Island, through the central office. If in any district in this country a big operation is to be undertaken next week, why cannot the employment be divided up through the facilities would be granted to this Government to enable part of the young men of this country to proceed to the West, if they wanted to go. There is nothing more degrading to a young man than to have him walking around this city, out of work. It is not his fault. He cannot obtain the employment. I honestly believe that if

the co-operation of the Canadian Government was sought that we would be able to send every young man who had the desire for work, and was independent, away to the wheat fields of Western Canada each year, and now, Sir I did not intend to delay the House so long, but I hope and trust that in the very near future we will hear from the Government some encouraging news about what is going to be done for the unemployed and the destitute in the city and in the Island generally.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, custom has merged into tradition as far as the part goes that the opposition has to play, in speaking to the Speech from the Throne. First of all in following out that custom I want to congratulate you Sir, on the high office to which you have been elected and I trust that you will live for many years to occupy that office with the same dignity that you have already shown in it. I think, Sir, that I also should congratulate the Government upon the Speech from the Throne. That is an unusual thing for an opposition member to do. But I do it because I believe it is the best that they could get out in the circumstances and because I think that only a government which makes promises without having first considered the possibility of being able to carry them out could evolve such a Speech from the Throne as that before us. It has been taken for granted, Sir, that the opposition members always have a specific duty to perform in this House. I want to state, Sir, that it is my opinion that the Government or all Governments also have a relatively specific duty to perform as well, and I am afraid, this this government in conjunction with a good many other governments forget when they have been elected the promises they made to the country when they were appeal-

ing for the support of the electorate.

The Speech from the Throne says that the government has confidence born of the fact that the great majority of the people approved of their policy, and gave them the mandate to carry on. I am beginning to wonder just what the actual policy of the Government was. I do not want the Government to feel that I am criticising them in a spirit of vindictiveness, commensurate with that which they have shown during the few months that they have been in office. I want to tell the government that for my part as a member of the opposition I intend to criticise as constructively as I know how. I intend to offer suggestions which in my opinion may be productive of some good, and any measure that the Government might bring into this House will have the support that it merits as far as I am concerned. I am sorry to have to say, to-day, that I don't know whether I actually represent a district or not. And I am going to lay the blame for this at the door of the Government. My impression as a young man in politics is that whether he holds a seat on the government or the opposition side, he should on behalf of the district that he represents receive that respect and encouragement which is due in all matters where he shows an interest in the common welfare of the country generally. But I am afraid that there is a smattering of selfishness, of political vindictiveness, party politics as practised in Newfoundland, and that there is a want of respect for the man of the opposite party who represents a district in this loyal corner of the British Empire. What is the position of an opposition member. Is he to be ignored? Are the requests that he may send on behalf of his constituency to be thrust aside as if he had no voice in the affairs of his country? Are the wishes of an elected

member on the opposition side of the House to be totally ignored because his constituents exercised their right to vote in accordance with their conscience? I submit, Sir, that it is not a question of whether the opposition member wants to be thought well of by the government, but it is a question of whether the Government wants his opinion and his support, or whether the government is going to treat him as an outcast, and even as if he apparently was unfit to occupy a seat in this House.

Now, Sir, let us consider the attitude of the Government towards the district of Bonavista South. First of all I want to refer to the numerous dismissals that have been made in that district since the recent election. The Post Mistress at Brooklyn was dismissed shortly after the election of the present Government, and I asked the Minister of Posts why the dismissal was made. He tells me that the former Post Master who was dismissed in 1924 was reinstated. But he does not tell me that there was any reason why the Post Mistress that was already there was dismissed. Then he goes on to say in the case of the dismissal of a Mail Courier of 10 years service, that it was thought the service could be as well performed if a change was made. Surely that is no answer. Probably the dismissal of some official in 1924 was necessary. But presumably because that official was dismissed by a former government, the Monroe Government, then this Government takes on its own hands to appoint its own supporters. With that perhaps there is very little to be said because political expediency seem to be of paramount importance in this country. The point I want to make is this that it ill behoves a government and a Minister of a Department to concern themselves with such small matters, when there are far greater

issues to be considered.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is vague and incomplete; and that is the best I can say about it. I cannot see any policy in it. There is nothing in it. That old statement that is common in British politics, or was common previous to the war and during the early years of the war might be applied to it: It is a "wait and see policy." We wait and see what the commissions will have to say. The Government don't see existing conditions or what has to be done, and don't want to see, until the commissions come in and tell them.

When I was a school boy, and I am not much more now in politics, I had ideals of what political life was and felt keen admiration for wonderful characters that inhabited politics, that these exemplary individuals to me stood for all that was noble and upright and all that should be cherished. I am not going to say there are no men in the Government who are not noble and upright and good citizens in every particular. I am not going to speak about this Government in particular, but I want to state that politics in Newfoundland are rotten and contaminated, and have been for many years and until we get more truth told, more seriousness in the minds of politicians we will never have it otherwise. During my campaign I was struck very much by the distress to be found in the district I canvassed. I found conditions that apparently were nobody's business to inquire into; conditions that were appalling; and these conditions have been going on all through the years. So called Liberal Government in and Tory Government in, Liberal Government out and Tory Government out. Apparently when elections were over it was forgotten that a specific duty was there to be performed. Why should people be poor when they are

physically uable to provide for themselves. Why should a poor widow be offered the miserable sum of twenty-seven or thirty dollars a year to feed and clothe her children and attempt to educate them and make good citizens out of them. I would like to see something endeavouring to help such conditions mentioned in the Speech from the Throne; it is not only aid for physical wants that is required but for training characteristics of men, and to endeavour to make citizens of whom we can be proud. The boys and girls of to-day are the men and women of to-morrow; they have it within them to be good and useful citizens but what chance have such children as I mentioned of making good. Why does not the Government suggest some sort of state insurance. It would not eventually be taking money from the Treasury of the country, but protecting the Treasury from the demands made on it by charities from time to time. The reason why the Government does not want to is because the immediate effect "in value" for political purposes is not felt. That is what we have got to get away from. If we cannot exhibit practical foresight we had better get out of business as a Government and as a country and ask the Home Government to handle our affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my physical condition at this time will not permit me to carry on with the debate. I want to say something more on the subject, and with your permission I beg to move that the debate be adjourned until Monday afternoon.

Pursuant or order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act Relating to Contracts with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of th Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Phime Minister the second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was deferred until to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 19 George V., Chapter 18, entitled 'An Act relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered to 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.

It was moved that when the House rise it adjourn until Monday, April 29th at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 29th, 1929.

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

Hon the Prime Minister asked leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Colsolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens.'" "

It was moved and seconded that the Hon. the Prime Minister have leave to introduce this Bill. The motion was carried.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a first time.

The Bill was thereupon read a first time.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions respecting Amendment of Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Companies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the object of this Bill is to increase the maximum registration fee for deeds of large value from \$500.00 to \$1,000.

It is estimated that there are eight to ten deeds on an average annually of very large value and it is felt that a maximum of \$1,000 registration fee would not be unreasonable at the present time.

It is estimated that by making this change in the maximum fee it will be the means of increasing some three to five thousand dollars the revenue of the Department of Deeds.

For many years past in Newfoundland we have been carrying on a Registry of Companies at the cost of the public, the companies themselves not paying what has been considered a reasonable proportion for the normal work.

For instance, on a capitalization of \$10,000 a company paid \$10.00. In Nova Scotia the fees for the same capital was \$75.00. On a capitalization of \$25,000.00 the fee in Newfoundland is \$25.00 whereas in Nova Scotia is was \$90.00. On a capitalization of \$50,-

Galley 46
000 the Newfoundland tax is \$37.50, Nova Scotia's being \$115.00. On \$100,-

000 Newfoundland collects \$62.50; on the same capitalization in Nova Scotia the fee is \$152.50. On half a million dollar company Newfoundland collects \$137.50 while Nova Scotia gets \$227.00.

This bill is nothing more than the Nova Scotia scale without a change.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, my only comment on these resolutions is that we have lost quite a lot of money during the last twelve months is not having such a Bill introduced before.

All kinds of companies have been incorporated during the past year and thousands of dollars have been lost to the revenue.

We should have had these long and long ago and we would have been a lot better off.

People are incorporating companies—some of them fictitious—and not paying anything at all for the privilege of having their companies incorporated.

I give the resolutions my support.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred and had passed the same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and a Bill was introduced giving effect to the Resolutions which was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 24, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships.'"

It was moved and seconded that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries have leave to introduce this Bill.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a first time.

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions respecting the Amendment of Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

A Bill was introduced to give effect to these Resolutions which was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported having considered the matter to them referred, reported progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was deferred until to-morrow.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Replies to questions No. 1, 3 and 4 were tabled by the Minister of Public

Works and the Hon. Colonial Secretary.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Income Tax Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I wonder if the Hon. Minister will consent to the deferring of these Resolutions in order that we may have a chance to study the different contentious Sections of them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Whilst I am prepared to accede to the Hon. Gentleman's request I thought we might be able to get through some of the routine Sections of the Resolutions this afternoon and the debateable Sections can be held over.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity to rush this thing through, we want to study every line of this. We are responsible Members of this House, and we want to be quite clear on the matter. In connection with this Section, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he has taken into consideration the method of applying the Business Profits Tax over a number of years instead of one year. There was quite a lot of talk during the last Income Tax about businesses that made lots of money one year and then lost quite a lot the next year, so that they have to borrow money from the Banks to pay back the Income that they paid the Customs the year before. It was thought that it would be more suitable to average the Income over a period of say three years. I would like to ask the Minister if he has considered that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member I would like

to say that we have considered it, and when we get on further in this Act you will see that as regards personal Incomes, the three years are averaged up. The first year, a man may pay a big Income Tax, the next year he may pay a big one also and the third year he will get a refund. But in reference to businesses such as those carried on on Water Street, that would be a very difficult thing to do, because the dividends come from the businesses of that nature if there is a bonus at all it will be in the form of an Income, but when we come to get down to the businesses such as I have mentioned, it is going to be very difficult matter. We have thought it over very seriously.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I have already suggested that in arriving at the profit of business concerns engaged in the codfish business that it should be arrived at by taking a three years average of the profits made. We all know how uncertain the fishery business is. Some years are good and other years are bad. If they happen to have a good season this year, they may have a big loss next year, so it is very hard in that way. Other business corporations, I think, have a pretty average business all the year round and their profits do not vary considerably, at least in this country. But certainly in connection with the Fisheries, I think it is only fair to the businesses connected therewith, to calculate their profits on at least a three year basis. When we were drawing up a proposed Income Tax that was one of the suggestions outlined. I have not seen in this bill any such suggestions.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The ordinary man in this bill gets a three years average.

MR. SULLIVAN—, I suggest that the Income of Firms, particularly those supplying for the fishery should be ar-

rived at by average over a period of three years.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member I may say that that suggestion has been considered but I cannot see how we can do it. It is going to make untold trouble to the Assesor. Every man coming down to the department and presenting his returns is going to have a different profit this year than last year and the third year it is going to be different again. It will be a continual fight from beginning to end. Any man that makes a big lot of money this year he should be prepared to pay the income on it. If he looses he does not have to pay anything. If over a period of three years, the third year he makes another large amount of money, then he pays his income for the third year on that. So that if he does not make anything the second year he is clear of the tax. Whereas under the suggestions made by Mr. Sullivan if he looses money the second year he may be able to make up for it the third year. In the fishery business for example I may make \$100,000 the first year. The next year I may lose \$20,000. I pay income tax the first year on \$100,000. The next year I do not pay any, and the third year I make \$100,000. According to your scheme the whole is totalled up, and the average struck, so that I am bankrupt the second year unknown to myself.

MR. EMERSON—You will be paying on \$200,000 divided by three.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not think it will be workable anyhow.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I do not think the Minister thoroughly understands the matter. Suppose the first year you make \$100,000. The next year you make nothing,

and then the third year you make \$100,000. Now at the end of the three years the total, \$200,000 is divided by three and the assessment is made on that. That helps to lessen a big loss in the second year.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, it is almost certain that a large number of small corporations which to-day are practically family concerns could become unincorporated for the purposes of becoming individuals and in that way get the benefit of the act. May I also point out that lots of small businesses are not incorporated.

I would like to point out another feature. In this section that we are dealing with:

Reads:

What I am thinking of is stock dividends. The principle of the English Income tax with regard to this is that if a stock dividend is declared by way of income it is taxable but if it is declared by way of an increase of capital it is not taxable. I have not got the Act before me, or even an authority from which to speak. I happen to know because a very large case went to the House of Lords and they drew that distinction, that if any stock bonds were given away, and a shareholder give the right to take cash it is taxable, but if it takes the form of an increase of capital and there is not option but to take the stock then it is not taxable. If you have no option but to take stock they treat that as capital. But if it is given out with the option to take stock or capital than it is taxable.

I would like to ask if the Minister has taken into consideration the question of exemption of premiums for life insurance?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The matter has been considered, but that would in my opinion be a boost for the insurance

companies; a lot of money instead of going into income tax payments would go to the insurance companies. People would think it preferable to reduce their taxable income in this way by investing all they could in insurance. After all life insurance may be considered a saving and a protection; for a young man a saving and for elderly and married men a protection.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, the Minister has just said that life insurance premium payments are not exempt. Does not Sub-section (m) cover that?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No that refers to return premiums; amounts returned by the Company to the insured. That would not be taxable as he would have already paid his tax on it.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am of the opinion that insurance premiums should not be taxed. I don't think we can do too much to encourage investment and saving of this kind by young men particularly. I for one would very much prefer to see that as an exemption.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I am rather a booster of life insurance. It is a sort of compulsory saving once we start. The difficulty is to induce young men to start. I think the more inducement held out to insure the better for the country. The small amount paid in to the insurance becomes a good saving and investment and it will not be saved otherwise. However, if the Minister has made up his mind that it is not to be included as an exemption after consideration, there is not much use in going into the matter further now.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, I have made up my mind on consideration of the matter.

MR. EMERSON—Would the Minister mind if Sub-section 5 were allowed to

stand over for the same reason as Section R.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Not in the least.

MR. EMERSON—Am I to take it the Section 6 refers back to Sections A, B, and C. (Reads C.) Suppose a man left say \$10,000.00 in trust to be divided between two or three children, and the income of each child was less than the stipulated amount to be taxed, should we take the whole thing as one?

MR. CASHIN—Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN—I suggest that as the time is getting short that we pass the Sections that we have read and adjourn this reading until to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on "Telephone Resolutions."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, Section 3 is allowed to stand over. Section 11 is standing over, the last and lengthy sentence is changed to read as follows: (Reads). Mr. Emerson raised the point as he thought there was some liability on the country, and it is changed so that it may be abundantly clear to all. Section 8 is allowed to stand over, it is changed to read as follows: (Reads.). This meets the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, who would like to see our home industries protected.

Would the Clerk please read Section 3: (Clerk Reads.)

MR. PUDDESTER—Now just what does that mean. I take it, that section would include hand tools such as picks, shovels, etc.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, hand tools such as shovels, etc. It would not include anything which is manufactured here or can be commonly procured here. It is a much tighter provision than in the other agreements such as the Western Union. Of course it would not apply to special tools, such as one used for adjusting a tube, or other special piece of apparatus used in connection with long distance telephony.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Hand tools should not come in duty free under any circumstances. It is my idea that hand tools should not come in duty free if they can be procured in quality and quantity and are in common use in this colony.

MR. SULLIVAN—The lawyers say that as the section stands it will admit the hand tools free of duty.

MR. PUDDESTER—That section should have been attended to and made right during the adjournment regarding it. Why was this not done?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am afraid I must take the blame for that.

MR. SULLIVAN—A little more or less will not matter.

MR. EMERSON—I am not quite clear what that section means. It seems to me that the company is not bound to do anything until the Government has constructed a telephone system to connect with it. There is nothing in the rest of the agreement other than grants of exemption to the Company and the only obligation is contained in section 11.

Reads:

We do not know what the cost of constructing and connecting will be. We do not know how far away it is going to be. It may be at Port aux Basque. The Company is bound to nothing under this agreement for the purpose of long distance telephony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Company will bring the cable to the bottom of Placentia and Conception Bays. These are the points where connection is possible and the cable will be brought there. There is at present no means of connecting these places with the Avalon Telephone system. It will be necessary for us to make some arrangement whereby we can deliver the message to them with such electrical strength to permit it being transmitted. If we do not do that they cannot transmit the telephone message.

MR. EMERSON—That is the thing that attracted my attention I wanted to make the position perfectly clear on that point.

Now those are the facilities that are spoken of in the last part of the section.

“The company will become liable.

(Reads)

So they are not bound to provide any facilities until we provide a connection with their station.

Now doesn't that mean this—that under the act the company is not bound to do anything and that we have got to spend a large amount before they provide any facilities.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Company is not bound under the Act to lay a cable.

MR. EMERSON—The question is are they bound to provide facilities, and if it does prove capable of use as a telegraph business and they do not provide telephonic facilities, their answer will be: “You have not provided your fully acceptable connections and

therefore we are not going to put in anything for telephones at all” and it becomes simply a telegraph cable.

That seems to me to be a very one-sided agreement. I do not see what we are going to get out of it. The very best that could be said about it is that we have got another cable company coming here to run a cable.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the experiments in Trans-Atlantic telephone should be a failure. This bill is all based on the vision of the future development of the telephone system.

MR. EMERSON—It seems to me that the Company is getting the best of it.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, in the event of their not being successful with these experiments will they give up the idea or would they still go on with the telegraph connection?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, they are not a telephone company. They are called The American Telegraph and Telephone Co. but they operate telephones chiefly. Out of the eighteen million telephones in the United States, fourteen million are operated by them. It is not a telegraph concern although named The American Telegraph and Telephone Co.

MR. EMERSON—Haven't they the power under this Act, if the telephone business is not a success to turn it into a cable?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They are now working in their laboratories in New York upon an idea of operating a cable which is so constructed as to be capable of receiving telephone and telegraph messages at the same time. This is being done at the present time and in Newfoundland they are doing it over short distances. By using the copper wire it is possible to talk over the phone and at the same time to receive a telegraphic message clearly. The method is to put a con-

denser at the end of the wire which condenser degenerates the telegraphic electricity, but does not interfere with the particular class or current used for telephone.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—It might be of interest to the Hon. Prime Minister to know that I have personally conducted a conversation over an ordinary telegraphic wire over a distance of two hundred and thirty miles, so that shows us what is possible with a copper wire.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the meeting of the Assembly I was speaking on the Address in Reply and I was endeavouring to point out, Sir, how the Government were imposing scandalous restrictions upon the district which I have the honour to represent. I mentioned several matters which surely serve to point out that my assertion was correct.

In the Department of Posts and Telegraphs I found a number of dismissals. I found that officials who had been rendering faithful services were dismissed. In several cases these officials were people of mature years who could not be expected to take a part in the active industrial affairs of the country and, therefore, were not suitable for the particular work which they were engaged in. And I find, Mr. Speaker, that these people have been now replaced by young producers in several cases. Surely, Sir, if we have to find employment for young producers we need not do so at the expense

of people who have served their time, and who are now fulfilling their vocations in the civil service arduously and suitably to all concerned. When you take a job from a man who has been performing it to the best of his ability and in a very satisfactory condition as far as the country is concerned, whose age is sixty-five years, nothing less, and give it to a man whose age is twenty-one years—a producer of the country as I term him—then I state there is something wrong in the mind of either the person who made the change or the person who was responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if in the administration of the affairs of the district, the representative of that district is entitled to make a recommendation as to who shall fill the vacancy should a vacancy occur. In case this question is not going to be answered, it is sufficient to say that I have not been asked when a vacancy has occurred in the district which I have the honour to represent, who is the best one to fill that vacancy.

I state these things are not now being done in the best interests of the country. Personally I have no desire to push into office any person who has been a supporter of mine. I do not know a man, an individual, in the district which I represent who has actually been a supporter of mine. I never ask men for their votes. I say to a man "if you think you ought to vote for this party or that party or the other party in the interests of this country; it is your business to make your decision" and it is upon that ground that I claim I won my election. It is not my business, nor do I consider it the business of any candidate who solicites votes of the people of the country to tell the men whom they should or whom they should not vote for. Therefore why should a man who

happens to use his own judgment be dismissed from his job; and we have cases here where I have seen dismissed old men and young men given their jobs to serve base political ends.

I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here this afternoon. I consider the answers given to my several questions to be an insult to the intelligence of any individual. I consider these answers to my questions an insult to the intelligence of the people that I represent and I trust that when the vote for the Post and Telegraphs Department comes up I will have an opportunity to prove to him that my assumption is correct.

There is another matter in connection with the district of Bonavista South that I want to have cleared up, and that is the matter of timber licenses—particularly a license to operate a saw mill which a constituent of mine has been asking for. And I am going to make this statement that this individual should not have to come to beg from this Government or any Government to operate that saw mill. Take a man who supplies forty, fifty or a hundred families. In this case I know that he supplies fifty families—the producers of the country. He furnishes them with the food and clothes which they and their families need and they go into the country and procure the raw material and bring it back ready to be manufactured, and political spleen and spite and prejudice and all of the despicable things, that go to make up politics in Newfoundland prevent this man from turning this material into cash.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines will well remember what I am saying. I went to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and asked him if this man Stead was going to be given a fair show and he said this matter had been referred to the Ex-

ecutive. I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a question in this House as to whether this man, Alfred Stead was to get his license for sawing timber and the answer was no, he had not paid royalties, and at the bottom of the answer he said Stead has since paid royalties. I want to know in the interest of the fifty families that Alfred Stead supplied, and in the interest of the country in so far as there is fifteen to twenty thousand dollars worth of lumber in the woods which will rot if he is not given his license. I want to ask if you intend to ignore the urgent request of the seven hundred and seventy-nine people whose names are signed to petition now before the Government and allow this timber to rot, or are you going to grant this man the license?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, without interrupting the Hon. Member for Bonavista South, I would like to answer his question, if he will permit me. For some years back the three mile limit was cut over until it was left a place of desolation so far as timber is concerned and Mr. Stead was one of those who cut over that area, contrary to the Crown Lands Act, and the logs he cut the present winter were taken from the reserved area. Now Mr. Stead did not pay his license fee for years and since we objected to giving him a license this year he paid the royalty fee. Our main objection was not because he had paid up his licenses year after year, but rather was it for the reason that he was logging this year, in spite of the instructions given by the Department, over the reserved area.

Now, Sir, it is a well recognised fact that the three mile limit is the sole reserve of the fishermen and it has been over-exploited. There are men holding No. 1 licenses to-day who are

not making any money out of this industry because there are schooner loads of lumber that is not saleable at the market prices, and the result is that it is sold for building purposes. Now that lumber pays no royalty, because it was intended, under the law, for the use of the fisheries, and it is an absolute violation of the principle on which licenses are issued. There is to-day a dearth of timber in scores of places around our coast much to the detriment of the fishermen and it is my intention to rescind the law regarding the cutting of timber over the reserved areas.

MR. QUINTON—With all due deference to the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I want to remind him that the matter had passed out of his hands and into the hands of the Executive Government.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I meant to say that, doubting my own authority to deal with this matter, my advice to him was to apply to the executive Council.

MR. QUINTON—I want further to say that the Hon. Colonial Secretary had not the courtesy to reply to a letter I addressed to him on January 10th last, and that corresponds with a statement I made on Friday last when I said that members of the Opposition are not now being accorded the rights and privileges that were formerly accorded representatives of Districts of this Colony. I have a copy of a letter on my desk written by the Prime Minister to persons in my district to the effect that this subject matter of a timber license would not come within his purview in an official capacity, as it appertains to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. Now, Sir I want to know whether the Agriculture and Mines Department has the right to do its own business or is the Executive Council the head of that

Department? I want to know also, if a man who invests his money and employs a number of men is to be disregarded and forced to lose that money, simply because a particular group of politicians can have things done exactly as they wish? Personally, I do not believe for a moment that this matter lies either with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines or with the Executive; but I do believe that it is the handiwork of a dictatorial group of unscrupulous political satellites and heelers of the present Government who either arrogate to themselves, or are given, the authority and the right to administer the affairs of a section of the country. I am not blaming the Minister of Agriculture and Mines particularly nor the Hon. Colonial Secretary specially respecting this license episode. I am blaming the vicious method of the administration of such matters and the sooner we get a departure from such iniquitous and nefarious practice the better for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. At all events Mr. Stead did not get his license this year and so any candidate who eventually happens to go to that section of Bonavista South on behalf of the present Government, to seek election will, no doubt, receive a mighty cold reception.

There is a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne that refers to the matter of trade expansion within the Empire and the better marketing of our products. Notwithstanding that statement (in this document, which is the mouthpiece of the Government) it appears to me that when the Government went to the country their chief object and their main idea was to disrupt trade, destroy industry and paralyze everything that meant for the accumulation of the earnings of the individual. In pursuance of that policy they proclaimed that the merchants were people who had apparently no

right to live and that any individual who came along to start some kind of business was a "blue blood" or a "lounge lizard". There is a cleavage that I maintain has existed ever since we had Responsible Government and that cleavage is between the man at the bottom on the one hand and the man on the top on the other hand created by politicians and self seekers. People have been lead to believe that the person who was poor was denied the right to exist and the person who was rich could take everything he could get. Every land has its economical difficulties to grapple with, but until politicians in Newfoundland realise that it is in the constructive application of material, men and things they can help to produce prosperity, that prosperity will never come.

Take the question of the products of the Empire brought into Newfoundland and the exports from Newfoundland going to different countries of the Empire. I find that seventeen millions of dollars worth of Empire products came to Newfoundland during the year under review and eleven millions of dollars worth went from Newfoundland to countries within the Empire. I find also that we have imported from foreign countries goods to the value of eleven million dollars and we have exported to them twenty million dollars worth of our products. Our imports have come principally from countries where the standard of living is high and our exports have gone to countries where the standard of living is very low, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such condition of affairs is not conducive to prosperity in Newfoundland. There is an unfortunate circumstance that we must not be unmindful of and which cannot be disregarded, and that is the material we import from countries where the standard of living is high we got to pay for either in spot cash

or on very sharp terms, and against that the material we export to countries where the standard of living is low, is very often sent in its raw state out of this country and sometimes is not paid for before six months or so has elapsed. In other words, we are burning both ends of the candle at the same time.

We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that a Commission is going to be appointed to deal with the question of our fisheries. I hope that when the Commission is appointed it will render efficient and practical service and not follow in the trail of previous Fishery Commissions we have heard so much about because of its uselessness. Probably the most vital and most advantageous things in connection with the fishery question is how to secure high priced markets for our products, and, in my judgment, the best way and the only way to accomplish that is by the improvement of the quality of the goods we export and not have indifferent cure as has happened in too many cases in the past. We have almost next door to us—the United States—a market that contains around one hundred and twenty million people—a market where there obtains the highest standard of living that any country in the world can ever hope to attain, for centuries to come, and it is up to us, as a fishing country primarily, to find our way into that market with our products and turn those dollars into our own country to distribute among our people who pay the taxes. It must be remembered that we have severe competition to face and it is only by organization that we can hope to meet that competition and to realize the possibilities that must come to us by careful handling of our fishery products. We have quite a number of mercantile men in the country prominently identified with the fisheries.

each in their own way trying to develop new markets, without any assistance so far as the Government is concerned. No serious attempt has been made in the past in that direction, and so I would suggest that this Government set to work and employ experts to investigate and report on the possibilities of our doing more business with the United States with regard to the exportation of our sea food products; but, I would like to add that the Government of the country should not interfere with respectable and legitimate business interests, as has happened in the past, but should be regarded as a sort of information bureau for dispensing information in respect to the marketing of our products. Now, it must be remembered that we are not the greatest fish producing country in the world. Take, for instance, Canada. They provide annually fifty million dollars worth of sea food. Not many years ago a Liberal Government of which the present Prime Minister was Leader, tried to control the prices of fish foods while in competition with countries that were producing more fish than we could dream of producing. Fifty years ago Canada's yearly fishery production amounted to one million dollars. Now, if Canada can find a way to expand that industry to the extent of practically fifty million dollars in fifty years, why should we remain in the same, or perhaps worse condition during that period? Something must be wrong and my opinion is that it is all attributable to mis-directed effort and lackadaisical methods. We have been too haphazard in the past. We want organization and we want compactness in our methods. There is too much undirected effort. We concentrate on new paths and get lost in a maze of undevelopment. I have a particular interest in the statement that I am making today as an individual who

has had some opportunity of studying these things. I want to see Newfoundland come into her own. Our country with its wealth of raw material should be one of the most prosperous on the face of the earth. And here we are appointing a commission to come in and tell this House what to do with unemployment.

The most important department in the whole country is the department of Marine and Fisheries, because this is principally a fishing country. I notice in the Speech from the Throne that it has been suggested (and naturally will be done) that a bill is coming into this House to provide for capital expenditure for public services such as education, the fisheries and for road operations. I want to point out that if we are to spend any further money on education in this country, we should begin to spend it in a practical way. On practical education. It does not matter how many lawyers and doctors we may make. We have to begin and educate the ordinary producer how to produce, and to produce things that will benefit himself, his country and the world at large. I would like to see that important department of Marine and Fisheries merged into a commercial intelligence department. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has an opportunity, which if he takes advantage of it, will enshrine him in the hearts of Newfoundlanders forever. That opportunity is to forget red tape, to hand over the mechanical part of the office to the Government Engineer, the clerical part to the clerks of some other under worked department and enlist the services of a group of experts, to find out the valuable things that we have in this country, of which we are ignorant ourselves, and then to find markets for those things, and in that way bring back dollars to Newfoundland. Sooner or later, whether this

government finds its way clear to do it or some other government, we have got to find whether we are really going to exist as a commercial country and fight our way into the markets of the world or sink down into oblivion.

Now, it has been suggested that you are going to spend some money on education, I would like to suggest to this House that in view of the new developments that are taking place in Newfoundland with regard to the fishing industry, and in view of the many thousands of dollars that are being spent in this country on experiments, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries take upon themselves to find out some thirty or more young fishermen who have a stake in the fisheries and an interest in them and send these young men away to some country that has done some profitable experimentation, and then let these men come back to us charged with the idea to do something that will profit the country. I believe that if we begin to realise how serious the business of educating the producer is, if we begin to take upon ourselves the responsibility of educating the producer to see the situation as it should be seen, Newfoundland will soon be a far better country to live in, if not immediately, then in ten or fifteen years from now. We do not need to take every fisherman and give him an intensive education, but we need to give them some grounding in training that may assist them to increase their earning power and the earning power of the country generally. No matter how menial the job that the producer has, no country can expect any growth of trade unless necessary knowledge is fully dispersed

There is need for us to pay more attention to the peculiarly valuable quality that our products contain in Newfoundland. And the most unfortunate

part about it all is that we ourselves know very little of the wonderful values. The time will come, sooner or later, when somebody will be making an immense fortune out of the resources of this country, and we ourselves asleep, and we will wake up as we have done in a great many other cases, when it is too late.

Now I am making these comments more or less for the benefit of the fishery commission that eventually will sit on this question. The great obstacle that I see is the location of the raw material. Our country is sparsely populated and consequently the amount of raw material available at any particular point is not very great. And, therefore, the question of transportation enters into the problem more acutely perhaps than any other question brought to bear upon it. An opportunity will be afforded I hope, Sir, when the Railway Estimates come before the House to discuss this matter of transportation more fully.

We are changing in this country. To-day we are finding it difficult to find markets for our products. We are faced with severe competition in all markets where our products go because we are not organised. And if we as a country, (or as a government which after all is the first business of a country), do not fully appreciate the effect of the delay that we are occasioning in these matters, we will wake up some day and find that opportunity has passed by our door while we were steeped in indifference. There is one particular industry that is growing and that I want to pay particular attention to this afternoon, with your permission, Sir, and that is the squid business of Newfoundland. I have some figures here that was given to me by the High Commissioner for Newfoundland some time ago, the late Capt. Victor Gordon, wherein he stated that in the year 1923 which

may be taken as a fair average year there were 3,750,298 quintals of squid produced in Japan. A large proportion of which found its way into China. This matter is far more important than we appreciate. As I have already said, my sole interest is not to stand here and talk for political purposes. It is as far as my knowledge goes to dispense any idea or information that may tend to increase the earning power of any individual in this country. I want to refer to the squid business for a moment as being one of the most important of the fishery branches of industries that has come to the attention of the people of this country. Suppose that the value of a quintal of squid is five dollars. Here is an industry worth to Japan fifteen million dollars. That is an important point, Sir, particularly when you consider that in this country we have such an amount of this material that it has become a nuisance. There was a time when this particular fish in Newfoundland was considered to be fit only for fertilizer, and applied in a very crude manner at that. Now we find whereas ten years ago this industry brought one thousand dollars to Newfoundland, last year it brought in fifty thousand dollars. While this may be a very small amount to discuss before this Legislature, yet the possibilities justifies an extensive continuation of this industry. I can quote instances in this country, in fact I think it is the district that I have the honour to represent, where a large number of the population derive their income out of this particular industry coupled with the salmon fishery. We must get together, government and opposition, and evolve some method whereby standardisation is brought into play in this and all the fishing industries that we operate in this country. Surely we are prepared as a country to stand behind the goods

that we raise and furnish. If we are not prepared to do that then there is no hope for an expansion of the fishing industry in Newfoundland. In connection with the squid trade people have been known to go along to some one who had a barrel of these fish for sale and without looking at the contents, without knowing what it contained pay him so much for the lot, and then send it to St. John's and have it carried away to the foreign market. I think it is a downright scandal that such loose methods should exist. I hope when the Fishery Commission begins to function, it will give these points the proper consideration that they deserve, because in the encouragement of an industry, if we forget to satisfy the demand that we want to create, then, Sir, we shall have failed in the performance of our first duty.

So far for the fisheries. I have said that when the Railway Estimates are tabled, we shall have an opportunity of discussing transportation, which I consider to be one of the pressing needs in the country to-day.

Speaking of agriculture, I do not pretend to know very much about it. Being of fishing stock, naturally I would not be expected to. But one point struck me rather practically the other day. "The Trade Review" came out and said there was a protection of \$14.00 per ton on hay in Newfoundland, and that caused me to look up the records of imports of hay into this Colony, and I found we imported a total of 7,687 tons in the year 1928; this netted us a revenue of \$23,000 and the total value for this year was \$101,501. Now, Mr. Speaker, if all other products fail to mature in this country, hay can grow; therefore with a protection of \$14.00 per ton I fail to see why some means cannot be found to encourage local farmers to produce \$100,000 worth of hay. Surely

we can keep out foreign goods and keep our cash at home in a case like this. We talk about unemployment; here is an industry that can be developed that could keep two hundred families comfortably. Field Marshal Earl Haig in 1925 at a conference which I had the honour to attend made a statement, in effect, that if we as a British people do not develop the resources given us by Providence, we do not deserve to retain them, and perhaps no truer statement than that could ring down through the years. I submit that the first consideration of every member of the House ought to be to help the workers of the country to produce more, and so bring about happiness in their homes that is sadly lacking to-day. It is not the business of Government to compete with legitimate trade but it is to assist in developing business, and help out our industries in every way possible by the proper sort of encouragement, by helpful trade agreements, and above all by creating a spirit of harmony and concord between all ranks of industry. Every additional dollar's worth of material product and marketed means increased earning, increased spending power, increased comfort, and what is more important happier families and a contented population.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, before going into the subject of the Speech from the Throne I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election in the House to the Speaker's Chair. It is not very often that a man just entering politics can occupy the high position that you occupy at the present time, and I fall in line with those who have spoken before me in what they have said in this connection, and I will abide by your decision in this House. I wish to congratulate the Honourable Members who proposed and seconded the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from

the Throne on their splendid address. They are like myself men from the Outports, and occupying seats in the House for the first time; and I trust with the knowledge they possess of the fishery, and its several branches that there will be good fruit from their efforts. I don't profess to be as well posted as some Honourable Gentlemen in the House on some of the Bills passing through, but I do profess to know something about the needs and requirements of the West Coast and my district of Port-au-Port. I notice the Government intends floating a loan in the near future, and means to devote some of that money to Public Works.

Now like a good many more I do not believe in having our National Debt mount year by year and leaving it as a burden for future generations to face, but I do believe that money spent in giving the people good roads throughout the country is really more of an investment than an expenditure; and I am sure that money spent in this way will give good dividends by giving people a chance to earn more money. Good roads would enable the production of a number of men to be increased. This would give them a certain amount more earning power, and so more spending power, and when they spend more the benefit would also accrue to the revenue in higher returns. Now as far as I can see the Avalon Peninsula is pretty well off as far as roads go, but the people of the West Coast have yet to know what a good road looks like, and I think a very good start would be made if the Honourable the Prime Minister carried out his promise last year and had a road built from Port-aux-Basques to Corner Brook. I only hope the Prime Minister has full intention of carrying out that promise. It would certainly open up some of the finest country in the Island. It would

induce people of other sections to build homes and settle down along there. It would be opening up some of the finest agricultural land in the country; and some of the finest salmon rivers in the country. It would induce automobile importation to a far greater degree than we have at the present time. We have lots of people around Bay of Islands and St. George's and Port-au-Port with money in their pockets who would be only too glad to spend it in buying motor cars if they could only see some benefit from purchasing a car. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking of this highroad business one must not lose sight of the importance of good local roads. I am now speaking of my own district of Port-au-Port, we have a road from Stephenville Crossing to Port-au-Port that I might say is in a condition that is a disgrace to any community. It is in a terrible state, and has been for the last number of years, and is getting worse, and if something is not done in the near future it will be a road that won't be able to be used by anybody or anything. That road is seventeen or eighteen miles to Port-au-Port. Last year I think something like seven thousand dollars was spent on it under the supervision of the High Road Commission. If half of the money had been taken and thrown over the wharf here in St. John's before it was sent out there we would have got better value as far as the road was concerned, half of the money was wasted. Of course it went into somebody's pockets but as far as results went it would be better if it were thrown over the wharf, the road was made ten times worse than it was before. All last fall the road was impassable, and now with spring opening it can be more impassable, it will that. This road from Stephenville to Port-au-Port might be called the main artery of the district. The traffic going over that

road in the summer time is considerable; there must be thousands and thousands of barrels of potatoes and other agricultural products and lumber going to the station; besides all the other commodities from the station coming from St. John's going down to the district. We have not one single harbor in the whole district of Port-au-Port. Leaving St. George's the first harbor you come to is Lark Harbor in Humber District. So we are really unfortunately placed with no harbor between two districts. Round the peninsula of Port-au-Port there is a road which if put in good condition and joined to the one I have referred to as the main artery would be a wonderful help to the people to make their ordinary living.

At the present time there are lots of people engaged in agriculture but they have nothing to encourage them to do more than they are doing, as there is really no sale and no way of transporting their produce. We have on our bay a small Bay Boat. It is pretty well alright in the summer time, but once it comes to October, November and December, during those months we have no harbor round the district. This means of transportation is not then available for the district. If we had a good road fit for motor traffic from Stephenville to Port-au-Port and had that connected beyond the Peninsula with another good road fit for motor traffic, there would not be one part of the District any further than three or four hours from the station at Stephenville Crossing. This would render possible the proper handling of all commodities to go and come from the station.

There is another thing I would like to refer to, Mr. Speaker, the Game and Inland Fisheries Board gets an allocation of around \$20,000. I think that that is a shame. I think the sum of \$20,000 is not enough to look after

anything. That grant should be around three times as much. We have several salmon rivers round the district of Port-au-Port and St. George's. River wardens get \$40.00 a month to keep rivers in good order and free from obstruction in accordance with the salmon regulations. Now how can any man getting \$40.00 a month for that kind of business get interested enough to do the work properly.

We are advertising Newfoundland to-day as the Sportsman's Paradise and so I think the Game and Inland Fisheries Board should have more money to look after the rivers. A warden only working three or four months at \$40.00 a month cannot be expected to give the high degree of work that we ought to have and to have great interest in his work. Now we have two rivers in Port-au-Port for which we have never had wardens. These are two good rivers and really need looking after and I think if the Board had a little more money at its disposal to put on a few more wardens and to give the wardens a proper recompense there would be good results in income to the district and the country generally.

There're a few other things I would like to speak of but it is getting late and I will get some other chance, but before I sit down I would like to say that as a Member of the Opposition I do not think I am here merely to oppose, and anything I think will help the business of the country and particularly anything I think for the good of the district of Port-au-Port I will support to the best of my ability.

On motion of Mr. Moore the debate on address in reply was deferred until to-morrow.

Mr. Alderdice gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Ryrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 30th, 1929.

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

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Plate Cove in the district of Bonavista South in respect of restricting apparatus for procuring squid, and I ask leave to have it referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration.

HON. MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Hodge's Cove in the electoral district of Trinity centre.

The petition is in respect of a well which the people of that section require, and require, to my knowledge, very badly.

In the western portion of Hodge's Cove the land is low and the nature of the country in that neighbourhood particularly with reference to drainage makes it extremely difficult to get water that is fit for drinking purposes.

They ask for a very small amount for the purpose of erecting a concrete well and I ask leave that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question of potatoes, in courtesy to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I feel I should say that I am not ready to table an answer to the question, since detailed information that is asked for by him is going to take a long time to prepare.

There are several reasons for this. One is that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Bayly, has been ill for the past six weeks and only he and myself are qualified in experience to handle the questions now referred to us.

I cannot to-day tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition what he wants to know but there is certain information that I can give him.

For instance, in Harbour Main we have upwards of two thousand barrels; from Avondale four thousand; Clarke's Beach two thousand; and in other places from four to five thousand.

We know of two thousand and that will probably be five thousand; Colliers five hundred barrels; Bay Roberts two thousand barrels; South River six hundred barrels; Bacon Cove five hundred barrels; Costigan, Harbour Main five hundred, and so on.

These records are in the department and the date on which the public estimate was acquired. The best of those are left. Some of the figures were taken from applicants mentioned by letter. We did not receive any reasonable offers.

We could only deal with those making offers of \$2.50 a barrel and to-day that offer is enough for what is requisite to quote, but I will endeavour to get as fully as possible all the information the Hon. member asks for. Owing to Mr. Bayley's prolonged ill-

ness, and in fact ever since I took charge of the Department, I have worked sixteen hours daily and then cannot keep up with the volume of business that keeps pouring in. I work from 8.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. from 1.30 p.m. to 5 p.m. and from 6.30 p.m. to 10 p.m.

Now with regard to those offers we receive, they comprise 15,000 barrels, but that is only touching the fringe of the matter. I have not heard any complaint from the large growing potato settlements on the subject; the only people I have heard from are those who held their potatoes too long. I was speaking by long distance telephone to-day, with the Hon. member for Carbonear, and he informed me that he had arranged for the sale of 2000 barrels of potatoes. Respecting the price of P.E.I. Potatoes, they can be landed for less than \$2.00 per barrel plus the freight would bring the cost up to \$2.50. I know that last year potatoes were bought from P.E.I. for 50 cents per barrel, but no potatoes are sent from P.E.I. except upon order. I think we might act with a good deal of propriety, by keeping this in view with regard to the matter of further taxation on P.E.I. Potatoes.

All the Salmon and Herring that we ship from the West Coast goes into Canada duty free, and I fear that if we attempt to enforce further duty on their products, our fish will be subjected to taxation. I know that last year a shipment of our fish was held up because of this question of taxation, but after a while the shipment was admitted duty free.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—This is not the form in which I want the replies to my questions. I want them in typewritten form laid upon the table of the House.

The Minister of Public Works tabled replies to questions no. 14 and 15 on the Order Paper.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens' was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 24, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the benefit of the House and those on the other side that there is only a very slight change in the present Bill. By ruling out clause B and C of sub-section One of the old act, section two of this Act reads:

(Reads)

The Marine and Fisheries Department at the present time receives a fee for the inspection of boilers only, but by ruling out these words the Department will receive a fee for the inspection of boilers and machinery. I may say that up to the present time the Inspector has to do both jobs but he only receives a fee for inspection of boilers. At the present time he happens to be away in New York inspecting the Furness Withy Boats in conjunction with the Canadian and American inspectors. They charge a fee for both work and we charge for only one. But it was thought that in the interest of the traffic he should do both and in fact did both. This change will increase the revenue of the department of Marine and Fisheries.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 6 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series)

entitled 'Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary,' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and other Documents,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, Committee of the Whole on Income Tax Resolutions was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alco-

holic Liquors,' " was deferred until tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to make a few comments on the legislation outlined in the Speech from the Throne. Before doing so I first want to congratulate yourself, Sir, on the honour conferred on you by this House. And I pray that you may be just in your dealings and rulings. And if there is any latitude to be allowed, seeing that we are small in numbers compared to the opposite side, I hope that you will give us a little advantage. I would also like to congratulate the Hon. members for Bay Roberts and Hermitage on the able manner in which they handled their case. Particularly do I want to congratulate the member for Bay Roberts, on his remarks leading up to the present conditions of the Labrador fishery. But I was really disappointed, in as much as he did not offer some better suggestions by which that could be improved and brought up to the standard that it was before. He remarked about the salmon fishery being second only to the cod fishery due to the efforts of the Liberal Government under Sir Robert Bond after the failure of the Labrador fishery, in introducing measure for an improved cure and the finding of new markets for number one cure. He went further and stated that we have a fishery now that looks as if it is going to become second only to the codfishery that is the salmon fishery.

Our people in Carbonear this year sold the salmon right off the stage, so that they had not the trouble of packing and sending into the city and getting number two or number three prices for them. There are great possibilities for that fishery in the near future provided there is any assistance given by the Government to pro-

secute that industry. We have now very few vessels where we had 300 or 400 prosecuting Labrador fishery from the south of Placentia Bay, in the past. I remember in passing twenty five or thirty years ago when we had 65 to 70 vessels from Carbonear alone, each loaded to the hatches not only with supplies but with traders to the Southern of Labrador. To-day there are practically none going down. But there is no means of transportation, except by the railway company or the Government steamers. Now we have only about four hundred men and boys engaged in that fishery. There has been no attempt for the last three years since the salmon fishery started of placing these people on the coast before the twentieth or the twenty-fifth of June or the first of July. The salmon fishery is then practically over. Codfishery alone is not able to support these people but if you provided means whereby these people could be on that coast no later than June the fifth, I do not think there would be any trouble, but on the contrary there would be a great many other who would go down there, who to-day are walking around the streets of Carbonear waiting for their member to get off the train. It is easy enough to criticise the policy of the Government, and it is very little use as far as I can see of any member outside the Government ranks offering any suggestion to relieve the situation. Now if the Government could see their way clear to hire a boat for about three hundred dollars, to take at least from the district that I represent, one hundred people who are not going to get out of that this year, but are going to be dependent on the Government the same as last year, it would be of great assistance in enabling these people to increase their earning power. If it were not for the policy of the Monroe party in building that railroad, or di-

verting it around the Topsails, and the consequent distribution of what the Liberal Press chose to call a slush fund, here would be a great deal more destitution in Carbonear than there is to-day. That is money that was spent and there was some return for it but there is no return for the dole that was given out since that system came into force in 1921.

And now sir, I want to ask the Minister of Public Works whether in connection with the grants for the different districts, whether it is the intention of the Government to give the members sitting in this House, whether they be Government members or Opposition, the control of those monies, or whether the claims of the Opposition members are to be ignored in favor of defeated Government candidates.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member I may say that by own opinion in the matter is that every member whether government or opposition should have his own grants to spend. But I do not know what the Government intend to do. However as I told the Hon. member when he came down to my office the other day, I thought that the Government would fall in line with that idea.

MR. MOORE.—You did this then on your own initiative, without the authority of the Government? You made these appointments without Executive authority? There is another question I want to ask. Will the money go out to these people named there? Will the money belonging to the district go out to the district to these people, John Duff, Harry Cowan and the others?

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Yes.

MR. MOORE.—Do you take it on yourself to appoint these road boards? Don't you think the representatives of

the district should have a say as to the grants?

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—This is the first time you objected to those men.

MR. MOORE.—The elected representative should be recognized and you admit that yourself, but you put this in the hands of the defeated candidate, and John Duff.

I can give you an instance of what happened some years ago under the Warren Government there was \$250,000 spent on Public Works for roads and \$10,000 was handed over to the Motor Association of which you were the Chairman and John Duff was a supporter of your section of the House of Assembly. He had charge of the allocation for Hearts Content to Brigus and the men there were the only men paid less than \$2,00 a day. And I can get the returns in connection with it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—First I would like to correct the Hon. member. I was not Chairman of that Commission. The Chairman was the Minister of Public Works. As regard to the returns of Duff's expenditure the returns were received, whether correct or not I cannot say but the returns were received by the Roads Commission and are at the Public Works office to-day.

MR. MOORE.—They were refused to be given to me. I was told they were in your possession as Secretary of the Roads Commission.

Again there was a cheque sent by the Public Works Department to one William Thomas of Carbonear who was either chairman of the Road Board or a special commissioner a man who could not read his own name. This cheque or the envelope containing it was taken from the Post Office by Duff and Duff endorsed that cheque. The handwriting is the same and compares

with Duff's handwriting. That is signed by William Thomas's name and marked and witnessed by a son of the man who wrote the name and made his mark. Thomas himself said he did not see the cheque. Now should money be sent out like that again, and no reference or advice from the representative, and risk that kind of thing happening again? If we are going to have Government by Minute of Council and the representatives of the district have no say at all I don't see any use in our coming here.

We have a commission in connection with unemployment; we know that exists. I say that the first commission to be appointed should be in connection with this Honorable House and should be a fishery commission that should endeavour to get all the people possible going to the fishery on the Labrador. If the number of people are reduced going there you have more dependent people.

I was going to speak on the income tax too but that does not effect me so I will leave discussion of it to those whom it does effect. It is like talking about somebody else's business. I suppose as I said it is only wasting breath to ask the Government to do the things we want. I was sent here by Carbonear to see that the money allocated that district came to that district and through the proper channels and I entirely disapprove of appointment of Road Boards without executive authority and and expenditure of money without any consultation of the representative of the district. May I ask the Minister if the representatives will have the handling or giving of advice in connection with local moneys, any special grants?

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That is my idea that they should.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, on rising to speak on the Speech from the

Throne I want first to congratulate you on the signal honor of your unanimous appointment to the Speaker's Chair. I trust that your conduct of the affairs of the House in the future will be as able as that which has characterised it since you have assumed the high office of Speaker. Should it be necessary at any time to assert your authority over any of us the junior members of the House we can assure you that we will in every way be governed by your wishes and abide by your rulings. I also wish to offer congratulations to the Hon. Mover and Hon. Seconder of the Speech from the Throne.

I listened with great attention to the Speech delivered by Captain Parsons and his speech to me seemed very constructive. I am sure it was a constructive speech as regards the affairs of the country, especially as regards the fisheries. With respect to that particular industry it showed clearly that he was in a better position than most men in this House to deal with that industry that we have laid particular stress on. Mr. Fudge the Hon. member for Hermitage also delivered a very instructive speech and I hope as the session passes we will have the pleasure of hearing from him on very many occasions. The Prime Minister told us on opening day that the Speech from the Throne was a first class public document. Taking the document as a whole I think sir he did not do it justice. Up to the present we have had practically no legisaltion brought before the House.

The only thing we have laid before us is five commissions. The first commission which I want to refer to is the tariff commission. Why is a tariff commission necessary. Some years ago the present Prime Minister appointed a tariff commission, which cost the country something over \$11,000 with what result? Has any report been

made? If so, why have not its suggestions been carried out? Surely if that report has been made there is no necessity to appoint a commission? Why does not the Minister of Finance deal with the matter himself. I am sure he is a capable man and could handle it in a proper manner.

But now as there is a commission appointed it is up to them to investigate the cause and apply the remedy. I don't intend to delay the House to any extent on this commission as the Hon. member for St. John's East, Captain Byrne in his address of a few days ago put the position square before the House, and I think that the Government, judging by the applause they gave the Hon. member, would do well to get his views on the matter. But why should the Government appoint such a commission? Why not appoint Mr. E. J. Godden, the Hon. member from Trinity South, he is the only man in Newfoundland to-day who could handle this problem satisfactorily. Surely if he was prepared to import Italians, Greeks and other Europeans and guarantee them steady employment for three years without any charge on the Government, you will agree with me that his appointment on that commission would be a move in the right direction. It clearly proves one thing that he could get employment for outsiders but Newfoundland laborers had to get work as best they could.

I wish to dwell for a few moments on the question of our Fisheries. The fisheries are our greatest natural resources but they have been sadly neglected by this Government and by all other Governments as well. We never had a Government that looked after the Fisheries as it should be looked after. If we had the fisheries would be the greatest public asset that we possess. If we had a Department of Marine and Fisheries that looked after

that industry as it should, it would be said that the Fishery in Newfoundland is going ahead in leaps and bounds but after hearing the speech delivered by Capt. Parsons I very much fear that such is not the case. There will not be any progress made with our fisheries until the Department of Marine and Fisheries is reorganized and an efficient Minister appointed. I believe that in Hon. Mr. Lake we have such a man, and I hope that when the Fishery Commission is appointed he will see to it that such men as Capt. Parsons and Mr. Fudge are appointed on it. Even over here he may find men who can give him some assistance, I especially refer to Messrs. Moore, Quinton and Abbott. When the Hon. the Prime Minister was asked what had been done he gave no satisfactory answer, but I implore him to consider the benefits to be derived from the all important fisheries, if he handles the question of the fisheries properly, there is no doubt but that he will get the credit for it.

On the opening day if I remember rightly the Hon. member for Lewisporte laid on the table of the House some resolutions in connection with the "Bottle a Day" Act introduced by the Monroe Government. He spoke at great length on this question dealing with all its phrases. He was no sooner seated than Dr. Campbell rose and supported it. Mr. Grimes is sincere in what he said, no doubt, but I wonder if when Dr. Campbell supported the petition he had any idea that when prohibition is brought in the same thing will happen as happened before, I mean that the Doctors will reap the harvest again. Shortly after Mr. Grimes and Dr. Campbell had finished the Hon. the Prime Minister asked leave to introduce a Bill respecting Alcoholic Liquors. On or about the opening day the Minister of Finance and Customs was asked a question re

the seizure of a consignment of liquor, I went to the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs and showed him correspondence I had received from my firm, part of which I shall now read:

(Reads)

What are the circumstances? The circumstances are right here. The Eastern Trading Company were appointed purveyors to the Board of Liquor Control. Mr. Godden told us that his only connection with the Eastern Trading Company was as landlord of the two warehouses, one in the East End and one just East of Marshalls. On the same ship that the two hundred cases of Teachers Whiskey arrived, there also arrived sixty one puncheons of rum consigned "please notify Eastern Trading Co." That rum cost in Liverpool seven shillings a gallon. This rum came in transit. I know different people engaged in transit business shipping rum to the high seas and it did not cost seven shillings a gallon. There is supposed to be two hundred puncheons of rum in the warehouse which was unloaded from the schooner "Giant King" this is the kind of rum that goes to rum row and costs in Demerera two or three shillings a gallon. Then Mr. Blair comes in here and gets every agency in the country, we who held the agencies are not considered, I think it an injustice and small on the part of Mr. Blair and the other men associated with him in this business. Then there was another man a Mr. Hann, Mr. Godden do you know what firm he represented?

MR. GODDEN.—I think the Consolidated. But you know more than I do about this business.

MR. TOBIN.—Now I don't know so much about that, but Mr. Speaker, there is one thing fairly well proven in this dispute on the two hundred cases of whiskey and that is that there

are two men who came out of it with clean hands and these are the Minister of Finance and Customs and the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control. They proved beyond a doubt that they knew nothing about the passing over of the liquor from the Coltrillers.

In passing along I notice reference to the Hospital and Charities Committees, there are made repeatedly but we hear nothing from them. Why not save money and do away with these Commissions. They only cost money. Like my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Mines I am interested in agriculture and partly in the Fisheries, but I see no reference in the Speech from the Throne to Agriculture. Like my friend Mr. Downey I believe that this is a big industry.

I am extremely sorry to notice that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne regarding Agriculture. Next to the fisheries it is the largest industry in the country. Apparently from the report of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines we have an overabundance of potatoes all over the country. The same applies to my district as to St. Georges and the other farming districts. Some of my constituents have from one hundred to three hundred barrels of potatoes in their cellars now. They are good stock, the seed coming from the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and the bulk of them are the famous Irish Cobblers. Now we all know how good they are in quality, but even so in the next few months they will have to be dumped or used for manure. There is not the slightest mention in the Speech from the Throne of any encouragement to agriculture whatsoever.

I sincerely hope I have not tried the House with my first speech and perhaps I will have more to say on these matter at a later date.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, as far as the Opposition

is concerned the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne is drawing to its close. I must tell you that I feel very proud of my colleagues. We have lived up to our promises. We said that all criticism would be constructive and it would not be unduly long. We have in Mr. Winter an honorable member who gave us a very critical analysis of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Tobin has told us the facts about the liquor question that we did not know before. Mr. Bennett told us about trade relations and the abolition of the High Commissioner's Office in the Old Country. Mr. Abbotts address proved that when we hear from him again he will be worth listening to. Mr. Byrne told the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House more about the labour and unemployment situation than they ever dreamt of. Mr. Monroe enlightened us considerably on the question of grants and allocations, and who has charge of them. Mr. Emerson treated us to as masterly a speech as was ever given in this House. He marshalled his facts exceedingly well and thoroughly understood whereof he spoke. Mr. Quinton shows that he thinks deeply on all governmental questions. He will be of practical assistance in this House and has already given us some valuable suggestions regarding the fishery. These are the gentlemen who have spoken but we still hold our two biggest guns in reserve namely, the honorable member for Bay de Verde and the honorable member for Placentia West. Now I have just to make a very short review of the Speech from the Throne. When I saw it for the first time the first day I had but a few minutes to look it over. In connection with the Loan Bill and what it is to be applied to one thing especially to me. That was regarding education. We want to see the money spent in a practical way. I certainly would like

to see the children in the outports educated to respect the main and principle product of the Colony. It seems to me that we are ashamed of the fisheries. With a proper system of education the people could be educated with regard to the fisheries to bring it back to its former high standard. I sincerely hope that when the Minister of Finance and Customs goes abroad to borrow this loan he will be successful in getting money on good terms for the Colony. So far as the Commission for the revision of the tariff is concerned I do not know that there is and need for such commission. My honest opinion is that the Minister of Finance and Customs with his first assistant would do just as well as any number on a tariff commission. But perhaps there are some people in the Government who require assistance or help. Now there is one thing that struck me about the American Telephone and Telegraph Bill. I have heard of wireless telegraphy but I have never heard of costless telegraphy. I made a statement a few days ago that I hoped that this Bill would not result in bringing us into the same position as the stand in regard to the Commercial Cable Company. If the Commercial Cable Company were to put a line across this country it would cost them one half million dollars. That being the case it was worth that much to them and the charges should have been based accordingly. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has informed me that I am one hundred per cent wrong. Therefore according to the Hon. Minister, It cost nothing to put the line across country and it costs nothing to keep it in repair. With regard to the street car facilities we people of the eastern part of the town are particularly concerned with it. I hope that we shall get ample chance of discussing it when it comes before the House. In

Side wanted men to work for them the men refused and said they would rather work in the rock-sheds.

I just mention that because there seems to be an idea among some people that Liberalism means prosperity and Toryism means stagnation. I want honestly to say that so far as my opinion goes it is quite the reverse. Toryism, or Conservatism as I prefer to call it, stands for something different. As Mr. Baldwin said in England the other day, "Conservatives perform but the Liberals promise."

I said the other day that the Speech from the Throne was disappointing and I said it for the reason because it was disappointing to the people of the whole country. They all looked for a lot more—for bread and they got a stone. There is not one ray of hope in the Speech where people could look for employment. I tell you there is not one vestige of the hope earning, not one slice of bread, not one dry crust in the whole of the Speech.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will allow the opportunity to pass without saying a few words with reference to the Speech from the Throne delivered on opening day, but before making any remarks on that specific idea, I would like to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on the very high honor that was bestowed on you by being unanimously elected Speaker of the Peoples Assembly. I feel Mr. Speaker that it must be great personal gratification to you to find that on your first entry into the Legislature Halls of this country you are unanimously elected by the various representatives of all districts throughout the country to that high office and to the position of the Highest Commoner in the Land. I trust Mr. Speaker, that you will be spared many years to continue in public life and I feel that at this session of the

Legislature and the next three years you will give a good account of yourself and will carry out your duties in an able and efficient manner and with due discrimination to all sides.

I would also like to extend my personal congratulations to my friend Capt. John Parsons of Bay Roberts on the very able address he made on the opening day, particularly with reference to the fisheries of the country. It is seldom possibly in this House that an address of that nature is delivered personally by a man of the calibre of Capt. John Parsons who is a practical fisherman himself and who knows how to catch fish and how to clean fish and how to sell fish.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the Hon Member for Hermitage on his very able address made on opening day, and I feel sure that the district which gave him such a magnificent majority of October 29th will feel proud of its representative in the Legislature of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose so much to comment on the various items outlined in the Speech from the Throne as to comment on some of the remarks made by the Hon. members opposite which are the usual annual titles delivered in the Legislature. I quite well remember, Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Opposition side of the House for thee or four years and the same old story rehearses itself annually. The same old comment on the Speech from the Throne, that the Speech is notorious for what is not in it. Then we have a discussion as to what the term "Liberal" and what the term "Tory" mean.

I notice that my Hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon made a comparison of what the Monroe party did with what this party has done, and for the information of the House—because I was a

member of the Monroe administration when they came into office in this House—and I regret to have to inform the Hon. gentlemen opposite that the Monroe administration are responsible to the country to-day for increased annual expenditure of over one million dollars which has to be found from the taxpayers of the country. The Monroe Administration in 1925 repealed the Income Tax in one breath and after they had repealed the Income Tax they again discovered that they were unable to square their accounts and they had to adopt the tariff commission rates, which were so much trash, and which did nothing. They adopted the tariff commission report holus bolus without going into it with the result that when the Minister of Finance who presented the proposition and who presented the various changes, was asked about them he could not explain them. The tariff commission made the report and the Monroe administration adopted them.

MR. QUINTON.—Who were the members of the commission?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I don't know and I don't care.

MR. QUINTON.—It is your business to know. You are the Minister of Finance and Customs.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The Monroe administration accepted their report and they could not explain them any more than school children.

MR. QUINTON.—Nor could the members of the commission.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I am not going to explain the tariff, and when the Hon. Members were speaking I did not interrupt him.

Mr. Speaker, if these gentlemen wish to conduct a duel across the floors of this House, I am prepared for them at any moment. I have no-

thing in my political career that I am ashamed of, or any action of mine in this House. When I left the Monroe administration I left on principle. The Monroe administration was the most destructive administration that ever took charge of the affairs of this country.

What happened? They brought in that tariff in 1925 imposed an extra tax of from twelve to fifteen per cent on all articles necessary for the common people of this country. Taxes were increased from \$450 to \$500 a year and to-day we find that we have got to find another million dollars annually to pay the increased taxes which they brought about. We also have the twenty million dollars debt on which we have to find a million dollars annually to pay the interest, and last year, Mr. Speaker, this same Government prepared an Income Tax bill and within their own ranks it was objected against. Why? Because they did not have sufficient majority in the House to carry it through and the people who objected against it were in arrears in the Assessor's department.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I might tell the Hon. Member that is not so.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I tell you it is so because one of the dissenters paid the bill to the Assessor's Department a short time ago.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I was one of the objectors in the party and I hold that is not so.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Common talk!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes a comparison of the Monroe highroads as against the pit-props scandal, as it was known.

The Monroe administration on its first year of office intended to seek a loan of over seven and a half million dollars and that Loan Bill never came into this House. It was reduced to six

million, two million of which were allocated for the purpose of building high roads, and the Hon. Leader presumes to say that they built three hundred miles of road. I say they repaired three hundred miles of road, they did not construct three hundred miles of road. They repaired three hundred miles of road which cost a capital expenditure of three million dollars and we have to pay fifty thousand dollars annually to keep them up. We were considerably better off on the pit prop scheme because it only cost a certain amount and there is nothing to keep them up.

MR. QUINTON—What about the raw material?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—When I am finished my address you can have plenty of opportunity to reply, at any other time not now. While you are inexperienced and young in political life, I must remind you that I have gained some experience. I have interrupted men in this House and have been put into my pew, and it is time someone put you into your pew.

The highroads policy was an absolute football. A political scheme to suit themselves.

They built them from somewhere to nowhere. From here to Placentia. You arrive at Placentia and you can't get a fish to eat. Did they build any roads into productive sections?

The highroads was a high minded idea and shows the thought of the Monroe Government. They got themselves into a fix and we find that now we have got to keep them going and try and find money to keep them up.

Mr. Moore spoke of the Income Tax and I propose to make a few remarks on it.

They have been damning the Income Tax right along. Let us take off taxes, off anyone, but try our utmost to put

it on and they screech. That is what happened in the last election.

The Leader of the Opposition tells us that his party is not the Monroe party. The Leader himself was Leader of the Monroe Government in the Upper House last year and he took the mantle off Monroe's shoulders and returned to the House with only one member of the Monroe party, Mr. Sullivan who was Colonial Secretary in their Administration. Absolutely the same outfit as the Monroe Administration.

MR. EMERSON.—You are not here.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I got clear of them quick. And you were abusing the Monroe administration and you fell in with the Leader of the Opposition who took Mr. Monroe's place..

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has made a comparison of the rock sheds against the dock. The dock is a liability to-day which costs in the vicinity of one hundred thousand dollars a year.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—It is an asset too.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Would you call a thing an asset on which you pay one hundred thousand dollars a year and get nothing in return?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—It is an asset.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It is a monument. In a shape that looks to me—and I do not wish to make any reference to Mr. Monroe or Mr. Alderdice—but it is the shape of a casket and it helped to bury Mr. Monroe. This hundred thousand dollars a year has to be charged up so that in addition to the operating expenses of the dock we have got to find one hundred thousand dollars a year to pay the interest on the money that we borrowed to build it.

The construction of the dock was a scandal because the Monroe Government were under a contract to build it for one million dollars and it cost double that amount.

Now where is the nigger there?

It cost two million dollars. One million dollars thrown away. Now can the dock be made pay? Can the dock be made an asset? I say it can and I feel that legislation will be proposed to this House within a very few days that will see this dry dock made an asset.

Did the Monroe Government attempt to bring in any new Legislation in that direction? No, they never attempted to do anything of a constructive nature in connection with the Dock with the result that if a steamer breaks down in the North Atlantic to-day repairs at the Dock for such ship are out of the question, because in the first place, the cost of repairs is too high, owing to the high rate of duty that has to be paid on the material to be used; secondly, the Machine Shops near the Dock are not properly equipped; and thirdly, because every facility there is antiquated for the performance of such work. But this Government propose to introduce legislation whereby that Dock may be converted into an asset, and into such an asset as to be able to relieve some of the unemployment that exists in St. John's at the present time. Now let us look at the unemployment situation in St. John's West. I think I know as much as any Member opposite about this question. I may not be able to get up and make a better speech on it than the other fellow and Vice Versa, but nevertheless, the unemployed situation in St. John's to-day is so serious that any Government has got to make an honest effort to deal with it. We are going to make that honest effort and we hope to see it through to a

successful issue, and next year a program will be formulated whereby this unemployed situation will be considerably reduced. Some people will say now Cashin is talking politics. The question of dealing with the unemployed situation is not a political matter at all, although if an election was to be held to-morrow, we would have our friend, the Leader of the Opposition and his followers, go out and tell that they would cure all the ills for the workless people and possibly if I were in his place I would be trying to do the same thing. I think my Hon. friend will admit that that is correct. Now I think that this unemployed problem can be solved to a large extent. I heard Capt. Byrne here, a few days ago, make several recommendations in the course of his speech, and no doubt there was something concrete in what he said. Capt. Byrne has had a great deal of experience in connection with the unemployed situation in this town, and I understand he has already been called before this Commission to give certain information the Commission are looking for. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you will see that, as Capt. Byrne is a Member of the Opposition, this Commission has no Political tinge about it, but is getting any one they can to give them information in order to relieve this unemployed problem. Now this unemployed situation cost this Colony this year \$120,000 and it would be nice information for this House to know that from 1924 to 1928, the Monroe administration spent \$6,720,000 on hospitals and unemployed in this country, and then we got to sit here and listen to the Opposition—the fragment of the Monroe Government—telling us how to handle this unemployed situation I hope at a later date, to give the House a further explanation on this huge expenditure and give it in tabulated form, so that it can be published

in the Opposition press, unless they want to get paid for it. Imagine these so-called hospitals in the city—one would be inclined to term them dives—costing from eighty to one hundred thousand dollars a year during the administration of the Monroe Government. One of the first things the present Government did after assuming office was to cut down that expenditure to sixty thousand dollars a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much of what happened during the election that I better contribute my quota to a debate. Mr. Tobin told us that potatoes were going rotten in his district on account of no sale for them and that the people were up against it hard as a result.

Well evidently potatoes were not rotten last Fall in that section when they were distributed to every public institution in the service of the Government after being purchased out of money that was voted for specific purposes, and money that was taken deliberately to buy up the electorate. For instance, \$200,000 was voted for the encouragement of the fisheries. Half of that amount was taken and given to people to make roads in their gardens, and then we got to listen to twaddle coming across the floors of this House. Last Fall we heard a great deal about the great moral issues at stake in Newfoundland and people were opposed to the present Government because of such moral issues, but since it has been exposed that the then Government, through their press, that preached these moral issues spent \$320,000 of public moneys to try and get back to power, we hear nothing about these great moral issues, and when you listen to my Budget within the course of a few weeks you will find what I say now is correct. While the diversion of Buchans railway was under construction \$30,000 was spent

in transporting men back and forth last Fall and this amount was charged up and paid for out of the Public Charities Department. I hate to have to say these things, Mr. Speaker, but in justice to the party with which I am associated I cannot let certain remarks made by Opposition members go unchallenged. Why the whole thing would make a cat laugh. During the Monroe regime moneys were taken—\$10,000 in one case and \$6,000 in another case—by order of Minute of Council and placed in the Bank to the credit of private individuals and no record kept of such a transaction.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
What have I got to do with that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
You are shouldering their sins. That money was taken deliberately from the Treasury of this Colony and I am going to collect it. That is my job and I am going to see that my friends opposite when they make assertions with reference to qualifications of members of this party that they do not get away with it. My friend Mr. Emerson in referring to the Public Utilities Commission was pleased to term it a joke. I disagree with him. I look upon it as one of the most important items in the Speech from the Throne, and that it is not the matter of form stuff that we are used to getting here, but that it is the real thing. Now, as some of the gentlemen opposite represent the industrial elements of Newfoundland, here is the sort of business such a commission will have to tackle. In 1919 a barrel of flour was sold at \$15 in St. John's and bread was sold by the retailer at 12c a loaf. To-day flour costs between \$7 and \$8 a barrel while bread is at the same price per loaf as it was in 1919 when flour was \$15 a barrel. Now is it not time in the face of this fact that everybody is aware of to have a public Utilities Commis-

sion or a Commission of some kind to try and find out the cause of the present high prices charged by bakers. This Government represents eighty per cent of the common people of Newfoundland and it is our job to see that these people are not robbed any longer in the way they have been robbed during the past eight or nine years, and we intend to have those bakers and other individuals connected with similar industries up here to ascertain the reason for such differences in the prices of their products. It is not our intention to interfere with or impede industries. On the contrary, we want to see industries prosper, because when industries prosper the people prosper; but I do object to exorbitant profits being made at the expense of the toiler and any member of the House will agree with me that there has been exorbitant profits made in connection with the baking business. In fact they made two hundred per cent profit of their money. Therefore, I think that while Mr. Emerson might have serious objections to what is contained in the Speech from the Throne he will probably agree with the explanation I have given. Something should be done to protect the common people of the country from being fleeced by those baking manufacturers, who, no doubt, were back in the Opposition in the elections and denounced the present Government in every mood and tense. Now, Sir, before I go any further on this subject I want to say a few words to the Press and to refer briefly to their activities during the election campaign.

To begin with I may say, and it is not because Mr. Puddister happens to be a member of the opposition, that the few times that I did read the Daily News, it was fairly decent and it conducted the campaign in a fairly decent manner, but this other rag, edited by Mr. Jeffreys, I cannot say as

much about him. He attempted in his editorials from day to day and from month to month to discredit me and denounce me and even to brand me as the greatest kind of a political robber, and then a few days ago even yesterday he commended me. It just shows that this fellow, for that is all that I can call him, does not know what he is talking about. Why the sudden change in front, on his part. I do not mind fair criticism from a political opponent but I do object to slander, the recourse to which, that individual had, particularly in the recent election. Play fair and let the best man jump the ditch. But coming back to the Monroe administration and its tariff reform and fishery commission and if I remember rightly I advocated the cause of the Monroe Government in a public place in Ferryland in 1924 on a manifesto pledged to reduce taxation and give a bounty to fishermen. What happened? Did he even attempt to reduce taxation. He didn't even condescend to meet the fishermen from the north in later years when the Labrador fishermen came down in connection with the bounty on fish. When they came back into power the first thing that they did was to reduce taxation on themselves. Because Mr. Monroe and Sir John Crosbie were blessed with a considerable income and wanted to help themselves they took off the Income Tax. Then they discovered that they could not balance their budget and they whacked on twelve per cent. Even though the previous tariff commission recommended is they took their recommendation. They evidently had not the brains to work out one for themselves and so they took somebody else's (even though it was bad.) If they stood behind the budget that was made from that Tariff Commission, and I said at that time in the House that that Tariff Commission was not meant for any

Government whether Squires Government or Monroe Government, to copy in whole but merely made recommendations which in some cases would be feasible, and in other cases, it would not be practical to be carried out. But the Minister of Finance puts an extra two cents on butterine and the very next day he goes down and builds a butterine factory himself, or at least a few days afterwards. I denounced him in every mood and tense. I shall never forget the party meeting that night when the budget was placed before us, with the increase of fifteen per cent. I denounced it in the strongest terms. Things were coming to a climax. Mr. Monroe went out and rang up the Minister of Finance and asked him if they would change it. He was practically weeping, and some of the party members, almost seeing the tears run down his cheeks said "let it go through for God's sake." Lovely state of affairs, to be running a government by telephone. The same applies to the Tobacco Factory. They had very little occasion of increasing the tariff in that connection because they had an enormous protection, and they even have a large protection yet. And when that protection was taken off last year, one of our water street merchants, who contested a district on behalf of the leader of the opposition, I refer to Mr. Ayre, approached Mr. Hartnett the manager of the tobacco factory and tried to persuade him to close up his business and drive us to it. Thanks to Mr. Hartnett's good sense he did not listen to an individual of that character, who was prepared to go out of business to drive a Government to the wall. That is the calibre of the stuff that composes Mr. Alderdice's government, some of them at any rate, people that want to put you out of business because they have their pockets well-lined.

Now let us consider another incid-

ent in connection with the Monroe Government. I refer to the Besco contract of two or three years ago. This contract was brought in signed, sealed and delivered by that government in a Minute of Council. What happened to that contract. It never passed through the doors of the House of Assembly, and if that Government had been decent enough they would have resigned on the spot because it amounted to a vote of want of Confidence in the Executive Government. That day on a public platform on Bell Island I accused Mr. Monroe of that and he lied contemptibly. He said that he never saw the contract before. What is the result. There has been no tax collected from that outfit on Bell Island since 1921. To-day the company on Bell Island is in a very prosperous condition, and I feel that this year an arrangement will be made with that company whereby both the Government and the men on Bell Island will profit considerably. Last year when I asked the help of Mr. Monroe to try and get an increase in pay for the miners, he did not have enough courage to send a representative to the conference that took place between the miners and the company. They left the men to try and fight as best they could to get an extra two cents an hour. The night of the conference I came over here and found the Government in an awkward position. We went back the next day and got an extra three cents an hour, and whilst I was not the leader of a party or connected with any party I did more then, then the Monroe Government did in their whole term in office.

And then there is the Buchans contract. What have they done with that. They have made a closed town of that so that a man cannot get in there without first begging permission from some of the company. And I say right here and now that the Government are

going to get very little revenue under that contract unless someone steps in pretty soon, and ensures that that contract is carried out to the letter. Because that aggregation is prepared to cook their accounts. And I say that in all sincerity.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Who made that agreement? Sir Robert Bond in 1905.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—But when they came in in 1927 asking for concessions Sir Robert Bond was in his grave. They had them then if they had to hold out. We had them held up for five or six weeks and could not drive any sense into the Government.

As for the International contract. I supported that contract in the House because the old company that was handling things in Conner Brook was making a mess of it. As I pointed out in a speech in this House, they had no right to send people that are used to making guns, to run a paper mill. You had to have people that knew their jobs. The International people are making money. And I am proud to say that they paid \$75,000 into the treasury of the country not long ago. I think the Hon. member for Burin made reference to the South West Coast. Well Sir, I think that this Government recognized the South West Coast as it was never recognized before. Then he says that we cannot get down to business. Why ever since we came into office we have been trying to clean up the mess that was left behind us. I do not mean that the books were not kept properly. But when we came into office we discovered that every cent in the credit of every department was gone and I would not mind if it was spent in the proper way and efficiently, but it was deliberately spent to buy our people.

We have heard reference by members of the Opposition to some cases

of whiskey during the recent debate. We have heard a lot of talking about contracts entered into by the Government and the Eastern Trading Company or some other individuals. There is no such contract in existence. With them the talk about the two hundred cases of whiskey fades into insignificance beside this. If I was a member of the Opposition I would probably make more political capital out of the two hundred cases of whiskey than they are. The whole matter is trying to make political capital. I don't propose to go into the history of the whole thing now; but there is the whole matter. This individual Blair it seems writes firms on the other side and informs them he is going to do the selling to the Liquor Control and tries to bluff them into selling their liquor through him. He hopes then to sell to the Government, but the Government has no contract with him. There is no such contract in existence. He simply tells the people on the other side he has a contract, to try and get them to sell through him. But the Government is not going to be simple enough to buy from Blair or the Eastern Trading Co., some people we know nothing about. came in here from Canada the other day. This is simply a matter of members of the Opposition making political capital out of nonsense. You know what rumors are in Newfoundland. I give Mr. Tobin credit that certain rum, supposed to be bought through him as agent some time ago, was quite good rum, but it was circulated around that there were sixty or seventy puncheons of rot-gut rum here here, imported by the Liquor Control through Tobin because he was a Monroe supporter. We will be bringing in a Loan Bill soon, and three million of the amount is the result of the extravagance of the Monroe party. Coming back to the Income Tax Bill,

I speak of the Income Tax because I was always a strong advocate of that tax, and while I might have to pay a little myself, I am prepared to shoulder my burden with anybody else. But these individuals are screeching to-day and while they screech we can't get one constructive word from them to tell us where we could get the money to pay our bills. If any member of the Opposition or any man in Newfoundland comes along and says: "Cashin, here is where you will get the extra money to pay the deficit," Cashin will accept his suggestions; but none of them come along with any ideas where it can be got. The income tax is the most equitable tax that can be put on anyone. There is 59 or 60 millions collected in Canada in income tax, amounting to around \$7.00 per head. Here we collect about half a million, amounting to \$2.00 per head. In connection with that income tax I have said it is the most equitable tax that can be imposed on anyone and I believe the Opposition, were they the Government, would do the same if they had come back as a government.

We hear lots of talk from the members of the Opposition on the Address in Reply, but they have nothing constructive to offer whereby this necessary money could be got otherwise anything constructive to offer we can than by the income tax. If they had assume that they would have spoken of it. It is a duty of any member of the Opposition to offer such constructive suggestions and criticism as he has to offer. I would agree with some of the growlers against the income tax if they would come along and tell us how else the Government is going to get a half million, or so, that we will get from the imposition of that tax. But they don't do that, and all we hear is growls, and if you go down to the Board of Trade you find

your old friends won't look at you. I am almost afraid to go in there, and the next thing I suppose is that I'll get a notice from the Secretary terminating my membership.

When the proposition of the Banks comes along, I will speak on that, too. When the Monroe Government took off the income tax the banks promised to reduce the rate of interest, and they didn't do it. And the Monroe Government didn't make them do it; they hadn't backbone enough to make them do it. That income tax bill as constituted there at the present time is the fairest form of taxation; and it is to be paid by those who can best afford to pay, and after all those are the people who should pay. Why should some poor unfortunate fisherman only earning three or four hundred dollars a year have to pay \$20 or \$40 a year taxes while some other individual say myself, or the leader of the opposition who probably makes seven or eight thousand a year would only pay \$200 a year? It is the only thing to help pay a good portion of the deficit which the Monroe Government has brought about; and I might say if the Monroe Government had not erred in 1925 in taking off the income tax we would have no deficit to-day. For the past nine years we have deficits of over nine millions all accumulated. Last year the Finance Minister Sir John Crosbie estimated a deficit of two or three hundred thousand dollars and he had a deficit of a million or a million and a half. And these are the individuals who are the business men of the community, and that is the way they handle the affairs of Newfoundland. I trust in their own interests they don't conduct their own private businesses in a similar manner. If they were they wouldn't be where they are financially to-day. Now I have heard considerable reference to prohibition. I am one of those individ-

uals who don't believe in prohibition. I am one of those who think that as far as I am personally concerned I don't care what they do with prohibition. There is more liquor consumed in Newfoundlanad today than there was in the days of the open bar. On the other hand we are receiving considerable revenue to-day from the liquor business. During the past four or five years the country made four millions out of liquor importation. In other words we profited eight hundred thousand a year. That eight hundred thousand is absolutely necessary as I look at it, at the present time. I don't know whether the bottle a day change will effect it or not. I look on the liquor business as an ordinary every day matter. If a man wants to buy liquor or if a man wants to go and get drunk that is nobody else's business. That is my own sincere idea with regard to prohibition and I don't care who knows it. I don't care what they do, but when I want to bottle of whiskey I get it somehow. If the majority of people want prohibition let them have it provided they are prepared to carry it out themselves which is very unusual. I notice Mr. Quinton in his remarks referred to the promises of our Government and forgot to refer to the promises of the one with which he was associated. Mr. Speaker it would take me some time to emunerate the promises of the Monroe party or the Alderdice party when it went to the country. They had no more idea of carrying out those promises than the man in the moon. They had no idea of carrying out a reduction in taxation because they could not. And no Member of the Opposition knows more about the tariff of the country than I do myself. If they did they would not be in the position they are. The Monroe Government borrowed six or seven millions, two millions for highroads and went to wing and spent a mil-

lion and a half the first year and had to get another million; and without referring to the Caribou I don't think they made a good bargain in the Caribou. Whilst I myself haven't made a trip in her I have been speaking to people who have and it is anything but a decent steamer. I was on the Railway Commission at that time and still we knew nothing about the Caribou being purchased. It was done in secrecy. The purchasing of it never came before the Commission as a whole. The first thing we knew about it as a Commission there was a contract for it in Holland, and we could have got a better steamer in the British Isles for \$50,000 more. The argument they put was \$50,000 and it has cost more than \$50,000 in general upkeep in he last few yeasers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret having delayed the House at any length because I didn't propose to make any remarks at this time; but when I heard members of the Opposition speaking about this Government and promises made and referring to the Government and the tariff, I felt in justice to myself since I was associated with the Monroe Government at its inception, and I had a part thank heaven in its destruction, I couldn't let the opportunity pass without expressing some views on this Speech.

In my district they made every effort to get me out of it. One night I was held up on the road and a gang of thugs paid by the Government tried to beat my brains out. Then Shea was sent there paid by the Monroe Export Company to get me out of it, given money indirectly out of the public treasury to cause trouble. He brought in the question of sectarianism—you know what happened—sectarianism of the vilest character—abuse of every description hurled at me—it is enough to make my blood boil when I think of

that lackey of Monroe's—lackey, that is all I can call him, who has to jump or get fired. That is the kind of men who tried to get in the Government. Men who sent out a truck load of thugs to beat my brains out and these are the people who talk public morals. Mr. Howley however got his in St. John's West. It only goes to show that people who practise this sort of thing always come out second best. I faced Mr. W. S. Monroe on a public platform here and in Bell Island and he faded into insignificance. They only attack people in the dark, that is the sort of people they are, cattle such as they should not be allowed to live and I am only too glad of this opportunity to show up the disgraceful political opposition that these people put up. I have been associated in politics all my life and my father before me represented the district for thirty years, then some sniffers tried to get me out of it tried to get me defeated, they even tried to get my mother out of it. People who hired thugs to beat my brains out men who are too cowardly to live—that is the sort of morals that the Monroe aggregation possess,—the aggregation that went to the polls on October 29th, last year. They even got clergymen to follow me through the district in an effort to discredit me and get me defeated at the polls, an aggregation of hypocrites.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER.—You will please withdraw that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I withdraw it Mr. Speaker, because in this House I have to bow to your rulings, but I would like an opportunity to speak from a public platform, to speak the truth, where we are all free men. Here in the House we are restricted by rules and must bow to your decisions. But to get back to brass

tacks—speaking of the fair methods of the Opposition, the are not fair methods, I say that they are the dirtiest, vilest methods imaginable, they took monies from the public treasury and squandered it recklessly on their crooked election campaign, when a candidate pays a gang of thugs to way lay his opponent for the district and tries to beat his brains out, I think it is coming to something. Mr. Speaker, I have to speak, and I trust that it will be the last time that I may have to speak on these lines. I don't bear any personal enmity for the Opposition, I merely feel sorry for them, they fell down on their job, they didn't act square or decent. They tried to beat their way in as they tried to beat my brains out. They have my sympathy, I and my party fought square, we did not have recourse to the low vile methods adopted by the Opposition, we were not backed by industrialists and people whose purses filled from the coffers of the country. We were backed by the common people, these are the people who sent us here, the fishermen, the laborer, the farmers, it is to these people, and to these people only, that we owe what we got, and it is our sworn duty to exert our best efforts on their behalf, to give them our best, we owe it to them to put this country in a better condition than it was for the last four years, these are the people we have to answer to and to them only. I think that after a few more lectures of this kind that things will move along smoothly, we won't have many squabbles over things that happened in the past. I hope that if we live long enough to see another political fight, that we will see good wholesome debates and fighting, and not the thug stuff that was perpetrated during the recent campaign. I regret having to bring this up as all the opposition can not pass without reference and only de-

lays the House a lot more on the methods adopted. But anyway they have my sympathy, and as it now draws on the six o'clock and in justice to members on both sides who may be bored, I should terminate this speech, but finally I think that we should all work together for the common good of the country as a whole, as was suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on opening day and which was confirmed by the Hon. the Prime Minister. We should all work together for the best interests of the country. I feel that at the present time the country is in a grave financial condition from which great care is to be taken ere we extract ourselves. We are indebted to the sum of seventy or eighty millions of dollars on which we have to pay three or four millions interest every year, I hope that members on both sides realize the difficulties that we have to face, as I would if I were on the other side. I wish also that we would get fair criticism from the press, when they give criticism. These people know the situation perfectly well, because it was brought about by their friends, give us a fair sound criticism so that we may put the country on its feet. I have heard people say that I will not be able to balance my budget in the next two years but I feel that before the House closes, before next year I will be able to balance it, something which has not been done in the past nine years. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving the adjournment of the debate on the Address in Reply until to-morrow afternoon.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 1st, 1929.

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

MR. STRONG.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Pacquet and Woodstock in the district of White Bay asking that a sum of money be granted for the construction of a public wharf. It is unnecessary for me, I am sure, to point out the inconvenience which people in those places are subjected to, especially during the fall season, on account of having no public wharf at their disposal. I beg to lay this petition on the table of the House and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

I also wish to present a petition from the residents of LaScie asking that the use of trawls be prohibited there at certain seasons of the year. Those people have found by experience that the use of trawls in certain seasons is detrimental to the best interests of the fishermen. I give this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Joseph Patten, B. McCarthy, S. Batten and twenty five other residents of the constituency of the Humber which it is my privilege to represent in this Legislature. The petitioners ask for a road connecting the public wharf with the main road and request that the sum of five hundred dollars be allocated for such purpose. I have very much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the prayer of the petition, as I think the construction of such a road is a highly desirable necessity.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the constitutional

powers of a Public Utilities Commission; I also give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the development of the activities at the St. John's Dry Dock.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

MR. QUINTON.—To ask Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs:

- (1) Whether any portion of Marshall Brothers premises is now being used as a Customs Bonded Warehouse and if so whether there is in such portion stored at the at the present time any Alcoholic Liquors.
- (2) What are the quantities and description of each class of Alcoholic Liquor so stored.
- (3) When did same arrive in this country and by what method of conveyance.
- (4) To whom were said goods consigned, and in whose name are they at the present time bonded.

REPLY

NO. 2

Cargo schooner Fedra Himmel nan stored at Marshall's Building, consigned to Eastern Trading Company, Limited.

Date	Ship		Liquors, etc.	Quantity
Nov. 20 25	Sachem	2	cases Whiskey.....	4 gallons
Feb. 19 27	Newfoundland	20	cases Whiskey.....	40 gallons
Aug. 29 27	Farnorth	1	case Champagne	2 gallons
Dec. 2 27	Newfoundland	45	kegs Whiskey.....	500 gallons
May 10 28	Nova Scotia	1	case Beer.....	6 gallons
May 10 28	Nova Scotia	1	case Whiskey	2 gallons
May 10 28	Ulva	2000	cases Alcohol.....	10,000 gallons
June 12 28	Nova Scotia	2	cases Brandy	4 gallons
Nov. 16 28	Rosalind	100	cases Whiskey.....	200 gallons
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	20	cases Champagne	40 gallons
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	50	baskets Champagne.....	50 gallons
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	25	baskets Champagne.....	25 gallons
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	100	cases Brandy	200 gallons
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	4	cases Whiskey	8 gallons
		2371	packages.....	11,081 gallons

Stored at Marshall's Building:—

EASTERN TRADING COMPANY

May 16|28 Schr. Giant King 120 puncheons Rum..... 12,578 gallons

TERMINAL WAREHOUSE COMPANY

May 16|28 Schr. Giant King 75 puncheons Rum..... 7,680 gallons
 Feb. 25|29 S. S. Farnorth 100 cs. Teachers' Whiskey.. 200 gallons

N. B.—Notify Eastern Trading Company for the above 100 cases Teachers' Whiskey, afterwards warehoused in Terminal Warehouse Company's name by Mr. F. S. Blair.

Nos. 3 & 4

Date	Conveyance		Consignee
May 10 28	Ulva	Rept. 330	Eastern Trading Company.
June 12 28	Nova Scotia	Rept. 364	Eastern Trading Company.
Nov. 16 28	Rosalind	Rept. 150	Eastern Trading Company.
Nov. 21 28	Farnorth	Rept. 159	Eastern Trading Company.
Nov. 20 25	Sachem	Rept. 179	This Whiskey was consigned to Block Bros. Afterwards taken over by Eastern Trading Company.
Feb. 19 27	Newfoundland	Rept. 181	This shipment consigned to Royal Bank of Canada. Afterwards taken over by Eastern Trading Company..
Aug. 29 28	Farnorth	Rept. 76	Eastern Trading Company.
Dec. 2 27	Newfoundland	Rept. 195	Eastern Trading Company.
May 10 28	Nova Scotia	Rept. 328	100 cases Beer consigned to Eastern Trading Company; 2,497 cases Whiskey consigned to Bank of Montreal.

The 2,497 cases of Whiskey were taken over by the Eastern Trading Company and warehoused in their name.

(2) MR. PUDDESTER.—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table on behalf of the Railway Commission the Seal Fishery contract of the S. S. Sagona for the spring of 1929, and also a statement showing exactly the financial position of the venture as it affects the Newfoundland Railway.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to Mr. Puddester re the Seal-fishery Contract of the S.S. Sagona for the recent trip to the icefields tabled the following information:—

Total amount received by the Newfoundland Railway as hire \$5,338.00. The ship was hired at the rate of \$157.00 per day for at least 31 days.

(3) MR. PUDDESTER.—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table copy of letters, telegrams, etc., if any, received by him during the past four months from persons residing in Districts other than the City of St. John's, relative to the money that was being spent in St. John's to relieve unemployment, also table copies of all replies thereto.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Stated the answer was in course of preparation.

(4) MR. PUDDESTER.—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing:—

(1) When he or/and the Government first became aware that the Eastern Trading Company was claiming to have the exclusive right to supply goods to the Board of Liquor Control.

(2) When and by whom the Eastern Trading Company, Ltd. was appointed exclusive purveyors to the Board of Liquor Control.

(3) To produce copy of Minute of Council, Warrant, Commission, or other document containing such appointment.

(4) If the Government has made no such appointment, has the Government taken any steps to investigate the source of the alleged appointment.

(5) If such investigation has been made what has been the result of same.

(6) If no such investigation has been made, why has it not been made?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to question of Mr. Puddester, No. 4, on Order Paper said:—

(1) I have no knowledge that the Eastern Trading Company has claimed the exclusive right to supply goods to the Board of Liquor Control.

(2 and 3) The Eastern Trading Company have not been appointed exclusive purveyors to the Board of Liquor Control.

(4 and 5) The Government has taken no steps to investigate the source of the latest appointment.

(6) It is not considered to be the duty of the Government to investigate, or to attempt to investigate rumours that have no foundation in fact.

(5) MR. TOBIN.—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how many Boiler Inspectors are now doing duty in his Department? What are their names? When were they appointed? What are their salaries?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—In reply to Mr. Tobin: I may state three Boiler Inspectors employed by the Department viz: John Forbes, J. Barret and J. Cook. The two latter are designated as assistant Boiler Inspectors. Mr. J. Cook was appointed during April 1929 and receives \$1,728.00 per annum as salary.

(6) MR. EMERSON.—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House, a statement showing in connection with the General Hospital, the Asylum for the Insane, and the Poor House respectively:—

(1) The number of inmates month by month since the first of November, 1928.

2) The numbers of the staffs month by month since the first of November, 1928 to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply stated the reply was being prepared for next sitting.

(7) MR. WINTER.—To ask Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a state-

ment showing the profits made by the Board of Liquor Control during the last financial year:—

(a) On the sale of ca segoods;

(b) On the sale of spirits bottled by the Controller;

(c) On the sale of local beer.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Stated the reply was in course of preparation.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the only Section that remains outstanding is Section (4) relating to Section (73) of the Highroads Act. This Section (4) was outstanding at the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who requested some further amendment to be included therein. In the first line there is a printer's error. It should read as follows: "If any person while intoxicated be in charge of a motor car."

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not out of order in drawing attention to what should constitute a paragraph in this Bill.

It is not mentioned here or elsewhere but there should be a law here regarding the rule of the road. In every British country with the exception of Canada the rule of the road is to pass a vehicle coming towards you on the left and one going in the same direction on the right. The driver's seat is on the right side of the vehicle. That is absolutely necessary because

it gives the driver the use of his right eye and the freedom of his right arm. If the driving seat is on the left and you have to pass another vehicle coming towards you on the left you have not the freedom of your right arm or the use of your right eye to enable you to measure the clearance between you and the other vehicle. Consequently in crowded traffic accidents are practically unavoidable.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the point is well taken by the Hon. member. In a country where they have roads, but as a motorist of twenty years standing, having started my motor career as one of the original motor cycle owners and operators, in connection with the Motor Cycle Club at Topsail, I think that it has been found more suitable and safer to be able to see the left side of the road so that you would not get in the ditch and depend on the motorist coming towards you to do the same, and then when you get close enough you can make up your mind whether to pass the other fellow at that point or not. If we had roads as in Canada and England with definite widths and where it is possible to pass a motor car easily without going in the ditch, these rules would be very unnecessary here, but the danger in a town such as St. John's, where so much traffic is being handled is so much less by having the driver's seat as it is now, than it would be the other way, particularly on outport roads where you have to calculate to within a few inches of the ditch to enable you to pass at all.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

With the unanimous consent of the

House the Bill was now 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 to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and other Documents.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of explaining the Bill on second reading. It contains only one section amending section 36 of Chapter 111. It simply increases the maximum charge from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, before the Bill passes I would like to make one or two short comments. I do not know whether members of the House are aware of the circumstances,

but for many years the Registrar of Deeds, Mr. Adams, has not been able to attend to his duties. He has been there on some occasions but very infrequently; and the result is there are only two officials in that department Mr. Maddick and Miss Kavanagh. The result also has been that the department is really understaffed and these two civil servants have been called on to do very arduous work. I think it will be agreed by every member of the legal profession that they have performed these services with faithfulness and efficiency and uniform courtesy. I take it that in the ordinary course of events Mr. Adams will be retired. He is not now a young man and has been in the civil service for a great many years. I trust when that occasion does come consideration will be given to the claims of these two officials in that department, who have as I say given such faithful service and who have worked so hard, and that Mr. Maddick will be appointed to the position of Registrar and Miss Kavanagh to that of Deputy. It is with particular pleasure that I mention this because I think every member of the House will realize that there is nothing political or otherwise in the suggestion I make, and I feel sure that it will be appreciated by every member of the Government and particularly my Hon. friend the Attorney General that the services of these two officials should receive the proper reward of such fidelity.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the Hon. member has called attention to the fact that Mr. Adams who has been unable to carry out his duties for the past five years might be retired. The Government has been considering the matter of providing a pension. There is no possibility that he will resume the position of Registrar of Deeds and Companies. Mr. Adams

during his term of office was very popular with the profession, and exceedingly efficient and painstaking in discharging his duties. Naturally it is with great regret that we must record the fact that after his long years of service he is to retire, or continue in retirement for he has really been in retirement and unable to perform active work for some time. With respect to new appointments that is a matter for the consideration of the Executive Government. The position taken by Mr. Emerson with respect to the outstanding ability of Mr. Maddick who has really performed the work of Registrar of Deeds and practically of Registrar of Companies though he has had no official standing must be agreed with; the work has been done with outstanding merit. With regard to the stenographer associated with the office she too has disclosed herself to be an efficient and capable assistant and stenographer. Whether the Executive Council will consider the elevation of Mr. Maddick to the position of Registrar is a matter concerning which at the moment I do not express an opinion.

That part of the Act which constitutes the printed document has already been explained, it merely consists in the regulation of company fees which heretofore have been small. They have now been arranged to compare with those charged in the Maritime Provinces.

(Reads)

In addition to these suggestions the Hon. member for Placentia East has proffered the idea that a man or woman fill the position of Deputy Registrar. The Registrar of Deeds is also the Registrar of Companies and considerable difficulty is experienced in transacting Company business in the office of the Registrar of Companies. The office of the Registrar of Deeds and the office of the Registrar of Com-

panies are physically at least the same office. It is proposed to put before Section 1, or 2, a clause to provide for a Deputy who in the Registrar's absence may have an opportunity to sign documents.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geogre V., Chapter 24, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same with some amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that

the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 6, of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary'" was read a second time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—As the copies of the Bill have already been distributed to the members I will avail of this opportunity to refer very briefly to one or two point in the Bill by way of explanation as to the purpose and scope of the Colonial Secretary's Department. Since the earliest days of Responsible Government the practise began of imposing on the Department of the Colonial Secretary nearly everything under the sun in the way of Legislation If you have reference to the Consolidated Statutes you will see the lists of things placed under the control of the Colonial Secretary.

(Reads)

Then recently the question of Air Navigation was referred to him. While this practise was going on, several sub-divisions grew to such an extent in importance and responsibility that in one case it was found necessary to draft regulations to place this sub-head under the control of a separate department, namely Education. This was handed over by the late Government to a separate department with a Ministerial head. It has changed somewhat of late, it is now handled by a bureau with the Prime Minister at its head. This was not the only thing that grew, for many years the Commissioner of Public Charities and the Public Health as well were charged to it. The act in regard to the Public Health is necessary to solve that problem, as both sub-divisions are now at the department of Public Works and the President and the staff, efficient and

capable as they are find that it is too much and that they are altogether over taxed. During the late administration a board of Public Health was established by order of Minute-of-Council and certain regulations were drafted for its guidance but it appears that for some reason or other the board refused to function and the membership dwindled so that finally we find the board of Health under the control of the Secretary of the Hospital Commission.

The Government is satisfied that the time has arrived when some division of labor should take place and this Bill provides for the taking from the Department of Public Charities all matters appertaining to public health and put them under the management and control of the Newfoundland Board of Health. Now it is claimed that by this sub-division, by handing over all matters of public health to one body, there will be a great saving of time. The overlapping of the two boards will be avoided which has occasioned considerable delay and consequently misunderstanding. It is also claimed that the Department will function with greater efficiency and we think that under this management it is possible to have the work of public health so administered that there will be a considerable saving of money. We have arranged this in such a way as not to minimise the chances of the patients from the various parts of the Colony for entering the hospitals, because of the excellent work that has been done and is being done by our hospitals here.

The wonderful cures effected and the wonderful operations performed by certain of our medical men in St. John's has to a large extent done away with the prejudice of outport people against going to hospital. People who never would have thought of entering hospital are now very anxious to get

there in order that they might have the service and the best medical advice that the country can provide. I may say in summing up that we claim that this Bill makes for greater efficiency. It will afford a greater measure of control and there will be a saving of money on this account. I therefore beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. EMERSON.—I wish to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary if he will be good enough to explain the necessity of this Bill before it is read a second time. At the present time I am not familiar with this Act. It would appear that under the Department of the Colonial Secretary the Public Charities has been in the character of a permanent department composed of the Colonial Secretary, the Deputy and his clerks. He is in himself an Hon. official. The department itself is a permanent department and so is the department of Public Charities. It seems to me that the control of the Board of Health should rest always in a stable and permanent head. Under this Act there will be the Colonial Secretary ex-officio, who will change with every government.

There will be a medical health office ex-officio and a chairman appointed by the Governor-in-Council. With the result that you are creating a department which will suffer from all the defects incidental to political control and which will fluctuate with the political life because these two members of it will change with every change of Government, and this is a department which should be thoroughly familiar not only with the medical side but also with the country in general and the method of getting people to the hospitals and the management of hospitals. I would suggest to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary that if the Board were made permanent it would be far better. I do not see any neces-

sity for having the Board presided over by a doctor and the Colonial Secretary when the Commissioner of the Charities Commission could do the work as well. One of the things it is likely to suffer from is political influence and will consequently not operate to the best advantage.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Speaker, I am replying on behalf of the Colonial Secretary to Mr. Emerson's question because I am thoroughly familiar with it, and in the next place I happen to be the Chairman of the Commission appointed by the Governor-in-Council to investigate these matters during the last four to six months. We had only started our investigation when we discovered that the whole investigation would occupy many months before we would be in a position to thoroughly look into the public service and report to the Governor-in-Council. In the meantime reorganisation was considered necessary by the Governor-in-Council and that it was far from desirable that the administration should be on such a basis that has been the case for many months or perhaps years. As I understand this Bill, it is the intention to provide for such administration, temporary if you like, until suitable arrangements are made. It is not intended to anticipate the report made by the Commission of Public Health. When these recommendations are made it is the intention to consolidate all the acts in relation to the public health and have one act, a genuine public health act, along lines suggested by my friend, the honorable member for Placentia East. The intention of the Bill is to give the Board of Health complete control to carry on as economically and in as efficient manner as possible until the commission has had a chance to complete its investigation and its recommendations and until the Government has

had a chance to make the reorganization of all health affairs along some permanent and efficient manner.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Speaker, why does not the Government wait until the Commission reports before you make the changes. What is the need of making changes now?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—It is not possible under present conditions to carry on. The Board of Health is not controlled by the Charities, nor is it included in the votes of the Estimates. It is very essential for the Board to have the opportunity of working very efficiently and economically. It is absolutely impossible for anything to be done along the lines of public health unless some changes similar to these are made in the department of the Colonial Secretary. The Act is an attempt to give the Board of Health a chance to operate more efficiently. Things have not been conducted as economically as they might have been. These people have not been in a position to carry on the thing in the way in which it should have been done.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask if the Commission is going to use the data collected from the former Commission?

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—We certainly are. It is very valuable.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I am glad to hear you say so.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday evening I was about to close my few remarks about the address in reply. Yesterday I was speaking from memory and I did not have before me the exact figures to prove the statements which I made with the

result that I feel that it is up to me to produce the necessary documents to prove the statements that I made. I now propose to prove that the figures I quoted were absolutely correct. Yesterday afternoon I was making statements regarding the misappropriation of certain moneys by the Alderdice Government from the loan raised in this House in 1927 to be used for the purpose of encouraging the fishery to the extent of two hundred thousand dollars and another amount to be used for the purpose of public buildings.

During the Alderdice Administration and during the election which took place in the fall and up to May, I claim, and I am prepared to prove by letters written by the Auditor General to the then Prime Minister which I shall read—that money was illegally taken from the treasury during the election and spent on roads—money which was specifically to be used in the further development or encouragement of the fisheries. And for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I shall read a statement which the Auditor General prepared for me some time ago with regard to how some of the money was spent.

(Reads)

According to the statements of Mr. Quinton you would think he didn't get any of this misspent money, but he got \$2,500.00 on October 9th.

(Reads)

In passing I might say, Mr. Speaker, that Hon. members who spoke here and congratulated you on your appointment to the high position of Speaker were taking money which they should not have taken to try and keep you out of the Speaker's Chair.

I shall further read from the Auditor General's Report regarding these illegal expenditures

(Reads)

This makes a total of \$96,531.12.

And now Mr. Speaker, while on the policy pursued by this Administration we find that the Auditor General steps in and writes the Prime Minister, the present Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a letter. And I purpose to read this letter to the House in order to show that anything I said yesterday was correct. It may have been crude and not what might be called parliamentary, but it was a bold statement of facts. And here it is:

(Reads)

And, Mr. Speaker, the then Prime Minister and present Leader of the Opposition did not see fit to reply to the Auditor General, because he does not put his reply in here, and he then writes him again, when this illegal expenditure of public moneys was still being continued and he says:

(Reads)

And I know, and it is in his report which is made under Section 33b to see, how he refused to consent to authorize a letter of credit on the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, I am only an ordinary individual, and I am not a pugilistic individual, but I have never seen documents presented to this House of more serious character than these two letters which I have read—documents which in my opinion are most damaging to the party or parties that were associated with the handling of this fund. Why? Because they went and took money which had been previously voted for specific purposes, to be used in connection with the fisheries and when the Loan Bill was passed in this House it was mentioned in the Bill that the money could not be spent for any other purpose than in connection with the fisheries, and we find that Mr. Alderdice and his associates have taken this money and slung it away, used it as a slush fund to try and win the election. Nothing more and

nothing less. Why rumours came to us during the election that members of the Alderdice party were spending so much money on their constituents in going through their districts that they ran short of funds and had to send in for more and some members of the Alderdice administration protested, and they were told by the Leader of the Opposition that the end justified the means and to let it go. That is common talk.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—That is not true. Mr. Speaker, I must ask the Hon. gentleman to take that back.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I did not say that it was true. It is common talk. I agree that my talk may be common but it is common sense and dollars and cents.

MR. PUDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes a denial of a certain statement. That denial must be accepted by the Speaker.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, when I made that statement I did not say that it was a fact. I said it was common talk. I cannot stop common talk.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I submit that he can stop common talk by not repeating it unless he knows that it is true.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It might be better than to get the persons and bring them before the Bar of the House and have them examined.

MR. EMERSON.—The Hon. Minister is quite in order and if that was done in other matters and persons were interrogated at the Bar of the House I do not think that he would like it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I am prepared for anything that you may bring before this House in connection with my political career. If

the remarks hurts and he did not do it, well and good. I am prepared to take it back and deny it if the Leader of the Opposition can show that I am wrong, but I am just jointing out a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that when I lay this report under section 33b of the Audit Act on the table of the House, the Government papers will publish the letters that were written by Mr. Berteau to the Leader of the Opposition in connection with this expenditure of money, in the astute manner that the Opposition papers published the letters in connection with the confiscation deal, and make a step in that direction. It is just as well to be fair to one side as to the other. That is the position I take. I want to be fair to the Leader of the Opposition and to every individual member of this Assembly, but if they are prepared to publish letters that may be misleading, they should also be prepared to publish letters that are not misleading and I contend that these letters are not misleading, and I am going to have them published whether the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else likes it or not.

The Alderdice party spent some hundreds of thousands of dollars during the last election and now I am going to tell how they spent it.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We were not in power then.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I agree that you were not in power then but when I am finished you will see what I mean. The amount of money expended from July to November 30th and you were not in power then—was something like \$1,700,000. I had the common decency to give you credit for \$100,000 which was spent on roads and bridges and which ordinarily would have been spent, and here are the amounts:

(Reads)

And I can see the Opposition members saying that the highroads are not a political tool.

(Reads)

Speaking of the railway there is over a million dollars gone from there into the slush fund. Why, they spent some \$30,000 to transport people to and back, out of the charities of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, when these people looked for a raise of pay a year or so ago that same administration—because I look upon them as the Monroe administration—and I can have my opinion—they never raised a finger to get them an extra raise in pay, but when the election was on they gave a five cent an hour raise. I do not need to be hit on the head with an axe to understand that. They even paid out of the Treasury of the country the man who nominated my opponent—paid him \$30,00 for the job. Isn't that beautiful? \$30,00 out of the Treasury of the country. The Road Board paid it to him but he never made any return and never did any work for it and it was paid to him to nominate my opponent.

I do not propose this afternoon to delay the House very much longer but I do propose to speak a little on the commissions. We have been criticised in the debate on the Speech from the Throne for the various commissions which we propose to appoint.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Will the Hon. member kindly table the statements which he just read from?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I will table everything when I am finished with it. I am not quite done with them yet, because I will have them during the session and every time you say anything wrong I will use them again.

I was talking about commissions. When speaking my Hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition forgot to

make a comparison with the Monroe administration in connection with the Commission that was appointed to investigate the expenses in Public Charities. The commission consisted of the Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm and Sir A. B. Morine.

Now let us see what they did. I mentioned this before in the House and my friend the member for Bay de Verde will remember the several occasions but I want to tell him again because they have succeeded in effecting a saving of \$17.00.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Get the Hon. Dr. Mosdell's opinion on that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Not because Dr. Mosdell has his opinion that I haven't got another one.

They saved \$17 on the salary of a Postmistress at Catalina, yet they paid Mr. Cramm \$2,000, Sir A. B. Morine \$2,000, and Mr. Sullivan the member for Placentia West, \$2,000 more. The balance the \$15,000 they paid out for other expenses in connection with the Commission. Furthermore, I want to tell the member for Bay de Verde, who represents a paper, that I do not mind being criticised, but when they go out and deliberately misconstrue any statements I may make in this House, then I think it is time for me to defend myself. Now I went to the trouble to get my remarks from the stenographer and I will read to the House exactly what I did say. Very often when a man is making a speech he may make mistakes, but I am going to make sure whether I did or not. This morning people were even sent to my office from the "Telegram," office to find out what I did say. No doubt the editor of that paper was trying to make political capital out of what I did say yesterday afternoon and he sent a man down to find out. Here is what the "Daily News" quotes me for having said:

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a deliberate lie and it was deliberately published by the "Daily News" to injure me, but they got to swallow it. Now it is easy to see the kind of stuff that is in the back of the heads of the people at the "Daily News" office. This is what the stenographer who reported my speech states what I said and any member can see it.

(Quotes from Reporter's Copy)

Now I want that paper to retract that statement to-morrow morning. If they are decent they will take it back; but if they are indecent they will do the other thing.

I think, however, that the member for Bay de Verde should be able to assure me here this afternoon that that decency will be accorded me. Of course, I am accustomed to such kind of attacks and it is like water on a duck's back to me, but on this occasion they are not going to get away with that stuff with impunity. That kind of individual at the "Daily News" office preaches prohibition in public and drinks rum in private.

Another matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to is that a new paper called the "Watchman" appeared on the street last Thursday and it is evidently the organ of the Opposition because a picture of the Leader of the Opposition occupies the front page of this paper. Now there are two daily newspapers in the community which supported the present Opposition in the recent general election. It strikes me that the Opposition started this new paper for the reason that the two dailies did not want to publish filth which probably the Opposition wanted to be published, with the result that the "Watchman" is now on the street. I may say that there are various penmen and hangmen connected with this paper and if the records and

characters of these individuals were exposed it would make interesting reading for the Opposition, and so I feel that this new paper is to be the mouthpiece of the Opposition Party and I have every justification for making this statement, particularly in view of the way public moneys were spent during the general election. Now that paper gave me a little free advertising last Thursday, but I do not think it cost very much. Some very peculiar remarks were made concerning me, but I do not mind them. But I want to point out Mr. Speaker, that my predecessor in office was one of the persons that paid the individual who wrote that article a fat fee to try and keep me out of my seat in the Legislature.

Before closing up my remarks I would like to give the House the record of the Monroe Government from the time they took office right up to the time the Alderdice Government went out of power. The Monroe Government held office for over four years and during that period spent sixty million dollars, twenty millions of which was borrowed on the credit of the Colony and the other forty millions was spent out the general revenue of the Colony. They borrowed twenty six millions but had to repay a loan of between six and seven millions, consequently, the remaining twenty millions at five per cent would mean an annual expenditure in interest charges of one million dollars a year. Now what have they got to show for this twenty millions of dollars they expended. Let us summarize it and see. They re-railed three diversions of railway line and spent considerable money on capital account amounting to four million dollars. They built the Dry Dock in St. John's, a job that they contracted to complete for one million dollars and it cost two, because another million was wasted

while the Dock was being constructed. They contracted for the building of the S.S. Caribou in Holland for a half million dollars when that ship could have been built for practically the same figure in England, and that contract was signed in secrecy by the Executive Councillors of that day. They built—or correctly speaking—repaired three hundred miles of road, called highroads, at a cost of three and a half million dollars. Some people are unkind enough to say that they built the new Hotel. Sure they did, and it is not paid for yet. The management of that Hotel to day is not what one would like to speak of in complimentary terms because it is in a hopeless mess financially and this Colony will shortly be called up to pay for it, if not to pay the yearly interest charge of eighty or ninety thousand dollars. Now, Sir, I have told how ten million dollars approximately was spent with very little to show for it, but we have nothing to show for the other ten million dollars that was absolutely wasted, because it was used for paying deficits on current account and on railway account, and this year the present Government has to come in and ask for a loan of another three million dollars to pay deficits incurred by the Monroe administration. That makes thirteen million dollars and nothing to show for it. Now, Sir, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition was at all justified in getting up yesterday and making a comparison as to what the Monroe Government did and what the Squires Government did, because the Monroe Government squandered more money than any previous Government ever did. They came into office at a period when times were getting very good in this country and if they had taken the right and proper steps I have no reason for doubting that the Monroe Government would have made good; but they started out

by borrowing money in huge amounts when the country could not afford to pay the interest charges. If they had first borrowed three million dollars instead of six—and they wanted to borrow seven and a half—and forgot about Highroads, the country would be better off than we are to-day. Consequently, the Monroe Government will be written down in history as the Government responsible for whatever disaster that may come—though I doubt if any disaster is going to come, at least, for the next four years with the present Government at the helm. The Monroe Government had the opportunity of a lifetime. They had good fisheries on the shores, yet they took the people away from the fisheries and put them on the highroads. The highroads never produced anything but spent money galore. They even employed “goats” and paid them \$5 a day for their work. And still, in the face of that, we have the Leader of the Opposition making comparison as between this Government and the Monroe Government. We have been in office about six months and we have done nothing frightful yet.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to that article that appeared in the “Daily News” this morning I want an assurance before this House adjourns that a complete retraction of those words used against me will be made by that “Daily News” aggregation. This evening the “Telegram” I notice is linking me up with that same kind of stuff, and I, being a Catholic representative in this House, want it taken back and I want the member for Bay de Verde, who is a representative of the “Daily News,” to see that a retraction will be made and that it will be given the same prominence as the article that attacked me. I want it in the Editorial columns of the “Daily News,” and I want it put on the records of this House. With regard to this fellow who

edits the "Evening Telegram." This fellow is a grave-digger and he is biting the hand that fed him. Here is what he wrote and I want to draw the attention of members on both sides of the House to it:

(Reads)

Now I did not make any such statement and I will hand my remarks to the Hon. member to see for himself.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—I may state it is only fair that the Daily News should retract the statement that it made this morning. I think it is incorrect and that the papers generally should be careful to report fairly and accurately statements made by members of the House. So I would ask Mr. Puddester to assure the House that his paper will retract that statement. I do not suggest that Mr. Puddester made it. I am only asking that he attend to it.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, you do suggest that I made that statement.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—No, I do not but I am asking you to see that as the statement is incorrect, that it be retracted.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I have already told the member for Ferryland that that correction will be made to-morrow. But I want it to be clearly understood that I have nothing to do with the editorial.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, I accept the assurance of the Hon. member for Bay de Verde but I do not want that retraction hidden away. These retractions of a political nature are generally hidden away amongst the advertisements.

Now, Sir, I was winding up by making a comparison of the Monroe Government. And I want to point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that while we have not done anything wonderful yet, having only been six

months in office, we have had our work cut out so far in trying to clean up the mess that was left behind by the outgoing government, but I feel sure that within twelve months we will have done something at least by virtue of those commissions which we have appointed, even though we are called a Government by commission which will be at least in keeping with the commission appointed by the Monroe Government which cost the country \$15,000 and which commission made a saving to the country of \$17 a year.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, in opening the few remarks that I may have to say here to-day I want first of all to tender to you the customary congratulations on the honour which has lately been conferred upon you, and I do so not from a mechanical point of view because your appointment to the Speaker's Chair in this House is one which touches the personal note in myself. I regard your election to the Speaker's Chair in this Hon. House of Assembly as a gracious tribute to the District which both yourself and myself have the honour to represent. I feel sure as the years go on and you become more accustomed to the Rules and Orders of this Hon. Chamber that you have been called upon to preside over. I feel that the Hon. Gentlemen of this Chamber will have no cause to question your rulings, and that you will respect their privileges as well as the privileges of those on this side. I also want Sir, to join with previous speakers in extending my congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the Motion for the Address in Reply. As it was so well put by Mr. Alderdice, the Speech of Capt. John Parsons is one worthy of special note. Capt John Parsons represents the practical man in this Assembly and when he speaks we feel that his voice is the voice of the fish-

ermen of Newfoundland, and the Hon. members of this Assembly and the whole country in general feel proud, and they have just reason to feel proud of the remarks made by the Hon. member for Bay Roberts. What has been said of him can be said with equal force of the member for Hermitage. There are very few men who are as closely indentified with the staple industry of this country. His district has just reason to feel proud of him for the manner in which he made his initial speech in this Assembly. Now we have sat here for some days and listened, I for one have anyway, with very rapt attention to the various speeches that have gone before. But I may say I have been keenly disappointed by the stand taken and the remarks made and the so-called criticism put forward by the Hon. members on the opposite side of the House. It brings it my mind the truth of the old time philosophy "none are so blind as those who do not want to see," and by the Leader of the Opposition who employed the expression of that the Speech from the Throne was disappointing, down to the last Speaker who took advantage of the opportunity to speak on the Address in Reply in order to villify some of his neighbours in his district, the same theme has been followed throughout "the gospel of gloom." It only recalls the fact that those gentlemen went to the poles, pledged to do their best in regard to the issues that were before the country and to respect the interests of the country. They came out of that battle not even clear headed or clear sighted, and if they remain in the House for the next four years and if they are still suffering from that chronic disease they will go back to their constituents at the next election and be lost with all hands.

Now their speeches have not a ring of constructiveness about them at all.

They see nothing in the Speech from the Throne, they talk of commissions and criticise the Leader of the Government for suggesting commissions. They realize that this is the year when something must be done along the various lines suggested, but they have not got a practical idea to put forward to say what they can substitute for those commissions. The member for Placentia East whom I have known for years and from whom I expected something really good in this House suggested nothing practical at all until he came to the contract dealing with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and his only criticism was that the country was not getting enough out of it. The Hon. member for St. John's West (Extern) took advantage of his opportunity to speak from his seat and to criticise the action of the Government because they moved his father from office, and because the Government of this country considered that the fishermen had fed Sir John long enough. He took advantage of the occasion to vomit forth all kinds of vilification at our Leader who was absent from his seat at the time, and he did not level his attacks at any of the members of the Executive who were in their seats at the time.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Hon. member that I do not know of any time when the Leader of the Government was in the House while the Opposition members were speaking on the Speech from the Throne except yesterday, and if any remarks have been made about him in his absence it is his own fault. In fact when Mr. Bennett was speaking, and by the way I notice that he is not here now, he asked shortly after he had commenced to speak, that a messenger be sent to ask the Prime Minister to come into the House so that he could speak in

his presence on these matters.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—To go on with my remarks I may say that it was not a matter of sufficient importance to the fishermen of this country as to whether or not a four o'clock tea party was spoilt in London, because Sir John Bennett was removed from his High Commissionership. If that is the kind of criticism to expect from the Hon. member on the opposite side, then it would be better that all those things were left unsaid and we got back to our own work.

The Hon. member for Burin East also reiterated what has been said by his Brother in Arms, the Hon. member for Placentia East. In referring to the Speech from the Throne the only thing that he could say was that it was a record breaking speech. Yes it is a record breaking speech. But there is in that speech a ring of originality. It has in it the seeds of something that in the future years, with some luck, will germinate into something that will revolutionize this country.

Now let us consider the Speech from the Throne paragraph by paragraph, and we will find more to appreciate in the four or five paragraphs that that speech contains than in what we have heard from all the opposition members put together. Let us take the first paragraph in reference to the question of unemployment, and the suggestion that a commission be appointed to deal with that unemployment situation, and to find a remedy. The Hon. members on the opposite side criticised that and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that the first policeman that you meet on the street would tell you the cause of the unemployment. They all know certain causes. But is there anybody can tell us the remedy. The members on the opposite side have not suggested one. They have however declined to criticize the personnel of that commission

and I think that the members on this side will agree that the personnel of that commission is beyond criticism. We all agree that the question of unemployment is a festering sore on the body politic of this country. And we all agree that some way must be found out of the difficulty. How is that way to be found. Was this party and the members thereof sent back to represent this country, and to spend their days and nights trying to find out a solution to this problem. Is that the functions of a Government. I say no, and then the only way that a question of this kind can be handled is by a commission, untainted by political intrigue, free from the influence that ordinarily affects other bodies of this kind called upon to investigate questions of this nature. And here we have a commission composed of Sir Patrick McGrath, Sir William Lloyd and Inspector General Hutchings; and, Mr. Speaker, I may say that those three men representing the thinking men of this community, practical men are men well qualified because of their everyday intimate touch with this situation to deal successfully with it. This paragraph is a ray of hope for the people of the West End of the City, who, as the leader of the Opposition has said, were promised great things and got nothing. This question of unemployment arose about 1919 and since then has been growing through five or six administrations. It was gradually becoming worse, but under the present government let it be said that it has practically been confined to St. John's. And when a paragraph like this is included as the first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, those people that are desirous of work and cannot get it, will realise that their problem is the first in the consideration of the Government of the country, and that the present party, under the leader-

ship of Sir Richard Squires, is anxious to find a way out.

This government is prepared to act on the recommendation of that committee, and I hope that the people of St. John's, particularly, those who are suffering from this sore, will be relieved. But they cannot be relieved if we are to sit down and follow the suggestions of the members on the opposite side of the House, to sit down and let the situation cure itself.

One way in which the position can be met is by the encouragement of our local industries, and I think that I am safe in saying that in a few days from now legislation will be introduced which will provide for the establishment in the West End of this city of an industry that will give continuous employment to upwards of two hundred people. That industry is, I hope, the first of many that will follow during the régime of the present government. And with three or four industries of that kind the question of unemployment will be a thing of the past.

The next thing brought out in the Speech from the Throne is in connection with the Public Utilities Commission. There were members on the Opposition side who tried to minimise the importance of that Commission, but every independent voter in this country, particularly in that section of the country which is served by these public utilities, will be as one in their reply that never was a time more opportune for such a thing as a Public Utilities Commission. A public utility exists for the service of the city and the country generally but there is always the possibility of a dangerous monopoly. I think that on the Avalon Peninsula, and even right here in St. John's, we have two or three concerns possessing almost unlimited power and at times exercising it. It is a case of pay up

your telephone bill or we will shut off the telephone, to quote only one example. It is the intention to safeguard all legal interests involved and particularly the people from unfair charges. It is not very long ago since one of the Public Utilities in this town decided to put up its rates, and an arbitration board was appointed. I think the member for Placentia East was the solicitor on that Board.

MR. EMERSON.—I was the solicitor for one of the telephone companies.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Then you were the solicitor for one of the parties concerned. As a result of that arbitration board the telephone rates went up one hundred per cent.

The daily papers supporting the Opposition criticise the Government for appointing those commissions, and criticise the Speech from the Throne for having that paragraph in it. They come out and denounce us because this thing it allowed to happen. They see no results to come. On this second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne what have they got to say?

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Daily News supported that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne since it was delivered, and I have supported it, too, and will support it.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—I am very glad to see somebody on the other side is able to see light. The honorable member for Bay de Verde has not spoken yet on the subject. We had not heard what he had to say about it, but the Hon. members opposite speaking before him have taken the attitude that these commissions are things to be derided and no worth having. and no worth having.

The Public Utilities Commission if it functions, and I hope it will function, will result in bringing great

benefit to the producers of this country who are the people most concerned, and if exorbitant profits have been made, and are being made, and there is little doubt but that is so considering the conditions under which these people operate and the rates are much higher than in the neighboring provinces of Canada under much more stringent conditions. I submit that when the findings of the Commission are made known the public of the country will bless the day this paragraph was put in the Speech from the Throne and the common people of the country will say that the Prime Minister was true to his pledge and his party were true to their pledge that they would put the interests of the common man first.

Now, the next important paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and one, too, that has not been seriously considered by the honorable members of the Opposition, is in reference to the Fishery Commission.

Mr. Quinton, the honorable member for Bonavista South, did speak favorably of that. This is something that has been long sought by the fishermen of this country. We all remember in 1924 the Monroe government, of which the members opposite are the remnants, went to the polls with a policy of encouragement of the fisheries and with great promises of reduction of taxation, and what happened? Mr. Speaker, when they went to the country and were returned on these pledges with a substantial majority, they forgot the fishermen. But today in the Speech from the Throne we have a paragraph providing for the appointment of a commission representing all classes of fishermen for the purpose of delving into and investigating different classes and different qualities of fish caught and cured in this country, and every

serious-minded fisherman will agree that the system of cure and the system of marketing fish in this country is such as should be dead and buried a hundred years ago.

We are today carrying on the fisheries in the same way as our forefathers did when they first came to the country. We know nothing or practically nothing, about the by-products of the fishery. We know practically nothing of the marketing qualities of various classes of fish apart from the codfish. I have the honor to represent a constituency which has possibly the best natural bait depot on this side of the North Atlantic, and it is only since the last two months that we have been able to make any practical steps towards establishing cold storage in the district. Within the last two months I have had occasion to be in communication with American capitalists interested in the fisheries of this country, and they, too, have expressed surprise at the fact that Newfoundland had not realised the tremendous asset she had in the fisheries apart from the codfishery. I take it, and I hope that this Fishery Commission when it deals with the questions outlined here will delve into every corner, every crevice, of fishery questions, and if the personnel of the commission are men qualified to handle adequately such questions, then Newfoundland is round the corner. I have no doubt but the revenue from the fisheries can be increased 100 per cent.

Last year in the district of Harbor Main alone we took in \$50,000 in cash. That \$50,000 was actually produced in Harbor Main by aged, wornout men, and it represents Canadian money brought in by deep water Canadian fishing schooners and spent in the district for bait, ice and supplies. This year, before the 1st of September, we

hope to have in our district also a fishery bait depot cold storage plant capable of caring for three hundred thousand pounds of squid, frozen squid. This squid is marketable to the fishermen of the South West Coast at a price of 3 to 5 cents, and is today practically impossible to procure.

Last year we had a hundred thousand pounds of squid and had to beg the business interests of Water St. to allow cold storage space in St. John's. The squid was brought in in a fresh state at a quarter or half cent a pound. The next day or two, when this was shipped, it fetched 3 to 5 cents a pound. Now that shows something. It was done pactly as an experiment. -Today, if the Fishery Commission goes into this question, investigates these matters and the future that there is for the fisheries of this country, and makes recommendations, and the Government, I take it, is prepared to follow all recommendations made in that regard, provided they are practicable; then it means that instead of the codfishery being the primary export industry of this country, there will be other various fish products on a par with the codfishery.

The United States of America has an unlimited market for fish provided it can be put there in a fresh state. At the present time we are confined to the European markets, where they have exclusively a taste, so to speak, for salt cod; but if, as a result of the Fishery Commission, we can induce American capitalists to buy our fish, and the American householder to consume it, then the day has gone when Newfoundland has to worry about the financial condition, because it is a matter of common knowledge that our supply of fish is inexhaustible and no matter how great the demand in the United States may

be, no matter how great the demand in Canadian markets may be, we still have the supply to give them; and what has been done by some firms in Halifax should and can be, and let us hope will be, duplicated in Newfoundland within the next four years, and if as a result of the findings of this Commission these things are brought about, then Newfoundland will be a country worth living in and second to none in the British Empire.

The next item mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and which, too, has been considered of little importance by honorable members on the opposite side of the House, is the contract entered into by the Government of the country and the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

My honorable friends opposite can see nothing in that. Mr. Emerson says that we are giving away our rights for \$4,000.00 per cable, and I say that it represents a step in scientific advancement in the country, and it means that if a man in New York is able to carry on a telephone conversation with a man in London, with Newfoundland as the connecting unit, Newfoundland will be placed on the map. This country should keep pace with scientific advancement and I should hate to see an opportunity such as this of keeping up with the scientific progress of the world slipping out of our hands.

After all, what are we giving away? This company intends to land the cable in the bottom of Conception Bay. I have the honor to represent that district and I say here and now that I hope that they do land the cable there. We are almost prepared to pay then \$4,000 to land the cable there. I foresee as a result of this scheme that we will have two Bay Roberts in Newfoundland during the next five years. I am not interested to any great extent in the taxes, but what I am inter-

ested in is what is to follow. The landing of the cable will necessitate the building of a land station, staff houses and repair stations. The building of a land line and other such operations will give employment to our men and women and while there may not be many, it means that the foundations will have been laid for a trade for our sons and daughters at the landing station. My honorable friend, the member for Bay Roberts, knows what has been done there and I think that he will agree with me in that many Newfoundlanders have learned a trade there and are scattered all over the Atlantic seaboard earning a comfortable living. I foresee that this development will mean also that more of our men and women will be given an opportunity to earn their living either here or in the United States of America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said here and indeed most of the talk has been about the seizure of the two hundred cases of Teachers Whiskey. These two hundred cases of whiskey came in here apparently consigned to some men in the city. The Minister of Finance and Customs seized it, and because he did his duty the Government is bombarded with questions. The honorable members of the Opposition are all trying to get some information so as to implicate some member of the Government in an imaginary scandal. I think that the answer was given yesterday by the Minister of Finance and Customs when he told what he knew, and I am quite in accord with him. If this Mr. Blair tried to put one across on the country, is that the fault of the Government? Why should we be bombarded with questions? What does it matter to us?

Then, again, Sir, the amendments to the Alcoholic Liquor Bill were minutely discussed and various reasons

put forth why the amendments should not be passed. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one honorable member of this Government who is in close touch with the unemployed situation who can give a very effective answer to this matter. The Hon. member for St. John's West can give some information as to why these amendments were made. I am a prohibitionist. Anyone who has seen the reports of the sale of alcoholic liquors in this city will know that something must be done, some tightening up must be effected and some cure found for this disease.

Instead of the 'Bottle a Day' Act introduced by the Monroe Government, we intend to introduce legislation to cut down the supply to three bottles a week. That, I submit, and I am sure that the country at large will agree, is quite sufficient. This legislation has been long overdue and I hope that when the Act is introduced it will go on the Statute Book.

I do not intend to keep the House much longer on the Speech from the Throne. I merely wish to say that I think that the document itself commends itself to the entire electorate of the country. It contains something of interest to the workingman and the producing man. Every type of man engaged in any sort of producing industry is remembered, and it outlines possible ways by which economical problems may be solved and some of our financial troubles may be alleviated.

I cannot resume my seat, however, without making some reference to the attitude taken by the honorable gentlemen of the Opposition. When we went to the polls on October 29th last they covered the whole country with propaganda, and we were shoulder to shoulder with the stuff they were prepared to put across, and then we have to come in here and listen to the

stuff which they try to get away with now. The Minister of Finance and Customs read the records of that Government and I think it is second to no other administration which ever disgraced this Assembly.

In Harbor Main district we had to meet and overcome all sorts of obstacles. In looking over the lists I see that ninety thousand dollars was spent on marine grants and seven hundred thousand dollars on roads. Now, since we have been returned we have to listen to questions regarding moneys spent by the various departments in the districts since the elections. Let me say that the money spent in Harbor Main district by the Alderdice Opposition was all taken from the slush fund. Their late Minister of Agriculture and Mines came into the district and threw the flood gates wide open. He built wharves everywhere he could find enough water to build them; now we have to find money to keep these wharves in repair, to keep them from being washed away in the winter.

But the fight went on, and in spite of the resources at their disposal, in spite of the slush fund that was thrown around so carelessly, the people felt that in justice to themselves and in justice to that party which had so shamefully neglected their duty and had practically starved them for their four years in power, and had forgotten their promises and given them no road grants for the last three and a half years, that they would not trust them with another term of office.

I think the record of the Alderdice party put on the table of the House since we came in has justified the contention of the people of Harbor Main district. My feeling is that when the time comes for this present administration to go back to the electorate and submit itself for their consid-

eration, the pledges laid down in the Speech from the Throne will have been fulfilled by this Government. This country will have passed the day when she will have any serious financial condition. We are on the road to industrial development and prosperity and the honorable members of the other side of the House will have ample time to cool their heels in opposition.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Assembly for the first time a paper-maker has been returned as a representative to this honorable House. I wish, sir, before I deal with the debate, to congratulate you, as the other speakers have done, and in doing so I wish to pay you no empty compliment. I was surprised on coming here to find so young a man as yourself was the choice of the party to sit in that honorable position, but since you have been in that position, looking back, I can see the foresight of the party which picked you from the ranks of so many men, for no other man could so ably fill the position.

It is my sincere wish that you shall be called, and it will be your privilege, to sit in that position and serve your country on the floors of this Legislature for many years to come.

I wish also to congratulate the honorable member for Bay Roberts, Capt. Parsons, on his very able address. He brings to this party a great practical experience in the business of the country. He is also a tower of strength to the party. I should also like to congratulate the honourable member for Hermitage, Mr. Fudge, on the able manner in which he seconded the address in reply. He is a strong addition to this House and in the address he made he showed that he had a grasp of the affairs of his district which is a fishing district, and there is no doubt but that he will give a

great account of himself in this Legislature.

I do not feel very much at home standing here and hearing so much talk of the fishery, coming from a district where no fishing is carried on. Nevertheless, I come from a district possibly the greatest industrial district in the country. A district which is independent. A district which turns in six or seven hundred thousand dollars net into the revenue, and by the end of the four years we will be in office I have no doubt that we will be returning in a million dollars annually revenue to this country.

It is not strange to me that my friends on the opposite side of the House, as Dr. Campbell explained here at the early stages, saw nothing in the Speech from the Throne and tried to ridicule it. They tried the same when the former Liberal statesman, Sir Robert Bond, brought in the bill incorporating the A.N.D. Company.

Public meetings were called to try and put down that great industry. The Liberal party carried it forward, and today you can see the result of that progressive Liberal party in the district of Grand Falls, a district where everybody can get a job, where the conditions of labor are better than anywhere else in this country. Where we have the eight hour system, where people can get a decent living. That is the result of the progressive policy of the Liberal party.

I became active in politics when the Liberal party, under its present leader Sir Richard Squires, brought in the Humber project. What did the opposition party of the time call the Humber proposition? They called it a white elephant. Today it is no white elephant. The Humber industry, along with the Grand Falls industry, are the two bright spots in this country, and I do not know what this

country would do if we did not have these two great industries brought into being by the progressive Liberal party. It would do one's heart good after passing through the country to come to Grand Falls and Corner Brook.

I do not wonder that in the present Speech from the Throne that the present leader of the Opposition and the other gentlemen of the Opposition tried to criticise it and say there is nothing in it. I see in this Speech from the Throne that the International Paper Company, which now runs Corner Brook industry, is also thinking of expanding that great industry at Corner Brook. There is also much talk of expansion at Grand Falls and much depends on the legislation or treatment which will be accorded these companies by the present parliament. The Government will not in any way antagonise these companies. Their wish will be to co-operate with them, to encourage them, but in the meantime it stands on its dignity and Newfoundlanders will be recognised in dealing with the companies. I may say that from my experience that so far as the country is concerned, in dealing with these companies this House in the past has robbed the people of the country and not the companies themselves.

I see in the Speech from the Throne that a Public Utilities Commission will be appointed. I stand right behind such legislation. The Commission will be carefully picked. They will be men with experience and I believe much good will come from a commission of that kind. The honorable member for Ferryland says that in this city that while the price of flour had been reduced considerably the price of bread remains the same. At Grand Falls we have the famous closed town system and there is no competition. There will be quite a job

for the Public Utilities Commission there. You will be surprised to know that Newfoundlanders in this country have to pay twelve cents per pound for fresh codfish. The people of Grand Falls district are kicking against the closed town system. It is a system which might have been all right a quarter of a century ago to experiment with. It can never be tolerated in this day. When the Monroe government brought in the famous Buchans Mine Bill which I have before me, they shut up that town. It is impossible to get within nine miles of it. I have had to visit Buchans Mine at my own expense, being a recognized labor man trying to better conditions for the working-men of that section.

There will be work for a Commission along these lines in this country. The working-men of this country should not be subject to such restrictions. They should not be living in a semi-servitude manner. I feel that in these closed towns there is a supression amongst the people which should not exist, and it will be a great work for the present Government if they should appoint another Commission, and I would be very much in favour of it, a Labour Commission, or Labour Department, to deal with such problems in this country. It is absolutely useless to be bringing into this country companies if the standard of wage which they are paying is not enough for the people to exist on. And remember my Hon. friends that a wage that is paid here in St. John's cannot be applied to a district like Grand Falls or I might say, Corner Brook, or at Buchans. A man can get things so much cheaper in this section of the country than he can in these districts. And with a big paper making concern or a big mining company, I contend, if we are to get anything out of it, if we let them in duty free and give them

the same possibilities and do the same for them on the same plan as they would in Canada,, then I contend that the wages paid should be the same as are paid to the working-men of Canada for like industries. You cannot compare these big billion dollars companies with a little small fishing merchants who are around this coast, and because this House has not recognized this, the working-men of the country and the country itself and the revenue of the country, has suffered the loss of millions of dollars.

I have been told that during the last administration all these companies had to do, if they wanted anything in duty free, was to wire the Minister of Finance and Customs and it would be wiped off the slate, and there was no comeback to ask are you doing anything for the working-men of the country. The hard stories of the companies were taken and the country and the working people suffered. This, I do not think, will be carried on during the regime of this present Government.

I see that this Government proposes again to bring in the Income Tax. I do not belong to the class of people who will pay this Income Tax. I may say that I am a labouring man, a trained paper-maker. I have been sent to this House by the labouring people of Grand Falls, by the working people of that great industrial district. I notice that it is set forth that it will not come hard on the tradesman, It is set at \$3,000 with certain amounts for each child.

I consider, Sir, that that Income Tax when it was removed by the late Government one of the greatest political crimes ever enacted in this country. They went into power to reduce taxes and they reduced it off themselves and put it on the poor honest working-man who is in need. The result is that to-day you have poor men

and women—the hardest sight I have seen in my life—struggling along through the streets of St. John's a disgrace to those who were in authority the past four years. I have been told that when that Income Tax was taken off that you practically made a present of one hundred thousand dollars to the British Government, which you were getting from the A. N. D. Co. Would you ever think it possible that such legislation as that would be enacted, by men who had the interests of the country at heart? No. They did not care so long as they saved a paucity few thousand dollars themselves.

In the executive of these great companies are men getting enormous salaries, getting it by managing these great concerns, managing it for the paper making companies. These men are possibly paid at the rate of twenty five to thirty thousand dollars per year and it would do some of my Hon. friends good to see the smiles that came on some of their faces when, as they said, the Government in power were such fools as to bring an Act in like that to take the Income Tax off the rich and put it on that poor man out there shovelling coal. That is some of the Monroe legislation and it is no wonder that when Sir Richard Squires unfurled the Liberal banner in this country, that the country rose to the occasion and sent him back to power with one of the strongest Governments that has ever come here.

I might say that I hear considerable rumours around the streets that there is dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Government. That is absolutely false and I would like to tell the Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that I organized among men of considerable spirit but I have never been among such a body of men, where such loyalty and such a natural

spirit to carry forward the work and to continue to carry on. Yes, Sir, we are going to carry on for the next four years and then be returned for four more.

I do not wish to delay the House to any length, but as I have stated I have been elected to the House as a representative of labour—not as a Bolshevik by any means. I have received my training from the American Federation of Labour. I recognize the rights of people who are, so-called, capitalists. Men who use their brains and their money for the benefit of the community in which they live to the best of their ability are worth every man in his employ, but the man who is selfish, who sees only himself, who tries to get wealth at the expense of everybody else, I believe that man is a menace to any community. I believe in the working people getting due returns for their labour. I believe in high wages and I don't see why we cannot have that in this country. The American industrialists see the benefit of that and they advocate high wages. High wages may bring temporary set-backs but eventually when the working man gets enough to supply his needs, he gets enough to get a little luxury and I say that a man, no matter how humble he is, is entitled to this. I hope the time will come in this country when the common working man will be looked upon with more respect, that laws on his behalf will be passed by this legislature and that we shall have more prosperity among the working classes. Poverty I regard as a crime.

Some of the Commissions appointed by the present Government under Sir Richard Squires, if they work honestly, thoughtfully and straightly, I am sure that they will do much to alleviate the suffering and help to give the new order hoped for to industry at the present time.

With that point in view I have made a tremendous sacrifice to come here as a representative of the labouring man. I had to give up my position. Nobody in this Assembly has made the sacrifice that I have made in that respect and every chance that I get I will uphold the labouring man on the floors of this Assembly because, after all, the producer and the working man is the foundation of any country. If you are a professional man, if you are a merchant, it is by the labour of the individual of the lower classes that keeps the respectable coat on your back. It is time we realized it in this country as they have in the great country of the United States. I believe we have made a start. We have a long way to go but if we never start we will never get anywhere, and I believe that when the people elected this Government to power they have made a start in that direction and this Government will go down in the history of the country as one of the best that has been sent here.

I have looked carefully over the Speech from the Throne. While I have not touched on it possibly as I should because all that can be said about it has been said; but in going over it and studying it carefully I find a wonderful lot in it and in the legislation which is to be brought before this session of the House there is a wonderful lot more which will be a benefit to the people of this country.

This Government which is now in power realizes that it is the common men, the laborer and the fisherman of the country who sent them here to occupy these seats and unless they render a service to these people, unless they come first in their consideration, unless they do their best for them, when they go back again to the electorate they will not be returned.

I believe, Sir, and I would like to

impress it upon every member of the Government and every member of the Opposition, and I know that there are some men there who have the country at heart, that we should all work together honestly for the good and general welfare of this country for the next four years.

I think, Sir, that the Speech from the Throne will take a place with that famous speech of Sir Richard Squires when he brought the Humber industry to this country, a Speech which will live in the history of the country bringing other industries which will remain long after we have gone.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, debate on Address in Reply was postponed until tomorrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 2nd, 1929.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Development and Activities of the St. John's Dry Dock.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy"

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would

on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the Amendment of Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9 George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13 George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Quinton gave notice that he would ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table the following information on behalf of the Railway Commission: If the steamship "Susu" was recently purchased by or for the Railway Commission; if so, what was the purchase price? To table all correspondence relative thereto.

Pursuant to order and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Constitution and Powers of a Public Utilities Commission" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Naturalization of Aliens," 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents,'" 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 con-

currence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 14, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships,'" 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Companies" 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 the Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary.'" "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I think that if the Government do nothing else in connection with this matter than the wiping out of these so-called hospitals, they will render great service to the country. It seems to me to be the case, particularly in the out-ports, when a doctor gets tired looking after a patient he sends him on to St. John's to stay here indefinitely. I think the Government are to be congratulated on this step in connection with public health matters.

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 tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to trespass upon the time of the House unless in connection with some important matter with which I am more or less familiar, or that may have particular reference to the district I represent. I will not trespass upon the time of the House upon this present occasion even to offer the customary congratulations to you, Sir, on your appointment to the high position you occupy and to the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply, because I realize that this House is fully aware of the fact that in nominating as Speaker your honorable self it was making no blunder.

It is realised and has been so well expressed by all speakers that you will perform your duties in a satisfactory manner and so as to bring credit to yourself.

The same may be said of the two honorable gentlemen who functioned in connection with the Address in Reply. I feel, too, that with the numbers of congratulatory speeches made them further such may be even wearisome to them.

I would not trespass just now on time time were it not for what I consider an unhappy expression of the Honorable the Leader of the Opposition in his speech in connection with the dry dock, and to the effect that the dock was an asset to the country and a credit to the Monroe government.

I think I may profess to be as familiar with matters pertaining to dock

construction as anybody in the House, and perhaps, without any intention of being self-laudatory, as anybody in the country. I think some years previous to 1882 the mind of the country had been prepared through talks and newspaper discussions to the necessity of Newfoundland possessing a dock. Situated as we are out in the Atlantic and having at that time on this side of the North Atlantic only one other dock of the size it was contemplated building, and that in New York harbor a thousand miles away, it was taken into consideration that ships damaged in the North Atlantic by collision, encountering ice or otherwise, would naturally come to the nearest place suitable for repairs, and the decision was come to that we were justified in constructing a dock as a paying enterprise.

The Government of that day entered into a contact with Simpson & Son of New York for the construction of one of their patent docks. Work was begun in due time and finished within the contract period, and the result was an economical, serviceable and well-constructed dock. It was 600 feet in length.

From the start I was connected with the operations. I first laid the boarding that established its location. I did round piling and straight piling. I made excavation concreting and finally other features to its completion, and I docked the first ship ever taken into it. I remark this to establish in a way that I am not talking about a matter I do not understand.

The dock, unfortunately, proved a failure. In years past we had a considerable local fleet of foreign going ships, besides the sealing fleet, and ships came here for repairs, but nevertheless, it was a dismal failure. As the time went on the dock showed signs of wear and strain and in 1925

the Government decided to reconstruct, rebuild or build a new dock. Knowing as I did that in 1882 conditions were very favorable and would convince anybody that a dock would be a paying proposition, and that in the years intervening a marked change had taken place, I knew that an expensive new dock could not now possibly be a success.

When first constructed there was no other dock on this side of the Atlantic but one, and that a thousand miles away, but in the intervening years docks had been built at Quebec, St. John, Halifax, Boston, Baltimore and the Bermudas. So should any foreign ship meet a disaster anywhere in the North Atlantic eastward of Newfoundland, every captain knew the conditions to be met on approaching our shores, particularly in winter, and to tackle field ice or bad weather in a disabled ship would be disastrous, and with numbers of docks to leeward he would run to one of these under more favorable conditions rather than meet with ice and bad weather conditions to be found round our coast.

These conditions killed all hopes of a new dock built here under more costly conditions proving a greater success than the old one. I myself at the time tried to convince the government that it was a mistake, but without avail, and a dock was built that will be a monument to somebody's blunder. Nobody regretted it more than I did, and I did my utmost to prevent the embarking on this enterprise, but as I said, without avail.

I will not trespass on the time of the House in connection with other matters that I might discuss and will confine myself simply to the statement that the Government built in the worst possible way, and constructed a dock which need not have cost what it did. I made an offer to make the

old dock as good as new at a cost of \$300,000, but that offer was rejected, and we purchased the present incubus at the cost of two millions, and thru the years we have its cost of administration and upkeep.

As I undertook not to delay the House, and have nothing else of particular importance to say just now, I will not add anything further to the debate.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Speaker, I had no intention, Sir, of addressing the House on the occasion of the Address in Reply. It is usual for the Leader of the Opposition to wind up the speaking on the Opposition side of the House and for the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, on the other side, to reply on behalf of the Government, and the address in reply goes through. After the Leader of the Opposition had said a few words in connection with the Address the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs took it on himself to reply on behalf of the Government instead of the Prime Minister. Since that we have had other Hon. gentlemen on the other side replying also on behalf of the Government. I did intend to remain silent until after the address in reply as I said had gone through; and my bit of dirty linen could have been washed in supply or on the Budget; but apparently I have to wash my bit of dirty linen now, and wash it as the Minister of Finance said yesterday, over again on supply and over again on the Budget.

I wish, as is the time honored custom in this House, to congratulate you Mr. Speaker on the high honor conferred on you on being elected to the position of the Highest Commoner of the Land. I am not personally acquainted with you sir, but I have followed your career for the past two or three years and when I was in Halifax two years ago, walking up Spring

Garden Road one day with a medical student and a law student from Dalrousie University, I met a young man that I did not know. That young man was pointed out to me by my companions and I was told that he was making new records in the law studies at the University. That young man was you, and after all that I heard in and around the University, I was not surprised when last year you came out the Gold Medalist of the University in the faculty of the law. Now early in your career you have been elected to the highest position that is in the gift of this House to give you. I am quite confident that you will not do anything to bring dishonour or disgrace on the country or the people that elected you. I feel confident too, that you will not, carry that partisanship generally shown on both sides of the House, to the Speakers Chair, but will act fair, square and decent with members on both sides and if you err always err on the the weaker side, and if you are ever called upon to cast the deciding vote as Speaker, we won't blame you if you give it as tradition allows in favour of the Government I would like to also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply. One is a new man in politics and one is a man who ran an election twenty years ago and was not successful, but with such a long experience we expect him to give sound and sensible judgment on questions of importance affecting the interests of the country. The gentleman who represents Hermitage I do not know as I only met him a few days ago, but I have every reason to believe that he will never have cause to regret his actions in this House. The moving and seconding of the Address in Reply is an ordeal, I know it, I have gone through the mill myself, I know what it means, I knew certain young members to spend hours before

the looking glass practising the actions and gestures that become members when speaking in public. The Leader of the Independent party of a few years ago said that he considered it the greatest possible ordeal that a member could undertake.

I want to say a word of congratulation to His Excellency the Governor, I don't think that it has been said before, and not so much a word of congratulation as a word of welcome to the distinguished gentleman who has come to govern Newfoundland and its dependencies for the next five years. He has come among warm hearted people and I am sure he will receive a warm hearted reception wherever he goes. On the opening day when he, a perfect elocutionist, read the Speech from the Throne I said to a colleague of mine near me 'That is an excellent Speech' but I said that because the perfect elocution with which it was delivered impressed me so much that it carried me away.

Now, the Speech from the Throne has been reviewed by quite a number of speakers and I am not going to say that it is the worst speech from the Throne that I ever heard. I have heard a number of other speeches just as good and I have heard many other speeches which were perhaps worse. It is an average Speech. I can't say there is nothing in it and I have not much objection to most of it. The Speech from the Throne is generally written by the Prime Minister and is written to put forward in the best possible way the interests of his party.

It is the Speech of the Leader of the Government and it contains matter best suited to the Government of the day. I quite remember the time referred to by the Hon. member for Burin East, Mr. Winter, in 1910 I think it was, when the Government brought in the Speech from the Throne and the

Address in Reply was moved by the Prime Minister of the present day, Mr. Squires, he was then a follower of Sir Edward Morris, leader of the much despised Tory Party, and he moved it with much greater eloquence than he could possibly do so to-day. Sir Robert Bond said it was a bubble and he pricked the bubble and declared it was full of nothing but air. Then there was another gentleman who was fond of going away and who used to talk of the men Newfoundland could put in the navy, and who used to talk of seamen in Canada and other countries as compared with Newfoundland and Sir Robert Bond looked across at that gentleman and said that sort of talk was only "flapdoodle" I remember when members on the other side were on the Tory side as you call it, and in 1924 when we had a party of 25 members the mover of the address in that year was on the opposition side two years afterwards. So you can never tell what is going to happen and the less a man commits himself as either Liberal or Tory in this House the better it will be for himself if he ever changes over.

MR. SKEANS.—You won't see it this time. We won't change over.

MR. PUDDISTER—I'm not so sure, let me say, you are not out of the woods yet, only you got a job the other day from the Government you might not talk that way. The Speech from the Throne says that the elections were "marked by good order showing the law abiding character of our people." If that is true it is not in accord with the utterances of the Minister of Finance and Customs of a few days ago; either he must be right and the Speech must be wrong or vice versa. It will be conceded that if the Minister is correct that his campaign was not conducted in an orderly manner. I saw no roughhouse in my district, my opponent and myself conducted

our campaign in a friendly manner; if we met on the street we stopped and talked on different matters and were good friends throughout the election. Apparently the Minister of Finance and Customs did not conduct his campaign as I did. When the Prime Minister wrote the Speech he could not have known very much about conditions in Ferryland. The Minister had a rough time of it and had a great struggle to retain his seat and if he had had a colleague in a two seat district I am quite sure that he would have come back alone.

I shall pass over the articles on Trade expansion and the Seal Fishery with this short comment.

I am not an expert on the seal fishery but it is my honest conviction that the quicker we get legislation to protect that industry the better for all concerned. I remember that when the Minister of Public Works was on this side of the House and wanted to deliver a three hours speech he went back to the beginning of the seal fishery and told all the ups and downs and the ins and outs of that industry since 1824; and his own voyages and how many he had made. I think the next commission appointed should be a commission to investigate the seal fishery with a view of having it protected. There is no better man who can go on that commission than the man who has studied it and who gave us such an exhaustive detailed review of its history than the present Minister of Public Works.

The next clause in the Speech from the Throne is in connection with the International Power and Paper Company. Well, the great Liberal party of 1922 and 1923 has been given great credit for putting the hum in the Humber. I hope they will put the gang on the Gander very shortly. Members, including some on this side of the House voted to put the hum in the

Humber, but it only stayed there for two years and it came out and then we had a very heavy job to put it in again. We tried to do our very best and I can say myself and a few men associated with me at that time that we tried our best to get a contract that would be to the best interest of Newfoundland and to show you whether or not we were successful I have only to say that when the final division was taken in this House only four men voted against it namely Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Godden and Mr. Brown and on the Gander contract only three voted against it as Mr. Brown left his seat and went down stairs. Although I should have liked to see a better contract go through as far as the Humber contract was concerned it was a great tribute to the people who worked days and days and months and months trying to get it through. I never attended so many party meetings in my life before as in the spring and summer of 1928 on these contracts and we tried our best to get good contracts. It was a tribute to the Monroe Government that only four men voted against the Humber and three against the Gander. They voted for them because they thought they were good contracts. If it had not gone through we would now be paying interest of \$500,000 per annum with no returns whatsoever? There were lots of stories about what happened.

Some members of this House told me some stories of what happened but I saw no tainted money on my side of the House.

There are great numbers of men employed on the Humber to-day that obviously would not have been employed but for the work that the Government put in and the contract the Monroe Government put through.

I don't have to stand here as an apologist for the Monroe Government.

The Monroe Government made lots of mistakes but I can tell you this, Sir, that the Government that makes no mistakes is not much of a Government at all. They are not doing anything, and all I can wish and pray is that the Government that has just taken up office on the other side of the House, will make no mistakes and if they make no mistakes and do things they are expected to do they are as near to perfection as any other body of men who ever walked the earth.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—We won't make any mistakes.

MR. PUDDESTER.—No, you won't make any mistakes. With your experience since 1919, the nine years that you have been in politics, with all the experience that you got after the elections and before then and since you were in the House you certainly can come here as an experienced man and should not make any mistakes. I trust that your department will be controlled with a single eye to efficiency and all that is good for the people of Newfoundland and that the Road Commission of which you have recently been appointed a member that there will be no politics in it and will be controlled in the same way and that you will seriously get down to business and see that roads will not cost \$5000.00 a mile, and I suppose you will get clear of the Dutchman that you said you were going to get clear of when you were on this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I never said that.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You said that if you were a member of the Government you would get clear of the Dutchman that they brought here to make highroads.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I never said that. The gentleman is a friend of mine.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Yes, he told me that one day. He couldn't understand why you were abusing him. He said that you and he were the closest of friends and he couldn't understand why you were making speeches against him because when you met him face to face on the street you were all smiles.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, I want the Hon. gentleman to retract those words. You never heard me call him a Dutchman.

MR. PUDDISTER.—You say you never did? Well, I accept your statement. When you were on this side of the House in the position I now occupy two or three years ago, you were not so responsible for what you said. The Hon. member has a more responsible duty when he speaks from his seat in the Government and as Minister of the Crown than when he spoke from a seat in the Opposition.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—Does the Hon. gentleman retract his statement?

MR. PUDDISTER.—I accept his statement. The Minister of Public Works says that he made no such statement and I simply accept it. That is sufficient.

“The Statements of Revenue and Expenditures for the fiscal year which ended 30th June 1928 will be submitted to you. The revenue for the quarter ending March 31st last show as compared with the corresponding period of 1928 an increase of \$230,000 in spite of considerable reductions in Customs Taxation.”

That statement is correct, Sir, but I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs, if he does not mind me asking him a question. In the month of March did you receive some large amounts?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—For the information of the Hon member I might say that \$75,000, I think, was received from the International Paper Company.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Any other large amounts?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Not that I know of, right off.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Now then, the increase in the revenue from July 1st 1928 to March 31st 1929, according to the statement tabled by the Minister of Finance and Customs, was considerable over that period of nine months the year previous. In that period the Government occupied the benches about four months, that is from Nov to the end of March and the old Government went out of office on the 17th of November, a difference say of five to four. The total increase of revenue for that period is \$440,489.90. If you take it month by month you will find that during the five months that the old Government was in power the increase was \$290,087 and the four months that the present Government was in power the increase was \$150,402, which makes the total of \$440,489, which shows that the revenue of the country was making good progress during the first five months of the present year and it has also kept up the progress during the past four months. Five months under the old Government and four under the new Government the increase of revenue was \$440,000. But it is not fair to take all the credit and give the Alderdice Government no credit, because, as I stated, the progress started on July 1st and it has been maintaining itself ever since. But although the revenue has increased to the extent of \$440,000 the expenditure has increased also and the nine months expenditure is \$493,893 over last year. And that is on current account.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker; if the Hon. member does not mind my interrupting him, there is one item I might explain. The expenditure that he points out is on current account and is not according to the estimates.

MR. PUDDESTER.—The expenditure has gone up. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs says he had a lot of bills to pay that were brought in by the old Government as if any Government could come in and not have any old bills to pay.

In the last three months the expenditure has increased \$183,305, according to his statement, for this year over last year.

Therefore if we have increased the revenue and things are going along pretty good it is a pity that there should be an increase in expenditure of \$183,000, but that does not excuse the Minister of Finance and Customs for making a very indiscreet remark here—and I will tell him as kindly as I can—that the country was in a grave financial condition. His remark has been spread abroad and gone out over the world. I heard Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond on the other side of the House—when sitting down there in the corner a listener—give the Leader of the Opposition the greatest lacerating one man ever gave another because he said the financial condition of the country was not just as it should be. He said it was a terrible statement to send abroad. If it was a terrible statement for the then Leader of the Opposition to make in a debate what kind of a statement was it for the Minister of Finance and Customs to make?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—When the Minister of Finance and Customs made it he made it here. The Minister of Finance and Customs did not broadcast it, the papers that support the Opposition party did that. I

am not saying your paper. The Evening Telegram did yesterday afternoon.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You should know that you cannot make a statement in this House without it being published in the Evening Telegram or some other telegram and statements of everything that is ever said here are sent out the very moment they are said. Such a statement should be weighed and carefully considered before it is made by the Minister. In fact it should never be made at all. A member sitting on the Opposition side of the House in a free lance generally and in the heat of debate he may make statements that he is sorry for afterwards, but a responsible Minister of the Crown has a different duty to perform. He must weigh well his words before uttering them.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—interrupts.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I have something to say to you too. You were very anxious when you were in this side of the House to get that well boring machine for Fogo when I was trying to get it for the district of Bay de Verde. You were continually after the Minister of Finance and Customs to put a vote in the estimate for the boring machine. Well, the money has got to be provided for my district now before I let that vote pass. I have got you now where I want you. I could get the money when I was with the Government but I couldn't get the machine because you collared it for Fogo. That machine belongs to the people of this country, you would think to hear you it belonged to Fogo exclusively. We cannot afford to let this pass from our hands when the estimate come up for there are people dying of typhoid fever in Bay de Verde District every summer. We have tried year in and year out and we cannot get the machine and I am go-

ing to fight for that machine now until the last drop of sweat that is in me is sweated out.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Buy a new one.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Give me the me the money and I will find a machine. You can get the money. During the last number of years there have been people dying in my district through impure water and I want that machine and I must have it.

Now then the Speech from the Throne goes on to say "large deficits which my ministers have been called upon to assume." There is no question about it that there was a deficit at the end of June last and there will be another large deficit at the end of June this year, and the Minister of Finance has to provide for that, but, according to the Speech from the Throne, people who don't know the difference would be inclined to think that the present Government is the first to provide for a deficit of an outgoing Government. Now in 1924 the Monroe Government had to provide for a deficit of \$1,620,000 at the first session, although a statement of the Colony's finances were given to this House in 1923 and the Minister of Finance at that time estimated a surplus, whereas he had a deficit of \$1,620,000. I am not apologizing for any Minister of Finance who makes a statement that he is going to have a surplus, and then at the end of the year he has a deficit. That is happening all the time in Newfoundland. the Government that was in power from 1919 to 1923 not only had deficit after deficit, but they spent \$3,500,000 of a nest egg left by the late Finance Minister of 1919. When the Government was re-elected to power in 1923 all the nest egg was gone and that Government, led by the Prime Minister of to-day, had to provide for that deficit and the present Govern-

ment has to provide for a deficit this year of \$1,274,000, as against a deficit of \$1,620,000 the Monroe Government had to meet in 1924, and if all the bills had been listed in 1924 there would have been a deficit of over two million dollars. I merely mention this so that the younger members who are in the House for the first time will learn that one Government is equally as bad as another—Liberal or Tory. I remember the Finance Minister in 1924 recounting the deficits and legacies that were left by the outgoing Government through the purchase of the "Lobelia" and all the other kinds of "Belias" that had to be paid for. Now to-day the Finance Minister will tell the same thing about the deficits he has got to shoulder. Every Finance Minister has got to shoulder deficits, and, if the Finance Minister would not mind me saying so, I trust when he goes out of office he will not leave any deficits.

Then the Speech from the Throne goes on to say that the Government proposes to appoint a tariff commission. (It says: "It is proposed to appoint a Commission for the revision of the Tariff so that there may be an equitable distribution of the burden of taxation, and that inequalities of the Tariff may be eliminated.") Now, Sir, I have here on my desk a copy of the report of the Tariff Commission that was appointed in 1922 and which reported in 1925. During that period the Commission summoned everybody in Newfoundland whom they thought could give any information on the tariff. The personnel of that Commission was as follows: H. J. Brownrigg, who was Minister of Finance and Customs at that time, H. W. LeMessurier, Deputy Minister of Finance & Customs, who is the only expert in Newfoundland on the tariff and who should be on the Tariff Commission

now, Charles P. Ayre, J. V. O'Dea, F. F. Harris, F. W. Angel, J. J. McKay, Mortimer Greene, Harris M. Mosdell and H. V. Hutchings. Dr. Mosdell, the present member for Fortune Bay and present member of His Majesty's Executive Council, was appointed Secretary of that Commission. The report I hold in my hand consisting of 54 pages was prepared and written by the Secretary of that Commission, as it was his duty to do so. The Commission collected everything they could collect—and the Secretary collected everything he could collect—in the shape of evidence to present to the Government and to show the Government the anomalies that existed and where the tariff could be revised. Now when a Government appoints a Commission, and that Commission sits for three years and makes a report to His Excellency the Governor in Council, His Excellency the Governor in Council is in duty bound, I think, to accept the report of the Commission they appoint.

That Tariff Commission reported all the evidence they took for three years. The whole thing is listed here and there is an appendix added to the report. That Commission, as I have said, was appointed by the Squires Government in 1922 and reported in 1925. The Government of 1925 accepted the report of the Commission—probably they were mistaken for so doing—put the schedule into operation and the Monroe Government have been criticised for it ever since. The report was accepted on the advice of the expert who had taken the evidence, because it states here that the work of preparing the schedule and the duties therein is work of the expert of Newfoundland. Now after three years what necessity is there to appoint another Tariff Commission with the same expert who prepared that schedule and with the same Secretary, I presume,

who prepared that report to go over the same ground they went over for three years and then present a similar report to this one, because as I say—and I think I am on safe ground when I say it—that the terms of reference to that new Commission will not be to effect reduction in the amount of taxation you collect now? You know, Sir, that cannot be done and the terms of reference to the Tariff Commission will contain words to this effect that it is not their job to present a report and a schedule that will bring any less revenue to the Government than they get at present. Their duty is to make it bear more easily on the different classes of people than it does now; and in the report of 1925 the Secretary states that that is the very thing the Commission have done. I think myself, with all due deference to the Executive Government, that, if you propose to give the work of adjusting the tariff to a Commission of ten or fifteen business men, a very much better job could be done on behalf of the country by the Minister of Finance and Customs, Mr. LeMessurier, Deputy Minister of Customs, and his assistant Mr. Hutchings, who are experts at the work. That is my absolute candid and honest conviction. The man you will appoint as Secretary will no doubt be the same man you appointed before—Dr. Mosdell—who is used to getting on Commissions and who is going to give you the same report as before. Here is an interesting paragraph contained in the report. (Reads). Now that is the tariff the Monroe Government adopted and that is the tariff that was brought in by a Tariff Commission appointed by the Squires Government in 1922. Whether I agreed with it or not, it was adopted and put into effect. I will say to you younger men that if you disagree with a Government on such matters and if you never make any

compromise with a Government there will never be a Government in power longer than six months. The Government of this or any country is generally a Government of compromise. Governments make mistakes and if there is no compromise, no Government would be in power very long. It always happens that the majority rules, unless there is a great question of principle at stake. If that is so it is the duty of a man to get out from his party when he cannot agree on principle. But on matters that can be settled satisfactorily by compromise it is the duty of the member to stand by the party and by the Government that he has been elected to serve under. We have heard lots of talk and it formed the subject of debate on all platforms in this country during the 1928 campaign. I sat on the other side of the House for five sessions and I heard, day in and day out about the duty on lines and twines. You men who went to the districts associated with the present Government probably did not know that the Commission appointed in 1922 reported on the duty on lines and twines, and recommended that the 10% duty be put on. That report was adopted by the Government. And the very man who preached lines and twines and the ten per cent duty in Fortune Bay was the man who wrote what I am going to read to you now. It ill becomes any man or men in this country to take a commission from the Crown, report on that Commission, and then repudiate his own report when it suits him afterwards.

(Reads)

That is the findings of that Commission as far as the duty on lines and twines is concerned. And I say now that but for the fact that W. S. Monroe was the Prime Minister of the country and a share-holder in the Colonial Cordage Company and but

for the fact afterwards that F. C. Alderdice happened to be leading the Government of the day, we never would have heard about the ten per cent duty on lines and twines. That is the worst thing in connection with party politics in this country. And we are all guilty of it. I do not take any credit myself. I am willing to take as much blame as anyone. I am a politician you know. Some people do not admit that they are politicians.

Now to come to unemployment. The unemployment question has been before this House during the past number of years. And during my time on the other side of the House I listened to members of the Opposition talking about unemployment and the dole. The Monroe Government was denounced for giving the dole in St. John's. You have now appointed another commission to enquire into the unemployment situation. The dole was going to be cut out and I trust that this commission will cut it out and that we will have no more dole in St. John's. It is absolutely unfair, for \$110,000 to be spent on dole in St. John's and in the outports \$24,000. \$92,000.00 for work on the roads that will give about twenty five per cent value on the money. My position as far as the dole is concerned is the position of the British Government. That is if you want to save money for the Treasury give dole. If you want to expend money give work. Do you think for a moment that you would have the same number looking for dole as you have looking for work on the roads. If the rock sheds had never been opened you would never have expended the money that you did, because people will go a long way before they look for dole, but when it comes to getting work on the roads or the rock sheds, one man deserves as much as another. "If there is any work going I am going to get my share." But if there is

dole going and you are going to restrict the cases, then lots of men are going to steer clear of it if they can. That is why the Monroe Government adopted the policy of giving dole. Everybody knows what happened when there was work on the rock sheds. Money was flowing out like water, and especially in the general election in St. John's at that time, whereas if dole had been given out you would have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars. I did not want able bodied relief any more than any other man. I do not like to see unemployment. I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. I am not a blue blood or a lounge lizard either. If some gentlemen are, I am not. I think my colleagues speak for themselves. I do not like to see unemployment and I do not like dole. But what are you going to do about it. It is like the hospital that a man may have to go to at any moment. Are you going to let people die? There is a statement I have here from the Highroads Commission which shows that the highroads since December month cost \$92,237.22 and the dole \$18,494 making \$110,731 spent in St. John's. I asked the Colonial Secretary some days ago to give me a copy of the messages or telegrams or correspondence from the outports from people who are protesting against this going on in St. John's. I am told by a member of the Government that the Colonial Secretary was deluged with telegrams protesting against this.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is not true.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I accept the Hon. member's statement of course.

This relief work in St. John's. I protested against it, and when I was on the other side of the House if relief works were going on I saw to it that the people didn't starve in my district.

If dole must be given in St. John's give it, but don't let the people in the outports starve at the same time; and I regret to say some people in the outports nearly starved during the past winter. They deserve down there in my district, or any other part of the country, just as good treatment as they deserve in St. John's. They were six months in my district without being able to get a widow's dole or orphan's dole. There was no relieving officer in one section appointed. Starvation almost stalked through the district. . And that simply because the defeated candidate could not make up his mind as to whom he was going to appoint as relieving officer.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—What section do you refer to?

MR. PUDDESTER.—Broad Cove, Blackhead, and Mulleys Cove.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Kelloway is relieving officer.

MR. PUDDESTER.—He is not in Bay de Verde district at all; he resides up in the district of Carbonear. But the defeated candidate for Bay de Verde took some time making up his mind, and while he was making up his mind the widows hadn't a cent. Three months, January, February and March with no allowance until I ventilated the matter in the paper one morning. Clergymen had to come over and meet certain people asking them for goodness sake to try and make it possible for the widows to get their mites; and \$110,000 given out in St. John's. Those who are now acting as messengers in this House have been until recently foremen and timekeepers with the highroads relief and when they get paid off they come down here to this House and get jobs, jobs winter and summer, and other poor men walking the streets with nothing for supper to-night. We had 36 foremen employed practically all the time and other men

had to work a week and starve the next week and get 25c an hour; \$2.00 a day and the foremen got 40c an hour; superintendents got \$5.00 a day and they were on all the time; and timekeepers got \$75.00 a month and some \$100.00 a month. I think the Government could have done a little better than that. The Highroads Commission were given charge of that work. We were sitting on that side of the House for four years, and we were told that the Highroads Commission would never handle a case of that kind if some gentlemen got in power. Then the people who told us that went over to the other side of the House and suddenly the Highroads Commission are alright. It is simply a case of where you sit in this House with some people.

I thoroughly agree with the Colonial Secretary that the Government have got to try and cut down on Public Charities, but possibly you can go too far in one winter and it is going to take a long time to get back to normal. I did not intend to say so much on this matter but the mention of that \$110,000 gave me an opportunity to tell the Colonial Secretary about the conditions in my district; widows going from the 1st of October to the 1st of April without a cent. I do trust that the unemployment Commission will report something tangible that both sides of the House can agree on, and take the thing out of politics. I think it is a shame that \$110,000 should be spent on relief in St. John's, and the people who got it weren't relieved at all because they were starving although they were getting the little work.

Then there is a Bill for the more effective prevention of illicit liquor traffic in Newfoundland. That Bill has been deferred. I suppose the Government will meet tonight and decide what they are going to do. Now a lot

has been said about "the bottle a day Act". The Monroe Government brought it in. And it was an issue last fall and one of the issues "or one of the issues of another character I might say that helped the Squires Government into power. It went a long way towards defeating the Monroe Government in certain districts, but the Monroe Government went to the country with a manifesto, and the Hon. Minister of Finance will bear me out, that laid down that the Prohibition Act would be repealed, and the Prime Minister always contended he had a mandate from the people for the repeal of that Prohibition Act. He came back with that mandate and the new Alcoholic Liquors Act was introduced to try and get away from the lawlessness that was corrupting the Island of Newfoundland under the old Act. Everybody knows there was almost as much liquor sold then as to-day under the "bottle a day Act". It was characterised as "the bottle a day Act". The Act was introduced in 1924 and was mostly taken from the Quebec Liquor Act and the Alberta Act. Under these Acts you could buy as much liquor as you liked in a day. You could buy 25 bottles a day if you wanted to. In Montreal I want to tell you what happens there. You can go into the Liquor Controller's Department and buy a bottle. They won't sell you more than one. You can take your bottle, go out, and walk up the street a block, then return and go in again and buy another bottle, and you can repeat that procedure all day if you want to and purchase a bottle of liquor every time you enter the store.

When the Prime Minister was getting the Act ready he decided that in Newfoundland no more than one bottle a day could be obtained. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House who supported that Act and in their districts were elected because

of their exploiting of it, but they did not object very much in the party meetings of 1924 and voted for it in this House. As far as I am concerned—and the Minister of Finance knows—what a fight I had so as not to allow the sale of liquor in the outports. When the Bill first came down any town could have a saloon and I remember the fight we put up so that the outports would not be flooded with liquor, we amended the first draft so that five thousand people had to petition for a saloon before they obtained it. As far as I am concerned with the "Bottle a Day Act" I sat in the House and let it go through and wouldn't vote for or against the opposition amendment. But I was convinced as I am convinced now that we had to stop the lawlessness that was going on, and we want to take care that we do not have another recurrence of the script system in this new permit system. I knew men to come in from the outports under the old Act and bring in a pocket full of scripts and take back all the liquor they could carry. Men came into my office with their pockets filled and went to the liquor saloon next door and they could get fifty or a hundred bottles if they wanted to because they had the scripts from some doctor. Now in the Monroe Administration a man could only get a bottle a day, six a week. In the old Act a man could get ten or twenty or a hundred if he could carry them. I admit the Bottle a day Act was not a Prohibition measure. There are members on the other side of the House who voted for it, but something had to be done to stop lawlessness. Something has to be done now to stop the hard drinking. I will vote for any measure that restrict the liquor traffic. The Minister of Finance and Customs made a frank statement as far as prohibition is concerned and he was also frank enough to say that the

\$825,000.00 revenue per annum was necessary and if the country went out of the liquor business he had to get the eight hundred and twenty five thousand dollars, no matter where he got it. If he could not get it out of the liquor business he had to get it somewhere else as it could not be done without. I would like to remind him and he can figure it out that if people bought groceries and clothes out of the money they spent on liquor, he would get almost the same return in revenue that he is getting to-day. This is a seaport town and it is a hard job in a seaport town to keep the people from drinking a great deal of liquor. I don't know about the South Coast members, it does not effect them when it is to be voted on—there is no liquor drunk there. I shall read the returns of sales for 1928:—

Sold Burgeo	\$254.00,
Sold Hermitage	73.00,
Sold Fortune Bay	30.00,
Sold Burin West	12.00,
Sold Burin East	150.00,
Sold Placentia West	164.00,
Sold Placentia East	1,100.00,
Sold St. Marys	1,146.00,
Sold Ferryland	1,344.00,

Now something needs amendment when that state of affairs is going on. There is something queer about that. There must be a lot of lawlessness on the South West Coast, if there were no lawlessness there would be more than \$30.00 worth of liquor sent to Fortune Bay in one year. This deserves the consideration of the Minister of Finance and Customs and I hope that he will give it his attention.

Now passing on to the next item, the Fishery Commission—we have some experience in this respect. In 1927 this House appointed a Fisheries Commission to investigate the Fisheries and see what could be done to better them. This Commission we ap-

pointed in all good faith. The leading men on the Government side and two from the Opposition, the Hon. Leader and the Hon. Member for St. Barbe, were appointed to act on it and go into the matter exhaustively and report at the next session the best methods that could be adopted for the resuscitation of the fisheries in Newfoundland. But what happened? Hardly had the doors of the House closed than a letter appeared from the two members of the Opposition saying that they declined to serve on that Commission and the reason they gave was that they wanted to be free to criticize the findings of that Commission when their report was brought into the House. They wanted to be free to criticize the report—they forgot they could make a minority report. They were talking for four years to the Government urging them to revive the fisheries and keep the fisheries out of politics, but when the crucial moment came they couldn't act on the Commission—they wanted to make politics out of it. Was that action in the best interests of Newfoundland. If something about the question—and they had got together—men who knew brought in a report there would not have been one bit of opposition. But they refused to act on the Commission because they wanted to play politics with it. There was no man in the country who had a better practical knowledge of the fishery interests than the Leader of the Opposition in the last House.

The Besco business is next in the Speech from the Throne. The Besco resolutions of 1921 and of 1926 have called forth a lot of comment. I have heard a lot about Besco for the last three or four years. The Minister of Finance and Customs on the address in reply in 1928 made a speech on Besco and Bell Island affairs. I remember distinctly some words he said

on that occasion. It was a fair and square speech and by the way he trimmed the people responsible for the contract of 1921. I was expecting when the Minister of Finance and Customs rose in his place two or three days ago and talked about the Besco business he would have carried on in the same strain because the resolutions and contracts of 1921 and of 1926 were aired by him considerably in this House. He knows all about them and has told all about the Monroe Government being so lax in collecting the taxes from Besco from 1924 to 1928. It was a writer who put the question nicely a few days ago that all the governments were afraid to touch the Besco Company because they were afraid they would curtail labor and it would be worse for the people of Bell Island. That was the case of the Government of 1921 that brought the contract into this House passed it and had no intention of carrying out its terms. A past Minister of Justice made a statement in this House that he was told when it was going through that it was only being made for effect and that the government who brought it in never had any intention of enforcing the contract. In 1926, I think it was, another contract was brought in by the Government of which I was a follower. I attended my party meetings on that contract. The Hon. Minister said that the Government of that day should resign because they could not get it through. Before we had a chance of making or breaking ourselves on the contract Besco notified the Government that they were going into the hands of receivers and that is what prevented the Monroe Government from putting through a contract. The Government decided that it was better to let the receivers take the matter over and see what they could do with it and then make the contract after-

wards. That is the history of the Besco contract of 1926. It never came to blows in the party over it but I admit we had objections and I admit that it was better for the country that the contract did not go through because of the complications that have since arisen. And I would say to the members of the Government party opposite that they should exert themselves when contracts are before the Government and should not leave it to the Executive Council to decide everything and then pass it when it is laid on the table by the Government without ever having fully considered it. A take it or leave it policy if you like. I do not believe in that kind of a party and for the past two years that I was a member of the Monroe party it did not happen. For the junior members in that party exerted themselves and said they were not going to be mere voting machines for any party. I do not intend to be in any party of that kind and I hope to be in politics for many a day to come. I do not intend to be a voting machine but when I am in a party I think for myself and I take no orders from anybody without informing myself, not even the Prime Minister. I give a word of counsel to the junior members of the Government party. Take nothing for granted. You can never tell when something is being put over you. See everything in black and white. You are just as much a member of this House and you are just as much responsible to the people of the country as the Leader of the Government. You will be called upon to tell why you let this and that and the other thing be done while you were a member of the party and people outside will not know the difference. While I am dealing with that matter I may say this, that a great deal depends when a loan bill is being put through on one little clause in that loan bill. That little clause comes at

the end of a bill generally and it provides that the balance that is left over is to be applied by the Governor in Council for the general public services of the country. I advise you not to let that go in the loan bill. Let everything be listed down, earmarked if you will. It was not done during the latter years of the Monroe Government but it was done by the Governments that preceded it. I give the members opposite credit that when they were on this side of the House they insisted that that clause be taken out of the Bill and I trust that the same members now on the other side who were so active when they were on this side, will make sure that there will be no such clause in the loan bill. The Minister of Finance last year told a great deal about the Besco people and the slimy trail of buying the politicians and putting contracts through. The Hon. Minister waxed hot on that last year and rightly so. Every word he uttered then was true.

The Minister of Finance and Customs was good enough to reply on behalf of the Government to some criticisms of the Opposition and I have no fault to find with him. We should be always be able to give hard knocks and to take them and still be good friends after. I have been interested in politics for a number of years, I sat down in the corner and saw the Hon. Member for Hr. Grace Mr. Archibald, move his desk across the floor. I saw everything that went on in this House during the past fifteen years.

The man who sits on the Government side of the House and gets peevish because some members of the Opposition say something about the Government that man should not be there. I say Sir, that members on this side of the House should criticize the actions of the Government. I am fair enough to give the Government credit

for what they have done since being in power. But they have only been in power six months and I cannot criticize their actions much and I wish to give them a fair trial and I believe they are entitled to it. If the members on this side of the House have at any time criticized the Government it has been mild criticism. Members opposite should have been in this House during the last four years when we had seventeen here and nineteen there, and were criticised day in and day out and had to take our medicine. It has been very mild criticism that we have had here during the last few days. The member of the opposition who sits here and is not prepared to give fair and square criticism to the Government measures is not fit to be here. We should criticize as much as possible so that the best may be envolved. It is the duty of the members to watch everything. The men on the Government side should not get distracted because men in the Opposition perform their duty. We have been told that we are asking all kinds of questions of the Government. It is the duty of the Opposition to interrogate the Government. It is the duty of the Opposition to see that the peoples grievances are settled before supply is passed and all the information that we want we are going to try and get so that we may exercise our ancient rights and privileges. Some members on the other side of the House have had very little experience in politics in Newfoundland and if the Government criticized they should not mind it. You members are supposed to know the legislation before it is put on the table of the House. The members on this side are not situated that way. They have to learn about the legislation after it is tabled and when it is going through. We intend to protest our rights and privileges and do our best and then we will have no

cause to complain. Members on the other side when in Opposition criticized us unmercifully and they will be able to criticize again when they come on this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—We are not going over there.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Do you mean to tell me you are going to be stricken down with apoplexy. That is the only thing that can save you. Or perhaps you are going out of politics. I would remind the Hon. Member that in 1900 the greatest Liberal Leader that ever lead a party in this country came back here with thirty two members and there were four on the other side, and in 1904 the same Liberal Leader Sir Robert Bond came back with thirty members and six on this side. What happened in 1909? Five short years after Sir, Sir Robert Bond came back with ten and Sir Edward Morris with twenty six. And times are very different now than then. The people of the country are more critical now. It will take more than the Hon. Member for Trinity Centre to satisfy the people of the country during four years of office. Yes Sir, I know it has been rumoured that just before the time is up the Government will bring in a bill to prolong the term. The Mornoe Government came here in 1924 with twenty five members and this afternoon, behold I, and only I, am left to tell the tale. The Hon. Minister of Finance was the greatest Tory of them all in 1919, 1923 and 1924 and now he is a Liberal but the leopard cannot change his spots. Let me remind you that as soon as a Government begins to live it begins to die and it does not take much these days for a Government to be alive one year and very much dead the next. It begins to die as soon as it begins to live. These are modern times and no Government lives very long. The Minis-

ter says he was a member of the Monroe administration. I can very well remember what took place in connection with lines and twines. Then he talked about the income tax being taken off, and perhaps it should not have been taken off. But it was taken off and you are going to put it on again. You said that the Bill was printed two years ago and something happened that the Bill was dropped in our party meeting by influence from outsiders. I will tell you a secret there was no such thing at all. I am in favor of the income tax, I believe it is a just tax but I am not so sure that I am in favor of the business profit tax. I cannot see how we can discriminate very well between small concerns and large concerns. A business may make a lot of money this year and nothing next year and nothing the following year. And take care also that a business profits tax on a business concern in this town is not passed on to the consumer. It is easy enough to put on taxes but the man who is anxious to get rid of his taxes will find a lot of ways in an act to pass the thing on, that you or I cannot see when it is passing. If the consumer is protected, and the tax is not passed on to him, and the standard of living is not lowered then I have not very much objection to the business profits tax. I heard of a recent after dinner speech when the Prime Minister said this tax is to be paid by the wealthy men like Mr. Alderdice but poor lawyers like himself will not have to pay. If I go to my friend Mr. Emerson and consult him he will charge me sixty dollars now where he would have charged me fifty dollars before. In the end the consumer pays the tax and the people of this country and every other country will find a way most of the time to pass on the tax to the consumer and producer who will pay the piper in the end. Although I am in

favor of an income tax the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs said that we dropped that bill because it was objected to by outsiders. But it was dropped because two men in the party objected to the business profits tax until we had more information regarding it. I was one of them. Take the case of the well known Water Street firm that was worth hundreds of thousands of dollars two years ago. Now they are gone. How can you tax these people who make paper profits. They made lots of money during the war, but times are different now. Competition is very much keener to-day. I would advise the Minister to go very slowly.

The Hon. Member knocked the highroads. I am sorry the time is going but you will give me Sir, some latitude, I expect.

The Hon. Minister knocked the highroads and when the highroads bill was introduced in 1924 I was then on the other side of the House and I was not very much in favor of it. I was afraid of it and I was afraid the country couldn't stand it, but this much I will say, if the country is to progress and is to go ahead we must of necessity have highroads and we have got to have them if we are going to do anything. The Hon. Member said that the roads first led to places where they never caught a fish—to Placentia where there was not a fish caught, but the Government of that day had something else in mind.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Politics.

MR. PUDDESTER.—They had a tourist policy in mind. They were trying to get tourists here. I had no politics in my mind when I first came here in 1924.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—All the Government did.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I do not think the Government did and I give them

credit for it. There was an awful hue and cry in Conception Bay in 1924 about unemployment and the Government thought the fairest way to relieve it was to build some highroads. There were highroads built in this country that were not needed—I agree with you there—but most of the highroads were needed. Take the road from Hodgewater to Colinet, I do not think that highroad was needed. I say it was an absolute waste of money but how can you compare the highroads to cutting pitprops. We have the highroads and even if we have to pay to keep them up we have them, and that is more than you can say about the pitprops.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—There is no interest to pay on the pitprops and no upkeep on them.

MR. PUDDESTER.—They are not an asset. They have gone the way of all flesh. There was a time you know when a certain gentleman holding an enquiry in the other Chamber, pitprops scandals made a remark that pitprops paid for all. I am going to tell the members what the pitprops paid for—we got paid for pitprops even in my district when not one ever grew.

And the Hon. Member put pitprops against highroads. We guaranteed the bonds of \$450,000 on the Hotel. It is an asset and I know this much, in order to get anyone to visit Newfoundland as a tourist it is essential to have a Hotel and Highroads. And the Hon. members, some on the other side of the House, cried year in and year out that the fisheries had to be relieved that there were too many men at the fisheries and something had to come in to bring some money into the country, and then as an auxiliary to the fisheries the Government instituted and introduced the tourist policy to try and get Americans to come down

here. I give credit to the Government for that. I made no apology for them. They may have made a mistake or they may not. As I said before, a Government that makes no mistakes is no worth much and—the Government made no mistakes in the Highroads. Other countries have highroads. They are spending five billion dollars in the United States during the next five years making highroads. They are spending seven million dollars in Quebec this year making highroads. They are spending fifty million dollars in Ontario next summer making highroads.

It may be said that Newfoundland cannot stand the cost of highroads. Well we can stand to keep up what we have got made and repair them and not let them go down. I know this much that the highroads policy has so far been paying; the customs collected \$300,000 last year on motor cars and \$58,000 on licenses for driving motor cars. If that is so it was well worth spending two million dollars that was used in building highroads. The Hon. Minister then left the highroads and said a few words on the dock. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines had a knock at the dock this afternoon too. The Minister of Finance in 1925 supported that dock.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—For the million dollar contract.

MR. PUDDESTER.—One million one hundred thousand dollars. How much would the repairs have cost if they had repaired the dock?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—About three or four hundred thousand dollars.

MR. PUDDESTER.—The statement here is five hundred thousand dollars in your speech made in 1924. You have two figures one \$500,000 for repairs and the other \$1,000,000.

(Reads)

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I supported the dock in 1925 for the contract of one million dollars.

MR. PUDDISTER.—The dock itself was estimated to cost \$1,000,000 and \$179,000 for freight sheds, and they should have put the machine shop and machinery there then when they had the chance and they should have much more machinery on the dock and not leave it to this day and now we have got to put it there. If the dock is to be any good and if we want to do any business we have got to put it there. The dock is not paying at the present time; they haven't the machinery and when a ship comes in here it costs too much to repair it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Will the Hon. Member correct a statement that he made a moment ago. He said we collected \$300,000 last year in duty on motor cars. We collected \$165,000.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I got that from the Highroads Commission's report, not only that but the Chairman of the Highroads Commission gave me that information. It includes parts and tyres and all the rest of it I think.

The Public Charities did cost too much, but I saw the Government of which I was a member, making plans to solve the question and they were going to reduce it. It was not costing the country so much then as now. They made rules and regulations about the hospitals, but what happened? The people came into the hospitals all the same, and if a doctor says that a patient must get to a hospital or die what are you going to do about it? Leave the person in the outports to die? I now what you are doing with patients now. In my own district a man had to swear that he could not pay his passage. I do not think that is right and I do not think the Hon.

member would stand for it if it occurred in Ferryland district. The poor fellow was sick a long time and unable to work and he wanted to come in and go into the Sanatorium and he had to go before a justice of the peace and take an oath that he could not pay his passage over. I do not think that is right. He did go before the justice and he did take the oath that he could not pay his passage. That caused a lot of comment in the place where it happened too.

The Hon. Minister spoke about the potato situation in 1928. What happened to the potatoes I suppose was similar to what happened to the splits in 1923. Potatoes were bought in 1928 but splits were brought in 1923.

The Hon. Minister states that the Government was too busy trying to clear up the mess we left behind, old Government matters, I understand from a member of the Government that their time occupied with little petty matters and they have not had the chance to have anything of a substantial character done.

The Hon. Minister also made a statement about prohibition and he said that they could have prohibition as far as he was concerned if they wanted it—that he would get his bottle regularly if he wanted it—but that is the very sentiment that wrecked the prohibition act and that sentiment among the people of this country will wreck every other act that is on the Statute Book if it is persisted in. If we haven't the public behind the prohibition act or any other act it cannot be enforced. What happened to the members who tried to enforce it in this country. The Attorney General in 1919-20 tried to enforce the prohibition Act and he tried to stop the illicit manufacture that was contrary to the Prohibition Act in a certain place and he sent down policemen

and arrested the ringleaders. What happened? Almost the greatest prohibition district in the country when he went back and put it up to them drove him out of public life. So much for trying to enforce the prohibition act.

I come down now to the slush fund. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs accused us of spending \$1,380,000 in slush funds. He was courteous enough to say that he included in that the expenditure on the diversion of the railway, on that point I want to say that if a Government is in power and has a free hand to do what it likes with one million, two million or six million dollars with a clause in the Loan Bill that they could devote to any public works under the authority of the Governor in Council, we would have spent much more money last fall than we did spend. That is what saved the country, what will save it in any election, if the Government can find no money to spend. I am going to talk about so-called slush funds, and I am going back to the year of 1893 and I am going to trace the slush funds from that time down so that the members of this House may know and the young motives may know who are the people guilty of spending so called slush funds in this country and who are not, and I say before I start that Tory Governments and Liberal Governments and all past Governments spent slush funds in this country.

And before I am through I am going to offer a solution that will stop the slush funds in the future, and, if the Finance Minister is sincere, he will back me up.

In 1893 the slush fund was so rampant throughout the country that seventeen members of the Liberal Party, under the Leadership of the late Sir Willian Whiteway, were unseated and

disqualified after the election. I was an overgrown boy in the district of Bay de Perde going around with short pants on, but I have a vivid recollection of what happened. Immediately prior to the election crowds of men were working on railway connecting, roads and wharves were being built, all done for the purpose of catching votes. The result was as I say that seventeen members out of twenty three that were returned were unseated and disqualified after the election petitions were heard in 1894. So much for the Great Liberal Party of that year. In the election of 1887 the great Liberal Party were accused of handling a slush fund in the building of the Burnt Bay Branch from Notre Dame Junction to Lewisporte, and the change was made all over the country that the candidates for Twillingate would never have been returned had the Burnt Bay Branch railway not been built that year. In 1913 we had the building of Branch Railway lines going on in several districts for the purpose of sweetening up the people preparatory to fighting the election. That is a frank statement, Sir, and I take back water from no one on it. In that year the Government came back to power because of so much money spent on the Branch lints. The next general election was held in 1919. In that year the Estimates were brought in and laid on the table of this House and \$500,000 was voted in those Estimates for public works, simply because it was election year. The men voted for that on the Government fences were on this side a few days after, and what they voted for over there they denounced over here, said is was a slush fund to buy up the votes of the people, so you see it all depends which side you are on. Now the Leader of the Government party that year was the late Minister of Finance and Customs, Sir M. P. Cashin. I

remember well when the parties came back from the country, and sat here, the Opposition led by the late Sir M. P. Cashin and the Government by the present Prime Minister. That first session was a memorable one and lasted several months. The Opposition were denounced for using a slush fund to buy the electorate. They were denounced for the conduct of the different departments. One department had gone so low and sunk so low in the eyes of Sir Richard Squires and his Party that they engaged the services of Price, Waterhouse and Company of New York to enquire into the conduct of the Finance Department. The only man who got knocked as a result to that enquiry was a man who supplied gauze to the Hospitals. The Finance Minister at that time came out of it with flying colors, and Price Waterhouse and Company gave him a clean bill of health. But the slush fund was condemned strongly by the Squires Party who promised the people of the country that, if they were elected, they would never spend a cent by way of a slush fund. In June 1920 a Bye-Election was held in Bay de Verde district. I was a candidate for the Opposition and I know what kind of a slush fund was used to defeat me. I can tell you where some of it came from and who paid the bills. I was fairly strong in the district at the time and the slush fund was used so lavishly and so strongly against me by the Government that they even went so far as to pay men for working between Nomination day and Polling day and the excuse was given that such work was carried on at such a time as an emergency to repair fishing property. I say, Sir, that a slush fund and every other kind of a fund was brought into play to defeat me, and then the present Government talk of what I spent in Bay de Verde last Fall. On March 12th, 1921 a Bye-Elec-

tion was held in the district of Hr. Main. The Hon. Member for Hr. Main (Mr. Lewis) said yesterday that the flood gates were opened up last Fall. He should have been home in 1921 and he would have seen the flood gates operating at full blast in Hr. Main district. I was there and from Quigleys to Colliers snow was shovelled and public moneys were shovelled out also. If the Hon. Member for Hr. Main (Mr. Lewis) doubts the veracity of my statement, he can bring down the public accounts here—and he has more access to them than I have—and find out how much more money was spent in the Hr. Main Bye-Election of 1921 when the Government, led by the present Prime Minister, was in power. The Member for St. John's West (Dr. Campbell) can tell all the story, if he wishes to, and I can tell it too, because I had charge of one end of the district for the Opposition and he had charge of the other for the Government. Now for the information of the Hon. Mr. Lewis I might say that in connection with that Bye-Election his own revered father, who was a candidate for the late Sir M. P. Cashin, was elected, although he was openly and vigorously denounced in that district by the followers of the then Liberal Government and the prediction was made by the man who sit by him now that he was going to be at the foot of the poll. Why, even slush funds were used on Nomination day by both sides, and we saw, what was an eye-opener to me, every man from the North side of Colliers to Holyrood who had a horse and slide come to Hr. Main on Nomination day. Those men and horses were hired and were paid a five dollars bill each for coming.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Tell us what happened in Bay de Verde last Fall?

MR. PUDDISTER.—Let me give you a little sound advice young man.

You are not out of the woods yet, and, if you will act according to my advice, You will make a far better speech the next time than you made here yesterday, and I trust and hope that when the next election is held in Hr. Main district and you are a candidate that there will be no flood gates open. The money that was spent in Hr. Main in 1921 cost each side ten thousand dollars, apart altogether from slush funds but for personal expenses. Our party paid our bill out of our own pockets, but, Sir, where did the Government party of that day get their funds to pay their bills? The great Liberal Party we hear so much about paid their bills, amounting to ten thousand five hundred dollars out of rum that was taken out of the Controller's Department and went to a city druggist to be sold and the proceeds for the rum used to pay the election bills for the Mr. Main Bye-Election. Now, Sir, if I had not heard so much within*the last few days about slush funds and other kinds of funds, I would not have made these statements here this afternoon, and I trust that this will be the last time I will be called upon to talk about slush funds or anything of such a character. The record and the list of bottles of liquor totally the value of ten thousand five hundred dollars are in the hands of Crown Attorneys, and some of you gentlemen opposite know all about it too. The liquor that came out of the Controller's Department was sold and the money was used, as I have already said, to pay the bills incurred in connection with the Hr. Main Bye-Election of 1921.

The next election that was held was a general election in the year 1923 and the Hon. Member for Ferryland who spoke about the slush fund last Fall was a candidate for Sir John R. Bennett. They talk about me and what I spent last Fall in the General Elec-

tion campaign. I heard it was stated in the "Liberal Press" and the Finance Minister, if he is frank enough to say so, meant me yesterday when he said that a member of the present Opposition took over twenty thousand dollars to spend in his district and that when that amount was exhausted he came back for another twenty thousand dollars.

That rumour of charge has been going around this town for the last months and I have a chance of defending myself now. I do not care who made the statement, I brand it as a deliberate lie. I made requisitions of the Government. I fought for my district from the time I came here, until I left, and I am going to continue to fight for it. I am going to fight for my district as well as I know how. I went down to Bay de Verde last fall to fight the election and I never came back for any more money. I made a request for the public money that was promised to Job's Cove for a wharf. Petitions were presented to the Executive Government for a wharf in that place to accommodate the fishermen of four places. That money had been promised for years. I said that I would never go back again unless I started that wharf. That money was taken out of the encouragement of the fisheries vote as it should be. It was a costly job and I want more money yet. It is not built yet. It will be a God send to the pepple around that section. There is nothing more encouraging to the fishermen of that place than to have that wharf built. I could not get very much money for four years in Bay de Verde because I was told that the high roads went down there. I said that I wanted money to fix up the local roads, eighteen or twenty miles of those local roads are absolutely gone. I sent a request in and the Government voted me some money and I spent it as best I knew how. Some of

the money was in the nature of small grants to fix up agricultural roads. My purpose was to get all the money for the district that I could. I fought for it and I got it and I will tell you this that perhaps it is the worst thing that a public man could do to spend money before a general election. He makes more enemies than friends. The Alderdice Government would have had a better showing if they had spent no money. Some people say they spent no slush fund. I have a slush fund here for 1919 spent by a man that has been going around town trying to denounce me since last fall, telling people that I had pinned five and ten dollar bills on cabbage heads so that the women might get them in the morning. I paid my own expenses in Bay de Verde district. I never got a five cent piece from the campaign fund. During my twenty-six years of married life it has been all that I could do to get along with myself, my wife and my nine children without wasting money and pinning money on the heads of cabbage. I had no money to waste in that fashion. The man that put that story around must have a cabbage head. That man went down in 1919 into Bay re Verde district. He had a slush fund of \$16,000 for special grants alone. Then he spread all kinds of nasty stories around about me. He is jealous, because I went to that district, and got elected. I spent no money in Bay de Verde district decorating cabbage heads. I looked after my district for four years as I intend to look after it during this four year term the best way I know how, and I got the good will of my people with me. I got them to hospitals and prevented them from dying. There were forty-two cases in hospital from the one settlement during 1928. Twenty-seven cases of appendicitis. And it was "come to the hospital or die." Was I going to let

them die. I went over in my motor car in many cases and brought them here. When I went to the district I did not have to spend slush funds in Grate's Cove. They knew what I had done for them. I got them to the hospitals and saved their lives and I will do so again. That man that was circulating that stuff about me and getting lawyers to file petitions against me could not win Bay de Verde. He has not spoken to me for a year because I mentioned something in the speaker's room twelve months ago, when it came out in the Liberal Press that that man got \$97,000 out of the Monroe Government. Some of us members spoke to the Minister of Public Works and thought it was too much and that it should be shared out better amongst the people of Water Street if you like, who supported us. When I got the public accounts I found that that gentleman had received \$120,000, and then he went around the town denouncing me last fall.

Need I say anything about the slush funds of 1923. I have a statement in my possession of the slush funds of 1923 in Bay de Verde when it cost \$75,000 to defeat me in that district. Here are the amounts:— \$24,000 for road grants, \$29,000 for able bodied relief, and \$17,000 in the shape of a cheque from the Pit Prop Account. Then he was only elected by sixty-six votes as it was. And I make the statement now, sir, that one side has been no better than another. The slush funds were going to be finished in 1920. Let us finish them now. Let us get together now and bring down a bill that no money is to be spent in this country on public works for four months before a general election. If the Government will not do it, and I will give them fair time, I am going to present the bill myself. I am sorry that I have taken up the time of the House at such a length. I have dont

my best to put my few remarks in my humble way before you and I trust, sir, that the deliberations of this House will go on from now until we close in the best of harmony and good will, and if I say anything amiss in the heat of debate, I am only too glad to go across afterwards and apologize for it and I expect members to give me the same treatment, and in the spirit of amity and good will let us try and do the best we can for our country.

On motion of Hon the Prime Minister the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, Committee of the Whole on Income Tax Resolutions was deferred until to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 3rd, 1929.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Flatrock in the electoral district of St. John's East. It refers to the road to Martin's Point. I might say this road is badly needed in connection with the fishery. I heartily support the petition and I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Torbay

North in the district of St. John's East, in connection with the wharf at Tapper's Cove. Unless some repairs are done to this wharf as soon as possible, it will be impossible for the men in that section to launch their boats. I hope the Government will be able to see their way clear to make an allocation for this work.

I have much pleasure in asking that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Logy Bay in connection with the launchway there which was considerably damaged during the gale in December last. I would like to see some allocation made to effect repairs as at the present time the fishermen are unable to launch their boats to prosecute the fishery. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this petition referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. EMERSON.—I would like very much to support the petition introduced by my friend, the member for St. John's East (Extern). In the summer time I live in close proximity to the place and I can see a great deal of what goes on there, and I can say that the launchway is absolutely essential in carrying on the fishing industry in summer. I hope that something will be done promptly as the fishermen are now getting ready for the fishing season and this launchway is an absolute necessity.

MR. TOBIN.—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Torbay North in connection with the road joining the main line with the Bauline line. At the present time that road is impassable and the people have no way to get their manure. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to make some allocation for repairing this road and that this petition will be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT.—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Port au Port, Cape St. George, for \$500.00 to effect repairs to the hill there. The hill in question is about half way between Port au Port and Cape St. George and is in no condition for any sort of traffic on wheels. The repairing of this road is an urgent need to the people of this section and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to effect the necessary repairs as soon as possible.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This petition was received by me from the Cape St. George branch of the Newfoundland Liberal Association. I thank Mr. Abbott for having presented it on my behalf. I am particularly happy that the Liberal supporters of this section have organized themselves and identified themselves with advancing the public interests. This petition does not represent a benefit to the Association or the supporters of our party any more than to the public at large. Mr. Abbott is a big business man, perhaps the biggest business in that section, and it is to his interests to have the road repaired so that he may get his fish over the road. I wish to heartily support this petition.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the Amendment of Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9 George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13 George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, this Bill as an amendment to the Stamp Act Bill calls for two changes. Under the present Act a two cent stamp is

necessary on a promissory note, we propose to make it five cents. On a bill of lading a two cent stamp is affixed, we propose to make that five.

In asking the consideration of the Committee to these two amendments I do so because I feel that it will not be a burden of any consequence and I think that if we can get an extra revenue of twelve or fifteen thousand dollars we should do so. For the information of the House in 1928 when it was two cents on local bills of lading the returns were \$5,016.72, now this could easily be increased to \$12,000.00 by the extra three cents and we would get this extra revenue.

MR. EMERSON—How did you make up your figures?

MR. CASHIN—I checked the bills of lading at Harvey's, Furness Withy and the Railway, these are the chief sources where bills of lading are used. This was suggested to me by a man outside of politics and I thought it worth while to try it, if we can get an extra \$12,000.00 or so revenue I think that it is just as well to get it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Resolutions with 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 Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9 George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13 George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties," 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 and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the

Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy,' was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill relating to the Development of the St. John's Dry Dock was ordered stricken from the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to move that this notice be removed from the order paper. Since the notice was inserted I had a conference with the Minister of Finance and Customs and we feel that you will have better scope to deal with the Bill if it is included in the Revenue Bill and therefore a second bill will not be necessary.

I may say that in 1922 I interested myself in the matter of labour in St. John's West, as I then had the honour to represent that constituency, with regard to the Dry Dock. While visiting Great Britain, Canada and the United States of America I inquired into the matter of the prejudice against our Dock and was informed that the Dock in St. John's had a black mark against it. I was informed that the Captains of steamers, especially of the tramp class, were cautioned against coming to the port of St. John's. It was to be avoided for repairs which could be done in Halifax, Nova Scotia and St. John, New Brunswick. The reasons given for the decision were three fold:

1. That our docking facilities were entirely inadequate.
2. Enormous duties were charged on materials imported for the work and which went out again with the ship.
3. Labour conditions were such that in case of a strike a vessel having heavy running expenses might be detained here indefinitely.

I gave the assurance that if they removed the bann from our Dock steps would be taken in the Legislature to overcome these obstacles. The program consisted first of rebuilding the wooden dock at a cost of about one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. Since that time the Dock has been reconditioned at a cost of approximately two million dollars. Secondly I would undertake that the materials which should come into St. John's for the purpose of being used in the ship and would go out again would be subject to a refund. In Halifax and St. John, N.B. there is no duty charged on these materials. The same thing applies to jobs of bottom painting. There is a very high duty on the special paint used for this purpose. I also gave an undertaking that the duty on that paint would be refunded. The object of all this was to bring the trade to our Dock. The matter has been further developed during the recent months and we see a reasonable expectation of keeping the Dry Dock busy if these measures are taken.

The Government feels, however, that the thing can be more effectively and and perhaps more completely dealt with by discussing this under the head of the Revenue Bill which will be handled by the Honourable the Minister of Finance and Customs.

MR. PUDDISTER—I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if the recent stern post installed on the S. S. Cairngown came in duty free and was that the reason the dock was given the job.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I am very glad to hear the explanation given by the leader of the Government. I think the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs is wise in doing anything which will increase labour in St. John's which is rightly necessary. I am quite sure that the mem-

bers on this side of the House will be only too glad to lend every assistance and help possible.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

MR. QUINTON—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table the following information on behalf of the Railway Commission. If the steamship "Susu" was recently purchased by or for the Railway Commission, if so, what was the purchase price? To table all correspondence relative thereto.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to that question I may say that the purchase of the "Susu" is being considered by the Executive Council but nothing definite has been decided upon as yet.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary,'" was read a third time and passed, and it 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 and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We have raised the amount of the profit from two thousand dollars. We felt in making that change we were doing something to help out the smaller companies. Section 4 is where we start to-day.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am heartily in accord with the proposed income tax. I may say however, that several times at public dinners and other places when the subject of income taxation has been mentioned

everybody looked at me. I really do not know which is the worse plight to be in, to be wealthy and have the reputation of being poor, or of being poor and have the reputation of being wealthy. I am not very rich although I am spoken of as being such.

I quite agree that it is only right and proper that those who are better able to bear the tax should have it placed upon their shoulders. It is only possible to eat a certain amount and wear a certain amount and in all probability drink a certain amount. When we have reached that limit we should be willing to give a little to the revenue.

But while I give the Bill my support I think it is too drastic. I pay what is required of me to the utmost farthing and all Companies I am associated with have always paid to the last cent. Some people say "I will pay as much of it as I feel like and no more."

For instance, a man with a \$5,000 income, when his annual discount for payment is deducted, has to pay about \$30.00 although he has a couple of dependents. The Canadian Act is more advantageous because they give a discount of 20 p.c. whereas we give a discount of 15 p.c. only.

Take on a \$5,000 income a man pays \$40.00 here; on an \$8,000 here he pays \$290, in Canada he pays \$160; on a \$10,000 income he pays \$500 here, in Canada \$290; on a \$12,000 income he pays \$780 here whereas in Canada he pays \$460; on a \$13,000 income he pays \$920 here against \$560 in Canada. I am not going any further because the larger salaries than that do not interest me.

I know that if the Minister of Finance and Customs could arrange to give us a larger cash discount, as in Canada, it would be very helpful and the people would pay the tax with a greater willingness and feel that they were not being fleeced, because this

tax as compared with the Canadian is very very high and unfair.

As I said before, I am prepared to follow whatever the law is and for that reason I feel that we should make that tax easier, especially for the man who is willing to pay his just taxes, and I feel if the Minister of Finance and Customs could make the discount 25 p.c. instead of 15 p.c. he would have gone a long way towards softening the effect of this income tax bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I appreciate it because he expresses his approval on the principle of the Income Tax Bill.

I know that it is high in comparison with the Canadian Act. My reply to that, and the best reply I could make, is that this Income tax has been off in Newfoundland for four years now. During that four years the Canadian Act was in force and has been reduced year by year. My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that if the income tax had not been repealed in the first place possibly today we would be in a position that we would be able to reduce the tax and increase the discount in proportion to or even better than the Canadian Act.

The tax has been off for four years and if we have made a profit we are all the better off, if we have not it doesn't matter very much.

With reference to the discount I might say, Mr. Chairman, that it was only a couple of weeks ago, at the end of the Bill, when we were trying to tone it down a little, that we put in the 15 p.c. discount at all. That was about three weeks ago, and we lose considerable money even at that. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to give a good discount for cash payment, but I really cannot see my way clear, on behalf of the Government, to

allow any further reduction because we need all the money.

It is just as well to be plain about it. And I cannot see any other way of getting it and if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can point out any other ways or means of getting the equivalent money I shall be only too pleased to introduce it and reduce the income tax accordingly.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I don't think it is necessary for me to advise the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs as to the best way to collect the taxes. He knows what is best, and I feel that he knows that today the higher you make revenue duties inversely will you get returns. It is considered a short sighted policy when compared with the effect on the revenue. That is the position in Canada.

We have not been collecting income tax, for one reason, it was not a fair tax at that time, because so many people avoided it and I hope he is going to put his foot down in every sense of the word and is going to collect from everybody, friend and foe alike.

During the last four years the Canadian Government found that the state of mind in Canada was the same as we find it here. The people objected to the taxes that were imposed. And when the Canadian Government cut down the tax not only did they collect what they cut but they got twice as much, and I still submit that if we were to reduce the tax and make the discount say 25 p.c. or even 20 p.c. we would find that it would put the people in a better frame of mind towards the principle of this Income Tax.

Another thing, I refer to the discount for cash payment. Well now, usually the larger the amount paid the bigger the discount, but in this case we find that a man with a \$10,-

000 income has to pay \$500 in this country and only gets 15 p.c. discount for doing so, while in Canada he pays \$290 and gets 20 p.c. If we followed out the principle of cash discount for prompt payment I think we should give these people, in view of the fact that they are paying so much larger amounts, a larger reduction making it 25 p.c.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with what Mr. Alderdice has said about the principle of the Act. I do not think there can be any question what the income tax is the fairest method of taxation that can be imposed. There are many instances where customs duties operate to the best advantage, where a man, as most of us have in this country, has to spend practically the whole of his income, he is taxed on the whole income. But the income tax act, instead of being a tax on expenditure, as Customs' revenue, is a tax on receipts and naturally the people who do not spend the whole of their income are taxed on the amount they do not spend. But on the other hand, there can be no question but that in this country the customs revenue is far higher than it should be and now we are faced with an increase in taxation by having an income tax imposed which is far higher than it should be.

Now, it seems to me, as Mr. Alderdice has said, we could probably collect a far greater income tax here if we followed the Canadian practice, not only as to the percentages upon which the amounts are taxed but also on the simplicity in which the general act is prepared and also by giving a substantial discount to those who pay promptly. The advantage of a substantial discount is to save to the department what is spent on collection. I do not need to remind the Minister of the expense which has in-

curred in connection with the last income tax. By being generous we would save considerable money.

Now from what I have noticed, speaking generally, about the various acts in connection with the increase of expenditure that have come into this House what do we find? We had acts relating to companies, deeds and so forth and in every case they increased taxes. In every case we had a taxing act. For, take the Registry of Deeds, Incorporation of Companies and, if I am correct, similarly in the inspection of ships, more revenue is obtained. So far there has not been any suggestion as to how there can be a saving of expenditure. Possibly, when we get the Estimates from my Honourable and gallant friend, the Minister of Finance and Customs, we will find that there has been a substantial reduction in expenditure. I don't mean that some unfortunate civil servant has 10 p.c. deducted from his at present inadequate salary, but some considerable saving, not so much by cutting down the civil servants as by lessening the civil service.

Take the coastal steamers and the manner of their operation. The deficit on them will have to be considered. The same with regard to the railway, especially the branch railways and the saving will be the same there, because, as I have said, the only acts we have considered outside the Telephone Act and the Highroads Act and the Alcoholic Liquors Act which has never yet been explained to us, have been acts which impose further taxation, and in every case the increase has been very substantial. I presume that some revenue will be spent during the course of the next year in payment of commissioners that are being appointed during this session.

I hope the Minister of Finance and Customs, before these resolutions go through, will consider whether the

income tax cannot be dealt with on more generous scale and that instead of following out the principle of the old act that he might incorporate into it the Canadian scale and follow that out.

I do not know whether he has seen the figures in Canada. The position of a person of what might be called fairly good means in Canada, who has four dependents. A man with \$5,000 a year in Canada; in the first place they exempt each child to the extent of \$500. Here we do it at \$300. The exemption of income is the same so that in Canada a man with a \$5,000 income is totally exempt from the tax. Here he pays \$40.00 less 15 p.c. which is \$34.00. Then if you jump to \$10,000 you will find that in Canada this same man with four dependents pays, with the 20 p.c. discount, \$128.00, whereas here with 15 p.c. discount he will have to pay \$450.00. That is an enormous difference. As the salaries get higher, the difference becomes increasingly noticeable. For instance a man with an income of \$15,000 in Canada after taking credit for exemptions and discount, pays \$448.00, whereas in this country after subtracting the discount he has to pay \$1,045, a difference of \$600.

I expect the Honourable Minister has seen these figures and has possibly studied them and I do not wish to state any in case they are not correct. I might say that they are not my deductions but I presume they are correct.

The difference is very great and when we bear in mind that in Canada their customs taxes are very much lower than they are here it seems to me that we are overburdening all the country with taxes.

Now it is all very well to talk about men with large incomes but after all we haven't got any really wealthy men in this country. I doubt if there are

ten men in this country who has an income over thirty thousand dollars a year. It is very doubtful if there are. In any event most of these are business men and those men have to use their money in their businesses. They have, as I say, to expend large sums in their concerns and now they are called upon to pay a large amount of income tax.

I submit, Sir, the position is becoming so bad that, even if the Finance Minister is successful this year or next year in getting sufficient revenue to balance his Budget—and I hope he will be successful—he will be crippling industry. So far as I am personally concerned, it does not make much difference. In the good years when lawyers were making good money I was prepared to pay and did pay fully my Income Tax, and I am quite prepared to pay now; but from the experience that I have had for the past twelve months—and the law business is quite indicative of what the general trade of the country is like—the Finance Minister is going to get far less revenue than he anticipates, as the expenses incurred in collecting the tax are going to be great.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member for Placentia East I may say that, in my opinion, industries have been hampered during the past four years by the Income Tax being off, and, if it had been kept like what was done in Canada, industries would prosper and the people of the country generally would be much better off than they are. In Canada today they collect something like sixty million dollars from this income tax annually, or seven dollars a head for every man, woman and child.

In Newfoundland with approximately a quarter of a million people we hope to get a half million dollars from this income tax, or two dollars per

head. I agree that they have greater industries, more development and more wealthy men than we have, but their idea of lowering the tax was to get at the man who could best afford to pay, and that is why they got such a large revenue from this source.

In this country we got not more than fourteen or fifteen hundred people who can pay the income tax. We know them all. Now, but for force of circumstances, I would not be bringing in this measure at all, and I am frank enough to say that we need the money, and if I thought that we were going to get a half million dollars by increasing the discount to 25 p.c. for prompt payment I would gladly do so; but I am firmly convinced that, if we made this increase, we would get \$75,000 a year less than we would get under the Resolutions as they now stand.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to the cost of collecting this money. Well I want to assure him that while I am in charge of the Department the money will be collected fearlessly and without showing favors to anyone, friend or foe. That is my job and I am going to see it through.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I think that some consideration should be given to Joint Stock Companies and such like in the way of taxing their profits. Speaking from experience in connection with the fishing business. I am aware of some of the difficulties that are to be encountered by a Outport Stock Joint Stock Company. As a Shareholder of such a Company, I remember one year the Company made \$14,000 profits and the next year lost \$40,000. The next year the Shareholders had to put \$50,000 to keep the Company on its financial legs. If such corporations are going to be taxed in the manner outlined in the Resolu-

tions, it is obviously unfair, as against the treatment accorded private Companies, who can convert their profits into income and are subjected to three years averages. Therefore, why not give Joint Stock Companies three years averages?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, namely, that a Joint Stock Company may possibly make \$20,000 one year and perhaps lose \$50,000 the next year. We have gone into this whole matter at considerable length with lawyers, and supposing we allowed a three year average, what would happen is that the unincorporated concern would immediately get incorporated to evade this law.

The business that is not incorporated gets a three year average on the Supertax, but not on the Normal tax. Now if you give any one corporation or company a favor, you got to give it to the individual as well, and an entirely new measure would have to be brought down here to deal with it.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the Committee, but I think it ought to be made clear that the incorporated Company enjoys a privilege which is not accorded to the ordinary unincorporated Company. Out of their profits the incorporated Company pays 8 p.c., but pays no Supertax. If a business is not incorporated, they pay the Normal tax and have to pay the Supertax as well. It is true that on the Supertax the unincorporated business man is allowed an average, but it must be remembered that he alone has to pay the Supertax and that the incorporated concern does not have to pay.

Take the firm of A. E. Hickman Company, Limited, a large fish exporting concern that is prominently identified with the general trade of the country, they pay 8 p.c. tax on

their profits, as against the firm of T. & M. Winter, probably the largest supplying concerns of its kind in the country and which is unincorporated and who pay the Normal tax and in addition the Supertax, which Supertax the A. E. Hickman Company, Limited does not pay. There is an advantage the incorporated concern has, and it is in order to level up that inequality that the unincorporated business man is allowed the privilege of averaging on the Supertax.

I realise the unstable character of the profits of any businesses connected with the fisheries. One year a concern may make \$60,000 and probably the next year may lose an equal or greater amount. I concur with the principle of averaging for three years, provided that incorporated bodies are prepared to pay the Supertax as well as the Normal tax; but if the privilege of averaging is accorded to incorporated companies and you alter what is outlined in these Resolutions, you cannot stop there. The whole of the Resolutions will need amendment.

MR. EMERSON—I would like to raise a technical point, it says here (reads), at the present time if there is mortgage on property that is in arrears in Income Tax the Sherriff may sell it and if there was a writ of Execution for an ordinary debt, the property could not be touched, who would have prior claim.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Under this section the proceeds are divided.

MR. EMERSON—Suppose we let this section stand over. (Section 9).

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Very well.

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 Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I desire to put myself officially on record as opposed to the appointment of this commission, if for no other reason that there has not been explained to the House the necessity for it. At the present time the telephone service of the country outside of that run by the Government is under the control of the United Towns Electric Company and the Avalon Telephone Company and they are the same. So far as the Avalon Telephone Company is concerned, the board of arbitrators appointed by their contract is to settle whether they are or are not entitled to an increased charge on business in St. John's and the board of arbitrators, consisting as it did of three eminent men of undoubted integrity, reported that they were entitled to a raise.

So far as electricity is concerned the control rests by the contract with the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. When it comes to the telegraph the Government has that in its own hands. After all there is only the Government telegraph service plus the Anglo American Company. The other day the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs told us about the price of bread. That would be entirely satisfactory. Instead of that we are faced with the proposal to appoint a commission of seven to deal with these matters. It is absolutely unnecessary

to have such a commission appointed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to have the Bill read a second time. This bill has been considered by the Government to be a very important piece of legislation, and have the effect of providing a public check on the prices of current commodities. The commission is to consist of at least three and not more than seven men. No commissioner may sit who has any direct interest in the matter before the commission except so far as he may purchase food, use electricity, or ride in a street car.

Special provision is made in the bill in order to secure the secrecy of the proceedings of the commission. The commissioners are required to take an oath of secrecy. They are not to publish names unless specially authorized to do so. It is their duty and responsibility to inquire into prices of light, electricity, telephone charges and so on, also the matter of fire insurance premiums. So that the matter referred to the commission shall not be delayed and held over indefinitely for reasons best known to themselves. The commission must report within six months unless they are authorized not to. The report is to be full and give all particulars. They are not to hand in a general report saying nothing but are to express their opinions on the facts as found. For the purpose of having the matter thrashed out the proceedings are to be in camera if the person interested so requests.

The commission may if they so require employ counsel and also any interested person may employ counsel and such person with counsel may sit at the hearings. The commission may require any person to appear before them to be examined. The commission shall act like a court and shall have all the powers of the Magistrate's Court or the Supreme Court to require persons to produce documents. In the

final section it is provided that the Commission may go a little further than report their findings but may make suggestions. I feel that a measure of this sort in harmony with similar statutes in Canada and Great Britain will be generally helpful in the trade of the Colony.

Mr. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I was considering the personnel of the commission under sub-section d of section 1.

I do not think that the commission should contain any members of the Legislature, either in the other House or here.

When matters such as this come before the House members of the legislature should be absolutely free to give their opinion and discuss these matters without having been tied up beforehand.

Unlike my friend Mr. Emerson, I support the principle of the Bill. I believe we should have a proper Utilities Commission to serve the purpose of controlling certain commodities and telephone rates and light and power. I believe there should be a commission.

They have a Public Utilities in Nova Scotia and it is working very well and the various concerns courted it up there, and I think it will help Newfoundland and St. John's particularly, but I would wish to see no members of the Legislature Council or House of Assembly appointed to the Commission, so as they may be free and unrestricted when they come here to give their opinions on certain franchises or contracts.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the appointment of a Public Utilities Commission.

I think that it should do a lot of good and I don't see that it could do any harm. I think the personnel should be free of members of either House and carefully selected, free and

unrestricted.

There are some things such as profiteering going on and it should be relieved, and it would mean a relief to the men who are charged with profiteering if an investigation was taken and it was shown that they were not taking advantage of their position.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, in the closing moments of the debate on the address in reply I desire to extend again to you, Sir, hearty congratulations of myself, and I feel, of the whole House on the distinguished manner in which you have behaved as Speaker and first Commoner of the land. On opening day it was my privilege and pleasure to congratulate you on your very notable achievement in being unanimously selected by the representatives of the country, to that important duty. Now, Sir, after two weeks of occupancy, we feel that you have brought to that position ability and learning, you have conducted the business of the House in conformity with the hereditary duties and lived up to the high standard and traditions of your predecessors. You have given evidence of dignity, thoughtfulness in handling the procedure and expert knowledge in every department, and I am confident that you have a career to follow which will place you in a very high position in politics, as you are now high in the ministry and in social standing as our first Commoner.

Now, Sir, I wish to take this opportunity of extending heartiest congratulations to all members of the opposition in connection with their maiden speeches, with the exception of the Member for St. John's West Extern, Mr. Bennett, whose remarks in connection with his father were both ill-bred and ill-considered.

The opening speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Emerson was, for a

maiden speech in this House, dignified, active, strong, classic and easy in oratory, which shows that he will travel far as a speaker on the floors of this legislature.

I feel, Sir, as Attorney General that I should express our thanks to him for the interest he has taken in connection with the legislation that has been brought before this House. To one, whose work in the position of legal advisor to the Crown is doubtless onerous and important in supervising the drafting of legislation, it is a comfort to find a trained critical mind ready to express his doubts and offering assistance where doubtful points can be discussed so that the most perfect possible laws can be enacted.

To Mr. Abbott, another gentleman who delivered his maiden speech in the House, I extend congratulations. While the Honourable Member for Port-au-Port, Mr. Abbott, succeeded in overthrowing a candidate who I thought would beat him easily in Port-au-Port, he comes to us with a wide experience as a business man, and I am confident that he will be an asset to this Chamber. There is an old saying that a commercial man is not a speaker, that commercial men are men who do their thinking and keep it to themselves, who think and act. Mr. Abbott is a business man but when I saw him speaking today when presenting the petition from his district, I realised that he is well capable of looking after the interests of the constituency which he now represents and will represent for the coming four years, I trust.

The war has its representatives on the other side of the House in several persons, and I congratulate them on their eloquent and able speeches. I feel that at any time matters appertaining to soldiers and sailors, the important activities of the Great War Veterans Association in Newfound-

land, general philanthropy and up-building it is so much connected with, reestablishment of the soldiers and sailors and revision of pensions, will be greatly helped in general by the wisdom and guidance of these gentlemen whose careers are already known and whose experience in these matters is universal.

I also congratulate on his able address, my late law partner, Mr. Alex. Winter. This particular legal gentleman was associated with me in legal partnership for some years. I regret that he has decided to follow in the steps of his distinguished father and remain, what we on this side of the House call, a Tory. It is but right that the son of a gentleman who became one of our most distinguished politicians and legislators, Attorney General and Leader of a party in Newfoundland, should be seated immediately behind the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber.

It is regrettable to note that one member of the Opposition has not been in his place for the last three days and is prevented from taking part in the debate. We feel sorry and regret the absence of Mr. Sullivan who is one of the oldest members of the House and with Mr. Puddester constitute two outstanding men of public nature, and it will be the hope of the Opposition and in fact I speak for every man in this Chamber, when I express the hope that within a few days he will have recovered from his brief illness so that he may be with us to aid in the deliberations of the next weeks.

I now come, Sir, to the consideration of the speech of a gentleman who for many years was a very good friend of mine and during last year unfortunately for himself, possibly, and I know unfortunately for myself, has been opposed to me. I want to congratulate him again as I have done personally and also in moving the adjournment

of the debate yesterday afternoon. It is a pleasure to find in one's opponents on the other side of the House a man of knowledge and experience, a man who for twenty years has been actively identified with politics, although only occupying a seat in the House for six years; his forceful attack on us reflected credit upon him and his knowledge displayed in the affairs of this country for the last twenty-five years. I trust that he will live for many years and as the days go by and he again contests the district which he represents we will be able to have his active and earnest support as a member of our party in aggressive contests.

To the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition I wish to extend particular congratulations, because it is not an easy job for the first time in the House of Assembly and for the first time as Leader of a party to get sufficiently accustomed to the rules and routine matters, procedure and general business in connection with the debate; particularly for a man so intimately associated with business, not law, not politics, not debate, not with the people. I would like it understood as well that he is particularly worthy of congratulation because of the able way in which he handled the general debate of the House, the able way in which he held his party in their places during the debate and his splendid generalship in leading the discussion and above all, for holding in reserve his two second men, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Puddester, for the purpose of moving and seconding an amendment.

It is not my intention, nor shall I intrude upon the general harmony of this session of the legislature nor disturb the progress that is being made, by making any remarks of a mere political character which might cause debate and tend to delay legislation. I

feel, Sir, that the time has come in public affairs when partisanship and any excessive personal bitterness of the recent campaign should be forgotten. We should begin to forget the animosities which inflamed and dominated the minds of many of us during the recent campaign and put forward every effort to do the best humanly possible to introduce the most helpful, best worded and drafted legislation that it is possible to have, and I trust that we will have the co-operation of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in such important public measures as we hope to introduce for his support.

I consequently feel, Sir, that I could give the message of the Liberal party and possibly the message of the Opposition and labour representatives in the short closing lines of the well known poem:

"Let us then be up and doing
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labour and to wait."

On motion of Capt. Parsons seconded by Mr. Fudge the Address in Reply was passed without division.

On motion the Report of the Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne was adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister it was ordered that the Reply be presented to His Excellency by the Whole House.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next the 6th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 6th, 1929.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister, with the permission of the Speaker and Leader of the Opposition, addressed the House on "Save the Forest Week."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Speaker, with your consent and with that of the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to call the attention of the House to the week which it set apart and is known as Fire Protection Week. As you know the Governor has issued a Proclamation and I was particularly pleased to see suitable reference to it in the editorial of to-day's "Daily News."

This week is set apart and the calling the attention of the public to it is not a mere incident not a mere advisory recommendation, but it is absolutely necessary to call the attention of the public to the protecting of our great national assets. These forests are worth to us annually, \$20,000,000, \$13,500,000 in the form of pulp, \$500,000 as pulp wood, and the remainder is used in saw mills. Some of our houses are built with it, ship building, staves, shingles, firewood and fences, and other activities in our fishing operations consume the remainder. The person who sets fire to a house, a person who installs electric fittings carelessly should be regarded as a public menace.

The travelling man, any man who goes through the woods and thoughtlessly throws away burning matches cigar and cigarette butts should be regarded as a menace to the population as a whole. For our forests are not merely worth twenty million dollars annually, they also mean the upkeep of agricultural development, the stability of our water flow, the keeping up the reputation of Newfoundland as

a Sportsman Paradise. I think it is most appropriate to take this opportunity to call the attention of both branches of the House to this week so that if occasion arises they may aid in carrying out more effectively than ever the objects of the Fire Patrol.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the sentiments expressed by my Hon. friend the Prime Minister. There is a terrible wastage going on in this country of our forest wealth. Every year our forests are being destroyed. If we are not very careful our forests will meet the same fate as those of the Provinces of Canada.

I remember seeing a slogan on the West Coast one time and I was very struck with it. It was: One tree will make a million matches, but one match can destroy a million trees.

I am sure that we are all indebted to the Prime Minister for calling our attention to this "Save the Forest Week," and I feel that we will take all possible steps when we have a chance, to see that our forests are protected and take every care so as not to risk our great national assets.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from some of the residents of Stephenville in the district of Port-au-Port, asking for money for roads in that section and also that it be made a customs port of entry.

The roads in question lead to the best agricultural land in the settlement and if the necessary money is granted to them, it will be the means of helping them to reach more agricultural land where they can grow more vegetables and this will help the residents considerably.

I would ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

The Minister of Marine and Fisher-

ies gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding."

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I shall now deal with the various departments in the manner already intimated.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT—This shows a proposed increase of expenditure of \$8,291.70 partly on account of extra interest on last year's loan; \$4,000.00 omitted in last year's estimates for four extra members of the Legislature. The vote for the High Commissioner's Office in London has been cut by \$7,035.00. As outlined in the Speech from the Throne, it is the policy of the Government to establish a Trade Commissioner in London, consequently, it will not be necessary to vote the full amount of \$17,035.00 asked for in last year's estimates, as we think the round sum of \$10,000.00 will be sufficient for the establishment of such a service. There are also some small increases amounting to \$1,996.00. The amount of \$1,200.00 is being paid to a junior employee in the Auditor General's Department. This Department has been working short-handed since the death of the late Mr. Donnelly. Two increases in salary are

shown in the Finance Department which votes will be explained as we go through the estimates. Civil Pensions is a fluctuating vote which may increase or decrease any year. This year a small decrease of \$495,63 has been effected. I think this explains the changes in the Finance Department.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT—Last year the amount of \$213,409.00 was voted for this Department. In addition, Supplementary Supply has to be taken this year for approximately \$60,000.00 making a total expenditure for that Department of about \$273,000.00. This increase is principally due to the General Election last fall. Also officials in the Department received extra remuneration for their work, as presumably their duties were more arduous, and our predecessors in office thought fit that they should be rewarded accordingly. In the new Estimates \$85,000.00 has been dropped. Matters of detail will be explained by the Hon. Colonial Secretary himself as we proceed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC CHARITIES AND PUBLIC HEALTH—during the past few years has been one of serious concern to all Governments, chiefly on account of distress and unemployment throughout the country. The estimates voted for this Department last year amounted to \$535,403.16. In addition, a further \$218,960.00 will now have to be voted in Supplementary Supply. This brings the total amount under the head of "Charities Department" up to \$754,000.00—say, three-quarters of a million dollars, a terribly high figure. This year we are asking for \$562,124.80 and now members will vote that under the head "Public Charities" a slight reduction is being effected while under the head "Public Health" an increase of \$28,000.00 is being asked. Whilst this may appear an increase, it is actually a de-

crease, as the Supplementary Supply, which is to be taken in due course, is all under the head "Public Health." For instance, in the 1928-29 estimates, the grant for hospital treatment of the sick-poor was estimated at \$25,000.00 whilst the actual expenditure will be around \$140,000.00. As you are aware, the Government has gone into the matter of hospital expenses since taking office, with the result that considerable saving has been effected, and I trust that the coming year will see the amount of \$50,000.00 sufficient for the major portion of expenditure under this head. The total increase according to the estimates now before you, amounts to \$26,721.64 whilst the actual decrease, if we take Supplementary Supply into consideration, will be in the vicinity of \$190,000.00.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—had a voted expenditure for the last fiscal year of \$372,952.75, in addition to which about \$9,000.00 will have to be voted for over-expenditure; consequently, an increase of \$7,242.25 will be effected this year. These various individual increases will be explained by the Minister of Justice.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—shows an increase this year of \$54,937.50. It is the policy of the Government to give every facility possible to the sparsely populated settlements of the Island to receive a fair education. Consequently, this increase; the various other estimates being similar to the previous year.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—had a vote in the 1928-29 estimates of \$439,789.39. In addition, Supplementary Supply must be taken for \$97,220.00, making a total of about \$537,000.00. The estimates for 1929-30 is \$431,165.89, a decrease in the present Estimates of \$8,632.50. This Department had undergone considerable reorganization and the Minister will

explain the changes that have taken place. I might add that the sum of \$20,000.00 voted the past two or three years for the improvement of fisheries, and which amount was actually paid to fishery statisticians throughout the country, has been eliminated. The Government intends, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, to form a Fishery Commission, in the near future to go into all matters, consequently, it will be unnecessary to vote this amount during this fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—has undergone very little change if any. Last year \$117,160.66 was voted in the regular Estimates, and now Supplementary Supply will have to be taken for \$65,000.00, so that whilst an increase of the trival amount of \$140.00 is shown in these estimates, we hope to be able to avoid any Supplementary Supply next year.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—has been active latterly in winding up several so-called hospitals in the city, which has been effected; and, to cope with the situation, that section of the Poor Asylum inhabited by the Superintendent has been turned into an Infirmary into which poor and infirm people, who formerly were housed in these other places in town, have been transferred. This has brought about an increase in the Public Works Department of approximately \$17,000. In last year's estimates the amount of \$957,259.07 was voted for this branch of the service. In addition to this, approximately \$58,000 will have to be voted in Supplementary Supply in a few days. This will bring up the total expenditure of this department to over one million dollars, and as the Government hopes to effect large reforms in the various institutions I feel that the amount now asked for, \$975,020.16, will be ample for the requirements, which means an

actual cut in this vote of approximately \$40,000.00. The various changes and appointments that have taken place in this department will be explained by the Minister of Public Works as we go through

DEPARTMENT OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—through this department the various subsidies for the operation of the coastal service and the railway service have been handled and it is questionable whether the department gets the credit due it, for the enormous portion of work which is being performed by its various officials. Coastal and Railway subsidies amount to over \$400,000, in return for which the Postal Department merely gets the transportation of its mails. The country is aware that if a special steamer is to be chartered to bring home Labrador fishermen, the amount paid the charters comes through this department and is charged to its account even though the said steamer may only carry ten letters. This Government will, I hope, in the near future, take steps to reorganize in some way the transportation service of this country in order to take off the shoulders of this department the responsibility for monies for which it gets no direct credit. I merely say this in passing as a personal opinion, and feel that Hon. members realize that something in this direction should be done. The total vote, therefore, for this Department amount to \$1,273,705.30 which shows an increase over the proceeding years of approximately \$50,000. This is not actually an increase, as Supplementary Supply will be taken in a few days for \$55,000, to make up for expenditure short voted last year. The vote for Contingencies also shows an increase of \$10,000, and, as I pointed out a few moments ago, is brought about on account of the amount being short voted last year. Then on page 160, under the head

"Capital Account" "Repairs" is an increase of \$10,000, principally due to fact that in the various sections of the country our lines became deteriorated and whilst this kind of work might be performed under the head of "Capital Expenditure" and the money paid from loan, the Government proposes to vote it this year in the regular Estimates and make an earnest endeavour to pay for it out of the general revenue of the country. The various other changes under the head "Salaries" will be explained by the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS—this Department comes under my own supervision and explanations about it I propose to make myself. The total sum required this year for its effective operation is \$555, 832.50, while last year the Estimate was \$554,767, consequently an artificial increase is shown of \$1,065.50. But I would like to say that my predecessors in office, during the previous four years, employed various officials with salaries which were never voted in the Estimates, and I would refer you to page 167 in the Estimates and point out that last year ten sufferance warehouse-keepers were voted at an amount of \$11,505, whilst the annual number employed was fourteen, who were paid \$16,107. In the same page last year is an item which does not appear in the present Estimates, wherein eight Tidewaiters were paid \$1,150.50 each, ten were paid \$900 and seven paid \$825, whilst the actual number employed was thirty, who received, each and every one of them \$1,150.50 being an increase of over \$10,000.00. The boatmen who were voted last year \$5,880, actually received \$6,300. As we go through these Estimates, I shall be delighted to explain each vote to, I hope, the satisfaction of every member of the House. I would like to point out one or two more items as we go along, one

on page 172, "Outport Supernumeraries." The vote last year was \$2,700.00 whilst the actual expenditure will be somewhere near \$17,000.00. I hope to get along nicely on \$10,000.00 as one or two of these are already provided for in the regular Estimates now before you. Customs refunds show a decrease of \$25,000.00 principally because we have not paid anything to the Bell Island Company (as under their contract they are entitled to) but such money is being held on account of claims by us as to their Income Tax, etc.

I now come to the DEPARTMENT OF THE ASSESSOR, which Department, whilst eliminated last year by my motion in this House, was afterwards re-established by Minute of Council of the late Government, consequently there is another artificial increase of \$15,120.00 an expenditure which is quite justifiable, as we hope to receive for that expenditure an annual amount of half a million dollars through the new Income Tax.

DEPARTMENT OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS—is a fluctuating vote brought about by changes made in the Pensions Act a few years ago. I am informed that this vote will be increased slightly annually for the next few years when it will probably begin to decrease. Last year an amount was voted in the Estimates of \$629, 550, in addition to which another \$23,000 will be asked in Supplementary Supply. We are asking for \$646,550 this year, which is an actual decrease but an artificial increase is shown of \$17,000.

Mr. Chairman, this closes my explanation of the various departments. I would like to point out to Hon. members the importance of making serious efforts to live within the votes now before us. In order to do this we need co-operation from every individual member, both Government and Op-

position. I feel optimistic in a sense, for, as far as I know, the amount asked for is sufficient to cover every ordinary expenditure meditated. But I also know that emergencies show themselves on many occasions where money has to be found in order that the public services may be maintained in an efficient manner. I think that the Estimates now before you are capable of operating the public service in a highly efficient and economical manner, apart from such emergencies which I trust may be few, I feel that these Estimates can carry us on for the next twelve months and that if economy is practised there may be more than enough, on the whole. I trust that when I have the privilege of presenting the Estimates for the fiscal year 1930-31 I may be able to look at a decrease, having had the experience of twelve months behind me, and that following these Estimates, very little Supplementary Supply will be required.

In order to give the Opposition an opportunity to study the various votes, I now move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise, to 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 to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my sincere appreciation to the various members of the Opposition for their co-operation in handling this piece of legislation. We are all aware of the difficulty and responsibility entailed in putting this bill through its various stages and criticism that has been offered by the various members of the Opposition has been sound and whilst there are some clauses which have been held up for the purpose of having a committee of the House to draft these necessary clauses, I will have them ready when the bill comes up for second reading. The Committee consists of men who are well acquainted with that kind of legislation, namely Mr. Emerson, Hon. Mr. Bradley and myself.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same without amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public," be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 99 entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, on moving that this Bill be read the second time I will roughly go through the Bill so as to disclose its nature, and then when we come to the Committee stage, we will be able to discuss the merits or demerits of each separate section.

The policy behind this Bill is the assisting of the Department of Justice and the police particularly in carrying out effectively the Alcoholic Liquors Act of 1924. Its second purpose is to relieve the Liquor Control Board particularly Mr. Mifflin, the Chairman, from liability of a charge of criminal violation of the Act. Because of certain technical provisions in the Act, in necessary acts in the execution of his duty and the ordinary course of business he is liable to criminal prosecution to such an extent that should the penalties be enforced in full on him he would not be able to live out the term of penalty if he lived to the age of Methuselah. For instance by section 2, there is provision made for a 26 ounce bottle instead of 24 ounce. As a matter of fact the standard whiskey bottle is 26 ounces and the standard rum 24 ounces.

The 1924 Act must have been drafted by men evidently who only knew the proper contents of a rum bottle, or else perhaps by total abstainers, who did not know the contents of either. The result was every time Mr. Mifflin sold a bottle of 26 ounces he violated the Act, and he does not feel that he should for ever go on subject to the serious penalties set down. Section 9 has for its object the enabling of the police by certain records, to carry out certain protection in connection with the control of shebeens, which cannot be satisfactorily done at the present time. I think it was suggested by some Hon. member of the Opposition, or by somebody outside, or it was rumoured around the street that this section had something to do with a bottling plant. The section has no such implication and no such idea is dealt with there at all. I might say that section was drafted by the Acting Minister of Justice, Mr. Dunfield in collaboration with the Inspector General of Constabulary and is here as actually submitted by them. Section 13 brings in an amendment. This amendment may not be necessary but some people say that it is wanted there. It has been contended that under the 1924 Act Mr. Mifflin has no authority to send outside of St. John's where there is no bond store any intoxicating whatsoever.

There is a difference of opinion among legal gentlemen and it may be that the Board cannot by law send out liquor in the ordinary course of business as has been done continually. There is no change in the 1924 Act by this in so far as it was the intention of the 1924 Act to allow liquor to be sent to the outports and as a matter of fact that has been done continually.

MR. PUDDISTER—This clause does not make it legal to send by mail does it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
No, it refers to orders received by mail. It is illegal by another Act to send liquor by mail. That is not changed. There is, as I say, some doubt whether there being no bonded house at Grand Falls the Board has the right to make a sale to any person there and send out a bottle of liquor by express as it has been doing. That is what has been done continually. That is what the Act intended to be done; and we are merely clarifying the situation.

Under the Bill besides penalties there is slight change in policy. There is no change in policy rather only a change at the request of the Inspector General to enable him to get more definite control of the situation. We discovered when we came in and had to give large relief in St. John's West that there were 86 illicit places where intoxicating liquors were being sold between five in the afternoon and ten the following morning, and the object of the stringency of the present act is to enable the police to deal with cases of that kind.

Under this Act a person requiring intoxicating liquor is to have a permit, on which are to be endorsed the purchases made, along the lines of the Ontario system.

There is a change made to which I would call attention; not exactly a typographical error; a change made after consultation between the Inspector General and myself since the Bill was originally drafted. On the top of page 3 it will be noticed and also on page 2 there is a reference to clergymen in the granting or certifying of permits. "Clergymen" has been stricken out as we thought we should not put clergymen in the position of being called on to sign in connection with liquor permits, and we have changed that to "medical practitioners" in every place where "clergymen" was

inserted for that purpose before. I feel as clergymen deal particularly with the welfare of the soul, it would be preferable to leave the certifying of those permits to medical men whose particular care is the welfare of the body.

On page 4 there is a change that might be regarded as a change in policy that is not really a change in policy but rather to assist the Department of Justice in keeping control of liquor stores in St. John's, where liquor in quantities is on hand bought on the bottle a day system. The number is reduced to three per week. We do not anticipate that there will be any material reduction in the consumption of alcohol because of this as the number of people likely to consume more than three per week is very limited and will be still more limited if they continue that practise. There is a provision that people buying liquor with a label on the bottle must not wash off the label so that it will be clear whether it is bona fide liquor from the Controller or not. It is provided that serial numbers are to be put on.

Upon the recommendation of the Inspector of the Constabulary a stamp will be affixed showing the date that the bottle was sold. Quite recently, he told me that he had seized twenty bottles of liquor and it was impossible to prove that they were not bought on twenty different days and the police were put in the humiliating position of having to return the confiscated liquor, now if that had been in force this would not have happened. I do not know how this will work out but the Inspector General suggests that it is the best thing that could be done. Then too there is a clause whereby the first offence is minor in fine and the second and recurring offences are major in fine.

Under this Bill the police are given large and liberal authority. There is the usual section whereby one third of the fine goes to the Widows and Orphans Fund, one third to the revenue of the Colony, and one third to the Widows and Orphans Fund or in particularly meritorious cases where really excellent service has been performed, the Inspector General may award not more than one third to the constable who made the arrest. Under the present Act the constable has no power to arrest a drunk, the arrest is now made under the Nuisance Act. Section 13 gives him power to arrest and the trouble of arresting a man under one Act and prosecuting under another is done away with. In the latter part of the Act there are some new ideas which are taken from Legislature abroad.

It is a difficult matter to deal effectively with shops conducting an illicit traffic in liquor. In some cases the father is guilty, the mother is found guilty, the sons and daughters are guilty and we have three or four cases against the same house. Under section 17 there is only one case against the house and is dealt with by the Magistrate and a prime facie case brought against them. Considerable difficulty is experienced too, in convicting in cases which are not in the ordinary course of events. No doubt Mr. Emerson has experience in this matter.

MR. EMERSON—My clientage is higher than that. My Hon. friend from Bay de Verde suggests that I am a 'blue blood.'

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—All the remaining sections from section 18 deal with this matter. Section 59 provides that Stipendiary Magistrates send in the fines promptly, there have been cases where the fines have not been returned promptly due to negligence or some other causes.

The Act contains no new policy so far as the sale of liquor is concerned we do not intend to go back to the saloon days although some people are in favour of it. The idea is to put the maximum power behind the police so as to enable them to carry out existing legislature.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I am sure that the Hon. members are favourably disposed towards this Bill as we will support anything that will tighten up on the sale of alcoholic liquors, in fact a measure that brings about the restriction of the sale of liquor should have the support of every responsible man, we want to put down sheebenism. Unfortunately we cannot restrict the consumption of alcoholic liquors because the consumption of alcoholic liquors cannot be reduced to a simple sum in proportion.

I must confess that I am still unconvinced about section 3, if the Inspector General required what is intended there he might have made the language more explicit. It may be accomplished in committee and I think that all support the opinion of the legal men who say that anything could be read into it or it may be harmless. I have heard the opinions of both sides and I have confidence in both, but I would like to see the section amended so that the ordinary lay man can understand it, especially in view of the fact of the rumours that have been circulating since the early part of January—there may be nothing in them—about giving an option to the Eastern Trading Company although no attempt was made to hand over the conveyancing of any particular combine. Again the only objection that I have to section 3 is that I would like to see it made plainer and I would favour it if it is beneficial to the Inspector General. I am not a lawyer and I would like to see it explained.

perhaps the Hon. gentlemen of the other side may explain it. I may say that I am not for prohibition but I would like to see the sale of liquor restricted.

When we went to the polls in October last I was asked where I stood as regards prohibition, I candidly said that I was not for prohibition but I would like to see less consumption of the so-called hard liquor and a substitute found in its place, if a substitute could not be got give greater facilities for the purchase of beer, if a man has an urge to drink, let him drink a glass of beer instead of a glass of rum or some other spirits. I would like to see more beer drunk than other liquor as beer is quite harmless and I am told that the other hard liquors are harmful. On that account I would like to see this curse reduced as much as possible. The last liquor report showed that \$1,200,000 worth of liquor had been consumed in St. John's and the vicinity. Anything that goes towards cutting down this curse and curtailing this trade will have our honest support.

MR. PUDDESTER—I have been waiting for the past week for the Prime Minister to explain this bill, some are satisfactory and some are not. I suggest adjourning the debate so as to give the Opposition members a chance to go through it clause by clause. I don't agree with section 3 as it can be given a wide interpretation and I don't see what the Inspector General should have to do with marking or packing bottles or containers.

I don't like the alteration of Section 6 at the top of page 3.

I agree with cutting out "clergymen" there. I think it is an unfair thing to ask them to sign permits for their parishioners. They may be glad to do it in case of necessity and cases where liquor is required for medicinal purposes, but I think it is unfair to

a clergyman to ask him to sign a permit for a man to get a bottle as a beverage; and I think it is unfair to the man to have to go to a clergyman and ask him to sign a permit. I heartily agree with the obliteration, but not to go back again to the medical practitioners issuing scripts. We all know what was done as far as the medical practitioners were concerned before. If we are going back to where we were before—doctors and the old script system—we had better leave it as it is.

I am heartily in accord with most of the permit regulations contained in Section 6, but I would regret the fact of going back to the medical practitioners.

I move that the debate on the second reading of the Bill be adjourned until tomorrow when there is more time to consider it

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9 George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13 George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy'" was read a second time and ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation on the second reading in connection with this amendment.

At the present moment there is a bill on the Statute Book which says that a sailing vessel, signing on here in St. John's and going on a foreign voyage, when they return the seamen must pay twelve cents a month out of their wages for hospital dues.

That has been going on for some time and there have been attempts made to have it repealed, because foreign vessels signing off and on here do not have to pay their twelve cents. Furthermore, at the present way shipping is going it gives about \$60.00 a year to the country and they do not get any medical treatment for the \$60.00. Therefore, the matter of repealing the old act is really to get the thing where it should be. We are not undoing anything, only confirming what is being done.

Replies to Questions Nos. 1, 2 and 4 on the Order Paper were tabled by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Hon. Colonial Secretary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I take the opportunity of informing you that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive this House of Assembly for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 3.30 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

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, May 7th, 1929.

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

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that the members would be received by His Excellency the Governor at Government House at 3.30, whereupon Mr. Speaker, members and officials, preceded by the Sergeant at

Arms bearing the Mace, proceeded to Government House, and being received in audience, Mr. Speaker presented the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency had opened the first session of the Twenty-Seventh General Assembly of Newfoundland.

Returning to the Assembly Room Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address in Reply and had been 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.) J. Middleton,
Governor.

MR. SPEAKER also presented the following response of His Excellency the Governor to the Address to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, which had been passed by both Branches of the Legislature.

I thank you for your Address to the King's Most Excellent Majesty. In accordance with your wishes it will be my pleasant duty to transmit the Address to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs to be laid at the foot of the Throne.

(Sgd.) J. Middleton,
Governor.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
May 7th, 1929.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively "An Act Relating to Air Navigation," "An Act to Amend 19, George V., Chapter 18, entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes," and "An Act

Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company," without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment" with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendment was read a first time.

With unanimous consent the said amendment was read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendment had been agreed to without amendment.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Morton's Harbour and the vicinity in connection with the Alcoholic Liquors Act. With your permission, Sir, I will read the resolutions:

(Reads)

Since a Bill is to come before the House dealing with the Alcoholic Liquors Act, further comment is unnecessary.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Keel's on the subject of a break water, and asking that \$10,000 be granted to build the same. It is in the district of Bonavista South. It is very largely signed by all the residents of that locality. Living as I do, within five miles of this important settlement, I know that it is absolutely necessary that this amount be voted to enable the people to build that breakwater in order to secure protection for the fishermen.

Practically every man in that settlement is a fishermen. They are all independent people. It cannot be found where that settlement has received a dollar of Government relief of any kind for at least twenty years. Last year there was much destruction in property in Keel's owing to the sea and the heavy wind, where there was no protection and the men have suffered considerably owing to the fact that they have to haul their boats up whenever there is a sea or heavy wind. In asking for this amount I would urge upon the Government the necessity of giving full consideration to this petition. And if it is at all possible grant the amount asked for. In asking that this petition and the other be referred to the departments to which they relate. I have much pleasure in giving both my hearty support.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition Mr. Brown has so ably presented, and I concur with all that he has said with regard to the independence and worth of the people of that section. It is certainly a remarkable community and anything that can be done to improve the position of the fishing people there is well worth the consideration of the Government, and any request in this respect I am sure will have the consideration of the Government at the earliest possible opportunity.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

MR. PUDDISTER—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister to table all correspondence and telegrams between his Department and Thomas J. Hickey, Secretary of the miners' and workingmen's Committee, between March and October, 1928.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I am tabling all correspondence that the Secretary in the Department has been able to find. Unfortunately during recent years the filing in the De-

partment has not been perfect, and as a matter of fact I have been shown photographic copies of letters over the signature of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Alderdice as Prime Ministers that the Secretary had no knowledge of, but he assures me that those tabled here are all that we have on file in the office.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged the Public," 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 and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, we are under some difficulty in being able to say very much on the estimates today. As the Minister of Finance will agree, we have not had very much time to look over them in anything but a perfunctory manner, so my first observation will be that I do not think the Minister of Finance should prolong the debate. There is some work we can get through to-day, and there are two or three general observations I would like to make on

the estimates, and I won't delay the Committee very long. In the first place the Minister of Finance asks for ten and a half million dollars in round figures. There are numbers of people in the country who would like to see a very much smaller amount asked for to carry on the public service during the coming year, but I am one of those who take things as I see them and do not unduly criticise when I know there are no grounds for criticism. In looking over the estimates and comparing them vote for vote I can see where there is eight million dollars (\$8,000,000.00) of what might be termed uncontrollable expenditure, and after all we only have two and a half millions to run the public service of the country, that is in some measure controllable. We might crimp and pare and cut down wherever possible and I have heard the thing discussed time and again and gone over and over, but when you come down to hard facts there is very little you can cut off. If you do cut one or two hundred thousand dollars off of the Civil Service it doesn't amount to very much after all. In the first place we have four million dollars uncontrollable expenditure in connection with interest on our public debt. That certainly cannot be reduced. It was reduced some one hundred thousand dollars last year but that was because a loan came due having interest at six and a half per cent and when that came due another loan was raised to pay it off and that was raised at the rate of five per cent, and about one hundred thousand was saved in that way. The total amount we owe now is practically eighty million dollars and that carries interest charges of four million dollars annually which is absolutely uncontrollable, and next year it is going to be about four and a quarter millions dollars because we are going to have a

loan this year of six or seven or eight millions which would bring our uncontrollable expenditure on interest account up to four and a quarter million dollars. Now we have public charities and public health institutions that run away with one million one hundred thousand dollars. You might pare that amount down but not to any large extent. I have seen Governments who were very anxious to cut down the expenditure on public institutions and public health departments but the matter was a nine days wonder, and there was not very much done after all, because as I said the other day it is a very hard thing for Governments to cut down on hospitals and charities institutions. That sort of work must be carried on and we must look after the welfare of the human body. It is the first duty of Governments in this and every other country to take care of the sick people and do what they can to make people well. Now you have another vote that is absolutely uncontrollable, or I suppose that it is so. That is a vote of approximately one million dollars for education. And no man can come into this House if he is serious and conscientious and stand up and recommend the reduction of the vote for education which takes one million dollars. I am not going to say that we are getting value for that money. I have been of the opinion for a long time that if the educational grants of this country were managed in a somewhat different way we might get better value for the money than we are getting, but there it is, and you can't reduce the vote for education and we have to vote a million dollars, and there is a pronouncement in the Speech from the Throne that this year there will be an increase for sparsely populated districts of fifty five thousand dollars.

The Opposition are accused of not

saying anything in favour of that vote, well, I do so now. No man can accuse me of not being sympathetic toward the Educational needs of Newfoundland. I welcome this vote and I am sorry that it is not larger. I know the handicaps under which schools are carried on in the small outports, they need an increase more than the towns where there are large populations. I compliment the Government on having that vote in the estimates as the years go by it will have to be increased. I know that in my district there are places where the schools are only open for about five or six months in the year and for the remainder of the year the children are walking about the streets. This condition of affairs should be remedied, we owe as much to the children of the country as we do to the sick and suffering. Now we come to the Postal and Telegraph systems \$1,273,000. I don't see how the people of Newfoundland can do without this service and I do not know if expenditure in this department can be cut down, but I do know that in the years 1926, 1927 and 1928, the late Minister had no Supplementary Supply. I am going to ask the Minister how the vote came to be overexpended last year, \$50,000 is the Supplementary Supply and when we come to it I would like to ask the Minister to explain the overdraft.

War Pensions, \$646,000. This is increasing and it is an uncontrollable expenditure, it will increase during the next few years but it is a vote that cannot be done without. I made a survey of the public accounts in connection with that department and there are some pensions paid to people who had very good jobs and were fairly well off. Now I don't agree with this. This country had a war as well as other countries and that war costs this country about \$2,100,000 a year. That is in the estimates of to-day, of

\$10,500,000, the war is responsible for \$2,100,000. There were \$30,000,000 borrowed to carry on the war while it was in progress, the interest on this at 5 per cent is \$1,500,000 per year, then the Pensions vote brings it up to \$2,000,000. Then you have Civil Service and Old Age Pensions etc. That makes about eight million dollars that is spent every year which is uncontrollable expenditure and cannot be reduced.

Then we have \$2,500,000 with which to run the public service of the country. I don't blame the Minister for trying to get more money. I remember the Hon. Minister when he was on this side of the House saying that when the country had borrowed \$100,000,000 he figured that we were just about finished. We will now have about \$85,000,000 of a debt, we have only another \$15,000,000 to go and then as you say we are finished. I warn you sir, that you are treading on very dangerous ground and I suggest that you take into consideration the establishment of a sinking fund as soon as possible so as to year by year get the debt reduced. I remember reading a debate in the Dominion Parliament on this very subject and strange to say the Dominion Government has not yet established a sinking fund. The province of Ontario has, however, and hopes that in fifty years the debt will be wiped out, through the medium of their sinking fund. If we borrow repeatedly and pay nothing back, not having a sinking fund, it will be all the worse for ourselves, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister will take steps to establish a sinking fund before we get over the hundred million mark.

When the present Minister of Finance and Customs was on this side of the House he was very anxious to have the railway estimates brought down. The Hon. Minister used to ask the then Minister of Finance why it was

not necessary to have the Railway estimates brought down. I won't say that I am in favour of bringing down the Railway estimates but I take the opportunity to remind him of his anxiety when he was over here. There are certain votes when I look over the estimates, which remind me how eloquent the Chairman of this Committee waxed a few years ago when he talked of cutting them one third or two thirds. He is now in the position where he can make his influence felt, and I remind the Hon. Minister so that he can practise some diligence and get them cut down in accordance with his wishes when he was on the Opposition side of the House.

There was once a Leader in this House who, when questioned about certain matters, unpleasant perhaps, always said 'Well, I hear that now for the first time.' I heard the then Minister of Finance on Supply in 1925 when the estimates came in and showed an increase all round, his excuse was that it was on the recommendation of the Auditor General to avoid Supplementary Supply and he would see that it was not overexpended this year. The House took it for granted that he was trying to keep down expenses but he always managed to have a Supplementary Supply vote to cover over expenditure the next year. I give the Minister of Finance credit for trying to live within his means trying to keep within the votes contained in this book. I remind him however that many Ministers before him had the same idea. I was talking for half an hour this morning with a man who had a seat in the Executive Council a few years ago, a colleague of the then Finance Minister, Sir Michael Cashin, who knew what it was to run the business of the country and this gentleman told me Sir Michael Cashin always undertook to cut estimates as much as possible and he always said

that the more money you vote the more was spent. I don't want to knock the permanent heads of the departments of the Government, but it is not always that the political head of a department is to blame for over expenditure. My opinion is that if you allot \$500,000 to a department to spend they will find a way somehow to spend it.

There will be no curb on their extravagance, but if you do not give them money to spend they cannot spend it, and I have not such absolute confidence in the different permanent heads of the departments to think, and I say so fearlessly, that they will economize and cut down if given a large vote so much as if given a small one. Therefore, I say to the Hon. Minister that if I were in his place I would make the vote in the estimates as low as possible. I would rather have a little larger Supplementary Supply than have the vote large in the estimates, because, as I say, when you give them money to spend they are going to spend it.

I know of Departments in the Government of this country who have had a large vote in the estimates and have have it spent by December 31 and get the Auditor General's order to spend more and then ask when the House was in session for Supplementary Supply. As I say, the more the vote is the more you will have to vote next year.

As a late Finance Minister said "when a vote is asked for of \$1500 put it down as \$1200 and make him do the job for \$1200." We can do that in a great many instances.

I just want a word of warning to the Hon. Minister, that he need not be so sure that he will reduce supplementary supply to a very great extent by placing the full vote in the estimates in the first instance I have seen the thing tried and I have discussed it with numerous people who knew

what they were talking about, I have discussed it with officials in the departments as I have taken an interest in the question for a number of years, and I have come to the conclusion—and I say it honestly—that the lowest amount you can vote in the estimates is the proper amount to ask for so that you may minimize the overexpenditure by heads of the departments.

Now, as we go through the estimates we will see what differences there are and, of course, as the Finance Minister stated yesterday, we will expect an explanation to cover the votes of the different departments by the heads of those departments.

I congratulate the Minister of Finance and Customs on his first presentation of the estimates of the country and the reason I congratulate him is this, that he did not deliver a very provocative speech. I have seen Ministers deliver such speeches that it would take days for the Opposition to answer because of their offensiveness but the Minister of Finance and Customs did not pursue that course yesterday. He delivered a speech that was frank, honest, containing very little abuse and he laid very little blame on past Governments for bringing expenditures up to where it was when he took charge. If he had delivered a more provocative speech we would have to respond to him at greater length. We have little to respond to because he was very fair in his statement. I do trust, that when he presents his Budget it will be a statement similar to the Estimates, a statement having very little politics in it, but a statement of the finances of the country set out fairly and without any subterfuge, and if he does that we are bound, and we will give him a square deal from this side of the House, but if he states otherwise and makes of the Budget a political speech, then we

will give him as hot a time as we possibly can.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to a person leading a Government to recognize fair dealing and ability in an enemy. One of the first necessities of success either normal, average or excessive of political leadership or leadership in any executive capacity, as my Hon. friend has abundantly evidenced, is to find in the Leader of the Opposition, in a recognized competitor, in an opponent, in one who would down you if he could in a competitive commercial or political battle, real ability; and I do now want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition in having in his ranks a man, who, from his knowledge of business for the past ten or twenty years has digested the financial situation of St. John's in a way that would do credit to a Finance Minister. I have myself on many occasions during the last ten years looked the financial situation of Newfoundland in the face from exactly the same standpoint as the Hon. member for Bay de Verde. I have realized our unchangeable overhead, the irreducible minimum of public expenditure covered by interest, the almost unreducible public charities, by our absolutely unreducible old age pensions, by our absolutely unreducible educational grants, the absolutely unreducible and ever increasing grant to soldiers, sailors and pensions funds, recognized that the margin of which any Government has control, which they might call control, manipulatable or adjustable margin, is extremely small. I think Mr. Puddester fairly, frankly and manly put his finger right on the spot of the financial situation when he pointed out that while heretofore a Minister because of special economy might save \$1,000 or \$10,000 or a group of ministers might save \$100,000 or \$200,000 these sums, while

large to the average man on the street, in the home, schooner or office in St. John's, are insignificant when dealing with reducing the public service of Newfoundland which means an overhead of eleven to twelve millions; and the financial minds of the country, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition being one of them, have to think in terms of larger magnitude. Not the reduction of a salary here and there, a dismissal or charge here or there, curtailing the main vote here and there and not look so much to the policy of chopping off a man's head to save a ten dollars bill; but to work for renewed and increased industrial development, agricultural worth, timber worth, mineral worth, water power worth, so that by development we may keep pace and live, rather than by reduction.

I cannot do otherwise than rise in my place and express my appreciation to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and congratulate him on having in his party a man who has so fairly and frankly and without partisanship in a sound good business manner, laid before us the actual situation as it is.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words used by the Hon. Leader of the Government with reference to the Hon. member for the district of Bay de Verde.

I am aware of my limited knowledge and until now lack of opportunity to study the financial position of this country to-day. The greater part of our expenditure has reached a stage where there is little hope for further reduction, consequently, there is a very small amount that we can hope to save, and, as my friend on my right has just said, there are three departments in which we must not attempt to make any saving. I think it is an axiom of statesmanship that the health of the people shall be first

guarded and after that comes education, and I think that whatever we may try to save, we cannot touch the votes for health or education.

As far as Posts and Telegraphs Department is concerned, I believe it would be possible by the installation of a telephone system throughout the Colony to save money there. Of course I am open to correction, but I understand that the Monroe Administration went into the matter thoroughly. The Hon Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has undoubtedly studied the report very carefully, and perhaps there may be a chance, not this year but next year, to effect some saving there.

Now if we cannot save any money so far as expenditure is concerned and we are going into debt year by year, the only alternative, if we are going to keep out of debt, is to increase the earning power of the people, because if we can create a greater production that means greater earning power and and if we can create greater earning power that means increased spending power and that spending power automatically redounds to the finance of the country.

I did not intend to say much but as the Hon. Leader of the Government was so kind as to express his appreciation of the straightforward, manly and instructive speech of the gentleman on my right, I felt that I had to get up and say something.

Later, when perhaps I have learned something more of the accounts and different methods of criticism I will be able to say something then.

MR. PUDDESTER—I notice that there is an Assistant to the First Clerk down for \$1200. What is the explanation of that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That is a young man named O'Brien who was taken from the Government Railway Office. Ever since the death of Mr. Donnelly the of-

ficials in the Auditor General's Office had been working short-handed, so we put this young man with the idea of his working up, and we are paying him \$1200 per year.

MR. PUDDESTER—What is the explanation of this Vote of \$10,000 for the High Commissioner's Office in London?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The Government hopes to devise a means whereby \$10,000 will cover it. I feel that the whole thing should be wiped out, whether it is High Commissioner or Trade Commissioner's Office It's a joke; it certainly has been a joke in the past.

MR. EMERSON—If you are going to have a Trade Commissioner, how are you going to have it run any cheaper?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—By establishing a Trade Commissioner it is possible to get some business man in London to look after our affairs and who would not want a huge salary. I know personally that there are business people in London who would be prepared to take on the job for a couple of thousand dollars a year, even without any extra office staff.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Would not that be a dangerous precedent to set?

MR. PUDDESTER—What is the policy of the Government so far in this matter and have you decided who is going to be the Trade Commissioner?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—No, there is nobody decided on, we are just taking this vote for \$10,000 to cover the expenses of that office.

MR. PUDDESTER—What are the duties of the clerks in that office?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—General office routine work of the Department.

MR. PUDDISTER—At all events I am not sure if a business man in England is the right and proper person to be a Trade Commissioner and to look after our affairs. Now, Mr. Chairman, while on the vote for this Department I would like to know the idea for dispensing with the services of Whitehead Morris & Company, London, who were doing the printing and stationery work for the Government of Newfoundland. I think that was a little bit sharp. The firm of Whitehead Morris & Company did good work for us and during the war were most untiring in their efforts in looking after our men, and I do not think it was the right and proper thing to do to hand the work over to somebody else, without even asking Whitehead Morris & Company to tender for the work they had been doing for the past fifty years. Whitehead Morris & Company have Newfoundlanders employed at their works and are only too glad at all times to give Newfoundlanders the preference and to do everything they can do for us.

There is another matter that I would like to draw the particular attention of Ministers of the Crown to. We import a considerable amount of printing and stationery from Copeland Chatterson & Company, Toronto. I could not very well advocate heretofore what I am going to advocate now, as some people would have said that I had an axe to grind; but I have none now. The different Departments of the Government have no right to be doing what they have been doing, namely, importing printing and stationery in such large quantities from Whitehead Morris & Company and from Copeland Chatterson & Company, of Toronto, when they can get it supplied in Newfoundland. To this especially I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. His Department during

the past number of years has been importing stationery from the firm of Copeland Chatterson & Company. Large orders of printed envelopes have been filled by Copeland Chatterson & Company when young printers in local offices can do that work equally as well in style and finish as the Toronto firm. Therefore, I would ask the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to find out for our information how much his Department paid during the past five years for stationery imported and I trust he will put a stop to it. When the agent for the Copeland Chatterson Company comes here in the Spring of the year he unloads a lot of stationery when he should not be allowed to do so, and it is the Deputy heads and other officials of Departments who give him this opportunity. It is true that we cannot do the embossing work in Newfoundland, but I claim that it is only in special cases that this embossed printing is required and used. I have no fault to find with Ministers of the Crown using embossed stationery on special occasions; but when they are writing around Newfoundland I submit that ordinary printed letter heads and envelopes—work done in Newfoundland—is good enough, and I think that the imported product, if not cut out entirely, should be cut down and the work given to Newfoundland printers, particularly in view of the fact that we have lots of printers walking around our streets at the present time.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the member for Bay de Verde, in relation to this contract for stationery. I think it is really a shame the way Whitehead Morris & Company were treated and to my mind the Government acted in a manner that was entirely unjust towards this firm. When I asked the

question about the change in awarding this contract for stationery I can assure Hon. members that I had—nor have I now—any more personal interest in the matter than the child unborn because I know nothing about the buying of stationery and I do not know enough about the different prices. I understand from answers here that there was some saving effected this year from the buying of stamps. This I do not know; but from the answer to my question furnished by the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the firm of Whitehead Morris & Company, who had been doing the work for the Newfoundland Government for over fifty years were not given a chance to quote prices. It states in the answer to my question that the firm of John Dickenson & Son, of London, a very reputable concern, gave prices which would save money to the country; but we do not know, nor have we any means of knowing, whether or not the firm of John Dickenson & Son were asked to quote prices on products of a similar character that the firm of Whitehead Morris & Company supplied in the past. I certainly think, however, that it was very discourteous on the part of the Government not to give such a reputable firm as Whitehead Morris & Company an opportunity of quoting prices, particularly, a firm the principal member of which as the Hon. Minister of Finance knows, did such noble, meritorious and patriotic work for our men in London during the war—work that was unequalled in Newfoundland. Mr. Morris attended meetings, gave of his time and money, visited the hospitals and helped the wounded and the sick, and then after doing that to be treated so ungratefully is, Sir, a serious blot on our escutcheon. Particularly serious a matter associated with that act is the fact that the agent for John Dickenson & Son in this country is the King's print-

er, who, if not financially associated with the Hon. member for Fortune Bay, is a very close personal associate of his, and the answer I got from the Hon. the Colonial Secretary shows that this contract was awarded on Dr. Mosdell's recommendation.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—I hope the Hon. member is not insinuating that I am financially interested, directly or indirectly, with the King's Printer or with the firm the King's Printer represents. If he is, he is insinuating what is incorrect.

MR. EMERSON—I was pointing out the fact that a very close and intimate associate of the Hon. member is the agent for John Dickenson & Son in this country and the Hon. member is either the Chairman or the principle member of the patronage committee of this House and it was on his instructions that they were handed over the supplying in connection with the public offices. The inference is so natural that it does not call for any comment on my part. While I am dealing with this matter and particularly in view of the public service that has been rendered by Mr. Morris I want to refer to another matter. That is the closing down of Sudbury. I presume that we will get a statement from the Hon. member as to why this was done. I look upon it as a scandal. I am not familiar with the details but there can be no question about it but that Toc H and those who subscribed to the funds were doing a very great public service, in giving of their time to this work. The sad part of it is this that practically every effort to give public service is being blocked and the result is that to-day if any member of Toc H were asked to subscribe to the funds for a public or charitable purpose or give their time to them, they would be the first to say and with considerable justice "what is the use of doing it." I

may say before I sit down that I join in with Hon. Mr. Alderdice and Mr. Puddester in congratulating the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs upon the statement that he has put before us and the fact that he has disclosed what has been described as a grave situation is not his fault. He simply did the best he could with the matter at his disposal. Probably in the course of going through the estimates, criticism of the individual votes will be made, but I think that he has acted in a straightforward manner in his presentation of the affairs of the country, and I only hope that the wish that he expressed yesterday, that he would be able to balance his Budget next year will be even partially realised. I do not expect that he will succeed, but he has the good wishes of the Opposition in carrying out his arduous duties.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the House but I think it would be nothing less than ingratitude if I did not express my feelings on the question of the printing being taken away from Mr. E. R. Morris's firm in London. I was one of the many men who received his kindness and I want to take this opportunity of saying how sorry I am that the Government saw fit to take this step. I am sure that the Minister of Finance will agree with me that no man who had the ill luck, or perhaps the luck, to be in hospital for treatment and who received frequently splendid assistance and encouragement from Mr. Morris will subscribe to this treatment of Mr. Morris's firm. He was more of a Newfoundlander than most Newfoundlanders in England could be. And not only do I speak appreciatively of what he did for the men in hospital, but he went further. He was really the best of a friend in every particular; in the way that he looked after many young men who were young

when they entered hospital and inexperienced and knew nothing of city life and city dangers outside of their knowledge of St. John's. Those of us who had charge of the boys know what he did. And it is only on behalf of the many men who would like to show their appreciation of his kindness, but who have not the honor that I have, to be able to stand up in this House and say so, that as one of them, I want to say that I am sorry and I think it was an ill-advised movement not to give the firm of Mr. Morris at least the opportunity of competing with other firms, after his fifty years doing business with Newfoundland.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as being entirely in accord with the remarks made by Mr. Emerson, Mr. Puddester and Mr. Byrne. For quite a while I was in close touch with Mr. Morris and I know what he did. He neglected his business to an enormous extent to look after the interests of Newfoundlanders. Day after day he was spending his own money in very considerable sums bringing presents and things to the boys in the hospitals there. And he did not do it because of any ulterior motive, but because he liked Newfoundlanders and they liked him. He did not expect that he would get anything out of it, or that he would get an honour for it as I do not even suppose that the King even knew that he was doing it. He certainly assisted the Newfoundland regiment. And when the Government took away this from his firm, I think they did more harm than good. They have slapped him in the face for the great work that he did for our men when they were over there.

Before I take my seat I would like to refer just for a brief moment to the disestablishment of the High Commissioner's Office. And I would like in relation thereto to take exception to the

remark made by the Hon. Mr. Lewis. And when I spoke the other day on this subject I was taking exception to the fact that the High Commissioner's Office was abolished. If the idea in the establishment of a Trade Commissioner was to save money, then it could do some good. But the exception that I took was the way in which the High Commissioner was thrown out of it. In fact the first intimation that he had that he was no longer Commissioner was when he saw it in the newspaper at breakfast. I think that he had to wire back here to find out if it was true or not. Is that something that you are going to take sitting down? Is that something that you cannot get mad about. The Hon. Mr. Lewis said that the fishermen were tired of feeding Sir John Bennett. The fishermen fed him for a long time then. For thirty years he was in politics and he was only defeated once, and then because he went to a new district. They returned him because he looked after his constituents. And if he came back tomorrow, and stood, he would be elected to any district that he represented. A nice remark to make. When Mr. Lewis has a record like his then it is time enough for him to stand up and squeal. And I must sit here and listen to that. As Mr. Cashin once said his blood was boiling. He must understand then how boiling mine is now. Mr. Cashin struck to defend his own. I am sure that is why he did it. He left the Monroe Government because of his own father. I do not blame him.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The Hon. member is making a statement that he has no right to make. I did not leave on account of that. I left on a point of principle. I would like to have the Hon. member understand that. I do not mind the Hon. gentleman make a statement but he must make it cor-

rect as far as I am concerned. I ask therefore the Hon. member to withdraw that statement.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I made that statement to qualify myself and if it is incorrect of course I withdraw it. But with regard to Mr. Lewis, if he can sit there for the first time in the House and make a statement that he did about a man, whose political record he cannot equal and never will. All I say is that he has a political swelled head. When he made the statement himself he was not called to order, but I am not allowed to say anything at all. Because I say what is not acceptable to him I have to retract it, but he is allowed to say anything at all. He was referring to my father. I was referring to himself personally. I am only trying to defend my own in the House. There is nothing ill-bred about that is there? There does not seem to be any encouragement for a man to go into politics at all. I went into the fray and fought a clean fight, and when I came back I found election petitions filed against me. What for? But I only stood up here to justify myself some of the remarks that I made and also to make a criticism of some members of the Government who thought fit in my absence to stand up here and make dirty, slimy remarks that would not be made to me on the street.

I do not think it is even necessary to have a Trade Commissioner over there. That is somewhere you could save. Try and save it for a year and see how you get on. The few remarks I made only brought innuendoes and slurs from the Government side of the House. When I rose to my feet and made them, I couldn't help but do otherwise.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, there is a particular matter in connection with which I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the

previous speaker. Those of us who had the opportunity of being members of the Newfoundland Regiment and who were unfortunate enough to be incapacitated and were fortunate enough to be looked after at the 3rd London General Hospital at Wandsworth have many reasons to be thankful to Mr. E. R. Morris, of the firm of Whitehead Morris & Company; and I feel that whatever remuneration Mr. Morris might have got through the agency, the amount he earned would not compare with the money he spent for patriotic purposes helping soldiers of the Newfoundland Regiment and other Regiments of the Empire, (particularly the Newfoundland Regiment) in that hospital. Miles and miles of beds were traversed by him and his associates in the interest of our boys; and I am very sorry to notice that the Government saw fit to take away this agency from Mr. Morris. If the Government did not know the circumstances, I consider they are not to blame, but I consider, if they did, this action can only be characterized as very rude treatment of a friend of Newfoundland.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in connection with this matter also. I happened to be in London when the telegram came to Mr. Piggott, the Deputy Head of the Department to demand that all dies be taken from Whitehead Morris & Co., and handed to another firm, and there was consternation, among the friends of Newfoundland in London, Mr. Morris was one of the best known and most popular figures. Wherever Newfoundland was concerned, every meeting or committee, you would always find him present taking an active part and interest. The replies given by the Colonial Secretary in connection with the questions asked by the Hon. member for Placentia East were perhaps

unconsciously misleading, because there were certain charges on the bill which would not be charged on an ordinary bill. There is a comparison of the cost of the dies and stamps alone, I think it is not too late yet. I do not believe that Whitehead Morris & Co. would be as concerned because of the value of the order, or its intrinsic worth, as because of the fact that they have for over fifty years been dealing with Newfoundland, and that this should be discontinued by a peremptory demand, and I feel that the department purchasing these supplies for the Government should reconsider that, and still continue to give some part of the orders to this firm, so that they may retain some connection with us.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there are a certain number of payments of pensions for mail couriers. I would like to ask the Minister if there is any difference in the way mail couriers are treated. Are all mail couriers engaged on contract or are they salaried men?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I think 95 per cent of the mail couriers are working under contract and any votes you see here for pensions for mail couriers are being voted by the request of the representative of the district who has had push, power, or influence enough to influence the Executive Government to grant a pension.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might be permitted to make a short explanation. The mail couriers in this country are a lot of very poorly paid men and their services are not all properly compensated. Now take the case of a mail courier under contract going on year by year until he comes to the age of sixty or seventy, according to the strict letter of the law that poor man should be thrown out and not given anything, whereas

a man working under salary from the Government gets a pension. Recommendations have been made from the House and not the Executive Government, and I know of a number of cases during the past three or four years where the question of the services and the fairness of granting a pension to different mail couriers has come up, and the Government and Opposition have voted to give a small pension to these men to live on because they did not have enough when carrying mail to live on and provide for their old age. So those pensions you see there are pensions voted unanimously by this House. It not that right?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That is right.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this vote of pensions, we are able to vote in the vicinity of \$100,000 for civil servants pensions and only \$140,000 for old age pensions. Does not this tend to show that our system in connection with the distribution of charity or the provision for dependent people whom it is the duty of the Government to provide for is not as good as it should be. We do not break away from old inadequate methods carried on for years and years. The old age pension administration is inadequate to meet requirements as it is at present.

Take the case of two old men living side by side, one gets the pension and the other doesn't. One has to die before the other poor unfortunate gets his, now this is not fair, we are not in step with the times. I think that the Government should provide some due recognition to these old men. I do not intend to go into the question now as I intend to go into it later when I have some important points to raise but I don't see why if a civil servant can get the pension why can not the poor old man with absolutely no means of support get it.

MR. PUDDISTER—The reason for that sir, is I think that there are many old people on the lists at the Department of Finance and members go down and ask the Minister to put on men who have not yet reached the age of 75 years. We made a survey a few years ago and found that \$120,000 would give \$50 a year to every man over seventy five years of age in the country, this amount is going to fall short of the required sum because the Monroe Government added, widows of 65 years and over and also added \$20,000 to the vote. I think that was a good step, when the husband died the widow had no means of support unless she got the paupers dole which which amounts to \$24 a year. I advise the Minister of Finance to increase the vote or there will be a shortage, this amount is not capable of looking after the old men and old woman to. Three or four years ago it was a common thing for members to go down and get the pensions for persons who were not seventy five years of age, I know there were men in my district who were getting it and who should not be getting it. And again it is meant for men who have no means of support, I knew men who were getting the pension and who had nice fat bank accounts, this is not right, it should be the men who need the bare necessities to keep them alive that should get it. This trouble was started by members going down to the Minister of Finance and Customs and getting on men who were not seventy five years of age.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would plead guilty in having recommended men for the Old Age Pension who were not seventy five years of age, but in each case I did so on the recommendation of a Medical Doctor, pointing out that the man was physically unable to earn a living and rather than be an object of

charity, sweet charity, I recommended him for the pension. This applies to men of seventy two or seventy three years of age in my district, but in no case did I recommend an able bodied man for the pension. To cite my own experience there are circumstances to which a member cannot close his eyes and when Sir John Crosbie placed a man on the list who was not seventy five years of age it was done on the recommendation of a Medical Doctor.

MR. QUINTON—This raises another important question, if the man is not seventy five and the extenuating circumstances are such that he should get the pension before he is seventy five, why not amend the law so that this would be the only channel through which he may receive help from the state. If the machinery by which the stress is relieved is inefficient, it needs speedy change, why not bring in machinery that will effect these changes in a proper and business like manner.

MR. PUDDESTER—In connection with the vote for the debates of the House I would like to know why the Hansard was published from 1910 to 1927 and then was not published last year. This is a valuable record to the House. I hope that if the Internal Economy Commission cut it out last year for reasons of economy that the new commission will reconsider publishing it, because if any question arises the stuff from the reporters can be brought in and we can see just what was said. In the long sessions of it 1926 and 1927 cost a lot of money but if the Internal Economy Commission thought that a saving could be effected in not printing the hansard I don't see why they should print it from 1910 to 1927 and then drop it. I ask the Internal Economy Commission to print the Hansard of last year and also that of this year. I know that

while the House is in session everybody tries to cut down expenses but after the House has closed all kinds of votes go through.

(On the request of Mr. Puddester the typescript Hansard of 1928 was presented.)

This is different from what I thought it was. It is very much better than I thought. The last time I saw it, it was typewritten and was three times as big as you see it now. It is still typewritten, of course, and may be all right, but it should be indexed. It is very hard to find anything here without an index. It has been newly bound into three volumes. The last time I saw it, it was all in one.

I think it should be printed.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I well remember debates that have taken place in this House in former days on the very point that the Hon. member is just referring to now, and I take the position now that I took when I was on the other side and that is in absolute agreement with what he says. My argument is that the Hansard should be printed. I am only giving my personal opinion and am not seeking to impose it on the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House or the members. I think it should be printed and should remain here and go on year by year as a record just as well as a verbatim report of the debates for reference. As it is now there is no verbatim report in any of the newspapers, so that chances are in six or eight years if it is necessary to quote from an article or debate it will be impossible to find it. I believe last year's reports should be printed. It is just as well to have it part of the record that is available at any time. These are my views personally and I am only reiterating the position that I took myself when I was on that side of the House when this question was up for discussion.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, if the Internal Economy Commission in their wisdom decide to have the debates for this year printed, I think it would be just as well to have last year's printed also because it would be a pity to spoil the continuity of Hansard.

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 and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9, George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13, George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same 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 of the House the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and of 8-9, George V., Chapter 32, and of 12-13, George V., Chapter 21, relating to Stamp Duties" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered 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 and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 same 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 to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and 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 second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House. Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows:

**HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE
AND CUSTOMS.**

HON. MR. BRADLEY.

MR. EMERSON.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 8th, 1929.

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

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of West Bay in the District of Port-au-Port asking that a sum of money be allocated for the purpose of building a public wharf there. As I mentioned here a few days ago, we haven't a harbor in the whole district, and, as West Bay is a very central place, the erection of a public wharf there would be very beneficial to the district as a whole.

I give the petition my heartiest support, and ask that it receives the sympathetic and earnest consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the laboring men of Carbonear who are now suffering among the unemployed in Conception Bay where I am sorry to say there are several hundred men out of work, through no fault of their own. These men have nothing left from their earnings of last fall, and as the majority of them are men of families it is absolutely necessary that work of some sort be started at once to relieve their present circum-

stances. The petitioners suggest to the Government the advisability of considering the improvement of the water service at Carbonear

During the fire recently that wrought such havoc at Carbonear the water service proved very inadequate, although people could have suffered a great deal more than they did. Therefore, I hope the work of improving the service or some other work will begin at once in order to relieve the present unemployment situation that exists at Carbonear. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the following Bills sent up, entitled respectively "An Act to Amend 12, George V., Chapter 13, entitled 'An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs,'" without amendment.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

MR. PUDDESTER—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table all correspondence and telegrams between his Department and Thomas J. Hickey, Secretary of the Miners' and Workman's Committee, between March and October, 1928.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member for Bay de Verde, I beg to table copy of the correspondence asked for.

MR. PUDDESTER—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary:

- (a) Under what contract or agreement is Besco working since January 1st 1929.
- (b) Is it the intention of the Government to make Besco carry out the 1921 contract or is the contract abrogated.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon member, I may state that the Government has made no new operation agreement with the Besco company for 1929 but was holding them to the terms of their 1921 contract.

MR. QUINTON—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary on behalf of the Railway Commission to table the following information:

- (1) Who were the captains and officers of the different Coastal Boats during the season of 1928-29?
- (2) Have any changes been made for 1929-30?
- (3) Give details of such changes, if any, and reasons for replacements?
- (4) Who is now Shipshusband, and what are his duties and salary received?
- (5) Did he receive his salary when on a recent voyage to the icefields?
- (6) How many spare captains or Assistant Shipshusbands are now in the employ, and at what salaries?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in tabling the information asked for by the Hon. member for Bonavista South.

List of captain and officers of the different Coastal Boats for 1928 and the changes for 1929, as follows:—

Captain W.B. Kean transferred from Prospero to Portia.

Captain Jacob Kean transferred from Home to Prospero.

Captain Norman retired on account of age.

Captain Blackmore retired at the end of last season on account of illness.

Captain Bishop appointed command S.S. Malakoff.

Mate Gullage promoted to command Sagona in place of Captain Norman.

Chief officer Dyke transferred from Prospero to Meigle.

Acting Captain Hounsell transferred from Argyle to command Home.

Second officer John Carter transferred from Prospero to Meigle.

Captain Connors retired from Portia to be given special work on shore.

Acting Captain Percy Knee to go Chief Officer S.S. Clyde.

Captain Dalton in charge of Steamship Department as regards captains and general upkeep of steamers. Salary \$220.00 per month.

Captain Dalton received his salary while at the icefields in March last.

One spare captain, Captain Connors. Salary \$175.00. No assistant Shipshusband but John Pollock, Chief of Marine Engineers, salary \$100 per month, acts as Superintendent in the absence of Captain Dalton.

MR. EMERSON—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table on behalf of the Railway Commission the following information:

- (1) Have the Coal Contracts for 1929-30 yet been awarded
- (2) If so, table details of the awards?
- (3) How many tenders were received?
- (4) Table copy of all tenders?
- (5) Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the information asked for by the Hon. member for Placentia East.

Contracts have been awarded to the British Empire Steel Corporation, W. H. Hynes and Cashin & Co. in equal

proportions. There were eight tenders, but the lowest was not accepted "as some doubt about quality being satisfactory for general purposes railway and steamers existed." Tenders were received from:

C. G. Blake & Co., New York, \$5.72 to \$6.15, according to quality.

Maris Export Trading Co. of Great Britain \$5.42.

Tessier & Co., \$5.52 to \$5.88.

Donaldson Bros., Glasgow, \$6.12 to \$6.60.

Evans & Reid Coal Co., \$5.15 to \$5.25.

British Empire Coal Co., \$5.45.

W. H. Hynes, \$5.85.

Cashin & Co., \$5.20 to \$5.60.

MR. PUDESTER—To ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to table a statement showing in detail all amounts paid by his Department as overtime to the Deputy Minister, Financial Controller, Post Master, Superintendent Telegraphs and other Superintendents of Departments from January 1st, 1928 to April 30th, 1929.

The Hon. Minister of Posts tabled the information asked for, showing overtime paid to officials of his department from January 1st 1928 to April 30th, 1929, as follows:—

J. G. Hodder, Deputy Minister	\$175.00
W. Campbell, asst. Dep. Min.	120.00
P. Moore, Registration Branch	213.00
Joseph G. Kielly, Parcel Post Branch	214.80

These were the only officials who were considered in the matter of overtime.

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

Finance Department.....\$4,471,694.55.

The said Resolution was read a second time and it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that there is no possibility of handling the Department of Prime Minister and doing anything at all with a staff of less than four people. With respect to Mr. Carew's salary, the man is worth five thousand, and if he were secretary of a corporation outside Newfoundland he would receive three times that.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with that.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there are five changes in the department of the Colonial Secretary. Would the Minister please explain the changes?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. member I may say that under the head of salaries there is a total increase of \$884.00 which is accounted for in this way: \$400.00 for the second clerk and accountant who has been in the department for eleven years, and is efficient and obliging as indeed are all the officials of that department. He was passed over by the late Government for some unknown reason. \$100 is given to the stenographer and the clerk who has been in the office for twelve years, and \$100 each to the two typists. \$100 to the telephone and office assistant who has been there for nine years, making a total increase of \$884, put down under the head of special permanent contingencies. At the same time there is a net decrease of \$600 making the net increase in the department of \$284.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by Mr. Sullivan who is not present to-day, to ask the Colonial Secretary why Mr. Crocker was appointed Relieving Officer at Swift Current taking the place of another man, whose name I forget, in his district, in view of the fact that Mr. Wareham who is a very good Relieving Officer is I understand very near, comparatively near, at Harbor Buffett.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Swift Current as perhaps the Hon. member is aware is at the very bottom of Placentia Bay, and discussing the matter with Mr. Sullivan a few weeks since he thought it would be quite the right thing to do to have a man down there for that section, and that a certain portion of the territory now looked after by Mr. Wareham at Harbour Buffett might be assigned by him, and that is what has been done

MR. EMERSON—Since the three man districts have been divided up I quite understand how we may find cases where relieving officers who were formerly in a district are now out of it, for instance Mr. Wareham is Relieving Officer for a large portion of Placentia East though he is located at Placentia West. I can quite see how that happens under the new distribution, and it will be a little time before matters are adjusted. What I want to point out in connection with this particular Relieving Officer is this. I may say first of all that Mr. Wareham is a very good man, an excellent Relieving Officer, but he is situated on an island some considerable distance from Placentia East which he serves, and it is extremely difficult at times for people from there to communicate with him by boat, and in the winter no boats at all can get there, and because of that, people down there have not been able to get a message to him to get relief and people sick in the winter have not

been able to get his authority to come to town to hospital, for some considerable time, I want to ask the Colonial Secretary to take into consideration therefore the suggestion of appointing somebody on the main land somewhere between Arnold's Cove and Villa Maria.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the House unnecessarily, but while we are on this matter there are one or two things that I want to mention which came under my notice during the recent campaign in the district I represent. I notice under the different votes we have here for Public Charities \$306,361.05, Public Health \$255,763.75, and for Hospitals \$511,385.66, making a total of \$1,073,510.46, which can be termed Public Charities. The step being taken by the Government to try and concentrate on this question is a wise one provided it doesn't become lost in a forest of reports from commissioners and nothing be done about it. It is time to realize just how degrading this name of Public Charities can become and has become in this country. In new settlements and new countries there is and has always been a feeling on the part of the inhabitants that they should help themselves rather than depend on the Government, but as countries grow older and communities become more centralized the feeling grows that the burden may be thrown over on somebody else and incidentally the burden falls on the Government. This country is growing older and its communities are becoming more anxious to be selfish than unselfish. Accordingly the action of the Government is bringing together the different threads in connection with Public Health and Public Charities is one on which they are to be complimented if they can provide a solution for the numerous problems. Yesterday when the question of Old Age Pen-

sions was before the Chair, and the question of Civil Service Pensions, it was stated that certain individuals had been recommended for Old Age Pensions who are not of the age limit and had received pensions, and I said then that there was something wrong with the machinery that was in vogue in order to assist cases of destitution. Having had a great deal of experience in connection with this kind of work in connection with a particular association in this country I feel qualified to make a few remarks on this question of relief to destitute people and on Public Charities in Newfoundland under its various headings.

There are conditions in this country either with which we are not familiar or with which we are familiar and want to forget, which are an absolute disgrace. Just consider that a widow gets about \$28.00 a year to feed and clothe four or five children and try and keep them respectable. I submit that this condition of affairs is not quite good enough. I am not criticising the matter of Public Charities distribution as far as this Government is concerned, but I say that this question all through the years has been neglected, and I think that the Government are to be complimented in making a step forward in an attempt to solve the problem. During the recent election campaign I visited several homes in the District of Bonavista South where the breadwinners in each case were ill with T. B. and had been suffering for a number of years, and there was destitution in every corner of these homes. The children had nothing on their feet and scarcely any clothes on their bodies. The families of these men were half clothed and the men themselves were very discouraged and you could not blame them, and the Relieving Officer gave those families every month a half barrel of flour and a gallon of molasses

and a pound of tea. Whoever was responsible in the first place for the granting of such a diet as that to these invalids and their families could not have a true christian spirit.

Some time ago when the Address in Reply was before the House I mentioned the necessity of having some form of State Insurance inaugurated. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of any State Insurance Plan to discuss such details now and I do not intend to do so, but I feel that as a Legislature we should try and get down to some means of eliminating this word charity and bring about a state of affairs that would be a credit instead of degradation. At dinners and other social functions we sing the patriotic song "Land of Hope and Glory." That brings to our minds an ideal that should be cherished. We should do our part in living up to that ideal. We should work together Government and Opposition and make Newfoundland a country worth living in. I submit that the Departments of Public Charities and Public Health should give full consideration to this matter, and I trust that when the report of the Commission comes in we shall be able to compliment the Government on the result even to a far greater extent than on the commencement of the work.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, in going through the Estimates in a general way, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs a few questions along these lines: When a person dies and another is put in his place does that person go in at the same salary? When a promotion takes place or when a vacancy occurs and the man who comes next gets the smallest and most unremunerative salary, if the junior is taken in, is he given the same salary as was being paid to the former person before the vacancy occurred?

If you take an ordinary business office and take a clerk or typist, as the years go on if they are with you for some time you give them increases in pay but if they leave you or are dismissed and you employ some junior to take their place you do not pay the same salary. I did not find a single case in going through the Estimates, and I spent some time in going through them, where there has been a reduction, except the one that has just been mentioned by the Hon member for Fortune Bay, in the Health Board where they are giving \$600 instead of \$720.

Every day we go on ever and ever and have all the junior staff employed at the highest prices to be paid a junior staff. How can we expect any reductions?

The typists in the Government departments are paid too high when they are first employed. I do not think that there is any question about it. I certainly know that lawyers cannot afford to pay the same salaries. The Government civil service and the banks pay typists too much. I am not talking only of lady typists but men typists too. The competition for these positions is very very keen and I think that you pay too much. We go on ever and ever bringing in juniors at the highest prices paid—should it chance that the person had been there for a number of years—and the Estimates cannot come down in that way but are bound to increase.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, if a man dies and you want to reduce the civil service, the proper policy is not to put anyone in his place. We will never get the civil service reduced if we don't make this a hard and fast rule in departments that are overmanned now.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, might I ask what duties does Dr. Bishop perform?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, as far as I can learn from the Medical Health Officer, under whose department he comes, his duty is to examine all cattle that comes here from countries where there are outbreaks of various diseases peculiar to animals and generally to make sure that none of the animals imported are infected with these diseases, and if so, to have them destroyed. Animals that show signs of tuberculosis and various other diseases are surveyed by him and disposed of.

MR. EMERSON—Does he carry on his practice as well?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—I don't know if he does or not.

MR. PUDDISTER—Where is Mr. Bartlett?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—There have been some changes in the Department of Public Charities and Board of Health. As a new means of carrying on the administration to the hospitals and meeting of all patients that come to town to go to the hospital instead of picking up a casual driver now we have Mr. James Stamp retained under a contract. As the House knows, he has very long experience in that sort of work. He meets the trains on instructions and conveys the patients to hospitals that are designated and the various institutions. In the meantime we felt that we had very great need for a general inspector to survey the various institutions in the city, boarding houses above all, and see that patients were not "misled," as on previous occasions, to see that they did not stay around the hospitals too long; similarly to view the accommodation in the hospitals and see the patients, that vacant beds were filled, and when beds vacated to have the Board notified and get new patients in. This is being done at present by Mr. Bartlett and it is a much more important position than he occupied before, as I think, only hos-

pital admission clerk. Mr. Hogan, the second hospital clerk, is now down here as Assistant Inspector. These two gentlemen co-operate in connection with the duties outlined and have done very important work from the standpoint of the Public Health Department. More so, now because we use Mr. Bartlett a great deal around the nearby outports.

MR. EMERSON—What is that vote for the Grace Maternity Hospital for training nurses?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—The Grace Hospital is the only maternity hospital in the City. For a time the nurses in the General Hospital got no training in maternity work and their diplomas were not recognized outside of Newfoundland. Now, by arrangement, they go to the Grace Hospital and complete their work and this vote pays for their training and keep. Out of the same vote midwives are also taken care of and trained as well.

MR. EMERSON—Why should it be necessary to pay for their training when we provide the nurses? As I understand it we bring in people from outside to work there and receive their training. Why should the Government have to pay for their training and keep?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Government service is being rendered. The training is necessary.

MR. EMERSON—Professional nurses find it necessary to go up there to get their midwifery training and they go to the Grace Maternity Home rather than go away. Why does the Government have to pay to keep them there?

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Hon. member that we pay nurses while they are actually in training at the General Hospital. Therefore, the Hon. member might raise the same objection to that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when these nurses are at the General Hospital they are being fed and boarded at Government expense; when they are no longer situate at the General Hospital but are at the Grace Maternity Hospital for part of their training certainly the vote in this connection would apply up there.

They are not at the General Hospital but up there. If they were at the General they would be paid for and since they are transferred up there the corresponding fund is paid the Grace Hospital.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. the Prime Minister for his explanation but I was aware of that before.

If you send your daughter up to the United States or Canada to be trained you are going to expect that she will be paid by the hospital during the training period—not by the Government. Her keep is paid by the hospital. Now what is the difference between sending nurses up to the Maternity Hospital and sending them to some hospital in the States or Canada? In fact sending them to the Grace Maternity Hospital now is of value to the Maternity Hospital rather than giving them expense, because they have had a training at the General Hospital in ordinary work. I do not see the necessity. You say the Government pays them down there. So does every hospital pay. I do not question the Government paying but I do not see the necessity of paying the Grace Maternity Home when they get the advantage of the girls going up there to help them.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, this particular expenditure of \$3,000.00 has been in the Estimates for four or five years and was originally placed there on the recommendation of the Board of Governors of the

General Hospital, who made the arrangement. The Public Health Department was made responsible for payment of the whole vote.

One of the members of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital has a seat in this House, and I am sure that he would be glad to defend this arrangement. I think he feels that if a lot of girls who would not ordinarily have the opportunity of getting this beneficial training, can through this vote get a course in midwifery which would help them along with their nursing courses and become full-fledged professionals, the money is well spent.

Now only a small portion of that \$3,000.00 goes to the payments for nurses and general keep. The larger portion goes towards training outport nurses and midwives who go back to the various districts very much better equipped and more capable of performing their work than they were before they came here for such training. I don't think the Hon. member for Placentia East is really serious when he quibbles over this vote.

MR. EMERSON—I cannot quibble with the Hon member over a vote that was put in the Estimates several years before on the recommendation of the Board, and I agree that for the outport women themselves it is a very good thing but it is an entirely different matter to be training nurses at the Government expense.

MR. EMERSON—Would the Hon. Attorney General explain what the position is with regard to the appointment of a Deputy Minister of his Department? He knows that the position of a permanent head has been vacant for a long time, and I know that he could not have any better man to perform the services he is getting from Mr. Dunfield, who is Acting Deputy, but I think the House should know

what the prospects are with regard to Mr. Dunfield being definitely appointed for the job. I take it that he is not performing his present duties for the salary set down in the Estimates.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the position is that in the past the salary voted for a Deputy Minister of Justice, as it is voted today, is \$3600. In the past there have been incidentals come in and there will be incidentals continue to come in, such as preparing Crown cases for the Supreme Court, approximating \$2500. It seems that in order to get a real capable lawyer to do this work you would have to vote him a salary of about \$10,000 a year, as it is absolutely impossible to secure a capable lawyer for that job at a set salary of \$4,000 or even \$5,000 a year. In the meantime we are carrying on with Mr. Dunfield as Acting Deputy Minister of Justice in so far as there is such a thing as Deputy Minister, and he draws the salary that is voted for a Deputy, but that does not preclude him from attending to his own duties as a general practitioner; it only precludes him in Crown prosecution cases or in any matter that the Government is involved. To get the matter straightened out the whole thing will need to be gone into thoroughly. I may say that Mr. Dunfield is a good draftsman, is accurate in his work, is proficient in his knowledge of law and he has that natural rigidity of a prosecuting Attorney. I imagine he is one of the best we could get for the job.

MR. PUDDESTER—Does his work include any legislation for this House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In some cases, yes, and in some cases, no.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I can quite sympathize with the position outlined by the Hon. Attorney General and I can assure the House that it is

absolutely impossible to get anybody with the ability Mr. Dunfield has to take the position of Deputy Minister of Justice for the salary set out in the Estimates, and the reason I asked the question a moment ago is that I think provision should be made in the Estimates for the engaging of the type of man that the Attorney General requires as his Deputy. There is nobody to-day with the ability to perform that work properly who would care to take on the job for the present voted salary; and it is not a matter of legal ability that a man must possess for that position, but he must have experience in the business life of the country also, so that it would be impossible for the Government to secure a man to take that position with the ability and experience Mr. Dunfield has at a figure like the one I have just quoted. I, therefore, hope that an alteration will be made in the Estimates, and a salary for a Deputy Minister made sufficiently large to induce some efficient lawyer to take the position. Now, whilst it is impossible to get a capable and experienced lawyer for the post at the salary voted, it is equally impossible for a man to occupy the dual position of advisor to the Crown and be a general practitioner as well, and so I trust that before the Estimates go through the Attorney General will have this vacancy filled by a man of ripe experience and ability.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the suggestion made by my colleague, the member for Placentia East, and would strongly urge that an adequate salary be provided in the Estimates for a permanent Head of the Department of Justice. The reason, as has already been pointed out, why this position has not been filled is that it is impossible to get a capable and proficient lawyer for the salary voted to-day. At present Mr. Dunfield, who is Acting Deputy Minis-

ter, spends part of his time in his own office and part of his time in the Government Department. I hope that this matter will receive the serious consideration of the Attorney General with a view to having an able and experienced man fill the office of Deputy Minister and receive a salary that the importance of the work of that office merits, as the present voted salary is altogether unsatisfactory.

MARINE AND FISHERIES VOTE

MR. PUDDISTER—Does the Minister intend in pursue the same policy with regard to the packing of herring?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I might say we are making the same rigid inspection of all classes of fish with the exception of codfish. Some years ago under the old regulations codfish could be inspected but the whole thing was cancelled. At the present time we have strict inspection of herring, lobster, turbot, halibut, and now we are asked for inspection of squid. That is one vote that will have to be increased to give with full satisfaction the inspection required according as the work increases. At the same time very good work has been done we have been complimented on the inspection and I myself believe in inspection and I think we shall have good results from what is being done and has been done. We have a fine class of inspectors, but if we are going to carry on and inspect salmon, herring, turbot, halibut and perhaps codfish as rigidly and properly as we should we shall have to get an increased amount for that inspection.

MR. PUDDISTER—When I got up to speak about this matter I treated it as a kind of a joke but I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this vote of \$15,000.00. \$400.00 is my proportion and will not do anything, it can't do anything to cope with the needs of the

fishermen of my district. If there is only such a vote every year for the fisheries we are going to have slush funds and I say that rather than have these slush funds it is better to vote larger amounts.

MR. PUDESTER—Is the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines going to take into consideration a fund for the protection of potatoes?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—During the next session, we propose to introduce an Act for the purpose of standardizing and penalizing those who undertake to deliver potatoes, the quality of which is contrary to the contract made. Very often such is done and I have heard some disgraceful instances of the violation of contracts. Men have made some sales this year—and it has been proved to my satisfaction—that this condition existed, when they opened the bag the first few layers were good and below the potatoes were the very worst. That sort of thing has prevented the large sales that we hoped to make.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I might say from that standpoint there is absolutely no difficulty whatever in selling the potatoes that come in from Prince Edward Island. The pity is that you find the man who purchases our local potatoes does not know what he is buying, as it seems he might get good potatoes or he might get poor ones. When he buys P.E.I. potatoes he usually knows what he is getting.

Farmers in Newfoundland that raised the standard of their stuff have got excellent prices and have got all their goods on the market in the ordinary course.

The trouble is that our stock is not standardized and in this way it is difficult to compete when there is now a definite guaranty on the Canadian produce.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I had something similar to that in my own experience only yesterday.

I am very fond of a certain product that is canned in the northern section of the country and for lunch I had a tin of canned dandelion. When we opened the tin of dandelion the first thing we pulled out was a long string of rope yarn.

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.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries second reading of Bill to Amend "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding" was deferred until to-morrow.

Mr. Byrne 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.

THURSDAY, May 9th, 1929.

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

MR. STRONG—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Coachmans Cove for \$100.00 for a public wharf. I trust that

this matter will receive the consideration that it merits and I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

I also ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Lock's Cove asking for the extension of the telephone in that vicinity. This place is the distributing centre for the messages from the various places around and I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Public Enquires Act.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Highroads Commission Act.

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

Department of Agriculture and Mines	\$117,300.66
Department of Marine and Fisheries	431,165.89
Department of Education ..	986,965.03
Department of Justice	380,195.00
Department of Public Charities	306,361.05
Department of Public Health	255,763.75
Department of Colonial Secretary	132,033.00

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 Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is a matter I want to bring to the attention of the Government before we go into the votes for the Department of Public Works. I trust to the fairness of the Government that they will do the right thing in connection with grants for public works. The right thing was done by the administration under the present Prime Minister from 1920 to 1924, and by the Government under Sir Edward Morris, and by the last Government, and I am going to take it for granted that the right thing will be done now, and that is that members on this side of the House be given an opportunity to look after the grants for their districts and see that they are spent properly. I believe that members on this side of the House should be given that right. All Governments as I say in recent years have given the Opposition representatives charge of their districts. I do not mean in connection with Government appointments. I do not find fault with the Government for making appointments without the approval of Opposition members. It is the prerogative of the Government to do that; but it has been the policy of Governments during recent years to give members charge of the grants that go out. They are not very much. As far as the Marine and Fisheries grant is concerned in my district there won't be very much to spend: \$400. We can promise the Government in this connection that as far as our actions are concerned we will act justly. It will put us in a pleasanter frame of mind for next session, and I think things will go along much better. I do not see why the representatives of the District should not have a chance to say what is going to be done in connection with

road boards, commissioners, or otherwise in connection with the details of spending the grants for the districts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. member for Bay de Verde has remarked it was the policy of a previous administration of which I was Prime Minister to allow members of the Opposition have some say in the handling of affairs for their own districts. I think that is a correct policy. It has not I fear been fully carried out during the last four years.

MR. PUDDESTER—Possibly not the first year, when the Government had just come in, in strength, but it was the last three.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In all fairness to the constituencies we feel that the representatives should be allowed this privilege. The representatives of the constituencies have an opportunity of knowing the needs of the constituencies more fully and of attending to them more fairly than anybody else. They have seats in this House; and participate in the passing of votes and as I have said I think the proper policy is in the main to let members have a voice in the handling of the affairs of the district and the spending of these votes. There is one exception: If I should feel for instance that Mr. Puddester in the handling of the grant for his district was gravely discriminating against supporters of the Government Party in connection with Government work or appointments naturally I would have to turn round and say to Mr. Puddester that we would have to discontinue allowing him the privilege of managing those grants. The Departments to which these matters refer will be glad to co-operate with the representatives of the various districts so long as the representatives act in good faith and there is no discrim-

ination against Government supporters in the handling of public grants.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Prime Minister for his very fair and frank statement; and I do not think he will have any cause to regret pursuing that policy. As far as I am personally concerned the records of how the grants I had to do with in Bay de Verde were allocated will show that I did not discriminate in any way. I gave every man a square deal. Of course my leanings were towards my own supporters, quite naturally, but I never turned a man down because he voted against me. I never did it, and I don't intend to do it; and I think it is a bad policy for any politician to do so.

MR. EMERSON—I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his assurance that the Opposition members would have a say in the spending of monies in the districts that they represent. Since I have been a member and had dealings with the Departmental heads I have always been treated with the utmost courtesy and while they did not always agree with me, I must say that I was not treated entirely unfairly. As far as the expenditure of the "slush fund" in my district I had very little to do with it, it was in the hands of the Highroads Commission and there was no interference on my part. I assure the Prime Minister that I shall have very little to do, personally, with the expenditure of public money in my district, but I do intend to have a say in deciding when and where the money shall be spent. I don't see why defeated candidates should have a say in the distribution of money, I may be wrong, but we have no assurance that if it is placed in their hands that it will be spent in a better manner.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to point out to the mem-

bers who have not had previous experience in the House that it is the Departmental head who is responsible for every act of his department. This is a recognized political practise. I have noticed a number of questions being asked from time to time in which a Minister, the head of a department is asked who recommended this, that, and the other thing. The Minister, unfortunately has to assume the responsibility instead of the member making the recommendation and why I say this is, that whilst the departmental heads should be free and frank in accepting recommendations from Opposition members that is no reason why they should not be free and open in accepting recommendations from members of the Government party. The theory is, that a member representing an Opposition district waits upon the Minister and he gives him the same careful consideration as he would to a Government member.

But if that member discriminates against the Government party, then it is a case of considering the defeated candidate. The Minister of a department is under no obligation whatever to accept the recommendation of any Government member neither is he under obligation to accept any recommendation from a member of the Opposition. In this way he is responsible for the actions of the member when he has accepted his recommendations and he is to blame in the ordinary course of political business. But the Minister in charge of a department should go beyond the recommendations of any member of the Government or Opposition, as he has to take the blame, and ascertain whether the recommendations made are in the best interests of the constituency as a whole and not of the party to which the member belongs. I feel that this is correct public policy, in the interests of the De-

partment and in the interests of the Minister himself who is in charge.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION— I appreciate the policy of the Government in this respect but I rather take Mr. Emerson's side when he says that the member who is elected to represent a district should have a large say in the distribution of monies. The district showed that it had confidence in him when it elected him its representatives and for that reason I say he should have a large say. I am sure however that as we have the Prime Minister's assurance, we shall get fair play.

MR. QUINTON—I quite appreciate the remarks of the Prime Minister and I am sure that if this policy is carried out the Opposition members will get every consideration in matters pertaining to the welfare of their districts. I cannot say however that I understand the circumstances surrounding the granting of timber licenses, but as this is a public question rather than a political one, and as I understand the matter is before the Government at the present time I will not touch upon the matter here. I hope that the good will which has so far existed between Government and Opposition will be continued.

MR. PUDDISTER—I wish to say a word or two to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I am sure that they will agree with the sentiments of the Prime Minister, as far as I am concerned. We have no power in the allocating of money to the districts, the Prime Minister himself, if he wants an allocation for his district has to go to the Head of the Department concerned. Thus the Head of a Department is responsible and I say that if he makes an allocation of money for my district and it is not spent justly, I am going to criticise, for he is responsible to me.

I am sure that the Minister of Public Works will agree with me in the proposals put forward. I remember in 1925 and 1926 he had a lot to say about this, so much so that we finally had to agree. Even in September last, members on the other side of the House were allocating money for their districts, I mean that they were recommending that money be sent to their districts at late as December 25th, and some of this was published as slush fund, now that is not fair.

Now as regards the vote for a Plumbing Inspector, I would like to hear the Minister explain that vote.

I believe that we want a competent man to do that work and if he is given control I feel that he can earn his salary.

I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister just what control you are giving him.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I endorse all that Mr. Puddester has said with regard to the competency of the man appointed. Mr. Moore is a very, very active man and during the last two weeks since his appointment he has shown that he is very efficient.

With regard to the control that he has, he is given a free hand. Mr. Moore was appointed surveyor and inspector of plumbing and steam heating and he is in charge, but, of course, is subject to the Superintendent of Public Works, and that, I think, will be agreeable to both sides of the House. The Superintendent of Public Works, Mr. Churchill has jurisdiction over all public works and Mr. Moore will make his reports to him and, I think, he will be kept on the job continuously.

I feel sure that the Department will receive very efficient service from him. Many figures will be curtailed and there will be a big saving there and I

have every reason to believe that he will give satisfactory service.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there should be a report because I think Mr. Moore is capable and if he is given a free hand and you will see, as the Hon. member for Bay de Verde has said, that he will save four times his salary. I have some experience in steam heating and I know what can be saved and what can be wasted, and if you have an expert there with experience and ability who can save coal and safeguard the steam there is not the slightest doubt that this appointment is going to be very acceptable. I think Mr. Moore should write an annual report and we should have an opportunity of reading it.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting this appointment and I think it is a pity there are not more than one. I do not see why there are not more experts appointed to deal with the public institutions. I think we should have a Government architect, so that when contracts for large repairs are to be given then somebody of real expert knowledge will pass upon them. I dare say that we may lumber up the civil service with too many of these experts but as long as we are satisfied that they are capable and are performing their duties industriously, money will be saved. I take it not only will Mr. Moore have authority to inspect what is going on in the ordinary course of events in connection with plumbing and steam-heating but also if there are any contracts of that kind to be given out he will not be hampered by the Superintendent of Public Works when it comes to considering the estimates that are referred to. I think that in that way a large sum of money can be saved.

MR. PUDDESTER—I would like to have an explanation for the increase

of \$625.00 to the salary of the Resident Physician of the General Hospital?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, it looks as though the Resident Physician is one of fortunes favourites. His salary is \$4,600.00 a year and he gets an increase of \$600.00. Is that the case? He probably gets three or four thousand dollars from that source.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Hon. member, I might explain that the official position is that the Board of Governors of the General Hospital at various times passed Resolutions forbidding the practice of collecting fees respecting the treatment of, or the operations on, patients in any of the public institutions, and, I believe, that very recently an Order-in-Council was made confirming these Resolutions. In fact the official position is that not alone was the practice of collecting fees forbidden by this Government, but it was forbidden by the previous Government as well.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Evidently there was no notice taken of the official position, because I know a person who paid a bill of \$100 to Dr. Keegan and I know that when Dr. Fox was there he sent a bill of \$100 for services to a party, but no notice was taken of it. Now, if Dr. Keegan can carry on, in spite of instructions, and charge fees for work outside the Hospital, I do not see why his salary should be increased by \$625.00.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I think it is well worth while if he gets \$5,000.00 a year and \$600.00 extra money by the way of gratuity, \$6,000.00 is a cheap man at that. With reference to the other increases, when nurses went into training at the General Hospital, formerly they got no salary at all. Under this new scheme they will get a salary the

first year. That was the reorganization of the nursing staff of the General Hospital. A junior going into the hospital may not have much of this world's goods, she would have to keep herself and it is only right that she should get a \$100.00 a year. They can go away and do much better. In regard to the other matters, increases for matrons, dieticians etc., these are warranted. We had neither dietician up to this, but it was recommended by medical men that we should have one, and so we appointed one.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am not disputing the value of the services of Dr. Keegan. I probably know his value as well as anyone, but I thought it was a convenient occasion to find out whether he has the right to charge patients for his services, or whether the Government will allow him to do so. If the Government say he is not, I do not see how he is to be allowed to do so.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, the situation in connection with the Resident Physician of the General Hospital is very much similar to that mentioned by me the other day in connection with the Department of Justice. I think it would be impossible to get in any other country a man of Dr. Keegan's eminent qualifications to take this position. Anyway, I presume this question will come up before the Health Commission during the course of a year, and we will hear about it from the Hon. member for Fortune Bay who is the Chairman of that Commission, but I sympathize with the position that the Government is placed in, and I also realize the position that Dr. Keegan is placed in. The vice I foresee in connection with doctors in hospitals is this, that if you get a really good man to take charge of that hospital at an inadequate salary and a wealthy man goes into the hospital

for treatment he may get attention because he is able to pay an extra bill, the poor man may not get the same attention. I do not know anything about the General Hospital at all, as I was never treated there, and I do not suppose that condition exists, but that is a vice that is liable to grow up. On the other hand when you come to look at the amount and the value of the work performed, we all agree that Dr. Keegan is if anything quite underpaid. Of course he is not a young man and therefore would naturally seek a position of this kind, as we all will do later on in life, where the remuneration is not so great, and where the rest form general practice is of value to us. But then sometimes I do think that if the Health Commission can work out a scheme under which the doctor's duties are more evenly distributed, and he is properly remunerated, and forbidden to charge fees at all, they would be doing a very good work. I hope that when the matter comes up before the Health Commission during the coming year it will be given serious consideration.

MR. TOBIN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if during the present year the staff at the General Hospital threatened to go on strike for some cause or other.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The Government was not officially notified but I heard a rumour around to that effect.

MR. TOBIN—Well there was notice put up that they were going to leave the hospital at a certain date. Did the Minister of Public Works see the notice?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I heard some rumour about.

MR. TOBIN—I am trying to get a copy of that notice and if I do I will pass it over to you.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have heard this matter of hospital fees ventilated in this House time after time. Every session it comes up for debate. I agree with the other members that I do not think that it is right or square for a resident physician paid by the country a certain sum of money, and then if a man comes in for an operation, to soak him. I do not think it is right. Now I have nothing whatever to say derogatory of Dr. Keegan. I do not think that there is a better man in the whole Island. I am sure that he has had wonderful experience. He has been there for more than twenty years. He is a very valuable man. But I think that he should be satisfied to retain that position at \$5,000, and if he wants more money let him come to the Government for it. But let us stop this practice of charging fees. Four or five years ago, people that were down there were getting bills and they refused to pay them and the matter was aired in this House. They had operations performed and the bills were very steep. I do hope that the Government will take this matter up and see if they can do something to stop the dissatisfaction that is existing in connection with this matter.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion to the Chairman of the Board of Health, if I may, as to how this thing may be cured, and that is by making the General Hospital an open Hospital. For the information of the members who do not know the difference I may say that a closed hospital is one where the patients are in residence, and the treatment of the patient is in the hands of the resident doctor or those doctors who may be assigned to the hospital. In the open hospital the patient is permitted to have his or her own physician in attendance. So I would suggest that the new Board see

to it that our General Hospital be in future made an open hospital.

MR. EMERSON—Is not that what the General is now? You may have your own doctor.

MR. BYRNE—It must be very recently then.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That has been so for many years.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—That is a misapprehension, Mr. Chairman. The only people allowed to tend patients in this hospital, even for visiting purposes are the members of the staff. The activities are limited strictly to about six doctors who are on that staff. No other physicians are allowed without first getting the permission of the Superintendent. It is a closed hospital.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he knows anything about Twillingate Hospital. I think the Government hung up the grant for a period because the physician there refused to allow any other physicians to go in there.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I cannot say definitely because that vote has only recently been transferred to the Board of Health. It is done with the special purpose of giving check on that sort of thing. Hospitals like Twillingate and St. Anthony, that are getting large subsidies from the Government have of recent years got into the habit of sending bills in for extra payment. We have taken the position that these hospitals are supposed to look after all the sick in their own locality in lieu of the grant that is made by the Government. I cannot say definitely but I understand that Twillingate Hospital has been thrown open to other physicians than those on the original staff.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, while we are

discussing the hospitals I would like to say that there is a condition of things existing there that does not reflect any credit on us. Legislation is brought in in other countries to enforce a reasonable working day for men, and in this country in our dealings with foreign corporations, and in connection with the treatment of working men that we have to do with, we endeavour to see that they get proper treatment, and are not called on to work an unreasonable length of time. Yet we compel nurses in the hospital to render twelve consecutive hours service per day I think that it is a disgrace that we put such a strain as that on the constitutions of these women, and in addition to the harm done themselves it might quite possibly bring about serious harm in other ways, even the loss of human life might result. Nurses above all others should be in full possession of their facilities. After several hours of work on a twelve hour shift as daylight is approaching these nurses must very often be very tired and sleepy, and it would not be hard to conceive of a case where little or no blame could attach to the nurse. A patient, should he take the wrong medicine it could result fatally. I think if we are to show magnanimity to any of our civil servants, it should be those nurses, and the matter should be taken up immediately assigning shorter hours for them. I think it is too much to enforce on any woman and at risk of their physical well being.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Health to this statement, I think that it must be a misprint: Doctor, \$780.00, messenger, \$958.00, what sort of a messenger is that.

HON. DR. MOSDELL—The explanation is this, this amount is over and above his salary which is \$3,600.00 and this explains why it looks so small.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the matter of Highroad expenditure, I am of the opinion that until we put that business on a sound basis we are going to waste \$75,000 every year. The whole idea of giving about thirty cents a head per capita to all the little settlements in the country is an absolute waste of money. There are absolutely no results. You perhaps get a small bridge here and there and badly built too, as a rule, and we are simply going to waste another \$75,000.

While I am on this point it would not be unfair—it is not my intention to embarrass the Minister—for us to ask if he would tell us are there any particulars in regard to the Highroads Commission, as to the amount of money they will have to spend this year, whether provision will be made for it in the loan and whether it is going to be spent by districts or per capita. I think it is a matter that we are all entitled to know about and the public too. On the other hand if there is any policy or reason why we should not know now then the Minister can refuse. The old Highroads Commission must get credit surely for the highroads they built and they have undoubtedly spent the money well. The policy of where to build the roads is a matter for the Government. The other day the Minister of Finance and Customs spoke disparagingly of the road from here to Placentia. Of course that is a matter of opinion and I do not agree with the Minister of Finance and Customs. But that is beside the point. The one thing we all agree upon, I think, is that the Highroads gave very satisfactory service. They have got for the money expended very substantial returns and I think at this stage, when roads and bridges are being dealt with, the House should be informed as to what the policy is in connection with expenditure on the High-

roads this year—the amount that is going to be paid to the department and the question of how it is going to be expended.

I submit that the Hon. Minister should answer these enquires and give us some information on this question.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I might say in reply to the Hon. member that the Highroads Commission has prepared its program and it is before the Government. It involves an expenditure of something less than half a million dollars and covers the upkeep of the present roads, continuation of certain roads previously being built and certain other roads that are necessary as connecting roads, connecting sections which have been built with other sections. In all it involves an expenditure of something like \$480,000.

The policy is a matter for the Government to decide and as to whether that amount will be voted to the Commission. I submit and I believe that they will vote it. Just what other money will be voted for the roads, I cannot say at the present time. We are hoping that the Government will include in the program the necessary money and we are also hoping that they will say that we are free to spend a sum of money on other roads. It is a matter for the Executive Government and up to the present time I have no idea what they are prepared to do. It is possible that before the session ends I will have the required information.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Does that half a million dollars include the amount for maintenance and upkeep of the present roads?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Yes that is included.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works a question. I was given to

understand by Hon. Dr. Campbell that there was some scheme in view or policy adopted by the Government to fix up the South Side Road right along to Waterford Valley and that it was to be used as a pedestrians road or something of that nature. Do you know anything of that?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Nothing definite has been arranged as to what is to be done. Some of the gentlemen thought the old road could be fixed up and we would be able to divert some of the traffic on to that road off of Water Street. The argument against it is this, you will notice on the city end of the roads that a number of houses are built very near to the roadside and small children are continually coming across the road and it is dangerous to have very much traffic on the road. I think the Government is prepared to spend some money there but nothing definite has been arrived at with regard to completing that road.

MR. BENNETT—I hope it will be done eventually. I think it will be a splendid idea and I hope the Government will do their very best to put it through. At least it will give the pedestrians a chance to walk somewhere without being covered with dust from motor cars.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I would point out to the Hon. member that this road is not controlled by the Public Works or Highroads Department as it is under the Municipal Council. Some agreement will have to be reached to let the work be done by the Highroads or Public Works Department. If this matter is brought up at the next meeting I will suggest that the Highroads take over that road.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, before we get off the subject of roads there is a point that I would like to make.

It is possible that some \$500,000 will be spent on highroads in maintenance and expenditure this year. We seem to have got a lot of roads built on the Avalon Peninsula, and I submit that it is not quite fair to the northern districts, and I would like to know if you are making allocations for roads on that same basis this year and spending another \$500,000 possibly, in that way.

Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will tell us something about that.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Hon. member should wait until he sees the report allocating the remaining money for roads. The program of the Highroads will be known in a short time and when a road in his district is taken up by the Highroads Commission then the Hon. member will be relieved of that particular road and will have so much more money to spend on other roads in his district.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works a question or two.

There are twenty one miles of road in the lower part of my district that last year was practically impassable. We could do nothing with it and particularly from Bay de Verde to Grates Cove. The people there are all fishermen and they go over seven miles of that road every night for a certain period of the year to catch squid at Bay de Verde and bring it to Grates Cove. They go over in their horses and carts. Last year it was nothing less than bog and I took the matter up with the Government sometime in August and the Government designated the twenty one miles of road as second-class highroad and Mr. Cochius came with me through the district and his recommendation to the Government was that he estimated

it would cost \$33,000 to fix it. The settlements down there are large and all fishermen and it is very very hard to make a road there being nothing but bog. I took the matter up with the Government and they gave me \$2500 to spend on the road that Mr. Cochius estimated would cost \$33,000 to fix. I spent that \$2500 and finished up with another \$324.00, so it cost \$2824.00 to fix one road and that road is certainly not too bad.

There is another road to Grates Cove and Bay de Verde that has not been repaired and is a very very necessary road. I would like to ask the Minister, as Chairman of the Highroads Commission, if there is anything in the report in connection with these two roads because they are the most important roads that we have in my district. I don't ask that that much money be spent there but I do ask that they be put in some kind of passable condition. People have to go over seven miles of that every night during August and September, and there is a lot of traffic there for there is quite a lot of business between one settlement and another settlement. The vote is held for the Highroads now but that is a small grant of about \$240.00. You cannot do much with that.

I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to consider this and realize that I certainly would like my district to be on the Highroads Commission program and feel that if they could make some repairs to this branch it would be a very great benefit to the fishermen.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. member for Bay de Verde I would suggest that he would write to the Highroads Commission and set forth those facts and I am quite sure that the matter will receive sympathetic consideration.

It is proposed to finish those roads that were partially built last year and have those roads that were prepared put into the condition that they were in before, otherwise the money that has been spent will be lost to the Commission.

I think Mr. Puddester should write the Commission and I am sure the matter will receive consideration.

The Hon. members will doubtlessly understand that the Commission cannot promise to build any particular road because that is purely a matter for the Government to decide, but we make our recommendation.

MR. PUDDESTER—There are some motor cars down there now and I can tell the Minister that if they had that road fixed up they would have quite a large number of motor cars in that section.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Chairman, some few days ago I spoke of road conditions in my district and since have found that our total road grant is in the vicinity of \$2300.00. Now in thinking this thing over I find that this amount has to look after about one hundred and fifty miles of road which are in my district, roughly about fifteen or sixteen dollars to the mile. Now this is an extremely small amount for a district that has to depend practically throughout the year wholly on roads for transportation of its commodities. Our district is very much handicapped by the want of good roads. It has never had any show from any Government and the time has now come when the people are expecting better treatment than they have had in the past. A district without a harbour certainly looks to roads as its means of transportation.

The people of Port-au-Port district are to-day in the same position as they were thirty years ago, they have nothing whatever to give them an in-

terest in life and feeling that the Government has no thought for their interests they feel discouraged so to speak, but the same people, if given the least encouragement would buck up, take on a new lease of life, catch more fish, grow more vegetables which would increase their earning power and would in time go back to the country in increased revenue.

As I said here a few days ago, I firmly believe that the building of good roads throughout the country is a sound, solid investment, and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to spend a substantial sum of money in my district during the coming summer.

I will now go back to the two rivers of which I spoke here already. One of these rivers is situated in Stephenville and the other at Kippens, about two and a half miles from Port-au-Port. Both these rivers have a good run of Salmon in the summer season. They are both within one hour's ride from Stephenville Crossing. I know that the grant of the Game and Inland Fishery Board is limited, but I trust that they will strain a point and have these rivers looked after.

The Hon. member for Hr. Main dealt with the subject of a bait freezer or cold storage plant for his district a few days ago in the House. Undoubtedly the establishment of such a plant would be a great benefit to the fishermen in that part of the island. Conditions in my district warrant the same benefit for the fishermen. The fishermen of Port-au-Port lose thousands of quintals of fish each year for the want of bait at certain times, because as soon as the ice leaves, the waters of Port-au-Port Bay and Bay St. George team herring, and it often occurs that the herring are gone before the codfish strike in near the shores, owing to the ice being around the outside shores so long.

I would, therefore, ask that the Government gives serious consideration to this matter and that a bait freezer or cold storage plant be placed in Port-au-Port district at an early date. I might also say that we have one of the best Halibut Grounds in the country situated outside the mouth of Port-au-Port Bay from Long Point to Clam Bank Cove, a distance of about twelve miles. Two or three steamers and other vessels come here from Canada every year and return to their respective ports with loads of Halibut, whilst our fishermen on that part of the coast have to look on, without any chance of their prosecuting this very important fishery, and this is brought about by want of some means of saving the fish until the opportunity presents itself to get it to market. This goes to show another case in point where a cold storage plant will be of great benefit to the fishermen, there is no doubt whatever that if we have to look to the success of our fisheries in the future, it will be necessary to erect a lot of cold storage plants around the country.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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.

FRIDAY, May 10th, 1929.

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

MR. STARKES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from different settlements in Green Bay District, asking that the road leading from Badger to Springdale be re-conditioned and extended about seven miles to Springdale.

This roads for the past seven years has been in very poor condition and it is of great service to the public. I hope that the Government will see their way clear to do this, and I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I have here 11 petitions for presentation to the House, all of the same purport, and I might say that through the practical consideration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the main objection complained of in these petitions, is now rectified, but there is a paragraph in this petition which will appeal very much to the House, and with your permission I will read it.

(Reads)

I think I may justifiably claim, Mr. Speaker to be at least as familiar with the Salmon Fishery on the West Coast as perhaps anybody in the country. In 1898, I had for 10 years endeavoured to create an interest in the fresh fish business by writing letters to the various newspapers and otherwise, but I found I could practically accomplish nothing.

In 1898, after the completion of the Railway to Port aux Basques, knowing that the time would be opportune to take steps to organize that industry, I endeavoured to do something in that direction.

We intended to deal in fresh salmon, halibut, live lobster, smelts, and fresh

cod. The first winter we sold 60,000 lbs. salmon, 200,000 lbs. halibut and 10,000 live lobsters. The following winter we had a large amount of fresh cod. Fish was then \$4.00 a quintal and fresh fish was one and a half cents a pound, as you probably know it takes 308 lbs split fish to make a quintal and over and above this fresh fish is sold with the head on and the bone in.

We were abundantly pleased with the prospects for the next winter even though the first winter was the really successful one as the year after I had 27,000 lbs halibut on my hands for seventeen days as ice conditions, and conditions along the railway, made it practically impossible to ship it and it was only through the courtesy of the Reid's in allowing the boat to call in that I managed to dispose of it.

Salmon sold in the salted condition gives the fishermen 2½ or 3 cents per pound, when it is sold fresh it gives 10 cents per pound and never less than 6 cents per pound. We can thus see that the profits that accrue from the selling of salmon are far ahead of those that accrue from the selling of salmon in the barrel or canned.

It is of vital importance to protect our salmon fisheries, but I fear that through over fishing it is going to dwindle, that should be offset without debarring the coast fishermen from getting his share. The salmon should be permitted to spawn, otherwise we shall lose tens of thousands of dollars. To ensure that this will not come to pass it is absolutely necessary that the Government find means to increase the grant to the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. We have to depend on them to protect our rivers and without more money this is impossible.

I have heard mentioned some 'sportsmen' who go salmon fishing and bring back 200 fish for the season, an-

other 120 fish and so on. These men are not sportsmen, this is a wholesale slaughter. I will read the petition so as it may be understood how bad the situation is, and so that as soon as it is practical for an increased grant to be given it will be done. I would also like to see two wardens on the rivers all the year round to protect our fish and fur bearing animals. I have heard of people who were in the habit of going in the woods in the months of January and February and smoking out the young foxes and bringing them home in their pockets, it may seem a laughable matter but it only goes to show that an increased grant for the Game and Inland Fisheries Board is an absolute necessity.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition of my Hon. friend Mr. Downey. In some places the salmon regulations do not apply as they should, but here at least, we should endeavour to see that they are carried out. I should like to see the vote to the Game and Inland Fisheries Board doubled and even trebled. This board has to look after the whole country and \$20,000 is a very small amount compared to the amount of work that they have to attend to.

I attended every one of their meetings and I am satisfied that the money is both wisely and judiciously spent and I advocate very strongly the granting of an increased grant. The salmon fishery should be a source of great profit to us but it has to be admitted that we are losing ground and if the salmon are not protected we shall soon have no salmon at all.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the sentiments of the previous speakers and I may say that in younger days I used to do some salmon fishing and I know that many people used unlawful

means to catch them, in fact, the sportsman was the exception rather than the rule. \$20,000 is 50 cents per square mile and I submit that this is very inadequate and I have much pleasure in supporting the petition that an extra amount be given the Game and Inland Fisheries Board.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit a petition from the people of Hant's Hr. Some days ago a fire destroyed the Postal building there and at the present time the business is conducted in the local Hall and this arrangement proves very unsatisfactory as the Hall is not suitable. The petition asks that steps be taken to provide adequate quarters to take care of all public business in the at the earliest possible moment. Needless to say the petition has my heartiest support and I ask that it be referred to the Post and Telegraphs Department for their consideration.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit a petition from the people of Burgeo district in reference to a branch railway, I will read two or three clauses for the benefit of the House.

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker, this is quite a matter for the House to consider. At one time when Mr. Currie was the representative of the district it was thought that it was possible to get a railway service for the district but now there is neither road or rail connections between any parts of the district.

I trust that the Government of today will see its way clear to do something in this regard, if not a branch railway perhaps the Highroads Commission will be able to do something.

At the present time we are completely isolated. We have twenty five miles of road and it is impossible to travel over four miles of it. This district produces 170,000 quintals of fish

and I do not think that I am asking too much when I ask that a highway be built to connect with the Highroad from St. John's to Goobie's Siding. I could elaborate on this subject much longer, Sir, but I do not think that this is the time and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to grant of the concessions asked for in this petition.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Department of Public Works.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Replying to Mr. Emerson's question, just asked, the Hon. the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Speaker, the question which my Hon. friend has asked me with reference to International arrangements dealing with trade between Newfoundland and the United States of America is, I think, a question which might not be placed on the Order Paper, and one which I certainly could not answer. It would be quite improper for me to discuss in the House any private interviews that I may have had during my recent visit to the United States and I have no correspondence.

So, perhaps my Hon. friend will do me the courtesy of not asking that this question go on the Order Paper.

I shall be glad to interview him personally and give him an appointment at any time and shall be pleased to tell him what the position was as regards the United States and Newfoundland; rather than be reported on the subject.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject, I would like to remind the Hon. the Prime Minister of the answer to my question with reference to the Canadian-Newfoundland Trade Agreement?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I have gathered together all the correspondence, which is extremely voluminous, from the other departments, because there is a lot of matter included in the correspondence which is not relevant but which is covered by the question.

I have all the correspondence and I hope between now and Monday to have an opportunity to read it through; then I will either make an extract or give the whole file to my Hon. friend to go through.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs is preparing to introduce the Budget within the next day or two, and I think we should know something about the relationship existing between Newfoundland and Canada in connection with trade before we discuss the Budget.

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

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

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

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

Dept. of Public Works.....\$975,020.16

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding" was withdrawn and submitted into the form of a Resolution.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I note an error in the Order Paper. The Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding should be in the form of Resolutions and not in the form of a Bill in the various stages as it effects the matter of bounty on ships.

It has already been on the Order Paper for several days and has been deferred because we have been busy in consideration of the Estimates.

With your permission, Sir, and the unanimous consent of the House, I would submit it now in the form of Resolutions.

With the unanimous consent of the House and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Amendment of the Act 15, George V., Chapter 23, entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of

Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in amendment thereof."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House I might explain the changes made in the old Act.

These resolutions do not provide for any change except Clause 8.

(Reads)

That remains the same, that is Clause (a); Clause (b) is changed and it reads as follows:

(Reads)

That is the same up to one hundred tons, formerly it was up to fifty tons and \$16.00 a ton on every ton in excess of fifty tons. Now it reads \$16.00 per ton on tonnage in excess on one hundred and up to to one hundred and fifty tons. The idea of the change, Mr. Chairman, is to try and encourage some local shipbuilders to build the type of vessel which is greatly used in this country, around one hundred tons, and not import them from Nova Scotia, as people have been doing during the past number of years.

Section 3 has been changed and we now read section 3...(reads)...that formerly read...(reads.)

We have also changed that 'o encourage the local shipbuilders to build rather than import vessels.

Schedule D is now changed and reads...(reads)...that was formerly Section D in the old Act and read ...(reads.)

The reason for changing this is that the type of vessel and schooner used in the winter fishery and trade in Placentia Bay and the District of Burgeo and LaPoile is that fishing boat and frequently in the past they have been rebuilding the old boats which, in my opinion, are of a very inferior type, and we are trying to en-

courage them to build new boats and have them of a better type.

Schedule (E) applies to a type of vessel now being built for the sealing business and is as follows:

(Reads)

The idea of that is to try and encourage a fleet of auxiliary motor sailing schooners, and by doing this we are giving a bounty for a limited time so that we will know where we stand by 1932. I may say for the benefit of the Opposition members that the Rebuilding Act has been done away with and it is the intention of the Government to pay a bounty on all vessels rebuilt or in course of construction up to June 30th, 1929.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I have been often thinking what has happened our mercantile marine fleet. It seems to me that the number of our foreign going sailing vessels has dwindled down so rapidly the past decade or so that it will be only a matter of a few years when those vessels will have disappeared entirely. Owners of foreign bottoms state that the business did not pay, so that it is only a question of a short time, in spite of the bounty offered for the encouragement of shipbuilding, when this portion of our commercial activities will be a thing of the past, and probably the last of the foreign going sailing vessels will find its last resting place in some Museum.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be possible to give foreign going sailing vessels a bonus for every cargo of fish carried across the Atlantic. Some owners state that, if they could get free entry for all legitimate requirements for outfitting a foreign going vessel, they might be able to compete successfully with foreign owned fish carriers, but, as I am strongly against free entry generally, I would suggest the advisability of a

vessel owners paying the duty in the regular way and getting it back in the form of a bonus on every quintal of fish that is carried abroad. In this way the Exchequer would pay out on the one hand what the owners of shipping would pay it on the other hand.

As previously mentioned, each succeeding year our foreign going sailing vessels are getting fewer and fewer, and, in consequence, the splendid body of seamen, who prosecute the fishery in the Summer season and go in foreign going vessels during the winter, have practically all dropped out and given up their calling.

This, Sir, is a very regrettable happening, and, if our carriers of trans-Atlantic cargoes are to survive I would strongly urge that they be given by way of encouragement a substantial bonus on all dry fish exported in such bottoms.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, speaking with considerable knowledge and experience of the foreign-going fleet, I may say that a few years ago during the Monroe administration I asked them to try and put a preferential tax on the Newfoundland fleet, or in other words to put a tax on vessels engaged carrying our codfish.

In 1920 our firm had a fleet of four foreign-going fish carriers. Today we have one, and we cannot make her pay, and that is one of the reasons why I have the bounty raised and in order to encourage the building of that class of vessel in this country. At present it is impossible to compete with foreign-owned vessels, because the Norwegians and others pay small wages and can carry fish across the Atlantic cheaper than we can. That is why our vessels have to give up.

I agree with the honorable leader of the Opposition that something should be done to encourage the local

fleet, and anything I can do in this direction I shall be only too glad to do it. At the present time we are importing all our vessels from Nova Scotia, and today there is not one Newfoundland-built vessel among the whole banking fleet of the West Coast.

I think we are doing the right thing by encouraging shipbuilders in Newfoundland to build auxiliary motor sailing schooners for the sealfishery, as, in my opinion, the vessels that our people are buying from Nova Scotia to prosecute the sealfishery today are not fitted for such a voyage.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I have had considerable experience in the past in connection with timber, particularly when I was Acting Assistant Superintendent of the American Dry Docks in New York, and I found that pitch pine barks for spars, keels, stem and stern posts could be bought in the Southern States and exported to Newfoundland at a less cost than less suitable timber could be had for in Newfoundland, where today, unfortunately, our coast line is practically denuded of ship timber. With regard to the question of free entry, I think that could be successfully handled under the jurisdiction of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I may say that three years ago that the pitch pine that came out of the old dock in St. John's was as sound and as suitable as it was forty years ago, which was the period it did service for; and today that same timber is doing duty in some of our northern crafts.

If you want to increase our local fleet of foreign-going vessels, it is no use building them unless you make them sufficiently staunch to contend with ice and trans-Atlantic passages. We know that during the last few years that several of our local foreign fish carriers foundered in mid-ocean,

and all because the material used in the construction of the vessels was not what it should have been.

For the past few years the Nova Scotian built vessels have given good service because they are light and speedy; but for vessels to stand the wear and tear of the Newfoundland coastwise trade and trans-Atlantic voyages we want a class of Newfoundland vessel that is built of first class material.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend the Act George V., Chapter 23, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in Amendment Thereof'' was introduced and with unanimous consent of the House was read a first and second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, Before we start to read through these votes I would like to refer to a question discussed here the other day, the transferring of the foreign printing from Whitehead Morris to John Dickinson & Sons. I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if it is proposed to import quite a lot of stamps this year, or is he supplied?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—We will have to get a supply shortly.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Are you using the dies Whitehead Morris used?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I understand Whitehead Morris refused to give up the dies, and rather than have a law suit we made new dies.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—According to statements made, I think we can pay for the dies and have a saving effected.

MR. PUDDESTER.—It is a strange thing to me that Whitehead Morris should refuse to give up the dies.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I think the explanation of that is that in the printing of stamps, bank notes, and so on, in what is called security printing, they never pass the dies to other printers. Supposing an extra stamp appeared, or an extra banknote, it would be very easy to trace the leakage if the dies were held by only one firm. If two or three held them it would be very difficult. So the practice is with security printers of bank notes, stamps, etc., when they print anything they make an agreement that the dies will be destroyed once the work is finished.

MR. PUDDESTER.—My information is that we paid last year £900 for those dies, and I don't see why we can't get them if we had to pay that.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—The quotations for set of dies would be £100 for the total set of stamps printed last year.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I am informed that Whitehead Morris were paid £900 for those dies.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—That is true.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the position as I understand it is that Whitehead Morris

charged just nine times too much for dies and twice too much for stamps. On a £7,500 payment to John Dickinson & Sons the quotation for better stock, identical stamp, is £3,600 less than Whitehead Morris. Other quotations we have, if bona fide, show that we can get the stamps for half the price and the dies for one-ninth.

There is nothing of discrimination against Whitehead Morris concern. There is no discrimination against Mr. Morris. Mr. Morris is one of the most admirable of gentlemen, a philanthropic millionaire who has founded several hospitals, a man of outstanding reputation; an exceedingly high type of retired or semi-retired wealthy gentleman; but, unfortunately, the quotations of his firm for stamps was twice the market value and in the case of dies very much more.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—The transfer from Whitehead Morris to Dickinson & Co. was through the Colonial Secretary's Department and not through ours, and when the matter was suggested to me I said that the thing I was particular about was that the stamps should cost less and the quality be equal; and I was answered that there would be a great saving and the quality would be equal.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he has considered the matter we were discussing the other day of getting stationery here in St. John's in place of that order to Copeland Chatterson & Co.?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I asked Mr. Bambrick who looks after those matters to take the whole thing into consideration, allow for what is paid on duty, and see if we cannot get the stationery in Newfoundland of equal quality about the same price, and if we can

get the stationery in Newfoundland I assure you we will get it.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION. Mr. Chairman, In connection with this matter I must say I think it is most unfair to give government departments free entry for supplies that can be bought in the country. With the departments allowed to purchase foreign goods free from duty, the local firms cannot compete with them. The fact of making them pay duty would not cost anything; it would only be taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another.

I know in connection with the firm I am identified with we found it all the time, and it was impossible to compete with outside firms. I do not see why the government departments should have any discrimination any more than any other purchaser. I would like the Minister of Finance and Customs to consider the matter.

MR EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there are one or two comments I would like to make before going into the votes for the Posts and Telegraphs Department, Frequently it is charged against an Opposition that their criticism is not of a constructive nature, and I have in mind an idea at present the value of which I cannot guarantee or judge of owing to ignorance of various connected details. On the face of it it seems a good idea, but there may be substantial objections to it, and I would not be surprised to find it impractical but nevertheless I throw it out for what it is worth.

To date we have not much indication of saving by the Government probably they are not long enough in power to find out where savings can be effected. It occurs to me in connection with the Posts and Telegraphs Department, particularly in reference to the telegraphs, that a saving could be made in certain sections of the

country. Down the Southern Shore and round Conception Bay we are running a parallel line with the Anglo and in those settlements there are nearly all two stations; and considering both Anglo and Postal I think it will be agreed that neither is paying.

Could not some arrangement be entered into under which the Anglo would take over that service and pay us a sum of money for the right to use our service. They would then have no competition and the entire revenue formerly delivered from those settlements and earned some by the Anglo and some by the Postal, it is simply a matter of arithmetic. We are losing to-day on the cost of operation and we are getting a certain amount of revenue. Suppose for argument sake that the revenue from here to Cape Race is \$5000. I do not know what it is but let us assume that amount for present purposes.

The Anglo we will say are making \$5 000 also. Could we not make some arrangement whereby our office would be closed, the Anglo would get all the business and they would pay us say half our present revenue. They would improve their own position by having a practical monopoly without increasing their expenditure, and we would be making a profit instead of losing. The same thing applies around Conception Bay, from here to Hearts Content. Although there are not offices in every settlement, in those where there are not, some arrangement could be made to take over these offices. The amount as I suggested to be paid to us, half the revenue earned by our offices, might not be very large, but at any rate there would be a saving of the great losses we sustain at present from the upkeep of the various offices; and it would be to the advantage of the Anglo to do that.

There is always an objection to changes of this kind on the part of members of the House because of the number of operators who would lose their jobs and the political effect their dismissal would have. Even that difficulty might be overcome. Even though no profit would be made by the change the first year, the operators could be given a year's salary in the lieu of notice, and a saving would be brought about in the subsequent years. The cost must be enormous in running these offices and keeping up lines, and it would not add to the Anglo's overhead charges if they took over the whole business instead of having at present we will say half. I submit the suggestion to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs for his consideration during the coming year, if he is not able to carry it out this year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in connection with the matter the Hon. member has just mentioned, particularly in relation to the telegraph line on the Southern Shore.

I agree with the Hon. member that something should be done to cut down in the losses suffered through these offices, but our predecessors in office didn't think that because during the recent election, last fall, they put a new one in Ferryland for political purposes; and this Government are going to move it out. That is the second time it was put in and I hope when we succeed in closing it out this time it won't be put back.

There are four lines on the southern shore; Anglo Telegraph, Postal Telegraph, Telephone, and the railway. None pay and the Anglo wouldn't take the Postal Office as a gift because if all the business came to them it would not pay one operator's salary. The Anglo are running under a contract

they made some years ago and they have got to keep it up.

The Anglo lines are operated under contract, they, under the terms of their contract have got to operate and they don't pay the salaries. This office costs about \$450.00 a year and I will venture to wager that we don't get \$30.00 revenue. The original idea was to connect up the wireless from Cape Race.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I may say in regard to this matter that was brought to my attention by Mr. Emerson, that it has been given some consideration, I have had interviews with Mr. Saunders of the Anglo about this matter, and there is a slightly erroneous idea about the losses, there may have losses, but they are not as great as people suppose. I have a report here which I shall read:

(Reads)

Total revenue \$252.75, that I presume is messages to the value of \$252.75 multiplied by two, wireless Cape Race, \$972.23. The Cape Race messages come through our lines and I may say that the offices at Cape Broyle and Ferryland are not necessary for this. You will appreciate that something must be done.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I understand that the finding of that Commission was that a saving of a half a million dollars could be effected.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Well, you will save some and give satisfactory service but not in many places. There is an office along the Railway on the Bonavista Branch, Summerville I think is the place, where the Railway agent does the whole work of the Postal Telegraph and the Railway and when the trains arrive between six at night and six in the morning he has to be up

all night and consequently is not in fit state during the day to attend to the work of the Postal and Telegraphs Department. I merely cite this case without going into the matter and without any great consideration, but if we could cut out some of the offices and effect a saving of \$20,000.00 and give satisfactory service it should be done. Mr. Emerson was saying that the Anglo would pay us if they could take over our lines.

MR. EMERSON—I think that you misunderstand, if we were to close our office and let them get half the revenue of the Telegraph business and let us get half, I think that it would improve both our positions. They have got to carry on their business, let us get half the revenue and let them have a monopoly.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I see that the total cost is \$402,000, some saving has been accomplished but in accord with the report of that Commission. I look upon the Postal Telegraph system as a public utility and we have got to be prepared to pay for it, it is no use to say that we can effect a saving by closing down offices because we will have complaints from all over the country. I agree with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that we cannot save \$500,000 and give satisfactory service, it would be a public utility, and the great objection to the Telegraph system and the Railway business being combined is that anyone who had anything to do with the Railway would know the business of the whole country.

In Bay de Verde district you could not save three offices by placing the Telegraph under the Railway, double the number of agents would be required as one agent could not do all the work and there would be dissatisfaction from beginning to end. During the last number of years an effort has

been made to get the Telegraph operator to do the work of the Postmaster, if that could be done we would save money for the Post Office system.

If the Postmaster died or resigned we could try and make the operator do the work of the Postmaster and combine the offices the same as done before. A lot could be saved by making the one office do the work of two instead of reappointing another Postmaster. I saw the report of Mr. Halfyard and it does not convince me that we are going to have a very large saving by placing the Telegraph under the Railway, it will mean raised expenditure for the Railway and poor satisfaction for everybody and that is my opinion of that.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I think in 1920 when the Department was created with a political head, a deputy was appointed and at that time the idea that obtained in the Government was that the new appointment should not go on without an equal salary, and Mr. LeMessurier, who, I think, was accountant at the time, was appointed deputy at a salary of \$3100 and his successor has received \$3100 ever since. I am not in a position to express my personal opinion on the matter.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Hon. member. I do not think any man who goes into that office—somebody taken off the streets—should get \$3100.

As regards the raise in salary for the Assistant Deputy and Secretary, I wish to say that I am in entire accord with it. He is a man who has been in that office for the past forty years. He went there when he was a boy, and has grown up with the system and if he doesn't know all about it he should. He ought to know every jot and tittle

of the business and every change that has been made.

(Reads)

I am very glad to see that Mr. Jennings has got an increase in his salary. He is an absolutely conscientious official and I am very very glad that this increase has been recommended. He was a member of this House for a number of years and Minister of Public Works. I think it was very magnanimous of him to take a position carrying such a very small salary and I am very glad to see it raised.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—The first assistant, Mr. Ryall, Mr. Milley and Miss Mabel McDonald have all been there for a great number of years and the male section are married and how they exist I do not know, and we thought we would give them a little encouragement by giving them a \$100 increase.

(Reads)

That is Mr. Fred Bursey. He did the chauffeuring when we had a car up there for joy riding. We thought we would make a step towards modern distribution a few years ago and got a motor truck to get the mails around and we were ridiculed. The truck was sold and Mr. Bursey was put in as Assorter. He had been receiving \$1200 and he is making the same as he received four or five years ago.

(Reads)

Some of the assorters are very poorly paid and that is particularly known to all the heads of the departments and to some of the members of the House on both sides, and I hope to get a little increase for them in the additional estimates.

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 tomorrow.

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was deferred until tomorrow

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon, the 13th inst. at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 13th, 1929.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister, on behalf of Hon. Dr. Campbell, presented a petition from the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills, asking for the introduction of a Bill for the establishment of a Wool and Silk Industry in the City of St. John's West.

On motion the petition was received and referred to a Select Committee to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House in relation to Private Bills had been complied with.

His Honor the Speaker appointed the following Hon. members as members of the Select Committee: Hon. Dr. Campbell, Mr. J. Fitzgibbon, Capt. John Parsons, Mr. Emerson and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

Mr. Tobin gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, on behalf of the Select Committee upon the Income Tax Resolutions, presented the following report:

The Select Committee upon the Income Tax Resolutions beg to report

that they have met and considered the matter to them referred and recommend the following amendments: That in Section 2 sub-section (r) in place of the words "incorporated companies" there be inserted the following:

"Companies incorporated in Newfoundland."

and that there be added sub-section:

- (s) Nothing herein shall be construed to tax the gains, profits, interest or other income of "Personal Holding Corporations," organized under the Companies' Act of this Colony, derived from the investment in or trading in stocks, bonds, debentures or other securities where such stocks, bonds, debentures or other securities are physically located outside of the Colony of Newfoundland at all times during the taxable year; however, said "Personal Holding Corporations" shall be liable to an annual Franchise Tax computed on the basis of their authorised capital as set forth in this sub-section (s).

The term "Personal Holding Corporation," as used in this Act, shall be construed to mean a Company having not more than five stockholders all of whom are non-residents and 80% or more of whose assets, other than cash, consists of stocks, bonds, debentures or other securities and 80½ or more of whose income is derived from the investment in or trading in stocks, bonds, debentures or other securities and which does not do business with the public in this Colony.

In lieu of an Income Tax every Corporation exempt under this sub-section as coming within the definition of the

term "Personal Holding Corporation" is required to pay annually in advance on or before the 30th day of April in each year a Franchise Tax based on its authorised capital as the following rates:—

\$50.00 for the first \$250,000, or less.

.10 per \$1,000 for the next \$750,000.

.05 per \$1,000 for the excess above \$1,000,000.

Provided that in no event shall the Annual Franchise Tax on a "Personal Holding Corporation" exceed \$250,00. It is further provided that if said Tax is not paid within 90 days of the due date thereof the Company shall become liable to the regular normal tax on Companies for the year in question.

that in Section 4 sub-section (2) in place of "five per centum upon income exceeding two thousand dollars and not exceeding six thousand dollars, and eight per centum upon income exceeding six thousand dollars" there be inserted in the following:

"eight per centum on income exceeding \$5,000."

that in Section 4, sub-section (4) (a), (b) in place said sub-section (4) (a), (b) there be inserted the following:

- (4) (a) Every bank, banking corporation or trust company doing business in the Colony, except Newfoundland Savings Bank, shall pay an annual tax equal to eight per centum upon its net income derived from this Colony provided that if the tax in any year so calculated would be less than a sum equal to five sixteenths of one per centum computed on all business of such bank, banking

- corporation or trust company, that is to say, on all moneys on deposit in and current loans, overdrafts and discounts (excluding foreign bills) by such banking corporation or trust company computed monthly and paid on the average amount of moneys on deposit and current loans, overdrafts and discounts excluding foreign bills then the rate of taxation under this sub-section shall be increased to such a percentage as will make the annual tax equal to the sum of five sixteenths of one per centum upon the matters above mentioned.
- (b) Money lent by a trust company on mortgage of real estate for a term of two years or more shall not be deemed a current loan.
- (c) The accounting periods under this Act shall be from the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, to the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, and for each year thereafter. The tax shall be due and payable on the 31st day of January in each year after an accounting period. If the tax is not paid when due there shall be added, as part of the tax, a penalty of five per centum, together with interest at the rate of one per centum for each full month from the time when the tax became due.
- (d) Without limiting the provisions of this Section the expression "moneys on deposit" shall include all moneys received by any bank, banking corporation or trust company from any

person under an agreement whereby the said bank, banking corporation or trust company agrees to pay such person interest thereon.

that in Section 6, sub-section (b) in place of "it shall be lawful for the Minister to repay" there be inserted the following:

"the Minister shall repay"

that in section 7, sub-section (e) be inserted in the second last line of said sub-section between the words and of "the incomes;" sub-section now reading:

and the incomes of life insurance companies, except such amount as is credited to shareholders' account,

and the following added:

formula: for determining amount credited to shareholders' account:

"the proportion of total shareholders' earnings that premium income including consideration for annuities of Newfoundland business bears to company's total premium income including consideration for annuities."

that in Section 9, sub-section (5) in place of "said letter" there be inserted the following: "notice referred to in sub-section (1)."

that in Section 11, sub-section (9) there be inserted after Supreme Court" the words:

provided that nothing herein shall prejudice the rights of the holder of a duly registered chattel mortgage."

that in Section 12, sub-section (2) there be inserted after "penalties (the last word in sub-section), the following:

"Any trustee, assignee, administrator, executor or like person who shall have distributed after receiving a certificate as aforesaid shall thereafter be free from all liability notwithstanding it may subsequent-

ly be discovered that the certificate was granted in error.'

(Sgd.) PETER J. CASHIN,
F. G. BRADLEY.

St. John's'

May, 13th, 1929.

I naturally disagree with the principle of the Bill. I think also that other amendments should be made—but I agree with the above amendments.

(Sgd.) L. E. EMERSON.

On motion the report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said amendments be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to an amendment of the War Pensions Act.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a Tax on Certain Timber Lands.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines presented the report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for the year 1928.

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

Pursuant to order and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Department of Marine

and Fisheries," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding, and Acts in Amendment thereof.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 23, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in Amendment thereof,' " 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Enquires Act," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker: I rise to move that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering Ways and Means. In doing so, I propose to make the customary review of the Colony's financial affairs, with which this motion is associated.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Chairman, In making this, my first Budget Speech, I would ask the indulgence of the House, always generously extended to beginners, for this review of the Colony's finances. Twenty years ago this month, my deceased father stood at this desk for the first time in a similar capacity. That Speech was the first of eleven in succession that he delivered. That I may be equally fortunate is perhaps too much for me to expect. But following his example, I shall try and lay before the House a full and unbiased statement of how Newfoundland stands, financially and industrially.

In his Budget Speech a Finance Minister has to deal with three years—the past year, the present year and the coming year. I shall proceed with my presentation of affairs in that order, treating first the fiscal year 1927-28, which ended last June. During the whole of that year the Monroe Administration was in power and responsible for the Colony's affairs, and must be judged by the record it left behind of its financial stewardship.

On the 22nd of May last year my predecessor, Sir John Crosbie, presented his last Budget, only five weeks of the then current fiscal year remained, as it would close on the 30th of June, 1928. In that Speech he estimated the total Current Revenue at \$10,232,000, and the total current expenditure at \$10,592,000, which would leave a deficit of \$360,000. Sir John

Crosbie is known to the country as a capable and successful man in his own affairs. From this you would conclude that he would bring these qualities to the handling of the Colony's finances. In other words, you would assume that five weeks before the close of a year's transactions in his own business he would have a fairly accurate idea of where he stood, and you would expect him to be equally accurate in dealing with the Colony's finances. The truth, though, is that his statement of the Colony's financial position was most misleading. He over-estimated the Revenue for the year by \$765,994.46, it being only \$9,466,005.54. On the other hand he underestimated the expenditure by \$148,925.03, it being actually \$10,740,925.03. As a result, with the actual Revenue only \$9,466,000, (using round figures), and the actual expenditure \$10,741,100, the deficit was really \$1,275,000—\$1,274,919.-49, to be critically correct instead of \$360,000 as estimated by him in that Budget Speech.

I have had various statistical tables pertaining to our finances put in type already and I have asked the Clerk of the House to have them distributed to the Hon. Members immediately. This will, I hope, assist them in following my statement and render it unnecessary for me to read masses of figures which as a rule convey nothing to most people unless they have the figures before them and an opportunity to study them.

The Statement of Revenue, Budget Estimate and Actual Receipts, (see Table 1), shows that of thirteen Revenue Heads for that year, six—Postal, Crown Lands, Inland Revenue Stamps, Fines and Forfeitures, Fees of Public Institutions and Bank and other Taxes, estimated in last year's Budget at \$759,000, actually brought in \$799,512.-14, an increase of \$40,512.14, which I would regard as reasonably close es-

timating on the Minister's part. But the other seven Revenue Heads—Customs, Telegraphs, Liquor Control Profits, Broom Department—Penitentiary; Estate Duties, Taxes and other Assessments, and Miscellaneous Revenue tell a different story. These services, estimated by him to yield \$9,473,000, brought in only \$8,666,493.40; a decrease of \$806,506.60. But a study of those figures makes matters clearer. The Telegraph Department, earning \$178,418.70 was only \$11,581.30 behind—a not unreasonable shortage for so widely distributed a service. Taxes and Assessments, bringing in \$67,692.51, were only \$2,307.49 behind. The Penitentiary, Broom Department with \$2,760.56, had a shortage of merely \$239.44. On the other hand, the four Departments directly under the Minister's control, showed very startling decreases. Customs, estimated by him only five weeks before the close of the fiscal year, as I have said, as likely to produce \$8,500,000, only produced \$7,902,959.72, a shortage of \$597,040.28. The Liquor Control Department, which does a strictly cash business, and therefore should have been able to estimate its takings for these five weeks very closely, was credited by the Minister with \$360,000, but it only yielded \$250,000. Miscellaneous Revenue, again, he estimated at \$300,000.00, while its receipts were only \$224,661.91, so that he overshot the mark by \$75,338.09. Finally, Death Duties supplied only \$40,000, though he estimated them at \$50,000. These four Departments controlled by the Minister, and over which he might be supposed to exercise a closer supervision than over Departments controlled by other Ministers, are responsible for \$795,000 for over-estimate of Revenue in last year's Budget Speech. This is all the more extraordinary because the Minister was careful to assure the House that:

"The above figures for 1927--1928 are closely estimated, and if our collections on account of import duties keep their present upward trend it is not at all impossible but that they will be better than at present anticipated. For my part I shall not be surprised, as all Estimates of Revenue appearing in the Budgets since 1924 have been a little on the short side."

The story of the Estimates of Expenditure is much the same (see Table II). Of the fourteen Headings so included, all but two exceeded the Budget estimate. This was \$10,592,000, including \$185,000 for relief of destitution. The two services showing a credit were Public Works, which only spent \$919,532.71, against a Budget Estimate of \$950,000, a saving of \$30,467.29; and Education, which, at the end of the last fiscal year, had \$81.92 unspent out of a total Budget Estimate of \$930,000. But, on the whole, the Estimates of Expenditure do not seem to call for criticism. The Budget estimate of \$10,592,000 was overspent by only \$148,925.03, the total outlay being \$10,740,925.03. This is not a very great increase on the estimate, all things concerned. The really surprising feature of this portion of last year's Budget Speech is his estimate of income for the four department's under the Minister's control, an excess of nearly \$800,000 over the revenue actually realized.

The only comments I have to make on it are that there is nothing like it in any previous Budget that I have been able to study, and that I can offer no explanation of why such an estimate was made. It is difficult to credit that it was a genuine one under all the circumstances. Some people might suggest that it was for the purpose of making a good impression in the country for the General Elec-

tion due last fall, but I express no opinion as to that.

It may be of interest to know the proportions of the Revenue from the

various sources, so I supply a table of the percentage of heads of total Revenue collected during 1927-28:—

Service	Revenue	Proportion
Customs	\$7,902,959.72	83.49%
Postal	392,508.28	4.15 "
Telegraph	178,418.70	1.88 "
Crown Lands	183,004.12	1.93 "
Inland Revenue Stamps	52,620.04	.55 "
Liquor Control Profits	250,000.00	2.64 "
Fines and Forfeitures	5,746.37	.07 "
Broom Department, Penitentiary.....	2,760.56	.03 "
Fees Public Institutions	46,139.21	.49 "
Death Duties	40,000.00	.42 "
Taxes and Assessments	67,692.51	.72 "
Bank and Trust Co's.	119,494.12	1.26 "
Fire Insurance Co's.		
Landed Estates		
Arrears Income Tax		
Arrears Business Profits Tax.....	224,661.91	2.37 "
Arrears Sales Tax		
Miscellaneous Revenue including		
Interest on Guaranteed Loans		
	<u>\$9,466,005.54</u>	<u>100%</u>

In the same way I give the proportion which the expenditure of each of the principal heads of expenditure bears to the total current expenditure of the Colony:—

Service	Expenditure	Proportion
Interest on Public Debt as at		
June 30th, 1928	\$3,841,922.65	35.77%
Pensions, Naval, Military and Old Age	833,887.43	7.76 "
Civil Government	589,821.41	5.49 "
Administration of Justice	442,686.34	4.12 "
Legislation	96,337.12	.89 "
Education	894,749.59	8.33 "
Public Charities	1,115,931.58	10.39 "
Agriculture and Mines	98,443.01	.91 "
Marine and Fisheries	422,497.72	3.93 "
Roads and Bridges	215,892.89	2.01 "
Posts and Telegraphs	1,170,817.06	10.90 "
Customs	668,324.01	6.23 "
Contingencies	48,124.54	.45 "
Audit Act	261,591.36	2.45 "
Elections	39,898.32	.37 "
	<u>\$10,740,925.03</u>	<u>100%</u>

The Current Revenue actually collected in 1927-28, of \$9,466,005.54, was \$533,570.08 over that collected in 1926-27, which was only \$8,932,435.46, as shown in the comparative statement forming Table III. Eleven of the sixteen heads exhibited there show increases totalling \$736,564.91, of which Customs contributed \$581,447.20; Crown Lands \$75,401.36; and Postal Services \$37,831.80. Five heads showed decreases—Liquor Control Board \$100,000.00; Business Profits Tax Arrears, \$53,058.57 and Estate Duties \$49,803.03, while interest on Guaranteed Loans was the same in both years \$87,155.56.

A similar comparative statement of expenditure for the two years, (see Table IV.), shows that for 1927-28 the outgo was \$10,740,925.03, against \$10,533,408.87, an increase of \$207,516.16. Of the seventeen headings in this statement, twelve showed increases totalling \$560,702.31, of which the largest were Interest on Public Debt \$303,137.43; Audit Act Sec. 33, (b), \$81,264.10; Civil Government \$43,511.04 and Customs \$40,103.45. The other five heads showed decreases altogether of \$353,186.15, the largest being Roads and Bridges, \$242,648.54; Administration of Justice \$38,322.45; and Contingencies General \$32,184.72.

It might seem at first sight that we had cause for thankfulness on our Revenue increasing \$533,570.08 over the previous year, while our expenditure increased only \$207,516.16. But it must not be forgotten that the deficit for 1926-27 was \$1,600,973.41, an even larger deficit than that for 1927-28, with which we are now dealing, and that the enormous expenditure of the previous year was still further increased the past year. The House will better understand the situation by a study of Table V. which is a comparative statement of the past five years, showing fluctuations of Revenue in

the various years, and Table VI. which is a similar statement of the expenditure, showing a steady growth in outlay under the late Government, from nine and one half million dollars (again I use round figures) in 1924-25, their first year in office, to ten and three quarter million in 1927-28, their last year.

But for the fortunate circumstances that the Customs Revenue increased by roundly \$580,000 in the last fiscal year, through the Colony's business expansion; the Crown Lands Revenue by \$75,000, through the greater activity in mining matters; the Postal Revenue by \$35,000, half through greater trade activities and half through sales of new issues of stamps and Miscellaneous Revenue by \$22,000, the late Administration would have closed the fiscal year with a still larger deficit than the \$1,600,000 of 1926-27, and would have left office with the unenviable reputation of having burdened the Colony with the heaviest deficit for any normal year in the Colony's history, while the House would probably have to face the problem of coping with another half million dollars of a shortage to be provided for.

I might explain here that the heading Miscellaneous Revenue 1927-28, \$137,506.35, comprises the following principal items:—

Balance Dry Dock Sales Account	\$33,000.00
Balance Dry Dock Sales Account	1,774.79
Quarterly Interest Bank of Montreal	46,173.14
Sale of Product Lunatic Asylum, etc.	7,700.25
From Municipal Council, services of Mr. Whelan ..	1,670.00
Repayment of Interest from Finance Dept.	17,029.90
Contribution to Fire Department	14,000.00
Sale of Oil Casks, Turbot	

and Herring Inspection Fees, from Marine and Fisheries Department 8,140.00

Table VII. gives a summary of expenditure which shows the main and supplementary grants by the Legislature, as well as transfers, the actual sums expended and the grants exceeded or otherwise. The total appropriations were \$10,893,952.83, the largest sum ever voted under normal conditions, so large, indeed, that the Government was unable to expend it all, and returned \$153,027.80 to the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year.

In addition the following expenditures on loans were made during the year:—

From Loan Account 1919..	\$	708.28
“ “ “ 1921..		3,419.60
“ “ “ 1922..		4,943.55
“ “ “ 1923..		870.17
“ “ “ 1926..		367,751.27
“ “ “ 1927..		3,488,368.68
		<hr/>
		\$3,866,061.55
		<hr/>

Some of the smaller items of expenditure included in the above are—cutting pulpwood \$1,000, eel grass experiment \$2,144, visit of Mining Congress \$1,000, survey of Pinware River, Labrador \$4,875; Harbor Grace aerodrome \$6,914, Marine Works \$130,000, Lighthouses, etc. \$45,000, telephone and wireless installations \$13,195, additions to Sanatorium \$7,000, Magistrate's residence at Corner Brook \$4,500, police station and gaoler's quarters at Corner Brook \$5,000, additions and alterations to Public Buildings \$33,775, dredging Dock by Priestman \$16,790, on account of deficit 1925-26 \$82,000, to liquidate the Militia Account \$90,000, on Account of Railway Capital Expenditure, January to June, 1928 \$50,000; cost of arbitration Municipal Council—Railway \$16,000, advertising Loan \$858, printing bonds of Loan \$1911, steam

coaches for Railway \$76,000, two steel sleeping cars \$75,000 and Labrador Boundary \$93,000.

The larger expenditures were \$235,000 on account of the Railway diversion; \$617,000 for the deficit on the railway in 1926-27; \$1,000,000 for the deficit of the Colony in the same year and \$697,000 on roads, etc.—\$400,000 through the Public Works Department and \$297,000 through the Government Engineer's Department.

In the Budget Speech a year ago, as already stated, the Minister estimated a deficit on the Colony's General Account for 1927-28 of \$360,000, and to meet this made provision in the Loan Bill which followed his Budget for such an amount. But after the Loan was raised it was found that no provision had been made by him for meeting the discount on the Bonds and the cost of raising it, a sum of about \$200,000. This amount had, accordingly, to be deducted from the \$360,000 set apart to meet the deficit. This left only \$160,000 available for the purpose, so the Government will have to ask the Legislature to provide \$1,114,919.49 at this session to liquidate this unsatisfied shortage on account of the last fiscal year.

But apart from the General Account there is the Railway Account. In the same Budget my predecessor made another serious error when he estimated the loss on the operation of the Railway for the fiscal year at \$300,000. But the actual deficit was \$446,544.43. In the Loan Bill provision was made for this \$300,000 also, but \$146,544.43 remained outstanding, and this will have to be provided for now in the same way. In other words, the Legislature will have to provide a sum of one million two hundred and sixty-one thousand, four hundred and sixty-three dollars and ninety-two cents (\$1,261,463.92) at the present session to cover these amounts which were

underestimated in the last Budget. I recognize, of course, that it is impossible for any Finance Minister to accurately estimate the financial position at the end of a year, but there has never been a case, I believe, where a Finance Minister, with only five weeks of a year remaining, was so far out in his calculations.

The operation of the Railway System during the fiscal year resulted, as already observed, in a net loss of \$446,544.43, against a similar loss of \$617,675.56 the previous year, and of \$743,797.38 in 1925-26. Table VIII gives a comparative statement of the Revenue and Expenditure accounts of the Railway for the past two fiscal years, and Table IX of the various steamers operated as part of the Railway System. I summarize them here, as follows:—

	1926-27	1927-28
Loss on operation of Railway.....	\$680,476.35	\$637,655.10
Profit on operation of Steamers.....	5,821.79	139,305.11
Profit on operation of Dockyards.....	56,979.79	57,805.56
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Net loss	\$617,675.56	\$446,544.43

The development of the Red Indian Lake mining areas will unquestionably result in a large net increase to the Railway earnings, and, I have no doubt, will materially decrease the deficit for 1928-29.

A very large increase in the Steamer Revenue for 1927-28, as compared with 1926-27, will be noted. The cause for the increase will be gathered from the comparative statement of

Total Revenue 1926-27....	\$3,057,809.88
Total Revenue 1927-28....	3,200,908.50
	<hr/>
Increase 1927-28	143,098.62
Total Expenditure 1926 27	\$3,675,485.44
Total Expenditure 1927-28	3,647,452.93
	<hr/>
Decrease 1927-28.....	\$ 28,032.51

I would like to note, in passing the welcome fact of a reduction in Expenditure at the same time that a substantial increase in Revenue is recorded. During the past two years both the Steamers and the Dockyards have earned a net profit, the losses of the system being entirely in the Railway. This is shown by the following statement:—

the earnings of the fleet which is in Table IX.

The difference in expenditure between the two years in question was \$8,856.97 in favor of 1927-28.

During the year ending June 30th, 1928, there was charged to Capital Expenditure Account of the Railway System the sum of \$396,161.08 on account of expenditures made and work done, as follows:—

On Rolling Stock	\$ 6,993.99
On Re-railing the Railroad between Clarendville and Bishop's Falls	120,438.73
On Re-railing the Railroad between Humbermouth and Port aux Basques	139,353.12
On various additions and improvements to railway properties....	27,104.13
On re-constructing Bridges and Culverts	26,054.18
On re-conditioning steamer Clyde.....	30,792.36
On re-conditioning steamer Glencoe.....	24,158.97

On improvements of Dock Waterways.....	16,790.00
On survey of Topsails Diversion of Railway.....	4,535.60
	\$396,161.08

During the previous fiscal year the capital expenditure on account of the Railway System was \$959,616.59, so that our capital outlay the past year was lower by \$563,455.51.

I shall have some more extended remarks to make respecting the Railway System later in this address.

The net Funded (\$75,720,628.30) and Floating (\$1,946,666.66) Public Debt of the Colony at the end of June 1928 was \$77,667,294.96 irrespective of the deficit for the current account and the railway for 1927-28, viz: \$1,274,919.49 and \$446,544.43, respectively. To cover these deficits \$360,000.00 was provided for the former and \$300,000.00 for the latter in the Loan Act 1928. Of the \$360,000.00 appropriated for Current Account deficit, \$160,000.00 only is available, as \$200,000.00 will have to be taken from this to offset the cost of the raising and of the discount on the Loan.

It will therefore require \$1,114,919.49 more to meet the deficit on Current Account and \$146,544.43 for Railway Account, in all \$1,261,463.92. Eventually this amount will have to be added to the Public Debt, thus making it \$78,928,759.88 or, estimating the population of the Colony at 270,000, a principal charge of, approximately, \$292 per capita with an interest charge, placing the interest at 5 1-8 per cent on the whole debt, of a little over \$15.00 per head.

I propose also to deal at greater length with the Public Debt in the next section of this speech.

The total trade of the Colony for the fiscal year showed a gratifying increase of more than four and one half

million dollars over 1926-27, the imports having increased \$1,823,322.00 and the exports \$2,804,760.00, as will be shown by Table X.

The figures show that the largest increase was in the trade with the Mother Country, our advance in imports from it being well maintained, while our exports to it enlarged by nearly one and a half million dollars. On the other hand, Canada made the poorest showing, especially in her purchases from us, though she is our nearest neighbor.

As Hon. Members are aware, an effort was made at the beginning of 1928 by the Colonial Secretary of that day, to negotiate a Trade Agreement with Canada, and it was announced at the time that he had succeeded. But differences of opinion as to exactly what had been agreed upon arose between the Canadian authorities and ours, and the project came to nothing. Recently the present Prime Minister renewed negotiations and the matter is still under consideration, so I will only say that Newfoundland will welcome an opportunity to reach an understanding with Canada on trade matters which will be fair to both Countries.

I now turn to the current year. At the Session last year estimates were presented and approval for the total sum of \$10,438,139.39—say ten and a half million dollars in round figures. The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech said: "These votes have been carefully considered, and from the information supplied me by the expending departments as well as my own experience during the four years now ending I feel that the requirements of

the Public Service for the coming year have been fully supplied by these appropriations." The Monroe administration, at that time in power, retained office until August 15th, 1928, a period of six weeks of the current fiscal year. It was succeeded by the Alderdice Administration, to which Mr. Monroe transferred his mantle. This Administration remained in power until Nov. 15th, or three months longer, when the adverse vote of the country at the general election compelled it to retire.

During this election a tremendous expense was incurred by that party, mostly on the authority of Orders-in-Council, and letters of the Auditor General to the heads of that Government recently tabled by me, showed that he protested against much of this expenditure as illegal and a flagrant departure from recognized constitutional practice. At my request he has prepared for me a statement of expenditure from July 1st, 1928, to November 30th, 1928:—

Public Works, expenditure Roads and Bridges from July 1st, 1928, to Nov. 30th, 1928		\$478,613.79
Of this amount there was spent—		
For the usual Main Line Grants....	\$58,265.04	
For the usual Local Line Grants....	46,862.60	
For the usual Railway Connecting Roads	1,930.00	
	<hr/>	\$107,057.64
		<hr/>
		\$371,556.15

(The above amounts include the allocations for May and June on account of the succeeding fiscal year vote which under the ruling now in force in the Department is not set up in the books until July as expenditure for these two months is looked upon as belonging to the year 1928-29—amount \$92,547.16.)

Marine and Fisheries expenditure.....		137,882.51
Highroads		320,342.11
Railway expenditure on capital items was	\$973,221.90	
On the Topsails Diversion	327,206.25	
		<hr/>
		1,300,428.15

The total of these amounts is \$2,237,266.56 but if we deduct the \$107,057.64 of ordinary road grants, and say, \$800,000.00 for re-railing part of the railway, there remains an outlay by the late Government, for political purposes alone, of about \$1,330,000.00. This was incurred for the sole purpose of trying to corrupt the electorate into voting for the candidates

of their party, but I need not say it failed. Our opponents offered themselves to the electors as champions of a "great moral issue," but I fancy they will have some difficulty in justifying the morality of these proceedings. They diverted into this "slush fund," as it has been called, every dollar they could find in any of the public departments, and they sent out to

the railway diversion work hundreds of men, and on nomination day, when the work had to shut down, brought back all those employed there and charged all their passages to the Public Charities Department, which had to pay bills amounting to \$30,000 for this purpose. Because of this, the expenditure of the department was heavily increased so that my estimate of the total cost of carrying on the public services for the twelve months ending in June next, based upon the actual outlay for nine months, and an approximation of three months, is \$11,197,451.85. This estimate of expenditure is given by heads, thus:—

Estimated Expenditure for 1928-1929.

Interest on Public Debt..\$	3,897,659.12
Finance Department	480,617.66
Colonial Secretary	280,524.39
Public Charities	917,436.97
Justice Department	372,122.62
Education	942,027.92
Agriculture and Mines ..	175,789.25
Marine and Fisheries	522,920.37
Public Works	957,043.43
Posts and Telegraphs	1,408,796.83
Customs	581,006.32
Pension Commissioners..	641,506.98
Miscellaneous	20,000.00

Total\$ 11,197,451.85

Last year the Finance Minister estimated the revenue for the twelve months at \$10,200,500, which figure he also said had been checked carefully and represented in his opinion a close estimate. The deficit that would result, therefore, from an estimated expenditure of \$10,469,000 and an estimated revenue of \$10,200,500 would be only \$268,190. Unfortunately, however, no such favorable result rejoices us today. The actual Revenue, as near as I can estimate it, will be \$9,913,630.44, and instead of a deficit of only about \$270,000, as he then foreshadowed, the actual shortage will be \$1,283,821.41,

or say \$1,280,000 in round figures. For none of this deficiency does the present Government accept any responsibility whatsoever. When we took office we found the Treasury bare; we found every appropriation made in previous years seized and misapplied for election and other purposes; we found uncontrolled expenditures in every department, and everywhere public money was being scattered broadcast without any thought of the future. We had to set ourselves to work to curtail in every quarter and to restrict expenditures to those absolutely necessary. But in spite of all we could do it proved impossible for us to reduce the outgo to anything like a due proportion of the income. Indeed, only for the increase of Customs Revenue resulting from a good fishery and the industrial activity incidental to Grand Falls, Corner Brook and elsewhere, the position would not be so fortunate, and the deficit would be much larger. I give here the estimate of revenue for this year, by heads, based, in the same way, on the actual receipts for nine months:—

Estimate of Revenue for 1928-1929

Customs	\$8,213,863.48
Postal	415,711.67
Telegraphs	183,424.23
Inland Revenue Stamps....	53,335.13
Crown Lands	162,000.00
Liquor Profits	350,097.42
Fines and Forfeitures.....	5,666.55
Interest Guaranteed Loans	87,155.56
Broom Department	1,666.66
Taxes and Assessments....	67,700.00
Fees Public Institutions....	42,335.79
Death Duties	30,000.00
Income and other Taxes....	175,000.00
Miscellaneous	124,673.95

Estimate Total Revenue 9,913,630.44

Est. Total Expenditure, \$11,197,451.85

Estimate Total Deficit \$ 1,283,821.41

The Railway System, it is estimated will do somewhat better than last year, but we are allowing for a deficit on this account of \$400,000.00.

The total Public Debt at the end of June next, I estimate at \$81,424,140, including \$1,946,666.66 of a loan from the Imperial Government, but not including \$1,261,463 of last year's deficits and the whole of this year's deficits—\$1,283,821 on Current Account and \$400,000 on Railway Account—a grand total of debt still to be funded of \$2,954,284, which when done will make our Public Debt \$84,369,430.

I now turn to the year that is to come—the fiscal year 1929-30, beginning on 1st July next. For that year I estimate a Revenue as follows:—

Customs	\$ 8,650,000.00
Postal	440,000.00
Telegraphs	195,000.00
Crown Lands	120,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	55,000.00
Liquor Profits	350,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures....	9,000.00
Broom Department	2,000.00
Taxes and Assessments	70,000.00
Fees Public Institutions	55,000.00
Death Duties	60,000.00
Income Taxes	550,000.00
Miscellaneous	400,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,956,000.00

For the same year I estimate the Expenditure as follows:—

Agriculture and Mines....	117,000.00
Colonial Secretary	132,000.00
Finance Department	\$ 4,472,000.00
Justice	380,000.00
Marine and Fisheries.....	431,000.00
Public Works	975,000.00
Customs	556,000.00
Assessor of Taxes.....	15,000.00
Pension Commissioners..	647,000.00
Education	987,000.00
Public Charities.....	306,000.00
Public Health.....	256,000.00

Posts and Telegraphs.....	1,274,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,548,000.00
Additional Estimates, this	
year	320,000.00
Supplementary Supply,	
next year	275,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$11,143,000.00

Money will doubtless be spent under the Audit Act Sec. 33 (b) but I hope this expenditure will be offset by any dropped balances that may accrue. The average yearly for dropped balances is \$150,000.00. Therefore, with a Revenue of \$10,956,000.00 and an Expenditure of \$11,143,000.00, I estimate a deficit of \$187,000.00 next year. To secure even this means that the Revenue must be augmented considerably, and as a contributory to this we are enacting an Income tax law.

As the House is already aware, it has been decided to appoint a Commission to revise the Tariff, which is expected to submit its report in time for next session, when we hope to be in a position to make such changes as will reduce the burden on the working classes, and at the same time increase the revenue somewhat. In connection with this we look forward to such readjustments as will enable us to balance our Budget thereafter.

Having dealt with the three years embraced in this review I now turn to the larger aspects of the Colony's problem. The question is "where are we and whither tending?" My answer is that we are in a serious situation and tending towards disaster unless we devote ourselves to the serious task of reorganisation, reconstruction and industrial development. For nine years, including the present fiscal year, the country has been struggling with the problem of deficits on current account. For nine years we have been borrowing to

meet current account liabilities. The most alarming fact is that the deficits for the three immediate past years covering July 1st, 1926 to June 30th, 1929 amount to a total of \$4,159,716, or an average of \$1,386,572 annually.

I ask you to note particularly the 1928-9 deficit, estimated at \$1,283,824. This is a horrible situation—Grand Falls running at the full, Buchans a going concern, Corner Brook at maximum output and further developing, Bell Island working at full capacity. In spite of this there is a deficit half as great as the deficit of 1920-21 when our country was staggering, in common with the rest of the war-stricken countries, under the terrible commercial disaster of post-war catastrophe.

The first and most serious matter that confronts us is that of balancing our Budget—making two ends meet. No country, or no individual, can keep above water who tries to live on borrowed money. I am sure that neither this Legislature nor the electorate feels satisfied that it is a policy we can continue much longer without ruinous consequences to the country. Since 1919-20 there has not been a genuine surplus declared in this House. I know that my predecessor claimed a surplus for 1924-25—the first year he was in office—of nearly \$350,000.00 (using round figures). but it was an open secret at the time, and shown by me later from my seat across the House, that it was produced by charging into the accounts of the previous year, when his opponents had been in power, everything that could so be charged before the books of the year were closed by him. In that same way, I have already shown, he presented accounts here last session showing the deficit as only \$360,000 instead of \$1,275,000, by increasing the estimate of certain items of Revenue far beyond the figure it was possible to reach for the

rest of the year then remaining. The actual result of our book-keeping for these nine years, even crediting this alleged surplus, is:—

	Surplus	Deficit
1920-21	\$2,513,449
1921-22	857,862
1922-23	675,529
1923-24	1,620,468
1924-25	\$347,003	
1925-26	112,616
1926-27	1,600,973
1927-28	(Est.) 1,283,824
		<hr/>
		\$9,939,637
Less 1924-25 Surplus.....		347,003
		<hr/>
Total net deficit for 9 yrs.		\$9,592,634
		<hr/>

This is at the rate of \$1,065,848 annually for the nine years, all of which, as well as a great deal more, we had to meet by borrowing money in the form of loans, which have been added to the public debt, burdening us and those who come after us with the interest charges that must be paid thereon.

I would repeat here that the point I have just made as to the deficits for the past three years. It will be seen from the figures that in each year of the three the deficits exceeded 1.1-4 million dollars, and was greater than any year of the nine except 1920-21, when the Colony faced the post-war depression. I do not overlook 1923-24, because the big deficit shown then was not a genuine one but was created by my predecessor charging into expenditure for that year large amounts which should have been charged against the next year but were charged to 1923-24 with the object of showing a surplus for Sir John Crosbie's first year in office. The fact that for the past three years such enormous deficits were created speaks volumes for the real capacity of the men who assumed office under a

pledge 'to 'clean up and keep clean' and who paraded before the country as possessing greater fitness for the task of running the Government than any other people in our history.

What I have meant by the words "a great deal more," which I have just used, is that in all these nine years we have been incurring deficits on account of the Railway as well, for in 1920 the Government first became identified with the operation of the railway system. These deficits are as follows:—

Year	Deficits
1920-21	\$1,758,000.00
1921-22	953,000.00
1922-23	593,000.00
1923-24	6,000.00
1924-25	358,000.00
1925-26	743,000.00
1926-27	617,000.00
1927-28	446,000.00
1928-29 (estimated)	400,000.00
<hr/>	
Total of deficits for 9 years —.....	\$5,874,000.00

This is at the rate of \$652,667.00 annually for these nine years; and all this money had to be raised on loan, too, and added to the public debt in addition. I would call attention at this point to the fact that the efficient control of Railway Expenditures resulting from Government association with the Reids in Railway management during the years 1920 to 1924 caused a reduction of annual losses from \$1,758,000 in the first year to \$6,000 in the fourth year.

But as everybody knows, the railway and the steamers were in a frightfully "rundown" state when we took them over in 1923-24, and the dry dock required considerable attention in the same way, though whether it needed rebuilding on the scale that was undertaken may very well be doubted. However, the cost of im-

provements to the railway, including re-railing of three of the divisions, new passenger and freight cars, locomotives, steam coaches, re-conditioning of the steamers, rebuilding of the dock and other outlays and charged to Capital Account had been up to the end of last June, as follows:—

Year	Capital Expenditure
1923-24	\$ 236,394.10
1924-25	294,938.26
1925-26	1,403,555.04
1926-27	959,616.59
1927-28	396,161.02
<hr/>	
Total	\$3,390,665.01

Here we see three items alone which represent an addition of nearly \$19,000,000.00 to our burdens in the past nine years—nine and one half millions of dollars through deficits on Railway Account, and nearly three and a half million through Capital Expenditure on Railway Account.

Up to now the Railway has been as serious a menace to our financial stability as our unbalanced Budgets. Even as things are, heavy outlays must be yet made to render it fully efficient. The remaining division has to be re-railed, which will cost \$800,000; other Capital Expenditure next year is estimated to cost \$350,000; and the diversion at Buchans is also certain to mean a large outlay. But when these undertakings are completed the most serious calls upon the Colony in respect of the Railway System for some years will have been met.

We are accustomed when discussing the Railway System, to express the hope that it will soon be self supporting. But in so saying we forget entirely that allowance should be made for the interest on the cost of construction, improvements, etc. In order to obtain the exact annual cost of the railway to the country it will be ne-

cessary to add the interest chargeable on Capital Account. That interest is contained in the vote for Interest on Public Debt and its annually paid therefrom. Funds for Railway construction, etc., have been obtained for the most part by loan; the balance, (a very small proportion of the total), has been supplied from time to time from the Surplus Trust Fund. The Auditor General has made up the cost of the Railway System as amounting to \$39,586,625.00, of which \$36,863,096 has been obtained by loan, the balance being from the Surplus Trust Fund, Current Account, cash for sale of rails applied to maintenance, and value of land grants.

At, say, five per cent, the annual interest paid on loans incurred on account of the railway system amounts to \$1,843,155.00. The loss on operation for 1927-28 was \$446,544. The cost to the Colony for the system for that year was therefore \$2,289,699.00. It may be taken consequently, as a definite fact that the Railway System costs the Colony about two and one quarter million dollars every year, because, while we are seeing its operating deficits, which show every year in the public accounts, gradually reduced, we are, on the other hand increasing the interest charges, which do not so appear, by the interest on the money we borrow from year to year to meet expenditures on capital account, like re-railing, new equipment, etc.

Like the Dominion of Canada with its National Railway System, we should be very glad if we could get ours to pay its way annually, with the Colony continuing to bear this interest charge without any hope, certainly in the near future, of the railway being able to contribute anything towards reducing this interest charge. Conditions in regard to the Railway are becoming more encouraging of

late years, and a recent address by the general manager of the Railway System indicates this. It showed that the Railway has now a total mileage of 906, has eleven steamers working as part of the system, and operates the dry dock in this port as an auxiliary. This system has now gross earnings of over three million dollars yearly, and has become an efficient transport system, which today is in better condition than ever before in its history, though there is still much work to be done, and its program of ballasting and other improvements must be carried to completion. A sum of \$350,000 has been asked by the Railroad Commission for this purpose during the next fiscal year. Ballasting alone cost \$100,000 a year for some years past, but after another year or two this item will be much reduced. On the other hand, the central division of the line, from Bishop's Falls to Humbermouth, requires to be re-railed with heavier steel and provision will have to be made for this. The matter of the diversion of the Topsails Section is one of great importance and has been giving the government much concern.

The General Manager's address also shows that for the six months that ended December 31st, 1928, the Railroad was operated without loss, whereas during the same period in 1921-22, the first year the Government was connected with the Reid Co. in operating the system, there was a loss of half a million dollars. The period from January to June of each year is always a most difficult one in which to forecast net earnings as winter operations are uncertain and an open winter without snowfalls may prove more expensive than otherwise, because of running trains to keep the road open, and running them and the Gulf steamer without sufficient traffic to warrant it. However, the outlook is improving, and he suggests that with another

large industry on the West Coast and still another between Clarendville and Bishop's Falls the railroad could operate through the year without loss whatever. During the last year the number of miles run by all trains was over 1,000,000; 275 thousand passengers were carried and 232 thousand tons of freight via North Sydney were conveyed over and above any year in the last seven. The management argues, and very properly, that this Railway System, being our own, should be patronized to the fullest extent possible by our own people, both as to passengers and to freight, claiming that the system can easily handle five or six times the present tourist traffic that it is getting and hoping for the day when daily expresses will be operating all through the summer months.

The Auditor General and the Government Engineer have each made exhaustive studies of the whole question of the cost of our railways, and they have been good enough to place their material at my disposal. From it I have made a summary which, I think, will be the first public statement that has yet appeared regarding our Railway enterprise and what it has cost us. In 1875 Sir Sandford Fleming advocated the railway across the Island and a survey of it was undertaken costing \$42,000. In 1878 Sir William Whiteway introduced resolutions in this House based on the Fleming survey, which developed into the Harbor Grace Railway, (as one feature of a larger proposal known as the "Newfoundland Railway"), and cost \$2,043,677.24, including \$1,581,666.66 for the purchase of the line by the Government from bond holders in 1896. Following the Harbor Grace Railway came the Placentia Railway, completed just thirty years ago at a cost of \$554,944.27. In 1890 there was started the Hall's Bay Railway, fol-

lowed three years later by the decision to extend it to the West Coast, this enlarged project being known as the Northern and Western Railway and costing altogether \$8,094,010.75. Following then came the shore lines: (1) from Brigus Junction to Tilton, and (2) from Harbor Grace to Carbonear, costing \$583,245.00; the Lewisporte branch costing \$195,202.00; the branch into the West End of St. John's at a cost of \$165,014.07, the re-railing of the various branches at a cost of \$111,750.00 and the acquisition of the Municipal Basin in this city for a deep water terminal, which cost \$250,000.00. In 1898 the famous "Reid Deal" was made and three years after was unmade, in part, at any rate. To buy back the reversion of the Railroad and pay the awards for rolling stock, stations, etc., cost us \$2,254,425.52. To increase the usefulness of the Railway many railway connecting roads were built, costing \$103,000.00. Then in 1909 came the "Branch" lines by the Morris Government, costing \$7,448,234.37. In 1920 the first Squires Government, because of the handicaps to the Reid enterprise from the post-war depression, had to inaugurate the policy of a Commission and joint control. The first year showed a deficit of \$1,758,000; the second year saw this big deficit reduced to \$953,000, the third year it was further reduced to \$593,000 and in the fourth year, due to the Humber Industrial Development, it was practically extinguished, being only \$6,000. In 1923 the same Government decided to purchase the line at a cost of \$2,061,033.33. The operation of the system under Government control to the end of 1927-28 cost \$8,429,692.61, and the proportion of loan discounts chargeable to it was \$148,851. Finally, land grants secured by the Reid Company for operation represent \$1,392,475.00.

The recapitulation is:—

Fleming Survey	\$ 42,600.00
Newfoundland Railway	2,043,677.24
Placentia Railway	554,944.27
Northern and Western Railway	8,094,010.75
Shore Lines	583,245.00
Lewisporte Branch	195,202.00
West End Branch	165,014.07
Re-railing Branches	111,750.00
Municipal Basin	250,000.00
Railway Reversion and Awards	2,254,423.52
Railway Connecting Roads	103,600.00
Branch Lines and Discounts on Loans.....	7,448,234.37
Commission and Joint Control	5,886,416.28
Under Newfoundland Government Control	8,429,692.61
Proportion of Loan Discount, 1921, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28	148,851.00
Purchase in 1923 and Discount	2,061,033.33
Land Grants	1,392,475.00
	\$39,765,169.44

This does not take into account the Telegraph arbitration of 1905, when it cost us \$1,570,555.00 to get back our telegraph lines from the Reid Company besides \$31,000 in fees, on which system we lost last year \$200,000 besides the interest on the \$1,600,000, it cost us, say, \$80,000 a year more.

If in addition to the sums already spent on the Railway we take into account the Buchans Diversion, we may say our Railway enterprise represents roundly, an outlay of forty million dollars, or about half of our Public Debt.

Another menace to the solvency of the country, which is equally serious, if not more so in some respects, is that involved in the growth of Expenditure on what may be called Social Services—the provision of Hospitals and Medical Treatment, Pauper Relief, and for Orphanages and other Institutions and similar services. I have had a statement—see Table XI—covering these services for the past five years, prepared, which shows the appalling total of \$6,720,207, an average outlay of \$1,344,042, annually. As the statement is very full and is cumbersome

to handle, I have made certain summaries which I will deal with here not alone for the serious consideration of this House, but for the even more serious consideration of the people of the country, who have to pay the bills. The totals for the five fiscal years are as follows:—

1923-24	\$1,652,397.00
1924-25	1,192,985.00
1925-26	1,140,243.00
1926-27	1,361,000.00
1927-28	1,373,582.00
Total	\$6,720,207.00

The figures above show that in 1923-24, for most of which period the Warren Government was in office, the Expenditure was the largest of the five years. During this year there was expended in able-bodied relief through Public Works \$218,532, no similar expenditure having been made since in any year, while there was expended through Public Charities \$283,390.23. In each year since there was an expenditure through the latter agency, starting with \$172,000 in 1924-25 dropping to \$100,000 in 1925-26, increasing

to \$180,000 in 1926-27, and going up to \$262,000 in 1927-28. In other words, the Monroe Government, in spite of its talk of reform, increased this expenditure from \$100,000 in 1925-26 to \$262,000 last year—an advance of \$80,000 each year. This is all the more remarkable because during this period the late Government had in operation what was known as a Finance Commission, consisting of Hons. A. B. Morine, M. S. Sullivan and R. Cramm, in reality a Committee of the Executive Council, appointed for the express purpose of reducing expenditure and instituting reforms, and for which service they were handsomely paid. The figures I have just quoted, and the total figures for the four year they were in power as given above, showing an increase from \$1,200,000 in 1924-25 to \$1,375,000 in 1927-28, prove that their efforts were not conspicuously successful.

I propose next to give from the figures in Table XI an idea of the average cost of operating hospital and asylum services during the past five years, including, in the case of hospitals, the fees paid by the Public Charities Department for pauper patients in these institutions:—

General Hospital	\$214,000	a year
Sudbury Hospital	19,000	"
Fever Hospital	46,000	"
Sanatorium	98,000	"
Lunatic Asylum	156,000	"
Poor Asylum	41,000	"
St. Clare's Hospital	14,000	"
Southcott Hospital	6,000	"
Grace Hospital	21,000	"
	<hr/>	
Total	\$615,000	"

This total represents payments every year for institutions in this city alone, and in addition there has grown up during the last three years of the Monroe Government an agency termed "emergency employment in connection

with public hospitals," costing \$2,500 a year. There are also expenditures on account of hospitals in the Outports, including grants in aid, which are:—

Notre Dame Bay Hospital.....	\$15,000
Grand Falls Hospital.....	360
Deer Lake Hospital (2 yrs).....	2,000
Corner Brook Hospital (2 yrs)	500
Battle Harbor Hospital.....	2,000
Indian Harbor Hospital.....	1,000
St. Anthony Hospital.....	6,500
Pilley's Island Hospital.....	2,000
Okak Hospital.....	200
Gand Bank Hospital.....	900
	<hr/>
	\$30,460

When all the services these outport institutions give to the people all over the Island are considered, the expenditure, on the whole, cannot be regarded as unreasonable.

I would next deal with the so-called receiving hospitals in St. John's, which have come in for a good deal of discussion lately. The first is the "Field" hospital so-called, which did not exist in 1923-24, but received \$1,890 the next year, \$9,789 the next year, \$13,091 the next year, and \$17,482 last year, a total of \$42,248, or over \$10,000 a year for four years. Next to that comes the "King" hospital so-called, which in 1923-24 got \$198.20, received the same amount in 1924-25 less the twenty cents, increased its receipts the year after to \$2,752, jumped a year later to \$10,113 and last year secured \$15,455, a total of \$28,716 in the five years. Yet another is the so-called "Martin" hospital, which was doing quite a large business as long ago as 1923-24 when it obtained \$5,132, got \$2,960 the next year, then increased to \$3,415, then to \$4,340, and last year grew to \$6,841, a total of \$26,729 in the five years. These three places secured from the Public Treasury in the past five years over \$92,000 and this in spite of the fact that the

reformers of the Monroe Government created another agency to cope with this growing scandal, a so-called Board of Health, headed by Inspector O'Reilly with Dr. Brehm and Dr. Roberts as colleagues, and Mr. Wm. Rennie as secretary. It is curious that, whereas in 1924-25, before they were appointed, the expenditure on these places amounted to only about \$6,000, it had increased last year to almost \$40,000. Various other places in St. John's received amounts for boarding people while awaiting admission to hospital, but the amounts are too small to trouble with.

I now turn to another aspect of this matter, the growth of similar places in the Outports, notably in Placentia, for the returns show that the Conran establishment there secured \$1,046, \$550, \$1,142, \$1,961 and \$3,131 in the successive years, a total of \$7,820 in the five years. The Delaney establishment at Placentia appears to have secured about \$250 a

year for four years, and the Hunt establishment at Jersey Side, apparently opened last year, got \$729. At Argentia there was one operated by somebody named Power getting \$898 the first year, \$1,827 the second year, \$2,088 the third year, \$1,289 the fourth year and \$537 last year, a total of \$6,640 in the five years. I understand that this establishment is used partly for housing patients going and coming by the Coastal Boats, but in all the other cases it is singular that the last years of the Monroe Government saw the sums they received grow steadily larger, though the Morine-Sullivan-Cramm Commission and the O'Reilly-Rennie Board of Health were supposed to be actively at work.

Now I would turn to various services operated by the Public Charities Department and would show the average annual cost for the five years:—

Permanent and Casual Poor (widows and orphans).....	\$215,000	a year
Medical attendance paupers (drugs, fees, etc.).....	45,000	"
Pauper lunatics (doctor's fees and travelling expenses).....	4,500	"
Conveyance of sick poor.....	15,000	"
Extraordinary expenditure (burials, etc., and artificial limbs	23,000	"
Public Health, Outports (doctors' fees, drugs, etc.).....	26,000	"
Sick Fishermen, Labrador.....	3,300	"
Public Health, Labrador.....	5,700	"
Shipwrecked crews.....	6,000	"
Orphanages	29,000	"
Charitable Societies Donations.....	18,000	"

Besides this outlay of \$390,000 annually there are smaller outlays which I have not included. A study of the above figures in detail, though, is instructive. The payments to permanent and casual poor are constant over the whole five years at about \$215,000 annually. Medical attendance of paupers started with \$46,000, dropped to \$38,000, then advanced to \$41,000, from that to \$43,000, and last year jumped to \$52,000.

Emergency cases started at \$8,000, dropped to \$7,000, then to \$6,000 jumped to \$10,500 year before last, and further increased to \$13,300 last year. The conveyance of sick poor started with \$17,000, dropped to \$12,000, then to \$11,000, then increased to \$15,000, and last year further increased to \$19,500. The same is true of the item of Extraordinary Expenditure, such as burials, artificial limbs, etc. It started with \$25,000, dropped to \$21,000, then

to \$19,000, but, advanced to \$21,000, and last year was \$28,000. The Public Health, Outports, covering doctors' fees, etc., showed an amazing decline. Starting with \$44,000 it dropped to \$42,000, and then to \$23,000, and then down to \$9,000, but last year it went up to \$13,300. The vote for Orphanages was fairly constant over the whole period, but donations to Charitable Societies, ranging from \$13,000 to \$14,000 during the first three years, jumped to \$28,000 the fourth year and was \$23,000 last year. Broadly speaking, 1923-24 showed nearly every vote in all these various services at the highest figure, then there was a drop, but in the last two years there was a marked increase, although, as I have already pointed out, the Morine-Sullivan-Cramm Finance Commission was in existence and the O'Reilly-Rennie Board of Health was also active.

No fair-minded man can study this Table without being satisfied that there are grave and constantly growing abuses connected with these services; that the tendency is for everybody who can to impose himself on the Government, and that the fine spirit of independence which marked our forefathers is sadly lacking in many of their decendants to-day. It is equally certain that a fair share of the responsibility for these abuses must lie at the doors of some of the medical men, both in the city and the outports, who have prostituted themselves for the easy money that was to be got by working on Government cases. As the House is already aware, the Government has appointed a Commission to go into the whole question of the carrying out of these services and the Board of Health has been reorganized with the same object in view. It is not for me to anticipate the report this Commission will make in due course, or what the Board is doing, but I may say that the Government is greatly

pleased with the evidences already afforded it that the work of reducing the outlay without impairing the efficiency of these services is being conducted most intelligently and efficiently. Of all these services the expenditure under the definite heading of Public Charities is perhaps the most alarming. Large grants under section 33b of the Audit Act have had to be made in each year, as the annual appropriations have been invariably overdrawn, and vigorous measures are needed to prevent worse coming to pass. I hope that a year hence it may be possible for me to report a considerable improvement in these services and that a substantial saving may be effected.

Certainly, this scale of outlay cannot continue, on these various services over one million dollars a year. The expenditures have now come to represent 10 per cent of our total annual expenditure and it must be apparent to everybody that we cannot stand the drain indefinitely. The Government found itself compelled to carry out certain relief work in St. John's during the past winter on which it expended about \$100,000, and it is obliged to furnish relief to many destitute people at present time. So seriously does it regard the matter that it recently appointed a Commission to investigate this problem of unemployment in the hope that some policy of coping with it may be adopted in the near future.

The earnest co-operation of the whole Legislature is invited in dealing with the question of reforming these services.

A year or two ago large advertisements were published in newspapers, warning people against coming here seeking hospital treatment without proper authority. These were signed by the late Colonial Secretary and strongly supported by his colleague, the Finance Minister, but it is com-

monly stated in circles associated with this work that these were the first to disregard this regulation when it suited themselves.

Although the customary tables of exports of fishery and other products for the fiscal year are attached to this statement, having been compiled from the official returns, I have thought it desirable, in order that the House and the country at large may get a better idea of the situation at the end of the calendar year, 1928, to secure additional particulars of our industries covering the twelve months which ended on December 31st, and in some cases for the previous calendar years as well. These particulars are not, perhaps, as complete as those obtained through the Customs House, but they have been supplied in some cases by the Companies concerned in the production, and they will serve to show the progress of the country's trade during these years. The Newfoundland Board of Trade, whose views on commercial matters may be regarded as those of the St. John's business community, says in its report that trade generally was good during 1928, and that \$2,000,000 was distributed among the fishermen alone on account of the extra price of codfish in 1928. It also says that "standing on the threshold of the new year it is pleasant to look back upon the satisfactory year just elapsed and to be able to look forward with reasonable hope and expectation that 1929 will not be less prosperous." The report then goes on to say that in 1928 the codfishery was very satisfactory; that trade generally was good and local manufacturers and merchants reported increased turnovers; that the fall trade was very good and that the seasonal business at Christmas the best enjoyed since the post-war boom in 1919; that good progress was being made in the marketing of fresh fish;

that our salmon is already well established in English and other markets, and that much attention was being paid to what might be called the minor fishery products. The report further remarks that our paper mills were running at full capacity; that it was reasonable to expect the establishment of another similar enterprise on the Gander before long; that the mining development at Buchans and surrounding district was encouraging, and that the future for mining in this country could hardly be brighter. It also observed that attention was being given to the development of our codliver oil industry which was progressing; and to development in regard to cold storage, agricultural progress, the berry industry, and other matters of interest.

The outlook for the future I regard as decidedly encouraging. Last year, as I have just noted, the products of the fisheries put \$2,000,000 more in the pockets of our people than the previous year, and this will help to a more active and general prosecution of the cod-fishing industry this season than for some time.

The paper mills at Grand Falls have been operating to full capacity. The company has completed a dam at Millertown for raising the water of Red Indian Lake several feet and thus ensuring themselves of a complete supply for all purposes. They have perfected plans for the construction of a new power house on the other side of the Exploits River from their present works, with the object of enlarging the scope of their operations, and they have been rebuilding the paper-making machines installed in the mill when it was opened, so as to increase the output. At Corner Brook mills great improvement in the work there has been noted since the property passed into the hands of the International Paper Co.

The machines now operating there are each producing to full capacity also and the mill ranks among the best in the world, and among those having the largest production. Here, too, plans are being made for an enlargement by adding two more machines in due time, the first step towards this being the provision for securing additional horsepower energy from the hydro-electric installation. It is not too much to expect that very soon both these enterprises will show a decided expansion. Negotiations have been resumed between the Reid Co. and American capitalists for the establishment of a third paper mill on the Gander, and if these are successful, as we all hope they will be, another paper mill equal to either of the existing ones should find a home there within the next few years.

The same sort of expansion is noted at Bell Island. The mining company there shipped nearly a million and a half tons during 1928, and has contracts with German buyers for ten years which ensure annual outputs at least as large. This means that the company is now producing ore there annually to about the limit of its mechanical capacity, and that it will have in the near future to increase and improve its equipment so as to allow of its producing some two million tons annually. All these undertakings will involve, in the first place, large construction programs with very considerable expenditures running to millions of dollars for such purposes, and in the second place, of course, will provide permanent employment for much larger numbers of men thereafter in carrying out the increased operation.

The work at Buchans Mine last year reached the stage where the first cargo of concentrates was shipped to market, some 5000 tons in all. During this year it is hoped to produce some-

thing like that quantity per month, or 60,000 tons a year. There is talk of a smelter being erected to enable a further stage in the treatment of the mineral to be carried on, and prospecting work is being undertaken, not alone on the property held by this company, but elsewhere in the region with, I am informed, very hopeful prospects. At the same time attention is again being directed to our copper deposits, which are extensive and promising, and with copper now about twenty cents a pound some competent authorities hold that development can be profitably undertaken. An arrangement has been reached between the owners of St. George's Coal Fields and the International Paper Company for an expenditure by the latter to test the possibilities of these coal areas. If the test proves satisfactory this mine should be able to supply not alone the paper mills at Corner Brook but all the requirements of the West Coast and enable us to operate the western division of the railroad with our own coal. All these facts, I submit, justify the conclusion that the Colony is on the threshold of big developments and that the future has much in store for us if we have confidence in our country and are prepared to work together for the common good.

Recently the Government, on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, reserved the area in the centre of the Island, containing the most promising mineral regions, from grant in the meantime, so that the Colony may be able to obtain any advantages which may arise through discoveries of importance in those portions of this area which have already been granted and it is hoped to work out such a policy in connection with this as will enable the Colony to profit to the very fullest extent from any such discoveries.

Another evidence of the improved conditions of trade and industry afforded by statistics supplied me through the courtesy of R. G. Dun & Co. It shows figures of the business difficulties in this Colony for some years past. It appears in Table XII and the small number of firms in trouble last year and the much reduced figure of the amounts involved, is very striking proof of the improvement in our business world. I am informed also by the representative of one of the bond houses doing business in this city that he estimates that bonds and high grade securities pur-

chased last year for investment, as distinct from ordinary Stock Exchange operations must have been at least \$2,000,000. The customary statement of the amounts held in the Savings departments of our banks shows an increase of \$1,942,954, also an encouraging symptom, and the figures as to life insurance supplied to the Finance Department indicate that the amount of this protection secured by our people last year was very substantial. The details as to Savings Banks and Life Insurance will be found on Table XIII.

Public Debt.

The Funded Public Debt of the Colony at the close of the Fiscal Year 1927-28 was as follows:—

Gross Public Debt on July 1st, 1927:

At 3 per cent	\$15,881,666.66	
At 3 1-2 per cent	18,905,060.00	
At 4 per cent	8,926,352.29	
At 5 per cent	8,561,926.66	
At 5 1-2 per cent	20,499,526.66	
At 6 1-2 per cent	13,543,400.00	
		\$72,017,932.27

To which was added during the year under report:—

Loan 18 Geo. V. Cap. 18, @ 5 per cent	\$5,000,000.00	
Loan 19 Geo. V. Cap. 18, @ 5 per cent.....	10,002,946.00	
		\$15,002,946.66

	\$87,020,878.93
And paid off 8 and 9 Geo. V., Cap. 35.....	7,543,400.00

Leaving the Gross Funded Public Debt at.....	\$79,477,478.93
on June 30th, 1928.	

To ascertain the net Funded Debt of the Colony it will be necessary to deduct the following from the above, viz:—

Due by St. John's Municipal Council.....	\$1,905,588.22	
Amount paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund, established under Act 56 Vic. Cap. 13	1,540,097.88	
Imperial Treasury Bonds and Cash held by Glynn Mills & Co., London, for further redemption of loan under Act 56, Cap. 13.....	311,164.53	
		\$3,756,850.63

The net Funded Debt will, therefore, be.....	\$75,720,628.30
--	-----------------

The sum of \$13,700, Harbor Grace Water Co. Script, is held by the Government, but as it is of no value I have omitted it from this statement.

This net Debt is represented approximately by the following, viz:—

Railways and Railway Award	\$33,307,000.00
War purposes and re-fitting "Lobelia" etc	12,725,000.00
Highroads, Roads and Bridges	8,200,000.00
Dock and Marine Works	2,985,000.00
Telegraphs and Telephones including Award	2,472,000.00
Public Buildings	1,964,000.00
Rebuilding St. John's, Hr. Grace, Carborear	947,000.00
Lighthouses and Alarms	715,000.00
Encouragement of Fisheries	705,000.00
School Buildings	620,000.00
Able-bodied Pauper Relief	595,000.00
Encouragement to Agriculture	360,000.00
Labrador Boundary	375,000.00
Dredge, purchase of	50,000.00
General Revenue Deficits	12,908,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$78,928,000.00
	<hr/>

A Loan Bill will be introduced in a few days to raise funds to liquidate the deficits already referred to, and for other purposes, which will increase the Public Debt by that amount.

The Consolidated Fund Balances as at the close of the fiscal year 1927-28 were as follows:—

CONSOLIDATED FUND
Balance Sheet—Close Fiscal Year 1927-28
DR.

Bank of Montreal for:		
Surplus Trust Fund	\$	3,015.00
Estate H. J. Crowe		138,498.42
Loan 1898		10,000.00
“ 1921		3.07
“ 1922		1,004.50
“ 1923		3,924.09
“ 1926		251,827.98
“ 1927		1,437,281.32
Debenture Redemption		18,271.49
Note Reserve Fund		33,739.10
Debenture Conversion		263.41
		\$1,897,828.38
Savings Bank:		
Estate W. J. Cairns	\$	9,678.25
St. John's Municipal Council		1,905,588.22
Deficit Account 1927-28		1,274,919.49
Imperial Government (temporary loan)		1,946,666.66
Fire Insurance Co., Fire Fighting Appartus..		4,411.96
Water Stock Account, Hr. Grace Water Co.		13,700.00
Public Debt		79,447,478.93
		\$86,530,271.89

CR.

Surplus Trust Fund	\$	3,015.00
Estate H. J. Crowe		138,498.42
Loan Act 1898		10,000.00
“ “ 1921		3.07
“ “ 1922		1,004.50
“ “ 1923		3,924.09
“ “ 1926		251,827.98
“ “ 1927		1,437,281.32
Estate W. J. Cairns		9,678.25
Temporary Loan—Imperial Government		1,946,666.66
Debenture Redemption		18,271.49
Debenture Conversion		263.41
Note Reserve		33,739.10
Guaranteed Loans, St. John's Municipal Council		1,905,588.22
Bank of Montreal, Deficit a/c 1927-28.....	\$1,274,919.49	
Bank of Montreal, Fire Insurance a/c.....	4,411.96	
		\$1,279,331.45
Hr. Grace Water Co., Stock Account		13,700.00
Sundry Loan Act Balances		79,477,478.93
		\$86,530,271.89

Eliminating from this balance sheet all credits such as loans, Treasury Note Reserve, the Crowe and other Trust Funds, etc., which are ear-marked for special purposes and cannot be used in the reduction of the Colony's indebtedness, it will be found that the financial position of the Colony on the 30th of June last was as follows:—

DR.

Sundry Parties for Loans	\$79,477,478.93
Imperial Government—Temporary Loan @ 5½	1,946,666.66
Deficit 1927-28	1,274,919.49
	<hr/>
	\$82,699,065.08

CR.

St. John's Municipal Council	\$ 1,905,588.22
Sinking Fund Loan 56 Vic. Cap. 13.....	1,851,262.41
Debenture Redemption Fund	18,271.49
Debenture Conversion Fund	263.41
Surplus Trust Fund	3,015.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,778,400.53

This does not include the deficit on the Railway Operating Account which was \$446,544.43 for 1927-28.

I note the following commitments of the Colony as on June 30th last—

(a) Guarantee of Mortgage Debenture Bonds and Interest (at 5½% per annum) of the International Paper Co. of Newfoundland Ltd. under Act 14 Geo. V. Cap. 1., as amended by the 1927 Act £2,000,000 stg., in 1973	\$ 9,733,333.33
(b) Guarantee of Mortgage Debenture Bonds and Interest (at 6½% per annum) of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Co., Ltd., under Act 16 Geo. V. Cap. 6	450,000.00
(c) St. John's Municipal Council guaranteed Loan from the Royal Bank of Canada not funded.....	170,000.00
(d) Guaranteed Stock and Interest (3½% per annum) of the Eastern Marine Railway Dock Co. under Act 15 Geo. V. Cap. 13	33,000.00
(e) Balance of the stock of the Hr. Grace Water Co. The Government held \$13,700 of this stock, which is not included here	62,700.00
(f) Stock of the Carbonear Water Co.	40,000.00
(g) Stock of the Placentia Water Co.	18,000.00

With regard to (e), (f), (g), while the Colony guarantees the interest on the stock of these companies it is not legally responsible for the principal. There is, however, no question, in view of their hopeless financial position that, in the event of a call made

for the payment of their script, the funds to do so would have to be provided by the Colony.

With regard to (b), I beg leave to report that the Acts 1925 and 1926 relating to the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Co., Ltd. have not been car-

ried out so far as it relates to the Government Guarantee of the Debenture Bonds and the interest thereon.

The Sinking Fund should have had to its credit, on May 1st 1928 the sum of \$27,000. It had only \$3,500 paid into the Fund by the Hotel Operating Account, no interest on the Debenture Bonds issued, (\$450,000), has been paid Up to November 1st, 1928 this interest

at 6½% amounted to \$67,000 for all of which the Colony is responsible under its guarantee.

The Surplus Trust Fund is also included in the Consolidated Fund Account. The following is a statement of the Receipts and Expenditure of this Fund and of the Reserve Fund since the inception of the former in 1901-2 and the latter in 1898-9:—

SURPLUS TRUST FUND

From its Inception in 1901-2 to June 30th, 1928.

DR.

To Received from time to time from Surplus Revenue, viz:	
1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4, 1904-5, 1905-6 1907-8, 1908-9,	
1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12, 1912-13, 1913-14, 1914-15, 1915-16,	
1916-17, 1917-18, 1918-19, 1919-20, 1920-21, 1921-25	\$ 7,993,618.91
Received from Business Profits Tax Account 1919-20	3,707.21
	<hr/>
Total Receipts	\$ 7,997,326.12

CR.

By Expended on Account of the following, viz:

Deficit Current Account	\$ 2,540,356.92
War Purposes	1,301,401.25
Railway Purposes	1,212,122.40
Roads and Bridges	894,572.51
Steamers including "Prospero" and "Portia" (\$400,000)	785,391.00
Bonds for Old Age Pensions Fund	290,000.00
Marine Works	446,272.01
Education and School Buildings	98,275.94
General Elections, 1908 and 1913	92,328.59
Public Buildings	93,546.09
Lighthouses	57,000.00
Purchase of Salt	54,699.77
Contribution to Halifax Disaster Fund	53,815.77
Grand Bank Pier, in aid of the construction of,	35,000.00
St. John's Gas Co., in aid of purchase of coal	31,829.22
Encouragement of Herring Fishery	26,067.94
Agriculture, in aid of	16,500.00
Telegraphs, (Marconi)	14,000.00
Purchase of Aeroplane	12,917.82
Festival of Empire, contribution to Fund for,	10,213.90
Wembly Exhibition	10,000.00
Postal Contingent Account, in aid of,	8,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$7,994,311.12
Balance	3,015.00
	<hr/>

\$7,997,326.12

RESERVE FUND

From its Inception in 1838 to its close in 1915

D.R.

To Received from time to time from Surplus Revenue 1898-99, 1899-1900, 1900-01, 1902-3, 1903-4 1904-5, 1905,6, 1906-7.....	\$500,000.00
---	--------------

C.R.

By Transfer to Exchequer to cover Deficit		
1913-14	\$301,849.08	
Transfer to Exchequer—Account Current Re- venue 1914-15	198,150.92	
	<hr/>	\$500,000.00

I considered very seriously whether I would speak as frankly as I have done and tell the story of our condition as fully as it is set out in this address. There may be some who will agree that it is a mistake to tell the whole truth in such matters, but I have come to the conclusion that the only way to have our people realise the condition that confronts them is to do as I have done and put all my cards on the table. The country has been living in a fool's paradise too long. There is a widespread notion that money can be found for every purpose and that the Government exists solely to spend money here, there and everywhere, without any thought of where the money is to be got or how it is to be repaid, until today there are communities which imagine that if they have not the energy or the ambition to look out for themselves they have only to press a button, so to speak, and the Government will do the rest—find them work, or feed them, or cater to them in any fashion they may demand. I find the same thing with regard to what are commonly known as "Government jobs." Nothing has so depressed me since taking office as the avalanche of applications from all sorts of people, all over the country, for positions in the public service—for vacant positions, for positions to be made vacant by dismissing those who hold them

and appointing the applicants, or for the creation of new positions suggested by the applicants themselves. In reply to all these I would say, and I know that I speak for colleagues as well as myself, that the public service is already over-manned, and that hereafter the Government will have to decide whether as unnecessary positions become vacant they should be filled again. It will be essential from now on to cut down in the civil service where possible by reducing the number of civil servants and the expenditures on public services generally.

With regard to our fiscal future I hope to adopt the same policy as the premier of Nova Scotia, who, in his Budget Speech last month as Financial Treasurer of that Province, made a very full and complete statement of its financial position. He thought that it would be possible to produce a balanced Budget there in 1931. I am equally hopeful and feel confident that we will be able to do the same. Perhaps in my case it is the optimism of youth and inexperience in this position but my associates and myself will do our best to see the programme carried out.

In conclusion, I would ask the people of every shade and condition of public opinion in this Colony to stand behind us in the endeavor to restore the country's financial stability. If it

is not done the country cannot go on in its present course for many years, and no well-wisher of the country desires misfortune to happen. That the country can be restored to a state where its accounts will balance, I am convinced, if we only work together for the common good. That conditions are improving I have shown from the facts and figures laid before you as to the result of our trade in 1928 and the outlook for the present year, and that the Government and every member of it will do their utmost to ensure our financial restoration I pledge myself as strongly as possible.

I now beg leave to propose certain Resolutions amending the existing tariff. Most of them deal with mere matters of detail, such as arise from year to year in the carrying out of the Act.

Among the more important changes are those which relate to the removal of the items hitherto based upon the treaty with Spain, as this treaty no longer exists and these articles will be considered under the "Most-favored-nation" clause hereafter.

Also, certain classes of agricultural implements and essentials are admitted free and others are to be allowed in at 10 per cent.

Then there are revisions and re-arrangements of certain classes of cotton, woolen, and velvet goods.

Likewise, there is a change to cover the decision of the Government after taking office, to allow lines and twines free entry.

Finally, there are clauses to provide for free entry for iron, steel, and other materials for use in repairing ships entering this port in distress, and for coal and fuel oil supplied to them; as well as free coal to ships bunkering here. This gives effect to our policy for increasing the activities of the Dry Dock.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLVED:—That the Act passed in the fifteenth year of the Reign of His Majesty King George V. Chapter 34, entitled the "Revenue Act 1925" and the amendments thereto, be further amended in manner following:—

1 The following is added to the said Act as Section 39:

Sec. 39. It shall be lawful for the minister of Finance and Customs to pay the Export Bounties set forth in Schedule E. to this Act.

2 (a) The changes in the following items shall be held to have come into effect at and from the 20th day of November, 1928, at 9.30 a.m.

Items 43, 44, 79, 222, 224, 230, 231, 234, 277 and 368,

(b) The change in the following item shall be held to have come into effect at and from the 24th day of January, 1929, at 9.30 a.m.

Item 235.

(c) All other changes made by these Resolutions shall be held to have come into effect at and from the 14th day of May, 1929, at 9.30 a.m.

SCHEDULE A.

Item 21—Strike out "30 p.c." and substitute "20 p.c."

Item 22—Strike out "30 p.c." and substitute "20 p.c."

Item 43—For "5 cents" substitute "3 cents."

Item 44—For "5 cents" substitute "3 cents."

Item 55—Oranges, Lemons, Grapes, Peaches, Pears, Plums, Apricots, Bananas, Cherries, Gooseberries, Currants, Strawberries, Pineapples,

Pomegranates, Guava, Shad-docks, Mangoes, and similar green fruits and fruit pulp—ad val. substitute for “25 p.c.”—“15 p.c.”

Strike out “Oranges, Grapes and Bananas, when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the agreement between Great Britain and Spain—free.”

Strike out “Raisins when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Treaty between Britain and Spain—per 100 lbs. \$3.30.”

Item 56—Strike out “Walnuts, Hazel Nuts, Almonds (shelled and unshelled) when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Treaty between Britain and Spain—free.”

Item 66—Strike out “Olive Oil when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Agreement between Britain and Spain—free.”

Item 66—Strike out “Preserved Vegetables when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Agreement between Britain and Spain—free.”

Item 71—Strike out “Brandy when purchased by the Importer

in Spain or Spanish Possessions, and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Agreement between Britain and Spain—per proof gallon \$4.50.”

Item 72—All other kinds of Sugar N.E.S.—per lb. substitute “2 1-2 cents” for “2 cents.”

Item 75—Tomatoes and Onions, substitute “25 p.c.” for “30 p.c.” Strike out “Tomatoes and Onions when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom during the continuance of the Agreement between Britain and Spain—free.”

Strike out “Dried and Preserved and Canned when purchased by the Importer from Spain—free.”

Item 77—Strike out after the word “duties” the words “provided that Wines imported from Spain shall not pay a higher rate of duty including surtax than was paid in May, 1923.”

Item 79—Strike out “48 cents” and substitute “40 cents.”

Item 101—Crude Petroleum and Fuel Oil—strike out “free” and add “per gallon—2 cents.”

Item 112—Strike out “Cork and Corkwood when purchased by the Importer in Spain or Spanish Possessions and imported therefrom, during the continuance of the Agreement between Britain and Spain—free.”

Item 168—After “Tin in Sheets” add “Aluminum in Blocks, Ingots, Bars and Slabs.”

Item 181—is amended by substituting therefor the following:

181—Agricultural Implements and parts for same, N.E.S. and not including Lawn Mowers; Raffia, when imported by Florists, Bone Crushers, Air Motors, Churns, Cream Separators and Incubators; Wire Fencing and Fasteners and Gates for Wire Fences, when the gates are made chiefly of wire—ad val. 10 p.c.

181—(a) Hay and Feed Cutters, Hay Binders, Hay Loaders, Hay Waggon, Mowing Machines, Horse-drawn Hay Rakes, Manure Spreaders, Tettors for hay spreading, Harrows, Gang Ploughs, Cultivators, Horse-drawn Seeding Machines, Treshing, Reaping and Binding Machines—free.

Item 222—is amended by substituting therefor the following:—

222—Manufactures of Cotton of all kinds, N.E.S., Quilts, Counterpanes and other Bed Covers, Sheets and Sheetings, Towels and Towelings and like articles, made up or not made up, N.E.S.; Gloves, Hosiery of Cotton, Art Muslins and Cretonnes, Ladies' Undergarments, sewn not woven, Aprons and unenumerated manufactures of cotton, N. E.S.— ad val. 50 p.c.

222—(a) Piece goods of grey, white, colored, printed or dyed cotten goods, Italian Cloth, Alpaca, Orleans and similar fabrics, Twill, plain or jacquard; Coat Linings of Cotton Batting, ad val. 35 p.c.

Item 224—is amended by substituting therefor the following:—

224—Wool Hosiery, Gloves and Mitts, Blankets, Bed Coverings, Quilts, Woven and Knitted Shirts and Drawers, Cardigan Jackets, Sweater Coats, Guernseys, Buntings, Carpets, Carpetings, Rugs, Mats, Shawls, Railway or Travelling Rugs and Lap Dusters of all kinds, and Fabrics made up, composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted, N. E. S. ad val. 50 p.c.

224—(a) Piece Goods of Flannels, Serges, Swanskins and Kerseys, Cashmeres, Coburgs and Similar Dress Goods, Nuns Cloth, Tweeds, Doe Skins, Cloths, Felt Cloths, Felt Pressed, and Fabrics not made up, composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted, N.E.S.. ad val. 35 p.c.

Item 230—Substitute "25 p.c." for "30 p.c."

Item 231—is amended by substituting therefor the following:—

231—Velvets, Velveteens, Silk Velvet, Plush and Silk Fabrics in the piece and not made up, ad val. 35 p.c.

231—(a) Manufacture of Velvets, Velveteens, Silk Velvet and Silk Fabrics, N.E.S. ad val. 50 p.c.

Item 233—Substitute '45 p.c.' for "65 p.c."

Item 234—is amended by substituting therefor the following:—

234—Clothing, Waterproofed by any process other than by oiling, and not to include

rubber suits for fishermen,
ad val. 45 p.c.

Item 235—Add after "Oiled Clothes"
the words "and Fishermen's
Rubber Suits."

Item 238—Add after "Furs" the words
"and garments trimmed or
lined with fur."

Item 242—Add "Insecticides when im-
ported by Agriculturists un-
der a certificate from the
Department of Agriculture
and Mines, ad val. 10 p.c.

Item 277—Amend by substituting the
word "Free" for "ad val. 10
p.c." after the words "Lines
and Twines used in connec-
tion with the fisheries, not
to include sporting tackle."

Item 315—Add after "Confectionery,"
"and Bakers of Soft Bread."

SCHEDULE B.

From Schedule B. strike out It-
ms 347, 348 and 349; add 359b.

Item 359b—All iron and steel, iron and
steel plates, machinery,
composition paint for ships'
bottoms which is not manu-
factured in the Colony, and
any other material used in
the repair of ships. Coal
and Fuel Oil supplied to any
repaired ship upon her de-
parture after repair.

When required by Con-
tractors or repairers of any
ship entering any port in
Newfoundland for repairs.
Such refund on material
shall be made only on the
certificate of the Master of
the repaired ship when it is
countersigned by Lloyd's
Surveyor or other duly
authorized Surveyor who
passes the said ship after
repairs have been effected,

and such refund on fuel
shall be made on the certi-
ficate of the supplier, count-
ersigned by the Master and
Chief Engineer of the ship
so supplied:—

100 p.c. not to include stamps or fees.

Add to Item 354 the following:—

Item 354—Coal.

When supplied to vessels entering the
port of St. John's for the purpose only
of obtaining bunker coal:—

**A rebate of the duty paid shall be
made to the supplier upon the pro-
duction of the proper evidence of
supply.**

SCHEDULE D.

Items 368—Substitute "34 cents" for
"40 cents."

SCHEDULE E.

Native Berries—

When exported packed
in 1 lb tins.....20c per 96 lbs
in 2 lb tins.....15c per 96 lbs
in larger tins.....10c per 96 lbs

Herring and other edible fish, except-
ing Lobsters, Salmon and Trout.

When exported packed
in 1 lb tins or over.....20c per 96 lbs

All Native edible fish. (Sardine cans)

When packed
in quarters or halves 35c per 100 lbs.

**RESOLVED—That a Bill be intro-
duced to give effect to the foregoing
Resolutions.**

TABLE I.
Statement of Revenue—Budget Estimate and Actual Receipt—For The Fiscal year 1927-28.

	Budget Estimate	Actual Amount Received	Over	Under
Customs	\$ 8,500,000.00	\$ 7,902,959.72	13,004.12
Postal	380,000.00	392,508.28	\$597,040.28
Telegraph	190,000.00	178,418.70	12,508.28
Crown Lands	170,000.00	183,004.12	11,581.30
Inland Revenue Stamps	50,000.00	52,620.04	2,620.04
Death Duties	50,000.00	40,000.00	10,000.00
Taxes and Assessments	70,000.00	67,692.51	2,307.49
Liquor Control Profits	360,000.00	250,000.00	110,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	5,000.00	5,746.37	746.37
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	3,000.00	2,760.56	239.44
Fees Public Institutions	45,000.00	46,139.21	1,139.21
Taxes and Assessments	70,000.00	67,692.51	2,307.49
Banks and Trust Co's.				
Fire Insurance Co's.				
Landed Estates Income Tax	109,000.00	119,494.12	10,494.12
Arrears Business Profits Tax				
Arrears Income Tax				
Miscellaneous Revenue, including in- terest on Guaranteed Loans	300,000.00	224,661.91	75,338.09
	<u>\$10,232,000.00</u>	<u>9,466,005.54</u>	<u>\$40,512.14</u>	<u>\$806,506.60</u>
				40,512.14
Net under Estimate		765,994.46		765,944.46
		<u>\$10,232,000.00</u>		

TABLE II.—Statement of Expenditure—Budget Estimate and Actual Disbursement for the Fiscal Year 1927-28.

	Budget Estimate	Actual Expenditure	Over	Under
Finance	\$ 4,300,000.00	\$ 4,305,601.03	\$ 5,601.03
Colonial Secretary	160,000.00	164,507.67	4,507.67
Justice	360,000.00	365,597.47	5,597.47
Education	930,000.00	929,918.08	81.92
Public Charities	620,000.00	637,343.23	17,343.23
Marine and Fisheries	465,000.00	471,485.21	6,485.21
Agriculture and Mines	140,000.00	143,223.66	3,223.66
Public Works	950,000.00	919,532.71	30,467.29
Postal and Telegraphs	1,195,000.00	1,210,781.27	15,781.27
Customs	655,000.00	668,324.01	13,324.01
Assessor of Taxes	7,000.00	10,000.00	3,000.00
Naval and Military Pensions	625,000.00	636,390.82	11,390.82
Government Engineer	16,628.51	16,628.51
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$10,407,000.00	\$10,497,333.67	\$102,882.88	\$30,549.21
Public Charities, Audit Act, Sec. 33 (b)	185,000.00	261,591.36	76,591.36
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$10,592,000.00	\$10,740,925.03	\$179,474.24	\$30,549.21
Net Expenditure Over	148,925.03	30,549.21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$10,749,925.03		\$148,925.03	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Net Revenue under Estimate		\$ 765,994.46		
Net Expenditure Over Estimate		148,925.03		
		<hr/>		
		\$ 914,919.49		

Deficit established in Budget, \$360,000.00; Actual Deficit, \$1,274,919.49

TABLE III.
Detailed Comparative Statement of Current Revenue—1926-27 and 1927-28.

	Amt. Collected 1926-27	Amt. Collected 1927-28	Increase	Decrease
Customs	\$7,321,512.52	\$7,902,959.72	\$581,447.20
Postal	354,676.48	392,508.28	37,831.80
Telegraphs	170,040.56	178,418.70	8,378.14
Crown Lands	107,602.76	183,004.12	75,401.36
Inland Revenue Stamps	48,762.23	52,620.04	3,857.81
Fines and Forfeitures	4,613.08	5,746.37	1,133.29
Business Profits Tax (Arrears)	61,364.35	8,305.78	53,058.57
Income Tax (Arrears) etc.	34,391.64	36,296.87	1,905.23
Manufactures' Sales Tax (Arrears)	691.64	1,042.62	350.98
Fees Public Institutions	43,512.66	46,139.21	2,626.55
Broom Department	2,893.79	2,760.56	133.23
Liquor Profits	350,000.00	250,000.00	100,000.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	87,155.56	87,155.56
Estate Duties	89,803.03	40,000.00	49,803.03
Taxes and Assessments	140,283.14	141,541.36	1,258.22
Miscellaneous	115,132.02	137,506.35	22,374.33
	<hr/> \$8,932,435.46	<hr/> \$9,466,005.54	<hr/> \$736,564.91	<hr/> \$202,994.83
		<hr/> 8,932,435.46	<hr/> 202,994.83	
Increase over 1926-27		<hr/> \$ 533,570.08	<hr/> \$533,570.08	

TABLE IV.

Comparative Statement of Current Expenditure—1926-27 and 1927-28.

Exclusive of amount of \$8,000.00 received for interest from Old Age Pensions Fund expended in payments to Pensioners.

	1926-27	1927-28	Increase	Decrease
Interest on Public Debt, Sinking Fund, etc.	\$ 3,538,785.22	\$ 3,841,922.65	\$303,137.43
Civil Government	546,310.37	589,821.41	43,511.04
Civil Pensions	89,426.23	94,202.19	4,775.96
Militiary and Naval Pensions	618,835.08	620,747.74	1,912.66
Old Age Pensions	114,425.00	118,937.50	4,512.50
Administration of Justice	481,008.79	442,686.34	38,322.45
Legislation	93,676.51	96,337.12	2,660.61
Education	914,958.97	894,749.59	20,209.38
Public Charities	1,135,752.64	1,115,931.58	19,821.06
Agriculture and Mines	79,629.66	98,443.01	18,813.35
Marine and Fisheries	408,275.40	422,497.72	14,222.32
Roads and Bridges	458,541.43	215,892.89	242,648.54
Posts and Telegraphs	1,142,949.10	1,170,817.06	27,867.96
Customs	628,220.56	668,324.01	40,103.45
Contingencies—General	80,309.26	48,124.54	32,184.72
Elections	21,977.39	39,898.32	17,920.93
Audit Act, Sec. 33 (b)	180,327.26	261,591.36	81,264.10
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$10,533,408.87	\$10,740,925.03	\$560,702.31	\$353,186.15
		10,533,408.87	353,186.15	
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Increase over 1926-27		\$ 207,516.16	\$207,516.16	

TABLE V.
Revenue for Five Years—Comparative Statement.

	1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28
Customs	\$6,602,957.31	\$7,996,972.55	\$7,790,533.62	\$7,321,512.52	\$7,902,959.72
Posts and Telegraphs	468,208.05	523,442.97	514,706.62	524,717.04	570,926.98
Crown Lands	97,931.78	159,015.21	112,133.77	107,602.76	183,004.12
Fines and Forfeitures	5,649.66	5,952.26	4,939.05	4,613.08	5,746.37
Inland Revenue Stamps	42,850.00	42,496.80	50,381.85	48,762.23	52,620.04
Interest Guaranteed					
Loans	86,543.46	86,849.51	87,155.56	87,155.56	87,155.56
Brooms, Penitentiary	8,411.67	6,658.46	3,486.14	2,893.79	2,760.56
Fees, Institutions	51,932.98	55,121.25	49,038.30	43,512.66	46,139.21
Taxes and Assessments ..	68,119.83	96,088.16	64,130.74	67,596.68	67,692.51
Estate Duties	22,708.02	47,332.38	149,271.86	89,803.03	40,000.00
Liquor Sales	219,243.20	176,662.56	410,276.93	350,000.00	250,000.00
Excess Profits Tax	14,439.13	16,548.09	7,016.95	61,364.35	8,305.78
Income Tax	366,414.69	351,080.73	168,980.64	34,391.64	36,296.87
Manufactures' Sales Tax	66,758.21	11,094.42	8,832.16	691.64	1,042.62
Miscellaneous, General					
Revenue	167,490.15	79,803.90	261,792.26	115,132.02	137,506.35
Bank Tax	112,011.85	127,769.21	69,874.63	72,686.46	73,848.85
	<u>\$8,401,669.09</u>	<u>\$9,783,188.46</u>	<u>\$9,752,551.28</u>	<u>\$8,932,435.46</u>	<u>\$9,466,005.54</u>

TABLE VI.

Expenditure for Five Years—Comparative Statement.

Exclusive of amount of \$8,000.00 received for interest from Old Age Pensions Fund, expended in payment to Pensioners.

	1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28
Interest on Public Debt, Sinking Fund, etc.	\$ 3,016,257.23	\$3,128,224.96	\$3,381,706.09	\$ 3,538,785.22	\$ 3,841,922.65
Civil Government	475,640.79	475,163.58	510,047.32	546,310.37	589,821.41
Civil Pensions	57,119.97	75,717.77	89,159.33	89,426.23	94,202.19
Military and Naval Pen- sions	561,959.17	594,499.27	626,559.64	618,835.08	620,747.74
Old Age Pensions	95,825.00	97,787.50	104,637.50	114,425.00	118,937.50
Administration of Jus- tice	536,996.27	457,767.64	447,627.27	481,008.79	442,686.34
Legislation	120,552.72	98,042.97	90,807.91	93,676.51	96,337.12
Education	834,237.23	835,842.77	858,996.98	914,958.97	894,749.59
Public Charities	1,172,776.83	1,059,775.91	1,080,244.03	1,135,752.64	1,115,931.58
Agriculture and Mines ..	76,841.95	51,898.16	86,427.35	79,629.66	98,443.01
Marine and Fisheries	295,141.20	316,966.18	424,606.73	408,275.40	422,497.72
Roads and Bridges	236,339.20	224,563.70	218,362.42	458,541.43	215,892.89
Posts and Telegraphs	1,371,885.25	1,249,949.46	1,168,062.18	1,142,949.10	1,170,817.06
Customs	529,114.75	509,552.25	673,102.55	628,220.56	668,324.01
Contingencies, General	109,765.80	89,940.70	76,718.95	80,309.26	48,124.54
Elections	72,236.94	21,977.39	39,898.32
Audit Act, Sec. 33 (b)	418,530.66	181,228.06	28,101.19	180,327.26	261,591.36
Shipping Department	40,916.02	7,284.35
	<u>\$10,022,137.45</u>	<u>\$9,436,185.23</u>	<u>\$9,865,167.34</u>	<u>\$10,533,408.87</u>	<u>\$10,740,925.03</u>

TABLE VII.

Summary of Appropriations and Expenditures for the Fiscal Year 1927-28.

	Grant, Including Supplementary Act and Transfers	Expenditure	Grants Exceeded	Grants Unexpended
Interest on Public Debt, Sinking Fund, etc.	\$ 3,874,381.50	\$ 3,841,922.65		\$ 32,458.85
Finance Department	351,732.54	344,740.88		6,991.66
Colonial Secretary's Department	172,209.00	164,507.67		7,701.33
Justice Department	373,833.42	365,597.47		8,235.95
Education Department	930,658.06	929,918.08		739.98
Public Charities Department	637,383.26	637,343.23		40.03
Marine and Fisheries Department	494,310.35	471,485.23		22,825.14
Agriculture and Mines Department	147,085.66	143,223.66		3,862.00
Public Works Department	958,380.24	919,532.71		38,847.53
Posts and Telegraphs Department	1,213,676.15	1,210,781.27		2,894.88
Customs Department	669,726.00	668,324.91		1,401.99
Government Engineer's Department	15,120.00	16,628.51		593.46
Tax Assessor	17,221.97	10,000.00		5,120.00
Old Age Pensions	140,000.00	118,937.59		21,062.50
Board of Pension Commissioners	636,643.32	636,390.82		252.50
Audit Act, Sec. 33 (b)	261,591.36	261,591.36	
Total appropriations	\$10,893,952.83	\$10,740,925.03		\$153,027.80
Total expenditure	10,740,925.03		
	\$ 153,027.80			\$153,027.80
Balance of Votes unexpended and surrendered to the Treasury		\$ 153,027.80		

TABLE VIII.

Newfoundland Railway—Comparative Statement of Earnings and Expenses For the Years 1926-27 and 1927-28.

Revenue	1926-27	1927-28	Increase	Decrease
Freight	\$ 768,914.43	\$ 793,258.28	\$ 24,343.85
Passenger	662,575.69	636,513.01	26,062.68
Mail	60,614.52	60,162.29	452.23
Dining and Sleeping Cars	60,237.20	60,143.10	5,905.90
Miscellaneous	41,248.75	66,703.26	25,454.51
Express	153,987.98	158,600.45	4,612.47
Steamer	872,917.24	997,544.38	124,627.14
Dock Shops	393,344.19	382,037.75	11,306.44
Rry Dock	43,969.88	39,945.98	4,023.90
	<u>\$3,057,809.88</u>	<u>\$3,200,908.50</u>	<u>\$184,943.87</u>	<u>\$41,845.25</u>
		<u>3,057,809.88</u>	<u>41,845.25</u>	
Increase in Revenue		<u>\$ 143,098.62</u>	<u>\$143,098.62</u>	

TABLE VIII.—(Continued)

Newfoundland Railway—Comparative Statement of Earnings and Expenditure for the Years 1926-27 and 1927-28.

Expenditure	1926-27	1927-28	Increase	Decrease
Conducting Transportation	\$ 994,360.10	\$1,002,150.70	\$ 7,790.60
Dining and Sleeping Cars	52,251.38	50,132.28	2,119.10
General Expenses	182,043.32	193,573.57	11,530.25
Maintenance of Way, etc.	718,200.24	700,041.23	18,159.01
Maintenance of Equipment	449,185.98	443,260.29	5,925.69
Express	32,013.90	29,877.42	2,136.48
Operating Steamers	718,284.93	768,223.17	49,938.24
Repairs to Steamers	148,811.31	90,016.10	58,795.21
Dock Shops	363,068.21	349,006.87	14,001.34
Dry Dock	17,266.07	21,111.30	3,845.23
	<u>\$3,675,485.44</u>	<u>\$3,647,452.93</u>	<u>\$73,104.32</u>	<u>\$101,136.83</u>
	3,647,452.93			73,104.32
	<u>28,032.51</u>			<u>\$ 28,032.51</u>
		\$617,675.56		
Deficit for 1926-27 amounted to	\$143,098.62			
Less Increased Revenue 1927-28	\$ 28,032.51			
Less Decreased Expenditure 1927-28				
		<u>171,131.13</u>		
Leaves the Deficit for the Fiscal Year 1927-28 at		<u>\$446,544.43</u>		

TABLE IX.
Railway—Result of Steamer Operations.

Steamer	Earnings		Expenses	
	1926-27	1927-28	1926-27	1927-28
Argyle	\$ 77,146.19	\$ 75,647.04	\$ 60,978.67	\$ 69,878.56
Clyde	63,597.05	64,825.81	50,516.76	61,433.74
Glencoe	92,024.14	79,285.32	94,596.47	70,892.63
Home	58,348.05	81,066.73	59,779.32	68,766.68
Kyle	97,045.30	89,538.46	109,522.80	77,051.40
Meigle	77,182.37	55,655.97	55,232.58	67,003.61
Sagona	62,052.26	72,047.20	66,462.44	74,007.92
Caribou	145,370.83	169,562.34	142,797.00	133,966.25
Portia	121,269.25	112,590.97	112,814.03	95,180.33
Prospero	23,712.35	146,862.16	66,545.73	100,211.42
Malokoff	48,168.06	48,312.35	37,753.92	36,505.18
Sebastapool	7,001.39	10,096.52
Earl of Devon	2,150.03	3,341.55
	<u>\$872,917.24</u>	<u>\$997,544.38</u>	<u>\$867,096.24</u>	<u>\$858,239.27</u>

TABLE X.**Comparative Statement of Imports and Exports for the Fiscal Years 1926-27 and 1927-28.**

Imports			
From	1926-27	1927-28	Increase
United Kingdom	\$ 4,527,533	\$ 4,986,838	\$ 459,305
Canada	11,635,110	12,141,574	506,464
U. S A.	8,553,567	9,330,697	777,130
Other Countries	1,097,661	1,178,084	80,423
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$25,813,871	\$27,637,193	\$1,823,322
Exports			
To	1926-27	1927-28	Increase
United Kingdom	\$ 6,273,344	\$ 7,597,378	\$1,324,034
Canada	2,087,496	2,639,834	552,338
U. S A.	9,420,038	9,833,446	413,408
Other Countries	13,058,981	13,573,961	514,980
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$30,839,859	\$33,644,619	\$2,804,760
Total Trade			
With	1926-27	1927-28	Increase
United Kingdom	\$10,800,877	\$12,584,216	\$1,783,339
Canada	13,722,606	14,781,408	1,058,802
U. S. A.	17,973,605	19,164,143	1,190,538
Other Countries	14,156,642	14,752,045	595,403
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$56,653,730	\$61,281,812	\$4,628,082

Trade Statistics 1922-23 to 1927-28

Year.	Imports	Exports	Total
1922 - 23	\$19,321,824	\$20,956,863	\$40,278,687
1923 - 24	27,677,182	21,071,571	48,748,753
1924 - 25	36,404,674	23,590,186	59,994,860
1925 - 26	27,552,305	27,563,213	55,115,518
1926 - 27	25,813,871	30,839,859	56,653,730
1927 - 28	27,637,193	33,644,619	61,281,812

TABLE XI.—PAUPER AND RELIEF EXPENDITURE

Permanent and Casual Poor (Widows and Orphans).....	Public Charities
Medical Attendance Paupers (Drugs and Fees, etc.).....	do
Emergency Cases (mostly Doctors' Fees, etc.).....	do
Pauper Lunatics (Doctors' Fees and Travelling Expenses)....	do
Conveyance Sick Poor.....	do
Extraordinary Expenditure (burials, etc., and artificial limbs)	do
Public Health Outports(Doctors' Fees, Drugs, etc.).....	do
Public Health, Labrador (Drugs, etc.).....	do
Sick Fishermen, Labrador.....	do
Shipwrecked Crews.....	do
Orphanages	do
Charitable Societies (Donations).....	do
Child Welfare (Donations).....	do
Outport Nursing (Donations).....	do
V. D. Treatment.....	do
General Hospital (Operating Expenses).....	Public Works
General Hospital, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
General Hospital, Fees.....	Public Charities
Lunatic Asylum, Operating.....	Public Works
Lunatic Asylum, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
Sanitorium, Operating	do
Sanitorium, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
Poor Asylum, Operating.....	do
Poor Asylum, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
Fever Hospital, Operating.....	do
Fever Hospital, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
Sudbury Hospital, Operating.....	do
Sudbury Hospital, Repairs and Equipment.....	do
Sudbury Hospital, Fees.....	Public Charities
Emergency Employment in connection with above Hospitals	Public Works
St. Clare's Hospital, Fees.....	Public Charities
Southcott Hospital, Fees.....	do
Lady Northcliffe Hospital, Fees.....	do
Notre Dame Bay Memorial (Donations).....	do
Notre Dame Bay Memorial (Fees).....	do
Grace Maternity Hospital (Donations).....	do
Grace Maternity Hospital (Fees).....	do
Salvation Army Rescue Home (Donations).....	do
S. A. Rescue Home, Board and Lodging, Sick & Pauper Cases	do
Field Hospital, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Albeen Hospital, St. John's, Fees.....	do
A. Hurley, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Halleran, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. King, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Martin, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Grenfell Institute, St. John's, Fees.....	do
A. Whelan, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Bruff, S. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Ryan, St. John's, Fees.....	do

FOR THE YEARS INDICATED.

1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	TOTAL
\$ 212,655.57	\$ 214,282.45	\$ 217,368.50	\$ 214,834.00	\$ 215,702.00	\$1,074,842.52
46,284.41	38,643.63	41,680.72	43,186.48	51,795.52	221,590.76
8,271.48	6,964.35	6,195.63	10,554.77	13,303.56	45,289.79
5,281.94	4,388.58	4,123.83	4,672.63	4,126.29	22,593.27
16,865.24	12,391.90	11,655.64	15,052.75	19,538.50	74,904.03
25,064.84	20,885.47	19,027.02	20,746.00	27,861.19	113,584.52
44,299.32	42,262.44	22,892.49	8,818.51	13,352.64	131,625.40
4,932.21	5,578.20	5,960.25	5,757.28	6,228.24	28,456.18
5,126.20	4,024.65	2,065.90	2,594.05	2,157.15	15,967.95
5,987.48	5,735.42	7,044.03	6,084.83	5,116.33	29,986.09
31,184.08	29,076.27	29,523.08	27,486.47	26,096.46	143,366.36
12,935.35	11,832.14	14,251.25	28,259.74	23,365.65	90,644.13
1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	5,000.00
4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	20,000.00
6,066.66	5,569.11	2,697.75	2,317.25	2,432.50	19,083.27
182,756.30	165,234.41	161,506.13	166,798.51	153,890.36	830,185.71
37,207.03	10,473.00	20,651.47	17,606.64	10,837.38	96,775.52
33,414.00	28,830.00	20,612.00	36,082.00	22,656.35	141,594.35
140,094.02	136,498.17	144,357.88	143,073.34	143,601.82	707,625.23
18,681.81	11,509.73	8,178.08	17,196.06	16,976.00	72,541.68
87,190.76	87,784.43	88,768.12	94,747.09	95,751.78	454,242.18
9,346.79	3,614.35	3,628.08	7,596.10	12,427.71	36,613.03
40,925.73	39,244.35	39,993.53	37,768.78	36,771.02	194,703.41
2,128.66	3,502.49	1,872.92	2,355.71	1,995.62	11,861.40
62,716.36	43,257.41	35,850.35	33,272.88	36,832.15	211,929.15
9,729.06	2,035.62	2,042.69	4,099.53	2,360.84	20,267.74
23,133.89	17,046.63	15,636.73	15,472.09	9,054.59	80,343.93
9,142.60	644.10	1,607.48	1,568.98	640.03	13,603.27
.....	2,092.00	2,092.00
.....	3,262.79	1,600.10	2,686.63	7,549.52
12,132.01	14,318.90	18,737.95	12,642.50	13,600.00	71,431.36
10,462.05	11,555.38	7,509.50	608.50	30,135.43
1,060.00	308.00	242.50	215.50	1,826.00
10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	15,000.00	20,000.00	65,000.00
103.00	177.40	24.37	440.60	745.45
1,800.00	6,900.00	4,050.00	2,700.00	2,700.00	18,150.00
196.00	229.00	24,551.55	29,217.00	36,172.50	90,366.05
1,650.00	1,650.00	1,650.00	1,650.00	1,650.00	8,250.00
192.85	878.70	2,589.35	7,180.20	10,390.95	21,232.65
.....	1,890.00	9,785.00	13,091.00	17,482.00	42,248.00
403.00	403.00
6,014.90	1,432.35	94.00	135.00	7,676.25
204.00	204.00
198.20	198.99	2,752.00	10,113.50	15,455.00	28,716.70
5,132.80	2,960.90	3,415.00	4,340.00	6,831.00	22,679.70
.....	627.50	627.50
.....	399.00	477.80	364.00	1,240.80
.....	119.00	119.00

TABLE XI.—(Continued)—PAUPER AND RELIEF EXPENDITURE

	Public Charities
Mrs. Walsh, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Flynn, St. John's, Fees.....	do
Mr. Conran, Placentia, Fees.....	do
P. Delaney, Placentia, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Hunt, Jersey Side, Placentia, Fees.....	do
Lavinia Keats, Argentia, Fees.....	do
P. Power, Argentia, Fees.....	do
Mrs. Healey, Argentia, Fees.....	do
Ed. Monahan, North River, Placentia, Fees.....	do
P. Ducey, Marystown, Placentia, Fees.....	do
Harbor View Hotel, Twillingate, Fees.....	do
Deer Lake Hospital, Fees.....	do
Corner Brook Hospital, Fees.....	do
Battle Harbor Hospital (Donations).....	do
Indian Harbor Hospital (Donations).....	do
St. Anthony Hospital (Donations).....	do
Pilley's Island Hospital (Donations).....	do
Okak Hospital (Donations).....	do
Grand Bank Hospital (Donations).....	do
Able Bodied Relief.....	Public Works
Public Charities.....
Municipal Council.....

N.B.—St. John's Salaries not included in these figures.

Small amounts for Board & Lodging included in **Medical Attendance, Paupers.**

FOR THE YEARS INDICATED.

1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	TOTAL
.....	179.00	179.00
.....	177.00	177.00
.....	208.00	208.00
1,046.40	550.50	1,142.00	1,961.00	3,121.00	7,820.90
.....	239.00	349.00	201.00	269.00	1,058.00
.....	729.00	729.00
225.00	225.00
897.50	1,827.00	2,088.30	1,289.80	537.50	6,640.10
.....	196.00	196.00
.....	112.00	112.00
.....	149.50	149.50
.....	107.00	107.00
.....	2,460.84	1,522.00	3,982.84
.....	487.25	540.27	62.00	1,089.52
2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	10,000.00
1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	5,000.00
5,000.00	5,000.00	4,000.00	8,500.00	10,000.00	32,500.00
2,993.60	1,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	9,993.60
200.00	400.00	200.00	200.00	1,000.00
1,141.43	850.00	850.00	850.00	850.00	4,541.43
218,531.95	218,531.95
283,390.23	172,000.00	100,000.00	179,715.51	261,591.36	996,697.10
.....	89,354.87	89,354.87
<u>\$1,652,396.71</u>	<u>\$1,192,984.59</u>	<u>\$1,140,242.95</u>	<u>\$1,361,000.02</u>	<u>\$1,373,582.22</u>	<u>\$6,720,206.49</u>

TABLE XII.

Comparative Statement of Business Difficulties from 1921 to 1928

Date	No.	Assets	Liabilities	Deficits
1921	93	\$3,697,368	\$6,031,153	\$2,333,785
1922	79	763,933	2,106,975	1,343,042
1923	70	1,569,080	3,963,636	2,394,556
1924	48	486,299	1,886,544	1,400,245
1925	45	128,977	467,045	338,068
1926	52	175,566	679,409	503,843
1927	56	153,574	822,826	669,252
1928	31	341,060	560,155	219,095

In submitting these figures, we might state that the liabilities are taken from the statements submitted either at Creditors' Meeting, or in the Insolvency Courts. On the other hand assets only represent 50 per cent of the actual assets shown, as seldom do the assets realize more than 50 per cent of the figures appearing in the statements.

TABLE XIII.
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF SAVINGS DEPOSITS IN NEWFOUNDLAND SHOWING AMOUNT OF DE-
POSITS AS AT 31st DECEMBER FOR EACH OF THE PAST FIVE YEARS.

	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
Bank of Montreal	\$ 7,461,911.99	\$ 7,682,316.50	\$ 8,158,286.60	\$ 8,479,631.86	\$ 9,348,715.66
Canadian Bank of Com- merce	752,523.23	971,194.00	990,066.00	963,555.00	1,018,484.00
Royal Bank of Canada ..	3,750,604.07	3,940,325.94	4,079,537.89	4,325,565.27	4,511,170.32
Bank of Nova Scotia	8,254,494.28	8,571,132.02	8,664,691.58	8,766,405.74	9,448,721.77
Govt. Savings Bank	1,915,695.45	2,014,155.55	2,011,262.88	2,011,452.72	2,162,473.43
	<hr/> \$22,135,229.02 <hr/>	<hr/> \$23,179,123.56 <hr/>	<hr/> \$23,903,844.95 <hr/>	<hr/> \$24,546,610.59 <hr/>	<hr/> \$26,489,565.18 <hr/>

The following figures will show the savings by the people from life insurance

	1924	1925	1926	1927
Premiums paid by Policy Holders	\$ 964,954.36	\$1,061,543.99	\$ 1,175,659.39	\$ 1,292,810.63
New Policies Issued	3,983,748.32	5,215,024.34	5,793,414.16	5,196,337.14
	(1785 Policies)	(2935 Policies)	(3264 Policies)	(3566 Policies)
Total Insurance in force 31st Dec.	28,070,129.08	32,071,970.52	33,760,957.52	37,660,710.70
Value of Securities deposited in Bank of Montreal to meet adjusted reserve	4,469,566.21	4,950,932.90	4,948,932.89	6,114,878.21

N.B.—The Insurance Returns are always a year in arrears.

Statement of Iron Ore Exported from Bell Island for Calendar Years 1924
to 1928 (Supplied by Collector of Customs at Wabana.)
Ton—2240 lbs.

	Tons	Value
1924		
Sydney	155,895	\$ 265,021.50
Germany	806,265	1,370,650.50
United Kingdom	15,135	25,729.50
U. S. A.	Nil	
	977,295	\$1,661,401.50
1925		
Sydney	343,567	\$ 584,063.90
Germany	788,433	1,340,353.10
United Kingdom	Nil	
U. S. A.	Nil	
	1,132,010	\$1,924,417.00
1926		
Sydney	416,037	\$ 707,262.90
Germany	330,135	561,229.50
United Kingdom	Nil	
U. S. A.	119,544	203,224.80
	865,716	\$1,471,717.20
1927		
Sydney	429,248	\$ 729,721.60
Germany	845,151	1,436,756.70
United Kingdom	Nil	
U. S. A.	61,030	103,751.00
	1,335,429	\$2,270,229.30
1928		
Sydney	616,354	\$1,047,801.80
Germany	886,953	1,473,820.10
United Kingdom	27,540	46,818.00
U. S. A.	37,048	62,981.60
	1,547,895	\$2,631,421.50

NOTE.—The export value is given in each year at \$1.70 per ton.

BANK FISHERY

(From Nfld. Year Books.)

Q—Quintal, 112 lbs.

Year	Vessels	Men	Catch
1923	57	939	Q. 69,372
1924	36	607	70,013
1925	41	753	101,384
1926	47	874	109,847
1927	47	740	99,663
1928	57	932	123,675

SEAL FISHERY

(From Nfld. Year Books.)

T—Tons, 2240 lbs.

Year	Steamers	Men	Seals	Weight
1923	8	1,224	101,770	T. 2,674
1924	8	1,227	129,561	2,802
1925	10	1,423	127,882	5,248
1926	12	1,648	211,531	4,616
1927	9	1,634	180,459	3,713
1928	11	2,110	227,022	4,629

PULPWOOD

Exported from Hampden during the Calendar Years 1924 to 1928 (Supplied
by the Customs Collector, Hampden.)

Cord—128 Cubic Feet.

Year	Cords	Value
1924	7,167	80,834
1925	10,788	139,679
1926	11,560	120,788
1927	34,258	411,099
1928	30,989	371,864
	94,762	1,124,264

Statement of Catch of Codfish for Calendar Years 1925-28
(As supplied by Department of Marine and Fisheries) Quintals—112 lbs.

Year	Shore	Straits	Labrador	Total Qtls.
1925	801,164	52,000	359,220	1,212,384
1926	979,588	13,630	175,380	1,168,598
1927	888,938	34,350	291,245	1,214,533
1928	853,421	18,830	301,750	1,173,991

Note by Minister:—"I am unable to guarantee these figures to be absolutely accurate, as our system for compiling statistics is not what I would like it to be; but I am hoping to put it on a new basis for the coming season."

Statement of Codfish exported for Calendar years 1925 to 1928.

Supplied by the Official Broker at Customs House, St. John's)

Year	Qtls.
1925	1,244,666
1926	1,467,523
1927	1,650,212
1928	1,382,630

Year	Cod-Liver Oil. (Tun, 252 gals.)	Tuns
1927		1248
1928		1309

Year	Cod Oil	Tuns
1927		2708
1928		3087

Year	Salmon (Pickled). Tierce—336 lbs.	Tierces
1927		3103
1928		3352

Year	Herring (Bulk, frozen, Pickled.) Brl., 200 lbs.	Brls.
1927		46,561
1928		62,633

STATEMENT OF PAPER EXPORTED FROM CORNER
BROOK FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1925 to 1928
(Supplied by Customs Collector, Corner Brook)

	Ton—2000 lbs	
	1925	Value
	Tons	
U. S. A.	17,556	\$1,141,129
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	286	18,600
Total	17,842	\$1,159,729
	1926	
U. S. A.	98,674	6,413,788
England	642	41,715
New Zealand	1,902	123,653
Total	101,218	\$6,579,156

	1927	
U. S. A.	103,884	\$6,752,441
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	2,969	192,980
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	106,853	\$6,945,421
	1928	
U. S. A.	133,798	\$6,311,146
England	Nil	Nil
New Zealand	127	8,266
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	133,925	\$6,319,412

Also 60 tons wrapping paper, valued at \$2,499.45, to England in 1925; and 344 tons wood-pulp, valued at \$4,468.77, to England in 1928.

FROM GRAND FALLS

(Supplied by the Customs Collector at Grand Falls)

	Tons—2000 lbs.	Value
	Tons	
	1923	
U. S. A.	58,888	\$5,075,755
England	Nil
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	58,888	\$5,075,755
	1924	
U. S. A.	55,538	\$4,879,243
England	3,902	345,927
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	54,440	\$5,225,170
	1925	
U. S. A.	61,432	\$5,231,132
England	5,832	516,939
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	67,264	\$5,784,071
	1926	
U. S. A.	70,882	\$5,099,755
England	9,263	668,636
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	80,145	\$5,768,391
	1927	
U. S. A.	78,403	\$5,747,674
England	2,822	203,737
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	81,225	\$5,951,411
	1928	
U. S. A.	87,045	\$6,387,916
England	Nil
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	87,045	\$6,387,916

Statement of Amounts Advanced by Newfoundland Government on

Year	Operation Account	Account Capital	Relief Work
1920-21	\$1,773,192.50	\$1,042,616.15
1921-22	1,249,993.00	235,081.13
1922,23	814,345.59	100,819.27	91,395.05
1923-24	200,000.00	203,460.52	90,355.45
1924-25	290,000.00	311,774.18	128,964.73
1925-26	630,000.00	217,973.69
		1,246,345.79
1926-27	365,000.00	975,070.44
1927-28	617,675 56	385,186.21
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$5,940,206.65	\$4,465,246.25	\$545,796.36
July 1, 1928, to April 9, 1929	300,000.00	888,089.83	
		390,759.87	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$6,240,206.65	\$5,744,095.95	\$545,796.36

New Dock Construction

Purchase of Railway

NOTE.—Included in the amount advanced to the Railway Commission for the year 1920-21 is the sum of \$372,000.00 approximately, balance due the Reid Newfoundland Co., Ltd., for accounts other than loss on operation. This amount was written off as a part of purchase price of Railway under the Railway Settlement Act, 1923.

Account of Newfoundland Railway, July 1st, 1920 to April 9th, 1929.

Reid Nfld. Co. Acct. Written Off	Loss on Coal Brook Mine	TOTAL
\$372,294.78	\$115,396.57	\$3,285,000.00
		1,485,074.13
		1,006,559.91
		493,815.97
		730,738.91
		2,094,319.48
		1,340,070.44
		1,002,861.77
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
\$372,294.78	\$115,396.57	\$11,438,940.61
		1,578,849.70
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
\$372,294.78	\$115,396.57	\$13,017,790.31
.....		\$1,947,324.10
.....		2,000,000.00
		<hr/>
		\$ 3,947,324.10
		<hr/>
		\$16,965,114.41

DR.

STATEMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT

Loan at 3 per cent	\$ 1,581,666.66
Loan at 3½ per cent	18,905,060.00
Loan at 4 per cent	8,926,352.29
Loan at 5 per cent	2,061,033.33
Loan at 5 per cent	6,500,893.33
Loan at 5 per cent	5,000,000.00
Loan at 5 per cent	4,999,526.66
Loan at 5 per cent	10,002,946.66
Loan at 5½ per cent	6,000,000.00
Loan at 5½ per cent	6,000,000.00
Loan at 5½ per cent	3,500,000.00
Loan at 6½ per cent	6,000,000.00
	<hr/>
	<hr/>
	\$79,477,478.93
	<hr/>

Examined by me and found correct,

F. C. BERTEAU

Comptroller and Auditor General.

TO JUNE 30th, 1928

CR.

Act 54 Vic. Cap. 8 at 3 per cent		\$ 1,581,666.66
56 Vic. Cap. 1	\$3,384,473.35	
56 Vic. Cap. 2	4,708,800.00	
60 Vic. Cap. 4	456,980.00	
61 and 63, Vic. Cap. 6 and 4	351,373.33	
1 Ed. VII. 6	2,263,000.00	
5 Ed. VII. 2	1,900,433.33	
10 Ed. VII. 39	3,893,333.33	
2 Geo. V. 18	1,946,666.66	
	at 3½ per cent	18,905,060.00
49 Vic. Cap. 3	60,000.00	
50 Vic. Cap. 6	480,000.00	
50 Vic. Cap. 7	320,000.00	
51 Vic. Cap. 3	50,000.00	
51 Vic. Cap. 5	218,000.00	
52 Vic. Cap. 5	408,000.00	
56 Vic. Cap. 1	602.30	
58 Vic. Cap. 13	2,676,666.66	
60 Vic. Cap. 2	973,333.33	
5 Ed. VII. 1	2,885,000.00	
9 Ed. VII. 7	380,000.00	
10 Ed. VII. 7	90,000.00	
1 Geo. V. 32	384,750.00	
	at 4 per cent	8,926,352.29
14 Geo. V. 2 at 5 per cent		2,061,033.33
9, and 10 Geo. V. 2 at 5½ per cent		6,000,000.00
11 and 12 Geo. V. 2 at 6½ per cent		6,000,000.00
12 and 13 Geo. V. 1 at 5½ per cent		6,000,000.00
14 Geo. V. 9 at 5½ per cent		3,500,000.00
15 Geo. V. 20 at 5 per cent		6,000,000.00
15 Geo. V. 22 at 5 per cent		500,293.33
17 Geo. V. 25 at 5 per cent		4,999,526.66
18 Geo. V. 18 at 5 per cent		5,000,000.00
19 Geo. V. 18 at 5 per cent		10,002,946.66
NOTE—Operating Sinking Fund.		\$79,477,478.93
Amount of Loan under Act 58, Vic Cap. 13	\$1,539,611.20	
Amount invested in British Treas- ury	311,164.53	
		\$1,850,775.73
Harbour Grace Water Co. Stock	13,700.00	
Municipal Council Stock	1,905,461.32	
		1,919,161.32
		\$3,769,937.05

PETER J. CASHIN,
Minister of Finance and Customs

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made 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. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies' and "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and other Documents,'" without amendment.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 14th, 1929.

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

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Boyd's Cove in the District of Twillingate asking for an amount of money to complete the

roads in that section. The people in this section feel that the roads there have been sadly neglected and they also feel that too much money is being spent in the Southern part of the Island while none is being spent in the Northern part.

Boyd's Cove needs about five hundred dollars to repair these roads and as the question will be taken up with the Government at a later date it will be unnecessary for me to say anything further except to give it my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of St. Lawrence asking that some regulations be made regarding the matter of trap berths. At the present time there are no regulations governing the drawing for trap berths and they ask that regulations be made somewhat similar to those in force at St. John's and elsewhere. The regulations they suggest are set out in the petition. I strongly urge that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question on the Order Paper for May 13th asked by Mr. Byrne relative to a comparative statement of the total expenditure and revenue, by Departments, for the four months, January, February, March and April in 1928 and in 1929, I may say that information has already been tabled twice in this House and can be got from the answers to questions asked by Mr. Puddester and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

In answer to a question asked by Mr. Quinton on the Order Paper of the same day with regard to Old Age Pensions, (for worn out fishermen) whether the present grant is sufficient to meet needs of qualified applicants, I

may say it is not. And is it proposed to increase the grant to suitable proportion? I feel that it is impossible to do so under the present circumstances.

While I am on my feet I might refer to the question asked by Mr. Tobin as to whether the Minister of Finance and Customs from his department during the years 1927 or 1928 paid any bonuses to any officials or employees of the General Post Office. I think that question should be directed to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of H. M. Penitentiary for the year of 1928.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

- (1) MR. EMERSON—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary whether Mr. Joseph de Champlain has made any offer to the Government in connection with the sale of Labrador, or any part thereof, and if so, to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence and Minutes in Council relating thereto, and to state to the House the attitude of the Government in relation to it.
- (2) MR. BYRNE—To ask the Minister of Public Works to table a statement showing in detail the amounts paid to different firms for plumbing, heating and repairs in the different public institutions since June 30th, 1928.
- (3) MR. TOBIN—To ask Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if from his Department during the years 1927 or 1928 any bonuses were paid to any officials or employees of the General Post Office? If so, to whom were the payments made and table details of same.
- (4) MR. WINTER—To ask the Minister of Public Works what

arrangements, if any, has been arrived at between the Government and Hon. Dr. Campbell in relating to his services on the staff of the General Hospital. If such arrangement is in writing, to lay a copy of the same on the table of the House.

- (5) MR. PUDDESTER—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table the certified copy of Minute of Council approving of the St. John's Municipal Council drawing from Sinking Funds to the extent of \$62,000.00 to reduce its deficit of \$81,208.51 on Current Account to December 31st, 1928, as contained in the Auditor General's report on St. John's Municipal Accounts, clause four, wherein he states that the Governor in Council sanctioned this action by allowing the Municipal Council to draw on Property Improvement Fund \$18,700.00, Small Homes Fund \$9,000.00, Housing Fund \$34,300.00. Total \$62,000.00.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions relating to an Amendment to the War Pensions Act 1922.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this is merely a formal Bill which this House formally passes every year.

In Canada they changed their policy and we then passed an Annual Act placing the bonuses on the same basis as the Canadian bonuses for soldiers and sailors.

The Bill is passed annually so that if there are any change or deductions

by the Canadian people of their legislation in that regard we can automatically alter our Bill which passes annually.

On page 252, Chapter 16 War Pensions Act of the year 1927, we find as follows:

(Reads)

We now have to pass an act for this grant or make them payable to the end of June 1929, and I was going to make a suggestion that we let it be made to the end of June 1930 and then we can pass an act to take it to 1931.

The grant must be passed annually or every second year as the case may be, ever since the arrangement was made by the Ministry, of which I had the honor to be leader, I think, in 1923.

The resolutions are an identical copy of the Act as I have just read with the date changed.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises (on the question of War Pensions,) I would like to state that it is generally understood that the Canadian Government two or three years ago made this bonus a permanency.

I was just wondering if the Government is in possession of any information in that respect and if they are prepared to follow the action of the Canadian Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—At the present moment we merely intended to pass an Act making it law up to the 30th day of June 1930. In the meantime there will be ample opportunity of studying it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

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

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Committee on Supply to consider the estimates on Lighthouses which were asked to be deferred until Mr. Sullivan was here. It has been held over for a considerable time now and Mr. Sullivan is not very well and possibly it will be some time before he can come down to the House, so perhaps the Opposition will kindly consent to go ahead with them.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, at the last sitting on Supply I think the Committee rose on account of Mr. Sullivan not being present and it was expected that he would be back shortly, but, unfortunately, he is still ill and unlikely to be here for some time.

I do not know much about the instance in connection with which Mr. Sullivan was going to have a discussion—that of the Jude Island Fog Alarm. It created a lot of comment and a great deal of newspaper controversy has taken place in connection with the matter.

On behalf of Mr. Sullivan, I would like to hear the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries explain the exact position of this matter at the present time.

Mr. Sullivan drew my attention to the fact that there is no vote for either

salaries or maintainance of the Jude Island Fog Alarm in the estimates, but there are some additions in connection with other alarms on the South West coast. It is the intention of the Marine and Fisheries Department to place the alarm there and are you having a definite vote put in the additional estimates?

I would like to hear from the Minister on this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. gentleman I might say that no provision has been made for the Fog Alarm on Jude Island.

I hope to get a vote on the new loan and I have asked for a grant for light houses along that coast.

The Government has made no decision yet.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Is the Hon. Minister in favour of this Jude Island Light?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Personally I say no.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Then you are hardly likely to recommend it.

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that no provision is being made for this fog horn to be used? If not, I wish to make a protest right here and now on behalf of the residents of the district which I have the honor to represent.

Although technically within the district of Placentia West, Jude Island is geographically as much a part of Burin East as of Placentia West, so that the residents of the northern extremity of my district are deeply interested in seeing that the erection of this fog alarm is proceeded with. This applies particularly to the residents of Flat Islands, who I am sure will be quick to resent the action of the Government in attempting to remove this very necessary alarm.

It will, I think, be apparent to anyone who will consider this matter with an unprejudiced mind that Jude Island is the obvious and logical place for a fog alarm in that vicinity. As has been pointed out by several recent correspondents to the daily papers who have been travelling over this part of the bay for years past and can speak from personal experience. Jude Island is the point that the fishermen make for when leaving St. Mary's grounds, on the other side of the Bay to go to the north west side of Placentia Bay, and I understand it is a fact that on more than one occasion lives have been lost which might have been saved had there been an alarm there in years gone by. And surely the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he is honest with himself, must agree with what I say. Why does he persist in his efforts to penalize the people of that section, many of whom were supporters of his when he represented the whole district of Burin. Why the change of attitude towards his former constituents? Surely this is carrying politics to extremes.

No one has any objection to the people of St. Jacques getting a lighthouse or a fog alarm, if it is required, but I question very seriously whether the people of St. Jacques want a fog alarm at the expense of the people of Burin East, Placentia West of Placentia East; and had the people of St. Jacques known that the idea of the Government was to remove this very necessary public service from Jude Island, I believe they would have nothing whatever to do with it. Besides, a large amount of money has been spent on the erection of a dwelling house for a keeper, and on the machinery for a fog alarm, and I predict that any attempt to remove it now is going to create serious trouble, so that I would urge upon

the Government to reconsider its decision in the matter, and make provision for the erection and operation of this alarm. For a number of years the honorable member for Placentia West has been endeavoring to get this fog alarm at Jude Island, and now that his efforts are about to be realized, we are told that it is going to be taken away and brought to another place. I protest most strenuously against such a proceeding, and the waste of public money which it would entail, and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to allow this fog alarm to remain at Jude Island, as originally intended. We were told by the Prime Minister in this House the other day that the members of this Assembly would have the right to recommend public works in their various districts. Well, if that is so, surely the recommendations of the honorable member for Placentia West should be taken into consideration in this matter. Were he able to be here today I am sure he would be loud in his denunciation of the Government's action in this matter.

Another matter that I would like to refer to is the cutting out of Marystown and St. Lawrence as ports of call for the coastal steamer "Portia." I asked for an explanation some days ago from the Colonial Secretary as to why these ports had been cut out, and was informed that the members for the South West Coast had recommended the change. As one of the members for the South West Coast I want to say that I was not notified in any way, shape or form of the proposal to change this schedule. Only to-day I received a telegram from Marystown saying that fifteen men were waiting there to take passage to Sydney. That sort of thing is happening quite frequently and I merely cite it now to show the necessity for the service. If

this service is unnecessary, as alleged, all I can say is that it has taken a long time to find it out. As a matter of fact it is just as necessary to-day as ever, and I would be recreant in my duty if I did not protest such actions which as I have said, can only be dictated by political spite.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, neither the Department of Marine and Fisheries nor myself have anything against the people of Burin East, Jude Island or anywhere else. I think the Government gave the assurance that the advisability of completing the fog alarm at Jude Island was under consideration, and, if the Government decides to have the alarm there, it will be erected there.

As far as Marystown and St. Lawrence are concerned, I think these places are very well served by the "Argyle" and "Glencoe." The people of Marystown and St. Lawrence get the best service of the whole South West Coast and there are other places on that Coast of far more importance getting very little service. Furthermore, this is a matter that is dealt with by the Railway management who recommended the change. I consider the remarks of the member for Burin East altogether out of place, especially when he knows practically nothing about the South West Coast. I do know something and I can tell him why he spoke in the manner he did and I am prepared to handle him, without gloves, if need be.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Hon. member for Burin East said anything that would justify the last remark from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but I want to associate myself with the Hon. member for Burin East in protesting over the absence of a decision on the part of the Government

The Hon. Minister has informed the House that the Government were prepared to give consideration to the erection or removal of the fog alarm equipment at Jude Island. Well, goodness knows the Government have had long enough to decide it and it does not strain the memory to any great extent to determine one way or the other, and certainly no practical seamen, like Mr. Lake himself, who complains of the ignorance of the member for Burin East in regard to South West matters, should be more ready and willing to appreciate that there is no time for delaying this very necessary aid to navigation, and to be able to inform the House as to what the intention of the Department of Marine Fisheries is with regard to this fog alarm at Jude Island.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this proposed removal of the fog alarm from Jude Island to St. Jacques, the member for Placentia West informs me that nobody at any time tried to prevent the people of St. Jacques from having a fog alarm. They deserve it and they are entitled to it; but I do not think it a just thing to take a fog alarm from Jude Island or from anywhere else and place it at St. Jacques.

I think it would be only common justice to the people of Jude Island to have this necessary aid to navigation put into operation at once. The apparatus was on the grounds for the fog alarm and a dwelling house erected for the keeper, and I think it would be scant justice indeed to the people of that vicinity to have the equipment removed now.

I came in contact with a large number of fishermen and heard their expressions of opinions on how vitally necessary a fog alarm at Jude Island was, and if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would hold an investigation

and find out from those mariners and fishermen the true state of affairs, I have no doubt but that the result of the investigation would be that the erection of a fog alarm at Jude Island is one of extreme urgency. During the last week I heard in particular, one man, 78 years old who had walked six miles to Jude Island to be present when the people, who had been sent there to remove the equipment, should arrive to try and impress upon them the absolute necessity of leaving the alarm there. The old gentleman told them that the body of his son was lying half way down that cliff—a victim of a schooner that had met her fate in those waters. He said, “my son is gone, and I know there is no way to recall him, but I am going to try and prevent a recurrence of such a tragedy.”

Therefore, I would urge upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in all decency, to allow these people to have what they have looked for and anxiously looked forward to for a great number of years. I would suggest to the Minister that he place this vote in the Additional Estimates and let Jude Island have their fog alarm, and, if the people of St. Jacques need a fog alarm, let them have one too. It will be money well spent, because, after all, money for fog alarms is something like the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, and it will give those toilers and producers of the sea who fish around Cape St. Mary's and that section of the Island the fog alarm that they have looked for so long.

SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—

Mr. Chairman, I will explain the various votes in the Supplementary Supply. Of the \$20,000 under the Finance Department, \$4,000 is for the members of the House. Some more is for interest on loan, and other contingen-

cies. Next is the Colonial Secretary's Department. These votes I pointed out the other day. Contingencies vote has been used up and we got to take supplemental supply for it. War Graves vote is extra money that is used over on the other side, in connection with work for which we are responsible, and consequently we have to legislate for it. The next vote of \$120 is for a young lady down there. Our predecessors gave her that amount. The next vote, contingencies \$1000, is also overdrawn. General Contingencies is overdrawn, or will be on June 30th. The General Election vote speaks for itself. The last vote is for expenses in connection with the carrying on of additional work in connection with Public Health. It is voted by our Government.

Department of Justice

With regard to the first vote we discovered that we needed \$5,000 in supplemental supply this year, in addition to the amount voted last year. The same explanation applies to the Supreme Court Contingencies.

Bureau of Education

The Educational Department in my eyes is rather a conflicting one, as there are so many various accounts and one account may be overdrawn and another away in credit.

Public Charities

I think I sufficiently explained that in my Budget Speech.

Marine and Fisheries

Most of the votes are self-explanatory. The last three or four votes are for the purpose of erecting fog alarms, as a result of incessant demands all over the country.

Agriculture and Mines

Under Forest Fires is a large increase of \$35,000. That was incurred during the last year of the Monroe Government. There were considerable forest fires even around St. John's,

and considerable money had to be spent to try and put them out. As regards the Encouragement of Agriculture Vote, I may say that an extra \$12,000 worth of cattle, etc., was sent around to the various sections of the country.

Public Works Department

The Repairs to Public Buildings Vote may call for an explanation. When we took over office \$105,000 had been spent on repairs to public buildings and even then numbers of public buildings were absolutely out of repair, and on some of them the work had been incurred and the bills had not been paid, and consequently we had to find the necessary money to pay the bills. For instance, we discovered that a building had been erected at Rose Blanche or somewhere at a contracted amount of \$1400 and the building had cost in the vicinity of \$3,025, and we had to find the extra amount.

We had to find an extra amount. The same applied in connection with the cost of the building at Buchans Mine.

The amount for Poor Asylum alteration speaks for itself. That work had to be taken on in trying to do away with a number of these so-called hospitals in the community.

Then there is an amount voted here now for a watchman to look after Sudbury Hospital.

In connection with the amount for mail bags. I made an explanation of that on introduction of the Estimates.

Customs Department

The explanation of this is very simple. As I pointed out when explaining the estimates, in the regular estimates

10 or 11 tidewaiters were voted, when the actual number was about thirty. That is just one example.

Board of Pension Commissioners

That is a vote that is fluctuating in a

sense; although it is fluctuating upwards.

As we go through, under the various heads the Ministers of the Departments particularly concerned will be able to give all information to the House that may be required.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman, in connection with the vote of Supplementary Supply there is just one change I might suggest. My suggestion is that an amount be put in under the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, fog alarms, so that in the event of the Minister deciding in connection with the Jude Island fog alarm after investigation of the matter that it is a place where a fog alarm might reasonably be put, then there would be sufficient funds at his disposal for the purpose of completing operations there.

There is also a matter on which I would like to get the ideas of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as to whether or not we should insert another item. When I came into office as Prime Minister, last November, I went into an office that was absolutely disreputable. I do not suggest for a moment that there was a riot in the Council Chamber and the Prime Minister's Office during the term of my predecessors but I found not a chair in the place that could be safely sat upon; no curtains in the place had been dyed or replaced since 1919 when I first went into office and had it done; the ceilings although not actually eaten are all cracked and altogether the office is disgraceful. I feel that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that it is not an office in which one can do decent work, and is in a terrible condition. It is not a place that the Hon. member would have as a private office for an hour.

When I have had to entertain various personages of some importance I

have always endeavoured to make the appointment for my own private office in the Bank of Nova Scotia Building which I keep in a reasonably respectable state of appearance, rather than have to introduce people to rickety furniture and general shabbiness in the place called the Council Chamber.

I feel that if the entire House approves of the idea the expenditure of a few thousand dollars improving those rooms so as to make them at least habitable rather than disreputable would make them not a liability to the Colony but an asset. Recently I had occasion to meet a visitor here of some importance in the world outside, and I noticed him observe those general conditions I have referred to. Considering that such a state in the office of the Prime Minister may be said in a way to reflect to the general temper of Newfoundland I was exceedingly sorry on that occasion that I had not made the appointment for my own office rather than in the Prime Minister's Office.

At the last Council meeting I noticed that a couple of the chairs were actually falling apart, not from any undue action of energy on the part of members of the Council but from the natural defects of the chairs. I do not think an important Government office should be allowed to remain in such a state so I suggest to the House if it is in entire accord that a vote of a few thousands should be put in supplementary supply for the purpose. Naturally I am not pressing it. It is a non-partisan matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman, in connection with the re-adjustment of certain salaries in the Department of Public Works, I may say that I have talked the matter over with the Minister of Finance and Customs and it was decided that we give Mr. William Churchill, the super-

intendant, an increase of \$500.00. It will be remembered that Mr. Churchill was given a bonus of \$1000.00 a year when he was working at architectural work during the late ministry, making his salary \$3,000.00 thus taking off three or four hundred dollars that he ought to receive, I am not saying that it was intended, but if any of the Opposition members can recall it, the late Government were very anxious that he be put as he should be. I suggest that he be given \$3,500.00, \$500.00 be put in the additional estimates for him and \$500.00 for Mr. S. A. Churchill. These men are of the utmost value to this department and I would like to see them getting a reasonable living wage, as you know in connection with the construction of a building there is all the difference in the world between large loss and successful operation. These men can ensure successful operation and therefore I have great pleasure in moving that this amount be included in the additional estimates.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks and I am sorry that the Minister of Public Works is not here as some time ago I referred to the fact that the water supply in my district is very bad and that I would like to get the boring machine that is now in Fogo brought down to my district for the purpose of drilling some wells. At the present time there is a poor water supply in the town of Bay de Verde, there are ponds two or three miles in, but it would not be feasible to bring a supply from them as they are on a lower level than parts of the town and it would be impossible to get the water up the sides of the hills. There is only one other chance by which we could get water and that is by the use of the well boring machine. When I was in the other side of the House I tried to get this machine to bore some holes

but it was in Fogo and I was told that the people wanted it so badly that it was impossible to get it until they had sufficient holes bored to meet their needs. I now ask the Government on behalf of the people in my district that they vote a certain sum so that wells may be bored there. In 1927, we had an epidemic there and the fishermen had to haul their boats up on the shore and lose a whole summer's work because of sickness, the same conditions prevailed at Lower Island Cove and Old Perlican. This is the only place where I can ventilate the matter and I implore the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs that some provision be made so that I can get that machine and try and bore some wells and get a pure water supply, if not these places will soon be wiped out, Lower Island Cove especially. It is absolutely imperative that they get a pure water supply at once, the clergyman there was sick with typhoid last year, scores of men were sick and lost large sums of money through not being able to secure their summer's catch of fish. I bring this matter to the attention of the House now and I will take it up again at a little later date.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad that my Hon. friend Mr. Fuddester has called the attention of the House to the condition of outport water supply.

We are spending fifty to sixty thousand dollars a year for several years trying to handle small-pox epidemics. By means of a medical investigation in which Dr. Campbell took a leading part we found that Bell Island was the breeding place for the disease. As a result of vaccination, which unfortunately could not be compulsory, but with the co-operation of the schools, churches and the medical men we have cleaned out practically all the small-pox. The hospital has been des-

troyed and unless a steamer comes into the country bearing small-pox it is an unknown disease.

The next disease which we wish to attack is the typhoid and one thing it is necessary to get in order to combat this disease is a boring machine particularly in such places as Old Perlican, Winterton, and Petty Harbour where there is an outbreak of typhoid particularly every year. They need good water in order to have an opportunity of getting free from this disease. Along the South coast for example there are some places where it is almost impossible to get water. On more than one occasion while campaigning we took water in our boats in jars and bottles. It was not used, as has been suggested for rarification, but rather for purification.

I feel that the members are happy that Mr. Puddester has mentioned this thing and I assure him that his district is one of the first that will be looked after in this respect, not because it is an Opposition district, but because its needs are apparently most urgent and because of the dire need of good water.

Mr. Chairman, I still have to intrude upon the Committee to make some addition to the estimates. It will be remembered the member for Placentia East, Mr. Emerson, called attention to the fact that Mr. Adams, the Registrar of Deeds, has been continually absent from his office for some time, and the Government considers that the time has arrived when he should be pensioned, and while we desire to express our appreciation to Mr. Adams for his long and faithful service, the Government also desires to provide an adequate pension for him. If we consider the salary alone when estimating the pension it would amount only to sixteen hundred dollars. In connection with the salary there are how-

ever included some emoluments. The practice has been when estimating pensions to give credit for these emoluments. We have done so in this case and the total amount of the pension will be two thousand dollars.

The next matter concerns the magistrate of Springdale, Green Bay, who has lived such an upright and righteous life to be an octogenarian and has passed the stage when he can adequately administer justice, even in such a place where the administration of justice is so little required. His pension will be nine hundred dollars. His name is Mr. Cunningham and he resides in Springdale.

The third matter is one of policy. It is connected with a bill introduced a few days ago, copies of which have been distributed this afternoon. When we passed the estimates for next year our annual expenditure for public prosecutions works out at about twenty five thousand dollars. And in the supplementary supply an extra five thousand dollars have been included for that purpose to bring the vote up to its average. I realize I am not making myself very popular with the legal men on this side of the House or our opponents in law on the opposite side of the House by advocating the appointment of a Solicitor General who will have the responsibility of handling all these claims. This is similar to the manner it is taken care of in England. The salary would be five thousand dollars and we would thereby save fifteen thousand dollars. We feel that instead of this cost to the Colony of twenty five thousand dollars per year, there should be the appointment of some one man who would be compellable to manage all matters in the Magistrates Court and the Supreme Court, as in England. I feel that as a member of the Law Society I am not making myself very popular

with that body by advocating this Solicitor Generalship at five thousand dollars per year, but I believe a very great saving can be effected. We shall have an opportunity of further debating when we go into committee stage on the bill which I have asked to be distributed.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, I presume it will be understood that this salary is to be strictly limited to five thousand dollars.

MR. EMERSON.—I ask that the vote stand over until we deal with the bill that creates the office.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Enquires Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker I explained the necessity for this Bill at the second reading. We are attempting this year to collect these long outstanding and cumbersome reparation claims. There are a considerable number of these claims outstanding and we are attempting to adopt the quickest and best means of handling the matter.

There are a certain number of the claims that can be done under the Public Enquires Act but if the Commissioner has to make enquires himself personally in many cases it is going to mean a lot of time and going

to necessitate heavy expense. If there is a case in the town of Bonavista, for instance, if the Commissioner has power to delegate as his representative the Magistrate at Bonavista, the work could be done in much less time and with much less expense than if the witnesses had to be brought down here or the Commissioner had to visit the place himself for the purpose of investigation.

That is the object of the Bill which is before the House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

The Bill was then read a third time passed and ordered to be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that is be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Following the suggestion that a Select Committee be appointed to go into the various amendments in connection with the Bill, a Select Committee consisting of myself, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Bradley met and I would refer the members of the House to the various changes or amendments which we now propose.

The first change is in Section 2, sub-section (r) on page 6. That section referred to the case of a tax on

persons other than residents and it is proposed now to change it to this:

(Reads)

Then on page 7 "a company" is changed to "Personal Holding Company."

The next change is in Section 4, sub-section 2, on page 11, where in place of "five per cent on income exceeding \$5,000 and not exceeding \$6,000, and eight per cent on income exceeding \$6,000" be inserted the following:

(Reads)

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, it seems rather unfair that while a \$20,000 company wallows in profits of 25 per cent and pays no taxes, a \$450,000 company which is paying 2 per cent has to pay a tax. Surely there is no equity in that. But I suppose, as the Minister of Finance and Customs says, he has to have the money.

MR. EMERSON.—There is another aspect of this matter, Mr. Chairman that I would like to make a point of mentioning.

There are many people who have large businesses which consist of separate companies. For instance, call it X company or X family, has a number of ships, each of these ships is incorporated. It is possible that they are in the coal business and the coal business would be X Coal Company and then there might be X Fish Company. Now in each case they have to get \$5,000 worth of profits before they pay any tax; whereas if this family had all their interests in one company which would be perhaps a million dollar company, they would have to pay a considerable tax. With the result that you will probably find that a very large business having these various interests under one head, will make their business X company, Y company, Z company and A company and in

each case will have to have a profit of \$5,000 before any tax is paid.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—They will have to pay the incorporation fees.

MR. EMERSON.—That is only one, whereas they will have to pay income tax until this Government is defeated.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The next change is in Section 4, sub-section (e) on page 12—Bank Tax.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister to explain one thing. In section five there, it says:

(Reads)

What does that actually mean?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It means that if you go down and pay too much and you can prove that you did, you will get a rebate.

MR. BENNETT.—You mean an error in figures. But supposing in making business returns you put down bills collectable as an asset. And supposing that afterwards that person becomes bankrupt, then those bills are not actually collectable.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—That is adjusted on the three years basis.

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 amendments.

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 a Tax on Certain Incomes," 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 until to-morrow.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Winter gave notice of question.

Mr. Byrne gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 15th, 1929.

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

MR. GRIMES.—Mr Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Salt Pond in the District of Lewisporte asking for the installation of a telephone at that place. The petitioners point out that at the present time the only way in which messages are received is from the telegraph office at Lewisporte, which is eight miles distant from Salt Pond. The people at Salt Pond are served with mails only once every week so that every telegraph message is held up for several days before reaching its destination, and the petitioners wish to have a telephone installed so that messages can be directed over a telephone wire.

I would, therefore, ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs with a request that consideration be given it at the earliest opportunity.

Hon. Dr. Campbell, on behalf of the Select Committee presented the following Report:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills, Limited have considered the matter to them referred, and beg to report that in the opinion of the Committee the petition-

er has not complied with the rules of this House in connection with the publication of its notice of its intention to apply for the introduction of this Bill in not stating more fully than it did the objects and nature of the proposed Bill.

Your Committee, however, realizes that for many years notices of this kind have been published and Bills have been introduced at the request of petitioners.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends that leave be given to introduce this Bill, and that the petitioner be excused from strict compliance with the Rules of the House.

Your Committee, however, recommends that notice in connection with private Bills should strictly comply with the Rules of the House and set forth clearly and distinctly the objects and nature of the Bill.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) Alex Campbell,
L. E. Emerson,
John Parsons,
Joseph Fitzgibbon.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 33 of 15, George V., entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.

Hon. Dr. Campbell gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act Relating to the further Preservation and Protection of Caribou."

Hon. Mr. Lewis gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 93 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "An Act Respecting the Recovery of Tenements in certain cases."

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Loan upon the credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes."

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a Tax on Certain Timber Lands."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman, I move the House at this moment into Committee of the Whole so as the Resolutions might be distributed. I might read the Resolutions to the House and explain the reason of them, and I then propose to ask the Committee to rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow so as to give Hon. members time to consider the Resolutions before going into debate on them. The Resolutions are as follows:

(Reads)

Mr Chairman, the object of that clause is to provide absolutely that no concessions whatever shall be given over any areas in Newfoundland or Newfoundland Labrador, which have been surrendered or forfeited in accordance with the provisions and terms of this act, until the whole matter shall have been submitted to the Legislature.

In other words we do not anticipate to be able to submit to the country or

the Legislature a new Crown Lands Act, and getting the House to consider the conservation of our timber, water power and mineral resources, until the next session of the Legislature, when I do feel that we will have a program that will have the result in converting into considerable revenue and possibly a liquidation of the public debt, some of the wonderful resources of the country which during recent years, not in the immediate past administration, or any immediate past administration, but ever since the Crown Lands Act has been in force, have been in effect going into the hands of speculators.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to a Tax on certain Timber Lands," 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:

Department of Posts and Telegraphs	\$1,276,683.60
Department of Customs...	557,592.50
Department of Assessor of Taxes	15,120.00
Department of Pension Commissioner	646,550.00
Supplemental Supply	691,743.20
Additional Estimates	323,375.00

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 notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on War Pensions Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee passes this bill there are one or two things that I want to say in connection with it. It has been the custom of the several Governments since the Pension Act came into force, to view this matter from a purely formal point of view, without perhaps considering one or two unfortunate incidents that may be connected with the operation of the act, and it has come to my notice (and I think that I can speak with authority on the matter) that certain individuals who should have been pensioned under this Act are not pensioned. I quite agree that the amount of money that this country pays on account of war pensions is very large and I agree that there is a probability that in the future it may be larger. I also agree that this House and the Country owes it to the people who made the sacrifices which entitles them to pensions, that money should not count when it comes to making reasonable remuneration for the sufferings they have endured. We have a duty to perform in that respect which I feel sure that this country will never neglect. We have been faced with tragedy as a result of the great war and that tragedy has created a duty, "a special duty," which it is our privilege to perform and I feel sure that we will never neglect that privilege. But the point that I want to make is, that there is a class of man who was wounded and captured by the enemy during the war time and carried to enemy territory, and there he did not have the opportunity of re-

ceiving medical attention on account of these wounds that his more fortunate comrades of war had when they reached our own hospitals. There are several of those individuals, to whom I could refer, and these cases I feel sure if they were brought to the knowledge of the public, would receive not only their sympathy but their enthusiastic consideration for the betterment of the conditions under which these men labor. Take the case of a man who was captured by the enemy and carried to a strange land under strange conditions. And there, we have every reason to believe, and not only do we believe, "but we know," that his treatment was not of the best. That man came back and there is a gap in his medical history. That gap cannot be bridged, and the man is not given the benefit of the doubt. That is one strong point that I want to make, and I believe that in considering this Pensions Act if it is not possible to do so now, at any rate in the immediate future, the whole thing should be gone into carefully so that the act may be administered as fairly as possible giving just consideration where such is merited.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There may be cases of very great hardship. But we have had in that connection an entirely non-political Board, not subject to partisan pressure, and it has not been interfered with by political influence in any degree so far as I know, and I feel that they are doing the best they can to administer the Act. I know that I have often made representations to them, and I thought that they erred on the side of stringency rather than leniency; but that is a public trust; they have to administer a large vote and while the people of Newfoundland are anxious to do all possible everybody feels that it must be handled with a reasonable degree of rigidity.

I shall be very happy to take up the matter as suggested by the Hon. member with the Colonial Secretary as soon as the House closes, and see whether at the next session of the Legislature some amendment might be made, or the rules in that regard might be relaxed.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks already made in this connection. I have a communication here from the Great War Veteran's Association, Grand Falls, which has been sent me on behalf of the association, asking that certain amendments be made to the Pensions' Act. With your permission, sir, I will read two or three paragraphs of this letter:

(Reads)

I wish to associate myself with what has been already said and I feel that when this thing comes before the Government for its consideration they will realize the great privileges we enjoy, the privileges of having civilization go on as we wish it.

There is nothing which can be put against the human life. It is above the value of money, and these men risked their lives to bring victory to our side in the great cause. It is our duty while we find it hard to help out those who suffered injury and to care for the widows and orphans as well as to do all in our power to make a lasting abiding peace amongst ourselves and all countries. I associate myself with this appeal and I hope that the Government will give to it coming from the Great War Veteran's Association the fullest 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 said Bill without amendment.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent of the House, the Bill entitled

"An Act to Amend 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 leave being granted and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act Relating to the Department of Justice" was read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the practice at the Department of Justice for many years past has been to have a Deputy who has done the clerical and office work of the Department, and advised in connection with Departmental matters, which work was very great, highly technical, and in many cases entailing great responsibility in the possibility of its effect, and required the whole time of the gentlemen who have successfully occupied that position for many years. I myself in fact go back in memory to the days when I being Minister of Justice, the present Inspector General of Constabulary, Mr. Charles Hutchings, K. C., was Deputy Minister in the Department. He was succeeded by Mr. Summers, who like Mr. Hutchings, was a highly efficient, capable Deputy Minister; followed by Mr. McGrath who devoted his whole time to his duties and left also the record of being a capable Deputy. During all these years it was absolutely impossible for the Deputy Minister to personally handle the multitude of minor criminal cases, the fair number of major criminal cases, and the very small number of exceedingly serious and particularly major cases. All these cases were handled by outside solicitors, practically in every case in every government, some supporter of the administration in power,

and were paid for on bills being rendered by these solicitors from an account known as Civil and Criminal Prosecutions. That account has grown from time to time until in recent years it works out at about \$25,000. The handling of these cases in a miscellaneous way by different solicitors has not been and cannot possibly be expected to be as efficient as if handled by one person, particularly considering that particular classes of work are considerably lighter when the responsibility attaches to one person of handling all these minor and those major cases save only those that have to be handled by the Attorney General in person, and that it will tend to a greater concentration of knowledge. There will be a great saving in legal expenses. It is estimated that there will be a saving of approximately \$10,000. As I explained yesterday, I feel that as a member of the Law Society of Newfoundland myself I am not introducing a measure that will be particularly popular with my brethren in that society since it cuts down the amount to be given out in patronage to various solicitors for legal work for the Government, but I feel with the able and prosperous bar that we have at the present time a few thousand dollars less divided amongst many will not be felt to any particular extent. On additional estimates a vote for \$5,000 was deferred in connection with this appointment, and it is now proposed that a section be put in the Bill setting the salary at that amount, rather than voting it in the estimates year by year. This section will be drafted and put in the Bill on the Committee stage. I beg to move the second reading.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the passage of this Bill; and I am fortunate in the fact that the Speaker of the House is also a lawyer,

and so I think he at least will have my sympathy. I look upon this Bill as being part and parcel of the policy of the present Government to provide employment at a fixed salary to those who are its members. At the present time the Executive Government consists of nine members. There is the Prime Minister who is also the Attorney General; and I think he is right in being Attorney General as I do not see how he can live unless he takes two portfolios; the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the Hon. the Colonial Secretary. I do not need to go through every one, but every one is a departmental officer; and I think anybody who is going to undertake the work of governing this country should be a departmental officer, and have a salary from the Government, and it is my opinion that these salaries are far too small. But I do object to the creation of further departments.

I think that the Prime Minister was not fair to the House when he was dealing with this Bill inasmuch as he did not explain that he was creating a new department. The office of Solicitor General is a department the same as the Attorney General is a department, and the result is that a new department is created for a member of the Executive. I have many comments on the subject of Commissions and I do not wish to go into the matter any further now, but I think that the members of the Opposition are against the bills introduced because they either increase taxation or create jobs for members of the Executive and if members of the Government will think over the bills they will see that this is true for all the legislation that has been done for the past few weeks. There is no reason to create this office the chief difficulty that prompted it is getting a Deputy Minister of Justice to do the work for a salary of \$3500.00 a year. Why not give the

Deputy Minister of Justice a salary of \$5,000.00 a year and get him to do the work instead of asking this House for \$5,000.00 for a Solicitor General who is a member of the Executive Council. Why not increase the Deputy's salary and get a good one and get a junior and give him about \$2,500 a year and let him grow up in the department and let him get thoroughly conversant with matters connected with it, instead of starting a new department. You will appoint a Solicitor General here and what can he do. The work will be so abundant that he will have to employ lawyers from outside and we will have the same system of patronage that has been so noticeable in the past. No one knows this better than I. If I were on the Government side I would try to get all I could out of it. I spoke of this matter at Law Society meetings, informal meetings of lawyers and elsewhere and I feel sure that they all agree with the views that this is simply to create an office for some one in the Government. There are three lawyers in the Government ranks, I don't think that it is the Speaker, then there are only two left, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Bradley, so I suppose it must be Mr. Bradley, one of them will be Solicitor General anyhow. I say that it is an office that should not be created, if the Opposition were returned to power to-morrow, we would have a gift of this office and we could point the finger of scorn at you and say that you created it. I don't want that to happen, we may have several lawyers in our party, but I oppose this bill as it only imposes a further burden on the country. Every bill that has been passed so far has either increased taxation or has furthered the position of some members of the Government. As far as our profession is concerned, I can certainly say that they do agree with the appointment of a Solicitor General. If

there is one class of people that should have been consulted in regard to this bill it is the Law Society, and they were not even referred to. The Prime Minister has talked glibly about cutting down the cost of Civil and Criminal prosecution and the vote has been increased to \$25,000.00, \$5,000 more than last year and \$5,000 for salary, is that a saving. If he thinks that by appointing a Solicitor General he will save \$10,000.00 why not cut it out of the estimates? Does the Minister of Finance and Customs know what is going to happen? I submit sir, that a Solicitor General should not be appointed, get a good competent Deputy, pay him \$6,000 a year give him a junior at about \$2,500 a year and do away with the awful patronage system. We shall probably starve. But I do say that there is no need for another legal department. It is perfect folly, I consider that matter is brought in to give a job to another lawyer—you laugh at lawyers, and you create a job for one.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the remarks of my friend the member for Placentia East, Mr. Emerson. When the vote came up and the salary of the Deputy Minister mentioned I expressed a few opinions and asked why the office was not filled, it is an important office and should be filled and a decent salary should be set aside for the Deputy Minister so as to get a competent practitioner, it is a positive disgrace that this position should be vacant so long and why? Because nobody could be got to take the job for the salary. I understood that in our sister Dominion alongside the Deputy Minister is paid handsomely, so handsomely in fact that judges retire to take the position. I heard Mr. Emerson's remarks regarding a Deputy Minister, and I quite agree with them, instead of handing his duties over to a Solicitor

General, whose duties are not defined, the Prime Minister says that they are the same as those of the Solicitor General of England, and these are not defined, we don't know if we are to have a Deputy Solicitor General. It is not possible for a Deputy to attend to all the work and provision is made for the Minister of Justice to call in other counsel. This shows that if the intention is to appoint a Solicitor General and to call in outside help, the \$25,000 will soon be swallowed up and no saving will be accomplished. We want a person in this office who is not connected with the Government, this is the most important office in the Civil Service and the official should be well paid and have the proper help to carry on the work of this department. There is no necessity to create a new department with all its trappings, why should a new department be created simply to give a job to some member of the Government, that I submit, is the only reason that it is being done.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just one word about this matter, I quite realize my inability to discuss this bill regarding the Justice Department as I have had no experience in this respect. My experience in this House is that lawyers on one side had nothing to say against lawyers on the other side, when lawyers on one side proposed something the lawyers on this side always said 'aye, aye,' and it is quite refreshing to see the opposite. I would like to go on record as opposed to the creating of this department. I am not convinced that it will reduce the cost of civil and criminal prosecution. The vote passed by this House for this during the past years has been large and it has become a regular camping ground for lawyers who are called in and get large fees, which perhaps they would not get if they were taxed. I protest against the Bill. If I thought that it

would cut out this system I would be only too glad to support it, but it only means another departmental head and cases will be farmed out to supporters and the same system of political patronage will continue as has been carried on for the past fifty years and we will not save one 5c. Here in the estimates, civil and criminal prosecution has been increased to \$25,000, I think that this should have been reduced if we want to save all we want to see saved.

There is no necessity of increasing the vote from twenty to twenty five thousand dollars if you do not expect to spend that amount next year. I will take a note of what you say and will remember it. Oh! yes, there have been deficits brought down before. There is another matter in connection with this. It looks to me as if we are going to have a bye-election very shortly. By the Legislative Disabilities Act 1927, if this position is given to a member of this House it means a bye-election because.....(reads).....I do not think it provides for a Solicitor General taking a seat in this House unless he goes back to the district as Solicitor General and is elected. According to that the Opposition will have a chance of contesting a district within six months. The Government will have to fight and the Opposition will have to fight, but I did not think we would have a bye-election so soon. I do not think that this new department is necessary and to my mind it will not save any money. My firm belief is that the patronage will be farmed out by the Government the same as in other Governments. You are merely creating a position to take care of the exigencies of the moment and therefore I object to the bill as it stands.

Whereupon the House divided when there appeared in favour of the motion.

Hon. the Prime Minister,
 Hon. the Minister of Finance and
 Customs,
 Hon. Dr. Campbell,
 Hon. Dr. Mosdell,
 Hon. Mr. Lewis,
 The Minister of Agriculture and
 Mines,
 The Minister of Public Works,
 The Minister of Marine and Fish-
 eries,
 Mr. Earle,
 Mr. Starkes,
 Mr. Fitzgibbon,
 Mr. Skeans,
 Mr. Grimes,
 Mr. Scammell,
 Mr. Winsor,
 Mr. Archibald,
 Mr. Godden,
 Mr. Parsons,
 Mr. Bindon,
 Mr. Strong,
 Mr. Greene,
 Mr. Smith. (22)

and against it:

Mr. Puddester,
 Mr. Emerson,
 Mr. Winter,
 Mr. Quinton,
 Mr. Tobin,
 Mr. Bennett,
 Mr. Abbott,
 Mr. Byrne. (8)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

It was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
 I think that copies of this Bill were

distributed yesterday. The necessity for this Bill arises out of the situation usually known as "Brown's Dog," as my learned friend Mr. Emerson will appreciate. It appears that some years ago certain territory was used by the fishermen for the purposes of the fishery. In the ordinary course of events the Department of Marine and Fisheries took it over and arbitrated upon it. It seems that the arbitration was irregular and an award of fifteen thousand dollars was made for property worth about three thousand dollars. The late Attorney General Mr. Higgins criticised the way the arbitration was handled. Mr. Howley felt the same about it and the burden came upon my shoulders to follow the example of my two predecessors. In the meantime the owner of the property who had had an American business career returned home and extended his business. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries decided that he would take possession of the property. When we examined the law to find out what we should do about it we found that we could not make up our minds about it. It appears that under the Public Works Act the Minister can expropriate lands for certain public works, but public works do not necessarily mean marine works. I am informed that in the Marine and Fisheries Act the Minister cannot take possession of property. All this has been done in the past by or under the Board of Works, but it never came up before, because of the large Government awards. It is necessary to introduce a bill to give the Minister of Marine and Fisheries power to deal with the situation and to take possession of property as is done by the Highroads and the Department of Public Works. The object of this act is to bring the Public Works Act and the Marine and Fisheries Act in absolute harmony.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I

have had some experience in this matter as my friend the Attorney General stated in connection with the act and I think that he is quite right in introducing a bill to deal with this matter. It is only when trouble arises in connection with these things that there is any doubt as to what powers the Government actually possesses. The Government must have power to expropriate land. Although I have not gone into the Bill I feel sure that under the able direction of the Attorney General the Bill has been drawn in such a way that the Government will have full power in connection with the appropriation of land, and to deal with other property. There are serious defects in the dealing with property and I am very glad to see that the Government has taken the matter in hand.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if under this Act absolute authority is given to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to expropriate lands, and is this a power which he never had before?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is so.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Public Works,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was read a second time.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a second time there are one or two comments upon it that I would like to make.

You will remember, Sir, that when I had the privilege of addressing you for the first time on the Speech from the Throne I dealt with the matter referred to in that speech, which told us of an Act to deal with the illicit traffic of liquor in St. John's, and had I addressed you before I had I would have had to deal with it in a very short and simple manner because the Speech from the Throne merely stated that the Act which we would all support was going to be introduced, but when I did address you we had before us a day or two before a copy of the proposed bill and I discussed it in the course of my remarks in a general way.

My references were naturally short for two reasons. In the first place the introducer of the bill, the Hon. Prime Minister was out of the House, and, if I may be permitted to refer to the fact, he is out of the House again now, and secondly, certain questions had been asked by the various members of the Opposition which had not been answered, in some cases because the time was too short to obtain the information and in other cases because the Government did not see fit to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, it is early in the afternoon and the remarks that I have to make upon this Bill are likely to involve charges against members of the House who are not present. Those members are the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs and I ask for an adjournment of the debate until they are present in the House.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—Does the Hon. member wish me to put the question?

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of such great public importance that, as I say, what I might have to deal with might involve

charges against these members and it is only fair that they should be present. I do not wish to say anything against them when they are absent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is absolutely impossible for me to be in the House for the next half hour and I feel that my presence is not necessary to induce the Hon. member to make an able speech.

MR. EMERSON—Possibly not; but it would be unfair to you not to be present when I make my speech and if the Hon. the Prime Minister cannot be present then I ask for an adjournment of the debate until to-morrow and I further ask that it stand first on the Order Paper.

On motion the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors'" was deferred until to-morrow when it was ordered to stand first on the Order Paper.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is going to introduce the Bill he gave notice of some time ago, which has been struck off the Order Paper, in connection with the Dry Dock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I explained that before. I gave notice of it as a Bill but it was decided subsequently that instead of treating it under a separate head we would include it in the Revenue Act and it was introduced into the Revenue Act which is now before the House and will be debated under the reading of Ways and Means.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, Ways and Means is on the Order Paper. We are prepared to go ahead if you are. I don't see any necessity to lose an hour or an hour and a half. We might go ahead if the Opposition has no objection.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, our objection is that the leader of the Opposition is sick in bed and expects to speak on it to-morrow and it would not be fair to go ahead when he is not present.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Establishment of Electric Light, Power and Telephone Services on the Burin Peninsula.

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 16th, 1929.

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

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 with respect to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled the following Reports:

Report of Child Welfare Association.

Report of the Commissioners on Lunacy.

Report of the Newfoundland Board of Health.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Bill "An Act Relating to the Further Preservation

and Protection of Caribou," 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 and Customs, the Bill "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 on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Legislative Disabilities" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to the Tourist Bureau.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the raising of a Loan upon the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
Mr. Chairman: In introducing these Resolutions before the House and for the consideration of the Committee, I do not think it is necessary for me at this juncture at any rate to go into any details as to how this money is to be distributed or handled. But the Loan Bill, as Hon. members will see, is for these purposes:—

(Reads)

It is necessary for me to say that I have got to spend three million of this amount to pay off debts of my predecessors in office. I think that the point was brought out by me in my Budget

Speech, when I showed that considerable deficits had to be arranged for by our Government and that approximately three million dollars, it may be a little more, will have to be found to pay off our old debts. The Loan Bill that was introduced last year, as was pointed out a short while failed to include in that amount, the cost of raising the loan.

The loan cost somewhere in the vicinity of 97½. Consequently 2½ per cent on \$10,000,000 is a quarter of a million dollars approximately, was not provided for in the last loan bill. In this bill now before the House provision is made for the cost of raising that loan. There is very little information that I can add now to what I have said, only that someone probably will tell us that we should raise more money, and that instead of \$6,000,000 we should be raising \$9,000,000 because we have a loan coming due next year of approximately \$3,000,000 at 4 per cent. My contention is that that \$3,000,000 or \$2,800,000 to be critically correct can be taken up in this colony, because most of that money is held in the colony by local people, and next year it will be possible for the Government probably, and not only the Government but members on both sides of the House to advocate to their constituents the importance of our people contributing to the loan which will be raised next year in payment of the \$3,000,000 that is due now, and get Newfoundland bonds to replace them.

Statements have been tabled in this House showing that the people of this country have in the Savings Bank of Newfoundland \$26,000,000 in cold cash, and surely it is only good business if they have any faith in their country whatsoever, that they should be prepared to invest some of their money now held at 3 per cent by local banks.

in Government Bonds at 5 per cent thereby making an extra 2 per cent on their money. I feel that between now and next year when the next loan bill is introduced considerable advertising will have to be done if we feel that this country should be helped onwards. Because if we are not prepared to help our own country out, it is difficult to expect foreigners to come in here and help us, particularly in relation to our National Debt.

As we go through this bill I will be only too pleased to help, and explain to the best of my ability everything in connection with the \$6,000,000, but it is unnecessary to explain the 31-4 million dollars. My friends will say probably, what are you going to do with the other \$2,500,000. Well that is in order to eliminate any such possibility as happened in the past whereby money has been voted in this House for specific purposes and after the legislature closed, then whatever Government might be in power took that money that was voted for specific purposes and spent it on other purposes, and we should be hypocritical in my opinion if we allocated say \$400,000 for roads and bridges for argument's sake, and then after we closed the House took that \$400,000 and spent it on something else. That is what has happened in the past under my predecessor.

I do not know if there is any further information that Hon. members opposite may require in connection with this bill.

MR. EMERSON.—Would the Minister explain one thing. You have certain heads of expenditure. Could the Minister give us any idea as to what amount is going to be spent under each of these heads.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—No; it is impossible to say because we don't know what we have got to do.

MR. EMERSON.—Why then ask for six millions, why not ask for five or four?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It is absolutely necessary to begin certain work; apart from necessary public works there is work that has to be done on the railway; everybody knows that.

MR. EMERSON.—Haven't you got any idea as to the various amounts necessary?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Well the rerailing from Humbermouth to Bishops Falls I imagine will cost eight or nine hundred thousand. That is four million gone already, and no doubt Hon. members on both sides of the House will be looking for special allocations for their districts.

MR. EMERSON.—Under what heads?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Improvement of public works roads and marine services. With regard to the diversion of Buchans Railway the Government are going into the matter very seriously; there is considerable money earmarked for that purpose at the present time but we do not know what it is going to cost to finish this work.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister should give members of the House an opportunity to study this Bill and no doubt in accordance with the usual courtesy of the House he will do so.

In connection with the account for the diversion of the Railway in answer to a question I obtained from the Colonial Secretary I find that the Treasury has \$920,000 in hand to complete the diversion at Buchans. He says also that it has cost \$11,640 per mile; that is cost of mile for grading; and even saying it cost \$25,000 a mile taking into account rails and telegraph you have \$920,000 to do that work.

I will read the list of expenditures under the Loan Act.

Section 2: (Reads:)

It does not say how much you are you are going to spend on that.

Sub-section 1: (Reads:)

Sub-section 2: (Reads:) There has always been a specified amount for that purpose and of course we would like to have the amount specified.

Sub-section 3. How much is to the credit of that account? About \$90,000?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—We are going to try and bring that back where it was \$200,000.

MR. PUDDISTER.—(Reads Sub-sections 4, 5, 6.)

Sub-section 6 "and other public business of the Colony." In other words the Governor in Council may devote this money to any purpose in any amount and we have no idea whether any of it will go in the various purposes mentioned or if any does what amount; we only know it is to be used for the public business of the Colony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That section refers to the liquidation of obligations previously incurred. I may say that was inserted this morning at the request of the Auditor General who felt there might be items of past expenditure included in the deficit that might not be specifically provided for and he asked that section be added.

MR. PUDDISTER.—With all due deference to the Auditor General if he asked that that section be added he can give us some idea how much it is likely to be. It would not have to be stated exactly; within \$10,000; but putting that down and giving an opportunity to divert it for any purpose whatever; that is what I object to. We expect the Minister to get us information and give us an idea of these

amounts before the Committee rises. In other Bills the amounts were listed down. They might be diverted afterwards, but in doing that the Governor in Council had to take the responsibility together with the Auditor General. The Auditor General may be alright in writing letters. He can so put himself on record as being opposed to an action. But there are other means the official comptroller can take to stop that kind of thing going on. I have been in the House when the Auditor General was denounced unmercifully for doing things like that. We have had no opportunity of studying this. We have certain rights on this side of the House, though we may be small in numbers; and we intend to protect those rights, and intend to get every scrap of information we can possibly get.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Before the Committee rises I want to assure the Hon. member that we are prepared to give every bit of information we possibly can and are only too glad to do it. We are not trying to railroad anything through.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I might suggest that what the Hon. member for Bay de Verde has just said is quite correct. In the past all loan bills have specified the amount to be spent on certain items, and the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has been to some extent right in stating that past Governments may have diverted money intended for one source to another; but that is no reason why we should make the power under the Bill even wider and give the Governor in Council more power than he had before. If Governments in the past have not put specific sums to their specific purposes, and have illegally transferred funds in loans voted for one purpose to some other purpose, that is no reason why one Gov-

ernment should make it worse by making it legal for the Government to do it. I submit the Minister should bring down a bill laying down specifically what the money is supposed to go to item for item. That is the only chance we have that it will be spent the way the House has voted it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—With regard to the only chance of its being spent the way the House voted it, I remember three years ago I was a member of the Opposition and an amount of one million was voted for public works which meant that each district throughout the country should get its per capita share. What happened? We came in the House next year and asked the question, and discovered that the million was spent every how; and I don't propose to bring in a Loan Bill and put expenditure down to specific purposes and not have it spent that way.

MR. EMERSON.—Why not put it down and spend it that way.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It is impossible; and our predecessors agreed it was impossible. They came in and the excuse was it was impossible; that million was supposed to be used for public works and they paid a deficit out of it and showed the deficit smaller than it should have been. A deficit was shown on the Railway of a hundred thousand less. We don't want to do that if we possibly can help it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—That may be alright, but I am going to say we expected better from the Minister of Finance and Customs. A couple of days ago he said he was a beginner and asked us to be generous as such; and as a beginner you, sir, have no past. As far as the Government of this country is concerned you are just a beginner, and let me give you a bit of advice; "it is not that but this;" and

you won't be judged in four years time by what Alderdice did or what Monroe did but by what you did yourself, and in that Loan Bill with all due deference, you are not exactly creating a precedent but carrying on an old precedent, that you are going to be sorry for, and when we meet again after the passing of a year I will have the same opportunity of standing up and telling what I think of you the same as you did three days ago with the past Finance Minister. We don't want you to put down specifically every cent you are going to spend; the Auditor General is not unreasonable either and will give you a certain amount of latitude. As I said before it is not what Alderdice did nor what Monroe did, but what you are going to do. It is not a question of what past Governments have done; as a matter of fact there is no member of the past Government present on this side of the House; there are only two elected anyway and I had very little to do with it, no more than the rank and file members on the other side of the House have to do with affairs now. It is only fair that these items should be listed down to a certain extent.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I am prepared to give all information necessary but I say again I am not going to create the position of having a loan bill for specific purposes and having it illegally spent for numbers of purposes; and I am not going to be a party to that.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions relating to the Establishment of Electric Light, Power and Telephone Service on the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, on the Burin Peninsula there are certain water powers that are reported to be suitable for the development of electric light and power. The Avalon Telephone Co., as a result of the good work on the part of Mr. Lake, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, are interested in telephone and electric possibilities in that District. These resources are limited in that any specific water power is not given and there is an arrangement made whereby no more water power than is necessary will be given:

(Reads)

If they require additional power they have the right to ask for it and it can be granted to them, this period is for ten years.

(Reads)

We may have to add a few items to these that we will allow them to import, we may have to import poles, cedar poles and they need much cement in the original construction of their plant we may let them import some.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Is this a private Bill?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am introducing this on behalf of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a public Bill.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in interesting this Com-

pany in the development on the South Coast. This is a necessary public service and I hope that it applies to all the Burin Peninsula. By the way, I would like to ask for a definition of Burin, does it mean Burin district or what?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I take it that it is geographical rather than political.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order Hon. the Prime Minister moved that the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,'" be read a second time.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a second time there are certain remarks that I would like to make. This Bill, at the request of members of the Government and members of the Opposition, has been deferred several times and each day I am faced with the position where for the second time I am to address this House in connection with this Bill in the absence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs. The Prime Minister is the introducer of this Bill and the Minister of Finance is the political head of the Department and as I might say something that might result in charges against the department, I asked the House to defer discussion until they might be present.

On motion of the Address in Reply I spoke about it generally and confined my remarks to certain general

observations for two reasons. In the first place the Prime Minister himself who was the mover of this bill was as he has since told me which I believe involuntarily absent from the House. I consider his statement sufficient I did not wish when he was absent to go into details on this matter. He was also responsible for the Speech from the Throne. And in the second place I deferred my remarks because certain questions had been asked by members on this side of the House for information which we were seeking. At that time there was no opportunity for the various ministers who were to reply to these questions to prepare the answers and it would be unfair if they did not have the opportunity to make the answers before I make any comments. Consequently as I said I made my remarks in a most general manner and referred only to such parts of the documents as I had in my possession that called for immediate comment. I propose this afternoon to ask you to hear me for a short time on the purpose of this Bill. And I might say seeing that I am speaking about the answers of ministers that I think the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has not treated this House fairly. He is the political head of that Department and I will have occasion later on to deal with the answers which he has given to the various questions laid upon the table of this House, and he will also have an opportunity to reply.

His action in confiscating the two hundred cases of Teachers whiskey showed that he was prepared to carry out the law. His action in not answering the questions fully that were put to him has not been fair to this House and I shall comment upon it later on. We are still waiting for answers to questions in connection with these charges that have been made and the rumours which I think the House is

entitled to have cleared up. Now the principle of this Bill consists of three parts. First of all we have section three which deals with the powers of the Governor in Council. Then we have the question of permits for individuals. And then we have the principle in connection with interdicted houses. I do not object to the principle of this Bill that deals with permits or with these houses with certain amendments that will be proposed from this side of the House with a view of making these sections very much better than they are. The Bill should be passed but I object to the principle involved in section three. Now we all know the chief difficulty in carrying out the government of this country is the interference of politicians in the management of public services. The principle which was set out in connection with the Monroe "Bottle a Day Act," was that the Liquor Control Board should be free from political interference, that was the principle behind the Act, and I repeat it, in spite of the contradictions of the Hon. member for Trinity Centre when I referred to this matter before. The power in regard to the internal management was vested in the Board. It was done deliberately. You will find if you examine the act that the powers of the Governor in Council were strictly limited except in so far as rules and regulations made by the Board were subject to approval of the Governor in Council. Apart from that the Governor in Council had not power in the management of the Board except to dismiss the Officials. Now that, I submit, to the House is a very good rule. I regret to say that from what I can hear the same rule which was in force in the Transportation Service is not being followed by the present Government. I do not intend to deal with that at this stage. Now there may be objections to placing large, extensive

powers in the hands of permanent officials. There have been complaints in various countries on that ground, that these powers are uncontrolled by the executive Government. That is true. I am quite prepared to admit that friction is being caused by the fact that the Board of Liquor Control has been given powers which are being exercised by the Board unreasonably. I am quite prepared to say that the Board has not been reasonable in many respects and I have heard that many cases where the Board could have been reasonable. The more you keep the control in various public services outside the hands of politicians particularly Government politicians the better for them. We have had two outstanding examples in the last three or four years. We have had the Railway with all its defects, with all its losses it has been run admirably. We have had the Liquor Control Department and it will be agreed on all sides that the Board of Liquor Control has run it very well and this is due to the fact that its management was kept out of the control of politicians and so far as I am concerned, and I feel sure that so far as those who are associated with me are concerned, it will be agreed that these departments of the Public Service should be out of the control of politicians. If we were in your place to-day we would not interfere with the carrying out of this policy. This is particularly true in this country where your voters know you personally. They seek your assistance. This thing does not happen in larger countries and the evil of political interference is much greater in this country than in larger countries. Now when this election was over, it was not decided, it was generally agreed that the dead past should bury its dead and no reference to the past was going to be made. And I intend in my remarks to confine myself in my re-

ferences to the past simply to bringing out the point that I want to make. It was undoubtedly true quite regardless of innocence or guilt that management of the Controllers Department prior to the Bottle a Day Act was scandalous. I do not need to go into details. It does not matter who was guilty. The department was well managed under the Monroe Government and "Bottle a Day" Act. Whatever you may say about it there can be no question but that it has been well managed. There has been a minimum of political interference and the Board performs its duty with courage and firmness. It may be that the members of the Board are stubborn. You may say that Mr. Mifflin the Chairman of the Board has not at times always been entirely reasonable in the exercise of his powers. I have been told by members of the House that there has been some objection because the police are interfered with in connection with the arrest of men who are found drunk and should be prosecuted under the act and that has to be done with the permission of the Board. I hear also from similar sources when liquor is sold over the counter there is no necessity for cartons. But on the other hand I put it to you is it not very much better for him to be stubborn over these matters than to take control out of his hands and place it in the hands of politicians—I am not referring to my friends opposite only but also to their successors.

Anyway, if you want to give police more power and more freedom, if you want to do away with the cartons, do it in the Act. Do away with the evils but do not do away with the system. The system is good, and I would state to my Hon. friend from Lewisporte that the system is good, once you admit the policy that you are going to sell liquor. You admit the policy, then I say let Mr. Mifflin alone except in

cases where you think that you find stubbornness and wrong and then take power to deal with the stubbornness and the wrong specifically but not generally.

So much for the general aspect of the situation. I now would like to point out to the Government that they are making this amendment to the law under circumstances of extremely grave suspicion.

As I said before under the old regime the conduct of the department was undoubtedly bad. Under the Monroe regime it was undoubtedly good. But, Sir, the mud had hardly been wiped off the boots of the various members opposite that held portfolios in the present Government on their first entry into office before we had rumours of a "first class public" scandal. I have described those adjectives when used by the Hon. the Prime Minister in connection with the speech from the Throne as being inaccurate, but, Sir, in connection with rumours which were current in St. John's shortly after the present Government took office, I do not know of any adjectives that can be more accurately used—a first class public scandal.

Now I am going to deal with these rumours with the evidence at my disposal under four heads.

In the first place I say that there was an attempt to grant a monopoly. I say in the second place that there was an attempt to establish a bottling plant.

I say in the third place that both these establishments—monopoly and bottling plant—were being done with the assistance of political influence. I say and persist in saying in spite of what has been said otherwise, that section 3 of the present Act is going to assist in carrying out that policy.

Now then let us deal with such evidence as the Government has given

us. It is true that the amount of the evidence that they have given us is far from complete—very far from complete and I would like to know why it is so incomplete. My Hon. friend, the Minister of Finance and Customs, has refused to answer questions upon the grounds of public policy, because forsooth he is going to take an action against some smugglers here in connection with two hundred cases of whiskey that was imported, and it might jeopardize the rights of the Customs. That two hundred cases of whiskey are worth \$2,300.00. I do not stop to think for one moment about the rights of the Government in the matter—the fact that two hundred cases of whiskey—Teacher's Whiskey—is liable to forfeiture, is likely to be the subject of a law suit means nothing in this matter. I only look at such a case as a minor incident, in connection with a far more important subject, and it would be better, if the Government is honest in the matter, to take a chance of losing \$2300.00 and tell us the truth and let us go into this matter.

Let us see what is the evidence available to show that it was contemplated to get a monopoly of the liquor business between the distributors, or whatever they are called, and the Government. You will find, Sir, in the correspondence that has been published in the various papers, on the 13th of February last Messrs. Lamb & Co. wired the Controller. (Reads.)

Who is Britcan? Perhaps the House does not know, but Mr. Mifflin knew. When the Hon. member for St. John's West stops telling riband stories I will continue—Mr. Mifflin on the 16th of February wrote Messrs. Lamb & Co. as follows:

(Reads)

There is no need to say Hear, Hear. You were not on the Board. Does the Prime Minister mean that when this

letter was written that he was on the Board? And said Hear, Hear, to this letter? That he was rather surprised that the Eastern Trading Company had exclusive supply of these goods?

But, Sir, that is not all. On the 14th of February Lamb & Sons write in connection with the sale of the rum which they had made to the Board.

(Reads)

I refer next to the correspondence with Hudson's Bay Company. On the 22nd of February the Hudson's Bay Company wired Mr. Mifflin, (reads,) to which Mr. Mifflin very properly replied, (reads.) Then the Hudson's Bay Co. write this letter, (reads.) A very decent and honourable letter.

And then we have that letter which was cited in the Daily News on April 27th from the Eastern Trading Co. to Mr. Massey of the Hudson's Bay Co., signed by F. S. Blair.

(Reads)

Now then in addition to the correspondence which has been tabled in the House and published in the papers, we find that many sellers of liquor to our Control Board have dismissed their agents since this Government came into power. Do you say "Hear, Hear" to that? And then we have the incident about which my Hon. friend the Minister of Finance and Customs has been so consistently silent.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—He is going to remain silent for a while yet.

MR. EMERSON.—Very likely. Now we only can deal with the evidence at our disposal and there ought to be considerably more before the House. As I said before, I think the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has not been fair with the House in connection with this matter. He will have an opportunity to tell us what he knows and if he can satisfy me that he had any explanation to justify his

silence I shall be happy to accept it, but at the present moment, my objection to the House is that he has not given us proper information about the matter which is of absorbing public interest.

Now then what do we know? We know that two hundred cases of whiskey came here by the "Incemore," arriving, I think in March sometime—the date is immaterial.

We know that the Department of Liquor Control did not know anything about them and we know that they were consigned to order—notify the Canadian Bank of Commerce; and we know that the Finance Minister, bringing to bear his military experience and supported by his sergeants, corporals and privates, went to the wharf, had some of the cases opened and the contents examined, had some of the cases marked Board of Liquor Control, Newfoundland; and we know that the Minister ordered them to be seized—not confiscated—and they now repose in the Edens building of Duckworth St. next to the Customs House, under the control of the Minister of Finance and Customs. We know further that since that time the Minister's office has been besieged by Messrs. Blair and Hand on many occasions, and I think this House will be interested to know what Messrs. Blair and Hand were down there to talk to the Finance Minister about. We know that Messrs. Blair and Hand are, apparently, the prime movers in the Eastern Trading Company and we also know that the Eastern Trading Company is a subsidiary Co. of the Canadian General Distributors, Montreal. I have read to you the correspondence with Lamb & Co. and the Hudson's Bay Co., and I have spoken of the Sandbank Co., and John Dewar and I have dealt with Teachers Whiskey, and I put it to the House now; was a monopoly contemplated by anybody? Was an effort made to

create a monopoly? Leaving aside the political aspect and the Governmental aspect and all these things, did somebody contemplate and work upon getting a monopoly? I put that question to Hon. members, and you are bound to say, yes, the Eastern Trading Co. and Messrs. Blair and Hand did contemplate getting a monopoly for the importation of liquor.

I only put it to you that they merely contemplated doing it and they took certain steps with a view to carrying out that object. When I brought up this matter before, it was dealt with by the Hon. members for Ferryland and Hr. Main and we have the splendid excuse—I am not sure whether it was mentioned by the Prime Minister—that this was the effort of a very clever individual named Blair who was putting it all over these ignorant agents in Newfoundland. He was grabbing their business without any justification at all and without any assurance from the Government of Newfoundland or any of its members. That was the excuse offered by these Ministers of the Crown. The idea was that Mr. Blair and his associates had tried to put one over on the local agents; but he did not try to do it under the Monroe Administration, and the present Government had hardly walked into office before we heard about Mr. Blair and his associates, we heard about a bottling plant and about everything else accordingly.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the question of a bottling plant and here again I find the footsteps of Mr. Blair, and here again I am going to criticise the Finance Minister for his lack of information. A question was asked by the Hon. member for Burin East in connection with correspondence relating to the importation of, and the duty on, cartons, and the Finance Minister tabled a reply to the effect that on the 12th of March and 3rd of April the

Hinde & Dauch Paper Co., of Canada, Limited, wrote the Assistant Deputy Minister of Customs here asking for a rate of duty on printed and unprinted cartons, and the following answer was sent by the Deputy Minister of Customs on April 10th:

(Reads)

It was only after he was forced for more information that the Finance Minister produced the letter of March 12th, but the letter of April 3rd has not yet been tabled.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I have not got any letter for April 3rd.

MR. EMERSON.—But you got a copy of the answer from your Department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I told the Hon. member before that I would table the letter and the reply. I know of no other letter and there is no other letter on this matter in the Customs Department. That is final. You are trying to convey the idea that we are keeping something back.

MR. EMERSON.—I am going to show you what you are keeping back. Your first reply referred to the two letters. On March 12th and again on April 3rd Messrs. Hinde & Dauch Co. wrote the Assistant Deputy Minister of Customs. There were two replies received and I have not got them. I have here a letter dated March 12th that your Department received from Hinde & Dauch Co. and it reads as follows:

Is the Hon. Minister prepared to table that letter now?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I shall produce it tomorrow.

MR. EMERSON.—That package had on it Board of Liquor Control or words to that effect.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You're out of luck. The spy who goes to the Custom House has evidently got wrong information.

MR. EMERSON.—You were asked by me personally several days ago about this document, but it has not been tabled since.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I was not asked for that letter containing a sample of the package.

MR. EMERSON—Why quibble about this thing. You had a question put to you asking you to table the correspondence and this correspondence refers to a letter and a package, and because the envelope could not hold the sample package that, therefore, it had to be sent under a different cover.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—If that letter had to refer to a punch-eon of rum would I have to bring it up and put in on the table of the House.

MR. EMERSON.—No, because you would not have an opportunity of drinking it. That cardboard sample of the carton is the main part of the correspondence and it could be very well enclosed with the letter and brought up here, if the Finance Minister wanted to be fair with the House. It may be asked whether this evidence which I have just produced is not naturally conclusive evidence, and, consequently, I am going to give you some further evidence, and the evidence this time is a message to the Agent of Kendrick Jefferson Company from the Agent here asking for quotations on ten thousand cartons and quart whiskey bottles to be packed in packages of one thousand, and, "if you are going to quote" the message adds, "do not forget our commission." The Agent here is Mr. Peter H. Cowan in whose house Mr. Franklyn S. Blair and Mr. Hand live. Now, did they contemplate a bottling plant, Mr. Speaker? And again I put it to the House was a bottling plant contemplated by our friend Mr. Blair, and was a monopoly contemplated by Mr. Blair?

Can you get away from the evidence that is at present before you? But bear in mind that you have not got half the evidence yet, though I hope you will get it, as I think you are entitled to it. But even with the small amount of evidence before you, the question naturally arises, why did they do this?

Now, we have head of people supplying Government institutions with articles such as coal, food commodities and hospital requisites, but we have yet got to find that anybody who has to do with the supplying of those goods who ever attempted to get a monopoly. Certainly there never has been a case when the suppliers have written away to the various agents of the Companies supplying those goods and told them that they have been appointed purveyors to the Government, and I say that the argument is perfectly silly and cannot be applied to the evidence in connection with the bottling plant, and I will tell you why. There is no competition here with a bottling plant.

You cannot say that this very clever man is trying to put one over the people of Newfoundland, the agents or their sellers, because there is no bottler here. And again I am reluctantly compelled to refer to past history. You will find as you know from the history of our country five or six years ago what happened under the last Liberal administration. And this Liberal Party this Government has hardly come into office before we are faced with the possibility of a similar scandal. And we naturally have to put two and two together and we say to ourselves that under those circumstances, and in the absence of clear denial, under conditions such as these we are left in no doubt that somebody in the Government is involved. And that these people these wealthy distillers, these distributing companies in Montreal, with

the little baby down here the Eastern Trading Company would not make those statements in connection with their business unless they were satisfied that they had an understanding with somebody some person or persons in the Government, that would carry out what they desired, and make a contract to supply liquor to the controllers, and have a bottling plant in St. John's. And I so say that under my third head it is quite obvious that political influence was going to be used. I do not suppose now that it ever can be used, but that it was intended to be used was quite obvious from the recent correspondence, not depending even on the verbal evidence in connection with the matter.

Now sir, who is to benefit? Is it the people of Newfoundland? Assuming for a moment that this scheme for a bottling plant was on foot, who is to benefit from it? Is it those who drink the whiskey or the rum? No. Is it those who bottle it. Yes. And why? I have learnt quite a lot about liquor during the last five days. I knew a certain amount about it before. And one thing that I have learnt was this that whiskey imported in bottles is twenty per cent underproof. Whiskey imported in bulk may be anything between five per cent under proof and five per cent over proof. And the bottling plant can reduce this by the addition of distilled water and there is their profit. Now sir, it was not for the benefit of Newfoundland, it was for the benefit of two lots of people, first of all the political influence that was behind it, and secondly, the Eastern Trading Company, and its various associates.

The political influence behind it must have been going to receive considerable graft. That is all. You can put it in politer language if you like, but I am not speaking about any mem-

ber of this House, and I think that I am entitled to use that term.

Now sir, the fourth point that I am coming to is one upon which the Hon. the Colonial Secretary questioned me when I spoke about it before I said that you were introducing this bill under suspicion. It has been ascertained to a certain extent how that suspicion arose outside the House and now it has become even greater inside the House. I understand in connection with section three that the opinion of lawyers has been taken about it. What an extraordinary condition of affairs. I thought that when a bill was introduced into this House it did not need lawyers' opinions, being drafted in the proper department. But the opinion of other people since I made my comments on the Speech from the Throne, have been obtained about it, and they have expressed varied opinions concerning it. Some of them are not in favour of the opinion that I expressed. However that is not altogether surprising, as I have known cases which lawyers disagree. But I am not going to depend upon the lawyers' opinion at all. I am going to depend on the opinion of the Hon. members opposite, laymen. The Prime Minister, who has as usual fled when this matter comes up, made in his explanation of the bill the other day, the statement that this bill had to do with the cleaning up of shebeens. It has nothing whatever to do with it except in a minor particular. The bill as it is at the present time gives the Governor in Council certain powers. This new bill is going to give far wider powers. It is going to give to the Governor in Council, that is the politicians, about whom I spoke early in my remarks, the power to make rules and regulations in connection with matters incidental to the sale and distribution of liquor unless specifically excluded in the Act.

Now sir, I am going to speak to the Colonial Secretary. When bottling whiskey incidental to its sale and distribution, it is absolutely essential to have a bottle, and the Governor in Council is given power to establish a bottling plant and you can do it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I have asked for the proof before and perhaps the Hon. member will give it now?

MR. EMERSON.—you have the proof.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Not at all.

MR. EMERSON.—And you were the Minister of Education; then I am not surprised that the Ministry of Education was abolished.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, do you call that good enough.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—I must ask the Hon. member to take back that remark.

MR. EMERSON.—I appreciate that my Hon. friend the Colonial Secretary may have taken exception to my remark, and if I have given him any offence, I am sorry, as it was in the heat of argument that I spoke. Now sir, as I was putting the question to this House, is the bottling of whiskey and rum incidental to its sale and distribution. And I say that it is not only incidental but absolutely necessary. And it will give to the Governor in Council power to make rules and regulations in connection with all other matters not specifically provided for in the act. Now at the present moment there is a bottling plant here, in the controller's office. When the rum comes in bulk it is bottled at the controller's. But that is done under the control of the controller. Now it will be done under the control of the Governor in Council. And I say that the suspicion which this matter and the evidence before us in connection with

the liquor act, particularly in view of the history of the past Liberal Administration in connection with it, is borne out by section three of this Act.

And now sir, I am going to make a motion to amend the motion to read the Bill a second time.

Before I sit down I have only a few more remarks to make. In the first place I want to make it clear what the meaning of my amendment is. It is not a wholesale condemnation of the bill, it does not entirely disagree with the principle of the bill. It simply says that this House is not fully informed about the efforts that have been made in connection with liquor in this country and that before this bill is read a second time, and the principle agreed to, that all those that know anything of this matter, or are acquainted with any documents, should be summoned before the Bar and give evidence upon oath, so that this House may be fully informed as to what is going to. I shall vote against the second reading for one reason and that only that I do not know the facts about these matters, and I think that I ought to know them, before the House reads the bill a second time. So much for the meaning of this amendment. But I have to bring before this House the culminating bit of evidence that come into my hands this morning. A client of mine came to my office and informed me that he had been telephoned for and spoken to on the telephone by the Hon. the Prime Minister and Attorney General and told that his interests would be jeopardized to the fullest extent unless my mouth was shut. Now are you going to have an enquiry?

MR. WINTER.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the amendment so exhaustively and ably dealt with by my Hon. friend the

Hon. member for Placentia East. The amendment asks that the second reading of the Bill be deferred until an inquiry be held to settle matters about which the public today is suspicious. I am quite sure we have all listened in this House with rapt attention to the way in which my Hon. and learned friend has dealt with this matter. The way in which he has delved into it must envoke the admiration of all here. As he says this matter is a first class public scandal; the matter which has caused him to make this motion here to-day. Now in seconding that motion, Mr. Speaker, I want to make myself clearly understood, I do not object to the principle of the bill now up for second reading. In so far, sir, as the bill is designed to check the illicit sale of liquor in Newfoundland, I am heartily in accord with it, and I am sure every member in this House is also in accord with it to that extent. But, sir, that Bill does contain a section which I submit, as has already been submitted, is not designed to check the illicit sale of liquor in Newfoundland. Rather I would say it is put there to aid and abet the sale of liquor in Newfoundland. Now I had occasion to refer to the Bill when speaking on the Address in Reply, and I stated at that time when criticising the way it was introduced as a measure to check the illicit sale of liquor that that was not the only reason it was introduced, and I am sure all who have listened to-day to my Hon. friend's learned address on this matter will agree with me. I am sure as we come to know full particulars, and having listened to the able way in which the facts have been presented to us we should all come to the conclusion that a grave public scandal does exist to-day, and in asking now for this enquiry we should agree that this enquiry should be held. It is a matter of grave public importance,

and I can see no possible harm in this enquiry. If there is nothing in it it does no harm, but I say the public is suspicious. There can be no doubt about that. That is evidenced by the attendance here to-day; and one hears about it everywhere on the street. The public wants to know about this matter. Information has not been given and we want to know and the only way the House can know is to bring the parties up here at the Bar of the House and have them examined.

Now what is this 3rd section that has evoked all the comment. As my Hon. and learned friend has already pointed out formerly under the Alcoholic Liquors Act the Governor in Council had very limited powers, purely powers dealing with finance and appointments, and the Government of that day were very careful not to take other powers; they were very careful to leave powers to the Board and that the responsibility for these should fall on the Chairman of the Board. The Government did not want to go into the liquor business. It would seem that that is the intention. The matters left to the Board under the Act are that they "may make any regulations they may deem necessary in respect of the handling and the conduct of its business and so on and so fourth." All details of management were to be left to the Board of Liquor Control. Now, the Government are assuming the power of dealing with certain matters not specifically given to the Board. It is contended that under this section there is no power given of bottling liquor. There can be no doubt about it, I submit that power is given. My opinion is only one of many lawyers opinions, and lawyers are bound to differ, but I ask this House can there be any doubt on the grounds that the Hon. member for Placentia East has referred to that "matters incidental to the sale and distribution

of liquor" does not include bottling. There is no doubt about it and I do not believe any lawyer in the community will say that it does not mean that.

Why does the Government want to take these powers from the Board or add to its own. "why change the situation as it is to-day. Surely the Board of Liquor Control has the confidence of the people. As my learned friend has pointed out the public services to-day that are being run free from political influence are the best run. The Railway is an instance of that; and up to date the Board of Liquor Control. I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the light of what we now know; what has happened; the reason for this amendment becomes apparent.

A situation has arisen; I shall not deal with the matter at any great length; you have already heard it dealt with at length by my hon. friend, but a situation has arisen which I say has assumed the proportions almost that there is a public scandal. Questions have been asked in this House by myself and by other members on this side of the House. I was very much interested and rather at a loss to understand why some questions were not asked by members on the other side of the House. It is a matter of public importance; and I am quite willing to admit that a great number of members sitting on the other side of the House know no more about this matter than we on this side; and this being so why should they not be interested and ask these questions and obtain information. It was a matter of great surprise to me that some of these questions did not emanate from some of the Hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House. Some of them presented petitions on the subject of temperance. Surely they should be sufficiently interested to ask some of the questions asked by members on this side of the House.

Then the reasons given, Mr. Speaker, I submit with all due deference, for not answering questions are not satisfactory. The reason the Finance Minister gave was that certain legal proceedings were in contemplation and the answering of these questions might prejudice the Customs interests. I say that is not a satisfactory reply. We are not told what the proceedings are; who are going to be the parties. Surely we are entitled to know these matters in the House. Was action taken by the Minister or against the Minister? If against the Minister why should the House facilitate the party going to take action? As far as I can see there is no attempt to commence legal proceedings. Then I asked a question as to what advice the Attorney General had given in connection with the matter and I have received no answer yet. "We do not know. If a breach of law has been committed it is the duty of the Attorney General to advise action to be taken to bring the culprits to justice, and that justice be done quickly. The Attorney General is expected to advise someone to take that action. It is evident that there was attempt to create a monopoly, that a monopoly was intended. Of that I submit there can be no possible doubt whatever. We have Mr. Blair's letter to the Hudson's Bay Co. when he writes that the Eastern Trading Company are purveyors to the Board of Liquor Control having the contract to supply the various brands. Now there is a statement "having the contract," that this Company has the contract to supply the Board of Liquor Control with its various brands. Surely we cannot be asked to accept the statement that there is no truth in this, that this is a bluff on the part of this man. Is this man going to make this statement without some authority. If so, why not

bring him up and ask him. There can be no objection to such a procedure. That is the amendment put here asks and we would see what he knows about the matter, and if the Government is sincere they will do that. Now also bottling in this country was certainly contemplated. There cannot be any doubt either I submit about that; not the slightest possible doubt. Enquiries were made of the Deputy Minister of Customs as to duties payable on packages, cartons, so on and so forth. Surely there can be no doubt what the intention was; and the same Mr. Blair is mixed up in this. Now this Eastern Trading Company claimed to have this monopoly. When questions were asked the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control states that he knows nothing about it; he does not say that in answer to a question, that appears from correspondence. He says he knows nothing whatever about it, and the Minister of Finance has informed us that the Government has entered into no contract with the Eastern Trading Company and the Colonial Secretary states that the Eastern Trading Company have not been appointed exclusive purveyors to the Board. Now then I ask if that be so, by what authority did the Eastern Trading Company claim to be sole purveyors. Have you then any objection to enquiring from this Company and all concerned and finding that out.

We want to know who made them purveyors, and who made a contract with them and where it was made. This House wants to know. Then why not give an opportunity to Mr. Blair to come up and explain. I say that if the Government are sincere they will accept this amendment and do that; but if the Government is not prepared to afford the House and Mr. Blair that privilege, the Government is under suspicion; the whole Government is

under suspicion and the sooner the matter is cleared up the better. It is no mere rumour; there is a direct statement by Blair. I believe the Colonial Secretary was quite honest when he thought it was a mere rumour but a statement has been made here. Now the position is that Blair has been repudiated by the Board of Liquor Control, by the Minister of Finance and Customs, by the Colonial Secretary. Well then who gave him authority to make that statement. It was some one in authority. You know the situation; it is unnecessary for me to labour it.

Well, who gave him his authority, the agents here lost their appointments. Mr. Blair says that he has a monopoly, the Government says that he has not, then what is the objection to holding the enquiry as suggested by the Hon. member for Placentia East, Mr. Emerson. Someone has broken the law, the Minister of Finance and Customs acted with commendable promptitude in seizing the liquor but what is going to be done about it? Is it going to be allowed to drift on till this House closes? If the Government are sincere they will have this enquiry held and clear up the situation, public suspicion is aroused and will continue to be aroused until this enquiry is held. The members on the other side want to know, and I am sure that they will have no objection to this enquiry being held and the public wants to know. No harm can come out of it and it will save the country the ignominy of another liquor scandal. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this motion so ably proposed by the Hon. member for Placentia East.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to make any remarks on this liquor Act, as I previously made the remark that I had an open mind on Prohibition. I gather

from the remarks of my Hon. friends the Hon. members from Placentia East and Burin East, that this is a field day on liquor and a special effort is being made to make a display on rum. I remember three or four years ago we had a similiar day and the Minister of Finance and Customs placed two or three bottles of whiskey on the table of the House. I am sorry that I didn't bring up two or three cases of Teachers whiskey for the edification of those who came here to-day to see us made fools of. The finger of scorn has been pointed at me and the impression is given that I am holding something back. Because I do my job in the Customs Department, because I considered that the liquor should be seized and I seized it and gave no particulars so that the Opposition might not have a chance to make something out of it, I am hiding something. I seized the liquor for fun, and my job is to cater to the Opposition so that some lawyer can get hold of the facts and hire himself to some rum runners. I am keeping the facts to myself in the interests of the Customs Department and I am not going to cater to individuals.

Since I have been a member of this House I have always treated the members fairly and I never attempted to hide anything, I have a reputation for being outspoken, and the Hon. members on the other side know that I tell the truth. Now they talk of bottling plants and the Government having a contract with the Eastern Trading Company, and because a letter was tabled here in this House that was sent to the Customs Department by some Irishman in Montreal asking the duty on cartons and we replied telling the duty, I am holding something back. I would point out to Mr. Emerson what happened before, when they were going down and drawing the rum off the puncheons and bottling it.

stealing it, and there was an awful lot stolen, there were several hundred cases seized from the steamer "Herbert Green" and found its way into the East End Bye-election for the edification of the people of the country. Now we are told that Mr. Blair is handling the liquor, he has been selling it for the past twelve or fifteen months when he should not be allowed to sell it. There are no questions about that, no investigation there. It is intimated by Mr. Emerson and even by Mr. Winter, that I am mixed up in this liquor business.

MR. EMERSON.—I made no such charge.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—No, but you said yesterday that you had charges to make against the Prime Minister and myself, now make them.

MR. EMERSON.—My charge is that the Minister of Finance and Customs is not treating this House fairly in not giving the information desired. I don't think that he is in any way mixed up in this business.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—These are the charges against the Minister of Finance and Customs and what are they? That I am not prepared to give away information to Mr. Emerson and everyone else that will cost the Customs Department \$2400.00 or \$2500.00. I need all the money I can possibly get to square my accounts. In the past people could lose money, some could steal it, and there would be no enquiry held, well bring a lot more people to the Bar of this House. I rose not to speak on the principle of this Liquor Act, I look upon prohibition, and I want to make my meaning clear, as a curse to every country that has it, an absolute curse, and if it was for the good of the country and I had my way I would open bars on every corner of Water Street, and I would have a good editorial to my credit in

the Daily News. I don't believe in hypocrites, people talking prohibition on one hand and lowering, down not lime juice, perhaps champagne and various other kinds of liquors, then they criticize the liquor Bill, I don't care what kind of a Bill is introduced, any kind of a Bill will do me, I have no principles on liquor, I believe that it was the worst day that ever befell the country when prohibition was enacted, and when you are writing your editorials you can put that in.

M.R. EMERSON.—And you can join my name with yours.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Yes, and don't forget to join Mr. Emerson's name with mine when you are writing your editorial. That paper is written by people whom it is not safe to let loose among intelligent people, it is denounced by all decent members.

I would like to inform the editor that he would not say these things to my face. These individuals have no character to stand for that kind of a paper that prints that kind of stuff, and I made it clear that it only came to a "bubble," as Sir Robert Bond once said about the Speech from the Throne, it is only a "bubble." Mr. Speaker, I don't care two cents whether the job at the Customs House is open for me or not, I can earn my living in spite of the Ministry of Finance.

Mr Speaker, I regret this afternoon was made a field day for rum and that people were brought in here to see an exhibition made of me. I want to tell the people that I have more interest in this country than they have. I came from the common people of Newfoundland, sprung from the fishermen. They came here expecting to hear some charges made against me and they would not come when there is any decent public policy going on. They will hide behind some door. Some of these people who were going to make

charges with regard to rum failed to make the charges consequently I regret that I cannot vote for this motion that is put up to have an enquiry. The Hon. member opposite said he made no charge against me but at the same time he puts a motion to have a charge put against me. There charges do not exist. They said I should give more information. If they were in my place would they give more information. I regret that I have not got a few cases of whiskey to give the guests that came here this afternoon.

Now, my friend Mr. Winter said that I failed to give information which I should have given. And I would put myself in Mr. Winter's position tomorrow and he in my position would he go and tell the public all the information that he had that may come before the court in order that people may use that information, and you will give that as your legal opinion and stake your reputation on it as a legal man. That is the position. I have heard talk of lawyers of all kinds, although some of my own party are lawyers. We have heard of contracts for coal but we never heard of any contracts by lawyers. They do a job and then send in their bill and you do not know what it is going to be. I am sorry Mr. Speaker, that my ire has been aroused to such an extent that I have been put in such a position and told that I have been derelict in my duty and false to the country. Now no charge has been made against me although yesterday I was given to expect that one would be made. Now I am asked to vote that there is no charge against me. I challenge any one to make the charge against me if you will get up and make it. To use common language, it is a case of "put up or shut up." I do not know of any other expression which puts it so neatly, since I have not had much op-

portunity of dealing in polite language. But I believe in being outspoken and calling a spade a spade. As I said a moment ago it has been a field day on rum. Tomorrow afternoon let us hear something on the Budget from the members opposite. There is nothing that will draw the crowd when we are debating on the Budget. Well we will bring rum in the Budget. There is three hundred and fifty thousand dollars in the Budget for rum. I use the word rum because I know it is nauseating to some people. If I said liquor it would be too polite. What makes me wild is charges being insinuated against me in my duty to the treasury. But I found that there is very little left for any one to steal for it was stolen before I arrived there. There was no charges made concerning that but I am prepared to make them against the late government. Enquiry should be made concerning it. I would almost go a bit further than your remarks Mr. Speaker when you spoke of clearing the gallery. Strangers are here as an act of grace. They should not even be allowed to smile because some of them smile so as to ridicule members here. There is very little more that I have to say but I challenge every member to lay down the charge and if not cut it out, and get down to business, that they were talking about yesterday afternoon. I am ready for them right here in the front row. If they have no charges to make let us get down to business. Cut out the rum talk. I have no policy on it but an open mind. I do not care what you do with it. The member for Placentia, Mr. Emerson, talked of Mr. Blair and Mr. Hand beseiging my office. They were there once only and there were other members of the Opposition there more frequently. I treated Mr. Blair and Mr. Hand so well that they did not come back again. There were members of the

Opposition interested in rum but there were no rum scandals last year. What about the rot-gut rum down on the Furness Withy premises? But when some fellow comes along from nowhere and starts to say he has contracts with the Government, they say some one must be getting graft. When we come to showdown there is no charge to make. If you have no charge to make against me cut it out for we are not going to stand for it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say and I am not going to make any charges against anyone unless I can prove them. This is the first time I have spoken on rum. I have not asked a question about rum. I will have something to say about the bill when it goes into committee. With regard to amendment of certain sections. I quite agree that we cannot alter it on the second reading. There is a clause in that bill which is very obnoxious and I have not been able to convince myself that that clause should be there. I am quite prepared to discuss that with the introducer of the bill and with other members of the Government when we come to that and I will. And while I now support the amendment for certain reasons I want to say that I shall press very strongly for an amendment when we go into committee to that clause. So as to make it absolutely certain that there cannot be any shadow of doubt left in my mind, that certain gentlemen in this town cannot pack and repack and make money on liquor to the detriment of the citizens of St. John's. If a clause can be put in that bill that will convince me that it cannot be done, then I am in favor of the bill. I am in favor of the principle of the bill as related to permits and interdicted houses and the only section I am against is the section that permits the Governor in Council to enable people in this town to bottle

rum for sale. I want it understood that that cannot be done and I think that that is a square deal. If the gentlemen opposite can convince me that this cannot take place then I will vote for the bill. But I want that clause put in such language that any ordinary common sense individual can understand it.

I have a clipping from the Montreal Star, I think, telling all about the liquor scandal witnessed in this House when bottles of Rye Whiskey were placed on the table.

I regret, regret exceedingly, that down through the years since 1917, since the Prohibition Act was placed on the Statute Book on the first of January in that year, I regret that its dirty trail has followed us down thru the years and the slimy business of rum and all associated with it has been discussed in this House nearly every session since then.

Now, I don't know very much about what is intended to be done in connection with bottling plants in St. John's. I have read the correspondence. I have read lists and lists and lists of liquor that is stored in St. John's at the present time—stored by men who pose as prohibitionists too—stored here for their companies, stored here for the purpose of taking it into the United States of America illegally and making the people of that country drunk.

Three years ago, Sir, there was a clause placed in the Speech from the Throne of that session, stating that the Government of the country recognized how unfair it was for Newfoundland to be a transshipment port whereby bootleggers, could make this a camping ground where they could land their liquor, store it and export it again and bootleg it into the United States of America to try and break the law of a sister nation, and there was

such a howl and such an agitation started at that time against the measure because, forsooth, it was going to curtail a little bit of labour that we had done in the warehouses and the landing places, if the Act was brought in and the Government felt that there was too much opposition to it and cut the thing out of the Speech from the Throne and did not enact the measure. Although I supported that Government I think it was a disgraceful procedure. Some of the members of the House to-day know all about what happened then. I trust that the day will soon come when St. John's will be no longer the transshipment port for liquor and we will be rid of that much anyway.

I know the men who have the liquor stored and I can tell you the names of the firms and since you ask me I will tell you—the Eastern Trading Company and Terminal Warehouse Company. I have that from an answer to a question here. That is all I know. That is the official answer handed down here by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

I know the history of some of these concerns in Montreal. I read that they were before the Commission of investigation held in Canada and their agent is here to-day, of the Canadian Consolidated Distilleries—and their company admitted on oath that they had during three years paid \$280,000 to both political parties to give them the policy of the shut-mouth to do what they wanted with bootlegging business in Canada. That was in June 1927 when the Canadian Consolidated Co. were up before that commission, whose agent is here to-day and whose agent has got some rum here in bond, and it makes people suspicious when that kind of thing is going on. And I want to say frankly that I am not accusing anyone of anything on the other side of the House. I never did

that and I never intend to do it. When I make a charge I can prove it straight to the hilt and I do not intend to make any charge that I cannot prove, but when I make a statement I have the goods behind me. And I make a statement that Canadian Consolidated Distilleries in June 1927 before a Commission of Enquiry in the Dominion of Canada admitted that they had paid \$280,000 in three years to political parties, of both sides, to make them immune and not to take any action against them for bootlegging. That makes me suspicious when I know the history of that concern down through the years. There may be an attempt to bribe me to-morrow and you the next day. We want to stop that kind of thing from going on. It is not so long ago since agents of somebody else went to a member and asked if he would use his influence to sell a certain amount of liquor and he was prepared to divide fifty-fifty with him. Do you want to know who that was, new?

These things certainly make one suspicious and I would like to see the House summon Mr. Blair before that Bar so that I could put a few questions to him through the Speaker of this House. I would like to see Mr. Hand there, the agent of that concern that bribed the political parties in Canada, so that I could put a few questions to him through the Speaker, and I would like to see Mr. Miffln before the Bar of the House and ask him what he knew about the matter in January and February of this year when he wrote these letters and put a few questions to him through the Speaker of the House, and let him say what he has to say, and let us get the thing cleaned up absolutely. There has been enough talk going on about it and the dirty slimy trail of rum has followed up down through the years. It is about time we got it cleaned up.

Rum! Rum! Rum! Every Government that gets in power is tainted with it. They called us the "bottle a day" crowd when we were in. Now they are going to call you the "half-gallon a week" crowd, for if you bring in this bill it means half a gallon a week.

In 1927-28 you collected in liquor duties for the Government of this country, \$250,000. For the year 1929-30 the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs estimates that he is going to collect \$350,000. The prohibition crowd who denounced us! I don't know if anybody else was denounced but I was denounced as being a "bottle a day" man. Their candidate would get the women gathered around him and tell them not to vote for me because I voted for the bottle a day.

No man who reads this letter but will come to the conclusion that the authorities of this country knew there was going to be a bottling plant erected. The Minister of Finance and Customs even admitted it.

(Reads)

I put it to you now, sir, that they got the stuff and they think it is there for the establishing of a bottling plant in Newfoundland, to bottle up Windsor Lake and sell it to the people as whiskey. That has got to stop. And will the Hon. introducer of the Bill satisfy me of that when the Bill comes before the Committee?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That clause cannot possibly be construed to mean a bottling plant outside of the Department.

MR. PUDDESTER.—That is your mind, but that is not my mind. Put it there so that a layman and not a lawyer can understand it. We want it stated in the ordinary, everyday, English language that anybody can understand, and then I will be satisfied to vote for the Bill. I am in favor

of the policy of the bill, but I want Mr. Blair, Mr. Hand and Mr. Mifflin, right there at the Bar so that we can ask them some questions. After that I will support the Bill.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I would like to comment very briefly on one or two points raised by one or two of the speakers opposite.

I do not propose, Sir, to discuss the merits or demerits of the Bill that is before the House. I will have an opportunity of doing that later, but I think when my name was coupled with the discussion this afternoon, it is incumbent upon me to make myself clear.

Certain questions have been asked, directed to the members of the Executive Government. One of these questions was, "did anybody contemplate a monopoly?" It has been said, and I think justifiably, that an unwise man can ask more questions in ten minutes than a wise man can answer in a lifetime. Hon. members will agree with me that this question is an extremely wide one. "Did anybody contemplate a monopoly?" I do not undertake to answer that, Sir, and I feel that no person in this Chamber or outside will undertake to answer it; but a definite answer has been given, definite answer has been given to me, and I stand here this afternoon to repudiate the statement of any member who insinuates that I was not speaking the truth. My political record is before this House and I challenge any man in this Chamber or outside to question it.

MR. EMERSON.—That is correct. I accept that and do not challenge your statement.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Then the answer that I have told the Hon. members was that there is no intention on the part of the Government to give Mr Blair or any person the

right of the exclusive privileges as purveyor of liquor to the Controller. Surely that ought to satisfy them. I make the statement as Colonial Secretary, fully conscious of the answer that I gave. Another point was raised, "was there a contract entered into?" Another of those broad questions that no person in this Chamber or outside can answer. If the question is intended to mean was a contract given to the Government I am in a position to answer in the negative that no contract has been entered into and also that the gentleman in charge of the Liquor Control stated that he had no knowledge of a contract. Now I would like to ask between whom would a contract be made? Surely the contract would be made between the seller of the article and the buyer. The seller of the article may be Mr. Blair or Mr. X. or Mr. Somebody else, the purchaser of the article, in this particular case, would be the Chairman of the Liquor Control and he has told members opposite that there was no contract. Surely that ought to be sufficient. It is sufficient for me that definite, clear and brief answers have been given to the questions that have been directed to me, and because those answers are given truthfully, honestly and straightforwardly I am prepared to vote against the motion put by the Hon. member for Placentia East.

Mr. Emerson then moved, and Mr. Winter seconded, the following amendment:

WHEREAS a charge has been made that a monopoly in the sale of liquor to the Board of Liquor Control, and the establishment of a bottling plant outside the control of the Board, were contemplated;

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest generally and in the interest of those under suspicion in particular, that a full enquiry be

held into the whole matter. This House is of opinion that such enquiry should be made by this House forthwith, and that all necessary witnesses be summoned to the Bar of this House and there examined, and that all documents relating to the matter be laid upon the Table of the House; and that the Second Reading of this Bill be delayed until such enquiry has been held and reported to this House.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Puddester
Mr. Emerson
Mr. Winter
Mr. Quinton
Mr. Tobin
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Abbott
Mr. Byrne (8)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Colonial Secretary
Hon. the Minister of Finance
and Customs
Hon. the Minister Posts and
Telegraphs
Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker
Hon. Mr. Bradley
Hon. Dr. Campbell
Hon. Dr. Mosdell
Hon. Mr. Lewis
The Minister of Agriculture
and Mines
The Minister of Public Works
Mr. Brown
Mr. Earle
Mr. Starkes
Mr. Fitzgibbon
Mr. Skeans
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Winsor
Mr. Archibald
Mr. Godden
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Fudge

Mr. Bindon
Mr. Strong
Mr. Greene
Mr. Smith (27)

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion that the said Bill be read was put, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Colonial Secretary
Hon. the Minister of Finance
and Customs
Hon. the Minister of Posts and
Telegraphs
Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker
Hon. Mr. Bradley
Hon. Dr. Campbell
Hon. Dr. Mosdell
Hon. Mr. Lewis
The Minister of Agriculture
and Mines
The Minister of Public Works
Mr. Brown
Mr. Earle
Mr. Starkes
Mr. Fitzgibbon
Mr. Skeans
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Winsor
Mr. Archibald
Mr. Godden
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Fudge
Mr. Bindon
Mr. Strong
Mr. Greene
Mr. Smith (27)

and against it:

Mr. Puddester
Mr. Emerson
Mr. Winsor
Mr. Quinton
Mr. Tobin
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Abbott
Mr. Byrne (8)

So it was passed in the affirmative and ordered accordingly. It was ordered that the Bill be referred to a

Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

At 6.30 Mr. Speaker left the Chair to resume sitting at 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8.15 o'clock.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Public Works.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that this Bill is merely a copy of the one passed in relation to the Department of Marine and Fisheries; the only alteration being "Department of Public Works" takes the place of "Department of Marine and Fisheries."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was re-

ceived and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Justice.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Following the suggestion made on yesterday it will be necessary to add section 2 to provide for a salary of \$5,000 annually.

MR. EMERSON.—Where is the money coming from it is not in supply?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We will have a sufficient credit balance to the Civil and Criminal Prosecutions account; we expect to save on that vote.

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 tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture and Mines is a dual department at the present time. It is our intention if it be the pleasure of the House to divide it into two different branches; not two separate departments but one department under two deputies as the Finance and Customs

Department is at present. The intention is to have a Deputy to handle matters in connection with mines and water powers, etc. and one to handle matters of an agriculture nature. Among the graduates from Canadian Agricultural Colleges, first class practical farmers with scientific training there are outstanding sons of Newfoundland.

We hope to be able to secure the services of one of these Newfoundlanders to take the position of an expert adviser in agricultural matters in Newfoundland and taking up the position under the supervision of the Minister, Mr. Downey, of Deputy Minister of Agriculture; we hope then to be able to establish an agricultural policy in the country that will help the country and the revenue. I think the idea that Newfoundland is not an agricultural country has been exploded. Such a man as we hope to secure will be able to go around the country and visit the farmers personally and give personal instructions, so that all may have the full benefit of scientific knowledge, so that in connection with the Minister and Government a strong agricultural program can be developed. A real live agricultural policy is I think a policy that my Hon. friends opposite as also every member on this side of the House will be enthusiastic to see instituted. The Bill has no other significance and contains no other provisions than this.

MR. EMERSON.—Has the Minister recommended the appointment?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—I undoubtedly do. I support the Bill on many grounds. The first is as the Prime Minister has told us the Department is a dual department. The same staff have no familiarise themselves with two such divergent industries as mining and agriculture. It is true no doubt that both involve delv-

ing into the earth but there the affinity between them ceases; there is nothing else in common between the industries. Both call for scientific treatment and owing to the limited number of the staff we had nobody specialising in either, but with the improved status that will result from the Bill before the House I am more than hopeful very much effective work will be done and we will be able to specialise in both of these subjects with far greater benefit to the country. The change to be effected I think should have been brought about long since. However through long deferred it will be no less welcome now that it has come.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Duder has been in this department for a quarter of a century, he has worked his way up and has familiarized himself with the work of the entire department. It is true that he may not have the expert knowledge that today is considered so important, but he is a dependable man, he is a loyal, efficient, and industrious servant and is the type of man that we need today. I have great pleasure in proposing this motion be adopted.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—I heartily endorse the remarks of the Prime Minister, Mr. Duder is an efficient officer and has been in the department for a great number of years. There are certain features introduced into surveying of recent years and modern methods have been adopted which we are not as well up on as we might be but it is possible that now he may find time to qualify himself on all these subjects.

The Bill passed the second reading and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the House re-

solved itself into a Committee of the Whole concerning an Act authorizing the Governor-in-Council to enter into a Contract with the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, I would draw the attention of the House to this Bill, one word was omitted in it, it was to be introduced yesterday by Mr. Lewis and the Bill was set for a first reading, but with the unanimous consent of the House, both Government and Opposition, the error can be corrected and the reading proceeded with.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, there are a few remarks that I would like to make about this subject. As you know, there is great necessity for something of this kind in St. John's West to-day. We have succeeded in interesting certain parties in a Wool and Silk Mill, producing woolen goods, caps and artificial silk goods. Caps to value of \$200,000 are imported here and I don't see why we can't get some of this work for the people of our own country. Of course we would have to allow them to import machinery and such other goods as are commonly allowed to companies to bring in free when they are starting projects here, there will not be any trouble about that. However, the objectionable feature I see is the guarantee of the bonds, but there is urgent necessity for work of some sort in the West End to-day, lack of labor and unemployment stare us in the face to-day. Since the war we have had five Governments and every one of them had to spend from \$100,000 to \$150,000 every winter to feed the people. Now some solution must be found. At the present time there are one thousand families too many in St.

John's. During the war many people came from the outports to St. John's and built homes for themselves and now they have no work, consequently we have a surplus population. My excuse and the only reason I introduce this Bill, I am not personally interested in it, is that it may provide employment for 300 people who to-day are out of work. This year the roads will unload a good many people into the usual avenues of employment but still there are two men for every job. There has been an objection to the guarantee bonds, well I would like to see no guarantee of bonds. But, I would remind the members that the old mill had a guarantee, so has the Riverside mills and while it is distasteful we have to do it. We had to guarantee \$10 000,000 for the Humber and it is still going strong and it looks as if we will never be called upon for that guarantee.

Even if two mills were established and we guaranteed bonds, it would not amount to near what we have to spend every year on able bodied men who are getting poor relief. Up to the loss of the S. S. "Florizel" Mr. Smythe, the manager of the mills, was the brains of the business and when he was drowned the mills failed. He, I understand was imported from "Stanfields and the Eastern Cap Co. We import cargo lots of these goods and make money for outsiders, why should we not keep this money here and give our people a chance to earn a living right here. I appeal to this House, this is a private bill, the labor situation we have staring us in the face is critical and if this bill is passed it will mean the reducing of this situation to a certain extent by employing some hundreds of people. Young boys and girls will be able to find employment, and you know very well that if the young girl finds employment and her father is home sick, she is the first

to bring home her earnings. We have to find employment by some means and cheerfully carry on our surplus population and not be spending from \$100,000 to \$150,000 every year on poor relief. Again I appeal to this House, I have no interest in this Bill, the only reason I introduced this Bill was because I would be glad, as everyone else would be glad, to see this fester of unemployment removed from our city. I am sick of it, the Opposition is sick of it, the people are sick of it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I thought that ten days after you came into power the unemployment would be all over?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—You have been hearing queer yarns down in Bay de Verde, I am afraid that you misunderstood, but however I am trying to relieve one third of it now if I can.

MR. PUDDISTER.—May I ask who are the petitioners?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Collishaw, Mr. Moore and Mr. J. A. Barron.

MR. PUDDISTER.—What Mr. Moore is that?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I think that he was connected with the old mills.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Well, Mr. Moore was into my office the other day and said he had nothing to do with it and was very sorry that his name was mentioned in connection with it and that they had no authority to use his name, he said that he had some dealings with Collishaw last fall but had made no agreement with him.

MR. EMERSON.—I do not want Mr. Barron's name used on the floor of this House. His partner is a man who signed the papers as we all do, merely in a legal capacity. This concerns Mr. Collishaw. Now I want to know from the introducer why it is necessary to have a guarantee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The Humber has it, the Riverside Woolen Mills, and the old Knitting Mills had a guarantee.

MR. EMERSON.—Now I want to say nobody has more sympathy for the unemployed than I have. I am quite willing to assist the establishment of any industry that will help the unemployment problem. I am not prepared to aid the establishment of any industry like this at the expense of the country for the benefit of Mr. Collishaw. If you are going to ask for a guarantee for this company you have got to show the necessity for it. You have not done so. You have not shown why you should get the guarantee and unless you do so this House should not agree with it. You are the introducer of the Bill. Show us why he should have a guarantee. Why not go up there and start the factory. Is this to be a charitable concern or is it to be a money-making concern for Mr. Collishaw.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—We have been through all this before in the case of the Humber. When we introduced the Humber Bill in 1923 it was necessary to put in the guarantee otherwise we would not have got the Humber and the west coast would not be what it is to-day. And there are men in this country that are just like you. The explanation is that we will not get that factory established here unless we give the guarantee. If you can get someone else to establish the factory in the West End I will tear up this Bill and put it into the waste paper basket. I have seen more poverty in one day than you have seen in a lifetime.

MR. EMERSON.—I was entirely wrong. I am always wrong and my friend across the House is always right. Quite so. I am not concerned with what I said about myself. You would imagine that I was going to

start some operations which would abolish starvation. Anything that can be done to relieve the unemployment problem will receive the consideration of every member on this side of the House. And I agree that Dr. Campbell does see more of starvation than I do because of his work. Perhaps that makes him more sympathetic towards it. However I am prepared to give my support to any bill that comes in here to relieve the destitution in St. John's. But I am not prepared to give my support to a bill that is intended as graft for Mr. Collishaw. Now there is no justification for this guarantee, except that Mr. Collishaw says that he will not go ahead with the mill unless he gets the guarantee. You have no assurance that there will be employment for three hundred people.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The suggestion of the introducer of the resolution was that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow. I told Mr. Lewis and Dr. Campbell that I did not think the bill would easily pass in the House. I assure you that my party would be prepared to stay here till daylight to pass this bill but I do not think that after the way Mr. Emerson has treated this Bill, that it would be given the careful consideration, owing to the heated arguments that it has received.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I want to assure you that I have no interest in the Bill as the introducer. I have no personal interest in Mr. Collishaw or anybody else, but I want to get some employment in St. John's West.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to point out one or two things that strike me in connection with this Bill. I have no personal interest in it beyond the fact that I have certain sympathies with the re-

sidents of St. John's West. Because I live in St. John's West and I have personal and political interests there, and I am prepared to support this Bill on principle and from a business standpoint as Minister of Finance and Customs. It will be a benefit if it gives only six months work in a year and even if the Government has to pay for the other six months. Let us figure that the Government has to pay \$12,000, and let us figure that they work for six months and pay in labor \$75,000 to the people of St. John's West. Supposing we are bound to pay the \$12,000 on the guarantee then they pay \$100,000 which is brought into town. That is looking at it solely from a financial standpoint. Perhaps we make on one side, and we lose on the other, will have to pay the \$12,000. If we only pay out \$12,000 you get in labor \$75,000.

MR. EMERSON.—Where do you get the \$75,000?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—That will be the amount paid to three hundred and fifty people working for six months.

MR. EMERSON.—Where will you get the three hundred and fifty people?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—There are plenty of them in St. John's West. You will not have much trouble in getting them.

MR. EMERSON.—But will the factory employ them?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—They will have to employ them. Then if there were not three hundred and fifty but only one hundred and even at \$60 that would mean \$36,000 a year distributed to the people here. We pay out \$12,000 and receive \$36,000. The people are in \$24,000. That is dollars and cents.

MR. EMERSON.—Sense?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Not in some people's opinion of sense, but people differ and I have just as much sense as anyone, at least I think I have, when it comes to talk dollars and cents.

I am prepared to support the principle of this Bill and I have no interest in it whatever personally but I want to see something established in the city to try and cope with the present situation and I am sorry to see that the members of the Opposition are opposed to it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Chairman, so far I have not said one word in opposition to this Bill. I asked a question of the introducer as to who were the petitioners as I wanted to get some information. I am sorry that this heated debate started because I did not intend to start it, but I certainly did want to know who the petitioners were, when a man told me he wasn't a party to it although his name was used in the House.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—That was my mistake.

MR. PUDDISTER.—So far I have not said a word against it and I am going to give the bill very careful study. I want to see employment in St. John's as well as any one but I do not want to see anybody putting one over on the legislature and I am not going to stand for that. I know the reputation of this gentleman and I am going to get every scrap of information before we consider this bill. Let us know how many people are going to be employed. Let us know how much money is going to be used. Let us know how long they are going to operate. We do not want to create a doubtful industry in St. John's West for love of the promoters. We had an instance of that before when the Woolen Mills, for six or seven years, year in and year out, lay idle and for years men were going

to the Treasury of the country and drawing dividends at the expense of the people.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Hon. member I might give him some figures. In 1915 they made a profit of \$11,000, in 1916 they made a profit of \$16,000, in 1917 they made a profit of \$20,000, in 1918 they made a profit of \$4500, in 1919 they made a profit of \$11,000 and in 1920 they lost \$12,000. From that it was different. They only closed up 3 or 4 years ago, when Mr. Smythe was lost in the "Florizel." It was a paying business, because I have a man in my employ now who worked there and he has told me about his work in the Woolen Mills.

MR. EMERSON.—Why didn't they continue. Why do they want a guarantee?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—They want to have some guarantee.

MR. EMERSON.—If the prospects are so good surely they do not need to get a guarantee from the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—They have got to have something.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House I might point out that Stanfield's Underwear is probably the best in the world. In my experience in London, in the Strand, if you went into the very best stores and asked for a couple of suits of the best underwear they would produce Stanfield's. And they are very popular all over North America. From their factory the old company got a man named Smythe, an outstanding man in his line and while he lived he produced a grade in Newfoundland just as good as Stanfield's unshrinkable. I think while he lived and while he was manager all the concerns in Newfoundland particularly

stocked his underwear. Unfortunately we lost him and some of the very best men of this town in the "Florizel" disaster. Then the thought came to these people to take over the concern and try and get a man of Smythe's class, to add to the knitting mills the manufacture of caps and artificial silk and it should be encouraged if we can do it at all, because there is no city that needs more employment than the town of St. John's.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I was going to remark a few moments ago that I am not directly—but I am indirectly—interested in the present bill at all, but I want the House to realize that it will aid us agriculturally as well as industrially. It may not be known to every member of the House that we have in Newfoundland more sheep per capita than they have in Canada. The Newfoundland market for wool is very low, but here is an industry that will assist to make a greater market for our wool. When in Canada not very long ago I visited Stanfield's great industry at Truro. They are not nearly supplied to Canada but have to export largely. Newfoundland is still one of Stanfield's best customers and many thousands of dollars worth of their goods come in here annually, what should be our own product. If this industry is started we will save a considerable amount of money which will be kept in the country. The plant in the present factory is obsolete. It is just as well to have it sold as scrap as it would not be capable of being used, but we need to install an up to date machinery there. That is necessary for production and sale of the goods.

For these reasons I am prepared to support the Bill.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to

make just a few remarks on this Bill, and I, for one, wish to state that we cannot have too many industries in this town. As a matter of fact it would save the city from the unemployment situation in a great measure if we can induce more industries to come in.

While Hon. Dr. Campbell is convinced that this industry can employ three hundred people and while I am going to be all for anything that is going to give employment to our people still I think it is only the duty of this House to see that no individual or individuals take advantage of the present labor situation that confronts us and thereby, because of our dire need of employment, put in a contract and get concessions they would otherwise not dare to ask for.

It is stated that they will be able to help us by giving employment in the mill and the Hon. member for St. John's West hopes to reduce one third of the unemployed in the west end. Possibly they might but if they are going to employ any appreciable number we would like to know definitely something about it because we have a grave situation. There are about one thousand families unemployed, as the Hon. member for St. John's West says.

As I understand it, the knitting mills will be mainly operated by machinery, naturally, and it looks to me that they will not need many men but will mostly employ girls, so I feel that it is not going to help the householders in so far as the men are concerned, the men who want employment—the bread winners.

I am not clear on the fact that it is going to relieve the employment situation to any extent and I would like the Hon. member to show us something more about it and state what number of men they will be able to employ.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to make one or two remarks.

It seems to me, as a younger member of the House, that when any matter comes before the House, somebody will always raise the point of precedent, of what has been done before, what other governments did. To my mind that is the wrong attitude to take entirely. It should not be what other people did but what are we going to do.

I agree with all those speakers who said the unemployment question was a matter to be considered and every available dollar expended in order to reduce it in the ordinary way, but I fail to see why an individual is permitted to come to the Legislature, or the Legislature to go to him, and for a consideration undertake to relieve the unemployed. That is the position of the thing as I see it. It is customary if it is to be profitable you will have to induce the investor to put his money into it and if it is not profitable the investor will not place his investment. According to the introducer it will be a profitable industry, why then if it is to be profitable do you want the Government to give the guarantee and if it is not profitable why should the Government be made to pay. That is the situation as I see it.

Three hundred persons are to be employed in the mill, it has been stated. They will be using a great amount of machinery then we find it will be mostly girls and boys that will be employed and then we find that six per cent of the preferred cash capital will be paid in cash. But provided the company does not call on the \$12,000 but has no need of that and carries on with the six per cent that is paid up on the capital, the Colony in the fifteen year period that you give to them in the Bill will have lost \$180,000 of profits to the Colony.

When the Bill comes before the Committee there will be an opportunity to say further about it, but until more facts are before this House, I, as a representative of Bonavista South and a member of this House, do not feel like giving the measure the support I would like to give it otherwise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, I must confess my almost inability at the present time to deal with such an important matter as the Budget speech that was delivered by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs two or three days ago. I did think that after the heat of the discussion this afternoon that I would be given a breathing spell to night and come down to-morrow afternoon and be able to deal with the Budget speech in a more efficient manner, but the Finance Minister wants to get along with the Budget and wants to hear the criticisms of the Opposition members to make ready his reply and then deal with the Resolutions as we go along. I am always glad to accommodate the Finance Minister or any gentleman opposite in the House. I do not think you can complain that I have taken

up the time of the House unnecessarily since April 17th last when it opened. I tried to be fair in my criticisms of the Government on the Address in Reply, and I have tried to be fair in anything else I have said. When I seek information I usually try to get it as fully as possible and generally I judge for myself as to the merits or demerits of the matter that comes before the House. I never let anybody else make up my mind for me. I always make up my mind myself, and that is why, perhaps, some people do not like me. I was never a parrot for any man; not even when I was a member of the Government of the day.

It is an auspicious occasion in connection with any Parliament when the Budget speech is delivered. It generally contains a review of three years, the past year, the present year and the future year, and the Finance Minister in his delivery of the Budget speech a few days ago so dealt with the finances and the affairs of this Colony for three years. It is the duty of a Finance Minister to give a fair unbiased statement of the affairs of the Colony that come within his purview. I have always deprecated the political tinge that Finance Ministers in the past have given to Budget speeches, and I deprecate exceedingly the political propaganda in his Budget speech, which was perhaps, following the beaten track of Finance Ministers.

The present Finance Minister, who has taken on the job for the first time, came into this House, and, as far as he could got after his predecessor in office. Not only that, but he unmercifully flays the Opposition members on this side of the House. Thus, do I say, the Finance Minister of to-day was following the line of thought and the beaten track some past Finance Ministers because in 1924 and again in

1925 the Finance Minister at that time certainly introduced political propaganda into his Budget speeches. I can well remember in the House in 1923 when the new Finance Minister of that day introduced his Budget in somewhat political language and when the Leader of the Opposition on this side of the House trounced him unmercifully and claimed that he did not even write his Budget speech and that it was written by an ex-Prime Minister, who, the then Leader of the Opposition stated, was an adept at fooling and bluffing the people. The Finance Minister of that day had to take a severe castigation from the Leader of this side of the House for indulging in political propaganda in his Budget, and, Sir, if you will turn up page 383 of 1923 Hansard, you will get there the castigation administered by the late Sir Michael Cashin to the present Prime Minister of this country, who was then an ex-Prime Minister, but the Finance Minister of the day was Mr. Cave. Sir Michael Cashin said:

(Reads from Hansard)

I quote that to show that down through the years we have had Budgets delivered in this House of a political nature and containing political propaganda, and I did think that the present Finance Minister was going to take a new course and was going to plough his own furrow and lift this country out of the mire of political propaganda so far as Budget speech was concerned. More than that, the people of the outside world read those Budget speeches and they are perused by the money lenders of the world.

And how in the name of goodness do you think the people of the world are going to view Newfoundland. What are they going to think of Newfoundland when they read Budget speeches of Ministers of Finance accusing predecessors of robbing the revenue, ac-

cusing predecessors of misappropriating public funds. Are we going to be deluged with scandals. It seems to be the favourite topic of everyone. I did not think when I made my few remarks in connection with the Address in Reply that I would have to deal over again with certain matters that I have to now, and if the Minister of Finance has gone back to the years 1925 and 1926, surely he has no reason to complain with me if I go back just a little further and remind the House and the country at any rate of what took place between 1919 and 1924. I say that I did not expect to have to indulge in washing any more dirty linen, and when I was through with my few remarks that I had to make on the Address in Reply I said to the Finance Minister that if he would not indulge in cheap political propaganda in his Budget speech I would promise him that I at any rate and I think that I can speak for members on this side of the House, were prepared to give him a fair, square deal. He asked us for the generous treatment that this House always accorded a beginner, and I for one would be only too glad to give him the most generous treatment that any man on the Opposition side could give another, but when charges are made, and figures are misquoted, and made to say what they really do not say, then of course we on this side of the House must answer it. We have certain rights. We are small in numbers. But our rights must be protected at all costs. And being one who was a member of Mr. Monroe's party, I cannot let things reflecting on that Government pass without saying a word of comment thereon.

Now, Hon. members in this House know that you can make figures do almost anything, especially if you are any way smart at accountancy. I am not accusing the Minister of juggling the figures, but I am accusing him of

making those figures of the Budget present the best possible statement that will suit him as Minister of Finance. And I am not finding fault with him for that but what I am finding fault with him for is, that he did not go a bit further. He remarks in the first place that the late Finance Minister was out in his Budget to the tune of \$900,000. He was not very much out in his statement of expenditure. Only \$148,000. Now he made up his Budget speech about the 15th of May, 1928, and he had two months to go and more as far as the outport revenue was concerned. And of course he made the best showing possible. The present Finance Minister hints that he made the showing because it was election year. There may be something in that. But I would suggest to him that the Finance Minister of that day had to go into the money markets of the world and borrow \$10,000,000, and I presume that he wanted to make the best showing possible, and if he were out \$547,000, I think it was in his revenue, if he did carry it a little bit too far I think there was some excuse for it. I am not apologising for him. I believe in giving the country a fair, frank statement but I do not believe in exaggeration one way or the other unless there is very good reason. If you are going to borrow at all you should be putting up the best possible statement, to show the money lenders of the world that we are not a bankrupt country, as some of the newspapers of Quebec termed us not very long ago. He had to go into the money markets and borrow ten million dollars at 97¾, and I do not want to discourage the present Finance Minister in any way, but if the money lenders of the world read his Budget speech, the official document from the Minister of Finance himself, I question whether there will not be some drop on 97¾. I am satisfied to give the late

Finance Minister the benefit of some doubt, and some credit for trying to do the best possible as far as the borrowing of the ten million was concerned. I want to be as charitable as possible. I heard the Leader of the Opposition on this side of the House, if I must refer to that again, accusing the Prime Minister of that day, of absolutely juggling the figures to give a good showing to the underwriters in London, when he gave them the financial statement of the country. I do not think the Finance Minister went as far as that. Because it was a terrible charge and it has never yet from that day to this been refuted. And it was a charge against the present Prime Minister of this country. The charge was made by the late Sir Michael Cashin from that desk, that the present Prime Minister juggled his figures and presented a false statement to the underwriters in London when he gave them the statement of financial affairs of this country. That statement as I say has never been refuted. Never has such a charge been made against anybody that I have been associated with, since I have been in politics. Sir John Crosbie was out \$148,000 in expenditure, and \$547,000 in revenue in his own department under his own control. Might I suggest also that it is not always the Finance Minister that makes up the Budget speech. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs knows that. He has financial advisors. Financial advisors who will mislead the Finance Minister in his Budget speeches are not worthy to be called financial advisors of this country. And I have heard these same financial advisors from this side of the House denounced in no uncertain terms for having given false advice to the Minister of Finance and Customs and these financial advisors were the financial advisors that the late Minister of Finance and

Customs had, before you, and if these advisors deceived the late Minister of Finance, they will deceive you. And you should take care to check up every figure yourself and to find out where you are and what your revenue it. Do not take anything for granted. But some people such as the financial advisors of Newfoundland like to see a good statement go before the Minister of Finance and Customs. It is meat and drink to them. They do not want to have it said that as the financial advisors of the Colony they give misleading advice, but they want a good impression of the financial condition of Newfoundland to go broadcast into the money markets of the world.

Now the Finance Minister claims that Sir John Crosbie was out in his revenue. I would like to ask the Finance Minister a question. You make a statement here about a jump in your miscellaneous revenue from \$124,000 to \$400,000. That is a very big jump. Are you able to tell us where you are going to get it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I will tell you next year.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Then you are only estimating it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—No, I have it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Well, we will hold you to your word. Then the Finance Minister goes on to discuss the railway. And he tries to show that the credit for the good showing of the railway in the years 1924 and 1915 was due to the Government commissions of 1921 and 1922.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You will find reference somewhere else to the Humber construction.

MR. PUDDISTER.—But it leads up that that. Now I think I can speak as far as the railway is concerned with some knowledge, from 1903 to 1915 at

any rate. And from 1911 until 1915 I was an auditor in connection with the railway, right at the very heart of things. I can put my finger to-day on the very thing that created the loss on the railway from 1911 to 1916. No doubt the railway was in a very bad, dilapidated condition in 1919 and 1920.

And it was then jointly operated in the year 1920-21 by Government Commissioners and by the Messrs. Reid. In the first year of the joint operation they lost \$1,720,000. Losses went down little by little after that. But do you know the reason why? The first year of these operations under Government Commission and joint control was a year of political influence in connection with the railway; and I think it was a very bad mistake; and when they saw it was detrimental to the railway, some attempt was made to put a stop to it, and every year after that the political influence became less and less, until in 1924-25 the present manager of the railway took charge and political influence was eliminated practically altogether; and that political influence being eliminated is reasonable for the railway being efficiently managed in 1924-25 and 1925-26. The railway was in a bad way during years 1913 to 1919. It was absolutely neglected. Nothing was done to keep the railway up at the time. They tried to make all the money they could out of the railway and other activities, with a view to unloading the whole thing on the Canadian Government by an Act of Confederation some time around 1918 and 1919. It was figured the war would go on a little longer. During the years of the war absolutely nothing was done to keep the contractor up to his obligations to keep the road in running order. I know when the branch railways were being built in 1910-15 not a mile of ballasting on the old track was done. The whole equipment of the railway

was used in building the branch lines, and they had no equipment whatever to keep up the main line and other branches. Because of that disregard of ballasting and other neglect it fell to pieces, and then when they tried to sell it was nothing more nor less than a scrap of heap. And I agree with the Minister of Finance and Customs, it has taken the Government of this country from 1920 to 1919 to put that railway any way in shape, or in any way what you would call a decent railway system; and the ballasting may have to go on another year or two; I heard that two years ago; another two years and the ballasting would be finished; but I do hope we will hear the last of the excessive ballasting except for maintenance of the line very shortly. I think we have an opportunity now to know that the ballasting should finish shortly, particularly with heavy rails laid, and new rails laid from Bishop's Falls to Clarendville, and from Bay of Islands to Port aux Basques; and this year we will have from Bishop's Falls to Millertown Junction, and then we have the diversion of the railway, and the rails to Bishop's Falls relaid; and we should have good results from the railway; and I do hope and trust we will hear the last of money being spent on capital account for ballasting of the railway before long. There may be a certain amount of ballasting to keep the line maintained, but we will not have the expenditure after the next year or two that we have had for the last seven or eight years.

The Finance Minister next deals with the debt of the country. Well the debt of the country is appalling. There is no question about it. People talk glibly sometimes of Newfoundland easing the burden of itself by going into confederation with Canada. They think Canadians have no debt and if we joined with Canada our debt would

not follow them. I want to tell the members of this House, though I presume they know; they cannot study the Budgets of other countries if they don't know; that the Federal Debt of Canada is \$2,227,000,000 and with a population of nine million that figures out at \$248. per head, a little lower than the per capita rate of Newfoundland. The Finance Minister figured our debt per capita at \$292. and the yearly interest at \$15. per head. But in addition to the Federal Debt all the Provinces have debts.

They have both Federal and Provincial debts; Quebec for instance has a debt of about a hundred and twenty millions; and then in addition they have municipal debts; as the city of Montreal has a municipal debt of a hundred and sixty millions. Then we in St. John's think our city debt is enormous if it is a million and a half or two millions. As I say the city of Montreal has a debt of \$160,000,000. Quebec and all the other Provinces have debts and all the other cities of Canada; and I do not think we can look forward with any reasonableness to thinking that Canada will take us in with all their debts, Federal, Provincial and Municipal, and have our burdens eased any at all. Taken altogether the per capita indebtedness in Canada is much higher than in Newfoundland. On the other hand the earning power of the people of Canada is much greater than that of the people of Newfoundland, but I do not think that it is in proportion. Our great drawback in Newfoundland is that we have not the earning power; that we cannot bear up under our burdens the same as they can in Canada; but the proportion is just as great and in Canada to-day they are chafing under their debts and as I told the Finance Minister some time ago outside the Province of Ontario; I am not sure whether there is another province;

they have not yet started a refunding process so that they can liquidate their debts. Ontario has done so. I surely would advise the Finance Minister during his term of office to take due regard of that fact and try and create a sinking fund whereby Newfoundland can liquidate her debt in fifty years. If we don't do that we can't go on piling up our indebtedness all the time; and as the Finance Minister said when he sat on this side of the House it will go pretty hard with us when our debt is a hundred millions. The experts who gave the Finance Minister of Ontario the advice in connection with their sinking fund and went into the matter with Premier Ferguson I am sure would be quite glad to have a visit from the Minister of Finance of Newfoundland and give him all the information whereby he can go to work and start a sinking fund for Newfoundland to try and get her debt somewhat reduced as the years go by. If not, and we are going on borrowing there 's nothing left for us but disaster. We can't go on piling up debts and decreasing our earning power. We can't go on adding to them. We are borrowing six millions this year and some more next. And if we have deficits and keep on increasing our expenditure all the time; our expenditure is \$430,000 more than last year; if we keep on like that there is nothing left but to tackle the situation earnestly and see where we are tending. The Finance Minister was very frank indeed when he told the people of the country in his official capacity what is to become of us if we do not tackle the situation earnestly; and I quite sympathize with the Finance Minister when he comes in to the House and says these are the Estimates: Supplementary Supply and Additional Estimates; I sympathize with him when his own Prime Minister gets up and over his head increases these

votes to the tune of some thousands of dollars. The Finance Minister is custodian of the finances of this country and not the Prime Minister. No man can get up and move that a vote be increased unless the Finance Minister concurs. I think it was quite uncalled for; and I sympathize with the Finance Minister; and if I were there I would not stand for it. The place to increase estimates is at Executive meetings and at party meetings. Surely no member of the Government is going to get up and ask that a vote be inserted in additional estimates unless it is some very urgent and necessary thing. That is what Additional Estimates are for; to fill in anything left out; and when they are placed on the Table that ends it as far as the Finance Minister is concerned except perhaps he might want to accommodate some Opposition members who asks for a small increase in the vote. There is always that latitude allowed. Now I come to the place where the Finance Minister trounces members on this side of the House:

(Reads)

If the Minister of Finance and Customs had not put these words in the Budget speech I would not have had much criticism to make, but when you are attacked you have to hit back you know. A member from this side met a certain gentleman going out of this House a day or two ago and he said to him 'What kind of fellows are you that you spent so much money on the elections.' Well, I am going to prove that we are not so bad as we are painted, and if that gentleman wants to find out what kind of fellows he is associated with all he has to do is to read this little book which I hold in my hand. It is the Walker Report. If he would read the report on the Pit Props, Relief Work, the Model Farm, and the Public Charities during the regime of the present Prime Minister

from 1920 to 1923, he would see how bad some of his associates are. I am going to read some extracts before I pass on to the slush fund so as to enlighten the members who have come into this House for the first time, with clean hands and pure hearts, at least I presume they have. There are certain things that happened in the years that I am to refer to that will show that the great Liberal Party, that they are so fond of talking about, is no better than the contemptible Tory Party, that there is no difference between them, one is no better than the other. I have been interested in politics for a number of years, but I have been steadfast, I am still in the same party as when I first entered politics, at least they tell me that I am.

Now, the Finance Minister accuses us of having spent \$1,300,000 as a slush fund. First there is this \$30,000 for passes for bringing the men back from the diversion on the Topsails. I have been in communication with the Colonial Secretary of that time and he tells me that that \$30,000 was charged to the Railway Diversion account at the Railway. I have gone to the Railway and interviewed the General Manager and he tells me that the fares of the men back from the Diversion amounted to \$35,000 and was charged to the Railway Diversion account at the Railway. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not the Charities Department, if the Minister of Finance and Customs can bring down figures to contradict that, I will be glad to take it back. These men that worked on the Diversion had certain arrangements whereby if they stayed ten days longer their passage in was paid, and the arrangement was also that when the work was over, many of them had not made enough money to pay their passage home, it was decided that some of the money allocated for the Diversion would be

spent to pay their passage home, and that is not charity.

The next amount is \$250,000. The Finance Minister claims that we used as a slush fund, \$250,000 that was voted for certain Public Works but does he know that the year before that we voted \$500,000 for the same purpose and it was spent in the months of September and October, does the Hon. Minister call that a slush fund. Last year only half that amount or \$250,000 was voted to be spent and every member had a chance to spend his per capita in his district and I know members on the other side who allocated some of that money in the last part of September. Now, we should not be accused of spending that money as a slush fund when members on the other side allocated their share and moreover when we voted double the amount the year before for the same purpose and spent it in the very same way. Now the Hon. Minister says that we spent \$327,000 on the Railway Diversion, well, the amount for the Railway Diversion was in the Loan Bill of last year and if I remember rightly, the Hon. Minister voted for that and also for the \$250,000 for the Public Works that was allocated proportionately in the districts. I don't think that you can call that a slush fund when members on the other side spent their share or proportion in their districts.

MR. BRADLEY.—We didn't, we could not get a cent.

MR. PUDDISTER.—That \$250,000 was allocated for the districts and the members on the other side had a chance to get their allocations, and if the member for Port de Grave did not get his allocation it shows what kind of a representative he was. Highroads \$320,000. Now the Highroads went on continuously from 1924 and there was no work on the Highroads in my dis-

trict last year because they were all finished to Old Perlican and I had to go and beg for \$2800.00 to finish a piece of road there when Mr. Cochius estimated that it would cost \$33,000. I tell you that when I need anything in my district and there is anything going I am going to get my share.

Now the Minister of Finance and Customs said that over eight hundred thousand dollars for the railway and capital account was a part of the slush fund. But it was not eight hundred thousand dollars, it was nine hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars. That makes a little difference of one hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars. This nine hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars was spent in rerailing the railroad on capital account, which amount was voted in the Loan Bill. Now you add that together, add the two hundred and fifty thousand that we voted for special works and three hundred and twenty thousand for the railroad diversion, and three hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars for highroads and one hundred and seventy-three thousand that you failed to credit for railroad capital account, how much does that amount to? It is one million and seventy-one thousand dollars, and you claim we spent one million three hundred and thirty thousand. Now taking your figures: I am not saying that we did not spend more than that, but that is what we get from your figures.

There is two hundred and fifty-nine thousand dollars against one million three hundred and thirty thousand dollars that we are accused of spending; but what is the record of the past government? If you want the whole report I am prepared to read for you. Certainly goodness you can not blame us for going back for a year or two if you go back three. I thought we were finished with it. I do not in-

tend to say anything about when you went back to the country under Mr. Bennett in 1923, and you know what happened afterwards. I hope that when we finish we shall be shaking hands and be friends. This report which I have deals with work undertaken in the town of St. John's in 1923, and if you refer back to the Loan Bill of 1922, you will find that in the year 1922 session here was a Loan Bill passed in this House for six million dollars and the terms of the Loan Bill were something similar to the terms of a Bill presented to the House this afternoon. That you could divert any amount left over to certain public purposes of the Colony. The election was called in 1923 and what happened? I do not know if it is worth going into. The country knows the story. Millions of dollars were squandered, and you say money was squandered last year by the Alderdice government for political purposes. But what was it squandered for in 1923. There was a citizens' committee that was organised in St. John's to do certain works. I have been told certain stories in connection with it here in the House. I do not have to tell the full story.

Talk about slush funds! \$29,000 was spent in my district in 1923 to elect two candidates of the Government side in able-bodied relief alone, and \$24,000 in road grants, and when polling day came there was a certain gentleman who kept a store on the corner of a street in Grates Cove and the polling booth was up a hill, and every man who went up the hill was called into this store and they were given whatever they wanted provided they would go and vote the right way, and at three o'clock—the booth closed at four—he had nothing in the store but a lot of salt fish, and every man who came into the store after that hour was given a salt fish

to carry home if he would only vote for the right man, and the bill was paid by the Department of Public Charities; and in the same election there was one relieving officer there and the gentleman who fought against me appointed two more relieving officers—three relieving officers in one small place—and every relieving officer gave out scripts—not scripts for liquor—but scripts supposed to be for pauper relief. Talk about slush funds in this House! Well, I will tell you, if every man who fought an election had his deeds marked across his forehead there would none of us here—not one of us. Let me give you a quotation: "There is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us, it ill behooves any of us to throw mud at the rest of us."

I tell you it is not road grants that defeated me. The less a man spends on road grants and public works during elections the better for the candidate, in my opinion. But when it comes to giving away barrels of flour and rubber boots and everything else you could mention just before election, that is what counts, and relief money used by relieving officers just before an election, that is what counts, and counts in votes. But there is one government that went to the country that I have nothing whatever to say against. I do not believe they spent five cents, and that government was lead by Mr. Hickman in 1924. Absolutely no slush fund then. I have nothing to say against them. That is the only government that I know anything about that went to the country and didn't use slush funds. \$29,000 I had to fight in relief account, that was given out by way of barrels of flour, tubs of butter, rubber boots, oil clothes, etc. In one place some people didn't have to buy a barrel of flour until the

next September or October after the election was held on May 3rd, 1923. That case came out in the enquiry. Whole lists were put on the Table and bills from everybody under the sun, and you find three relieving officers in that small place. Then you expect to have decent politics when that sort of thing is going on. I am going to give the honorable members a chance tomorrow to say they are going to finish this thing once and for all. I am going to introduce a Bill that will stop it as far as we can stop it, and I have been promised the support of a good many men on the other side of the House. Sir William Coaker, in particular, who came to me and said that if I introduced that Bill he would give it his entire support. Of course, after this term if there is a change of government and a new Finance Minister gets in, he will have an opportunity to deliver the same kind of a speech as the Finance Minister delivered the other day; just the same kind of a speech, if you people do not help me pass this Bill and stop slush funds.

We heard slush funds denounced in this House from 1920-23. In the year 1920 enquiries were made and there were election petitions filed; men were unseated and disqualified, and in the by-election two or three months after the same thing went on. The same men who denounced slush funds in 1919 spent two million dollars of slush funds in 1923. I have heard of a Minister of Finance and Customs himself who purchased his way to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland. Can anybody forget what happened to the cargo of the "Kyle" in Fortune Bay, 1923. I need not recall the incident of when the "Malakoff" came to my district on a Saturday evening and landed flour for the district over Sunday, and that Bill was put upon the Table at the

enquiry in 1924, paid for by the Public Charities.

What about St. John's West in 1923? Need I tell that? Why, not only was the election bought three weeks before polling day, but the name of His Excellency the Governor was brought in between nomination day and polling day and he had to sign an order—because it was illegal to spend money on any roads during those ten days—to have grocery orders filled. They thought it was all right as long as they got His Excellency the Governor's Coat of Arms on it, and \$10.00 orders were given out before polling day, secretly, to those who were told "if their vote would be given the right way." and the \$10.00 orders were taken to the grocery stores, and I can bring witnesses here to prove that in numerous cases they got \$10.00 in cash instead of \$10.00 worth of groceries. I call that a fine scandal. This thing has gone on and on and it is about time to stop it now. And I am going to give the honorable members on the other side of the House a chance to vote it down as far as legislation can, and let us go to the country and combat elections properly and not purchase the votes of the people. No one can point a finger of scorn at the other. I am finished with relief money and slush funds, I hope, because if I am tempted again I am going to read that whole report and every part of the evidence that is there.

I wish the Prime Minister was in his seat because I want to say something about the Dry Dock.

With reference to the Dock we were going to have a bill of some sort, a revenue bill or a Loan Bill. I am anxious to see that Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Hon. member, I might point out

that from these Resolutions here they get a rebate of duty on every thing that is going to come in here for repairs to ships. When a foreign ship comes here and is repaired it has been urged that they should not have to pay duty on the materials used. When a ship comes here and is repaired there is no rebate duty and consequently the Dock has to charge duty to those ships and it has made the cost of repairs very high. The bill that was spoken of is in these Resolutions.

MR. PUDDESTER.—That is not what I thought you were going to introduce. I have nothing to say against that I thought you were going to introduce something in connection with new machine shops. I will tell the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs that his action is a very good thing to do, but there is some thing else. You are not going to get any ships to come to that Dock unless you do something else but I will not tell you what it is, but I will tell you personally and tell the Prime Minister personally. I was a bookkeeper there from 1903 to 1908 and I know all about the Dock and I know why you do not get any ships now and why we are not going to get any ships here while the present policy is in force. In the first place, it costs too much for repairs, and you have gone some distance by taking the duty off to invite ships in here but there is something else, but I cannot see for you, you must find out for yourselves. I will tell what it is and it is up to you to decide whether you will do it or not. I am opposed to the policy myself and I cannot advocate it.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal more to say, but, as it is now past eleven o'clock, I shall continue my remarks to-morrow afternoon. I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 17th 1929.

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

Mr. Godden presented a petition from the residents of Hearts Delight on the subject of a road.

MR. EARLE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Millertown asking that a road be built from Millertown to Buchans Junction. I may say that the name of Millertown is well known to the country; a prosperous town at the bottom of Red Indian Lake head waters, where lumbering and logging operations of the A. N. D. Company are carried on. During the past years these enterprising settlements have been neglected, I may say through the lack of knowledge on the part of those in charge of the affairs of this country, and I hope and trust that the present Government will see their way clear to granting this public utility to these busy places contributing as they do so much to the prosperity of the country, and that this benefit will be granted the working people of that section of the country.

The road asked for from Millertown to Buchans Junction will be of great benefit at the present time and its utility will be enhanced when the diversion of the railway takes place which possibly will not be immediately but I have no doubt will be at some future time. I support the prayer of the petition and I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion the petitions were received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. Puddester gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the Suspension of the Rules of the House respecting all matters now before the House or to come before it.

Mr. Skanes gave notice of question

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "Relating to Tourist Traffic" was introduced, and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that the Tourist Bureau expires by Statute I think on the 21st of July of this year. It is considered not desirable to make any radical changes in the operations of such a bureau in the middle of the season when they are in touch with the tourist traffic, and the Bill is intended to bring the term of their operations up to December 31st. It is considered better to have a Board dealing with tourist trade end its year or its term at the end of the year rather than in the middle of the season. That is the only

purpose of the Bill I beg to move the second reading.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Lewis, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act Cap. 93 of the Consolidated Statutes, (3rd Series)" entitled 'An Act Respecting the Recovery of Tenements in Certain Cases' was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, in asking leave to introduce this Bill I do not think there is much necessity to elaborate on it. My learned friends on the other side of the House, members of the profession will realize that this Bill fills a long felt want. In the past in the Central District Court or Magistrate's Court there was not jurisdiction in respect of the recovery of tenements in certain cases particularly monthly tenancies and considerable inconvenience has been caused.

The Act asked to be amended conferred jurisdiction on Magistrates in dealing with certain questions of this kind in certain cases, but for some reason or other omitted to give jurisdiction to deal with monthly tenancies or weekly tenancies. This Bill is introduced for the purpose of filling that long felt want.

Owing to the defect in that Act actions to be taken in the Supreme Court for the recovery of tenements held under monthly tenancies and as a result very heavy costs were sometimes incurred altogether out of proportion to the amounts involved by reason of the Supreme Court having to do what a magistrate should be able to do.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries," was read a 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Public Works.'" 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Justice,'" 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 certain Resolutions respecting an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, before the Resolution is passed, I want to say that I have no criticism to make of them. I think anything that can be done in the way of improving interests of the life of the community, within reason, should be encouraged, and there is nothing in the Bill at the present time that justifies any criticism of the Bill.

There are just one or two questions that I am going to ask the Prime Min-

ister in connection with the Resolutions which have already been passed. Referring to Sub-section 3 of the Resolutions, it is provided there that if one of the rivers is not sufficient, upon the report of the Government Engineer, the Company can obtain further powers over other rivers. I want to ask this question, supposing in the course of this agreement other people applied for rights over these rivers are they reserved in favor of this Company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—For the first ten years only.

MR. EMERSON.—Now in regard to the paragraph 4, it states.

(Reads)

I think you stated yesterday, that that is rather shorter than usual.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Two feet shorter.

MR. EMERSON.—The point is, is it safe?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes.

MR. EMERSON.—There has been advice given to the Government, then? As they are getting the right to import cedar poles free of duty we ought to make sure that there is no possible chance of danger to the people, because after all these electrical wires are carried across a large section of the country, and it might easily happen that the people might lose their lives on account of these poles I happen to know a little about this, not very much, because I had some had some experience in connection with an operation of this nature, and it was recommended by this same Company to have the poles tarred, therefore I thought, that we ought to get the opinion of somebody else

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Before including 18 feet in this section of the Resolutions, we made enquires and found that two feet lower

than the standard requirements was sufficient for all practical purposes. We were told that it would only be necessary to cut them of sufficient length, that when they were put down six feet in the ground, they would be the required length over the ground. However I will be very glad to have this matter looked into.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula," was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Agriculture & Mines."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I think that this is bringing back the obnoxious Agricultural Commissioners of the years of 1910 and onward. You know what happened then and I hope that the same will not happen now, it was only for the purpose of getting jobs for members, all they did was draw

their salary and sit in the House. I register my protest because it is only creating jobs for members. The Prime Minister told me that he was getting an agriculturalist from Canada to do something with the agricultural problem here. I have not much objection to that, but I object to legislation which creates positions for members of the House.

MR. EMERSON.—I would like to associate myself with Mr. Puddester, but I would not protest so strongly if I were sure that all the members were so qualified to act on this board as Dr. Campbell. In spite of my bad manners last night I think that it would be a good thing to appoint Dr. Campbell to this board. He is fully qualified to act on this Board as he has had considerable experience in agricultural matters.

Really, I think it is ridiculous to have five men on that Board. Why not lump the money together and give it to Dr. Campbell? I am certain that he would do better than a Board of five men who would never meet and never advise the Minister. Another objection is that the salary is settled by the Government and not by this House and not passed in supply. I submit that this is not right to create a Board of five members which will never meet and whose salaries are fixed by the Governor in Council. It would be better to appoint the member for St. John's West.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—The Prime Minister was only joking, I am glad to see him in such a good humour.

MR. PUDDESTER.—You will never balance your Budget when you are increasing salaries to the extent of \$60,000 and we have five more positions which mean \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year. A Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines means \$4,000 and thus we have another ten or eleven

thousand dollars we are going to spend. Now this Bill is a very important one, and I must confess that on the second reading of it I did not see its significance. I did not think is contained clauses whereby a commission or Board of Agriculture could be appointed. The Governor in Council can appoint five commissioners and can fix the salaries to be paid. We hardly know yet what is the significance of this measure and I ask the indulgence of the Prime Minister to rise the Committee now and go into it more fully to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Chairman of Committee of the whole reported having considered the matter to them referred, made progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Opposition if they desire to go on with the bills on the Order Paper or shall we go into Committee on Supply.

SUPPLY

MR. PUDDESTER.—Supply, if that is agreeable.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose last night I had reviewed the Budget Speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs up to a certain point. I think I had left to deal with the references to the deficits of the Colony for the past number of years. I do not know whether I can carry on the debate in the same frame of mind as I would have continued it last night. I shall try and deal with the Budget as dispassionately as I can and be as fair with the

Finance Minister as I know how to be. The general deficits of the colony for years past were dealt with by the Finance Minister. He went back to the year 1920 and showed us that the Government had deficits for the next four years to the extent of \$5,677,308. That is a colossal amount and it all had to be squared by borrowing money.

It is all very well for Governments to go into the money markets of the world and present their financial statement to carry on capital expenditure which results in assets to the country, but it is a different matter for any Finance Minister to go into the money markets of the world and admit that he failed to balance his budget as this year the Finance Minister will have to go and face the underwriters and admit that since 1921 we have had deficits totalling nearly \$10,000,000. Surely this is not a creditable showing for this country.

With the exception of one year, and the Finance Minister disagrees and says that if everything had been charged in there would not have been a surplus, but 1924-25, is the only year since 1920 that shows a surplus, of revenue over expenditure. In the year 1920 there was a surplus shown of \$1,300,000 but that surplus was a fictitious one, the records of the House prove that the Minister had taken from the surplus Trust Fund \$3,500,000 and transferred it to the credit of the exchequer account and thus showed a surplus—he borrowed from the Trust Fund and transferred to Current Account, that is why we had a surplus, and we have never had a surplus since with exception of 1925. I do not blame the Finance Minister for trying to clear up his accounts and balance his budget, we are prepared to give him all possible assistance on this side of the House, provided, that he keeps good faith and does not in-

crease his estimates and other unnecessary expenditure. I will show how Sir M. P. Cashin had surpluses when he was in charge of the Finance Office.

(Reads)

Then, after that date it was good bye surpluses, except in 1924-25 and that Finance Minister claims that that was a fictitious one, we have never seen a surplus since. No wonder our finances are bad, but people say that we got the benefit of that state of affairs, we did to a certain extent since 1923 when we had turned the corner of post war problems and conditions. Incoming Governments took the duty off flour, pork, beef and gasolene, the duty on flour amounts to \$40,000, we could not expect to have surpluses when we took so much duty off. Our debt has been added to to the extent of millions and millions of dollars. What is the record of our debt and loans since 1919 and 1920 since we stopped having surpluses?

(Reads)

It cannot be charged to any one Government, they all trod the same path and I say to the Finance Minister that it is time to turn over a new leaf. As I said before is it not what the Squires Government did, it is not what the Monroe Government did, it is not what the Alderdice Government did, it is what the present Government are going to do, and we expect the Finance Minister to turn over a new leaf and balance his budget by the beginning of 1931, and to balance your budget you have to sail very close to the wind, you won't do it next year or the year after as you have not proven that you will have enough revenue to carry on with and unless you have an abnormal revenue you wont do it. I have heard that the Finance Minister had a conference with the banks in connection with the Bill. I am not in favour of granting special privileges

to the banks, but did they threaten to put up the rate of interest if the bank tax was increased.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Not directly, but they hinted at it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I object to threats being made to the Minister of Finance and Customs of this country, Liberal or Tory, and I would like you to go into the matter more fully. Now as regards loans, the Squires Government borrowed 23 millions, the Monroe Government borrowed 26 millions, 6½ of which was to pay off an old loan which was contracted in 1918 and which fell due in 1928, and some deficits of the old Government. Quite a lot of these loans were spent to pay current account debts, as far as the Monroe Government is concerned, we spent some of this money in the following manner.

(Reads)

That is how the money was spent as far as the Monroe Government is concerned, we are responsible for a certain amount of it but it is not fair that we shoulder the full amount of it. So much for dealing with the deficit and surplus years and the loans and I have tried to tell the House what was done with these loans for the years that we were in power.

The Minister of Finance deals with the Railway, well, I dealt with that last night and I don't intend to deal with it again. The Finance Minister says here, regarding hospitals:

(Reads from Budget)

I sincerely hope and trust that the Minister of Finance and Customs will not have the same thing to say about the new regulations and I do trust and hope that your regulations in connection with these hospitals and doctors will have the desired effect and that next year we shall see a great cut in connection with these. But, if we have the same amount of appendicitis

cases as last year, and the year before, we will not be able to have very much of a cut. The doctors in the out-ports do not prefer to perform the operations at home, but send the patients to the General Hospital. Thirty years ago a doctor placed a man on a couch and cut off the finger and the offending member was well in a few weeks. Now everybody must come to the General Hospital.

I saw some of the doctors bills in the Public Health Office. I do not blame the Minister of Finance for saying what he did. I think there should be more treatment given in the out-ports by the doctors. There may be some reason for the change, science has advanced wonderfully during the last few years and the doctor will not take the same risk to-day that he took a few years ago. But certainly goodness, with a small population like we have, small facilities and small means to carry it on the sum of one million dollars a year for Hospitals is outrageous. It is pure charity. And I do trust that when we next come here we are going to see a cut in that expenditure.

The Finance Minister winds up his budget with a very very frank statement and I give him credit for it, and I do hope he will keep his upper lip stiff as we go through and try and save the Colony from disaster. As I said before we cannot go on borrowing year after year. Our interest charge now is four million three hundred thousand dollars. In a few years our interest charge will be five million dollars and our total revenue from the Customs is only eight million five hundred thousand. No country can go in that manner and we cannot bear very much more taxes. You can tax in Canada and the United States of America where the earning power is much greater. It is I believe about eleven hundred dollars per year in

Canada while in Newfoundland the average earnings is about two or three hundred dollars per year. Most of the necessities of life to-day are not taxed. There is no tax on flour, pork, beef, kerosene and gasolene, lines and twines etc., which are the common necessities for the fishery. If you put the tax on these commodities it will be very hard indeed. My fear is that the taxation bills that we have put thru in this House are going to be passed on to the consumer and the producer. If the Bank Tax is passed the Minister of Finance knows who will pay it. The bank will pass it to the business man and the business man to the consumer, The producer and the consumer will have to pay the tax, whether it is the income tax, the business profit or whatever kind of tax it is. Even if it is on the lawyers they are going to pass it on. (Mr. Emerson interjected that they had no one to pass it to). You told us yesterday that when you dropped your fees you would expect business from some other sources. If I had to consult you to-morrow where you would only charge me fifty dollars if there were no tax, you will now charge me sixty dollars. I think all that is clearly proved not only in this country but in every country that the taxes, where ever possible, will be passed on to the consumer and will count in the standard of living, and I think result in nothing else but a lowering, and we cannot afford to lower the standards of living in this country. They are very low now. So low that we have the Sanitarium filled with tubercular patients. If the standard of living were higher we would not have so many in it.

The Finance Minister when winding up his budget made this statement:

(Reads from Budget)

Now if the public service is overmanned there is only one thing to do. That is cut down all the Civil Service

as I suggested to him the other day. It is the only way even if it is slow and to my mind it will take years to cut it down, but the proper way is when a vacancy occurs not to fill it. If you go ahead filling vacancies you will always have the service overmanned. It is very hard to put a man on the street, and I know it, but something has to be done to cut down Civil Service. Not only the Civil Service but there are so many other services. But if the public want the services and must have them, they must be prepared to pay for them; and the Minister of Finance knows there must be more taxes go on if we have more Public Services. But what is the record. What has been added since we tabled the estimates? This list I hold in my hand have been added to what we already have passed together with and the office we made yesterday and another one last night, that of Solici-

tor General. We are putting the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat, adding on new offices to the extent of thirty four thousand dollars. I have taken a list of the increases and new offices to the extent of approximately fifty four thousand dollars. That is not the way to cut it down. I do not blame you Mr. Minister of Finance. I believe you are sincere in trying to cut down, but it is no good in your being sincere if you are not backed by your Executive Colleagues. It is no use for people to get up in this House and on the spur of the moment increase salaries or propose new offices. You must be firm to keep expenses down. If you increase one salary in a Department, you are going to have endless trouble for yourselves and for the Ministers.. When one salary is increased all others want their salary increased.

(Reads)

INCREASES IN SALARIES

	From	To	Increase
Chief Acct. Finance Department.....	\$2,500.00	\$3,000.00	\$ 500.00
Acct. Old Age Pens., Finance Dept.....	504.00	800.00	296.00
Asst. Secretary to Prime Minister.....	840.00	1,500.00	660.00
Second Clerk, Col. Secty's Dept.....	1,800.00	2,200.00	400.00
Stenographer and Clerk Col Sec. Dept.	900.00	1,000.00	100.00
Two Typists, Col. Sec. Dept.....	1,440.00	1,640.00	200.00
Telephone Oper. Asst., Col. Sec Dept....	720.00	820.00	100.00
Asst. Messenger, Col. Sec. Dept.....	660.00	744.00	84.00
Asst. Typist, Vital Statistics Dept.....	600.00	720.00	120.00
Cashier, Charities Department.....	1,347.00	1,500.00	153.00
Bookkeeper, Charities Department.....	1,347.00	1,500.00	153.00
Asst. Bookkeeper, Charities Dept.....	1,347.00	1,500.00	153.00
Steno. and Gen. Clerk, Charities Dept..	720.00	1,000.00	280.00
Relieving Officer Upper Island Cove....	78.00	200.00	122.00
Asst. Inspector, Public Health.....	1,100.00	1,200.00	100.00
Laboratory Asst., Public Health.....	959.00	1,200.00	241.00
Clerk and Acct. Marine & Fisheries ...	1,200.00	1,850.00	650.00
Clerk and Asst. Acct. Marine & Fish....	1,100.00	1,500.00	400.00
Clerk and Messenger, Marine & Fish....	900.00	1,080.00	180.00
Typist and Sec., Marine & Fish.....	1,000.00	1,200.00	200.00
Fifth Clerk and Steno., Public Works..	900.00	1,000.00	100.00
Clerk to Super., Public Works.....	1,100.00	1,200.00	100.00
Sec. to Minister Public Works.....	900.00	1,000.00	100.00

Messenger and Clerk, Public Works....	700.00	900.00	200.00
Keeper, Department Building.....	1,166.25	1,200.00	33.75
Keeper, Memorial College.....	960.00	1,104.00	144.00
Stenographer, General Hospital.....	380.00	440.00	60.00
Coachman, General Hospital.....	526.50	600.00	73.50
Resident Physician, General Hospital..	3,220.00	3,845.00	625.00
Super. Nurses, General Hospital.....	1,150.00	1,300.00	150.00
Electro-Ther., General Hospital.....	1,005.00	1,200.00	145.00
Electro-Ther. Asst., General Hospital..	786.00	900.00	114.00
Hospital Sec., General Hospital.....	783.00	900.00	117.00
Matron and Dietician, Gen. Hospital....	720.00	900.00	180.00
Night Super., General Hospital.....	818.00	960.00	142.00
Storekeeper, General Hospital.....	1,296.75	1,470.00	173.00
Orderlies, General Hospital.....	1,582.50	1,620.00	37.50
Boy, General Hospital.....	180.00	300.00	120.00
Asst. Cook, General Hospital.....	324.75	360.00	36.25
Asst. Laundress, General Hospital.....	300.00	360.00	60.00
Telephone girls, General Hospital.....	452.00	600.00	147.50
Chief Attendant, Poor Asylum.....	845.00	960.00	115.00
Second Attendant, Poor Asylum.....	845.00	870.00	25.00
Third Attendant, Poor Asylum.....	760.00	786.00	26.00
Chief female Attendant, Poor Asylum..	420.00	600.00	180.00
Cook, Poor Asylum.....	292.00	400.00	108.00
Female Attendants, Poor Asylum.....	2,053.00	2,296.00	243.00
Asst. Deputy and Secretary, G. P. O....	2,200.00	2,500.00	300.00
Enquiry Clerk, G. P. O.....	1,200.00	1,400.00	200.00
Customs Ledger Keeper, G P. O.....	900.00	1,000.00	100.00
Cashier, G. P. O.....	1,644.00	1,800.00	136.00
Stamp Clerk, G. P. O...N.....	1,596.00	1,800.00	204.00
Customs Entry Clerk, G. P. O.....	1,200.00	1,400.00	200.00
Registration Senior Clerk, G. P. O.....	1,500.00	1,600.00	100.00
1st Asst. Money Order Dept., G. P. O....	900.00	1,000.00	100.00
2nd Asst. Money Order Dept., G. P. O....	900.00	1,000.00	100.00
Clerk, Money Order Dept., G. P. O.....	540.00	600.00	60.00
Clerk, Money Order Dept., G. P. O.....	435.00	540.00	105.00
Clerk & Cashier, Parcel Post, G. P. O..	1,000.00	1,100.00	100.00
Window Clerk, Parcel Post, G. P. O ...	1,000.00	1,100.00	100.00
Assorter, G. P. O.....	1,035.00	1,200.00	165.00
Stamp Clerk, G. P. O.....	750.00	800.00	50.00
Telephone Exchange Clerk, G. P. O.....	480.00	600.00	120.00
Deputy Super. Postal Telegraphs.....	1,760.00	1,800.00	40.00
Check Clerk, Postal Telegraphs.....	960.00	1,100.00	140.00
Asst. Check Clerk, Postal Telegraphs..	846.00	1,000.00	154.00
Asst. Check Clerk, Postal Telegraphs..	762.00	900.00	138.00
Asst. Check Clerk, Postal Telegraphs..	1,660.00	1,800.00	140.00
Clerk Cons. and Repairs.....	1,600.00	1,800.00	200.00
Clerk, Cable and Wireless, G. P. O.....	1,300.00	1,500.00	200.00
Fifth Clerk, Customs Department.....	1,300.00	1,500.00	200.00
Clerk & Surveyor of Shipping Customs	3,000.00	3,500.00	500.00
Superintendent Public Works.....	2,000.00	2,500.00	500.00

Asst. Superintendent Public Works.....	350.00
Woods Ranger.....	1,565.00
Penitentiary Increases.....	1,600.00
Poor Asylum Increases.....	5,000.00
Extra Post Office & Customs Raises....	

NEW OFFICES

Assistant to First Clerk, Auditor General's Department.....	\$ 1,200.00
Civil Service, 17 new pensions.....	10,151.83
Typist, Prime Minister's Office.....	840.00
Filing Clerk, Prime Minister's Office.....	720.00
Relieving Officer, Swift Current, P.B.....	38.00
Relieving Officer, Branch, St. Mary's.....	38.00
Messenger, Public Health Department.....	300.00
Fourth Clerk, Agriculture & Mines.....	1,070.00
Assistant Typist, Agriculture & Mines.....	720.00
Inspector Heating and Plumbing, Public Works Department.....	2,500.00
Keeper Newfoundland War Memorial.....	365.00
2 Electro-Ther. Assistants, General.....	1,560.00
Masseur, General Hospital....	500.00
Fourth Attendant, Poor Asylum.....	720.00
Nurses, Poor Asylum.....	1,650.00
New Letter Carrier, G. P. O.....	480.00
New Assorter, G. P. O.....	1,200.00
Solicitor General.....	5,000.00
Superintendent Mail Clerks, G. P. O.....	1,800.00
Travellings Auditor, G. P. O.....	1,800.00
Assistant Travelling Auditor, G. P. O.....	1,500.00
New Deputy Minister Agriculture.....	3,600.00
Cleaning Prime Minister's Office.....	5,000.00
Total	<u>\$37,795.03</u>

In addition to these there were the other positions on Commissions, Agriculture Commissioners, Fishery Wardens, Deputy Ministers, and the other jobs provided for in various bills for which no salaries have been voted. What amounts these would be paid is something that has yet to be learned.

All these are new jobs and increases in salaries and amount to about \$60,000, and I want to say it as kindly as I can, if you go on like this year by year you are not going to reduce. It is all right to make a frank statement at the end of the Budget Speech but you surely must keep faith when you make a statement like that and not have such increases. I am not saying that the people do not need the in-

creases. I am not saying that, because I know that they deserve them. I know they are poorly paid, but you have to cut the garment according to the cloth. If we haven't the money how can we pay them? You have any amount of people travelling the streets of this country unemployed who would be very glad to come in and take these positions at lower salaries.

And then, I did not mention it at the time but I did not think it was necessary to vote \$5,000 to renovate the Prime Minister's office. I am not against the Prime Minister's office being renovated and cleaned up but I do not think it should cost \$5,000. I guarantee you every cent of that money will be spent; cleaning one office. And we voted it just the same as if the money belonged to ourselves—if it belonged to ourselves we would not vote it, but because it is the country's money, somebody else's money we were very slick in voting it. There are increases in the estimates to the extent of fifty to sixty thousand dollars and new commissions appointed. We cannot afford to have new departments and new Solicitor Generals when we have deficits upon deficits since 1920 to the extent of \$9,500,000. We will never do anything else as long as the Finance Minister doesn't stand on his dignity and say NO, and his colleagues say no and take the consequences like men. You must feel, Mr. Finance Minister, that that is right.

I come now to the changes in the Schedule of duties. The first one is a reduction of 10% on oxen and bulls. Do you think for one moment that is going to benefit anyone? If you reduced the price of meat and beef to that extent you would be doing something. I will tell you what you have done. You have put money into the pockets of the wholesalers and retailers, and have not benefitted the consumers. There will be no reduction of the price of meat, and I trust that when the Public Utilities Commission is appointed that will be the first thing they will inquire into and see that the price of meat is cut down to the extent that you reduced the duty on cattle coming in. Is not that correct? Should not the Public Utilities Commission act in such matters?

I think it is right to reduce the duty on oranges and other fruits from 25 per cent to 15 per cent and I give you credit for it. My only objection to that is that you have not taken the duty off apples. An apple is a necessary thing and with other fruit you will find that it is the greatest friend you have, and I am sorry to note that the introducer forgot to place apples with the other fruit, but we will have to pay more now for apples, grapes and bananas coming from Spain because they are taken off the free list. And we will have to pay more for raisins coming from Spain because it is off the free list.

These next few items do not matter. The people who buy them are able to afford to pay, and if they are not able to afford to pay for them they should not have them.

Olive oil, not free now, there is a duty on that. Brandy, when imported from Spain. We have to pay more for that now.

I come next to a very important item and that is this. Duty has been increased on sugar $\frac{1}{2}$ c a pound. That may not look very much, but last year we imported fifteen million pounds of sugar into Newfoundland. Fifteen million pounds of sugar which is bound to come in, at $\frac{1}{2}$ c a pound extra, will mean \$80,000. You will get \$80,000 in the Customs next year because of the $\frac{1}{2}$ c per pound on sugar. Nobody would think that matters much but the worst feature is this, not only will you get it, not only will you get \$80,000 but another $\frac{1}{2}$ c will be clapped on the consumer by the retailer, and the consumer next year will pay \$160,000 more for sugar than he paid last year. \$80,000 to you and \$80,000 to the people who sell it. That is what is going to happen, an extra \$160,000 on sugar.

Tobacco is cut from 48 to 40. Crude petroleum and oil is 2%, increased

where it was free before. I am not sure how much is used but I do not think the fishermen use very much of it. It will mean an increase in the revenue, I presume, of about \$500 a year.

The rest of the Schedule does not amount to very much and I will not weary the House by going any further into it.

I want to make just one statement in conclusion, that I entirely agree with the Hon. Member that he should try in the Government and I will also, as far as I can on this side of the House, to convince the Finance Minister to put the loan bonds on our own market and try and raise as much as we can here.

I heartily concur in that. I believe the people of the country should be given a chance to see what they could do with regard to the buying of the bonds of their own country, and thereby keep the money in their own country. We send quite a pile of money out of this country every year, and I do not see why the Minister does not put the loan on the local market this year. We lost a lot of money last year when the local bonds were redeemed because the people had $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent bonds and then had to get them redeemed and had to invest the money in something else. A great deal of that money is gone out in Stocks and Shares, in German Bonds and French Bonds and other things of that kind. I contend that a lot of these Companies incorporated here selling Bonds and Stocks should be driven out thru the Narrows. We have at the present time in the Newfoundland Savings Bank \$26,489,516.18 and we also have in force Insurance to the extent of \$36,600,000. That is \$63,000,000 in all. Therefore people ought to be encouraged and invest their money in Stocks and Bonds in their own country, and I hope the Finance Minister will raise the \$3,000,000 in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the Budget as best I know how, I might have had to say things last night that, perhaps, would be better left unsaid, but the Finance Minister also gets spirited in the heat of debate too, and we come together afterwards as friends. I have to admit however that there are certain things in the Budget that I agree with. Provided the Finance Minister sticks to his views there is some hope, but, if he does not and lets everybody who come along ride rough shod over him, we are bound to meet with disaster. Having finished my review of the Budget, I now conclude with the hope that next year when the Budget is placed in our hands, a flourishing statement will be presented.

MR. QUINTON.—Mr. Chairman, the last time I addressed the House at any length I was somewhat incapacitated. I am glad of this opportunity, altho I regret to see so many occupants of the Government seats absent. After hearing an exhaustive review of the Budget and of politics generally in Newfoundland covering very many years, by the Hon. member for Bay de Verde. I feel like quoting the Pharisee who stood in the Temple to pray; "Thank God I am not as other men are." As I have previously remarked, I am an amateur member of the House and I have been told by a member of the Government that I have a great deal to learn here, yet at the same time I fail to see where the difference comes in, in point of view of representation and based upon the selection of the people or its representatives, whether a man is a senior or junior member of this Assembly when it comes to discussing the subject matters that are brought before this Chamber and as they relate to the district representative themselves.

The Budget speech is now before the Chair and I do not intend to make any

extensive remarks thereon. Perhaps I should say that I am not sufficiently informed upon politics generally and the trade of the country generally as it applies to politics to make any extensive remarks. I think the Hon. Finance Minister made an excellent attempt in his delivery of the Budget speech and which the future will disclose the accuracy of. I am sorry to have to say that, in common with all other human creatures, one is apt to feel aggrieved when statements are made which are not quite in order and one has been told that he went into politics because one had to. I think the time has come when one has to register a protest. I do not want the Finance Minister to feel that I am vindictive so far as the treatment of this Government has been to me as a representative of this House, but I want him to understand this, that I feel I have as good a right to stand up here as he has, and I have as much right as he has to exercise my privilege which was given me by a majority of the people of the constituency of Bonavista South. I represent a section of the people of Newfoundland as he does another section and I resent—and I am not concerned whether he takes back his statement or not—his statement that I am here because I had to be here. I am not ashamed to make that statement.

I stand here as a representative of five thousand people, industrious people, people who earn their livelihood by the sweat of their brow and people who contribute their proportionate quota to the revenue for the maintenance and upkeep of the country. Therefore, I am not ashamed to be here in the capacity of their representative; but so long as political seekers of fortune are establishing precedents and gladly avail of the opportunities of those precedents, just so long will this country suffer financially, industrial-

ly and commercially. There is no reason for any member, whether junior or senior, getting up and attempting to justify the actions of previous Governments. I am not responsible for the action of the previous Government, nor do I consider that any member of a Party returned in the recent election is responsible for the actions of a previous Government. After all, this question of precedents that we hear so much about and which is so often dinned in our ears is calculated to make us physically and morally disgusted.

What does it matter to us whether the Government that existed before the present Government came into existence did something wrong, or whether some Government that existed fifty years ago did something wrong? Does that prevent the present Government from doing something good? I am afraid, Sir, that in the performance of our duties as legislators we are often too apt to remember what somebody else did and govern ourselves accordingly, rather than to make some serious and honest attempt to do what the people of the country elected us for and expect us to do so. I want to challenge the statement that public moneys were spent in the past by one Government more than another. Except for certain allocations, perhaps, the whole public service has been used as a political football, and, particularly, is this the case since the present Government assumed office. I make that statement, backed by the majority of voters in the district of Bonavista South, without fear of successful contradiction. Go to the Manager of the Railway today, or to any Roadmaster in any section of the country and he cannot give a man a job with a pick and shovel unless he is recommended by a defeated candidate of the present Government. Not only does that apply to

the railway, but it applies to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and the Department of Marine and Fisheries and other Departments as well. That is why I claim that the whole public service is used as a political football from the time the Government is elected until it is thrown out of office, and all that is brought about because the Government is rotten at the top.

Then when we come to realise that 35 per cent of the revenue is expended annually to pay the interest charges on the public debt of the Colony, is it any wonder that it is almost a hopeless task to balance that Budget. There are members on the Government side to night, who, when they were in Opposition, virgorously opposed and bitterly denounced the practice of borrowing and they objected on principle to the things the then Government did, whether it was right or wrong. I know that, as a young fellow who has come here for the first time, irrespective of what a Government member said while on this side of the House, he does not care two hoots what he said while in Opposition, now that he is on the Government side tucked away in a nice cushy job and at a very remunerative salary. That is a noteworthy trait and outstanding characteristic that members of the present Government have acquired. That is an unfortunate state of affairs. That is not what the free and independent electors of this country elected men to this House for. We have too much of the junior member talk here and too much evidence of responsible Ministers of the Crown absenting themselves when important matters concerning the honour, reputation and fair name of Newfoundland are under discussion. For instance, the district of Bonavista has four representatives and only one of them is in the House while the Budget speech,

which deals with an expenditure of millions of dollars, belonging to the taxpayers of this country, is being gone into; but, if these four men were in Opposition to-day, they would all be here and doing what I am trying to do on behalf of my constituents. It has been intimated that the Opposition members have not been fair to the Government this session, and that reminds me that last night my eyes were opened when I heard the Prime Minister say that if a certain measure came up before the House that it would pass because human tendencies were uppermost.

Now we have not as on Opposition, obstructed this House. In fact we have privileged this House, not because of the smallness of our numbers, not because members of this side could not have talked for hours on certain proposals, but because we hoped that the Government in their wisdom had brought in measures that the country wanted put through. That the country as a majority had brought this Government into this House, and I am speaking for myself generally as far as the Opposition is concerned, I am satisfied that the will of the majority should prevail.

And that brings me to the point, about the will of the majority. The will of the majority did not prevail in Bonavista South. But the time will come when, in this House of Assembly whether I am a member or not, the will of the majority will prevail, and we will be able in our position as administrators of the country's affairs to ensure that the opposition members equally with the Government members will get fair play and their share of the decent treatment to which they are entitled. I often wonder, when men become peevish, if I may use the word, with one side against the other, whether they do not in their own minds

conjure up the things they would like to do if they were in opposition, and whether they do not condemn the things that they expect the opposition members will do, and towering up in their minds according to their frenzied efforts to feel powerful are the things that rise up and mock them.

Playing politics with the country's finances, to me as a young fellow in this House, appears to me to merit the fullest condemnation. If all the members of this House were of my opinion, they would set up a Carter's Purge, and tell the truth. I doubt if there are many legislators in this country or in any other country, prepared to take the same stand. I have nothing to be ashamed of in the past, and I hope that I will have nothing to be ashamed of in the future, as long as I occupy a seat in this House. The people of Newfoundland are law abiding, and they are sick at heart of the extravagance on the one hand and poverty on the other. And I am going to tell the truth this afternoon as I said a few minutes ago.

Now, the people of Bonavista South are, as I have said, a law abiding and industrious people. They pay for what they get. They supply their quota to the Budget of the country, and they help the Finance Minister to get the money to run the country. Then when you find there extravagance on the one hand, and poverty on the other, it is time to stop and consider. And I believe that if every Hon. member of this House told the truth, told the things that he saw in his district and with that substantial knowledge of those things, and would interest those things in the manner in which his own heart and soul means that they should be interpreted, then he would agree with me the statement that I am going to make. Now, are not the opposition the defenders of the rights of the people of this country as well as the Gov-

ernment. We are all here to represent the people and to ensure that they get fair play, a fair measure of the justice to which they are entitled. The fact that 35 per cent of the total earnings of the people of this country goes to pay the interest on the National Debt, is sufficient cause for alarm to me as a layman. Thirty five cents of every dollar that is collected from the public goes into the hole, and what happens to the other sixty-five cents. It is passed out to political heelers, generally speaking. The Government are drunk with power and they are selfish as politicians know how to be. We have evidence for that in the creation of new jobs for the members. This has been one of their first considerations.

Everybody knows that when a Government goes into power, and if there are not sufficient jobs already to satisfy the demands of their supporters, they do not hesitate to create those positions both for themselves and their followers, when their first consideration should be to endeavour to give labour and employment to those who need it. A logger's bill has been brought into his House. I do not know whether it has been passed, or whether it is what certain members have described it as being, but I do know that a member of this House has been appointed Superintendant of logging at a salary of \$2,500.

MR. EARLE.—He is a good man.

MR. QUINTON.—But the loggers are getting the same money as when Monroe was in power.

MR. EARLE.—It will take a little time to clear up that mess.

MR. QUINTON.—But it did not take very long to find a job for somebody. Now a certain man that is now on the Government side, talked of the curtailment of expenditure, when he sat in opposition. Now I agree that human

nature is peculiar. I agree perhaps that if I myself were fortunate, or unfortunate to become a member of the Government that that same peculiarity which belongs to human nature would manifest itself and I would perhaps endeavour to provide for myself. But I fail to see where the consistency is, when a man says one thing on this side, and then when he gets on the other side either says nothing at all, or else supports the measure that he objected to before. And then the trusting producers of the country stand up, and you have the spectacle of those on one side applauding Squires and those on the other side applauding Alderdice, and thinking that we are a grand Government and a grand Opposition.

Now you propose to borrow six million dollars. And you have not told the House how you intend to spend it particularly. Now all this effects the Budget. Because it increases that burden that represents thirty-five per cent of our national expenditure. I remember sitting in one of these seats behind the Bar some two years ago, when the Hon. member for Trinity Centre stood up and asked the Government what was intended to be done as far as opposition members were concerned in the handling of the grants for the different districts. And the Prime Minister at that time stated that he would be only too happy to see that members of the opposition equally with members of the Government had a fair share of the administration of those grants. And we have had already the spectacle of the present Prime Minister standing up and saying that he would be quite prepared to have the opposition members, within a reasonable scope, administer the affairs of their districts.

And that raises a question that I intended to introduce at the beginning

of this speech. The new loan has not been specifically referred to in the various items that they are supposed to cover. In other words we are supposed as an opposition to give a free hand to the Government in regard to this six million dollars, and the expenditure of that portion of it which is intended for new works or improvements, as far as their judgment may be exercised. Now I have every reason to think that if human nature is such as to permit a man on that side of the House to vote for a bill against the dictates of his better conscience, then in the spending of this money it is quite possible that that same human nature may come to the surface, and acting on it, he may spend this money in a manner not conducive to the best interests of the country generally. And have good reason to believe that opposition members, if the treatment accorded to them is the same as the treatment that has been accorded to me, will not get the fair show that they have been promised. Would the directors of a business house permit the manager of that business to borrow six million dollars to be applied as the manager thought fit. I ask that question in all sincerity. Not in the spirit of criticism. You know that the directors of no good business firm would do any such thing. And why does not this Government in their discussion of the loan come down and say how they are going to spend this money. And the Legislature of this country in my humble opinion are the directors of the greatest business in the country, the business of Government. But the share holders of this business are out of luck. The share holders of this country are the producers.

My opinion is this and I speak as a junior in this Assembly, before any Finance Minister comes into this House, and decided to vote money on

supply, he should be in the position to find out what money he has to spend, and then decide how he is going to spend it, and until that is done you will never balance your Budget.

I am speaking of something which will materially assist in helping to balance the Budget. Even if it takes twenty years for the country to catch up to its expenditures and balance its Budget. We should be getting our revenue from the natural resources of the country. We have not known and we still do not know the value of them. The revenue should not be taken from the poor people.

Last night I sat here quietly and listened to a bill being introduced by Dr. Campbell, the Collishaw bill. I did not intend to refer to it at the present time at any length because it will come before us in committee and we will have ample opportunity of discussing it. I only quoted it as an illustration to show what the Government can do in the way of patronage on the one side and can persecute on the other hand. Here we are asked to guarantee the sum of six per cent on two hundred thousand dollars for fifteen years from the net earnings of the country and at the same time to give them a protective tariff five per cent for fifteen years. Now I have prepared some figures taken from the report of the Customs Department in 1928-1929 that I intend to read. I have prepared them to cover the items which the company proposes to manufacture:

(Reads from Customs Report)

Now, Mr. Speaker, when that Bill was introduced last night it was suggested and I think that was the underlying motive that the Bill was simply intended to reduce the unemployment in St. John's West. It was stated that some three hundred people would be employed. Now I make this statement that if we spend one hundred thousand

dollars in St. John's for the purpose of relieving distress and in the endeavour to reduce expenditure we are creating an industry at the expense of the Colony. If the earnings do not reach expectations the Colony pays to the tune of one hundred and eighty thousand dollars in the fifteen years. And I am not sure whether in the mind of the person who introduced the Bill that that was the underlying motive. I am going to show the Minister of Finance and Customs that we will lose five hundred and twenty one thousand eight hundred and eighty seven dollars in revenue. Is it wise to lose this in five years to save one hundred thousand. It is penny wise and pound foolish. Now I do not want to be understood that the Government should be lax in the unemployment problem. I hate to see a man out of work who wants to make an honest living and for my part I would be only too happy in my humble capacity to assist any man of obtaining employment because in the obtaining of it so are the earnings of the individual increased, which results in the increased earning of the country. We want to see the greatest good for the greatest number. Then again this company asks for all material to be admitted to the country free of duty. What for?

I am not opposed to the Bill, but I am opposed to the squandering of the company's money at the expense of the Colony. Now, I want to contrast that with another situation. There is a gentleman in my district named, Alfred Stead, who has conducted logging operations for a number of years and also last year. He supplies more or less fifty families and cuts a considerable amount of logs, which he has not been permitted to turn into cash.

Hon. members may be inclined to smile, but I think that if they were

in similar circumstances they would be indignant. The people of Bonavista South are an industrious people and are prepared to work for their living as I am prepared to work for mine. I do not have to ask the Government to give me a job at five thousand dollars a year. Mr. Collishaw, or his friends, come in here and ask for this country to help them start a business and a constituent of mine who has started a business is driven into bankruptcy.

Now I am going to deal with this Bill fairly. There are no doubt men in this Government who are just as inexperienced and young as myself and many who are older and I feel sure that at the bottom of every member's heart is the desire to assist any man who has the desire to procure an honest livelihood. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary will remember that on the tenth of January I addressed a letter to him which I propose to read:

(Reads letter)

I have not yet received an official answer to that letter. Now I will read another letter received by Mr. Holloway on the third of April. He resides in Lethbridge in my district. The letter was written to that gentleman by the Prime Minister himself.

(Reads letter)

I will now read a letter written on the tenth of April to Mr. Holloway from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

(Reads letter)

Now, Mr. Chairman, during the few remarks which I made on the address in reply I stressed this point and following that I asked several questions which effect this particular measure,

One was the amount of pulp wood cut within the three mile limit and the number of saw mills operating both on the three mile limit and other territory.

I asked that for this reason. Mr. Stead was reported not to have paid royalty up to the time his license was refused. The answer given to me by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines stated at the bottom of the answer that royalty had since been paid, and at the same time informed me that \$34,000 and some hundred dollars was outstanding on account of royalty. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who is the personal leader, as I see it, in this matter, whether all the mills were curtailed in their operations because they had not paid royalty?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Not all.

MR. QUINTON.—Why then was Stead? Why was Stead refused because he had not paid royalty when other people who have not paid royalty carry on their business? I only want the reason. I do not exact a thing from the Government that is not theirs to grant. All these things react on the Budget. If fifty people are deprived of their livelihood they have less money to spend which means a loss to the Colony and a reduction in the Budget.

Then again, a statement that was given to me, or at least, told to me, that Mr. Stead could not get a license because he operated on the three mile limit. I have a copy of an affidavit which I gave on a telegraph message to the Colonial Secretary some two weeks ago, which I will read.

(Reads)

These two excuses, I shall term them excuses subject to correction, have petered out.

Now here is another letter addressed by the Hon. the Prime Minister to Mr. Fry and a number of other people of the settlement of Charleston.

(Reads)

Now, Sir, I was given to understand that the Department of Agriculture &

Mines had to do with this matter. This letter tells me, as did the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, with all fairness to him, that the matter had passed into the hands of the Executive Government. Now why does the Prime Minister state that this matter does not come before him in the ordinary course of public business. Does it mean that the business as transacted by the Executive Council of the country does not come before the Prime Minister in the ordinary course of business? There can be no other explanation as I understand it. I am always subject to correction. The unfortunate part about this matter is that while I understand that a petition of twenty men—I am subject to correction—signed by the petitioners against this license turns down a petition signed by one hundred and seventy-nine men who favored it, yet I am at a loss to know why the Government do not give an answer. Let the Government be gracious about the matter if they intend to drive this man into insolvency. He is losing \$20,000. Let them tell me and I will tell him. Why this useless delay?

What is happening? Thru political persecution this man is being driven into insolvency. What other reason can be conjured up? It is enough to exasperate me, not because I was elected up in the district of Bonavista South—the Government think I cannot win the election if I go there again—it is because this man is persecuted. Let the Government tell me if he is going to get the license or not and I will tell him and Stead is man enough to accept the decision of the Government elected by the majority of the country.

I say this Mr. Chairman, because it does effect the Budget. If that is the sort of thing you are doing in every district all over the country—and if

in one district, why not in another—the Prime Minister will have a hard time of it to put into effect all that is stated in the Budget speech of his.

That is what Mr. Stead says.

(Reads)

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that situation is most unfair. Now, then, on the second of May following that letter I addressed another communication to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, at his request after telephoning him, which I shall read.

(Reads)

Can anything be fairer than that? I am only asking for an answer. I have not got an answer. So much for that. I trust that the Hon. Colonial Secretary, who I have every reason to believe is a fair minded man, will tell me the reason for this.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt but might I say in reply just one word.

As soon as the correspondence from the Hon. gentleman reached me it was placed on the Agenda. It is on the Agenda now and has been on the Agenda every time we had a meeting, but the demands upon the Government and the important matters that have been taken up have prevented me getting to that particular document.

MR. QUINTON—I accept the explanation of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and am only too happy to realize that, as I hoped he would, he is giving the matter his earnest consideration, but I do hope a decision will be arrived at soon because the matter is of consequence to a man who is fit and ready to employ men and who must and will help keep them clothed and fed at his expense until such time as the Government sees fit to make a decision.

New, then, some time ago I asked the Minister of Finance and Customs

if he intended to increase the old age pensions, and I did so, not because, as I repeat, not that there were a lot of pensions desired only, but because I feel it is time for some one to stand up for the weak in this country. We find provision made for a number of other people, but unfortunately it seems and it has seemed in all Governments, that the person who has no voice to use on his own account, that the person who is impotent and cannot raise his voice in his own protection, suffers, and that is the type of man I love to defend and that is the type of man I feel God Almighty meant human creatures to exert themselves in defence of. We find that there is a vote of \$140,000. That is able to pay some twenty eight old age pensions of \$50.00.

Now I am going to read you a letter.

(Reads)

That is Francis Walsh. I know he is an ordinary individual, but he is a man who in his time did an enormous amount to help increase the revenue of this Colony. He is 78 years of age now and is practically starving to death after rendering those services to the country. What about it? We are told the Colony is poor, and there can be no more old age pensions. The financial standing of the Colony will not permit it, and then the Prime Minister comes in and at the tail end, so to speak, of the session increases the Superintendent of Public Works \$500 a year and also others \$500 a year and bills are introduced into this House providing jobs for all and sundry at the expense of the Colony. Certainly gracious the producers of the Colony have to receive some consideration. If it is impossible to give an old man who has served his time in helping to keep the country on its feet \$50.00 a year, why give bonuses under Section 33B of the Audit Act to people getting \$3300 a year and in some cases more.

That is a thing I am going to fight as long as I am in the House and do my best to bridge the position and get people to appreciate the unfairness of the means that deal with the long-suffering public of this country. I take the part of the widows and orphans. I went to the district as such and I feel practically certain, and I do not say it boastfully, that is why I was elected by the people in spite of all the spite and venom and political filth that was used to try and defeat me. I think my opponent was a gentleman as far as I know and he fought squarely.

We can come in here and make jobs for anybody who has the influence and power to get them but we cannot remember the widows struggling to bring along young men and women to make the country great in the future. God knows they were good enough to stop machine gun bullets and bayonets once, and I make no apology for the statement.

Take the case of the Sudbury Hospital. I went there on Christmas Day to perform a certain duty that I felt it was right to perform and I went to the top flat and what did I find? Children in cots, deformed, undernourished children, who if they had a chance might aspire to the Prime Ministership of this country.

I speak not as a politician, but as a private individual and whether I am in this House four years or four hundred years I don't want to see any more loans. Of course there will be certain purposes of necessity when it is essential but then let us be governed by common sense What are we going to do to cut expenditure to a minimum? Let us find out what is to be spent and then spend it in a business like way, just as if we had to toil for it with our own hands. I know that some of these things are dry political rot, but I am talking just as they come

to me, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the people whose appointment I have. Talking of balancing the Budget, not alone must one have the ability to balance it but the ability of the people to earn enough to pay the public charges on the Colony and I submit that this country is not able to earn sufficient to pay these charges and balance the Budget. The very life is crushed out of the people of this country.

I do not blame this Government in particular, all the Governments all through the years are guilty. Why? Because the line of least resistance is to be followed by the Government. I hope not but I am afraid we are getting revenue from a weaker source, and I intend to prove it, and giving away to outsiders, if we haven't done it governments in the past have done it. Take the Bill concerning the American Telegraph and Telephone Company. We are a natural half way house between the European continent and the American continent, that is we are the only recognized half way house. They figure that we accommodate their purpose. We allow them to import into the Colony materials for their operations. It is only natural to ask who made the first approach, and if so does he not do it for what he will get out of it. The whole trouble is that we are burning both ends of the candle and giving away privileges to strangers who are laughing up their sleeves at our simplicity and the trust we create. This brings me to the point of the unemployment question.

The question of the unemployed is uppermost in the minds of a good many people but unfortunately these people too often are found who only seek to benefit themselves and are only in it for what they can get out of it. It has been said that the fisheries are the mainstays of Newfoundland. Like the Finance Minister, I come from

fishing stock and I am not ashamed of it. The fisheries are the mainstay of Newfoundland, and I will prove it. I will show the great earning power of the fisheries and I will quote some figures and I hope that I will not weary the House too much. This is a comparison between the years of 1914 and 1928. The year 1914 because it was a year of stability, the fiscal year ends on the 30th of June and the 30th of June, 1914 is some distance removed from that awful nightmare which plunged the civilised world into a four years hell. In 1914 we produced and exported 1,247,347 quintals of codfish at a value of \$8,071,899. in 1928 we produced and exported 1,573,748 qtls at a value of \$11,540,976.

(Reads)

I have taken these years because as I have said 1914 was before the war, and 1928 is the nearest approach to stability since the war.

(Reads)

I will now give the principal items of export comparatively.

(Reads)

Now what does this imply, if this is not an argument that the fisheries are the mainstay of the country, I don't know what is an argument.

Our fisheries have not increased very much while some industries have increased six hundred per cent. What do you imagine would be the outcome if our fisheries increased six hundred per cent? Every fisherman in Newfoundland would be a wealthy man and if the population stood still everyone would be wealthy. It is time for us to realize the value of our fisheries to us and make a great effort to put them in much better than they are in at the present time, as I have already pointed out the Department of Marine and Fisheries is the most important department in this country.

We are told that the Government is going to borrow another six million

dollars very shortly. Now I do not know whether I am suffering from a nightmare or whether the cold shades of Opposition have so chilled my mental faculties, but it does seem extraordinary to me that the Government, through the Colonial Secretary, has not answered the correspondence I addressed to them respecting a very important district matter. The public wharf at Broad Cove, B. B., was severely damaged by a sea storm and repairs were urgently needed. I wrote the Government in this connection and pointed out that \$2,000 would be necessary to be allocated to rebuild the wharf. Here is what the letter stated:

(Reads)

I did that for the reason that I had interviewed the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the absence of the Minister, and I was told that the matter was referred to the Colonial Secretary for the consideration of the Executive Government. I have not yet got a reply from the Colonial Secretary, and still the people of Broad Cove are expected to contribute their quota to help the Finance Minister balance his Budget.

I am not in politics for what I get out of it, because I can get my living if I never touched politics, but I do say that while I am a representative of the people of this country, I feel that I am entitled to the consideration that an outpost representative would have on the other side of the House, as was promised this House by the Prime Minister in open session a few days ago. Why is it that the fishermen of Broad Cove are treated in this fashion? is it because Benjamin Stead was an adherent of the Alderdice Party or is it because I was the only candidate, out of 15 men, returned for the Opposition between Bay de Verde and Port au Port. I can hardly believe the Government is as unfair as that.

There is that settlement of Broad Cove without a stick to build a public wharf. There are some sixty men there who prosecute the codfishery, but they will not be able to catch any fish this year unless they get the grant for the wharf, which is so absolutely essential to them in pursuing their arduous calling.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the House longer. I am here because I was elected and while I am here I will endeavour to the best of my ability to facilitate any measures which makes for the betterment of the working people of this Colony. I will substantiate that statement any time any Party or any Government that I may be associated with. I hate to criticise; I prefer peaceful methods, but, I feel that when a man has been apparently ignored intentionally, it is time to speak up. I hope the Finance Minister will balance his Budget next year. If he does, no one will be happier than I, as a representative of the district of Bonavista South, and I wish him luck and success in his undertakings.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the Hon member for Bonavista South I may say that in the matter of the non-issuance of a license to Mr. Stead for the operating of a saw mill, the position is this: In the year 1917 by Proclamation of the Government five holdings in Notre Dame Bay were reserved and the timber areas Bonavista Bay were reserved for schooner building. Then for a period thereafter persons holding licenses issued by the Department of Agriculture and Mines were permitted to cut over the Bonavista Bay areas; but within the past Winter those holdings and those areas were trespassed upon and timber cut indiscriminately. Mr. Stead has been doing that for the past two or three years, and it is only within past two

months and since we refused Mr. Stead a license, he carried on a large amount of logging operations by cutting over those areas. Many persons, who do not understand the circumstances, wrote strong letters to the Department respecting the withholding of Mr. Stead's license.

One man wrote me two letters strongly protesting against giving Mr. Stead a license and on yesterday I received a third letter from the same man giving full particulars of the reserved areas cut in Notre Dame and Bonavista Bays. The letter came from Herbert Quinton, Charleston, and is dated May 15th:

(Reads)

I might say that it is the intention of the Department to prosecute those those who trespassed on the reserve the past year. That attitude is being taken in the best interests of the people of the country.

MR. PUDDISTER.—With regard to this subject, might I ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a question or two. I understand that three or four years ago the Government reserved an area around Gander Lake next to the Reid blocks for railway purposes. I also understand that you have a couple of applications in your office now asking permission to cut over those limits. Has that permission been granted?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—It has been refused and the applications were sent to the Colonial Secretary's office.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I asked the Colonial Secretary some time ago about them and he said they were in your hands and not yet come before the Government. Are you going to recommend that permission be not granted to those applications?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Sure.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved into a committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman. as myself and other members have a few brief remarks to make in relation to the Budget, may I suggest that the Committee rise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I concur with the suggestion to adjourn the debate on Ways and Means until eight o'clock, and, in the meantime to proceed with some other business on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It being 6.30 o'clock, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

Night Session.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8.15 o'clock.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Grimes took the chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, there is one particular point that struck me when we were referring to the estimates was the increased revenue anticipated from the Controllers Department. I anticipated that the provisions of the Liquor Bill would be in such form as to give the people enough to satisfy a normal appetite for liquor and that there was to be a curbing of drunkenness. The Government used this when they went to the the country. In certain sections Government candidates were elected thru this. In certain sections of my district individuals approached me in reference to the liquor act under the Alderdice Government and I could only answer truthfully according to the manifesto that the matter would be considered for the betterment of the people.

At first reading it seemed that the Government of to-day had intended moderation and restriction but by section five of the Act coupled with increased estimates lead me to believe that in spite of the fact that only three bottles per day are allowed, that section five is only a rider and more than three bottles will be obtained.

I will quote for the information of the House that part of the section.

(Reads)

In other words, I take it, anybody, by borrowing or collecting permits from friends, relatives or anyone, and using their own, can get up to even a dozen bottles of booze provided, of course, that the permits are not over the quota, that is, they cannot get more than three bottles on the one permit. People who do not want three bottles a week or do not drink at all, these people can procure a permit and these permits can be passed over to friends on endorsement only and the friends can get the bottles. Although the Act says they cannot be in posses-

sion of more than two bottles a day they can still go and get two bottles a day and over and above the three in the quota. I am open to correction on this particular section. This must be the case because I wondered why such a bill was brought in and I felt that my deduction was justified when I read the estimates.

What the Government had in mind when this section was put in the Act was as I said because the Minister of Finance and Customs has seen fit to increase the estimates on liquor profits from \$250,000 a year to \$350,000, or \$100,000 a year over last year. In other words the Act is so framed that further drinking is encouraged to the extent of over 40 per cent ahead of the previous year. I do not wish to pose as a prohibitionist. I am not. Like the Minister of Finance and Customs I have a particularly open mind on the matter, but I firmly believe that national prohibition is the worst curse ever imposed on any city or country. Take the United States papers of to-day, a supposedly prohibition country—take up the papers and read the headlines. All you see in every paper you pick up, Liquor Rings, Hi-jacks, Gang Warfare, I'm Alone Court Cases. That is what prohibition has proved in the world. A great big nation tried it out, and that was the result of it.

Moderation by legal restrictions, absolutely—I agree with it. That is what I thought it was when I saw the Bill for the first time—three bottles a week—that is enough for anybody. I went into it further and that is what I discovered for in section 5 you can have twenty bottles a week if you want them. That bill is nothing else but to institute a Governmental cocktail party. That is my opinion. That is the opinion of many. Moonshiners, sheebeeners are encouraged to go around collecting permits by the

thousands and storing up if they think they can get away with it. Of course they may have to lose their independence.

I want to say here now that I do not see if the Minister of Finance wanted to get further revenue, I cannot see for the life of me why he could not be open and above the board and put fifty cents a barrel on pork and beef and other articles and net the country about half a million dollars over last year. Wouldn't that be better than soaking the fishermen five hundred per cent profit on a bottle of rum. I do think the ordinary fishermen takes a drop of rum after being half-frozen and wet at sea. God knows at times he needs it. Surely about \$3.00 a year, that fifty cents imposed tax would be better for him to donate to the colony's revenue. Three dollars would not be objected to, but today if he wants a bottle of rum he has to pay about \$1.50 for something that cost the Government about 25c.

I sympathize with the Minister of Finance in his endeavour to raise money but it seems bad and is bad to capitalize. Distribute the taxes fairly, by all means, through the regular channels.

The Monroe Administration, of which nearly all the Opposition know nothing, cannot accept any responsibility. It has been blamed for expenditure of which we know absolutely nothing. We came in here, most of us, with the exception of two of this party, knowing nothing whatever about politics at all until we came out two or three months ago. We sat here and were jeered at and criticised and called hypocrites for the sins of others, I personally, came in here to try and do the best I could, knowing nothing whatever about practical politics and the first thing I got was an upper cut on one side and a bludgeon on the

other. It was not fair and not expected I can tell you that. You criticised the expenditure of the Monroe Government. Of course we can all go back and look up the records and see the expenditures of previous Governments. I find in previous years, and I looked over the records very conscientiously, that the Squires Administration left a deficit from 1920 to 1924 of about \$7,000,000. The Monroe deficit for the next four years was only \$4,272,000. Comparing the railway deficit in the same way, the Squires Government deficit was \$3,300,00, the Monroe deficit was \$2,604,000. In other words these two alone show a difference of approximately three and a half million. In other words the Monroe Administration has been criticised on the floors of this House as spending money, the like of which was never known in Newfoundland before, and still the Government of the four years prior to that spent three and a half millions more than they did and that Government is more or less represented on the Government side of the House today.

It is very easy to criticise when the figures are not before you to reiterate but these figures that I have just given you are absolutely correct. Therefore the Government had no reason whatever to come in and criticise us as the Monroe Administration and say we spent money like drunken sailors. If they cast their reflections to a few years prior to that they would realize that it would have been far better if they had said nothing at all.

The ordinary citizen works hard for his living, conscientiously pays his set quota to the state, and now he learns that people by the hundreds are given unlimited credit by the country—unlimited credit—thousands of dollars. No wonder there is a general kick; no wonder the evasion of

taxes. From the Auditor General's report I will read a few of the outstanding debts—just a few:

(Reads)

These items alone amount to about a quarter of a million dollars. I hope the Finance Minister, who has a good opportunity there, will show a clean sheet on those before his term of office is finished.

And now we have a supply bill \$425,000 over last year. Where is the retrenchment that was expected? Every day almost every bill that is put on the table of this House calls for further expenditure. Commissions are appointed—here we have one before us to-day that should be shelved. Nearly seventy per cent, I imagine, of the Government rank and file have got jobs of some kind. Increased expenditure, and that within two or three months after the Government came into power. What is going to happen during the next four years. For heaven's sake what is going to happen? I do not care, I tell you that straight. I tell everybody in this House.

I have a business of my own and I did not have to come into politics to make any money. I did not anticipate making any money out of it. The \$1,000 sessional pay that I get, if you would get four men of the Government side to do the same amount of work that I do I will donate that to these gentlemen. I have a business down there and it looks after me and the business needs to be looked after, and I am neglecting my business to come up here and sit in this House and be abused and called a hypocrite and God knows what else. Neglecting my business. I employ labour and I pay them and pay them well. Therefore I have no interest in politics. My experience in the Hon. House of Assembly so far as that it is nothing else but a mockery.

Just the other day we heard of another department being made—a job being made, that is all, a job being made—I don't care who likes it or who doesn't. I would be ashamed to sit on that side of the House and have a Bill tabled to make a job for me. Somebody's father educated him to make his way in the world as a lawyer, and has to be elected by catch cries and God knows what else, and he says he wants a job, that he cannot get out and earn his own living. I don't know what he is worth to the Government but he gets \$5,000 a year. (\$1,000 ahead of you Sir, if I was in your place I would stand up and kick.) And with that department he is going to have clerks, supernumeraries, typists and goodness knows what else. I don't know what it is going to cost. I do know it will be a great deal at any rate, but somebody is going to pay for it. And when the four years is up he will take the thing close up the book and say thank you.

Expenses, expenditures thrown ad lib.

Why, Mr. Lewis, over there, who stood up like a little man and made wise cracks at some remarks made the other day. He has reason to be satisfied for his first political picking was for \$2500 for one minor case, defending the railway commission in the Dawe case. People work for two years, and hard labor too, to try and get \$2500 and like that, in the first grab he got \$2500, and I feel sure that the fishermen will be glad to hear that and during the next four years that he will be taking that sort of action at their expense.

I would like to make brief reference to the question of road grants. The road grant for St. John's West (extern) is about \$1,700; the road grant for St. John's West (city) is \$5,400. It must be admitted that the road grant

for the city cannot be spent in the city because there are no roads to be kept up, except those that come under the jurisdiction of the Municipal Council.

Therefore, I would suggest to the Hon. Dr. Campbell that he pass that money over to the Municipal Council to be spent or, better still, as he has got a large number of unemployed men in the West End of the city and probably intends to make allocations to meet that situation, I would suggest that he spend that money on the extern roads and put his own unemployed men to work there; and, if that does not meet his views, why not divert that fund to re-condition the Southside road, which, as he knows, is in a deplorable and impassable condition.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—We spent nearly \$28,000 in your district this Winter and the newspapers criticised us for it.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Might I ask the Hon. Dr. who worked on these roads? How many of them from the extern and how many of them were in destitute circumstances?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Not all.

MR. PUDDISTER.—The road that you did from the Lunatic Asylum to the Topsail Road cost \$27,000. Mr. Bennett is talking about a different thing altogether and you know it.

MR. BENNETT.—I am talking of the \$1,700 grant that I got for the extern and it is only a timple full, so to speak, to meet the demands that are going to be made. The Hon. Dr. got \$5,400 and he has got no roads to spend it on unless he passes it over to the Municipal Council. I do not want the money myself—not a cent of it. I have no personal interest in the matter except in the interest of the people.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—What will you do for us? However, we will talk

the matter over and see the best that can be done.

MR. BENNETT.—Before resuming my seat I would impress upon the Government to put the Southside road in a decent state for the sake of the people living there. In conclusion I hope that the optimistic view of the Finance Minister in that he expects to balance his Budget next year will bear fruit.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to unduly prolong this debate or to unnecessarily delay the time of the House, because, after listening to the illuminating, comprehensive and impressive discourse of my colleague, the Hon. member for Bay de Verde, who covered so ably and so thoroughly and well the various important public matters in connection with the Budget speech, I take it that we all are anxious to carry on the remainder of the legislative business of the session with a reasonable degree of despatch. Consequently, any criticism I have to make will be brief.

The Hon. member for Bonavista South, whom I must congratulate on his splendid effort here this afternoon, was accused by a member of the Government of making a political speech. Personally, I think it was anything but a political speech. He merely took advantage of an opportune moment to air a grievance on the floors of this House and he had a perfect right to do so, and, perhaps, if it had been any other member—not excluding the member for St. Barbe—with a similar and just complaint to make, he might have been a little more aggressive and wrathful than the member for Bonavista South. Similarly, any remarks I have to make it is my privilege to point out, on behalf of my constituents who sent me here, wherein any grievance lies. It must be readily understood that, as we are at present constituted, there

are occasions when it is the duty of only one man to get up and speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

No doubt, the Finance Minister presented a fine Budget speech to the House and I hope his expectation of being able to balance his Budget next year will be realized. If he succeeds, and takes this country out of the chaotic state it is now in and put it on an even keel, I can assure him personally, as one who knows him from childhood, that I will be the first to stand up and laud him and to join in the congratulations that must be extended to him from this side of the House at next session.

Now, Sir, we all know that in the "drive" for seats last Fall when both parties did their utmost to come back with the honours we heard shouted from the house tops a great deal about the common man and more about the blue bloods, and it was conveyed to the common man in no uncertain terms that the blue bloods were living in luxurious fashion in this country at expense of the underdog. That went well and did its work effectively for the purpose for which it was intended, and the whole country knows the result. It is staring us in the face.

The Prime Minister stated at that wonderful meeting in the Star Hall that his party, if returned to power, would not be in office forty-eight hours before he would have the load and the burden taken off the poor labouring man.

Is the labouring man any better off to-day. It is true that we have had a reduction in duty on different articles which was a compromise in their promise last Fall to reduce the customs tariff on all necessities forty hours after the election. But now the Government have increased the duty on sugar. It is true that it is only a half a cent a pound, but as my Hon. friend

Mr. Puddester pointed out this afternoon, when you figure it out, it means \$160,000 tacked on to the poor man for sugar per year. That means an increase of \$80,000 on the consumption of sugar, and naturally Mr. Shopkeeper is not going to lessen his profit. He is going to put on his half cent, and it will be all charged up to the benefit of the common man and for the aggrandizement of the 'blue bloods.' Of course it is just a case of what class you are travelling in. When you are riding third class, and we know some people in history who did so, it is hard riding, hard grub and everything is hard. But you have only about a week on velvet, and then you forget all about the hard knocks and the hard meals.

Now I am very much afraid that that applies to more than one of our men in public life and to more than one man in public life to-day who made use of the much used cry "the common man," "the blue bloods" and if you like 'lounge lizards,' too. They put the duty on sugar and took it off tobacco. I presume it was meant when it was broadcasted that the duty was taken off tobacco so that the poor fishermen would have a cheap smoke. That is one of the very few comforts that the fisherman has, as well as the lumbering man and the laboring man. But I would like to be told in this House where the benefit has been derived from taking off this duty. I smoke tobacco. I cannot buy a package of tobacco one cent cheaper than I have been accustomed to buying it. It comes back to the same old story. When you took the duty off tobacco you gave it to the man who sells it. He is getting the profit as far as I can see. So here is legislation that did not help the poor man, or the underdog, but the business man. I am not quite sure just what the Minister of Finance means by a reduction on cattle, when he refers to bulls and oxen.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—It also mentions cows. Do not try to create a misapprehension.

MR. BYRNE.—And also cows, that are imported on the hoof for our markets. There is one thing I want to say, and that is that anything that the Minister of Finance has done in the way of making it cheaper for us to get good oxen or steers or cows into this country, I want to give him credit for it. And as regards bulls, if you could not prohibit the importation of bull meat altogether, by making it almost prohibitive for such firms as the Harris Abatoir, and the vendors of meat to sell it here, you would be doing a real favour to the people of this town and the country in general as far as that goes. I think there are more bulls imported into this country than to any other country in North America. And now I am going to show you where it is wrong, and if our inspectors were on the job it could not happen.

Right here I want to say that if there is one thing that the Utilities Commission can do of real benefit to the people, it will be in investigating this question of meat. There is no reason at all why, if any man goes into the meat markets, he cannot get meat that is fit to eat. It is common property that bulls have been brought in here that have been shod like horses, after being worked out in the agricultural fields of North America. Do you want to tell me that is proper inspection. Do you mean to say that if the people in authority gave any thought to the poor man this thing would be allowed. Therefore I say that in putting cheaper meats on the market, ensure that the ordinary man who goes to the meat vendor is able to buy his meat at the reduced price, but for goodness sake do not let us have a repetition of what is happening in the

case of tobacco, where the man that sells the meat is going to get the profit. And in that connection I expect and hope that the Board of Health is going to lay special stress on the great scheme that they have envolved for looking after the institutions. It is common knowledge that the very best prices are charged when this bull meat that I am talking about is unloaded on the public institutions. We have often heard it said that anything is good enough for the poor asylum or the insane asylum. And if we visit these institutions and enquire there, we will find that state of affairs there, and has pertained for years past. These are the things that I hope the Public Utilities Commission will investigate and put right.

I give you credit, Hon. Finance Minister, for reducing your duties, and I feel that you will follow up and see that the citizen gets the benefit of all such reductions. Now the Minister of Finance and customs to my mind although he is sincere and honest, and although he is convinced in his own mind that with his aggressiveness and with his knowledge that he has gained—in the first place from his experience on this side of the House, and secondly from his close study of the methods of the Government with the opportunity now before him—that he will attain to the balancing of his Budget, his ambition has an unhappy outlook. And I say this because of the fact that right here at the start of this administration, there is all kinds of loose expenditure.

My Hon. friend, the Member for Bay de Verde gave us a lengthy list of all the increases that have taken place in the public service. Although all those increases are small, yet when they are listed in the aggregate, they come to quite a handsome sum. Now I do not think that any man who knows what a

wage earner receives, is going to take the stand that any of those clerks, whose salaries the Minister of Finance has seen fit to raise, are not entitled to that raise. As a matter of fact after years of service, an increase is simply encouragement to many of those clerks. And after all encouragement for the clerks, whether in a merchantile firm or in a business, is what they want. But I am not going to weary the House by going through all those increases. I am in favour of a lot of them as far as they go, and if it was left to increases in the public service, then I would not raise an objection, because after all the increases that you gave could be easily looked after by curtailment in other directions, and savings in public works and institutions. But to carry on where Mr. Puddester left off. He only talked of increases in the salaries of public servants.

He did not tell us anything about the creation of new jobs and that, sir, to my mind in the important thing. Not alone have you gone all up and down the scale and increased wages of clerks and civil servants generally, but now we have many new appointments, and here to-day within the last forty eight hours we find an extra twenty four thousand dollars provided to be expended for increases and new jobs. I refer to the new agriculture deputy minister at four thousand dollars and five or six agricultural commissioners at I presume two thousand a year.

With all respect to Mr. Downey, I know nothing about agriculture, but I know the agriculture of this country can be looked after by Mr. Downey and Dr. Campbell if you like; and I will say this for Dr. Campbell when he was in charge he did start to look out for agriculture and certain steps were taken by him which if we are candid to-day we must say were

steps in the right direction. I say Mr. Downey and Mr. Bayley are quite capable of looking after our agricultural interests and improving the country agriculturally without taking in a new head and five new commissioners; and that won't be half the story; wait until we find out who the five commissioners will be and who the agricultural experts will be.

I understand when the Prime Minister stood up and discussed this matter on introducing the Bill that the intention was to bring down an expert from Quebec who would be able to give information to the farmers and help out our agricultural conditions, but now five or six men are looking for jobs and they are going to be found.

Then there is the Public Utilities Commission. That is going to be seven men; seven more men, Mr. Chairman, I presume at least \$4,000. Then the Tariff Commission. If I remember rightly the last Tariff Commission had ten men. I presume at the very least there are going to be ten on this.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—
No.

MR. BYRNE.—Anyway there is going to be a Tariff Commission and the Commissioners are not going to work for nothing. The point I am stressing Mr. Chairman, is not that I take any great objection to small increases in the salaries of civil servants, but I do object to tacking on large amounts to the public expenditure by the creation of new jobs; and I think the Minister of Finance and Customs is going to have a hard job to tackle in finding money for all these; and the House is not closed at all yet; this is what we are told while the House is open, but when the House is closed there is a long road to go until it opens again, and then the poor Minister of Finance will have to stand here and stand the

gaff of all the rest, and it looks as if he is going to have quite a lot to take.

Now there is another matter I want to refer to. Yesterday Dr. Campbell spoke of unemployment. I don't like to hear references to unemployment from the other side unless I feel it really means something to be done for the unemployed. I am sure every one of us here is very anxious about the working man. It is all very well if I get four or five thousand dollars I can very easily get up and shout about the poor working man and all that should be done for the common man; but I have looked out for mine first, and many a man in the Government ranks as well as the Opposition who is perhaps in the same position, is only a working man after all; and then we have got to have loud cries about the unemployed.

It is only another case of the unemployed being used. And the unemployed are being used even now, in connection with this Bill for a Woolen Factory. The introducer said it was only to help unemployment that he brought it in. That was the only reason, and brought it in as a private member, and although a few concessions might be a little on the off side he felt he was justified in doing it because of the help for the unemployed. Now when that Bill comes up I will have to take the stand that it won't give much help to our city labor. When the woolen mills were runing before they had a total number employed of one hundred, and of those only twenty were men, and those twenty men were employed as firemen, porters, packers and such other jobs for the heavy work about the place as well as in the actual factory work, so you can judge how many of the twenty were actually employed in the factory, and there were eighty girls. Now, Dr. Campbell intimated it was going to give employment to three hundred

men. He said that there were eleven hundred families in the West End that work was needed to be provided for, and then he said they would be able to reduce that one third.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I beg to correct the Hon. member I pointed out that it would give employment to girls as well as men, and the girls would bring their earnings home to the families. I said three hundred people.

MR. BYRNE.—I think you conveyed the impression of three hundred men, but anyhow take even three hundred people. The proportion of men is not going to increase twenty men per hundred because as I pointed out some of these twenty were for the heavy jobs around the factory and even if three hundred are employed now it would still only take round about twenty five men to run the place.

You say that the girls will bring home their wages, and I agree that working girls are willing to help in such cases but when you come to find out what the girls are able to bring home, as I know from investigating dole cases where girls in the families were working, you are up against the fact that the amount is inappreciable and their wages are not going to help out. I am referring to this because I consider that such references to the unemployed are merely using the unemployed.

Now, Sir, I would like to briefly refer to the Public Charities. The point was well taken by the Minister of Finance that the expenditure in connection with public charities has been a scandal, and for years past it has been and sir, I don't care who is to blame but I am saying here to-night in my honest opinion a lot of the blame is to fasten on the last Board of Health; but that is no reason why we all have to throw up our hats and expect any

great improvement from the new Board of Health. Personally here is one who is not looking for any wonders under the new Board. However, I give them the credit of going to start off with an honest endeavour and I trust that they will bring about some improvement.

I want to refer to the matter of the hospitals. Now it has been pointed out that there has been waste. We know there has been waste; and know that the Minister of Finance has put his finger on the most wasteful spot in the whole system, and personally I congratulate him and the Government on having wiped out these so-called hospitals, as he described them, round the country.

They were not only a disgrace but an absolute waste of money. But here is the point I am going to get at. We were told they were all closed and that all the hospitals that it seemed fit to the Board were going to be wiped out and that there was going to be a new hospitalisation scheme, and with the others Sudbury Hospital was wiped out, but I notice Wallis Hospital wasn't wiped out; that is still operating.

The Wallis Hospital was not wiped out, it is still going strong. What claim has the Wallis to being a first class institution? It is still going strong and Sudbury was wiped out without mercy.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Sudbury cost the Government \$17,000 a year and with the last aggregation it would probably cost \$25,000

MR. BYRNE.—I will come to that in a minute, Sir, as I said, Sudbury was treated the same way as all the other undesirable and disgraceful institutions, so-called hospitals around town. It was considered a waste of money and yet Wallis is still going strong. I would like to make a comparison in

reference to the history of Sudbury Hospital, as most members know it was originally purchased by the Government for retired soldiers and sailors who needed medical treatment for several years, when that period passed and the number was considerably reduced and it was felt that the number could be handled in the General Hospital, it was decided to close Sudbury Hospital.

If you remember many people felt that here we had an institution with first class equipment, as fine equipment as could be had this side of New York for electric treatment. You will also remember the agitation for a childrens hospital and many people felt that we had great need for a children's hospital, as there were many underprivileged children both here and in the outports who would make capital citizens if there was some hospital where they could get treatment, which they would get if they lived in some large city on the Mainland. I will now tell the House how Sudbury Children's Hospital came to be started. As I said, the agitation for a children's hospital being on, Toc H, to which I have the privilege and decided on action. For the information of the House I may say that Toc H is spread thruout the British Empire and any man who has a desire to help his fellow man or improve the community may join, and every man is subject to a 'jobmaster' and by his very bond, when he is told to do a job he does it to the best of his ability and his light is hid under a bushel, so to speak. We never advertise. As I was saying this institution was about to be closed and our organization felt the need for a childrens hospital and we decided that there was a chance to do something for the community at large.

We had a contract with the Government for the use of this building and equipment and we undertook to run a

childrens hospital on the understanding that all the poor children who were charity cases should be transferred to Sudbury Hospital and come under our care. Each and every child cost \$2.50 a day as against \$4.00 at the General, and \$3.00 at the Grace. Well the Government made a contract with us and altogether we moved 23 children from the public institutions and made room for general cases. One of the advantages of Sudbury is that we were able to relieve the General Hospital of the great majority of the children cases. We went around and collected \$2,300.00 from the charitably disposed people of this city and started what is known as the Sudbury Hospital. Well we carried on for practically one year. I forgot to add that in the contract the Board appointed by Toc H was at the expiration of the year to have an option of carrying on for another year. I would like to repeat that statement, the Sudbury Hospital had the option of carrying on for another year. We carried on and when it came to one month of the time for expiration we wrote the Government through the Attorney General and notified them that the year was drawing to a close, in other words asked them if they would give us their support again. We got no answer, we wrote again and got a reply from the Department of the Colonial Secretary which showed that the Executive Council was not aware of the conditions, that we had a contract and had an option of carrying on for another year and we got a letter telling us that for these reasons the Government could not go on for another year, if the Governor in Council had known that we had a contract it would not have written in this vague manner.

However, Sudbury Hospital was closed. It is said that Sudbury cost the Government twenty-five to thirty-five thousand to run every year, well as a

matter of fact according to my figures we had a total revenue of \$26,082.72, take off that total revenue \$2,300.00 donated and since handed back. Take off what the Government claims and it comes down to \$23,372.00 and I claim that what we got from the Government was \$17,500.00. The Government paid \$17,500.00 for the treating of charity cases at \$2.50 per day while if they were at the General they would cost \$4.00 per day and at the Grace \$3.00 per day. I say it is unfair to us and unfair to the children, now they have to pay \$4.00 per day, double what it would cost if Sudbury had remained open, if we have nothing else to our credit we at least saved the Government \$2.00 per day per child. Without boasting, I say that we put the children through at \$2.50 per day and you as a Government could not do so anywhere else at the same rate.

Now that is not all the story. The Government also told us that another of the reasons why we must close down was that we had eighty thousand dollars investment belonging to the Government for which we only paid one dollar per year. This is true but let me point out that during the time we had it we spent one thousand one hundred and sixty dollars and fifty cents in repairs plus X-ray equipment to the value of five hundred and eighty eight dollars and it cost in replacements two hundred and fifty four dollars. That is two thousand and three dollars, disregarding the cents, that we spent on Government property and I think that is pretty fair. It was something that we attempted for the public benefit and of handling the Government property entrusted to us. But, Sir, we do not admit that it was worth eighty thousand dollars and I am going to tell you that if you are counting on that property being an asset to the value of eighty thousand dollars you are certainly being misled.

It is in no way worth eighty thousand dollars and if the Government realize one quarter of that amount they will be fortunate.

If the Government paid eighty thousand dollars for it there was some graft or something rotten. We must remember that the man mentioned by Mr. Hollis Walker as the mystery man was concerned in this. This was Mr. Collishaw who brings in a bill before this House. All that he did was to go up and see Mrs Thompson and arrange the sale and he undoubtedly got paid for it. I know that to be a fact so after all perhaps you will find that the Hospital did cost eighty thousand dollars but it does not represent anything like that amount.

The point that I want to make it that it was closed down. I am only talking on this subject because it was a very ill advised step on the part of the Government because members of the Board are not in a position to talk for themselves, and I speak because that Board feels that in spite of any reasons given by the Government that, as it is put, they were politically hostile in their political beliefs. There is reason to believe that if the personality of the committee had been different that it would not have been closed down and that the Government would not have made the mistake of closing it down. The honorable member for Fortune Bay will realize before the year is out that it would have been much better for this Government to have given us the consideration or the courtesy of asking us to carry on until this new Board was in a position themselves to initiate the new childrens hospital, which I know they are going to do at some future day.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the Hon. gentleman who is speaking until he is finished and I kept silent until he men-

tioned me personally but the gentleman has just made a very grave and a very broad statement in regard to the closing down of Sudbury Hospital. That amounts to a charge that the Board of Health including myself have denied the children of this city and that through political reasons Sudbury Hospital is now closed down.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I have no charge to make against him whatsoever. I am merely stating the way the Board felt about it. I do not intend to make any charge against you.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. gentleman has stated definitely that he makes no charge whatsoever against the Hon. member for Fortune Bay and I believe that should be sufficient.

MR. BYRNE.—However, what we felt about it does not matter now. But I was saying that the step taken by the Government was a very ill advised one and I will tell you why. I feel confident that in that Hospital the treatment the children received there was the best that could be afforded in this country. And I am not saying that because I was attached to the Board that was running it but the doctors say it also not to speak of the parents. There were some thirty-six beds, ten for adults and the balance for children ranging from two months up to thirteen years of age. We had children with ricketts, tubercular bones, malnutrition and all sorts of childrens complaints. The place was run economically and scientifically and we took care that the nurses were highly trained especially for children.

I do not think it is a boast when I say that the General Hospital or any other could give the treatment that was given there. In one sweep the children were scattered and that is

where it ended. They have been placed where it is most convenient but where ever they are tonight they are not receiving the treatment they received in Sudbury Hospital. And it was closed down and the Wallace Hospital still goes merrily on. And some of the children are down in the Wallace Hospital and I am going to say in the handling of those children, and it is a strong word to use, I feel there was carelessness in moving those children from the Sudbury Hospital to the Wallace Hospital. Do you know that in the running of that institution so far from being a burden to this Government of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars, the institution was receiving the free services of twelve medical practitioners of this town, one dentist and a tonsolitis and adenoid specialist and the free service of a womans committee who supplied clothes. Now where are you going to get any branch of group who will give such service for nothing.

That is what you cleaned up together with these Rest Houses. That is why I considered it wrong. Because, why? Because it was felt that we did not own the Sudbury Hospital, a first class economical institution, that should not come within the control of the new Board, and, Sir, if we had been permitted to effect a purchase or been allowed grants we would not be under the control of the new Board but we would have given good returns.

I might inform you, Sir, that after running this hospital for one year—and we know no more about hospitals than the Mace in the House does—personally I know nothing about it—we have ran the hospital for a year and here is this \$9,334.00 net profit in the Bank, and mind you we were running it at \$2.50 per day and the nine men who served their time on that Board did not enter it to make any money.

As a matter of fact no one was more surprised than ourselves when we found the money creeping up to our credit. The institution was surely doing the work and it was greatly needed.

But, Sir, I am not saying this because the Hospital is closed, but I am saying it because this is the truth that I am stating and I wish every man here to believe that it is the truth, we were going to devote that profit we have now to the promotion and improvement of the Hospital institution. We were going to help the Government by reducing the \$2.50 we were charging, and we hoped if we thought we could do it we were prepared besides to still further reduce the cost of poor children, pauper cases. We had no wish to make money and were quite satisfied with the work we had done. We had made \$9,000 and we were wondering what we were to do with it. We did not think that we would have a profit and we were going to present at to the Government; and the answer is to-day, having paid the \$2300 to the good friends who gave the money to us on credit, we now have a balance of about \$8,000 on hand. That is devoted to some charitable institutions, and I suppose it will go to the Child Welfare or something else.

Now, if we never did anything else, Mr. Chairman, we did this much. We showed that an institution can be run in this country with a profit and in running a hospital you can run it on economical lines. We have gone a long way to disprove what has been held for the last quarter of a century that you cannot run a Government institution at a profit, and the proof of it is in this statement here that \$9,000 has been made. And we feel that if we have done nothing else we have demonstrated to this Government that you only have to cut out the loose ex-

penditure that pertains to those institutions and get a closer grip on the thing and do as we have done, eliminate patronage, and you get the best results for the least money and for the benefit of the country.

Now, Sir, when I rose to my feet I intended to refer briefly to this. I am sorry if I have gone to any length, but, Sir, speaking about Sudbury Hospital permit me yet to give a statement of the way we felt about this, we entered into this work of the institution after all without any hope of reward but just in the sense of doing something for the improvement of the country. We carried on for a year, but I would make this statement before I sit down, and that is that in that Hospital every man reported back. The men who assisted us have been put out of a job. They will carry on but they are now out of a job.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to state this to the Prime Minister, that I feel that the Prime Minister is sincere when he states that public expenditure had to be cut down, and that the Minister of Finance is also sincere in this matter, but let me make this statement to the Prime Minister—this proposition is mine, I have not even discussed it with them, but I know the kind of men I am talking about and feel safe in making the proposition—I know it is the desire of the House today to curtail expenditure. Our Board, the Sudbury Hospital Board is by no means composed of men who have learned and had experience, but have only learned for one year at Sudbury Hospital and proved their worth there and showed that they were able to economically run the hospital and put away a balance, and at Sudbury Hospital they learned quite a number of things and found what was wrong in the other institutions.

Now, Sir, again, the Government wants to save money, the Government

wants to reduce the money spent in the public institutions, and Mr. Chairman I make the Prime Minister this offer and I am not doing it for effect either. Our Board is out of a job but they are perfectly willing and they will back me up in this. If you want to save money—without training and inexperienced as they are—our Board is willing to take over the hospitals—all of them, the Poor Asylum and the like, and run them for a year and guarantee a reduction of twenty per cent when the year is up and will guarantee also to hand to you a hospitalization scheme that will be workable and a credit to this town.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the subject that has been handled by the Hon. member for St. John's East dates back considerably before my experience with public health matters generally or Sudbury Hospital particularly. I can only speak in respect of the experience that I have had since going into the Health Department as Chairman of the Board, but even the limited knowledge that I have gained in that time has given me cause to state that either the Hon. gentleman who has just spoken is ignorant of some of the facts of the case or else speaks under a misunderstanding.

The first time the Sudbury Hospital matter was brought to my attention was when the Governor in Council referred the case of the institution to a Select Committee of Council consisting of the Hon. Colonial Secretary and myself. We met a deputation from the organization that was operating Sudbury Hospital. We took up with them the matter of the agreement under which they had been operating, an agreement made by Order in Council of the previous Government; an agreement which they asked be renewed for an additional year.

Briefly, the points covered by that agreement were these. First, that the expensive plant and equipment known as Sudbury Hospital, originally costing approximately \$80,000, and still certainly sufficient in the way of equipment to run a first class hospital, was placed at the disposal of the Sudbury Organization at the nominal charge of \$1.00 per year. In the next place this agreement provided that the Organization was to be paid at the rate of \$2.50 per day per patient treated in the hospital. In the third place it provided that the Government was to place in the institution all patients of the class treated by that hospital as and when such cases were available. That was the tenor of the agreement.

Now as to the expense of the Government, during the nine months of operation of that hospital by the Organization known as Toc H, it was maintained very largely, almost completely, at Government expense. Eighty five per cent of the cases were paid for by the Government. In the first place during the last year when all the operations and expenses of Sudbury were paid by the Government purely and simply, for the twelve months of Government control the total cost of that institution for treatment of all types of cases whatsoever was \$17,000. Then came the change of control. For the nine months during which Sudbury Hospital was operated under Toc H management the accounts of the Board of Health show the actual cost to the Board of Health, these accounts, available to the House, if required to be tabled, show that the nine months cost to the Government of the establishment in question was \$25,300.00. That was the money actually paid to its Toc H management. More than that, Mr. Chairman, where the agreement called for a per capita charge per day of \$2.50, the actual cost per capita was \$2.75, because not

only was the ordinary treatment charged for but so were the operations and the operations that were charged averaged at the rate of 25c per capita per day.

It is obvious, therefore, that the Hon. gentleman who just sat down was in error when he stated that the cost to the Government of the institution during its period of operation, covering nine months, was \$17,000 and in the form of fees only. As a matter of fact, and as I have already stated, such costs amounted to over \$25,000 during the period of nine months, representing not only the fees set under the agreement but operation charges in addition.

The Hon. gentleman was further in error when he stated that Sudbury Hospital was treating juvenile cases at \$2.50 per day when all other institutions were charging for such cases from \$3.00 a day to \$5.00 a day. That is not correct. As far as I can learn from the accounts of the Board of Health the general treatment of children at the Grace Hospital has never cost higher than \$2.00 per day and, as a matter of fact, the average cost for all such cases to my knowledge and as far as I can remember from the records at the Board of Health has never been over \$1.50 per day.

Now at the conference held between the sub-committee of Executive Government and the management of Sudbury Hospital we discussed the high cost of the nine months of operation by Toc H representatives, which we pointed out, and when these gentlemen admitted a surplus for nine months of \$9,000 made on Government account, made at the expense of the Government, obtained from the revenue of the country, we suggested to these gentlemen that before the Government could begin to discuss a renewal of

the agreement for one year or any period they should be prepared to reduce their charges very materially. As a philanthropic organization, seeing the Government was paying for practically all the cases in the hospital, seeing there was no anxiety to make profits for the management, we contended the institution should be run as near to cost as possible, and we claimed it was very obvious that when a surplus of that amount could be piled up in nine months the Government had paid a good deal more than necessary and the charge should be much less than the set \$2.50 or the actual \$2.75 that was being paid.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that you did not give us a chance to reduce it. We were going to.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—The Executive Government Sub-Committee pointed out the facts just related to the two gentlemen who met us in the Colonial Secretary's office and urged that these two gentlemen should go back to their Board of Directors and should suggest to them that fees could be and should be graded down to a much less figure than \$2.50 per day patient before the Government could consent to bind itself to use Sudbury or any one other Hospital exclusively, particularly when Sudbury patients could be treated in just as up-to-date a manner, just as scientifically and just as efficiently in other institutions in the city, and at far less cost than was charged at Sudbury.

I think that was an absolutely fair and public-spirited stand to take. The Government allowed the free use of the medical equipment and surgical appliances to Sudbury and the Government were prepared to facilitate the treatment of children at that institution on the same basis as they would be prepared to facilitate the

treatment of child cases at any other institution of equal standing and of equal merit, but the Government refused to tie itself up to Sudbury and give that institution a monopoly, because, in the first place there is another institution ready to treat patients just as efficiently and more economically than Sudbury; in the next place they are planning and undertaking the building of an annex to their present building to be used exclusively as a Children's Hospital, where they have specialists trained for the care of children, and they are ready to quote us a lower rate even than \$2.00 per day on the average for the treatment of child cases; and in the next place the Government has commissioned a body of gentlemen to investigate all public health matters and provide for centralization of treatment for juveniles where children needing proper nourishment, or skilled medical or surgical treatment shall have it and where more efficient and more economical administration will be carried on, in marked contrast to the excessive figure charged at Sudbury.

The Hon. member for St. John's East has repeatedly said that the Government closed down Sudbury Hospital. The Government did nothing of the kind. The organization operating Sudbury closed it down of their own volition. That Hospital was closed down because the Government would not give them anything and everything they asked for, and, if, as the Hon. gentleman has insinuated, any spite was manifested, it was not manifested by the Government nor by any organization representing the Government. The Sub-Committee that I referred to pointed out the difficulties in the way of an unreserved renewal of the agreement and pointed out reasonably and fairly the position, as we saw it, that was certain to develop. Sud-

bury ignored our suggestions altogether held their meeting and decided to close down themselves. There was no pressure brought to bear upon them by the Government. The Government did not meet the full demands of their directors, because that would be unfair to the public and unfair to the other hospitals.

The Hon. member for St. John's East made a sneering and unfair remark to the effect that the Wallis Hospital and the Field Hospital continue to operate under Government control while the Sudbury Hospital is closed down. That was most unjust and I think was designed to have a most pernicious and misrepresentative effect. The Government has made all possible haste to close down objectable institutions—two in the East End of the city are already closed and the proprietors of the two remaining institutions with most of their beds unfilled, are besieging us to take our patients out. Naturally, it takes considerable time to complete such reforms when a multitude of other office duties have to be attended to. We are having an Infirmary prepared at the Poor Asylum to receive and take care of the patients as they come from the temporary hospitals. We are carrying on this work with all possible haste and we expect to complete our preparations in about a week. About the end of next week the Wallis and Field Hospitals will have been evacuated of patients who will be put in the Poor Asylum Infirmary.

When the Hon. member for St. John's East gives or seeks to create the impression that we gave preference over Sudbury Hospital to the Wallis and Field Hospitals he is endeavouring to create a misapprehension and a misunderstanding of the whole subject.

As far as the Board of Health is concerned and the subsidiaries of that

Board are concerned, their public activities have been faithfully and fearlessly carried out. It would be unethical and unprofessional to take such an attitude of curtailment of hospital services for political motives as has been insinuated or suggested. The high standard of the medical profession would not countenance such discriminatory practices where human beings, young or old, require medical and surgical treatment. We have dealt squarely with Toc H and everybody else, and we are endeavouring to get the administration of public health affairs on a sound, economical and efficient basis.

We cannot perform miracles in a day, but we are making such haste as we can with our endeavours to discover solutions for the problems that presented themselves to us when we came into office. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have spoken along these lines is because it is the line of thought and appeal adopted by the Hon. member for St. John's East and is also the line reported to me to have been followed by some prejudiced people outside this House and it is a line that is utterly unfair and entirely at variance with the facts of the case or the motives that actuated what has happened. I think, sir, that it is only fair to the Government and to those connected with public health matters to make this plain and unvarnished statement to the House this evening.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to create any heated debate over this matter, but I repeat again that Sudbury Hospital was practically closed down by the Government and the Hon. member for Fortune Bay knows it. The Government agreed to give to Sudbury the charitable cases of children, who would otherwise go to other institutions and you know, sir, they were not

going there from the time the agreement expired.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—How do you know that?

MR. BYRNE.—Because it was intimated by yourself to Mr. LeMessurier, Mr. Crawford and Dr. Knight. This is the Sub-Committee you are referring to.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—No such statement was made by me at that conference or anywhere else. The representatives of the management were told that if Sudbury were prepared to charge less than \$2.75 per day and to match costs with other equally equipped and equally efficient institutions, the Government would be only too pleased to use their hospital accommodation, as and when patients were available.

MR. BYRNE.—I am sorry I have not the correspondence, which, I think, will prove that I am right. Our letter to the Government, the Government's letter to us and our letters to you cover the whole ground. Perhaps, my Hon. friend might be able to look up the correspondence and produce it here. I think it will be found that my statement will be borne out that Sudbury Hospital was closed out not by a direct act of the Government or the Board, but just as effectively in that you refused to carry on under the terms of the agreement.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—I wish the Hon member would qualify his statement, to accord with the actual fact, which is that the Government refused a monopoly of treatment to the Sudbury institution at a higher price than is charged at any other such institution of equal standing and specialising in the care of children.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on the subject matter now before the House. I heard it said here

a few days ago that what Newfoundland wants in order to take her out of the financial mess in which she finds herself to-day is the starting of some new industries. Well, we all know, that we have some new industries already and, no doubt, they are helping the unemployed and the revenue of the country to some extent; but we must not forget our one great industry—the fisheries.

I think the fishery is the one industry that, unfortunately, we hear least about in this House or outside this House. I would like to point out that this industry is the backbone of this country and it must get the encouragement it deserves if this country is expected to get out of the rut in which she has drifted. It was the codfishery that put Newfoundland on the map hundreds of years ago, but, due to the apathy and indifference shown by past Governments, this industry has been on the wane, and it needs to be revived and looked after properly if Newfoundland is to take its place in the future in the march of progress.

I notice that last year the exports from this country amounted to thirty-three millions of dollars, eighteen of which was derived from iron ore and paper and pulp, etc., and fifteen millions were the products of the fisheries. Now, we all know that a large amount of that fifteen million dollars went into our revenue, whilst only a small portion of the money from the other industries found its way there. While on this matter I may add that it is a very sad comment to make that so many of our young men have given up the codfishery within the past ten or twelve years.

If this country goes on as it has been going with all our young men leaving the fishery and going into paper making, and lumbering etc., in the next fifteen or twenty years, there

will be no more fishery. Now, I think that there should be something done by way of inducing our young men to go back to the fishery. We know, of course, that these different industries have helped the unemployed to a certain extent in this country. They have to earn their living, and if they cannot earn enough to support themselves here they are compelled to go abroad and seek their living in other countries. But every season we see, down around Fortune Bay in particular, hundreds leaving Newfoundland and going to Lunenburg to help prosecute the fishery there. That is certainly very queer.

With our great fishery these men have still to leave this country and go to the neighbouring Dominion and help Canada to keep prosperous by producing codfish in that country. I think that it is very hard to understand how this is brought about, but when the fishery commission starts to function, perhaps, it will look into that and see why these things are going on in a fishing country. As regards the inferior quality and cure of fish sometimes seen in this country, I believe that to a large extent it is practically the fault of the merchants. For instance; a fisherman brings along a consignment of codfish, which is of a good quality, well made, and thoroughly cured, and he received the best price. Now, along comes another man with a cargo of inferior fish and receives the same price as did the man who sold the good quality, and if he can't get the high price from one fish buyer he takes it to another and generally ends up by receiving the top notch price for the inferior fish. And now I ask what encouragement is that to give a man that is trying to produce a good article. He says, why should I labor to produce good fish, when my next door neighbour is being

paid as good a price for his carelessly made article.

I think that as long as the merchants are satisfied to take any old make of fish you will never have any better in this country than you have at the present time. To me the curing of codfish is a very important item in the fish business of Newfoundland. In the first place the fishermen should be given to understand that from the time that the codfish comes out of the water until it is ready for market it should be treated as an article of food. It should be washed thoroughly, and handled and salted properly, and left the correct time in salt, and then washed again, and receive every attention in drying. The fishermen of this country use the sun-drying method and have to contend with the elements to a large extent. Still, I have known people in this country who, no matter if the weather be good or bad, always make good fish, and other people under similar weather conditions made bad fish.

Now, I am not a member of a firm that exports fish direct but I have a good idea of what the foreign markets want and I think that when fish is exported from this country there should be some kind of system whereby that fish would be branded as number one cure or number two, so that our customers would know in advance what kind of fish they will get. This would increase the confidence of the buyer in dealing with our country. Now, another thing that I would like to point out is that the price of fish is based on supply and demand. We cannot regulate the price of fish as was proved a few years ago but a certain amount of good can be effected by a closer cooperation and the regulation of shipments to foreign markets. In other words, the dumping of a large quantity of fish in any one market should be done away with, and I am sure that

this could be accomplished if the merchants got together and studied the subject more closely. So much for that.

In the last few years we have experienced a big increase in the fish business, especially in salmon. You see vast quantities of salmon being exported from this country to foreign markets. I have often thought "Why cannot lots of other different kinds of fish be exported in the same way."

Now, take for instance the lobster. That is a fishery that I am interested in to a certain extent. The lobster fishery here some four years ago had a close season. I am not sure of the figures with regard to the quantity exported before the close season, but I think it was seven thousand cases. That year fishermen received in the vicinity of twenty five or twenty six dollars a case for lobsters. That was a very good price, and helped the lobster fishermen to get a good living. I do not think that we should ever have had a close season, for experience has proven that we lost our markets during the three years we weren't catching, and last year when the season opened up again we couldn't find our old customers, they had drawn their supplies from our competitors.

We were all expecting a big thing in the lobster fishery last year. I was one of those who anticipated better results than what really happened. Lobsters were very plentiful. No doubt, in some cases, owing to the fishermen trying to handle more than they were accustomed to handling, they were not packed in the best way. The Fishery Board that handled the lobster fishery the year before last recommended that sanitary cans be used in the packing of lobster. I, myself, am a member of a firm that has been packing and exporting lobsters for the past forty odd years. We made up lob-

ster tins and always stood behind the quality of these packages. We had no trouble with them whatever. They were hand soldered.

Last year when we started in the lobster business we made about two thousand cases and I thought on account of the Fishery Board's recommending that sanitary cans be used we bought the balance of our requirements in St. John's. I am not in a position to say whether the cans were faulty or whether the closing machine was at fault, or whether it was the inexperience of the fishermen in using same that caused the trouble.

As to the two thousand that we made, there was not the least trouble about the pack. I know one instance of three men that packed one hundred and fifty odd cases last year using our tins. These men were always good packers and their pack was taken on their own merits, and only seven blown tins were reported. I think that is as good a record as any can made in the world today. Now as regards the Sanitary can, I know two fishermen that packed together under one license. They packed about sixty cases and dumped forty cases before they reached the markets at all and of the twenty cases that they sold I do not know if ten cases of these lobsters were any good. If that thing goes on long, there won't be one tin that you will be able to call No. 1. That is the experience of last year with the sanitary can. This year we made quite a lot of our own time, as in past years. Sanitary Cans to a certain extent are being imported now as the imported article of last year gave good satisfaction.

As to the outlook of the market, at the moment it is far from promising and I often wonder why there cannot be some way of shipping live lobsters into Canada and the United States. I

know that you can ship boiled lobster in ice, but there does not seem to be much demand for them that way. But I am certain that if something comes our way to enable us to export a portion of our lobster catch in the live state, it is going to be the making of our lobster industry, and will enhance the price all around.

Now, it is not only lobster. We have other kinds of fish in this country that can be handled in this way, and it is my firm belief that if we have to depend on the fishery in this country, then, something will have to be done to ship the fish to the markets in a fresh state.

Now, I am not going to speak much longer but there is one thing that I want to say, and that is, that when this fishery commission starts to function I trust that it will look into all those things very carefully and that they will endeavour to find some way whereby the fishing industry of Newfoundland can be put in a much better condition than we find it at the present time. My firm belief is that this great industry that we have to-day, if properly looked after, will be the solution of all our financial difficulties, and I am sure that when the Fishery Board takes up its duties, and gives to the fish industry the attention that it should have, Newfoundland will become a prosperous country and the Minister of Finance will have no difficulty to balance his Budget.

MR. TOBIN.—Mr. Chairman, having listened to so many speeches in connection with the Budget I do not propose to delay the House at any length whatsoever. I have listened to the Budget Speech so ably delivered by the Hon. P. J. Cashin, the Minister of Finance and Customs, and after hearing that speech one would imagine that the late Finance Minister was the only one who ever brought down a deficit.

A great number have been brought down year after year since 1898.

During the administration of the Liberal Reform Government 1919 to 1923 the deficits amounted to \$5,664,308. During the administration of the Monroe Government, 1924 to 1928, the deficits amounted to \$4,609,077.41. In other words the deficits under the Liberal Reform Government were greater than those under the Monroe Government by \$1,005,230.59. In 1919 there was a surplus brought down here by the then Finance Minister the late Sir Michael Cashin, and in 1919 we all know quite well the Liberal Reform Government led by Sir Richard Squires was returned to power and assumed control of this country under conditions such as no other Prime Minister had for years past.

The Finance Minister has told us that during the years practically since the Monroe Administration came to power that year after year deficits were brought down without any hesitation. He also tells us quite frankly in his statement that he expects a deficit next year, by 1931 he hopes to be in a position to balance the Budget, and I hope he will and if he does I will be one of the first to congratulate him on it. What I am going to say now applies not only to this Government but to every Government that will come after. If the Government were more anxious to practise economy by seeing that they got 100 cents value for every dollar spent conditions would be much better than they are at the present time. We are getting into a habit of dealing with thousands and millions of dollars as if a mere bagatelle, and we go on with large expenditure and increasing expenditure without any regard to the future. I think the time has come when we should try and break away from this. And the Finance Minister told us in

his Budget that the national debt practically amounts to \$78,000,000 and another loan will be taken within the next few months of six million that will practically bring it up to \$84,000,000, and he said of that debt there was due to the railway over thirty three millions of it together with twelve and three quarter millions for war purposes which brings it practically up to \$46,000,000. In other words the biggest part of our debt is brought about through the railway. There may be a few perhaps one, perhaps two, members of the present House, who are responsible for that big railway debt. What brought the big railway debt on this country? We all remember when Sir Robert Bond was defeated in 1909. What happened? After that branch railway after branch railway was built with the result to-day as the Finance Minister pointed out we have a huge debt attributable to the railway.

The Hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester, stated the other night, that we should try if possible to retire the indebtedness of Newfoundland by making a sinking fund, a certain amount being put aside towards its retirement every year. I would like to ask the Finance Minister or any other member of the House whether Newfoundland was ever in a position to begin this retirement or funding of her debt. Would the Finance Minister answer that question?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Yes.

MR. TOBIN.—I am going to quote the figures of a man who occupied the seat of the Finance Minister and who to my mind takes second place to nobody in connection with the compiling of figures. Sir Michael Cashin in 1921 stated:

(Reads)

Mr. Puddester, the Hon. member for Bay de Verde stated last night that

Canada had a debt of \$2,333,835,000 or thereabouts and Canada proposed to wipe out that debt in the short space of 45 years by putting aside each year an amount of \$20,000,000 at 4% and has the Finance Minister just said Newfoundland has been in a position to start the retirement of her debt and his late father stated in his speech in the Hansard that I have just read that he left \$4,000,000 in the Treasury. Surely the incoming Government should have been in a position to take at least a million and a half and put it away for a rainy day, and as the years went on probably we would be in a position to put other amounts aside. The Finance Minister is better acquainted with figures than I am and if he could put a million aside each year and make both ends meet he could see how long it would take to bring our debt down. As I said before I hope and trust that the Finance Minister when he comes back here in 1931 will be able to show us that he is not only able to make both ends meet but that he will have a surplus.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, there is one other matter I want to refer to as this is the first chance I have had of clearing myself. I have here the Liberal Press of January 26, 1929. We heard a lot about rum yesterday. I am sorry we didn't hear more about it to-night. I want to read an extract from this paper:

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, that article says that rum came consigned to an agent. That rum did not come consigned to an agent. It refers to the representative who contested St John's East Extern. That did not come consigned to me. I never had an agent come from the other side. He came on his own volition; not mine.

The statement that the Government Analyst found that rum unfit for human consumption is not correct.

I will read this communication in connection with the rum.

(Reads)

And furthermore, I would like to tell the House that that order was dated May 8th, 1928.

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, I have waited for this opportunity to speak in connection with this rum business and now I would like to ask the Board of Liquor Control what was stamped on the fifty puncheons that came in in May and the fifty that came in in June. You will find that B.L.C. was stamped on them. And I would like to tell the House that all my actions were above board and all my transactions with people in Liverpool were clean, Mr. Chairman, I never saw an invoice that went to the Board of Liquor Control and I think that it is only fair that you give me the same publicity that you did in January. I don't want to delay this House any longer but I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister to give me the same publicity in connection with this as he did early in January, it is only right and I think that I deserve it.

MR. SKANES.—Mr. Chairman, It was not my intention to address the House at this stage. Being a junior member I deem it wise to be a good listener and to learn from the speeches which are made by my more experienced colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's East (Extern) seems to be so disturbed over some questions I had put on the Order Paper this afternoon, I rise to make a few remarks and to assure the Hon. member that the information sought by me is in the public interest, and no matter how distasteful the information may be my friends on the Opposition benches must swallow the pill.

The member for Bonavista South, Mr. Quinton, this afternoon made some

nasty insinuations against the Hon. member for Twillingate; Mr. K. M. Brown. Those remarks were made when Twillingate's worthy representative was not in his seat, he having been called out of town on urgent business. If Mr. Brown were in his place in this House, I question very much whether the Bonavista South member would have made this uncalculated for and indecent attack on a man whose sterling qualities are well known, not only to members of this House, but throughout the country.

As a representative of the labouring classes I say without fear of contradiction K. M. Brown does not fear the cheap talk of Mr. Quinton or any other Opposition member, but I could not hold a seat and allow such silly twaddle to go on record without saying a word in reply.

It is quite true that he receives a wage as labor Commissioner; but the job that he fills is a very necessary one, particularly so as it applies to the logging industry of this country. The consistent part that Mr. Brown has played as the workingman's friend in and out of this Legislature will be remembered and appreciated when the long-winded speeches of his critic, Mr. Quinton are forgotten.

Just on the eve of the General Election I was asked if I would become a candidate for St. Barbe, my native district. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I was glad of that offer to become a Candidate for the Liberal Party under the Leadership of Sir Richard Squires. I immediately resigned my job as Travelling Mail Clerk and came to St. John's to consult my Leader. Within a few days I was in the district and am pleased to say that loyal old St. Barbe returned me as its representative with a substantial majority.

I well realize, Sir, my short comings in parliamentary usage, but I hope to

make up for this by practical effort and personal service in the interest of St. Barbe in particular and the country generally. I may say Mr. Chairman, that I worked on the Postal Service for nine years and I have a very good idea of the workings of that Department. I may say here and now that the Travelling Mail Clerk is poorly paid. I think both Government and Opposition members will agree that a man who crosses the country as Mail Clerk in all kinds of weather, who is on his feet between here and Port aux Basque, from thirty six to forty hours should get a decent wage. In my opinion the first clerk should get \$140 per month, the second \$120 and the third \$110. I have lived and worked with the men whose cause I now plead. While the influence or vote of the Travelling Mail Clerk may have little to do with my political future, I promise them, Sir, that while I occupy a seat in this House no occasion shall be allowed to pass when Walter Skanes shall not be on deck to see that the Travelling Mail Clerk is paid a salary which will be just and fair for the work he is called upon to do. I think the Minister of Posts will agree with me in the claim I put forth on behalf of the Travelling Mail Clerks.

There is another and more serious matter to which I want to draw the attention of this House. During my canvass of the district, I found that my opponent, Mr. Quinton, (a namesake, and I think a relative of the member for Bonavista South who is making all the noise over expenditure of public moneys) authorized the expenditure of some \$500.00 for public works. The men engaged took Mr. Quinton's word for it and did the work as directed, That \$500.00 is still owed to the men in St. Barbe; \$300.00 is owed to Wm. Roberts of Sally's Cove; \$200.00 to Stephen Taylor of Bonne

Bay and \$25.00 to Thomas Decker of Baker's Brook.

Evidently the Tory slush fund did not go far enough to cover this illegal transaction. I have already brought this barefaced attempt to buy up votes in St. Barbe to the attention of the Executive Government in the hope that the men who did this work in good faith will get their money. I have my own opinion what ought to be done with the gentlemen who so prostituted their offices during the Alderdice-Monroe Tory rule for three months. I hope this Government will take all necessary steps to let the people know the full extent to which the "Moral Issue" in so far as fleecing the taxpayers of Newfoundland was used to keep Toryism and Corporate greed in office.

Just one other point occurs to me in passing. My hon. friend, Mr. Puddester member for Bay de Verde, thought it was too late to continue longer last night, but I think I am right in the guess that although exhausted by his onerous duties here he was anxious to get down to the Daily News office and assist the various political scribes under his control, to concoct the Tory propaganda for this day's issue of that paper. I will say this much for Mr. Puddester, he tries to be fair and square, even if he does get heated up sometimes. Trying to lead that bunch of political juveniles over there is an excuse for Mr. Puddester, but he is a fast master at the political game. The District of Bay de Verde knows that and I am sure that Hon. members on this side of the House do not take Mr. Puddester seriously when he tells us how good the Tories were and how bad he fears the Liberals are going to be.

Mr. Chairman, one other matter concerning a constituent of mine, I wish to call attention to, it concerns the G.W.V.A. or rather the Pensions

Board. I say, Sir, the district of St. Barbe has not been treated fairly with regard to the men it sent overseas. You have a man down in that Pensions Board who turned down a man who gave his services overseas. This \$2,700.00 Official turned down a recommendation of mine when I wanted to bring a man here for medical attention. I refer to George Harding of Bonne Bay. He cannot work and has a wife and family. But, Mr. Chairman, if I can do it as representative of St. Barbe, George Harding is coming on to St. John's and will be given his Board examination, and receive the Pension he is entitled to like every other ex-service man.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed my Hon. friend Mr. Emerson laughed when I referred to questions I had asked this afternoon. He does not know what to think of them. His legal mind falters when he tries to size up the poor illiterate representative of St. Barbe. Might I remind the Hon. member, "he laughs best who laughs last." This is my maiden speech. I have I am sure the good will of the House, despite the smiling Mr. Emerson's superior talent. On opening day, if I remember rightly, the Leader of the Opposition said that there were hungry mouths on this side to be fed; all I have to say there is a thirsty crowd on the other side, all they talk about is whiskey, yesterday's overdose I hope has quenched their thirst. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not delay the House further, I am neither a lawyer nor a doctor, but only a common layman, but when I have been here for four years and four years after that, I hope to be able to do as well in debate as my Hon. friend from Placentia East.

MR. EMERSON.—I merely rise to ask if Hon. the Minister of Finance will rise the committee and defer this until Monday. The Leader of the Op-

position who is absent through illness would like to address the House in the Budget. It is usual for the Leader to sum up and I therefore request that the committee rise.

MR. PUDDESTER.—I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance that there are two discrepancies in the list. Two thousand four hundred and ninety four dollars and seventy cents in the Postal Telegraphs and two thousand one hundred and thirty four dollars in the Customs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Further Preservation and Protection of Caribou" was read a second time.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain in a few words what the idea of the bill is. It is to make a part of the Avalon Peninsula a deer sanctuary where caribou can remain at rest. It includes all the area to the east of the narrowest part of the Peninsula which is from Placentia Bay to Trinity Bay.

For many years there has been a small herd of caribou on the Avalon Peninsula. It is estimated there are about twenty four caribou but the herd is gradually diminishing. The idea is to prevent the killing of deer on the Peninsula, and to give the herd a chance to get back to its normal numbers.

The Game Board may bring others from some parts of the Island and put

them there, and we will thus protect the wild life and the caribou will be preserved from destruction on the Peninsula.

There is one section, Section 5, which might need a little explanation.

Certain areas are set forth by order of the Governor-in-Council that no person shall molest during certain seasons of the year, when fawns are born. There seem to be areas in the vicinity of the Salmonier Line where it is known that the deer fawn, and at that period of the year it is desirable to give them a brief rest and leave them undisturbed.

It is the desire of the Game Board to certainly favour that which may keep the herd here.

I do not think any further explanation is necessary. If there are any questions that Hon. members would like to ask at the Committee stage I shall be glad to answer them.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House by making any lengthy remarks but I would merely like to ask the Hon. introducer whether this Bill is the result of the consultation of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—No, I might say that it was suggested by a prominent member of the Game Association to me and is what had been in my mind for a long time, as to what means should be taken to preserve the deer. It came from a member of the Game Association.

Further, I might add that the moose which were introduced into Newfoundland twenty five years ago have now become very numerous, particularly in the Upper Humber, and it might come to pass that some of these be transhipped to the deer sanctuary.

MR. EMERSON.—I thank the Hon. gentleman for the reply to my question.

With the Hon. member for St. John's West, I think anything we can do to protect the game in the country should be done and if this Bill means nothing more than that protection to the game is going to be encouraged then I think the Bill deserves our hearty support.

The only reason that I rose to ask that question of the Hon. member was on account of the very disturbing advertisement in the Telegram some weeks ago that referred to an application to the Governor in Council. I think the Hon. member knows the advertisement to which I refer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, but I might say that the Governor in Council never heard of it.

MR. EMERSON.—I felt perfectly certain that the Hon. introducer of the Bill had nothing to do with it. I am very suspicious about that kind of thing and I rose particularly to put the question, not because I thought the Hon. member had anything to do with it but so as to have public announcement that this Bill comes from a prominent member of the Game Association.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I may say that various advertisements appear in the Telegram without the Government actually having any notice of them. This was not known to a member of the Government, unless it was one of the canards that are so common in the Telegram every day. I don't take anything I read in the Telegram as seriously as my Hon. friend. I would understand any man putting that in the paper as a joke. And I suggest that the Telegram people be brought to the Bar of this House.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell, and with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Commit-

tee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Preservation and Propagation of Deer"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," was read a second time.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Mr. Speaker, there are items in this Bill that I want to question. I have just checked over the estimates and find some pensions not there. There are two that were passed on the motion of the Prime Minister the other day, but I would like the Hon. Minister explain these: John Garcin, Lightkeeper, Rose Blanche \$621.00; Michael Breen, Attendant, Insane Asylum \$446.35 and Malcolm Green, Caretaker, Public Building Grand Falls, \$298.36.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member I might say that the mistake was made by me. I recommended these and probably it was my fault that they were not included in the estimates, so I put them into this Bill.

MR. PUDDISTER.—That is somewhat irregular. They should have come before the House and been voted. It is alright if it comes before the House. The House is all powerful; it is the highest Court in the land as far as these things are concerned. But these three names, this is the first we know of them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I may add that two of them were accidentally mislaid by me and I took the opportunity of putting them in.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, there may be a slight discrepancy that way next session of the Legislature in connection with Magistrate Cunningham. Since this amount was fixed, which was the amount which results naturally from the wages of the magistracy, it was discovered that thirty, forty or sixty years ago he actually was then in the public service and has served assiduously in various departments ever since. He served as a sub-collector and then in the Postal Telegraph Office. From the Postal Telegraphs he went to the Customs and then to the Department of Justice and various other promotions. It may be necessary under the Act to revise that sum and it may so happen that the pension will be somewhat more than is here stated.

MR. PUDDISTER.—What do you mean by that? Isn't the pension made up on the average of the last three years?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Teachers Pensions are made up on the average for the last three years, but not under the Pension's Act.

HON. DR. MOSDELL.—Civil Servants Pension Act, 1926.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—2¼% per year on wages. He has only been a comparatively few years in the Magistracy. We will have to go back and find out his wages.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I thought there was something about three years. The average of the last three years is taken and the pension made up on that.

In the case of Mr. Adams, the Registrar of Deeds, was that amount made up on his actual salary?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—He claimed that his emoluments of his

portion from the office reached practically \$1,000 every year and he expected one half of that to be included in the estimates. He claimed, and rightly so, that because of his position, so many emoluments came to him and to his successor in the ordinary course and he naturally expected to have that amount included. It worked out to \$1800 with the extra \$200 or \$250 representing one half of what he claimed, roughly. It was as near as could be and certainly is not excessive, and not in excess of what he could get under the Act if the Act had been worked out.

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Legislative Disabilities" was read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, this Bill was distributed yesterday. I don't think that this Bill is contentious in the same sense as the Agricultural Bill to which reference has been made generally and which certain members heartily denounced.

Consequently I move that this Bill be now read for the second time and if there is any contentious points we can discuss them in committee and if my Hon. friends raise any objection and call for a division we can have it just as orderly and more easily on the report of the committee.

MR. PUDDISTER.—Did you say that you changed it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Not as printed. It simply deals with the position of Solicitor General.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes it possible for a Solicitor General, if a member of this House when appointed, to sit in the House. The Bill reads as follows:

(Reads)

To make the position clear the amendment is necessary because we intend, as is probably known, to constitute a Fishery Commission. That will come under the Public Enquires Act. Captain John Parsons, member for Bay Roberts and one of the ablest authorities on a certain branch of the cod and seal fisheries of Newfoundland, will be a member of the Fishery Commission and this amendment will ensure that his seat in the House will not be jeopardized.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anybody who would be happier over the appointment of Capt. Parsons than I am, but I would ask the introducer of the Bill to let the Second Reading stand over because I would like to examine this particular section before I pass my opinion?

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Legislative Disabilities" was deferred until tomorrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 20th, 1929.

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

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Branch, in the District of Placentia East, which with your permission I will read to the House.

(Reads Petition)

This petition I may say is signed by practically every man in Branch, and I can assure the House there is no

public work in that district calling more urgently for consideration than this. Last year five thousand dollars was allocated for the work on this breakwater, but considerable difficulty was encountered by the Government Engineer and he had to change his plans and another sum of approximately one thousand dollars is needed to complete the work. I feel sure that this will receive the serious consideration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I ask that it be referred to that Department.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from residents of Shoal Cove and St. Brendan's, District of Bonavista Centre, in connection with public wells in that district. I need not take up the time of this House by saying that this petition is deserving of the most careful consideration, or going into its details at any length. I ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works, and I feel sure that when some money is forth-coming to be allocated to that District this matter will not be overlooked.

I also wish to present a petition from St. Brendan's in the District of Bonavista Centre, on the subject of better Coastal connection. The petition asks that St. Brendan's be made a port of call for the boat on the St. John's Fogo route, and secondly asks, that the settlement be connected with the usual Mail Ferry Service plying between Wesleyville and Gambo, on the North Side of Bonavista Bay. I quite realize that this is not a very easy matter to deal with off hand, but I do feel that the time has come when those islands I referred to, St. Brendan's and Flat Islands particularly, ought to have better connections with the outside Coastal Service than they have at the present time. As to the general principles as expressed in the petition, that these better facilities

should be provided, I may say that I am strongly in favour of it. As to whether that which is sought can be brought about just in the way that it is wanted, may be in some degree questionable. I present the petition in a formal way and in due course will take up the matter with the Railway and the Government. As I said I am in accord with the views of petitioners as regards the principle behind it. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, and he no doubt, in due course will present it to the Government for consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend a welcome to the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and I feel sure that Hon. members will be glad to see him again in his place. We all trust, I am sure that he has fully recovered from his recent illness and that he may be able, for the balance of the session, to give the House the benefit of his wise experience and sound advice.

I regret to state that Mr. Sullivan is not yet sufficiently recovered from his recent severe illness to resume his attendance in this Chamber and I am sure Hon. members will join with me in expressing the hope that he will be able to again take his place in this Chamber and be heard in debate.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for his kind words, and I may say that we are all sorry that Mr. Sullivan is not very well. The doctor says that he is over the crisis and it is our sincere hope that with a little rest he will soon regain his accustomed health.

Pursuant to Notice and an leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Puddester, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled

'Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly,' " was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Rules of the House were suspended respecting all matters now before the House or to come before it.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions to Amend Chap. 33 of 15 George V. entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, there is very little to explain in regard to this Bill.

(Reads)

The idea of that rule is that in the original Sales Tax Act of 1927, the phrasing is very broad and we have had considerable trouble in the past. In the opinion of the Justice Department we are entitled to a sales tax on coal. If this could be enforced we could have collected \$100,000 on coal from the A.N.D. Co., this clause is put in order that we may know where we stand.

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 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 Act 15, George V, Chapter 33, entitled 'An Act Respect-

ing a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland,' " was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 33, entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 33, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 33, 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.

Pursuant to Notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 Resolution without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures," 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 Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures," 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. Dr. Campbell the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Further Preservation and Protection of Caribou" 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 and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, my remarks on the Budget will be very short and very general. I shall confine myself strictly to two or three items in the speech which have been raised and especially in relation to legislation that is being brought in. It is impossible of course to deal with a general statement of our country's affairs without referring also to the legislation. I hope that in so far as I am critical, the Hon. Minister will accept what I say even if he feels that I am wrong, in the proper spirit. Mainly my desire is to be of as much assistance as possible in view of the remarkable danger in which the country's affairs are involved.

The shortness of my remarks is also made possible by the very able speech delivered a few nights ago by our financial critic, Mr. Puddester. His address was at the same time both analytical and constructive, and taking it all in all from a member of the Opposition, it can be considered as eminently fair and showed considerable knowledge of the country's affairs and

an experience in dealing with figures which was of great assistance to those on this side of the House. It is now thoroughly understood where we stand. I wish to associate myself with practically everything he said and leave my remarks at that. The Budget speech is characterized by several notable features. In the first place it displayed brutal frankness. In some parts I think that possibly the Minister permitted his feelings to overstep the mark. I would rather in that respect that he should have spoken as he did than by a lack of courage hide the country's affairs. I do not agree entirely with his criticism of his predecessor. I was not as he knows, a member of that party or one of its supporters. But I think the suggestion made by Mr. Puddester that the error in estimating his expenditure was not due so much to a desire to put before the country a rosy condition of affairs for the purpose of election, but because he was faced with the raising of a large loan, and did not wish to show the financial condition of the country that we had reached so far as estimates of the revenue are concerned. In view of the position as we all know around this country where it is so difficult to get in the proper returns, his exceeding the estimate of revenue calls for not much criticism. In a ten millions budget an error of one hundred and eighty thousand is not very great.

There is a considerable matter in the budget speech with which I am in hearty agreement. In fact looking it over a few days ago I realize the very great duty and the very heavy responsibility and the great difficulty which faces the Minister. Trying to balance a budget is an extremely difficult and thankless task as was pointed out by Mr Puddester.

We have here such a large irreducible sum in connection with the in-

terest on the public debt, education and various other headings that the possibility of reduction of expenditure is limited. Two or three million dollars out of ten has to meet yearly. This condition of affairs has not been improved upon during the last several years. There has been undoubtedly many features which have caused that. There has been great extravagance and several members of the house like myself have been staggered by the large sums of money expended on charities and hospitals. As has been said the first duty of government is to look out for health and of the poor, but I cannot but think that generous provision could be made with less expenditure, and I sincerely trust that the commission which has been appointed to deal with these matters will be able to show us at the next session how they can give the same service for a less expenditure of money.

Then, Sir, we have expenditure on the railway. It is true that the Minister of Finance and Customs who brought down last year's budget estimated the loss on the railway at considerably less than it was, but I think it was a remarkable performance. In the few years that the Government has had the railroad the loss has been decreasing and is now approaching a figure which may disappear in the future, and while I am dealing with that there is one thing I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary (if he does not mind my asking it without notice) am I to understand that at the present time there is only one commissioner of the railway outside of Mr. Russell? The commissioner is dealing with coal contracts and is further contemplating purchasing a steamer without having a quorum. I do not see how these matters of grave importance can be dealt with by a commission without a quorum. Perhaps he would take the matter under

consideration and give me an answer later in the evening.

Now I hope that the continued reduction in the expenditure on the railway will continue being as free from political interference as possible. I regret to say that it is rumored there are certain aspects of the transportation system which give me cause to think that political interference is going to result in the deficit being increased next year. These rumours are disquieting. When you are dealing with steamers and allowing politicians to interfere in the appointment of crews you are jeopardising the lives of passengers and the property of individuals. I sincerely trust that these rumors are not true and that changes will be made so that there will not be the repetition of what happened a few years ago and that transportation will be carried on with as little political interference as possible.

The third difficulty which faces the Minister of Finance in balancing his budget is the difficulty of being master in his own house, the difficulty of keeping control of expenditure, the difficulty of controlling the executive and the departmental heads and his political associates. It is all very well for a minister to come in here and tell us that during the coming year there will be curtailment of expenditure under section thirty three (b) of the Audit Act to such an extent that he will show a deficit of only one hundred and eighty seven thousand dollars but he can only approach that figure, first of all if he is strong and firm himself, and secondly, if he gets the support that he should get from his colleagues.

Now, Sir, I submit that the legislation which has been introduced this session jeopardises the Minister in that position. The Speech from the Throne has made reference to the appointment of numerous Commissions.

An Act in connection with one of them has already passed the House, I think, or very nearly. Under which the number of Commissions may be seven who can sit in two parts. They will employ secretaries at will, call experts and witnesses, and there are four more coming, which you can feel perfectly certain will not consist of less than three, and as likely as not, will provide for not less than five. So that you are providing Commissions to act over the next year which will involve appointments for anywhere from fifteen to twenty people.

In addition to that you have introduced an Act here creating a new position and finally, and this is where the real jeopardy arises, you have introduced an Act to amend the Legislative Disabilities Act. Now this is the difficulty, if this amendment to the Disabilities Act goes through which permits members of the House to hold seats on these Commissions, then the Minister will find it very difficult to get the support he requires in the curtailment of expenditure because of the fact that ones natural interest is to hold on to his job.

Now, Sir, neither in your Budget nor in your Estimates have you provided the expenditure necessary for these Commissions so that we start off with a substantial addition to the estimates before we pass Ways and Means. What that amount will be it is difficult to say. I raise you \$120,000.

But, Sir, if, as I fear, the giving of these positions and the exempting of members of the House of Assembly from disabilities attaching to make them carry the consequences, then Sir, owing to interference you are lost and you will not approach your \$187,000 deficit by \$120,000. No, Sir, you will not approach it by \$350,000 or more, and I shall be very pleased if, when you come into this House next year

you will be able to tell us with the same frankness, fearlessness and truthfulness about this year's Budget as you have done about last year's and if you can then I fear that your deficit will be not less than half a million dollars. I very much doubt it, but I can assure you that no one will be more greatly pleased than the members of the Opposition.

Sir, I was very pleased with the industrial summary which the Hon. Minister gave the House. I do not intend to refer to it at any length. I agree with him and I think that the industrial and commercial possibility of this country is on the upward trend. I regret that it was found necessary to introduce taxation which is going to retard it to some extent, but this country is resilient and it seems to rise very quickly. I think if conditions continue as they existed last year, with industrial development on the horizon in this country, with mining and other matters, the contemplation of fresh fish industry, if these things continue this year, as we all hope they will, then the prophesy made by the Minister of Finance and Customs, that we are industrially rising from the dust will be fairly accurate.

But, Sir, it is a pity that we start a year under such hopeful circumstances where on the one hand the Minister of Finance and Customs shows such a small deficit, yet we all fear that by interference with his policy and his budget, his prophecies will turn to nought. There can be no doubt about the Minister's ability. I hope he will use it firmly and honestly and, as I said before, if he brings in a Budget next year as honest and fearless as this is and shows a deficit of not more than half a million dollars I will be the first one to congratulate him.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, in concluding, as far as

the Opposition members are concerned, the debate on the Budget, I would like to say a few words. It seems to me that the whole situation has been so well covered by my colleagues that there is little left for me to say. I would like first of all in any case to congratulate the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs on the occasion of his first Budget Speech. I am quite sure it a great source of pleasure and gratification to his relatives and to his friends that he should be following in the footsteps of his late lamented father, and I am sure it is the wish of every member of the House that he may live up to the best traditions of the position which he now holds.

I remember having a casual conversation with the Hon. Minister, I think, sometime in September last. I expect at that time he had his eye on the position of Minister of Finance and Customs, and we talked a little about finance. I remember I ventured to propose that if I had anything to do with the finances of this country I would be very happy if I could balance my Budget for the fiscal year of 1930-31. The Hon. Minister looked at me with scorn and said "Would it take you all that time to balance the Budget?" And I said "Yes, and I will be lucky if I can do it then" "Why, he said I would balance it in six months." I expect he is a sadder and a wiser man now that he has learned the difficulties of the office and has found out that, like the transgressor, the way of the Minister of Finance and Customs is hard. He has a difficult position. A very hard task to take hold of. He has to learn to check expenditure, to say no and make it sound like a yes. He has everyone after him. The members, the heads of the departments, asking for allocations and extra money. They go to the Prime Minister first and he says "I am quite satisfied if you can only get the Minister of Finance and

Customs to see what he can do." So it is all thrown on the shoulders of the Finance Minister. I think one of the first things he has to learn, if he is a responsible man, is to say no nicely.

Although, Mr. Chairman, I have had no experience so far as Governmental Budget making is concerned, I have had considerable experience in budgets of industrial institutions and the like and I must say that in that particular line if we were to take the optimistic view that the present Budget under debate takes, that we would, from a financial point of view find ourselves very often landed in "Queer Street." I am afraid we would be forced into insolvency in a very short time.

I am not going to enter into a very lengthy discussion of the Budget but there are two things that I would like to draw the attention of the House to, which I consider two very important matters.

Since the Hon. Minister assumed office I had the pleasure of calling upon him. He is very much interested in his Department and I am rather fond of discussing the same thing, that is, the finances of the country. We discussed a good many things and one of the things discussed was the iniquity of free entry, goods coming into the country without paying duty. One of the first bills to come up had, in its details, the granting of free entry. That was the American Telegraph and Telephone Bill. One of the clauses gives them the right to import practically everything they require for the installation free of duty. Now I have always contended and still contend and I think the majority of the Hon. members agree with me, that things in common use in the country should not get free entry for every new industrial enterprise and certainly things similar to those manufactured in this country should not come in free of duty. And

when I got up and spoke along these lines I felt quite sure that I had a kindred spirit in the Hon. Minister. You can guess my surprise, pained surprise, when he got up and said he saw no objection to giving these people free entry because the amount was so small. It is not a question of discrimination. It is not a question of how large an amount they are going to get a present of or how small, it is more than that, it is a matter of principle. If you are going to stop free entry business there is no time like the present to do so.

Now to give you an idea, I have just put together a few figures. These are the only authentic figures that refer to the fiscal year 1927-28. I am quite sure the Hon. Minister has gone over these figures hundreds of times. During that fiscal year we imported twenty seven and a half million dollars worth of goods. Ten million of that amount was for goods that paid not one cent of duty. The balance, seventeen and a half million, paid duty in the aggregate of about eight million dollars. In other words we had to spread eight million dollars over seventeen and a half million; although we had imported twenty seven and a half million dollars worth of goods, ten million dollars worth came off Scot free.

Now when you figure out the average of duty that eight million dollars amounts to on seventeen and a half million dollars it comes to about forty per cent. Now if we had been able to spread the eight million dollars over the whole twenty-seven and a half million, we would have been able to reduce the rate of duty as low as thirty per cent. I am quite confident if having reached this idealistic stage with regard to duty, and had the Minister of Finance and Customs of the day pluck enough to reduce the average rate down to twenty five per cent.

at twenty five per cent we would get a larger revenue on the lower rate of duty. That is why I am always in favour of the abolition of free entry and I am quite sure that the present Minister would go down in fame if he would put his foot down and say "I am going to be the first man in this office to stop free entry." I say he would go down to fame on that account if for no other reason.

Now there is another matter that I would draw your attention to. That is the myth that when the Government takes duty off the commodity coming into the country that the tax-paying people of the country are relieved by the amount of tax being taken off. That is very very far from the truth. We will suppose, for the sake of example, that our customs revenue is ten million dollars and we will suppose for the sake of example that the Government desires to take duty off a certain commodity—it may be anything, silk hats or something else,—desire to give the commodity free entry and the revenue loses to the extent of one million dollars.

The Finance Minister requires that ten millions to take care of the Government expense and he gets it by simply spreading it over other commodities. In other words, he "blindfolds the devil in the dark" and he collects this much money from other goods coming into the country. We had an example of this the other day when there was a great flourish of trumpets in "The Liberal Press" which was featured with this headline: "Squires aids farmers by free import on all farm implements."

According to the Customs returns up to June 30th, 1928, the importations of agricultural machinery and implements for that year was \$26,355.00. That gave the farmers the munificent present of \$2,635.50 by removing the ten per cent duty which the farmers

used to pay on their imported machinery, and at the same time it created another entry item—the very thing that the Finance Minister should avoid. But, as he handed out this \$2,635.50 to the farmers, he pulls in with the other hand \$91,559.58 by putting another half cent a pound extra duty on sugar. That is being generous at some one else's expense. Now, Sir, this sugar business is a very interesting subject, particularly at the present time. A lot of people are under the impression that this extra duty is taxing the rich man. On the contrary, it is taxing the farmer, the laborer, or, as he is better known to our friends opposite, the 'common man' just as well as the rich man. For the year ending June 30th, 1923, the importations of sugar amounted to over ten million pounds and for the year 1927-28 the sugar importations amounted to over eighteen million pounds, meaning that in five years our consumption of sugar increased by eighty per cent, and we will likely find that by the 30th of June 1930 the consumption of sugar will have increased by one hundred per cent over what it was in 1923. It might be considered a good stroke of business from the view point of the Finance Minister to impose an extra sugar tax of a half cent a pound, as against the free entry for farming implements, but you are taking \$90,000 out of the pockets of the consumers by being so generous, and every home in Newfoundland consumes sugar, even the farmers.

Let us analyse this sugar situation for a moment. Take our population of say 270,000 people. We find that every infant, man, woman and child consumes about 70 pounds per year, so that it is very difficult to realize the tremendous consumption of sugar in this country, and when the Finance Minister put on another half cent per pound duty he struck hard at the

common people of whom the gentlemen on the Government side of the House were most solicitous during the recent election. Now this free entry business, as I have previously pointed out in this House, is an abomination and is going to become uncontrollable because eventually, if this sort of thing continues, everybody will be looking for free entry.

I must congratulate the Finance Minister in connection with the attitude he has taken with regard to the Public Health Department. I think it took considerable courage in order to eliminate the pest houses that existed in St. John's. It is known where people contracted worse diseases when they went to these pest houses than what they had when they went there. Therefore, I give the Government credit, if they can reduce this large expenditure.

Another expenditure that I am in sympathy with is that for education and I was delighted to hear the Prime Minister state that this grant was not intended to be spent on fancy education, it was not for higher education or for sending boys and girls to universities abroad; but it was to give the boys and girls in the outports as well as in the city an opportunity to acquire a good knowledge of Reading Writing and Arithmetic. As I have already suggested in this House, there is not enough taught about our fisheries in our schools. I think many of our young men are getting ashamed of the fisheries and of the fishermen and do not want to follow in the footsteps of their fathers, but I would suggest that the fisheries be included in the school curriculum, starting with the junior children and telling them something gradually about codfish until they reach the top grades when they might be told where our fish is principally consumed, the necessity for clean handling in the making and curing,

and what happens when it is neglected and how it may be reduced in value because of neglect.

I was speaking to an educationalist from the United States a few years ago here. He was here on a visit and I told him I was afraid we were over-educating our young people in certain respects, and that I thought we would advance them better for high scholarships, if we had them grounded in the rudiments of the "Three Rs." Speaking along these lines I gave that gentleman an instance in one outport where we had thirty men, who went to the Labrador coast and worked hard for their season's catch, lived their thrifty lives and when they died left tidy sums to take care of their families, but that you have not got one son there to-day carrying on the old calling of their fathers. They prefer the white collar and willing to live in genteel poverty, rather than pursue the industrious calling of their fathers. That gentleman said "no, you have not over-educated your boys. You have educated them in the wrong direction." That is why I say that the fisheries should find a place in our school text books. He told me that the same mistake was made in the United States at first. They were teaching the same curriculum in the country schools as they were teaching in the city schools and the result was that the farm boys left happy and contented homes and went to the city to live; but now they have the best educationalist that can be found in the United States trying to rectify the mistakes that were made and they have a different curriculum for the farm boys in the farm schools. After all a great many people do not appreciate the fine, healthy, independent life of the fishermen-farmer. He does not have to be dictated to as to when he shall go to work. He is his own master and can take a day off when he likes. That is the reason why

I advocated that the fisheries be included in our school curriculum.

I may say, Sir, that the criticism directed against Sir John Crosbie, ex-Finance Minister, by the present Finance Minister was altogether undeserved. I hold no brief for Sir John Crosbie or his Government, as I was never in their Councils at any time. But to give credit where credit is due, if a man estimated his expenditure within one and a half per cent of his actual expenditure, I think that is mighty good. Expenditure is a thing that a Finance Minister can't control. He can control fixed expenditure; but not the revenue. He can only figure the condition of the country, the possibilities of the purchasing power of the people and then guess what the revenue will be. If his revenue is falling short at the end of a certain period it is not possible for him to get people to import more goods than they require. Therefore, I hope that the present Finance Minister will be as fortunate as was Sir John Crosbie in making up his total expenditure for the next year, although I am afraid he is going to be a bit upset because of the expenditure he has brought in, in connection with Supplementary Supply.

I feel quite sure that a spirit of optimism was permeating the Finance Minister when he made up these figures so far as the revenue for the next year is concerned. I think he has estimated the largest customs revenue that was ever collected in this country, namely \$8,650,000, with the exception of the war years when we had inflated prices.

His estimated figure is very very heavy. Now there are two conditions I think he may be over-looking in making that heavy estimate, the first is that there are a great deal of goods coming in before the first of July that are likely to be lower in value than

they have been for some time. A good many people handling cotton goods have got it into their minds that they are going to see lower prices in cotton goods, and if that is so there will be a decrease in revenue accordingly.

There is another matter to be taken into account and that is that when there is any tariff revision in prospect we are going to see smaller imports. When duties are likely to change no one is going to import any more than necessary until the Tariff is fixed, and I am afraid there is going to be buying from hand to mouth until the Tariff is fixed.

Now the Liquor Profits, I have an idea that we have reached the height of our consumption of Liquor, and I believe from now on we are going to witness more temperate habits, and for that reason I believe the Liquor profits are over-estimated. In this connection I want to refer to the editorial of the "Daily News" this morning and if the figures are correct, they are to say the least, startling. The editorial gives a total amount for liquor sales for the past year of \$1,182,334.82. It estimates that more than a million dollars of this must have been spent in St. John's and nearby neighborhood. The Mail Order business done was \$153,839.30. Subtract this amount and it leaves \$1,028,441.52.

Suppose the people of such nearby places as Bay de Verde, Conception Bay and the like purchased one hundred and twenty eight thousand dollars worth of that liquor that would reduce the Liquor Bill for St. John's to nine hundred and eighty thousand roughly. Let us suppose that it was not all people of St. John's East and West who drank this liquor, let us say the external districts East and West are included. If we add up the votes of these, the male votes come to about 12,000. Now there may be some women

who as they say, bend the elbow, and suppose the number of those to be offset by the male total abstainers, then we may say we have about 12,000 people taking a drink on and off, and if we divide the 12,000 into nine hundred thousand dollars odd, we see that the people drink on the average \$75.00 worth of liquor a year, that is a lot of liquor, particularly when we consider the cost and that the Government has been giving out money year after year for relief, and I am very much afraid that some of the people getting relief are people whose consumption is greater than the average \$75.00, and that is one thing I believe that the Employment Commission might bring in, some suggestion whereby it might be so fixed that people when they get relief money cannot go and spend it on liquor and that it may go home to their wives and families.

Now there is one thing here which gave me considerable worry and that is, the estimate of death duties.

The Hon. gentleman estimates the amount he will collect for death duties for 1929-30 at \$60,000, although for 1928-29 it was only \$30,000. I was afraid that 1929-30 was going to be a very unhealthy year. Then I thought perhaps it might be that some of these people making up their Income Tax, in the Spring of next year when they figure the amount they have to hand over to the Minister are going to have heart failure and drop off. We find however, that it is the payment of arrears the Minister has in mind and that \$60,000 has nothing to do with the expectation of an unhealthy year or anything of that kind. The next thing is the Income Tax. When that Bill was going through I said I was in favour of the Bill. So I am. I think it the fairest taxation you can have. I believe it is cheap taxation to collect, I also believe it is the proper thing to

put the heaviest burdens on the broadest backs. The men who have got money should be willing to contribute; but it is rather discouraging to the men who do come under the Bill, who have got the money and the willingness to contribute if they find that the money is not going to be well spent.

We really thought when that was brought in we were going to see the exercise of very great economy; and I may say it is very disheartening and even disgusting to see all sorts of jobs created for men whom it seems must be supported by the Government. We are to have five Commissioners for the Agriculture department. I do not know whether these gentlemen are required to have any qualifications with regard to their knowledge of agriculture; whether it will be necessary for them to know the difference between a carrot and a turnip; but I am very much afraid the principal qualification, in fact the only qualification is that they must be supporters of the present Government.

Now there is one other item. I am quite sure the Hon. Minister has good reason for putting it in there. That is Miscellaneous Revenue \$400,000. He would not have put it there if he could not get it, or else he is going to be so much short.

Talking about the collection of Customs there is one thing some of us in business are aware of to-day and that is that there is not sufficient examination of goods coming into St. John's. I would like to see an amount here of \$200,000 for an examining warehouse that could take the whole consignment of goods. People are getting away with importing under too low duties day after day. I have no means of knowing of course, it is only a guess but I believe the Customs in respect of goods coming into St. John's are defrauded of at least \$100,000 a year.

Certain people would not sell goods at the price they do if they did not do away with a considerable part of Customs duties payment. I would like to see the Minister of Finance and Customs start to build a new examining warehouse where there could be thrown in a whole consignment of goods. An excellent place for it would be in front of the Customs House on Water Street. I do not know whether the Government owns the land there or not.

Now these are the only things Mr. Chairman, I had in mind. I do think in connection with the income tax that those of us who have to pay the income tax. I for one will pay to the utmost farthing, should have been encouraged by seeing an attempt at economy and an endeavour to make our dollars go as far as possible.

In connection with the Business Profits Tax: In the business of this country it is likely to be found that good profits are made one year and heavy losses the next. I am not referring now to manufacturing companies but to those engaged in what we call the business of the country. When these have to disgorge eight per cent of their profits in a successful year and there is no relief for them in a bad year commence to feel that a tax is oppressive and is unfair, and is going to strifle enterprise; and men are going to say why put more money into the industry of the country when it is a case of "heads the Government wins, tails they lose." And in every country when you make a tax oppressive and people feel it is unfair it is going to strifle industry and you are defeating your own ends in connection with that tax.

Now I have not said anything about the way duties were taken off last November. It was done in a most spectacular way and I am afraid there

was a good deal of vindictiveness shown in the taking off of these taxes. I myself when I went round Conception Bay told the people I thought the duty on clothing too high and would I said reduce the clothing duty to forty-five per cent. But I would not have reduced the duty in an illegal and disorderly way. My methods would have been orderly and legal and I would have had a thought of the men carrying stocks of clothing in the country, and not have taken the ground from under them so to speak by cutting duties and giving them what must have been heavy losses.

On the first of January it would be published in the Gazette and other newspapers that on the first of July clothing would be reduced to a certain figure. That would have meant for at least the first three months of the year people carrying stocks of clothing tweeds etc would have had a chance to get from under to some extent and I am quite sure from the first of April to the end of June the fact of the duty coming off of clothes would be taken into consideration and discounted in the selling prices from the first of April to the thirtieth of June. Manufacturers and importers of clothing too would have felt that they had received a square deal from the Government, and would have entered into it with a proper spirit and reduced their prices as soon as possible, but as it is some have their prices up to this day. But I fear the idea was to be spectacular and to be vindictive to the people who dared to be opposed to the Government in politics.

No Government can hope to bring prosperity to the country unless capital and enterprise have faith in the intentions of the Government and I am very much afraid during the last election it was the endeavour of the Government then a political party led by the present Prime Minister to drive a

wedge between capital and labour, a wedge between the men giving wages and the men receiving wages. I want to say that is a very short sighted policy. Even in England the hot bed of labor disputes and unionism they are commencing to see that unless they work together in harmony it is absolutely impossible for the country to prosper; and I hope the spirit of revenge and vindictiveness is not going to be continued, and because a man happens to support a certain party he can get anything he desires and if he happens to be against the Government he gets nothing.

I hope that sort of thing will be stopped as soon as possible and that we will see a square deal for all, because we all have the interests of the country at heart and want to try and make this country, as it can be, one of the happiest and most prosperous countries in the world.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make any lengthy remarks but I merely wish to thank various Members of the Opposition for their very fair criticism of my first Budget Speech. I have taken considerable notes on what a number of members have said in criticism but I do not propose to deal with all. No doubt while some claimed that I tried to make political capital out of parts of the Budget, it is perfectly clear that Hon. members opposite tried to some extent to make political capital out of it as well.

The main point that Mr. Puddester made was that we have to go into the money markets of the world looking for a loan when we cannot balance our Budget, well I would like 'o differ. I don't think that the inaccuracy of the Budget would have anything to do with the raising of a loan, because the banks can tell at a glance the

actual deficits, consequently it is only right that we tell the truth. I have heard Budgets in the past and I say that money was obtained under false pretenses, in not telling the actual situation. I would like to draw attention to the closing paragraph of Sir John Crosbie's Budget in 1924. In view of the fact that very few members have a copy I will read it.

(Reads)

Very dramatic, Mr. Chairman, indeed. These are the closing words of his Budget. Now I came in here and a worse mess was unloaded on me than was unloaded on him when he came in. The public debt was increased twenty million dollars and last year he was short in his estimates by a half a million. I estimate \$11,000,000 for next year and I think that I will come out in good shape, compared to him at least. Now some members are wondering where I am going to get the revenue, well I feel certain that the revenue will be maintained. You will see on page 15 I estimated for 1928-29 \$8,213,000, very conservative, Mr. Chairman. Why last week as compared with the same week last year we are \$139,000 ahead of it.

We are going to collect money from the people on Bell Island which former Governments were afraid to do, we expect to get \$200,000 from that source. I also intend to do away with the obnoxious Bill of Sight. There is almost \$200,000 outstanding that was never shown in the revenue, but it will be shown next year. I estimate \$550,000 from the Income Tax, some people say that this is very high but in three or four instances we have collected two or three hundred thousand dollars. Some members criticized the 1-2c. per lb. on sugar. They say it goes to shopkeepers; well, that is a poor tribute to shopkeepers of Newfoundland, they should not take advantage of it but at the same time they

may. I am criticised because there is no duty on flour, pork and beef, if I did it I would be criticised for the same reason that I am criticised for putting the half cent a pound on sugar and if I walloped into the free list as my friend Mr. Puddester suggested, I would still be criticised. The free list amounts to \$10,000,000, but I do not say that you would get \$10,000. Most of this is under contract and if I did away with it we would probably get about six hundred or eight hundred thousand dollars a year. It is impossible to do away with the free list now because if a new company comes in here, if a new paper company started, we could not expect them to pay duty on things that other companies are getting in free. Consequently it is impossible at the present time to do away with the free list. Mr. Puddester said that the National Debt of Canada was \$2,277,000,000 approximately \$3,000,000,000 and the Federal Governments have adopted a Sinking Fund, in Ontario I think he said, and other Federal Governments as well, but I think that Mr. Robb has shown a surplus of \$67,000,000 and we have not enough money here to pay our bills.

The last Government spent \$35,000 of the money on charity, that is all it is, plus \$10,000 from the Charities Department, consequently I was very lenient when I said \$30,000 and in reality it was \$45,000. Then they go back over the Governments of the past and show how during the war surpluses were shown and we had three to four million in reserve when my father was Minister of Finance and Customs. Yes, but you must not forget that these were very good times and it was not difficult to establish a surplus. Personally, I am not going to delve into the methods by which he got his surpluses, I would rather not, he is gone and I don't want to talk about it anyway.

Members of the Opposition criticised the half cent per pound on sugar, but they forgot that we reduced taxation as promised by the Prime Minister, approximately 24 hours after we were returned to power. Twenty per cent was taken off clothing, eight per cent off tobacco, two per cent off butter and lines and twines were admitted free, you forgot that now we are asking to ratify this. Some member said that when we reduced taxation the public did not get the benefit, well if they did not get the benefit that is not our fault, but you will find that tobacco that sold for 96 cents sells for 86 cents, sugar that went up to 8 cents a pound sells at 6 and 7 cents, suits that sold at \$20.00 are now \$17.50 womens coats for example, that sold at \$20.00 sell at \$17.50, and various other items. Consequently we did some good. The Hon. the leader of the Opposition made the point that if he were going to make these changes he would advertise in the public press three or four months in advance, well, what would happen? You would have the people going around the streets naked waiting for about six months for the price of clothes to drop.

We have heard, I have preached it myself that the fisherman is the most heavily taxed of all, I have gone to some trouble to prepare a list showing what an average family of five would consume in the ordinary course of a year. Flour 10 brls., 40 gallons of molasses, well that is not used as much now as it used to be, \$3.00 duty, 50 lbs. tea.

Pork is free, beef is free, sugar pays one half cent per pound duty, clothing fifty dollars per year, kerosene oil is free, gasoline is free. The average family uses about twenty-five pounds of tobacco on which they pay forty cents per pound plus fifteen dollars sales tax. The duty therefore paid by an ordinary family is

somewhere in the vicinity of one hundred to one hundred and five dollars per year. I have just mentioned this so that members of this House including myself may not over step the mark and say that the poor fisherman pays all the duty of the country.

While the fisherman catches fish which is sent from this country and receives cash for the fish and buys his supplies, on the average family he pays into the revenue the sum of one hundred and five dollars. In the average year he gets about seventy-five quintals of fish, which at the current price of eight dollars yields him six hundred dollars, and one hundred and five dollars goes into the treasury of the country. About four hundred dollars keeps the family and he stows away one hundred for a rainy day. That is the average all over the country. There is no real fisherman in the country who does not catch that much fish or its equivalent.

As we have some very important legislation I do not wish to delay the House. I want to thank the members of the Opposition for their fair criticism and in asking them to give us their help, particularly with regard to expenditure through the coming year, and while members of the Opposition have already intimated that I am going to be out one and a half million dollars, and a lot depends on what kind of a year we have. I am optimistic and perhaps it is the optimism of youth, enough to estimate now that if every member is prepared to play his part that the budget will balance next year in spite of the fact that I have estimated a deficit of one hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars. If you do yours, I for my part will do mine.

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 re-

commended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act 1925," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act 1925," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act 1925," 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.

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—If a man handles these insecticides will he get the benefit of this reduction?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—If he has a certificate from the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Does the man have to be an agriculturist?

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I approve very strongly of the new features introduced into this Bill. For the benefit of the outports and for the equal benefit of St. John's, as the best market for agricultural products, it is desirable to enable the farmers to get what is required for the satisfactory raising of crops at the lowest possible rate.

These insecticides are of great benefit to the farmers. Of recent years a lot of disease—fungus and other things—has been fought every year to ensure a sure return of crops and to prevent destruction of potatoes in the early part of the season, so we thought they should be available to the farmers at the lowest possible cost.

Now with regard to seed potatoes, it is an interesting fact to notice that there are a variety of potatoes produced here that are not of recognized standard. Two recognized standards are the Irish Cobbler and Green Mountain. The Irish Cobbler is the customary grade but there are very few Green Mountains being produced.

It is the intention of the Department to encourage the farmers to adopt these two grades to the extent of forty per cent or more. If a man gives an order to an outport dealer for fifty or sixty barrels of potatoes you will not get a single sack of the one grade, because of the vast variety of different seed potatoes in use and it is the in-

attention, if possible to induce the farmers to import certified seed potatoes so as to get a good sound crop and enable them to get these for the minimum cost. If they purchase them through the usual commercial avenues the cost is too high a figure.

I believe the measure that is being introduced to reduce the tax on insecticides and seed potatoes will produce very favorable results for the farmers and will benefit agriculture.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I think the Hon. gentleman misunderstood me. What I want to know is, must the farmer himself import them?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, he must have a certificate.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—If a certain number of men get together and undertake to import a given quantity, we will import them for them.

MR. EMERSON—Wouldn't it be better for the farmers if they were let in duty free and sold in the stores?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They would then be used for other things and for other purposes.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that insecticides have very great application and bring splendid results to agricultural development.

Farmers should be encouraged to obtain them as well as farm implements. For instance in Nova Scotia they can import the ordinary dray-cart or box-cart for less than here.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Loan on the Credit of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, the loan will be for six millions. For the cost of raising the loan, paying of deficits, and perhaps the guaranteeing of the Newfoundland Hotel. You can't tell what is going to happen; you have to have the money ready for an emergency, I put down an amount of three and a half millions.

Then there is railway re-railing.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, We understand that the deficit and cost of raising the loan together with paying the interest charges and sinking fund of the Hotel amounts to \$3,500,000? Railway, capital expenditure, \$350,000, this is for coal cars and etc., and is not used in building new machine shops? Then the Highroads, \$500,000.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We may not spend all of it.

MR. PUDDISTER—If you do not do it, you will have a balance on hand?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—You will spend at least \$350,000?

MR. PUDDISTER—Then there is a wing for the General Hospital, re-railing between Bishops Falls and Howley and from Howley to Bay of Islands, then the Districts special amount \$150,000, well that is little enough. I understand that that \$150,000 will be put to the credit of the Districts on a per capita basis and can be transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department or the Public Works Department. Will we have the same privileges as members on the other side of the House as regards this fund.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Absolutely.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, that is six million, it is going up pretty fast. Since the war started in

1914 the country has borrowed \$54,000,000, we borrowed \$18,000,000 to carry on the war from 1914 to 1918; from 1919 to 1924 we borrowed \$17,000,000, the Monroe Government borrowed \$19,000,000 altogether. We borrowed \$54,000,000 since 1914. If this continues, you know what is going to happen. Half of this loan is to meet deficits on current account and the other half is for capital expenditure. There will always be capital expenditure if we want progress, because so sure as you balance your Budget and have large surpluses the people are not going to stand taxation. When you have a surplus, you will have to reduce your taxation, therefore it is necessary, if you are going to have surpluses to establish a sinking fund and the people can not agitate for a reduction of taxation until your surplus takes care of the sinking fund. As I was saying, \$84,000,000 is the debt of the Colony. I figure that the war cost us \$30,000,000.

But there it is, we have to have money this year and we have an assurance given to us by the Hon. Minister that he will spend this money fairly and squarely. He is always responsible. If he gets this money and spends it for purposes which we do not like we may always come back here and ask how the money was used. He is a responsible Minister of the Crown. We have to take a firm stand, if we want to save ourselves, especially on current account. The other day a man said to me the money spent last year, one million three hundred and thirty thousand dollars was responsible for our deficit. As any body knows that was untrue. There was no money spent during elections to cause deficits. It was spent out of the loans and there can be no question about that. The money was spent out of capital expenditure and had nothing to do with deficits that

you talked about in your Budget speech of one million two hundred thousand dollars.

(Clerk Reads.)

MR. PUDDER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a loan of twenty five million dollars raised last week by the Province of Ontario. The money market was bad but they got 99.15. It is a five per cent loan. Our loan last year brought 97¾ while that of Ontario is 99.15. And the Municipality of Montreal is in the market for a loan of sixteen million dollars. They do not expect to raise the loan for any more than 97. I think the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have very high standing in the money markets. The National City and Trust Company of New York was the firm that bid highest for the Ontario Loan. The Dominion Securities also bid and various other firms but the National City and Trust Company bid 99.15 which was higher than the Canadian companies. And I do trust that the Minister will advertise in the markets and that everything will be done fair and square when he goes to raise the loan and that tenders will be asked for. As it is a very important matter may we have the second reading deferred until 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 Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

The Speaker left the Chair til eight o'clock.

At 8.15 o'clock Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stamp Duties,'" "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public," "An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary.'"

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 24, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships,'" with some amendment in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, after this Bill passed the House of Assembly, a communication was received by me from Messrs. Furness-Withy & Co., which resulted in a conference between Mr. Carey, the local manager of the Furness-Withy Company, Mr. Dunfield, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice and myself in the Prime Minister's Office relating to interpretation of this particular section with regard to British ships, as to whether it would or would not be capable of the interpretation—and there

is some some doubt in the minds of some—that we could compel a British registered ship to undergo an examination here which would mean a considerable delay. After a conference between Mr. Dunfield and Mr. John Fenelon, the solicitor for the Furness Withy Company, a draft amendment was submitted for the consideration of the Legislative Council. That draft amendment was one which met with the approval of the Government and it meets the amendment of this Bill which the leader of the Government in the Upper House introduced.

It needs the addition to the Bill of a section—it is in handwriting and is a little difficult to read.

(Reads)

I move that this amendment now be read for the first time.

MR. PUDDISTER—Was it the intention of the Bill in the first place or is this to change the Bill?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was not the intention at all and we are merely inserting a section to absolutely satisfy the British owners that the intention of the Bill is as stated.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were concurred in, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the amendments sent down in and upon the said Bill sent up had been agreed to without amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, surely it is not the intention of the Government to dispense with the matter of experimental farms?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Agriculture would naturally include that.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Then there is the question of the granting of bounties. There is a tremendous lot of land over the country where people have been given bonuses for clearing and is now lying waste.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is no immediate intention. They are not granted here but anything in connection with bonuses for land will be discussed. Agriculture would indicate that it is included in the scope of the word.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I would like to see included in propaganda and that is agricultural education in the schools to interest the children in it in the way of flower pots or some vegetation. Have a garden in the outport schools so that the children might take an interest and understand a little of gardening. Is it the intention of the Government to follow out anything of that kind?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is well taken.

What my hope was in this matter, with the concurrence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, was that we would be able to locate one of the dozen Newfoundlanders who have had expert agricultural training in various agricultural training schools in Canada, and be able to obtain the service of this man as Deputy so that he could talk along agricultural lines in the schools, visit the farms and give expert knowledge to the farmers, dis-

cuss with them and advise them as to their soils, fertilizers, limes and other things that the soil requires.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, supplementing what the Prime Minister has said I remember nearly twenty years ago I felt very strongly along the lines which the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has just mentioned with regard to agricultural education in the schools. I interested some teachers in certain sections of the country and they endeavoured to try it out and I furnished them with a certain amount of equipment but after a year or two it was a lamentable failure. I have tried the experiment again recently and have been largely successful in the way of giving lectures by an expert in one particular section of the country and the people of the locality have so far shown a considerable interest in it and it may be worth while following up on a larger scale. So far it has proved more satisfactory than I anticipated and I am prepared to give it extended or larger proportions within the next year, provided it will be within our means.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I presume, that these gentlemen, Commissioners of Agriculture, will be duly qualified men having a direct knowledge of agriculture and able to advise and direct. Is that your intention?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is our hope to do the very best we can in that direction.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I suppose the main qualification is that he will be a very strong supporter of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I shall hope to be able to give the preference to a supporter, as the Hon. member would do under the same circumstances.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, the latter part of this Bill is very contentious as the Hon. gentlemen opposite will very readily understand. It is to appoint a board of five commissioners—not exceeding five—agricultural commissioners. As I said the other day we are going back to the old board of agricultural commissioners instituted in 1910 by the Morris Government of that day. That Act was on the Statute Book I think until 1923 when the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I think, in this House, either he or the Prime Minister of that day, the late Mr. Warren, got that Act expunged from the Statute Book, because there was such a hue and cry raised that Agricultural Commissioners were going to re-appointed. Agricultural Commissioners who had seats in this House and who could not be of very much assistance to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines because of their lack of knowledge of anything appertaining to agriculture.

I do not see and reason why that Board should operate to-day any more than in 1923 when the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines thought it should not operate. You will see in section 5 that Clause 4 reads:

(Reads)

That means that you can take five members of this House of Assembly and appoint them commissioners of agriculture and they can hold their positions while members of this House and not have to go back for re-election. We had an answer to a question tabled here some time ago, and the name of one commissioner is already here on the roll. However, I have nothing whatever to say against that gentleman; but I certainly object to this part of the Bill, because I do not think it is necessary.

At the present time there is a man in the Agriculture and Mines Department who has grown up with the De-

partment. He has spent thirty years of his life there, and I think he is a very capable man. The fact of the matter is that he would make a very good Deputy Minister of Agriculture, now that you are going to separate the Departments. The gentleman I refer to is now Secretary of Agriculture, although I am not against the bringing down here from Guelph Agricultural College any Newfoundlander who went there and studied the subject. I would not object to the first part of the Bill at all, but I do object to appointing a Board of five Agricultural Commissioners and go back to the old regime of 1910-20.

In 1920 the Model Farm was built and we had agricultural commissioners up to 1923, and everybody knows they were members of the House who were put there for the purpose of finding positions of emolument for them, and there was such a hue and cry raised in this House that the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Prime Minister at that time expunged the Act from the Statutes. Consequently, I do not see any more reason to-night for appointing Commissioners of Agriculture any more than there was reason for it in 1923. I, therefore, cannot support that section of the Bill.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman. In connection with this Bill, I may say I am not an agriculturalist, and cannot speak with authority on the subject, I admit, but I find it difficult to understand that, although this is one of our minor industries and should be far greater, it is necessary to appoint a commission of five. At a time when development was needed to a far greater extent than at present, that is nineteen years ago, with the industry all those years of development behind what it is to day, it was only necessary to appoint three. Why should it be necessary to-day to have a commission of

five; and why should it be necessary unless it can be shown that any particular member of the House of Assembly is particularly qualified to advise the Minister on agricultural matters to give an exemption to members of the House of Assembly from provisions existing to-day. I remember when the commission was appointed in 1910. I think the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agricultural and Mines are the only members of the House here to-day who were then in the House. I happened to be here as a reporter, and I remember very well the debate on it in the House; on the question of members of the House being members of that commission.

Now it has been said that the three commissioners then appointed had no experience in agriculture. I do not think that is true, because the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines had had experience in agriculture years before he became a member of this House. So that there would be every reason to expect that some assistance would be given by him to the Minister of the day, who is the present Sheriff, Mr. Blandford. With regard to the other members of that commission, I do not know anything about their qualifications but I accept without reserve the statement that they gave valuable services; but I fail to see the necessity for the appointment of five; and I do not see why the Commission could not be constituted of say one of three who should be a member of the House and two others to be men outside the House qualified to advise the Minister; and that would be a good Commission and I do not think the Minister would take exception to it.

Before I take my seat I would like to ask the Prime Minister why there is constituted a Department of Agriculture and a Department of Mines instead of the one department with

two sub-departments?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, this phraseology I understand follows that used in constituting the two divisions of the Department of Finance and Customs. I am so advised by the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice and my instructions to him were that the wording used in respect of the Department of Finance and Customs should be followed.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

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

“That section five be deleted and sections following be renumbered as follows:—5, 6, 7, 8.”

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:—

Mr. Alderdice
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Emerson
Mr. Moore
Mr. Winter
Mr. Quinton
Mr. Tobin
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Abbott
Mr. Byrne (10)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Minister of Finance
Hon. the Minister of Posts
Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker
Hon. Mr. Bradley
Hon. Dr. Campbell
Hon. Dr. Mosdell
Hon. Mr. Lewis
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister of Fisheries
Mr. Earle

Mr. Starkes
Mr. Fitzgibbon
Mr. Skeans
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Winsor
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Fudge
Mr. Strong
Mr. Greene
Mr. Smith (22)

So it passed in the negative.

The original motion for adoption of the Report was put, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Minister of Finance
Hon. the Minister of Posts
Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker
Hon. Mr. Bradley
Hon. Dr. Campbell
Hon. Dr. Mosdell
Hon. Mr. Lewis
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister of Fisheries
Mr. Earle
Mr. Starkes
Mr. Fitzgibbon
Mr. Skeans
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Winsor
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Fudge
Mr. Strong
Mr. Greene
Mr. Smith (22)

and against it:

Mr. Alderdice
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Emerson
Mr. Moore
Mr. Winter
Mr. Quinton
Mr. Tobin
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Abbott
Mr. Byrne (10)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon on motion the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill respecting certain Retiring Allowances.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time has come to pension Mr. Fitzgerald. I have known him for the past fifty years, he was tutor to the Fisheries Board, he was its chief pickled fish and oil inspector and he had an all round knowledge of the fisheries of this country. He was the chief pickled fish inspector for many years but after a time some trouble arose and he left the position but was subsequently re-commissioned. I claim that he was a martyr to the duties imposed upon him by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I remember seeing him one night about 12 o'clock in a dory in Curling, drenched to the skin, after having travelled many miles, waiting for a steamer, he was then drafted to Humbermouth to inspect a cargo. The duties imposed upon him are very trying and it is a simple act of justice that a suitable allowance be made to him in his retiring years.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Fitzgerald was pensioned according to the Act.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, In reference to Miss

Ryan, suppose she recovered her health, does her pension continue? I have in mind the case of Miss Southcott, she was pensioned twenty years ago and now she is running a hospital, I think that that is absurd. If Miss Ryan being sick receives her pension and then recovers, she still gets her pension, I don't think that is right, surely some other way can be found to manage this. I think it should be understood that if a person gets sick and receives a pension, if they recover they should go back to work or lose the pension.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion the Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time and passed, and that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act," was read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Hibbs is in Kelligrews and Dr. Barnes is busy in the next room, I wish to ask that this Bill be read a second time now and be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow. The theory is this. The Colonial Secretary is responsible to this House for all matters in connection with the Highroads. The Government Engineer is responsible not to the Head of any Department, but to the Executive Government, that is, to the Colonial Secretary as Speaker of that body. In a small country like ours where we have only one engineer, he has a great deal of work

to do, he has to devote one day each week to each Department and so on. Thus the proposal was made that he be directly responsible to the Executive Government, therefore to the Colonial Secretary. That was the practise years ago when Mr. Hall was first invited here in connection with the railway. He undertook the work but there was no Minister directly responsible to the House for his activities. Consequently the Colonial Secretary feels that he is not the person to whom questions concerning roads and bridges should be put as they are not within his scope, he is not a road builder and therefore is not able to answer intelligently questions concerning roads and bridges. Consequently he feels that the Minister responsible to this House in this matter should be the Minister of Public Works.

I understand that the Minister of Public Works is glad to assume these responsibilities and this Bill will make the Minister of Public Works the head of the Highroads Commission the same way as he is head of the Board of Works. The Government Engineer is Deputy Chairman of the Commission and in connection with awards and such like a certificate signed by the Government engineer is necessary. I am not an expert road builder and I have no intimate knowledge of the Highroads Commissions except that some did good work and others did not do so well. But I feel that the principal concern is that the Minister directly responsible to this House should be the Minister of Public Works as he controls all the local grants which are not especially assigned to the department of the Highroads Commission. I therefore ask that this Bill be read a second time and we can discuss the details to-morrow.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that this be allowed

to stand over, as I think that the Opposition should have time to consider it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
I agree.

On motion of Mr. Emerson the Prime Minister agreed to have the second reading of the Bill deferred until tomorrow.

Fursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to a Tax Upon Certain Timber Lands," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I do not think it is necessary for me to delay the House with any extended remarks. When introducing the measure I outlined the reasons why this legislation is being brought before the House. Hon. members will remember I then stated that the Reid interests, who are deeply interested in the Gander Valley Project, have acquired during recent years several timber tracts in that section of the country and they now find that their titles to these lands are defective by reason of the fact that the original owners did not comply with the law in respect to their property.

I propose to offer some amendments when the House is in Committee as the Bill in its present form might interfere with the Gander Valley negotiations now being conducted. All these titles which the Company owns have been paid for in cash. They are listed as part of the Company's timber reserve and as such form part of their assets, but the titles, as I have already explained, are defective, and if this Bill passes as it stands it will have the effect of jeopardising these titles and will al-

so jeopardise the negotiations now going on regarding the Gander Valley proposition.

As to just how far this explanation is critically correct I am not in a position to say definitely at the present moment, as it was not until yesterday at two p.m. that Mr. Conroy called on me and requested that this go from me to the Executive and from the Executive to this House.

This is the serious problem which I had to face. I do not feel that I have any sympathy for these people at all, because if a house on Duckworth Street were for sale and a man buys it knowing that the lease may be terminated at any moment, and it is terminated, he will in the ordinary course of business will have to take his medicine. They have paid large sums of money to speculators such as Mr. Roberts and other gentlemen of Montreal and consequently I feel that this House might reasonably consider some amendment which is necessary but which would not jeopardise the negotiations of that timber area. That is the only amendment that has been considered.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that any other member of the House is in the possession of more information with regard to timber lands than my colleague, Mr. Sullivan. He has made a study of that thing and has been preparing an address which he intended to deliver on the second reading of this Bill. That is what has made him so seriously ill as he is to-day. Before we consider any amendments might I have your permission to read for the benefit of this House and the Prime Minister this speech which he has prepared?

I would not have done this but for the fact that it may help the Prime Minister in preparing some amendments. I do not know the purport and the details of this speech, but I

would very much like to read it and place it on record in this House, as possibly it may be the Hon. member's last work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would be glad if this be placed on record as the Hon. member's speech on the subject.

Mr. Puddister reads with unanimous consent of the House the speech prepared by Mr. Sullivan, as follows:

With reference to the Bill now before the chair, I want to say I am in full accord with the principle because I think it is about time that this country should receive some adequate return for timber and water power concessions. The Bill under consideration is most important and the closest attention should be given to it by every member of this House. In the past, we have received practically nothing for our natural resources, and the time is now come when important legislation of this nature should receive the most careful thought; on the other hand, it would be very bad policy indeed to pass legislation that could only have the effect of keeping back the development of this country's timber areas. It is true that the annual rentals charged in the past are much below the Canadian standard, still, the rental which is proposed under this Bill is far and away higher than is charged anywhere in the world as far I am aware. Later on, I propose to suggest adopting a policy somewhat similar to that of Quebec. The rental which is proposed in the Bill is excessive and is going to debar any Company from investing in Newfoundland or Labrador. I think it would be well to let the House know approximately what it means to a Company that proposes to establish, say, a 400 ton mill in Newfoundland or the Labrador. It has been accepted that about eight cords of wood to an acre is the

average yield in Newfoundland and the same average may or may not apply to the Labrador. No Company is going to invest capital in timber lands that will not assure them of at least fifty years supply. For the purpose of making calculations easy I am taking requirements in round figures, a 400 ton Paper Mill would require about 600 cords of wood per day, and assuming that there would be 300 working days, this means that, at least, 180,000 cords of wood per annum is necessary. The area of land required to yield this amount of Pulpwood for a period of fifty years, without allowing any margin for insect damage, forest fires, over matured wood and blown down timber and assuming that the timber area would yield eight cords per acre, after allowing deduction for water and barren land, would be, say, 1758 square miles. According to the Bill now submitted, an annual rental amounting to \$178,500.00 would be charged on this area or for a fifty year period the Company operating would have to pay the Government of Newfoundland in rentals the sum of \$8,790,000, plus the loss of interest and take all fire risks and other forest losses.

A capital of at least \$30,000,000 would be required to build and equip and provide working capital for a paper mill on Labrador, as it would be necessary to put in a stock for six months of mill and logging supplies. The interest on \$30,000.00 at 5 p.c. would be at least \$1,500,000 per annum. It is very doubtful at present if money could be borrowed for a paper industry at 5 p.c. (unless guaranteed by the Government and of Government guarantees we have had enough), this in addition to annual rental of \$178,500.00 for the timber lands, would mean that the Company would have fixed charges to start off with of \$1,678,500 per annum, without

allowing anything for sinking fund. With the condition of the paper market as it is and with the assurance of at least twenty years supply of timber available in Canada for Canadian Mills which can be obtained at a reasonable additional cost, I see not much hope of any Company going into the manufacture of paper on the Labrador, until such time as raw material becomes much more expensive in Canada and the United States than it is at the present time.

Whenever the pulp industry starts on the Labrador it will be carried out by different stages. People will have to be induced to settle there, towns will have to be erected to take care of employees. If title to timber areas can be secured at a reasonable figure the first timber industries will have to be Saw Mills and Rossing Plants, later, Ground-wood Mills and Sulphite Mills, and lastly Paper Mills.

It would be the policy of any Government to make reasonable concessions to any "bona fide" Company that is prepared to immediately proceed to the Labrador and start development work on any of the lines I have suggested, but if the Government persists in charging a rental of \$100.00 per square mile per annum, I see no hope of any development taking place. Labour for our people is badly required and we should do all we can to induce new capital into Newfoundland and its dependencies. A very good reason could be put forward why the development of the Labrador has been retarded, no Company would invest millions in an industry until they had absolute assurance of a proper title, no such assurance could be given until the Labrador boundary was settled two years ago, then, unfortunately, the paper market collapsed and it made it extremely difficult to induce capital to go in even for the erection of Rossing Plants and

Saw Mills, although, in two instances, negotiations were completed by parties holding areas on the Labrador, and in one case the machinery arrived in St. John's, Newfoundland, last October for a sawmill capable of cutting 120,000 F.B.M., every twenty-four hours, but owing to navigation closing it was impossible to get machinery transhipped to Labrador and erected by May 1st, 1929

Whilst I agree that rentals and royalties charged in respect of certain timber lands are, and have been, wholly disproportionate to the value of the timber lands in other countries, and that it is time the present Crown Lands Act, relating to grants on timber lands and water powers was amended, I cannot think for a moment that any member of this House who has the welfare of this country at heart and looks forward with hope to the development of our natural resources or who wishes for the establishing of industries to give that much needed employment, that our people are hoping and praying for, can vote for the Resolutions as they are. By all means, amend the Act, but do not pass such a drastic measure as the one outlined in this Bill. If this measure as it is (through the carelessness, indifference or incompetence of the members of this house) becomes law, then you members of the Government are responsible and on you one and all the responsibility must rest for retarding for at least fifty years the possibility of any timber industry being started on the Labrador, to give that much needed labour that the people of this country are asking for.

I do not know of any country placing such a rental on Pulp limits as that proposed by this Government. Certainly I am strongly in favor of increasing bonuses, rental and stumpage on, available Crown Lands

that we have to dispose off. Formerly we received \$2.00 bonus for the first year only and \$2.00 per mile rental with stumpage on sawn timber of fifty cents or \$1.00 per thousand. But there is such a thing as going too far. In Canada they know the quantity of timber on their Crown lands and can demand a bonus rental and stumpage according to the yield per acre. We in this country on the other hand know absolutely nothing of timber stands on the Labrador. Supposing a license has been held for an area, of say, 1500 square miles on which the rentals have been paid amounting to thousands of dollars. How many acres are barren land? How many acres are burnt timber? How much of timber is over matured? How many cords of wood is available on the land? Not any of these questions can be answered, and yet, the Bill calls for a rental of \$100.00 per square mile per annum for term of lease.

In the Province of Quebec, where some of the finest stands of Pulpwood are located, they would not think of charging any such annual rental as is proposed in this Bill now under discussion. Ontario has the best Mining laws in Canada. Quebec has the best Timber laws, and it would be judicious on the part of the Government to adopt a policy somewhat similar dealing with our timber resources to that adopted by the Province of Quebec, charge a reasonable bonus according to the value of the stand of timber, charge a stumpage on every thousand F.B.M., or cord of wood cut on the area and charge an annual rental. Bonuses charged on timber areas in Canada vary according to quantity of timber on the area, and also taking into account the cost of operating the territory ranging from \$50.00 to \$400.00 per square mile, but please bear in mind that bonus is

simply a charge for first year only and there is also annual rental which I think in most cases amounts to \$8.00 per mile per annum, stumpage is at the rate of \$2.50 to \$3.00 per thousand F.B.M. Assuming that for 60,000 square miles of timber lands on the Labrador, you are proposing according to this Bill to ask a rental of \$6,000,000 per year or fifty years period you would anticipate receiving rentals amounting to \$300,000,000 for timber rights alone, so that if you include water powers, mineral rights, agricultural rights and fisheries, Labrador would be of tremendous value. If this Bill goes through, it means that not one of the parties who held rights and paid their rents up to date can continue to hold their areas, as no such annual rent can or will be paid by any person or corporation.

I am absolutely opposed to granting any more timber lands or water powers to speculators, and no matter what bonus, stumpage or rental the Government may be prepared to charge, there should be a clause inserted in the grants compelling the owners to proceed with development within a reasonable time or otherwise the property will revert to the Crown.

As to License holders who have held timber lands and water powers in the past, and who have not, although paying their rents lived up to all their obligations, more particularly on the Labrador for which there is a reasonable excuse I feel that it would be only fair that on the payment of a reasonable bonus and increased annual rental and stumpage they should be given a further period of three years to carry out the conditions of their license or other conditions which the Government may impose, and if not then the license to be cancelled and they to be reim-

bursed for rental paid the Government, if not immediately on cancellation of license, then later on when the lands have been sold to individuals or corporations.

According to the rental which is proposed there is not the slightest hope of any of the license holders being able to induce capital to come in and develop our timber resources. No corporation would be prepared to erect a paper mill unless they were assured of a fifty years supply of raw material, and as I have already stated, a 400 ton mill would require at least 9,000,000 cords of wood for that period, it means that at least 1758 square miles would be required to give this quantity cutting at the rate of 180,000 cords per annum. The rental that would have to be paid the Government would amount to \$178,500.00 per annum.

Might I suggest, that people who have paid their rentals up to date be given an extension by paying reasonable bonus, and that any new applicants for timber concessions be charged bonuses according to the timber stands with the condition imposed for immediate development and continuous operation.

If this bill becomes law, it only means that before the dreams with which certain members of the Government entertained their constituents during the Election Campaign of selling the Labrador to America or Canadian capitalists can be realized the Act will have to be repealed. For at the figures mentioned, the timber rights for fifty years would cost about \$300,000,000, a sum which few Governments and no corporation could afford to consider for a moment. The highest sum mentioned by the Honourable Gentleman to whom I refer did not reach much over our capital debt, say, \$80,000,000. That figure would need considerable revision to

bring it up to the value which the framer of this Bill must have had in his mind.

Another aspect of this strikes me and that is may not this Bill if it becomes law have a very serious effect on promoting the Gander development. Several hundreds of square miles of timber lands have been acquired by the promoters and other large areas are under option, and in nearly every case, except the Reids own fee simple lands, have been acquired from parties who have not lived up to the obligations of their licenses. Again, I would like to call your attention to the effect this may have on the extension of the International Power and Paper Co., of Newfoundland Limited, Plant at Corner Brook, as I understand during the last eighteen months this Company has purchased in good faith large additional timber areas from owners who did not carry out the condition of their leases. An industry such as the one at Corner Brook needs large timber reserves as serious forest depletion might take place any day from forest fires. I do not know what effect this Bill will have on the purchases so made by the two concerns mentioned, possibly it does not effect the International Power and Paper Company, but I am afraid it will affect the Gander proposition. It is the duty of the Government to see that proper protection is given the International Power and Paper Company so that their proposed extension may in no way be curtailed, and that in the event of the Gander promoters being able to secure the necessary capital they should not be deprived of the timber limits they acquired from parties who had not lived up to the obligations of their leases. With the difficulty that has been met with in securing the necessary capital to promote the Gander deal in Newfoundland, where conditions are so well

known, we can easily understand what difficulty license holders of the timber limits on the Labrador had to contend with. How much more difficult is it going to be from now on to get capitalists to invest in timber limits either in Newfoundland or Labrador when they are to be called upon to pay a rental of \$100.00 per square mile per annum.

I merely mention this for the consideration of the Government as it strikes me that very serious consideration of this measure is necessary. One other matter I would like to call the attention of the Government to if they want any immediate development on the Labrador, and that is allowing the export of a certain quantity of rossed pulpwood at a royalty, provided wood from the Labrador cannot be sold in Newfoundland at a reasonable price and until such time as paper and pulp mills are erected on the Labrador.

Just a word more, should the Government cancel all the licenses on which the rentals have been paid to date and this must amount to a very considerable sum, this will entail a considerable hardship on the people who kept paying their rentals in good faith hoping that in many cases they would be able to secure the necessary capital required to develop the properties, but another serious aspect to be looked at is the great loss of revenue to the Government that will follow, as no person or corporation can afford with any hope of successfully carrying on a business if they are compelled to pay a rental of \$100 per square mile per annum. Can this country afford to lose the revenue that is bound to follow if this Bill becomes law.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I did intend myself to deal with some information that I secured from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I

shall not deal with it now but will say what I have to say when the Bill is in Committee.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly and Acts in Amendment Thereof,'" was read a second time.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, before this bill passes I just have a few remarks to make. I made most of them this afternoon but while the principle of this Bill is now before the House I wish to reiterate them very briefly.

Section (27) of the main act is amended by adding thereto the words "or for the purpose of enquiry under Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) or otherwise into the administration of any branch of the public service or into any matter relating to the good government of the Colony."

If members of the House of Assembly are appointed to it they are exempted from the penalties imposed by Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes.

It is of course well known to all of us that certain penalties are attached to members of this House holding seats in the House and receiving payment from the Government departments or holding Government Offices, and it has always been the intention of constitutional Government, both here and in England that with the exception of very serious exceptions, members of the House shall not hold offices of profit under the Crown, and it is for that express purpose that the Legislative Disabilities Act was passed many years ago, and the penalties were the vacating of the seat and practical penalties for voting after

having accepted these offices and held them beyond a certain period, and the object behind it was to see that members of this House should not be purchased—to put it bluntly—so that there should be an independent House, a House which was not paid to vote according to the wishes of the Government, a House that could not be controlled by the Government on that account.

From time to time this Act has been amended in certain particular cases, one of those cases before us to-night, the case where in 1910 the Agricultural Commissioners were appointed and they were made exempt from the penalties under this Act, but even in the course of the history of this country, it is quite seldom that the Act has been amended for any particular purpose, and if the reading which I give to this section 3 of the proposed Bill is correct, there has not been at any time as wide an amendment suggested.

Now in view of what has occurred during recent days in connection with legislation and announcements, legislation which created commissions, announcements which have told us about commissions are going to be created and the last one that we have had before us, and to which the Hon. the Prime Minister gave a very elusive explanation in introducing it, the Highroads Commission Bill, where the numbers are increased once more, it is a matter of very grave importance to consider how far this matter is going to go.

I do not suppose for one moment that any member of this House wishes to be otherwise than independent but what I do say is this, that this Act puts into the hands of the Governor-in-Council a power which it ought not have, in relation to the members of this House. I do not know whether members of the House at the present

time who are not in the Executive Government and who do not hold portfolios have been appointed to any positions. I do not know if any member of the House knows whether he is going to be appointed but I do say this that these offices are held out for you now and it rests with the Executive Government whether they are to be available and instead of having nine portfolios as there are to-day you are going to have innumerable commissions practically created not as ministries, not as Departments, but as jobs for anybody in the House who wants them.

Now I am going to go further than that and say this, that you are creating a very dangerous precedent for other Governments because if so many jobs are to be available for this Government they are going to be available for the next and that is bound as the years go by to create a corrupt House. I do not for one moment suggest that it will be created corrupt or made worse during the session or even during the present Parliament but I would say by passing this Bill you are creating a very dangerous precedent which will result in the years to come in this House being absolutely illegal and corrupt.

I would urge upon the Government to consider very seriously before you agree to section (3) of the proposed Bill and as to whether you are going to be guilty of what may be a serious offence against the constitution of this country.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record as being against this measure. I shall vote against it and I shall challenge a division on it. I voted against the Bill constituting a Solicitor General, and, having voted against that Bill, there is nothing left for members on this side of the House to do but to vote against this one as well. I heartily

agree with the remarks of the Hon. member for Placentia East in connection with this Bill. It not only enables the appointee to take his seat without having to go back to his constituents and ask their concurrence; also section (3) legalizes the appointment of members of this House as members of a Public Enquires Commission, which means that they can enjoy positions of emoluments under the Crown as long as they want to, without any necessity of going back to their constituents. I have also to request your permission, Mr. Chairman, to speak for Mr. Sullivan in this connection. Mr. Sullivan was feeling much better on Saturday last than heretofore and he told me he would be in the House on Monday no matter what happened. He prepared three speeches and shortly after preparing them he was stricken unconscious. I shall now proceed to read his speech in relation to this Legislative Disabilities Bill:

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker: With reference to this bill, I might say that I would be prepared to support it, provided I was certain that the Solicitor General was a permanent appointment, and would attend to all criminal prosecutions and generally do the work that has been done at considerable expense to the country by outside legal firms. Speaking for myself, I must say that I am somewhat alarmed at the very large amounts past Governments have had to pay to outside legal firms. I am very much afraid this new appointment of a Solicitor General is not going to meet the requirements that are anticipated by the Government. The Attorney General of England receives £1,000 per annum more than the Solicitor General of England. In this country, it is now proposed to pay the Solicitor General \$1,000 a year more than the Minister of Justice or Attorney General is receiving. The Attor-

ney General of this country has been receiving in the past \$4,000 per annum. I understand that it is proposed to pay the Solicitor General who is shortly to be appointed, \$5,000 per annum. As the appointment of Solicitor General is evidently not going to be a permanent one, I think the interests of this country would be better served if a Deputy Minister of Justice, at an increased salary were appointed. It has been pointed out how very difficult it is to get any of the senior lawyers to accept the position of Deputy Minister of Justice at the present salary of \$3,600 per annum, that is, for a lawyer who will devote his time to that position. I am afraid that the Solicitor General will not be able to undertake all criminal prosecutions and do other legal work that will be expected of him, such as looking after the legal work of the Railway and the Department of Finance and Customs, which is considerable. By appointing a Deputy Minister of Justice at a salary of \$4,000 per annum and giving him an assistant Deputy at \$3,000—all to be permanent employees—who would always be in close touch with all legislation passed and do all the legal work of the Government, better results will—in my opinion—be obtained, at much less cost to the country than in the past. If this were done, it would be unnecessary to bring in the Bill which is now under discussion, and if this bill becomes law, will discredit any parliament that passes it. However, if the Government in its superior wisdom, is satisfied that the appointment of a Solicitor General is going to be the solution of all the Government's trouble, without paying large legal fees then, undoubtedly, this bill will be put through as it is. Under this bill, the Solicitor General would be fully protected and would not have to vacate his seat in the House of Assembly. We would be glad to know

what is the necessity of having Clause 3 included in this bill. It has nothing whatever to do with the appointment of a Solicitor General. This is a wholesale proposition to destroy entirely what was intended when the bill known as "Carter's Purge" was introduced years ago. Yes, if this bill becomes law with section 3 included, I must regretfully suggest that the Placeman's Act be abolished, as it will no longer have any effect. You might as well abolish it, and if you do, it cannot cast any more discredit on your Government than the bill which you now propose to make law.

The legislators, both in England and Newfoundland years ago, who introduced what is known as "Pride's Purge" and "Carter's Purge" must have had very good reasons for introducing that legislation here. Now, we in the House of Assembly, are abolishing these if this Bill becomes law. Please understand, I am not protesting against the appointment of a Solicitor General or any other appointment that the Government can show me is in the best interests of this country, should be appointed, but what I do object to is giving the Government wholesale power to appoint every member of the House, both on the Government's side and on the Opposition side, if the Government feels like it, to appointments of emolument without having to vacate their seats in the House of Assembly. If you have any appointments to make of members of the House of Assembly to any positions, please name them, and if we consider your recommendation beneficial to the country's interests, there will be no unreasonable opposition from this side of the House. I am absolutely opposed to the power you will have to make wholesale appointments to members of this House to positions of emolument, if Clause 3 becomes law. Mr. Prime Minister, you are plac-

ing the members of this House in a most humiliating position when you ask them to practically repeal Act 18, George V., Chapter 8, entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities," if Clause 3 of this Bill passes the House, as it is now framed. This, Sir, I take it, is not a party measure, and every member of the House should use his own judgement. If this bill becomes law as it is, it will be considered the most discreditable and inexcusable act legalized by any Government. We—as an Opposition—so far have not embarrassed the Government by criticisms of the members who are now drawing pay for positions of emolument illegally. What I say is, name your men, and I, for my part, may have no objection to legalizing their appointments, but Mr. Prime Minister, do not ask us to give you "carte blanche" as you would have under Clause 3, to make wholesale appointments as commissioners to positions of emolument for every member of your party who holds a pistol to your head and demands a job. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we are so old fashioned and do not look at things in the same light as they did in olden times, when "Pride's Purge" and "Carter's Purge" were placed on the Statutes in England and Newfoundland. Possibly, we are more modern, and they have been all wrong and we—being wiser in our generation and more advanced in our ideas as to what is right and what is wrong—may as members of the House of Assembly, look at things in a very different light, as it is in our own interests to do so, but I am afraid that the public will not be as easily convinced as to the necessity of passing Clause 3 of this Bill, as the members of the House seem to be. You and I, Mr. Prime Minister, are old politicians, and I regret, Sir, that you have asked members of

this House to pass humiliating legislation that will enable every member of this House to take positions of emolument without coming under the Legislative Disabilities Act. I have had, Sir, the greatest respect for you as a politician, but so sure as this bill becomes law, you will be discredited by the people of this country. You and your party were sent here by the people of this country to practice economy, and what are you doing? By attempting to pass legislation that will give you new power to make wholesale appointments of this House to positions of emolument at a time when the strictest economy in the interests of the country, is most essential. This Bill, Sir, may pass the House, unless members of your party vote against it, as they are bound in honor to do, but should they not, then, we must trust to the Upper House to see that such a discreditable bill as this does not pass with the far-reaching Clause 3 unamended. I contend, Sir, it is unfair for any government to place His Excellency the Governor, in the humiliating position of having to assent to this bill as it now stands and I trust it will be sent back from the Upper House rejected, or at least, with Clause 3 erased. As it now stands, I propose to vote against it, and when the time comes for voting, shall ask for a division on the bill, so that the people may see who are responsible for passing such a measure.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I desire also to place myself on record as being opposed to this Bill. When this Bill came before the House a few days ago the Prime Minister gave us the assurance that the appointment of a Solicitor General would mean the saving for the Colony of thousands of dollars annually. It seems to me that you are simply giving the Solicitor General a retainer and section (3) of the Bill is part of

the scheme to put him in that position. It's disastrous for this country—to put it in plain words—that every member of the Government has his price. It degrades and lowers the tone of things when members are made dependent upon the powers that be in the Government, and we cannot expect to get the decent legislation that we should expect when members are placed in such a position.

MR. WINTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like also to go on record as being strongly opposed to the principle of this Bill. The principle of Carter's Purge has been well defined and lucidly explained by the hon. member for Placentia East, and I am quite sure there is not a statesman on the other side of the House but who appreciates the value of that enactment, and now it is the intention of the Government to wipe out the whole effect of this by appointing a number of members of this House to positions of emolument under the Crown. I take it that we, in this ancient Colony, are as proud of our constitutional rights and independence as any Britisher in the Old Country, and here we have in this enlightened age of 1929 a deliberate attempt to wipe out a very salutary provision in our constitution. I say, Sir, it is nothing short of scandalous, and I want to again register my protest in the strongest possible terms.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, because we say that we are going to pay a Solicitor General at a business rate of five thousand dollars a year and because it happens that some member of the House, not yet named, is to be paid five thousand dollars, that, that is the subject of some criticism. May I point out, Sir, that the late Ministry paid a member of its own Executive, at least, ten thousand dollars a year for professional services. It is considered entirely proper and entirely correct from a

constitutional standpoint for a medical man or a lawyer to receive fees in large amount, whether he is a member of the Government or whether he is a member of the Executive Government; whilst it is considered entirely improper for a layman to receive fees in small amount as a Government advisor. I would point out that we are coming in, in a straight-forward manner and appointing a Solicitor General, I feel myself, as Attorney General, that his appointment will save the Colony of from ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year. We are putting in a salary for him at next session of the House; this year he will be paid out of the Criminal and Civil Prosecutions account.

I do feel, Sir, that criticism of that character is hardly fair, particularly, when we have a precedent given us in this regard for the past five years.

On motion for the second reading of the Bill "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly and Acts in Amendment Thereof,'" the House divided, when there appeared in favor of the motion:

Hon. the Prime Minister
 Hon. the Minister of Finance
 Hon. the Minister of Posts
 Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker
 Hon. Dr. Campbell
 Hon. Dr. Mosdell
 Hon. Mr. Lewis
 The Minister of Agriculture
 The Minister of Public Works
 The Minister of Fisheries
 Mr. Earle
 Mr. Starkes
 Mr. Fitzgibbon
 Mr. Skeans
 Mr. Grimes
 Mr. Scammell
 Mr. Winsor

Mr. Parsons
 Mr. Fudge
 Mr. Bindon
 Mr. Strong
 Mr. Greene
 Mr. Smith (22)

and against it:

Mr. Alderdice
 Mr. Puddester
 Mr. Emerson
 Mr. Moore
 Mr. Winter
 Mr. Quinton
 Mr. Tobin
 Mr. Bennett
 Mr. Abbott
 Mr. Byrne (10)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly, and the said Bill was ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Commission Act, 1927," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Bill be read a second time I would like to comment on a remark made the Honorable Member Captain Byrne in reference to Sudbury Hospital, in which he suggested that Sudbury Hospital Board had been treated in a certain manner because of political hostility, and also to a reference here, an echo of that suggestion when it was likewise intimated that the action of the Government in connection with taxes or in some such case was based on hostility. I wish to state that there has been no such thought in dealing with taxes, hospitals, or the public service. In this relation I would like to draw the attention of the Government at the present moment

to the body of gentlemen who were associated with Captain Byrne working as a Tourist Commission, although they gave him and his party in St. John's East in the recent campaign their undivided and very earnest support, have been left every one of them to retain their memberships of that commission, and even though their term of office expires we are volunteering even without one of the Board suggesting it to change the statutory term and extend it.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Are they paid?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think the Honourable Gentleman has committed an error of judgment and an error of tact in making that observation. You have a tendency, Sir, to chip in irrelevant and discourteous remarks when other persons are trying to be courteous. I want to tell you how very difficult it is at times to be courteous even in this House. Since the House opened a telegram was received by an active party supporter and friend of mine who had a small account, a reasonable size account, with a Tory merchant of Water Street. He applied in the ordinary course for some supplies this spring. The reply he received from that merchant, a prominent man on Water Street, was as follows:

"You did your best to wreck this country by associating with Squires and other disreputable, etc., (reads).

Then there are some other statements which if read would disclose the identity of the parties. It closes with a peremptory demand for payment of the account.

(Reads.)

When I am getting handed in stuff of this sort from my opponents on Water Street, Honourable Members will see how difficult it is to be al-

ways courteous. I want to point out to you and to this House that this is the sort of stuff my friends here and friends throughout the country are being asked to put up with in the ordinary course of business. But, Sir, we are straining every nerve not to be resentful; we are straining every nerve to be uniformly courteous; and our policy has never been one of vindictiveness and will not be, even though on certain occasions as may be judged from the message I have read it is indeed difficult to continue to be courteous and not resentful.

MR. PUDDISTER, it does not much matter to me what sort of messages somebody on Water Street sends out; but there is a rule in May's Parliamentary Practise which says when anything is read in Parliament it must be laid on the Table of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I read extracts only from the message.

MR. PUDDISTER—I would very much like to know who sent that message. I have the utmost contempt for him. I don't care who he is; and I dissociate myself entirely from being in any way connected with any man sending such a message. This incident arose out of a debate on Friday night and some remarks made by Captain Byrne. Captain Byrne in his remarks said that Toc H organisation felt that they were being treated in a discourteous way because of political hostility. I do not think Captain Byrne made any charge in that connection; he simply said they felt that way; and as soon as an assurance came from the other side of the House that this was not the case and no hostility was meant, I know for myself I accepted the explanation with the very best intentions possible, and I think that was the case too with everybody including Captain Byrne. I did not, and I do not intend to throw anything across to Members on the

other side of the House that I think unworthy of this House. I think when Captain Byrne got an explanation from the Honourable Member for Fortune Bay that there was no political hostility intended, Captain Byrne accepted that. He made no charge but said that they felt they were treated with political hostility. As far as I was concerned I accepted it absolutely and I think Captain Byrne did.

MR. BYRNE.—Mr. Speaker, I think in answer to the Prime Minister a word from me would be in order. A few minutes ago the Prime Minister speaking on the Bill before the House informed the House that I made a reference that the Government tried to discriminate against the Board in connection with the Sudbury Hospital. As the Honourable Member for Bay de Verde has pointed out I stated at the time that our Board felt that we had done good work; while we are not boasting we felt we had done good work in the past year, had a sum of \$9,000 net profit in bank, and anticipated doing better; and that being so we felt there was no reason for the Government or any body of men to find fault with the work. We simply felt that the only reason possible for shutting us down was because of what has been termed the political hostility of individual members of our Board. But seeing that I only voiced an opinion, before any explanation was given by the Honourable Member for Fortune had explained, I think the Prime Minister should accept it; and I think really I have not been out of order. I contend I was perfectly in order. Every man is entitled to an opinion; and I simply said we felt that what I said was the case. When an explanation is given I think I am as ready as anybody to accept it.

Now as far as the Tourist Bureau is concerned although my position in

that office was a paid one, being that of Secretary, those of the others who are the Commissioners were not paid positions and the nine men who composed that commission for five years have done splendid service, and they are the type of men we should be proud to have in Newfoundland, and I hope we have many more. These nine men to my personal knowledge have given of their time, and more than their time. I can assure this House that the majority of them are out of pocket on account of their activities in developing the tourist policy in Newfoundland. I was paid for my services so I can stand up and speak for the men who were not paid; and they contributed a great deal. I can inform the Prime Minister he is only doing justice when he allows this Commission to continue and he is not only doing justice but he is taking a very wise course; because you can't do good work without having results, and the commission has just come to the time when they are reaping the profit of the good work they have done, and are just about reaching the stage when they are able to feel they have accomplished a little. In Nova Scotia those who started to attract tourists went around and collected funds from the public and for every dollar collected the Government gave a dollar. Thus they began their publicity and today they are in the happy position in Nova Scotia that last year they could figure they received \$13,500,000 from their tourists; and last year alone they checked 92,000, tourists en route through Yarmouth port alone. Just go back a few years and you will find that the Yarmouth Tourist Association figured if they brought in tourists whose expenditures would be five hundred thousand dollars they were going to make a record year, but now they are talking in millions. It is true we are off the main land, but the

more tourists come to Nova Scotia the more likely it is that we are going to have a larger number—that we will get some of the overflow, and those who come will tell their friends of the attractions we have and bring others. I must say I feel assured we have more attractions in Newfoundland to offer the tourist than Nova Scotia ever had. When it comes to tourist attractions, sporting, scenic, and in other respects, Nova Scotia has nothing to compare with Newfoundland. You do no more than justice, Sir, in carrying on that Tourist Commission. I do not see that you could do anything else. I am sure we want Newfoundland to be a tourist centre and want the type of men to assist who are in that commission, and I can only recommend that when the end of the year comes, whatever political affiliations they may have, the good work of that commission will be recognised, and it will be continued and in doing that you will be doing the very best thing for the tourist traffic of this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill passes, I would like to follow up the point which has arisen when the Prime Minister replied to the criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, and I will be frank about it. I have seen letters sent by Mr. Monroe to men whom they used to give supplies and who voted for Squires in Ferryland district. These letters demanded payment of accounts, amounts which they paid and were not credited with; in other words they were trying to collect money that was not owed to them at all. I can refer you in particular to Mr. Power of Tor's Cove and Mr. John Williams of Ferryland, who received letters telling them to come across right away and they discovered that they did not owe near as much as they were told to pay and the

reason for that was that they voted on the wrong side. I have seen letters refusing to give supplies because they supported the Squires side in the elections. I think that it has come to a pretty pass when we have reverted back to the days of open voting. You see the same thing on Water St. We did not fire this Tourist Bureau because they were wrong politically, they did good work and we allowed them to stay there until the end of the year. I think that it is time, that this kind of thing be shown up, Mr. Monroe refused to give supplies because they voted for Squires and then tried to collect money which was never owed him at all.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Traffic Commission Act, 1927."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Commission Act, 1927," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrosed, 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. Mr. Lewis the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 93 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Recovery of Posses-

sion of Tenements in Certain Cases,' " was deleted from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill relating to Wool and Silk Mills, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Speaker, since we were in Committee the last day some changes have been made in the Bill. There was an objection raised by the member for Bay-de-Verde. He pointed out that in B, Section 1, the company need only operate six months. We have changed that now. The idea is that often in factories of this kind stocks accumulate and they discontinue operations for six months. We have decided to change that to 9 months. Sub-section 3 is practically redrafted so as to meet any doubts and set at rest the fear that advantage will be taken of this to import materials for other purposes than what is intended by this Bill. It now reads as follows:

(Reads)

Hon. members will observe that radical changes have been made in the verbiage. The idea is that no advantage will be taken to introduce materials in an underhand way to manufacture other lines. I beg the indulgence of the House to familiarize Hon. members with the old Knitting Mills Act and if you will pay attention you will be able to compare them. This was when they reached the highest point of prosperity when they were operating successfully up to the time that Mr. Smythe was drowned on the "Florizel."

(Reads)

I may explain that this is practically the same section as we have here except that it is 6 per cent instead of 5

per cent and the reason for that is as you know that money cannot be raised at 5 per cent to-day. The old capital was \$100,000, the new capital is \$200,000, double the old.

(Reads Section No. 2)

This section is exactly the same as the one in this Bill therefore I will not read it. We ask for fifteen years in this. In the old it was twenty. It is practically the same as the new except that the knitting machinery will have to be scrapped. Then they go on to name the raw material that has to come in. There are some spinning terms here which although I am not a spinner I can explain. Even though I am not a spinner I can spin a good yarn sometimes. In section three there are some ambiguous terms such as tops, noils etc. Tops are fine wool combings and noils are the refuse from the tops. I may say before I sit down that in the same year on August the 8th, 1917 there was another bill introduced into this House and passed, an Act respecting the Riverside Woolen Mills which was operated successfully in Conception Bay and it is the same Act exactly as the old Knitting Mill Act.

Now, gentlemen, if in nineteen seventeen the members of the House of Assembly say fit when there was no unemployment problem, and my only interest in this Bill is to provide labor for the unemployed, if in nineteen seventeen when every man was working, the Government of that day put two acts on our Statute Books practically the same as we are introducing surely it cannot be a crime to put one twice the size on the Statute Books to-day and spend a quarter of a million dollars right away.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, have you any guarantee that they are going to spend a quarter of a million dollars? Perhaps Hon. Dr. Campbell does not understand the

whole transaction. It is rumoured that Mr. Collishaw bought the building for ten thousand dollars.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. member of the suspended rules of the House. Do you intend to put this through under suspended rules?

I understand that this is a party measure and the Government will be responsible for it. Clause (b) Section three, is a very material amendment and takes a lot of objection away, but I am informed that Mr. Collishaw bought that mill for ten thousand dollars and spent about two thousand dollars on it and then values it at one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. He is going to sell bonds for another fifty thousand dollars.

That being the case the promoters of this bill will go off with a good swag. I am living in the West end of St. John's and I trust the Hon. member will believe what I say that there is not another member more interested in St. John's West than I am, but still I am the member for Bay-de-Verde and I am responsible to my constituents. This bill effects the whole country, and if we have guaranteed two hundred thousand dollars for fifteen years at six per cent that money will come from the whole country and we will have to pay.

I have lived in the West end of St. John's for twenty years still I am a member in this House for an outport constituency and I have to look at it from a country wide standpoint and my opinion is that we can get that mill established in St. John's West without a guarantee. If it is such a rosy proposition as some people say it is then I do not think we need a guarantee. I am anxious to get a living for the girls in St. John's West and give them employment but still I am responsible to my district and to this House and I cannot stifle my conscience.

I am sorry that the thing has resolved itself into a party measure. You cannot very well introduce a bill as a private bill when it asks to guarantee interest on two hundred thousand dollars per year, from the finances of the Colony. St. John's is greatly in need of industries and if this mill carries on and employs three hundred girls it will be a great benefit for St. John's West and we would all feel the good from it. But can we get it established without that guarantee? If Mr. Collishaw thinks that the thing is going to pay why does he need a guarantee? He needs it because he has to sell his stock. How much stock is he going to sell? I think we should see the Prospectus and Articles of Association of the Company and that will satisfy our minds. It will be better if the Hon. member for St. John's West, after we have some debate on the matter, will defer it until to-morrow.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to do that but I would like to point out the sudden development of Opposition to this measure. It was only two or three years ago we guaranteed the Hotel. I think that Messrs. Blackwood & Emerson were the lawyers. And the Leader of the Opposition was the Government director on it. I opposed it strongly and I was absolutely right. But this is a different story.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Dr. Campbell was in the Upper House he denounced the Hotel guarantee but now he comes down here and proposes a guarantee for this concern.

It is just as I said a week ago, it all depends which side of the House you are on. If you are sitting on that side of the House it is all right for the Bill to go through but if you are on this side you would denounce it unmercifully.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as being opposed to this Bill as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's West. What I particularly resent is that the Hon. Dr. Campbell, the Introducer, is stressing, as I remarked before, the labour part of that bill with reference to the mill which Mr. Collishaw is bringing to St. John's. I do not think he has informed the members of this House what the labour value, in any industry is, that has eighty per cent. female labour. It seems that this is going to be merely a girls job in the factory.

I take this view of it. This Mr. Collishaw who seems to be the only one interested in the thing apart from Hon. Member for St. John's West, who appears so interested that as a private member he introduced this Bill and then when he found he had no authority to do so he asked his party to bring it in. I put it to the House, Sir, as the Honourable Member for Bay de Verde has so ably disclosed, that the only man interested in this venture is this man, "the cute man" I might call him, Mr. Collishaw; the man who even that astute mind, Mr. Hollis Walker could not place. He could place all the Newfoundlanders who came before him, put each in his little cubicle as it were, but he couldn't place Mr. Collishaw and so he termed him "the man of mystery."

When we come to think about it, it is synonymous for Mr. Collishaw to be predominant in this proposition, for he has certainly been in the warp and woof of the business of this country since he arrived here and it looks as if we have now got to back this proposition of the gentleman from Nova Scotia. He has purchased the plant for \$10,000 as it stands and has spent about \$2,000 on it; a total of about \$12,000. I ask the members of this House, apart from party politics,

why in the name of goodness should we try and put through a gilt edged proposition for Mr. Collishaw? If Mr. Collishaw bought this thing for \$10,000 why can't he go away and make a deal? Why do we have to give him a guarantee to make this proposition possible? Why doesn't he go to Stansfield's Manufacturers or the Eastern Cap Company or some other concern and interest them in the proposition. Instead of having this plant and that is all the introducer says he has, and instead of having to stand the possibility of loss or gain in this proposition, he will be enabled to go away and say the Newfoundland Government down there guarantees this plant for \$200,000 at 6 p.c. for fifteen years; they give us 35 p.c. and all importations duty free. I ask any man in this House wouldn't he be glad to go away with that proposition tomorrow. I would ask the Honourable Members if they honestly believe, if you or I or any Newfoundlander submitted that proposition would the Honourable Members of this House back you or me or any other Newfoundlander? I feel confident that nobody but Mr. Collishaw and the ramifications he has behind him in this country—the man of mystery—could get that through. Certainly no Newfoundlander could attempt to put up that proposition and get a Newfoundlander to introduce it. I would ask the Honourable Member for St. John's West to take note of that.

Now the members of the Government have stood for a lot in this House during the present session and I am not here to take issue with them on that. Divisions have been called in this House and Honourable Members of the Government have stood behind their leader, but when we take up this proposition, I would point out to the Government Members that it is no longer a party measure. This

is a proposition for this House, that is a deliberate attempt to have it foisted on the House, owing to the fact that we have hundreds of unemployed in St. John's and I assure you here now, just as sure as this passes it is not going to improve the unemployment in this town one title, and that the Honourable Member for St. John's West, the two Honourable Members for St. John's West, will not be advanced one little bit in the solution of this city's problem. There will be employment for a number of girls but that is not going to improve the condition of householders. There will be just as many family men unemployed as there are now. When we had the knitting mills running at full capacity there was employment for twenty men, who ran boilers, drove teams, did heavy work and packing, and eighty girls, and supposing they put in three hundred operatives they will only need the same twenty men and there will be two hundred and eighty girls.

And, Sir, that is not the only thing about it. As I said before, while we want industries in this town, and, Mr. Chairman, I am one of the men who hope and pray that all industries possible will be brought into town and I say that even if we have to pay a price let us pay it, but, Mr. Chairman, not this price, because this proposition is for some one individual, Mr. Collishaw. What does Newfoundland owe Mr. Collishaw? Why there are many Newfoundlanders that Newfoundland owes more to, and we have turned down their propositions. I can tell you of an intelligent and patriotic Newfoundlander who put up a proposition and it was turned down and it sent him out of the country, but later a stranger came in and made a similar proposition and he was listened to. This same stranger was entertained at the City Club by certain

people of this city and later he left here suddenly with \$4500 of these gentleman's money. They entertained a crook from abroad and he left them in the lurch.

A Newfoundlander may have the brains and may be clever, but there is nothing doing when he attempts to promote a sound proposition in his own country.

Mr. Collishaw, I refer to him because his name is mentioned in the Bill, is the only one as far as I can find out who is interested in this with the exception of the senior member for St. John's West. Contrary to Newfoundland owing Mr. Collishaw anything that gentleman left our shores owing Newfoundland much. He owes Newfoundland much in the way of his advancement. He was a much better off gentleman when he left our shores than when he came here and I think we should leave him in Nova Scotia. If he wants to run this proposition, that knitting and silk mill, let him run it on a business basis.

I am going to ask the members of the House to vote on this Bill, not as Government members or Liberal or Tory members; and I beg to remind you of what your leader, the Prime Minister, told you in this House when he said he had advised the introducer of this Bill and solicitor for the company that he did not think the bill would pass this House. Never mind what he said afterwards. Remember that your leader told you he had no faith in the Bill when it was being brought in, and that is why I ask you to vote on this matter as Newfoundlanders first and last, and in doing so I feel confident that you will vote against this Bill.

MR. FITZGIBBON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments in order to be given the opportunity of associ-

ating myself with my colleague, Hon. Dr. Campbell, in support of the Bill now before the House.

Like my Honourable friend, the member for St. Barbe I am to-night making my maiden speech and I would ask you to overlook any irregularities that I may make. The circumstances are slightly different than the occasion on which he addressed the House. He took the bridge in rather heavy weather when we were debating various rum difficulties; I face the music under the more luxurious conditions of wool and silk, but, judging from the remarks of my friends on the other side of the House it would seem that we are tending towards sackcloth and ashes, to believe all that has been said about this measure by my Honourable friends on the Opposition benches.

The Honourable member for St. John's East has referred to the thing from the standpoint of labour and has told this House that the Bill, if it is passed, and the mill if it is established, will not in one iota relieve the unemployed situation as it exists today and that the candidates for St. John's West, who claim that their one great object in supporting that Bill is to take charge of some of their constituents who would otherwise remain out of employment, are wrong.

Now, I might point out to him that if there is one thing, or if there are two individuals who do know something of conditions in St. John's West—and now I do not in any way detract from the Hon. Member for St. John's for knowledge of unemployment, and I give him every credit for the very admirable manner in which he carried out the work during the year he was connected with it,—nevertheless I do say, if there are two individuals in this city, who, without any undue boasting can give an opinion as to conditions in that district, I say in

all due deference to this House that the two who can take second place to none are Campbell and Fitzgibbon. The Hon. Dr. Campbell has had practical personal intercourse with the people of that district for the past twenty years. I have had the privilege and pleasure of making three very strenuous house to house campaigns with that gentleman, and I want to say to the Honourable members of the House to-night that if they had the faintest knowledge of the absolutely frightful conditions that exist in that district, and if the Government was bringing in a Bill such as is before the House here to-night, and we could put them there and let them see these conditions as we saw them and then produce a means whereby the unemployment can be taken care of in a great measure, I am satisfied that the criticisms would be entirely different than they presented to the House so far.

If there is one thing I have some knowledge of myself it is this very class of material that this very Bill deals with. I have some twenty-five years experience now in general merchandise of this country. I deal very largely in its woolens and caps and underwear and all things that this Bill expects to be largely carried out in this country if the Bill goes through.

I remember quite well the beginning of the old Knitting Mill and I also remember quite well its downfall. I was engaged in business on Water Street at the time, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that the only reason that the country was ever called upon to pay one solitary cent towards that guaranteed amount of interest for the old Woolen Mills of the West End, was because of the distressing fact that the brains of that industry went down in the Florizel

disaster and with his brains went the entire industry.

It is a well known fact to you, Mr. Chairman, who knows as well as I know, Sir, that the West End Woolen Mills of the old days was the child of Water Street, as many of our business men supported it. It is only the most natural thing to suppose that the parents will be inclined to adopt their own child. They will do everything possible to bring the child up and look after that child and it will take a lot to make them turn down their own child. And, I submit, Sir, that this fact is admitted that the Knitting Mill was the child of Water Street and that they were going to stand by that child in order to keep up its custom; but Water Street had to keep its trade and was driven to the position of having to abandon its own child in the shape of the Knitting Mills and of importing woolens and underwear, silks and the other materials that it is proposed to make here now, and have to import from abroad and see its own industry close up.

I am also of the opinion, Sir, that if we put this Bill through and the Mill as outlined by Hon. Dr. Campbell will be erected there, that if I know anything about that mysterious gentleman—that business genius—who creates a commotion when his name is mentioned—whatever else may be said about him, and I am sure Honourable Members of the House will agree with me when I say that he is not a fool. Therefore, I submit, if I know anything about the gentleman that, having learned by the experience of the downfall of the last mill, when he starts this new mill going he will secure the services of an expert to take the place of that gentleman who was lost in the 'Florizel' disaster, and, if such happens, I feel confidently certain that not only will this House and

this Government be not called upon to pay a guarantee, but that there will be presented to this House a statement of the affairs of the Woolen Mills showing a handsome dividend. That is my honest and frank opinion of this Bill, and, if I thought otherwise, I would not speak as I did.

A great deal of uneasiness and criticism was expressed on the street when copies of this Bill first appeared, and suggestions were thrown out that the Prime Minister made a statement in the House the other night that he had no faith in the Bill. Now, I do not think my memory is impaired to any great extent and I have yet to hear the Prime Minister make any such statement. The Prime Minister, in giving an expression of his opinion to Hons. Dr. Campbell and Mr. Lewis, stated that he doubted the Bill having the complete support of the House and the fact that the Bill came before the House for discussion at all is the best proof that the Leader of the Government did have faith in the Bill. One of the things that seem to be worrying the Opposition members is that they see great danger of being called upon to pay the guarantee of \$12,000, but I am satisfied, as sure as I am standing here, that there is not a gentleman on the other side of the House but who believes that, if this Bill goes through and this Mill is operated continuously, which it must under Clause (1) this country will never be called upon to pay that \$12,000.

The next thing that seems to be creating a bit of unrest is the fear that under clause (b) of section (3) certain classes of goods, other than that set forth in the Bill, may be manufactured by the Company, but I think, after the explanation and assurance given by the Hon. introducer of this measure who is just as anxious and as willing to

see that this country gets the best possible deal out of this proposition, such a construction can be removed. There should be absolutely no doubt whatever on that point now.

The next point I would like to deal with was raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East, Mr. Byrne who thought that the employment of 300 girls or boys in St. John's West would not relieve unemployment conditions in that territory one iota. Surely the Hon. Member was not serious in his remark. He knows that if there are 300 girls working in that factory, say representing 150 families, and they bring home their weekly earnings to the fathers of these families, surely that is going to relieve unemployment to some extent. Of course, I do not expect the Hon. Member to agree with that because that is what he is in opposition for.

I do not want to delay the time of the House any longer. I merely want to go on record as being heart and soul in favor of this Bill. It seems to me that the reason this Bill is being fought so vigorously by the Opposition is because Mr. Collishaw's name is associated with it, and I have been wondering if this man Collishaw name was Muldoon or some other name would they oppose the Bill as they do. According to the member for St. John's East, Collishaw left this country a great deal wealthier than when he came into it and he suggests that it would be better to leave him in Halifax. My reply is that it is to the credit of Mr. Collishaw to come here and by his own ability and energy accumulate such wealth. What would you say to a Newfoundlander who went abroad as a poor man and came back as a rich man? I don't think our American or Canadian cousins would censure him.

I feel sure that the member for Bay de Verde is just as anxious as

we are to see an industry of this kind started in St. John's West. He says that in considering this Bill we are not considering the people of Bay de Verde district, but I submit that this Bill affects the whole country and if the people of Bay de Verde would take advantage of the policy outlined by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines with regard to sheep raising they would reap good returns from their activities so far as this Woolen factory is concerned. Now the majority of business men in this country know that we use a great deal of the goods about to be manufactured at the woolen mills. Newfoundland is the biggest customer of the Eastern Cap Company in the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland is the biggest customer the Newfoundland Knitting Mills have and the biggest customer the American Fleeced Lined Underwear Company have, and if we can make the promoters of the present project in this country turn out as good an article as can be imported and at a less price, not only am I satisfied that this country will not be called to pay the \$12,000 guarantee and not only am I satisfied that this Company will have 300 persons employed, but I am satisfied that a staff of employees will be considerably enhanced.

For these reasons, I give the measure now before the Chair my hearty and unqualified support.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in rising to make a few remarks in connection with this Bill I want to be strictly understood that I am not espousing the cause of any individuals nor am I associated in any way financially with Mr. Collishaw. I regret that the member for St. John's East, Mr. Byrne, saw fit in his opening remarks to throw a nasty insinuation across the floors of the House by intimating that

Mr. Collishaw, or the Party on this side of the House, could not get a Newfoundlander to introduce this Bill. I take it that he was referring to either Dr. Campbell or Mr. Collishaw. I hold no brief for Mr. Collishaw, but when members of the Opposition denounce Mr. Collishaw because he does not belong to this country, why don't they denounce also that man who was famously known as "The greatest scoundrel that ever entered the narrows," who was very closely associated with the late Government of this country and who was responsible for an expenditure of twenty millions of dollars, upon which this Colony has to pay an annual interest of one million dollars.

That man has now left this country for this country's good. But I want to tell the member for St. John's, Mr. Byrne, that Dr. Campbell, even if he is a Canadian by birth, has done good work in this country and he represents to-day the largest district in Newfoundland. At first I was opposed to Dr. Campbell politically, but since I have learned of his admirable qualities, his creative ability and his outstanding knowledge of public affairs, I am prepared to take my hat off to him.

But he represents that district, and it is the most difficult district in the country to represent as you know and as I know; and he is attempting to try and get something done for the terrible conditions that exist up there even though it may be at the expense of the country. It was remarked that the years 1918 and 1919 were years in which were seen the greatest surpluses in the history of the country, and in these years if I am not mistaken a Bill was brought in in connection with the Woolen Mills in St. John's West and also one for the Riverside Mills in Conception Bay.

The question arose how much re-

venue we are going to lose and Mr. Quinton I think suggested \$500,000. Any man who says we are going to lose \$500,000 revenue from this is crazy. He has evidently taken the whole column of the Blue Book and filled it out and calculated as if they were going to manufacture everything there. There are a number of things come under the heading hats and caps for import, but what we have to consider is that there are about \$30,000 worth of caps imported into Newfoundland. Say 50% and say \$50,000 for argument sake. Say \$50,000 worth of shirts; that is \$100,000; \$75,000 at the outside. But we are told they are going to employ 300 people; and then somebody says that will not give work for St. John's West. Well if 300 people are employed that would not be employed if that mill was not there it has got to be some good. Put them down at starvation wages even, like some of these sweat shops around St. John's that we could tell some terrible stories about, put them down at \$8 a week and they guarantee to work nine months of the year. Figure that out and make dollars and cents out of it; and figure out the \$100,000 we gave out in St. John's for relief and how much are you going to be in the hole after. That is the position we have got to take. It isn't Mr. Collishaw or Mr. someone else. It is the principle of the thing. We guaranteed others and we had large surpluses brought about materially no doubt by the consumption of goods in the country. They did not affect the revenue then and if they did not then they are not going to affect it now.

We have one here now guaranteed in 1917 and they are not coming to the Government looking for interest; and there are members on the opposite side of the House who were supporters of the party who gave that in 1917 and it is a different thing al-

together now because this Government introduces a similar scheme.

I am in favour of this because I know something has got to be done, even if done at the expense of the Colony to try and help the laboring man in St. John's West; and I am interested not because I live there; not because I may ever be likely to contest the district; but because I have close associations with it and I look back to the battle of 1923 even when Dr. Campbell was opposed to me and look back to that political fight and know the stamina of the people of St. John's West. And I propose to throw in my lot and try and put an industry there even if at the expense of the Government to try and relieve the situation that exists there at the present time; and that is why I support the measure.

If the Opposition were over here today they would be doing something of a similar nature. And I suppose their answer would be if I was over there I would oppose it. Well such is not the case. I was in the Opposition in 1927 when the Humber Bill went through and I supported it, on principle, and I was not bought either; but I am supporting this, not because it may mean a good deal to Mr. Collishaw; not because Hon. Dr. Campbell is introducing it and he is a Canadian; not because Mr. Collishaw is a Canadian; but because I feel it is going to give two or three hundred people work in St. John's West who have not got a job to-day; and I don't see how anybody can say that is not going to relieve the situation to some extent. Any man who says it is not doesn't know what he is talking about.

There is no one working in a mill in St. John's West today. Then start to-morrow and put three hundred there; well, you have three hundred more working to-morrow than you have to-day. And it is the Minister of

Customs after all who has to take the responsibility for a shortage in the revenue in connection with it; and I am prepared to take that responsibility because I feel it will help the people of St. John's West somewhat; and it doesn't matter an iota to the Opposition members because they don't represent the district of St. John's West but if this mill had interests in Bay de Verde or Placentia East or Burin East or St. John's East the members on the opposite side would be supporting it, on principle.

They say they would not but I know that they would. Although this Bill may be obnoxious to some people, although there may be something in it that does not look quite as it should I am prepared to take the chance to help out the unfortunate people in St. John's West; and after all the gentlemen on the other side of the House should see the responsibility and necessity of helping out the unemployment situation in St. John's West. If they don't want to help two hundred people to go to work tomorrow why not get up and say so, put a motion to that effect. I think I made it clear that the revenue won't suffer a great deal, and I figured it out before I came here. We might lose \$40,000 or \$50,000 at the most and we will make it up because people will be making a certain amount of wages and will spend them buying something to eat and wear and it will find its way back into the Treasury by some means or other. That is the position. But all we hear is "Collishaw."

There is nothing said about the hotel that was guaranteed that Hon. Dr. Campbell just described inaugurated by other Canadians, and the Bill passed in this House, and to-day it is nothing more or less than a glorified hashhouse and the country will have to help it out, \$80,000 plus \$450,000; and an additional \$25,000; if we took

it over now to renovate the inside even though there was an individual paid four to five hundred a month to go down and see it was made properly; and to-day it is rusted out; if you turn on the taps and wash yourself with the water from them you don't know whether you are washed or not. Consequently our predecessors in office must feel proud.

Some reference has been made to Mr. Collishaw coming to Newfoundland from Nova Scotia and going home richer than he came. I want to say this I have no brief for Mr. Collishaw, any more than for Sir A. B. Morine, both came from the same country, but I want to say that if Mr. Collishaw came poor and went out wealthy there must be something in him. If some Newfoundlander goes to Canada, or the United States, and makes a mint of money we are always quite proud of him. I have seen banquets given men who went away from Newfoundland and were successful in making money in Canada or the United States and came home.

There is a guarantee asked here of \$12,000 a year, alright and we are prepared to pay it if we can get two hundred people employed in St. John's West. I am prepared to do so because I know where to find it again. I am prepared, as Minister of Finance and Customs, to pay that \$12,000 if we can get two hundred people employed up there for nine months of the year.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I think we are wandering far from the point. We must look at this matter from a business point of view. The reason the old woolen mills paid is that during the war prices were inflated, but when the slump came after the war, with all due deference to the late Mr. Smythe, he would have found it impossible to make this business pay. I know a gentleman who went into this thing close-

ly and he found it a very poor proposition to keep up.

Now if the promoters of this present project are prepared to insert a clause in the Bill to the effect that the factory will employ 200 girls at the average rate of \$6 per week for nine months of the year, I am prepared to support the Bill, notwithstanding my objections to free entry and the guarantee.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I merely want to make a few remarks in reference to these Resolutions now under discussion. I was in the House in 1917 when the original woolen mills Bill came before the House, and it was not passed, as introduced. The Bill was a very serious piece of legislation and it was introduced by the Prime Minister of the day, Sir Edward (now Lord) Morris.

I was a member of the Opposition side at that time and the Bill, as it passed, was put in form by the Opposition of that day. Had it passed in its original form, it would have been an abomination. Last year several gentlemen came to St. John's and approached the Government about passing a measure in favor of the opening of the woolen mills in the West End of the city, and I think an option was taken on the property. The Government prepared a Bill, the Bill was printed, if you will look into that Bill, you will find that the Government last year were prepared to give far more concessions than we are ready to give today.

I am surprised at certain gentlemen of the Opposition side of the House bringing much of the personal character into the debate on this measure. This is a business measure and should be either rejected or accepted on its merits. How much better can you make the Bill by introducing personalities and abuse. I cannot and never could understand such conduct. Now,

if we are going to discuss this Bill, let us discuss it on its business merits. I have been a member of this House for many years and I saw and spent some stormy hours here, but I was hoping that this use of personalities was disappearing from this Parliament of ours. Why attack a man upon personal grounds because he wishes to establish an industry in the country? If you do not like the proposition, say so? If it does not suit you, oppose it? If you want the Bill amended, bring in your amendment, but attach some constructive ability to your remarks. By all means protect the interests of the Colony in general, but give us criticism of a constructive character. Find out what the Government last year was willing to submit to this House in connection with getting this woolen mills opened up? I do not know if there are any records of that in the Department of the Colonial Secretary or the Prime Minister's Department.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, the man who brought the proposition to the Government was Mr. H. V. Andrews of Toronto. The Bill was printed and came before the Executive and discussed. The Bill was so far-reaching as this one, that after it was discussed it was thrown out by the Executive Government and never came before the Party.

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Do you know the reason? Because they had a majority of one member in the House and would not dare bring in the measure, fearing they would have to withdraw it. Now the present Bill is not a matter that has been brought before this House by the Government simply after on a half hour's notice. The proposition has been before us for some considerable time.

There were several sections in the Bill that I was not agreeable to at the

outset, but we discussed the provisions of the Bill and got it down to a reasonable and fair proposition to place before the country and the House, and to-day the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill came here with an amendment in order to meet the wishes and the desires and the criticisms of the Opposition and showed as far as possible that what we want is a genuine Bill that will create a new industry in St. John's West.

I have no personal interest in this proposition, and what I say here on behalf on the Bill is not for any personal reason whatever; but I will go as far as to say that never again will I vote in a Government for the spending of \$100,000 or \$150,000 on charity relief in St. John's. As an outport man and an outport representative, I intend to put down my foot upon that expenditure and having pauper money spent around St. John's year after year at the expense of the rest of the people of the Colony, as has happened during the past five or six years, and it is up to the members of this House now to try and devise ways and means in an endeavour to get over this relief question in St. John's and not be strangling the other people of the country year after year to keep up this huge expenditure.

Now what are you going to do to remedy this state of affairs? The Hon. Dr. Campbell strongly advocated the appointment of a Commission to deal with this vexed problem of unemployment and poor relief. The Government appointed three men who will have an opportunity of using their brains and finding out reasonable means in order to get over this awful position here every Winter in regard to pauper relief; and this is one of the inducements of this Bill. So far as the merits of the Bill are concerned I am satisfied that it is a fair Bill. If the Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition will

submit and show that this thing is not fair and reasonable I will be one of the first men who will not support their amendment.

I am very glad to see that, after all, there is some fight in the present Opposition members who fought this Bill to-night. You to-day were discussing measures here, and, if I were sitting on that side of the House, they would never go through—matters of a hundred times more importance than the matter submitted in the present Bill before the House. If some of the merchants along Water Street had the courage to spend money in an enterprise like the woolen mills, there would not be as much Opposition in the House to-day. The criticism of the Opposition is not based on principle; it is based on prejudice.

MR. PUDDISTER—I beg your pardon, Sir. I have no prejudice whatever towards this Bill. I do not care a snap of my finger what other people think of the attitude I am taking. I have my own mind to choose. Do you accept that statement?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—I do.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am a friend of Mr. Collishaw and my objection to the Bill is not based on animosity or prejudice, as I believe the Bill is wrong in principle; but if you put in the amendment I have submitted I am in favor of the Bill?

HON. SIR WILLIAM COAKER—Do you mean to say that the promoters of this industry would not want to see the mills working after they had put their money there? I am sure, as a business man, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not want it, and do you think a man like Mr. Collishaw would want it? We insisted upon having it provided in the Bill that the mill was to operate to the fullest ex-

tent, because the other mill when in operation had a guarantee and they kept a couple of machines working there for a few years and claimed the guarantee and we are going to protect ourselves against what happened then.

Consequently, I do not think it fair to be prejudiced against such an industry. By all means give us the benefit of your constructive criticism just as the Hon. member for Placentia East used some of his legal ability in connection with some other Bill; but do not resort to personalities. If you think this measure is not going to be any benefit to the people of St. John's West, turn it down; but if you think there is any hope in it of alleviating the unemployment situation here to any extent, back it up. You do not have to support it at a tremendous sacrifice to the Colony because that would be unfair to the country and unfair to ourselves; but, if there is anything in it that is reasonable and sound, let us support it.

Now is it possible to get the men that voted for this measure to accept an amendment and having a clause inserted as suggested. I am not in a position to say so but if it were possible I would be very glad to see it there because I do think that everything we do, we should do for the benefit of all concerned. But whether it is possible or not I do not know but I do not suppose that Mr. Lewis would have any objection.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman It is getting rather late, but there are one or two things that I must take exception to. Sir William Coaker congratulated the Opposition upon having some fight in them. We have a duty to perform and I think we have done very well so far. When these Resolutions came before the House yesterday I took exception to the factory working only six months of the year and getting a guarantee. We got the

time of operation of the factory increased from 6 months to 9 months. I consider that very good. That is something we have done. That in itself was worth holding up the Bill for two or three days, and so far as the suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, perhaps Mr. Lewis can get in touch with Mr. Collishaw and find out as to whether he is satisfied to put that in or not. If we cannot get it there is no harm done in asking, but if we get it in the Bill we shall have won a great victory..

HON. MR. LEWIS.—We have already discussed that phase with Mr. Collishaw, but he is the belief that if he were tied up to be compelled to employ three hundred people continually he would not be able to put the negotiations through and start the factory.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Say he employs two hundred girls at a minimum of six dollars a week, or at least pay twelve hundred dollars a week to operating.

MR. PUDDESTER.—We are here, as the member for Bonavista East said, to give constructive criticism, and we expect assistance from the Government. The hon. member said that if he were sitting over here certain measures have gone thru that would not have gone through. If these measures are such that you could not agree with them on principle, I needn't remind the hon. member of his own duty. We voted as well as we knew how to keep certain measures from going thru and I am very glad to have the approbation of the hon. member for Bonavista East. It is getting late and we want to further discuss and I think we will do very much better tomorrow afternoon than now and will be able to give more constructive criticism than we gave here tonight.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, perhaps my Hon. friends in the Opposition will go down to Water Street after this mill is in successful operation and get two more started.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula," 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. Puddester gave notice of Question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 21st, 1929.

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

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition sent to me in the form of Resolutions from the paper-makers of Grand Falls and endorsed by the paper-makers of Corner Brook. With your kind permission I would like to read these Resolutions to the House.

(Reads)

I have very much pleasure in presenting these Resolutions and I hope, Sir, that unlike in the past where such petitions have fallen on stony ground, that with present government which has been largely supported by the laborers and producers of the country that requests such as these will receive the attention which they deserve. To my mind the people in these trades are under-paid and if by any means their wages can be increased it means an increase in the revenue. If you had Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Buchans, and Bell Island getting what is due them (the workers of the country) the Treasury would be enriched some two hundred thousand dollars. I have very much pleasure in presenting the petition and strongly associating myself with it, and ask the consideration of the Executive Government so that it may receive the attention it merits.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with respect to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

- (1) MR. PUDDISTER—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table a statement showing the total amount paid by the Public Charities Department for able-bodied relief in the Districts of St. John's East and West (City) since December 15th, 1928.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked by the Hon. member for Bay de Verde, I beg to state that the information asked for is in course of preparation and will be tabled as soon as available.

- (2) MR. PUDDISTER—To ask Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to table a statement showing the details of disbursements and reasons for such disbursements from the Reparations Account since its inception in 1921.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the statement asked for by the Hon. member, number 2 on today's Order Paper.

- (3) MR. QUINTON—To ask the President of the Bureau of Education:

1.—Whether the Bureau of Education by law is called upon to table a report in this House, if so, at what date is the report to be tabled.

2.—Is it true that the report for the year 1927-28 has not yet been tabled, and if not why has it not been so tabled, and why should the country be kept in ignorance for nearly twelve months.

3.—Will the President of the Bureau state when this House may be favored with the report.

- (4) MR. QUINTON—To ask the President of the Bureau of

Education to table the following information:

(a)—Total number of pupils enrolled for the year 1927-28.

(b)—Total attendance made by such.

(c)—What percentage of the vote for Education has been wasted through

(1)—Non-attendance.

(2)—The employment of inefficient and untrained teachers.

(d)—Total number of passes (C.H.E.) in Senior Associate, Junior Associate, Intermediate, Preliminary and Primary.

(e)—To state number of Senior Associates prepared and passed by the following institutions:

Memorial College, Bishop Feild, Bishop Spencer, St. Bonaventure' Littledale, United Church and Salvation Army Colleges.

- (5) MR. QUINTON—To ask the President of the Bureau of Education to table the following information:

(a)—The names of the Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents of Education.

(b)—The names of other Inspectors and Supervisors.

(c)—What territory has been covered by each during the year 1927-28.

(d)—How many schools have been visited, supervised and inspected by these mentioned in questions (a), (b) and (c).

- (6) MR. QUINTON—To ask the President of the Bureau of Education:

(1)—Whether M. A. Wilson, Secretary of the Council of Higher Education is seeking a retiring allowance.

(2)—Is it correct that an imported teacher of about two years standing in the country is being recommended (to succeed him) to the post.

(3)—In view of the fact that we have many of our Newfoundland teachers fully qualified to fill this remunerative post, does the Government intend to appoint this imported teacher.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, with regard to numbers three, four and five, I would like to say that the Board of Education does table an annual report every year, but as it is a very voluminous one it is not usually tabled until it comes back from the printers. However, if so desired the typewritten report can be tabled. If the Hon. member would be interested in seeing the original I will make arrangements for him to do so at any time convenient for him. It is a very cumbersome volume to table before printed. I am in a position however to table the reports of the results of examinations conducted by the Council of Higher Education.

This volume also contains a financial statement of the office generally and this copy is to be laid on the table and the other is for the Hon. member. Number five is in course of preparation. With regard to number six, Mr. Wilson has not made any application for a pension. I have heard a rumour that an application was made by a young man in the event of Mr. Wilson being pensioned. I may say that the policy of the Government is to receive applications in the past from long service Newfoundland teachers in this connection. By Newfoundlanders I do not necessarily mean that the teachers must have been born here but must have given and completed long service here in the profession.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would

on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending the 30th day of June, 1929, and the 30th day of June, 1930, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly, and Acts in Amendment Thereof.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, before the preamble of the Bill is read I wish to say that this is a Bill which we discussed somewhat carefully on more than one occasion, and we on this side of the House put ourselves on record twice before as being opposed to this Bill. Nothing remains for us now but to place ourselves on record on the report of the Committee to the Speaker and with that in view Sir, I beg to place myself on record before the House as being opposed personally to a Bill of this character being placed on the Statute Book, a Bill wherein it provides that any member of the House of Assembly can take a position of emolument under the Crown without going back to his constituents and asking for their consent. It has been done in this Legislature before. I suppose nearly every session, but, with so much contentions legislation in the past few days it makes one wonder where the thing is going to end. And the safeguard was put in the Statute Book years ago by the fathers of this House. They had an

object in view and that was to keep the personnel of the House pure and unsullied and that every member would come in here independent, because the object of it was to keep an independent House.

There is a great deal to be said for the position taken by the House two years ago and by other Houses of Parliament in other places, where a minister just fresh from the country who has accepted a port folio, should not have to go back to his district. I believe that it is an unnecessary expense to have a series of by-elections just after a general election because certain persons may take office and must go back to secure the consent of their constituents; and therefore we did not create a precedent, but we are merely one of the first to pass an Act whereby elected members could take emoluments as cabinet members without having to again go back to the people who had just elected them in a general election.

But this is a different matter entirely. It enables a private member to take a position of emolument under the Crown and take a salary while a member of this Assembly without seeking the endorsement of his constituents and I wish to register a protest and desire to go on record against it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the Report the House divided, when there appeared for the motion:

Hon. the Prime Minister
 Hon. the Minister of Finance
 Hon. the Minister of Posts
 Hon. Sir W. F. Coaker

Hon. Dr. Campbell
 Hon. Dr. Mosdell
 Hon. Mr. Lewis
 The Minister of Agriculture
 The Minister of Public Works
 The Minister of Fisheries
 Mr. Earle
 Mr. Starkes
 Mr. Fitzgibbon
 Mr. Skeans
 Mr. Grimes
 Mr. Scammell
 Mr. Winsor
 Mr. Parsons
 Mr. Fudge
 Mr. Bindon
 Mr. Strong
 Mr. Greene
 Mr. Smith (22)

and against it:

Mr. Alderdice
 Mr. Puddester
 Mr. Emerson
 Mr. Moore
 Mr. Winter
 Mr. Quinton
 Mr. Tobin
 Mr. Abbott (8)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon on motion the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly and Acts in Amendment Thereof,'" was 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 5, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads,'" was read a second time

and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was distributed yesterday, I made some general observations as to the nature and object of the Bill and I now move that it be read for the second time.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I understood that we did not read the Bill for the second time yesterday because of the absence of the Minister of Public Works and I thought it was said that the Minister of Public Works was going further into the Bill and explain it fully on second reading. I think that is why it was deferred.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I really don't know why it devolves upon me to explain this Bill but since it is requested by the Opposition I shall be glad to do so.

The object of this amendment to the Highroads Commission Act is to place the responsibility for the operations of the Highroads Commission from persons who were not responsible to this House to some person who is a responsible party. In other words, the Government observes the principle that in any action that involves very large expenditures the person who is responsible should have a seat in Parliament. I presume that the honorable members on the opposite side of the House will agree to this. I feel sure that the value of this will be soon recognized, because I believe as this plan goes on the Highroads Commission will be operating and you will require information as to what the Highroads Commission will be doing and I am sure that you will recognize the advantage of so having somebody in the House to whom to direct questions and who can give the necessary information. This is very necessary, and I regret to say during the last

four years we were not able to get information in this House. I myself on several occasions have directed questions to the late Colonial Secretary, but he invariably said that he knew little or nothing about it. He did not feel that he was responsible, theoretically he was but not practically speaking, and we could get very little information.

Now I expect my Hon. friends on the other side of the House will agree that if I or any other person be voted the position of Minister of Public Works—that is my misfortune now and I have the responsibility on my shoulders—I am sure you will agree that if the responsibility is placed on the shoulders of anyone it is hardly fair to do so unless that person has some authority.

We do not think that anyone in the House should be expected to shoulder the responsibility for the next four, two or ten years as the case may be, and I myself certainly would not be prepared to do so unless I had some authority.

Wherever there is responsibility there must be authority and the object of the amendment at present before the House is to make the present Minister of Public Works the Chairman and Chief Commissioner and Mr. Hall who will carry on the technical work as he has done all along, will be made Deputy, and in the absence of the Minister of Public Works he will assume the authority which the Act gives the Minister.

That is the chief object of the amend, I may say, Mr. Speaker, and I say again, I think it will be very successful. I was strongly in favor of the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Russell, being the Chairman of the Commission. I think it was a great mistake that he was not. The head of the Highroads Commission ought to have a seat in the House and he is

there always to take the responsibility and that is why we have this amendment, instead of there being several persons responsible there will always be one person who will be able to answer for the Commission.

I think all around it will work to the advantage of the Highroads Commission.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to see the work of the various other departments carried out efficiently and economically just as it is my desire to have the duties of the department to which I belong carried out in a like manner, and so far as my advice goes I am prepared to help others to accomplish the desired results. I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Public Works was made the Chairman of this Commission for the reason that in the past we have had nobody in the House to answer questions and reply to criticisms that were made here. Now that difficulty no longer exists.

From the very start I could not see eye to eye with regard to the functioning of the Highroads Commission. I think it was a great mistake to appoint Mr. Hall as Head of that Commission because of the position he held as Government Engineer. It was unfair to Mr. Hall and it was unfair to the country, as everybody, who is familiar with the Public Works Department knows. We know that Mr. Hall is a very good railway engineer, but giving him credit for this, we must remember that railroad building is the very antithesis to highroad building. You can dump any kind of material in when building the railway with sand ballast on top, because the continuous weight pressed upon the embankment by the traffic of the trains solidifies the material underneath and enables it to carry the superstructure; but not so in the matter of highroad

construction, as instead of the surface constituting the material portion of the construction, it is the foundation that is most important, and, unless you got that, no amount of superficial material is going to make a permanent structure. I have a great many years experience upon different operations performed in connection with the railway and other structures of that character and I have seen condemned what was adopted by the Highroads Commission that would disgrace anybody of men, all begotten of the want of experience of those in charge. My first impression was that Mr. Hall lacked the highway experience to instruct his subordinates to give the country value for the money that was spent on highroads. His assistant, Mr. Cochius came here to materialize the plans of Bowring Park. Mr. Cochius was not the designer of the Park, but materialized the plans of the scenic artist. I had occasion continuously to witness the operations on the road near that place and I do not see how it reflected anything but discredit and disgrace upon the management of the Highroads Commission. It cost sixty per cent more than it should have cost, there was not sufficient labor put into that work and yet credit was given to Mr. Cochius, under whose jurisdiction the road was built, who had an abundance of material and all the money he wanted to spend thereon. I can take any man of ordinary intelligence, give him the aid of a text book on road-making, and he will construct as good a road as Mr. Cochius and at far less cost. Then again there is also work done by Mr. Hall's Department on the West Coast—I refer to the building of the Grand Bank Breakwater. That work, Sir, is enough to dam the reputation of anybody with any degree of reputation or skill. At the present time you can drive a team through a part of it and the rest of

the structure is honey-combing and a few hours sea will see the end of it. No sane man would build that breakwater upon the foundation upon which it was constructed. There is no base at all. It is built upon what constituted the old pier. Whoever was in charge of the actual work, which, of course, was under the supervision of Mr. Hall, knew of the action of, what is colloquially known in Newfoundland, the "undertow" and its destructive effect. The building of that breakwater was a most lamentable exhibition of incompetence and a wilful and more or less waste of public moneys. I have watched some of the operations along the line of Highroad construction work within the past four years and I have never seen such exhibitions of waste and extravagance, certainly not in this country, except one instance that happened many years ago when the Betts Cove Mines was in the initial stage of operation. The people there knew nothing of the business that was being conducted, and I saw waste and extravagance, which, if made the subject of an enquiry, would have landed the perpetrator in the Penitentiary. The same unfortunate methods appertained in the construction of the Highroads system. The first year the Highroads operated we were told that the organization was almost perfect and practically everybody took that for granted. The next year and up to now we have abundant evident proof that they did not know what they were doing and we have sufficient proof to condemn what they had started. I am not speaking now in any tone of censure, because I regret and always regretted that Mr. Hall was put in charge of that Highroads Commission. He was put in a false position. He was an efficient narrow gauge railroad engineer, but with regard to this highroads system he lacked the skill to organize and he lacked the

ability with the system involved in the building of highroads. I understand Mr. Hall was put in charge of the Highroads Commission by the late administration for the sake of economy; but that was false economy, as results have shown. Now that the Highroads organization is to be carried on under the supervision of the Minister of Public Works, who is responsible to this House and this country, no doubt, the work will be performed in a fit and proper manner.

MR EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, before the Bill passes Second Reading I would like to make one or two remarks. In the first place I think it is a move in the right direction for the Highroads Commission to be put under the control of the Public Works Department. That Department has a considerable amount to do with local and main roads and a very large sum of money is spent by that Department every year all over the country. I think that the highroads, which might be termed the high grade of roads than main roads, should be under the control of that Department, so that we could have the two grades of roads under the control of the one Department. I think also that it is a fortunate thing that a change is being made at a time when we have at present a Minister of Public Works who has made a very serious study of roads, who has been an active member of various road commissions in the past and who has written a book on road-making. Consequently, I do not know of anybody in this House who would be more capable of acting as the head of the Department of roads, and I think it is wise that the political head of the road Department should be the Minister of Public Works, and it is a happy augury that the affairs of the Highroads Commission will in future be in the hands of

the head of the Public Works Department.

Now I do not understand why a provision is included in this Bill that the Minister of Public Works shall be the Chief Commissioner, and, perhaps, the Hon. Minister will explain it. I have no objection to his appointment as Chief Commissioner, but would like to point out that we have no Chief Commissioner of Public Charities; no Chief Commissioner of Constabulary; no Chief Commissioner of Liquor Control or no Chief Commissioner of any other Department over which we have political chiefs in the House, and, as a rule, the policy of the Government has been that these sub-Departments should be run by permanent heads and mere matters of policy should be in the hands of Heads of Departments.

I say there must be some reason which my Hon. friend Mr. Hibbs, the Minister of Public Works, may urge in favour of his appointment as head of that department and Chief Commissioner, of which I do not know. I hope that he will inform the House on that point. And I would also like to ask if the Hon. Minister would inform us why the change from four to six commissioners. I am merely asking for information. It seems to me that speaking generally the system in the past with the three commissioners was working pretty well. And possibly the Minister will be good enough to inform us why the number has been increased. And before I take my seat may I say that I do not agree, in fact speaking generally I emphatically disagree with the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I know his great abilities. I know his experience, the experience of more than twice as many years as I have lived on this earth, and he and I have always been if not very great personal friends, at least men who have respected one another's opinions. I think

his reflection on Mr. Hall was very censorious. I am not apologising for Mr. Hall. But I do say he has given an exhibition to this country in connection with the work that he has performed, which has never been equalled, in so far as is possible to get from labor undertaken for the Government a return for the money, greater than any department, political or otherwise, has been able to get. Now I am not a roadbuilder. One naturally learns about these things from the papers, and prints and books. But I would say this, that for the expenditure that has been made of recent years on the Peninsula of Avalon, the only roads that I know, he has given a very remarkable performance, not only in regard to the construction and maintenance of these roads, but also in the way that they have stood up against our winters. There are portions of the roads which were badly damaged. You find cases where in going over flat country, or marshy country, the proper precautions were not taken for the throwing up of the road in the spring. But taking them all in all I think that anybody that has travelled to any extent will agree that for the first time in the history of Newfoundland we have roads. And the man in charge is Mr. Hall. And also I think you will agree that the men that he chose as patrol men performed their services very well. If you are passing along a country road far away from any settlement, and you come around a corner suddenly you will find the patrol man doing his job without any supervision at all. I can speak thus with the certain knowledge that what I am saying is correct. Because all the patrol men in the district of Placentia East were against me, and everyone of them was doing his work efficiently and economically and honestly whenever I came across one of them.

I am not able to go into the strictures of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, in the detail in which he dealt with them, but I do suggest that Mr. Hall has been here for over a quarter of a century, and he is a man that I have had very little to do with except in a strictly official way. He has given both on the railway and the roads as good a service as we have ever had from any civil servant in the country.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to my Hon. friend, the member for Placentia East, and in reference to the increases in the number of Commissioners from four to six, I may say that I am prepared to admit that you may have just as great efficiency with four as with six. It is not essential that there should be six. But at the same time I do not think that six matters. It is a perfectly balanced Commission. I think the late commission had a membership of ten and it was very helpful, I understand, because when you got the full board present at a meeting you are able to enjoy the advice of the various members. I do not see any reason why we should not increase it to six.

Now with regard to the Minister of Public Works becoming the Chief Commissioner, that is absolutely essential if the Minister of Public Works is to assume the responsibility, as Chairman of the practical working out of the commission, the Minister would be a mere figurehead. I could not accept a position of that kind, if I am to assume the responsibility, which I certainly will. I do not object to fair criticism, either from outside or inside the House, but in order to do that it will be necessary for me to be the Chief Commissioner as Chairman. Mr. Hall being Deputy will have his work to do. I think that is all there is to say in regard to the criticisms raised

by the members on the opposite side of the House.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 5, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Mr. Puddester the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that this Bill be now read a second time and in doing so I do not think that there is very much to say beyond what has been already said in the House before. We have dealt with the expenditure of public monies a month before election date, from the election of 1893 up to the last general election. And I would point out and I think we will all agree that this House being new, and fresh from the polls should do something to try and stop the evil where possible, if it is an evil, and I think that all will agree that it is an evil, and the quicker it is wiped out the better for all concerned.

After every general election we hear a howl from which ever side is elected about public money being squandered and spent during the election for the purpose of getting votes. I said the other day there was one Government which could be absolved from any idea of expenditure of public monies for the purpose of trying to make the electorate sweet so that they would be able to get in power again, that Government was the Hickman Government in 1924. I have heard nothing beyond some irregularities that occurred in a certain place where during polling day perhaps ten or fifteen extra policemen were placed in charge of polling booths; beyond that I have heard nothing to lead one to believe that public monies were spent illegally in that election; but they have been spent in other elections; and all parties are more or less to blame and as I said before I believe this House is the proper House to deal with that matter, and so far as we can prevent a recurrence in the future. Now the first section of this Bill provides that no money shall be spent other than that provided in case of emergency within 21 days of an election. Heretofore it has been ten days. This Bill proposes that ten days be changed to twenty-one days, and in case of a general election that no public money shall be spent after the dissolution of the House. I realise that there is a little difficulty in that. We had a difficult situation in 1923, and had a situation the past year where the House became automatically dissolved after the 14th day of July. In another such case it would be a long time for no expenditure of public money on legitimate public works between that and the 29th of October. But I am hoping when the Bill goes into Committee we will put our heads together and see what we can do to make that section of the Bill better than it is at the present time. My idea is to

get the date moved back as far as possible, but to also take care for any emergency that may arise by having to call a general election when it is not expected. If this Parliament was to go along and live out its four years and go to the country in 1932 about the same date as we went last fall it would be easy to fix a Bill like this. But as you will see it is very difficult to make all cases come under wording of this paragraph. In the spring of 1923 we had an election called eight or nine months before the regular time came and it is hard as I say to get a Bill to make provision for an emergency like that. Of course calling a general election is in the hands of the Prime Minister. He can call that when it suits himself, the same as in any other country working under the same kind of constitution.

Clause 2, b, sections B and C. The new section of the Bill reads:

"It shall be unlawful for the Department of Public Charities, etc."

All Hon. gentlemen know that sometimes when a candidate cannot get money to expend he goes to the Relieving Officer, to influence him to make an allocation to help out certain men, not because the relief is urgently wanted but to put them in a nice frame of mind towards the candidate for election day. We want to stop candidates from doing that kind of thing; and we can't prevent them from going to Relieving Officers but we can prevent the Relieving Officers from getting their bills paid.

Sub-section C. We want to prevent not only money being spent directly from allocations for public works from the Public Works Department but money might be taken as an allocation for Public Works and a man have it in his pocket for weeks or months afterwards and not spend it. We want to prevent the spending of money just previous to general elec-

tion and we want also to prevent the allocations being made.

I think I have covered nearly all the abuses as far as public moneys are concerned. Of course we cannot cover abuses of a kind that a candidate from his own private means is guilty of. There is no other means to prevent that happening but through a petition to unseat him in the Supreme Court.

I think that members will take this Bill in the spirit in which it is introduced, give it their full consideration, and let us get our heads together and try and evolve something to cover all cases, and see if we cannot do away with those abuses.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with this Bill. I have had some little experience in this connection, short, sharp, but by no means sweet; and I am convinced that expenditure by a Government immediately before an election is a handicap rather than a help; and so I feel the passing of this Bill as I hope it will be passed is rather a benefit to our opponents than ourselves. There have been great amounts of money spent before elections. We have been accused of handling large slush funds before the election but to my own certain knowledge there was a great deal less spent during the Fall of 1928 than in 1923. I do not say that two wrongs make a right. There should be no such expenditure at all. I think the Government and Opposition should go to the country on equal terms, and from my experience a Government going to the country with a so-called slush fund does not go on equal terms. The Government can give money to a few only and that leaves a great many others disappointed and these men have only one way of showing their disappointment and that is by voting against the Government. There is one thing I should like to

see added to this and that is that it should be made not unlawful to convey voters to the polls. I am sure we nearly all do it. We have to do it, we all know that, and we run the risk of being unseated for it. I would like to ask the introducer of the Bill if it would be possible to introduce such an amendment into the Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion that this Bill be read a second time. I think the Bill is one that in spirit and principle every member of the House will be in accord with. I want to thank the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his suggestion in connection with motor vehicles and motorboats. That suggestion was made by Sir William Coaker when he found that the Bill was to be introduced and I think when we are in Committee we might take the matter up and make an amendment an amendment covering that point. There are one or two amendments I may ask the introducer to consider when we come to committee stage. He has already called attention to the difficulty that may arise when the House dissolves in the spring and goes to the country in the autumn. I have been thinking over that paragraph and I hope we shall find some wording to meet every difficulty of this kind. The only suggestion I have to make is to make it "within the period from the proclamation of such general election to the date of such election." That would have to be more than twenty one days. That change would have to be made in three different places; section 1 sub-section b, section 2, and one other. I would like to ask you to consider an alteration to paragraph 3. Many years ago the inmates of the Poor Asylum had no vote. Later, under a general law they got the right to vote, and the situation in connection with the canvass of these voters and

the getting of them to the polls, in cases waiting to get them at daylight, does not add any great political honor to the party concerned. Now certain developments are being made in connection with the Poor Asylum. An infirmary is being added and it means there will be situated there sick poor cases, and under such circumstances it makes it still more important that the Poor Asylum should not be a battle ground for political parties a week before polling day and at daylight polling morning.

I would ask that there be considered the addition to paragraph 3 of the following:

(Reads)

These various amendments we will have an opportunity of considering in committee, together with the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition.

The principle of the Bill I heartily support and I have pleasure in seconding the motion made by the hon member for Bay de Verde that it now be read a second time.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I have also much pleasure in joining with other speakers in support of the motion. The Election Act as we have it at the present time is a very complicated measure. I do not know outside of one or two hon. gentlemen who have had petitions filed against them since the last election that there is anyone who has given to it so much study as I have. I think that in introducing the Bill for the original Election Act a very serious blunder was made by the draftsman, possibly due to the fact that he did not understand the election practise in England.

I did not understand it until I studied it. Agents in England manage the campaign for the candidate. Here an agent is a poll-clerk who acts for the candidate on polling day. In England these men are paid the same

as they are here. It is a difficult matter to sit in a polling booth all day long and watch everything that goes on and not get paid. It is doubly difficult to get men if they want to be at their farming or fishing when the election takes places, and it is an unfair burden to ask them to do it for nothing. One of the charges that was raised against me was that I paid agents. Well, I did, and I won. I think it was by 20 votes, and I had 20 agents. I suggest that the Act be amended to deal with that and I throw out the idea to consider if it cannot be amended so that all candidates pay agents at a fixed fee, say \$5.00 each. So far as is necessary for a general agent we could have the same rule as in England. He is paid out of the party funds. As we have no party funds here, therefore we would have no general agents; therefore, I suggest that we pay the agents in the polling booths a moderate fee of \$5.00.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this Bill, as I think that it is a step in the right direction. There is no question about it. Public monies spent before the election have had a demoralising effect on certain sections of the electorate

There are various aspects we can see this through. It has a demoralising effect and the money is wasted; there is very little value given for it. You could spend perhaps two or three hundred dollars and get perhaps \$50 worth of labor. A few years ago I made a little investigation and found in one instance that \$200.00 had been allocated for the digging of a well. The well was not dug and the money was spent and when the man was asked for his returns, he said that his wife had received the money when he was away and had spent it. There is another instance where \$300.00 was sent out to a man to have some work done and it was found that it was put

to his credit in the bank and we had a lot of trouble in getting it back. If these instances are multiplied by a multitude of cases you have the situation, and these individuals who sent out this money looked upon it as their own personal property and there were no questions asked. I am glad to see this Bill introduced if only to stop this practice.

DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to Mr. Emerson's suggestion about paying agents, that would be all right in his district, but in a large district like mine you would want to be a millionaire. Why, I would have to pay \$550.00 for agents. I think your price is too high.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the suggestion of Mr. Emerson about paying agents, I am not sure that I agree with him. In Bay de Verde district I never paid an agent in my life, directly or indirectly. Men spend the whole day there and never ask for a cent. I am surprised to find that so many members had to pay their agents. I am glad that the Prime Minister suggested the clause about the inmates of the Poor Asylum being debarred from voting, as they will not be called upon to undergo the humiliating situation of being dragged to the polls to vote. I say it's a disgrace the way these poor mortals are handled, especially in the recent bye-election. I understand that in the last election they were dragged out before daylight. Why, ladies had slept there all night in order to get them first. I think that this is undignified and disgraceful and I am glad that the Prime Minister made the suggestion that they be debarred from voting. Why, these poor mortals had to be schooled for hours to learn the meaning of the names on the ballot paper. They did not understand the marking of the ballot paper, and under these circumstances I think they should be debarred from voting.

I am thoroughly in accord with Mr. Alderdice's suggestion that old people be conveyed to the booths and I don't think that this should be a breach of the election law. In Canada the same thing is being considered and a Bill is being brought into the House of Commons to the effect that it will not be unlawful to convey people to the booths. Whether we should do so or not I am not sure, but I thank you for your support and I think that we will do ourselves credit to put it on the statute book.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan 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 the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER.—Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises I desire to say a few words in connection with a matter brought up the other day. When we were dealing with the Schedule of the Revenue Bill, the Hon. Minister will remember, I think, that the duty on oxen, bulls and cattle was reduced ten per cent. I thought at that time that the reduction would not benefit the consumer but that it would go into the pocket of some wealthy Canadian concern, such as the Harris Abbatoir Co., or some such other. Since then I have had a talk with the manager of the Company I mentioned, and he has assured me that when he sells cattle he produces his invoice to the Customs and the

duty is paid on the full amount. As far as his company is concerned, they cannot in any way benefit by the ten per cent reduction because he shows his invoices with the duty paid and the consumer or the butcher gets the benefit of the reduction of 10 per cent. I wish to say that I do not desire in this House to say or give any slap or slam to any corporation or individual carrying on business in this country. I have, as I say, been assured by them that they are not going to benefit, but that the benefit will be either to the consumer or the butcher. Now, there is one thing I wish to say before this Bill goes through. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if they have considered a pension for the late Magistrate of Harbor Main?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's benefit, I may say that the matter is being considered by the Executive Government.

MR. PUDDSTER.—That is why I ask. I was wondering where you would get the money for the pension. It is of no matter to me. I have no interest in Mr. O Toole whatever, but he has been in the service since 1908-1909, since the Morris government, and I do not know the gentleman very well, but it is hard for a man to be put out without a pension after twenty years service.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—When the matter was taken up by the Executive Government the Minute of Council was so drafted that if the Government decides to grant this pension it would be able to do so.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan 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.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting "An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter a Contract with the Newfoundland Wool Silk Mills, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have been told that there was some discussion on the Bill which developed into a debate after I left the Assembly yesterday. I did not have the opportunity of participating in the debate and I will now take this opportunity of so doing. The measure is part of the program advertised as the industrial development of the country last year. When I presented the petition to the House I informed the House that I was dealing with this Bill, not because I was supporting it, but because I was presenting it on behalf of the Hon. Dr. Campbell and Mr Fitzgibbon, the honorable members for St. John's West, who are interested in the measure because of labor conditions in their constituency. The policy of giving government guarantees in connection with private enterprise is not an outstanding policy of this government. The policy of this government is to avoid, where humanly possible, guaranteeing capital or interest on such developments. There are some circumstances, however, which justify

the giving of guarantees in such cases as the Humber. Then also the Newfoundland Hotel was guaranteed. When the government guarantees bonds of principal or interest in private firms or industries they should have a sinking fund and have a background of large private investment in the capital account, operating account, houses, timber lands, etc. The idea of guaranteeing a bond is entirely a different matter from guaranteeing principal of preferred or common stock in the company. Thus the guarantee of the Humber was in my judgment, justified, and there is abundant security. In the case of the Newfoundland Hotel it might or might not be justified, but it has substantial security behind it. In the case of this Bill the labor conditions in the city of St. John's justify it. The idea of merely starting an enterprise based on the financial guarantee is one which nobody in this Legislature and very few outside can appreciate more carefully than my honorable friend the Leader of the Opposition. There were considerable profits made by the old Knitting Mills until the unfortunate and lamentable death of its able executive manager, the late Mr. Smythe, and the enterprise was abundantly successful. It was only after his death that the industry collapsed and calls were made to the Government. I feel myself that if this thing is properly organized and properly capitalized and economically dealt with and if it is possible to secure an efficient manager of the class, standing and knowledge of the man who so successfully handled it before, that there will be no calls made on the revenue of the colony. But there we have to deal with equanimity of the personnel, and capital and value, and the direction of men, and knowledge of the trade, and all other such matters which, as the Leader of the Opposition is aware as an executive man-

ager, are necessary so as to fully protect the government of this colony in the matter of the guarantee. I propose to suggest an amendment in the form of a third paragraph of Section I to be known as C. I feel that we should adopt so far as this entire House is concerned the most stringent method possible from receiving applications for guarantees by other new private concerns.

The amendment I suggest is this:

(reads)

In other words, if in the first year the Company makes default and the Government has to pay, in the second year it makes a profit, a first charge against the profits of the second year shall be the amount which the Colony has paid.

So the Colony will have a reasonable opportunity of securing a refund.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of objecting to the principle of guaranteeing financially, even so far as interest is concerned, a private enterprise. And in addition to that guarantee, we are giving them a tremendous advantage in the way of tariff concessions. They are getting a protection of 60 per cent. and I presume they will pay a sales tax, which will mean that they are getting a net protection of about 58 per cent., and it seems to me that should suffice without any government guarantee.

Another thing, the government here is tied hand and foot in every way, but there are no restrictions in that Act so far as the company is concerned; not as to the number of people to be employed, their wage bill or anything, except that they must operate for nine months. Operating for nine months only means having a few there to run the mill.

The Hon. Dr. Campbell is very positive and the Minister of Finance and Customs is equally positive that

they are going to give a lot of employment. If that is so, I am in favor of the Bill. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs said he understood they would employ three hundred girls at the average wage of \$8.00 per week. That would be very good, but I do not look for anything like that. I do not look for half. I would expect two hundred girls at \$6.00 a week, because the average girl is not paid \$8.00 a week. If we could be satisfied that it is really going to give labor returns, all my objections vanish, but there is nothing here to guarantee that even twenty girls will be employed and that the wage bill will even be \$500 a month. I know Mr. Collishaw personally and I do not like to see him ridiculed. I found him straight in everything he had to do with me and I had a lot of business with him, and for his sake alone I would like to see him getting a decent show, but I am still more desirous of seeing that the country gets properly treated, and if he is so positive and if Mr. Collishaw's sponsors are so confident that this industry is going to be a tremendous thing for St. John's West, let them give us a guarantee stipulating the employment that is to be given.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on the Bill at all, because, apparently, when I spoke on it before, for some reason or other, probably my own fault, I gave such offence that I did not wish to make any remarks, but I wish to say that I agree entirely with what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said.

Before I deal with the point that I wish to make I would like to say that I agree with the Hon. the Prime Minister in connection with his remarks relative to a guarantee to assist private enterprise. I was opposed to the guarantee of the Humber on principle at the time, but looking back upon it I do not know of any circumstances

under which a guarantee was more justifiable. In the first place we had associated with us the British Government and the Armstrong-Whitworth Company, and the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. at that time was probably one of the most world-renowned firms in the world and we could not have had as partners better ones than the British Government and the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. and what objection I had to the guarantee on the Humber was not based upon any objection to the parties, but was an objection upon principle, which the Hon. the Prime Minister has stated he agrees with.

Now in connection with the labor aspect of the matter, when I gave offence before I was really asking the hon. member for St. John's West what evidence was that there was going to be three hundred people employed in the factory. And three hundred people, it does not matter whether they are girls, boys or men, is a large number to employ in a factory. There is no evidence before this House that there is that number going to be employed and the excuse for this guarantee is that there is going to be employment of this large number, and I do not think it was quite fair, if I may put it this way, that the hon. member for St. John's West and the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs should have assumed for their part that they were the only ones prepared to espouse the cause of the unemployed. I think they will agree themselves that we are equally interested in reducing unemployment. We do not want to see unemployment. We want to do our very best to cut it down, and so far as I am concerned I am prepared to do my very best to assist in any way that I can to reduce it and I think that if your factory started with even three hundred girls—and here I do not entirely agree with my hon. friend from St. John's East, Capt. Byrne—it

will improve greatly upon our unemployment position. I think it will be a benefit to the unemployed, but at the same time I realise the argument that he put forward on the matter, which was that it will not reduce the obligation of the government in connection with the bread-winners of the family, because in the past the employment of girls has never been looked upon as a source of defeating unemployment. The bread-winners of the family are the husbands, and it will not reduce the obligation of the government. It may improve the condition of the household.

Whilst I do not base my argument upon that at all. I say that if you employ three hundred girls in this factory it will be a very great boon to the town. I just put in that way—when I say you, I do not mean you personally, but the people you are introducing this proposition for—I simply say it will improve the conditions of the town and if you can assure us that you will give that employment, well then, you will have the blessing, I know, of the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Puddester, who have both spoke on it, and also of myself, because you have not got the monopoly of the desire to help the unemployed. We, as you, would all help them. Our position in this instance is to help and the government to deal with it, and we are willing to do the very best we can to help you in this regard, the only question is what is the price we are going to pay?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Under the new amendment we will not have to pay very much.

MR. EMERSON.—I only heard the amendment for the first time when it was read by the hon. member and I have not had time to consider it, but it seems to me in a general way that it is very good; but on the other hand I do not see why there should

not be some understanding as to the number of people to be employed in the factory because the excuse for giving these concessions is that they will give employment, and as it is now, you give the concessions without any undertaking to give the employment. I mean your company. When I say you I do not mean you personally, what I mean is the people you are speaking for in the House, say they are going to employ so many people. Well, why not undertake to do so? You are binding the government in regard to the guarantee, binding it in connection with free entry, binding it to the extent of 35 per cent on their goods. Why not bind the company to employ these people when that is the only argument they put up for the concessions?

I think that the hon. member for St John's West has had numerous experiences of companies coming to the country asking for a guarantee and their sole plea has always been "Look at the unemployed. We will give you work for the unemployed." Now this does not tell us much more than has been to past governments. They are going to give us employment and that is all they offer us, and when these concerns came before the various parliaments in the past, and I suppose when they come before the various parliaments in the future, we are always faced with the problem of unemployment and they work upon our feelings and those who support the measure plead that as an excuse, and those who oppose it cite it as a good excuse. It does not mean that we are unconscious of the unemployment problem. It simply means that as far as we know that the people promoting this measure do not offer us anything but labor. They do not offer anything equivalent to the concessions they are asking for, and I suggest to you that it is well worth your consideration. The time has come

when we should stop it, being faced merely as a question of importance and deal with unemployment rigorously. If you can say that this measure will deal with unemployment, very good. I realize, and have said so already, that this measure deals with a portion of unemployment. I have said that already; but if you could provide from this, from some foreign or local company, a request for concessions which would deal with the unemployment question in toto, or almost in toto, it would receive very favorable consideration; but you only deal with a very minor section of it. You agree with that, and I think it is not unreasonable for us to say if the company is going to get these very large concessions that they should show something more than a charitable case, because that is all they are offering us. They are working to have something which will help them through their difficulties, and they are offering us charity.. Oh, yes, don't make any mistake about that.

I heard from the Hon. Finance Minister yesterday something about sweat shops. I do not know very well the sense in which he applied them; but, if those people behind this Mill undertaking come in here and realise that we have a very important unemployment problem, surely they must realise that they can get cheap labor, and cheap labor means sweat shops. They have offered us sweat shops; but what are they getting? The Hon. the Prime Minister, the introducer of this measure, showed that it is a far-reaching one, and the Hon. Dr. Campbell, in his amendment last evening, also showed that it is far-reaching.

I trust, however, that my few remarks will not be construed to be as personal as the Hon. Sir William Coaker suggested, but that I hope the

comments I have made are those that will receive your consideration.

Mr. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, I have already commented twice on this measure and it is not my intention to delay the House now. The object of the Bill, as has been explained by the honourable introducer, is mainly to relieve unemployment in St. John's West. As I have pointed out on a previous occasion, I am entirely in accord with any measure which makes for the practical relief of the unemployed. I believe that in a country like this, with the opportunities which we have and which are too often not taken advantage of there should be less unemployment, yet I am ready to admit anything that is fair and reasonable in this or any other measure which will help to alleviate the distress of these who are unemployed. But, Sir, I have yet to find anything in this Bill which assures us that the unemployed persons in St. John's are to be given sole consideration, as has been suggested by certain members of the Government. Has the Commission appointed some time ago by the Government, to consider the unemployment problem, given any decision as to what measures are to be adopted with regard to apportioning relief? Did the promoters of this Mill ask the Government to bring this Bill ask the Government to bring this Government ask the promoters to bring it down here?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—It is a private Bill.

MR. QUINTON—Supposing that the Government is sincere in its desire to relieve unemployment, was it not the duty of the Government to devise some means of relieving it, or was it necessary to wait for somebody else to show them what to do in that direction. Last night the Hon. Member for St. John's West, (Mr. Fitzgibbon), stated that, in view of the fact that

the Company had considered the position of unemployed and in view of the promoters having such faith in the proposition of such a Bill, there was every reason to believe that the proposition would be a profitable one. He might have added, and in view also of the fact that the House is asked to permit the operators of the Mill to bring in raw material free of duty and to impose a thirty-five per cent. tariff upon manufactured products, that the foregoing is sufficient protection. Then why should the Government and the country be called upon to guarantee six per cent. on the actual paid up cash capital of the Company. I have an idea that this Company may expand the scope of its operations and, perhaps, develop an export trade, and, consequently, enter into competition with concerns endeavouring to develop world wide markets. Then, not being unmindful of the concessions we are asked to give the Company, as against what they are offering us, I submit, Sir, that this is a proposition that should not for one moment be entertained by this House, nor am I prepared to agree to the terms outlined in Clause (2) of this Bill.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, the position is this that it is not as if they were looking for concessions and until they get those concessions they do not know what they are going to do with them. But surely it is not impossible for them to give us some idea as to what amount of employment they are going to give, especially if they have everything definitely fixed as to the line of manufacture they are going into. It should be quite possible for them to give us a definite estimate of the minimum amount of employment that they are going to give.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—The mini-

mum that they gave us is three hundred.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I would like to see that incorporated in this Bill. Now I do not say that I am a manufacturer of wide experience, but I am supposed to be fairly successful. Have a minimum amount stated in the Bill, say so much per year. Now supposing that the idea was to manufacture, shall we say, straw hats, which we do wear here sometimes, and a man in that line knows that there is a possibility of getting concessions from the government because we are anxious to have our people employed. This man comes here. He knows his business thoroughly. And the first man that he goes to is the Finance Minister and he asks him what the imports of straw hats into the country amount to. He finds that out and then he goes to the different shops and finds the sort of hats that they are selling, and then he begins to figure out his cost. He knows the cost of the labour in the country where he has been working before. He finds what the labour is like here. He comes to a man like myself and he says: "What sort of people are the Newfoundlanders to work in factories," and I would tell him what I think of them, and that is that they are the finest crowd of men in the world, and I do not know where they are more adaptable and more willing to try and satisfy their employer. From that he figures out what the cost is to manufacture that article in Newfoundland, and what he is likely to get for that article, and then he makes application for any concessions that may be desirable and which he has hopes of getting. And he is in a position to be able to give a fair idea of what amount of labour he is able to give the people of St. John's. Is not that logic? Now I am not going to ask as

much as the Minister of Finance who stated that there would be employment for three hundred girls at eight dollars a week. That is too much. I say two hundred at \$6.00, or make it a thousand dollars a week.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word in reply to the Leader of the Opposition. I have been in this House since 1923 and similar matters have come up for discussion, and invariably I took up the labour problem from the opposite side of the House. I would say that there is no clause in the bill, saying how many people were going to get work and the answer invariably was, that they could not put a clause in the bill with regards to labour, how much was going to be paid out for labour, or anything of that sort, because it might affect the company when it would be going to raise its capital. That was invariably the answer, that I got at any rate. When I was in opposition, a bill was brought in, in connection with Bell Island, as a matter of fact it did not get very far, and I asked the Leader of the House why there was nothing in that bill in connection with the number of men that were going to be employed at Bell Island and the wages that they were going to be paid, and he could not tell the reason why. That agreement was drafted by men in the Government and outside of the Government who have had experience in this thing, and I do not think there is any agreement on the Statute Book telling how many men it is agreed to employ, or the wages that they are going to pay. He does not know where he is until he gets started and he cannot guarantee something before he gets going.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition I may say that in connection with a much larger guarantee, the

Humber guarantee, the largest that Newfoundland ever dreamed about, I was often asked: "Now how many people is it proposed to employ." I said hundreds. It turned out to be thousands. At that time I could not tell how many men would be required for that kind of work, I was not a paper expert but now we are all paper experts. If the honourable member will only have a little patience. The company is making ready to start business. I have that from the Solicitor representing the company. They are not going to spend money for fun, and employ only twenty or thirty men. I am just as anxious as the honourable member to see that this company prospers, and to see that Newfoundland is never called upon to pay one dollar of that guarantee.

HON. THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honorable member for St. John's West, this question. If they employed only twenty people, where are we then?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—That is provided for in section two (b). If the company does not operate continuously for at least nine months of the year, it shall not be entitled to its guarantee for that year.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition means. He means that this business may be run entirely by machinery and capital.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I have never seen a knitting mill or anything run by machinery only.

MR. EMERSON—I do not mean alone. You know that perfectly well. What the Leader of the Opposition means is this, that you are talking glibly about three hundred people being employed. You hope it will be that many. Whether your hope is realised is another matter. The point

is this that modern machinery may take the place of labour and should that happen and only twenty or forty people are employed, and they get the concession that they are given not only in connection with the guarantee but also the free importation of material the excuse that you give for the granting of these concessions, namely that they are going to give labour, will be futile. I may say that I was in the knitting mill that has been closed. I would also like to point out to Hon. Dr. Campbell that we have three or four clothing factories here that turn out an enormous quantity of goods, and the whole lot of them combined do not employ four hundred people. It is all done by machinery.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter into a Contract with the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to Enter a Contract with the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills Limited," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Emerson gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Quinton gave notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 22, 1929.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform this House that since our last session Mr. M. S. Sullivan, the member for Placentia West, has passed away. He was a gentleman with a large experience in governmental matters and was identified with the public service of this Colony since 1904. With your permission, Sir, I beg leave to read to this House Resolutions of Sympathy.

RESOLVED that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death of Mr. Michael S. Sullivan, for many years a Member of the House of Assembly, and some time Colonial Secretary.

RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives.

The late Mr. Sullivan was born at Presque, Placentia Bay, in 1876. He started his career by entering the employ of the Reid Company, and later the pulp and paper industry. He entered the legislature and completed many successful years. As a young man he received his education at St. Bonaventure's College, which institution was then, as it is today, a premier educational establishment in Newfoundland. He first entered the service of Newfoundland in connection with civil engineering and later became identified with the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, undertaking civil engineering work and surveys and then for four years

acted as assistant superintendent of that concern. In 1904 he contested the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, which returned him to the legislature. Since that date he has progressed in knowledge and experience until at this session of the legislature we looked upon him and his colleague, Mr. Puddester, as the two senior and most capable men which this legislature has had for many years. In 1924 he became a member of the Executive government under the leadership of Hon. W. S. Monroe and when Mr. Monroe retired and left the leadership to Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Sullivan was honoured by an executive seat in the government as Colonial Secretary. His progress has been identified with the industrial development of Newfoundland along the lines of pulp and paper. In the person of Mr. Sullivan this legislature has lost an able representative. Placentia West has lost a representative who was painstakingly anxious of its wishes and welfare generally, and we extend to his relatives our deepest sympathy and regard. Our great regret is that we shall no longer have his earnest and faithful services in this legislature. Mr. Speaker, I beg that these resolutions be given precedence to the regular business of the House.

MR. ALDERDICE—It is with feelings of deepest emotion that I rise to second the motion so sympathetically and so admirably proposed by the Honorable the Prime Minister.

The late Michael S. Sullivan has been identified with the public and parliamentary life of the Country for the last 25 years. During that period on two occasions only did he fail of election.

Probably no representative was ever more true to the trust reposed in him by his constituents. His courtesy and kindness to them was

unfailing. It mattered not whether they were politically opposed to him or not. They were all his constituents. The widows and orphans were his special care.

Sickness and helplessness ever found a ready response from him. For very many years up to the beginning of his own illness it was his unfailing custom to visit the General Hospital on Sundays. His bright cheery manner and sympathetic heart brought solace to many a suffering patient.

The late Hon. Member was prominently identified with the industrial life of the Country, particularly anything pertaining to our natural resources.

He had a share in the promotion of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. at Grand Falls established in 1905. I feel sure his thorough knowledge of our forest resources must have been of infinite value to this Company when contemplating starting operations here.

Undoubtedly he was the best informed man in this House in all matters concerning the natural resources of the country. His knowledge he unreservedly placed at the disposal of the Government of the day.

My acquaintance of the late Hon. gentleman is both personal and political.

It consoles me to think he looked upon me as a friend. He was true and steadfast in his friendships, candid, perhaps to a fault, but his transparent sincerity disarmed all resentment of his candour.

In politics and particularly during our short term of office I found him a delightful colleague. His knowledge of the different Government Departments made his aid invaluable.

His few months in office as Colonial Secretary proved abundantly his

eminent fitness for the position and had he held that position long enough he most undoubtedly would have proven himself to be one of the most competent occupants of that most important office.

He never sought office for office's sake. Of that he gave me abundant proof. When I was forming my Cabinet and finding it a little difficult to adjust the denominational balance without offending someone. Mr. Sullivan came to me and offered as a solution of the problem to relinquish all thoughts of office or a seat in the Executive Council.

He was ambitious for the welfare of Newfoundland and would have gone to any sacrifice to promote his country's interests.

During the Great War he gave valuable and practical service to the Empire in our Forestry Corps.

Although forbidden by his doctor to attend the sessions of this House he followed its deliberations with keen interest. This is verified by the fact that he dictated three speeches just previous to the attack which has taken him away from us.

At this hour our thoughts and sympathy turns naturally to his aged mother, his wife, his son and daughter. May God comfort them in their affliction.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the resolution that has been so admirably proposed by the Prime Minister and also equally admirably seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I can scarcely trust myself to say very much in connection with the late member who sat on my left the last time he was in the House. Not as much as a colleague of mine or as a member of the Opposition did he show his loyalty to us, but as a personal friend. For my own part I

have regarded him as a close personal friend since 1920 when I became first associated with him in public life and there was never a time during those nine years when I wanted advice or friendship that I could not find a friend in Mike Sullivan. I cannot help but think that he has sacrificed himself on the altar of his country. Two years ago I was uneasy about his health and was expecting this thing to happen and the blow to fall that has now fallen. In the negotiations leading up the contracts for the Humber and the Gander in 1927 this country had a firm friend in the deceased. He was a practical man and knew what he was talking about, and in the meetings where we discussed these measures there was no question whatever that Mr. Sullivan knew as much about the negotiations that were proceeding—so much about the subject as any other man that I came in contact with on these questions. During the present session of the legislature he has not been permitted to exercise his duty here as was his desire. Every day he thought it would be the last that he would have to spend away from this house. On Saturday morning last he became irritable and came to my office and told me that he had a troubled mind because of not being able to attend this House, and he thought that on Monday next that whatever the consequences were he intended to exercise his duties in this House. He discussed with me the several bills that were then pending and went home about twelve o'clock and with his stenographer he prepared three speeches for delivery in this House according to his views and lights and knowledge. It was too much for him. Shortly after he prepared them he became unwell and on Sunday night he lapsed into a state of coma and, with the exception of a very short

interval yesterday when he regained a little of his former strength, he has been unconscious ever since. I regard the last act of his as the essence of patriotism. A man who could not help from knowing that any exertion of that character would bring on fatal results from the disease from which he was suffering, who felt himself so constrained to try to do good for his country, that he risked his life to give to his country his views on the matters then before the legislature, is a thorough patriotic gentleman. He spared himself at no time. In sitting in this House in the sessions of 1927 and 1928 it were better for him if he had been resting and trying to regain the strength that was his. But he would not think of shirking his duty. Especially is this so in the session of 1928 when he sat here in this House suffering untold agonies and extreme weakness when he should have been in some sanatorium to try and regain his health. But he was so patriotic that he believed his duty was here and he stayed here until the end. We have lost, Sir, on this side of the House our most experienced, our most valued member, and the whole House has lost a patriotic gentleman, a man who knew the business of the country, as has been said, not only in the industrial sphere but knew the business of the country from a financial standpoint and during his short term of office as Colonial Secretary, when I was often in close contact with him, he not only won my admiration but I think won the admiration of the staff in the department and of the other members of the government and also the members of the party, by the knowledge that he possessed and his thoroughly efficient method of conducting the office committed to his charge. It has not been my privilege to come in contact with a Colonial Secretary here-

tofore that knew so much about routine, knew so much about the business of his office as did Mr. Sullivan. No agenda would go before the government until he had carefully considered it. He studied the agenda and studied the papers and documents in connection with it, and when the time came for explanation he was prepared.

I join in sympathy and deep regret that we have lost such a valued member of this Legislature.

To his aged and widowed mother, who now has reached the age of eighty-five years, to his wife and to his son and daughter I am sure the heartfelt sympathy of every member of this House of Assembly will go out in fullest measure.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the motion so ably put by the Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and supported by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester.

I have known the late Mr. Sullivan for the last twelve or fifteen years, but particularly have I known him during the last eight years since I have been associated with public life. He was associated with my late father when he went to the country in 1919.

Whilst I might say many things in praise towards Mr. Sullivan this afternoon, which things have been very ably put by the speakers that have preceded me, there is one outstanding feature of Mr. Sullivan's which I am an admirer of, apart from any political animosities that may have existed between us; one outstanding piece of manliness and worthiness which I always admired in the late Mr. Sullivan which, and I feel that every member of the House on both sides

will associate themselves with me when I say that the late Mr. Sullivan, if he was nothing else, he was a son of which any mother should be proud of, because he never missed one Sunday—and I lived in the neighborhood where she lives and know that he never failed to call and see his mother; and in the passing of her son I feel that the elder Mrs. Sullivan will miss him possibly more than his own family.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the previous speakers in connection with the Resolution now before the Chair, and in closing my few remarks there is very little that I have to add to what has already been said, but I want to close them up merely by saying "May God have mercy on his soul."

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I would just like to associate myself by adding a very few remarks to what has already been said.

My associations with the deceased gentleman have not been as long as those of previous speakers, but for a few years he has been a very near neighbor of mine and for the last few months a colleague in the political life of the country, and it is with feelings of deep sympathy that I rise to speak on this occasion. As I say, we have been close neighbors for some time and as you all know you cannot be a neighbor without getting an insight into the character of those who live near you, and one of the outstanding features of the life of my deceased colleague was his very deep family affection which he had. I have seen him in his house and in his garden with his family around him and I can assure the House that exemplary household bonds bound him to his family.

My association in politics with him has been fairly close also. As my honorable friend on my left has

stated, he never sought advice from him without receiving it, and I have been in the same position and I have never yet in the whole course of my conversations with him heard him make a nasty remark even about a political opponent, and I can assure the Government that from day to day on my way home, in discussing with him, on the roadside or in his house, the doings of the day, never was there a time when I was so pleased as to be able to tell him of the gracious gesture which was made by the honorable the Prime Minister and supported by several other members, in connection with his last act in this House, and he accepted it not because he felt that he had fought a good fight and won, but he accepted it as the gracious act from the Government towards him, and I can assure them today that they made his last days much happier by the gesture, and I feel that they are glad they did it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I might ask you, Sir, with the consent of the honorable members and out of further respect to our deceased friend, that this House now rising should adjourn until Monday afternoon at three of the clock.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next the 27th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 27th, 1929.

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

HON. MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of the South Shore in the district of Hr. Main asking for the service of the Dredge Priestman to be used in clearing the entrance to Long Pond Gut. As is well known to

Hon. members of this House, Long Pond is really the only port of refuge on the South Shore in Conception Bay from Capt St. Francis to Holyrood. In the Fall of the year that section of the Bay from Lance Cove Head to the Eastern end of Bell Island is very much frequented, not alone by people from our own district but by people from the north side of the Bay as well, and when boats are caught out in a strong north-east or north-west breeze it is absolutely impossible to make any shelter on the north side of the Bay and so they have to run for Long Pond Gut. During last Winter the approach to this Gut became locked by an accumulation of sand and silt and the petitioners now ask that the service of the Dredge be allowed to operate for a few days during the early part of the Summer, so that the harbor may be open for the fall fishing season. There is just another element that I might refer to on behalf of the petitioners, namely, that many of the South Shore men work in the mines on Bell Island and on Saturday nights it is their custom to go by motor boats from Bell Island to Long Pond and thence to their homes. Therefore, the dredging of Long Pond harbor would confer a wonderful benefit upon the people all along the South Shore.

I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries with a request that the prayer of the petitioners be granted with the least possible delay.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words in support to the petition by my colleague, the Hon. member for Mr. Main. I know that place very well and I know the necessity there is for having Long Pond Harbour dredged. Long Pond is the only place to harbor a boat from Topsail to the head of the Bay and people all along the South Shore suffer considerable hardship by

not having any harbor to run to in a storm. A couple of years ago an effort was made there to have the Gut accessible for boats to enter and a movement was started for promoting the prosecution of the fishery as well as the securing caplin for fertilizer, but in practically every case the work had to be abandoned, because there was no place to land and boats that were left moored on the collars sank with their engines in gales of wind.

I have spoken on this matter before in this House, pointing out the necessity for the dredge at Long Pond. The late Government spent some money there yast year, but unless the silt and sand is dredged out so as to permit boats to enter the Pond the expenditure of money there is a waste. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and I feel sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, being a practical man and knowing the necessity of having open harbor there as well as anybody in the House, will give the matter his support and have the Dredge Priestman sent there very soon.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from some 130 people of Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay. The petitioners ask that Flat Islands be made a port of call for the S. S. Home plying on the Fogo Mail Service. It will be remembered that a few days ago I presented a petition from the people of St. Brendan's in the same district and on the same subject. I am presenting this petition merely out of courtesy to the electors who have taken the trouble to draft and sign the petition, and later on I intend to take the matter up personally with the Executive Government and submit some practical proposals for the re-organization of the coastal service in a manner that will give the people of this important dis-

trict better connections with the outside coastal services.

I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a petition from the residents of the Outer and Lower Batteries in the district of St. John's East. These people are suffering a very great amount of disability. They have but very few lights, no sewerage, no water and practically no roads and yet they are expected to pay taxes. The petitioners pray that they should be relieved of their arrears of taxes and not be asked to pay any further taxes. It is impossible to put water and sewerage at these places because the engineering difficulties are almost unsurmountable and for that reason they do not think there is any chance of their getting any of the advantages belonging to city life, and, therefore, they think it is unfair to be called upon to pay up arrears or to pay future taxes. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. BYRNE—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague. It is difficult to realise, though nevertheless true, that half of the people of this section of St. John's are living under deplorable conditions. In the past neither Governments or the Municipal Council have not been in a position to give the people of that territory, which I might term "no man's land," any of the civic improvements that the people of the Inner Battery enjoy. The Municipal Council, both past and present contending that it is next to impossible to make improvements there. Therefore, I think that in requesting to be definitely relieved of their taxes the people of the Outer

and Lower Batteries are only asking for common justice.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Mr. Speaker, in relation to this petition I might point out that we have a similar condition of affairs in St. John's West. After the City Charter was brought in the city limits were extended considerably. The Battery was brought in, Munday's Pond section was brought in and that section North of the town was brought in and all suffered in the same way. They were not given water and sewerage and the result was the taxes were not paid and a pile of arrears are due from those areas. Under the new Charter, the Municipal Council would have the first claim on those areas, were the arrears collectable. We have taken the position up with the City Council, and they cannot see any way out of it at the present time, because some people have paid their taxes and others have not, and if the arrears are forgiven, those who have paid may come to the Council and ask that their payments be refunded, which the Council are not in a position to do financially. I think that this question should be gone into at the next session of the Legislature, and see if a solution can be found. The law is there but the equity of the thing does not seem to be quite right, that those people should be paying taxes without any chance of receiving any benefit in return.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

(1) MR. EMERRSON.—To ask the Minister of Public Works:

(1)—The cost of the recent alterations made at the Poor Asylum?

(2)—Where is the Superintendent residing at the present time and has he received or is he to receive any allowance on account of rent?

(3)—What the Government intends to do with the property known as the Sudbury Hospital?

(4)—Where has the equipment of Sudbury Hospital been removed?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member for Placentia East, I beg to table the answers to his questions.

(2) MR. EMERSON.—To ask Hon. the Minister of Justice:

(1)—If a motor car has recently been purchased by the Justice Department for the Inspector General?

(2)—What is the cost of the same?

(3)—For what purpose the said car is to be used?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Member I may say that a motor car has been imported for the Inspector General. The car that was provided in 1924, being four and a half years old cannot give sufficient service, and it was turned in to the dealer, and the cost of the new one is \$1800. It is used for the purposes of the Inspector himself officially and his wife and family. It was in 1873 that the arrangement was made with the late Inspector General, after being agreed to by the governor of that day, and it was generally felt that the Inspector General should be provided for his own private purposes with a horse and conveyance, cost of horses and their maintenance. When horses and drivers and the maintenance of these became not so customary as they were then, and the people developed into the motor car idea, the Inspector General was provided with a motor car for his own official use, for a fire, and when he was not using it in that way his wife and family used it. I

think that it was in the year 1917 or 1918 that he first changed over from a horse and carriage to a motor car, and this is the continuation now of the policy of 1873 modernized.

(3) MR. EMERSON.—To ask the Minister of Marine & Fisheries what was the cost of erecting light on Lawu Head?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, this information is being prepared by the Department and I hope to have it ready for tomorrow.

(4) MR. EMERSON.—To ask the Minister of Public Works, to state the balance now in that Department remaining out of the sum of \$10,000.00 allocated last Fall for the extension of the water and sewerage system by the St. John's Municipal Council along Pennywell Road to Prince of Wales Street. And also to state when it is expected said work will be executed.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information asked for by the Hon. member for Placentia East.

MR. EMERSON.—To ask the Minister of Public Works:

(1) If any motor cars have been recently purchased by the Highroads Commission for Mr. Cochius?

(2) What is the cost of same?

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Member, I may point out that there has been a car purchased for Mr. Cochius at a cost of \$1396.87. I may point out in this connection that in 1925 when the Highroads Commission was first formed and in 1926, Mr. Cochius hired taxis at a cost of \$5,000 to the country. This was the subject of much debate at the time in

the House of Assembly, and I for one from my seat on the opposition side strenuously protested against this. I suggested the purchase of a car. Eventually that was done, but it was a very low powered car, perhaps alright on the level ground but on hilly drives it was not up to the standard and it was abandoned. Now we have purchased a nice little car, at a very moderate cost. I think it is an economical more. We save \$4,000 in taxi hire.

(6) MR. BENNETT.—To ask the Minister of Public Works:

(1)—If the Government has been approached by the Municipal Council with reference to laying sewerage pipes along the Waterfor Bridge Road to Waterford Bridge; if so, to lay on the table of the House any correspondence relative thereto.

(2)—If the Government has taken into consideration the lighting of the said road and any decision thereon.

(7) MR. BENNETT.—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Internal Economy Commission, to table the number and names of Door-keepers, Messengers, etc., for the Assembly sessions of 1928 and 1929 and at what salaries engaged.

(8) MR. QUINTON.—To ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, if any Mail Subsidy has been, or is to be, granted in respect of a motor service from Musgrave Harbor to Lewisporte. To whom is such subsidy paid or payable, and what is the amount.

(9) MR. QUINTON.—To ask the Minister of Public Works to table the following information: If it is intended to operate a (motor boat) passenger service

from Musgrave Harbor to Lewisporte; if so, to whom is the contract to be awarded, and what are the terms and conditions of the contract and the amount to be paid in respect thereof.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th June, 1929, and the 30th day of June, 1930, 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 and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending on the 30th day of June, 1929, and the 30th day of June, 1930, 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 and Customs, 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 the 30th day of June, 1929, and the 30th day of June, 1930, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill without amendment.

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

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June 1929, and the 30th day of June, 1930, 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.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act," 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 of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, this Bill as already explained on Second Reading is a draft prepared by the conjoint efforts of Mr. Dunfield, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Inspector General of Constabulary, having as its object

the tightening up of methods of dealing with illicit liquor traffic. It is not suggested that the reduction from six to three bottles a week allowed to be bought will materially lessen legitimate consumption, but this gives an opportunity, however, to the police of dealing more stringently with the illicit liquor traffic in alcohol, if one has to give much credence to the reports of the police and the Inspector General that is the main source of trouble in St. John's. There are one or two points about the Bill I would like to hear fully debated in the House. As a matter of fact arising out of a conference between the Inspector General and Mr. Dunfield, an alternative section 6 has been drafted. It will be remembered that the Honourable Member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester, called attention to the fact that clergymen and medical practitioners ought not to be identified in any way with the matter of liquor permits. Taking these suggestions I tried to discover if there was any way that it was possible that the thing could be fully protected on the one hand, and that persons would have a reasonable opportunity of getting permits without a great deal of difficulty in outlying sections of the country. As a result of the conferences of these gentlemen I want to submit a redraft of section 6. I frankly admit that the technical wording of the section I have not myself studied. This section is the result of the drafting of these two gentlemen striving to improve the means of dealing with the illicit trade in liquor in this country.

I move that the Committee rise until a later hour.

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 later.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Mr. Puddester, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly.' "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, when we discussed this Bill on second reading there were some amendments suggested and which I was very glad to accept and incorporate into the bill. My aim and object in introducing this bill is to have the House get as good a bill as possible in preventing abuses said to be carried on at election time.

If the Honourable gentlemen will compare the old with the new you will find the amendments kindly suggested by the Prime Minister incorporated in sections one and two. The alteration means that instead of the date being at the dissolution of the Legislature the date is now put back to the time of the Proclamation. Thereafter no expenditure is to take place and no public money can be allocated. Then there is section three suggested by the Prime Minister in connection with the vote at the Poor Asylum. The Honourable Members will see that no persons residing at the Poor Asylum for one year before the election shall have the right to vote. I consider that it was a step in the wrong direction in 1910 or 1911 when the law was changed so that a person receiving pauper relief would be entitled to vote.

Section four is a section making it legal for a candidate to procure carriages or cars to convey voters to the booths. Especially is that necessary in St. John's. It will be done and it is just as well to make it legal. There

is not very much harm in a candidate hiring a car in large town for that day and we now make it legal for candidates to do so. In St. John's motor cars have always been employed to convey electors to the polls. It was absolutely illegal and the successful candidate could have been unseated. I mentioned the other day that in the Canadian Parliament they are having the same trouble. They are now making it legal for candidates to hire cars for this purpose. I commend this Bill to the favourable consideration of the Committee and I trust that it will pass and if there is any other amendment that we can add to make it better I shall be only too glad to accept it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I want to thank the Honourable Member for accepting the amendments that I made some days ago on the second reading stage. Would it not be desirable also to mention motor boats in the Bill. Motor cars are permitted and motor boats should, I think, also be permitted.

MR. PUDDESTER—I shall be glad to do so. We had a peculiar situation at Bell Island during the last election. It was alright to convey voters from Bell Island to Broad Cove, but after they landed there we could not bring them overland to their homes by cars or other conveyances as it was illegal.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I have had an opportunity here of saying anything on this Bill, I think that I must support it wholeheartedly and congratulate my Honourable friend on the other side of the House for having brought in a Bill into this House which will in some way do away with what is known as bribery and corruption at the time of a general election. I want to do this fairly, Mr. Chairman, and say a few words in connection with bribery and corruption during the last cam-

paign, but I will leave that until a little later.

During my absence from the House of Assembly on Thursday, I think, an uncalled for attack was made upon me by Mr. Quinton, the member who by accident happened to come to the House, and he was elected by bribery and corruption—and that I can prove. The man attacked me and he attacked me with the jaw bone of an ass, and I am very glad to be able to congratulate my friend and colleague, Mr. Skanes, who, in my absence, defended me on the floors of this House. The Honourable Member for Bonavista South did not have gall enough to attack me when I was in the House but waited until I was out in a storm—one of the worst we have had this season—in the Northern steamer, and then he took advantage of that and came in the House and attacked me simply because I am receiving a salary from the Government today. The salary that I receive from the Government today I am not ashamed to receive.

This is my third election to this Assembly and I did not buy my election in my district on any occasion and I have been elected three times and that is something which he will never be able to say. If that remark had come from my Honourable friend Mr. Puddester, who might be called the father of that side of the House today, I would say nothing, because he, like myself, has spent years in this Assembly, but to come from a baby member of the Assembly who has his political napkins on in here is an insult that I will not accept and I fire it back in his face.

You made an attack on me because I am getting paid as a logging superintendent. I am entitled to have that position and I want to tell the House now, Mr. Chairman, that I am quite capable of filling that position. You

are worrying about my salary Mr. Member for Bonavista South but wouldn't you take that salary if you got the chance? You would take it. Didn't you camp on my doorstep for two sessions in this city of St. John's and tell me you were itching for a job in the Government.

MR. QUINTON—I am not denying that.

MR. BROWN—Why did you come here and attack me then?

MR. QUINTON—I did not attack you, I merely said

MR. BROWN—Just hold on a minute until I am finished and then you can finish attacking me and I will attack you good and hard. I have spent too much time in this House for a baby member like you to attack me, and if I have to show you even to the extent of going around to your seat, I am going there and no one in this Chamber will stop me either.

I have done something for the country; I have been always working for the loggers and working classes of the country and members of this House will prove what I have done, but what you are mad about is that your Mr. Blandford was put off, and a competent camp inspector was put in his place. And you have other agitators from King's Cove writing you about the district and they are both as slimy as a Pacific Coast halibut.

MR. QUINTON—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

MR. BROWN—That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am addressing my remarks to the Chairman.

MR. QUINTON—My point is that I have been accused of conspiring with men from King's Cove, from what the Honourable Member has said. I have not had any conferences with men from King's Cove.

MR. BROWN—I will reply to that and tell him that there are people in King's Cove writing him letters.

MR. QUINTON—You are wrong.

MR. BROWN—He told me personally that they were writing him letters and we have discussed it face to face.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Bonavista South came in here and attacked me because I happen to be a member of the Squires Government. Since I have been in politics I have been a Liberal and before I came into politics I was, and the Honourable Member for Bonavista South was writing me letters asking me to try and get him on the Squires ticket and he wanted to know if he would get a department if he came in town. Deny that now?

MR. QUINTON—Produce the letters.

MR. BROWN—I haven't the letters here today but I have them and if I read all the letters that I received from you it is very doubtful if your job with Mr. Monroe would hold very long.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised, after sitting in this Assembly since the House opened with the exception of being away once or twice, that the Honourable Member for Bonavista South, whatever he had to say against me, would not say it to my face in the House but waited until my back was turned and he thought I would not be back here again before the House closed—but I am back here and ready for any attack from any member of the House. I have done nothing against the Honourable Member for Bonavista South but I will tell you here, Mr. Chairman, if I were in Bonavista South opposing the Honourable Member he would have been crucified politically before more than half through the district and he knows that very well too.

As far as being paid as a logging superintendent is concerned, I am paid a wage. I was able to live be-

fore I got that wage and I am able to live now, but I have done something for the loggers and I am still doing something for them and that was the question the Honourable Member asked. I can tell you what I have done and next year I will be bringing a bill in on that account and will you support it in the interest of the loggers?

MR. QUINTON—I shall be very happy to do so. I made that statement before.

MR. BROWN—The whole House will say that you said I had the position and what have I shown for it?

MR. QUINTON—I do not think I made that statement.

MR. BROWN — Three different people told me so.

MR. QUINTON—I simply said that the loggers were getting as little money as before in Newfoundland. I said that if a logging bill would be introduced I would be only too happy to support it.

MR. BROWN—I bet you that when I bring it in you will not support it, and you were one of the men who almost cried when Monroe turned down the Logging Bill of mine in 1924, and you had a lot of talk then. The idea of asking that question. You were greatly interested why Mr. Blandford was put out. I will tell you. Mr. Blandford was not the right man for the job and he couldn't do the job and do it right, and that is why we appointed a new man and the new man has put the camps in right condition for the men to live in. In going around the country for the first time they found the camps in a despicable condition and not fit for men to live in. Since they have been going around things are better. The companies are building new camps where they repaired old ones last year.

The logging industry in this country is a disgrace, not only to the

companies that operate here, but to the country at large. They do not pay men a living wage. The men are not getting due reward for their labour and the same thing applies to the men working at Buchans. That industry needs to be given attention to see that the men are treated right, and it has got to be done by legislation as that is the only way possible in Newfoundland to bring it about. I was sent to Buchans to make investigation of the whole question and I made a report and I am asked what I have done for the working men of Buchans. I was instrumental in getting the company to make the changes they are making and now the men are far better than ever before, and you can see how the men got on. I take my side with labour. I am a labouring man, first, last and always, and I have the interests of the working classes of the country at heart and am prepared to stand by them to the last straw. I have done so and have proved my position and my Honourable friend here can say Amen to that.

When you come to attack me, Mr. Member for Bonavista South you are attacking somebody that is prepared to go right across the floor now, if necessary.

You also asked questions concerning Capt. Dalton and Mr. Pollock of the Railway. I hold no brief for either of those men neither are friends of mine, but I would say that the salaries they get from the Government are disgraceful salaries for the services they perform. The Marine Superintendent of the Railway Dock should not get less than \$300 at the very least and the Assistant Marine Superintendent should not receive anything less than \$250. He goes down into the bowels of the ships and wears out and spoils more clothes in one month than the ordinary man

does in twelve months, and you ask a question about their wages. If I had my way they would be advanced to \$250 and \$300 a month.

But it is only for criticism, Mr. Chairman, that is what the Honourable Member started this racket about—just criticism to get his name in the papers. I know that all around Bonavista Bay stacks of the "Watchman" are being given away by postmen and everyone else, with Mr. Quinton's "phizog" on it.

MR. QUINTON—There must be new postmen appointed—there weren't many left.

MR. BROWN—There is going to be another appointed soon and over your head too.

I notice you didn't draw attention to the fact that Capt. Taverner received \$200 a month when he took the place of the late Capt. Stevenson. The late Government did that with Capt. Taverner—one of the smartest and cleverest seamen in the country today and a Newfoundlander at that. He took charge of the "Caribou" when Capt. Stevenson died and got \$200 a month and that was all he was given and that is all they would give him, and the General Manager said when he qualified for the job he would recommend him and he would get the salary of Captain Stevenson. He weathers the stormiest and hardest crossings and only gets \$200 a month. Why? Because they were prejudiced against Taverner and Taverner has gone across in the quickest time ever done across the Cabot Straits.

Why not be fair? All we ask is fair criticism and be fair in your remarks about members of this side of the House. If you ask questions we can answer them. We have the truth and we can give it to you in large measure. If the Honourable member is not satisfied with this let him get

up and ask his questions and I will tell him a thing or two. I have been in this House of Assembly too long to allow the member for Bonavista South, a mere baby, to attack me. If it came from Mr. Puddester I would not mind it because he is an older member of the House and although I know Mr. Chairman that you want to get ahead with the work and close the House, and I have no desire to hold up the House, but I had to make these remarks and if I was in the North and heard that the Honourable Member made these statements I would try and get here before the House closed. I am here to take any attack and if you select that indecent way to attack me again I will go right up there where you are. I see you up there where you are—don't worry.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would advise the member for Bonavista South, if he has anything to say about me to say it in my presence. If he thinks he can criticise me on wages or on anything else, he is greatly mistaken; but if he continues to talk behind my back in this House, I shall have to administer to him a dose that I have already mixed for him and one which I am sure he will not want to hear and certainly will be distasteful for him to swallow.

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 it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently..

Whereupon on motion of Mr. Puddester the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly,'" 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 certain Resolutions with respect to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, the final print of the Resolutions is entirely different from the first draft as presented a few days ago. Section (1) gives the Governor-in-Council the authority to reserve what rights they may deem fit. Sections (2) and (3) are the arbitrary clauses based upon the Judicature Act and other similar Acts of Parliament. Sections (4), (5) and (6) require the Company to commence the construction of its plant within two years from the passing of this measure and complete it within five years and shall in that period spend not less than three million dollars upon the construction of the plant, that figure being set as half of the proposed cost of the venture. The franchise of the Company shall be for a period of ten years.

Section (7) is a special contractual provision to prevent the Company from unjust discrimination in dealing with people mining ore. Disputes will go to the Public Utilities Commission and appeals therefrom to the Supreme Court. Section (8) deals with the importation of all machinery and duplicate parts necessary for proper equipment, etc., for original installation, but not in substitution for old including materials and articles for house-keeping and town construction. It will

be noticed on the top of page (8) the items are specifically set forth which limits the duty. The items are:

(Reads)

There is also the usual provision in Section (7) that if the Company imports anything that is subsequently sold in the ordinary course of business the Customs duty shall apply.

It will also be noticed that under this Section in dealing with damages there is an express reservation for Workmen's Compensation and Workmen's Liability. In the following Section (9) there are some words to come out and we can make the alterations as we go along. As we do not want any suggestion that the Governor-in-Council have not the right to deal with the export tax on ore, we have embodied in the Resolutions these Sections covering that point.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any definite scheme behind this. Whether these people have the capital and are ready to embark on this enterprise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. member I may say that I have received word from such outstanding men as Stobey, Furlong & Co., of Toronto, whose name it is only necessary to mention as bespeaking solidity in finance, and there are others of similar standing. All these men have been reported on by the Bank of Montreal, and their reports have been most satisfactory. They are prepared to take large shares and interests in this Copper Smelting idea. We may be absolutely sure from documents over the signature of these people, and from the reports of the Bank of Montreal, that we are not dealing with adventurers. However, I shall be very glad to submit the names of these people.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear of industrial enterprise coming into this country. But at the same time I know our experience in another place. Years ago we had men coming in here and asking for permission to erect a flour mill. We worked overtime getting the thing ready and that was the last we heard of it. Year after year we have people coming along and asking for franchises. It is not fair to ask this House to waste its time discussing imaginary enterprises when perhaps there is nothing but straw behind the idea.

I feel sure that the Hon. members will realise that I am not trying to delay the House but in going over this schedule here, it occurred to me that there are one or two technical matters that would really need a little consideration. For instance on page six, paragraph six, it reads:

I think Buchans have a concentrating plant. Now I am not mentioning that as one of the points that is of interest to me but I think that we should have an opportunity of considering how far this act goes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, the last part covers all the points which the Hon. member refers to, or I hope it does.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Prime Minister, I want to say that this latter part to which he refers only covers the points under discussion in part. But you cannot wink out of sight the fact that when the Buchans concentrating plant was started, and I hold no brief for them, there were other mines in the vicinity from which they could get their ore for their concentrating plant. I think it is very unfair, and that the parties who to-day are concentrating in this country ought to have their rights protected, and exclusive rights ought

not to be given to this company in this bill, in the pious hope that they would not interfere with the rights of people who have purchased rights to build concentrating plants in this country. It seems to me in looking over this bill that we are giving quite wide concessions. There is a wide term after concentration. "Treating and preparing for market." In view of those things I think we should have an opportunity of studying the bill for a short while discussing it further.

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 at 8 o'clock.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at 8 o'clock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that you now leave the Chair, Sir, until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair till 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8.15 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively:

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Justice.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series)

entitled 'Of the Department of Public Works.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Enquiries Concerning Public Matters.'"

"An Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes," without amendment.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with Respect to the Establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Hon. Leader of the Opposition with the keen financial sense that he is possessed of and by reason of which he is well noted as a successful business man in the country made certain inquiries as to the soundness of the financial standing of people behind or reputed to be behind this organization. I may say since assuming office in November last I have had a good many hundred people approach the Government and myself in connection with water powers, mines, timbers and such like and when I got such inquiries my practise was to communicate with my own agents on Wall Street in New York, and get a confidential report of the people as if I was doing business with them personally. The results I found were that at least 99% were not such people as one would wish to ask a Legislature to take time in discussing their propositions or would ask an Executive Government to deal with at length; and I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and this House that I would not have given a month of my time to this without a very strong hope of a programme that might be developed and without the

hope at least that the names behind it were those of people reputable in the financial world.

The following are the gentlemen we have been in touch with: Messrs. Stobie, Furlong & Co., a large mining brokers house in Canada. They have a particularly fine Bank of Montreal report. A. E. Osler & Co. The mention of these names is sufficient to intimate their financial standing. They have an eminently satisfactory bankers' report. Mining Research Corporation. R. S. Gowzie, Toronto, one of Canada's leading and outstanding mining capitalists and operating some of the largest mining corporations in Canada. The Bank of Montreal report on Mr. Gowzie is eminently satisfactory. A. E. Osler, Toronto, is President of the British Oil Company, and one of Canada's foremost financiers; a director of Noranda Mines. E. E. Campbell is one of Canada's leading mining engineers. Has been connected with

(Reads)

Mr. Campbell to whom I have referred writes a very lengthy letter which I might quote from just briefly:

(Reads)

The estimate an annual wage bill of a million and three quarters and that 1200 people will be employed. They estimate a capital expenditure of 7½ millions with immediate expenditure including expenditure on power plant of 3½ millions.

I may say I have no personal knowledge in this connection. The last thing in the world that I am is a smelter of minerals, whatever experience I may have had of smelting in the furnaces of life or of politics in this particular line I have no knowledge and have to be governed entirely by the opinions of these experts who have knowledge and say they believe in this.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Where do they propose to get the mineral to smelt?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It has been intimated along the South Coast. They buy the ore for smelting from mine operators. They are satisfied that both along the South Coast and Green Bay area there are exceedingly valuable deposits.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, there are a few remarks that I would like to make. As I said this afternoon, we are dealing with a matter of very high technicality and we have not got before us any really technical advise. I think you will agree that, in dealing with smelting, mining and the various aspects of mines, we ought to have the assistance of people who really know what they are talking about, I mean in a technical sense, as we are faced with the situation in which the terms used and the matters dealt with are beyond our understanding. I think that is really true, I do not blame the Government but at the same time that condition really exists. If you analyse the Bill you will find that it deals with such a very important matter that the absence of really good advice is to be depreciated. That is the first point. The second is in a certain measure a criticism of the Government. I think that we ought to know who are the promoters of the Bill, my Hon. friend the Prime Minister has told us of various people who are interested in this Bill, amongst whom is a Mr. Furlong-Stobie or Stobie-Furlong I really don't remember the names, and others who are people of eminence in Canada, but we are not told who are the real promoters. I suggest that before this Bill becomes law this House is entitled to know who are the people that approached the Government asking that this Bill be introduced. We do not know who this Mr. Stobie-Furlong is except that he has a very high stand-

ing financially, and we don't want to know, but we do want to know who is behind the Bill. I insist that I do not cast any reflection on the Government, all I want is information, we ought to know who is behind it. I don't accuse anybody of trying to conceal information, in view of the way the Bill has been brought down, I understand that the Prime Minister is a very busy man and would not bring it down if he thought there was nothing in it, but I say that this House ought to know who the promoters are. All we know is that some people want to start a Customs Smelter here in Newfoundland and I contend that we as a House ought to know who and what they are. When the Hon. member for St. John's West brought in a Bill here a few days ago we were told who the promoters were and I think that the Prime Minister should tell us who the promoters of this enterprise are, I do not know who they are and I am not suspicious, but I think that as a House we ought to know what financial interests are behind it. We are told that Mr. Stobie-Furlong, a man of good financial standing, and some others are prepared to put money into it when the Bill goes through, but who has money in it now? Who financed this scheme? It is not unfair to state who the people are because you cannot start a smelter unless you have at least \$3,000,000 we are told that the estimated expenditure is multiplied by two and they expect to expend \$6,000,000. We want this \$6,000,000 to be expended, but before this Bill passes the House, before it is even considered, we should know who are going to put up the \$6,000,000. We only know that certain people have written letters to the Prime Minister saying that they will give their support to this enterprise if the Bill is passed. I say what is the financial standing of the people behind

this Bill. These people who have written to the Prime Minister are obviously not behind it, for if they were they would have already promised to buy shares, or if they had not already bought shares they would have supported the company financially, but we have no evidence that such is the case. Therefore, before this Bill is considered, we ought to have some evidence so as we may know who is behind this Bill, who approached the Government. After all the Prime Minister is most interested in Bills of this nature and he is sure of what he is doing before he brings it before the Government.

MR. SCAMMELL—That ought to satisfy you.

MR. EMERSON—All I want to know is the names of the parties behind it; we are entitled to know, and you ought to know.

MR. SCAMMELL—Perhaps I do.

MR. EMERSON—Well I am entitled to know as much as you and if you know you ought to give the information to the House. However, I was speaking up to the last 10 seconds without any heat, which I understand is quite unusual.

I was suggesting that the House should be informed as to who are the parties behind the Bill. I honestly say that I do not know, and I go further and honestly say that I have not heard even any rumours as to the parties behind it and I think I am entitled to know who are the parties who promoted the Bill. After all a Bill of this kind must not be promoted unless the Government knows the parties who are interested in it. I say too that under ordinary circumstances these Bills are promoted by people who have a particular interest in the matter before the House and I think the House ought to know who are the parties and what are their financial

standing and the introducer of the Bill should tell the House. I am going to confine myself to that only and I want to make some suggestions later on when the Bill comes before the House for discussion. I do not know whether they will be helpful. I will put them forward as being helpful, and I am simply asking for that information so that we may know where we stand.

I am not speaking necessarily as a member of the Opposition. The Government party should know and as far as I can judge the Government party does not know and I suggest that the Hon. the Prime Minister should give us some information on this point. I think that the establishment of a Customs Smelter would be of very great value to the Colony, but greater value to the promoters. We have heard during recent days about the great difficulty which the Government has to face in connection with the unemployment.

I sincerely hope that my remarks will not be taken in any hostile spirit in that regard. If the smelter is established here and work is begun fairly early it will employ men. In the first place they will need from one hundred to one hundred and fifty men during the whole of the construction work.

That is a very considerable number of men to have employed in this country. If the plant is started it will mean you will have the loading of trains in connection with the mines along the railway and of steamers in connection with those mines which are on the seaboard, which will mean labour when they bring the crude metal to the smelter. You will have the loading of trains and steamers and the advantage of making our mines more valuable if you smelt ore and concentrate it in this country. That will be

cheap freight for valuable metal out of this country and therefore the mines themselves will make further efforts to develop to a higher degree and greater capacity. You will also have the number of men who will ship goods to the Smelter and the number of men employed in the Smelter itself, but in that connection I cannot speak with any knowledge at all. But if it is going to be of any value at all, to justify the payment of fees for counsel and the remuneration which the clerks receive on private bills, then it must employ at least one hundred men and that in itself means a great deal towards helping the solution of the unemployment problem and therefore should be welcomed by both sides of the House as long as it does not interfere with other mining interests of to-day. This brings me back to the question that I asked in the early stages of my remarks, providing we know who are the parties establishing the smelter now. I think it is important to realise that when bills of this kind are before the House we should not be instruments to pass bills which simply give concessions to people who may take them abroad and sell them. I do not know who is behind this Bill and I do not care if the Hon. the introducer satisfies me that the people behind this Bill are men of ability and means and can carry it out. Then with certain amendments which we can discuss when we start to deal with the various sections the bill will be received by me with pleasure but I am not satisfied simply to pass a bill promoted by company promoters so that they may go abroad and sell these concessions to Canadians and Englishmen and make a large sum of money out of the legislation that we pass. I do not say that in any spirit of criticism of the Government. I am seeking information and I shall be glad to know that this

Bill is being promoted by people of means and not people who are simply taking this charter, as it is called in Canada, and sell it. Because we are certainly doing the country no good, but handing these concessions to a company promoter to do what was done in years gone by with our timber limits when we allowed them to get timber and go and sell it to Canadians and Americans and other financiers who expected to develop an industry and unfortunately were not able to do so.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the points raised by my learned friend have been well taken. It is absolutely impossible to tell who are the people behind the Bill. I personally know only of three people or firms who have made any definite connection in Newfoundland and put up the money necessary, in connection with a Bill of this nature, for the clerks emoluments, etc. These firms are A. E. Osler and Company, the Mining Research Corporation Limited and Mr. E. E. Campbell. I will read reports on these people that I have received from the Banks.

(Reads Reports.)

These are the three and the only three that I personally know who are identified with the financial part of the measure, necessary for this legislation and the money to satisfy the clerks of the House.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask who is the counsel acting for the company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. C. J. Fox, K.C.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I know of no more happier selection of a place could be made for the proper and efficient conduct of the Company's smelting operations than in the territory mentioned, for the reason that there are no agriculture possibilities

there, as you dare not put a smelting plant in an agricultural part of the country because of the sulphur fumes emitted from such a plant would destroy vegetation.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of getting all the industries that we can in this country, and all the men that we can employ in this country. But one thing that I would like to see and it is this, that there should be in this Bill a stipulation calling for a minimum wage. I hope that I will not be looked upon to night as a Bolshevik for getting up and mentioning this fact. When the Buchans Bill was going through the House, one of the things that I asked from the then Prime Minister's side of the House, was for the insertion of a minimum wage clause asking that a minimum wage be paid to men working at Buchan's. And Hon. Mr. Monroe not only sneered at the idea, but simply looked down upon me for even mentioning the fact, which I feel sure that our present Prime Minister will not do. It is only the foreign trained men that gets the good wages in this industry, and I realise that, and I wish that we were in a position to-night to put the minimum wage clause in this Bill, but owing to the fact that the A.N.D. Co. and the Corner Brook Company have no minimum wage clause in their bills, we cannot have one in this. I do not say that we should discriminate against those people by inserting such a clause here, but I do say that a minimum wage should be made for all workers in this country, and unless and until that is done our working man will never get the wages that he deserves. Take the Buchans Mining Company today, they are paying nothing to the working man in proportion to the returns they are getting from their toil. They are treating the men rotten, as far as wages are concerned, and the living

conditions are disgraceful. And while as I stated before it would not be fair to put a minimum wage clause in this Bill to-night, at the same time I think legislation should be brought in that would ensure that the working man would get a living wage, whereby he would get a chance to live decently, which he cannot do to-day. And I say without fear of successful contradiction, that any industry that operates and does not give a living wage has no right to exist and I stand by that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am deeply indebted to my friend, the Member from Twillingate for having raised the wages point. I quite agree that at this stage we cannot discriminate against any company, and put into any particular Bill something of wider power than is contained in any previous Legislation of this class. But I do feel that at the next Session, this House might very well spend more than one hour on considering the question as how to ensure that work and workmen cannot be exploited in this country. There is a developing company with which I am concerned employing from thirty to thirty-five men, and the wages that these men get ranges from a dollar an hour down to twenty-five cents an hour. I want to assure you, Sir, that I would like every man on that job to be able to earn a dollar an hour, and that the very moment that they can qualify to be dollar an hour men, the better I am pleased.

The employers of labour if they are decent employers, interested in their workmen, in the development of the undertaking and the development of the country, they want to pay a fair wage for the value they receive. He does not want a lazy man on the job. He wants a man that will deliver the goods, and by delivering the goods be worthy of a substantial wage. For

instance there is one kind of man to whom you can pay twenty-five cents an hour, if you put him at farming. But if you put him at carpentry work the same man could not earn ten cents an hour. The problem centres around the adapting a man to the particular activities that he is fitted for, with his education, skill or trade, and his particular ability, his speed or standard of general activity, so that he can make the most in the particular line which he works.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am thoroughly in accord with the opinions expressed by the Member for Twillingate. I also know something about the labour situation, and I know that there are some men in this country who are paid abominably low wages. It is a short-sighted policy to deliberately underpay a man. It is a dangerous proposition, this minimum wage idea for the reason that when you fix a minimum wage, it very often becomes a maximum wage, and that is what we want to avoid. But I think that every employer of labour should pay a wage at the lowest of thirty cents an hour. I know that in every industry with which I am connected we would not dream of employing a man at less than thirty cents an hour, and the great majority are paid higher wages. I am able to see it from the labourers point of view. Unfortunately some employers see it only from their own point of view. You would be surprised at the number of men that come looking for jobs and willing to work for twenty cents an hour. Lots of employers say "no, if we had the work to give we would at least pay you thirty cents per hour." If you are going to appoint a Commission to investigate the labor situation, and you come to investigate this section of it, you will be surprised at the open mindness

with which the great majority of employers will approach this subject

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I quite agree with the majority of them, but when he says about men offering themselves for twenty cents an hour, then I say, that if men were paid a decent wage in this country, no man would be asking to work for twenty cents an hour. You would not see it in any other country of the world. It is time for somebody to set a standard in this country, and I hope that legislation will be brought in at the next Session in connection with this that will give every man a square deal.

MR. PUDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I well remember the time when the Buchans Bill was going through this House, the Honourable Member for Twillingate waxed hot on this subject, whilst he did not get his way, there was quite a lot of sound sense in what he did say. The Prime Minister said and also the Hon. Member for Twillingate, that it would be unfair to discriminate in connection with this Bill, and put a greater hardship on these people in comparison with the Buchans Mine people, but you have to start sometime, and I think that the Government should give some consideration even at this late date to the matter of fair wages, rather than at the next Session of the Legislature to come up and say "we cannot very well discriminate in this connection," because if you are going to carry on along on these lines you will be going on forever. Two fifty a day will be the standard wage in Newfoundland forever. Now this seems to be a pretty large undertaking, and if this mineral is as abundant as some people think it is, then we are in for great mineral development and this smelting business is going to be something worth while for Newfoundland. I think that \$2.50 a day

for work on that smelter is outrageous. I cannot understand why those companies can operate in Canada and the United States, and pay as high as seventy-five cents an hour, and get the same class of labour in Newfoundland for twenty-five cents an hour. I do not think it is fair or just to the people of Newfoundland. Of course what enters into it a great deal is the question of supply and demand. I appreciate the fact that we have an over supply of labour in this country, and consequently the working man has to offer himself for little or nothing in order to get a bite for his family. It is a very sorry state of affairs. I think that the government should give every encouragement to the companies to try and raise the standard of wages in Newfoundland. If you do that you will surely raise the standard of living, and then you will not have to pay as much for relief as you have been doing in the past. These Resolutions are a copy practically word for word of the Buchans Mine Resolutions. And if that Bill was wrong that we put through in favour of the Buchans people then this Bill is wrong also. And some of the members of the present government expressed themselves to me as being absolutely against putting through the Buchans Resolutions or being in favour of any company in Newfoundland getting the concessions that we put through for the Buchans people. I agree but you are putting through Resolutions now on pages 7 and 8 with exactly the same clauses in it, as was in the Buchans Bill, namely free importations. I think it is time to call a halt, and not to think of those companies at all. There ought to be some way of making the Buchans people see that they have to pay money into the national treasury. What have we done in the past. If we are going to carry

on in this way we are not going to get very much for our men. We can erect smelters and do everything in that way, and then the only thing that we will get out of it is a little bit of labour at \$2.50 a day.

Whilst I am not going to oppose this Bill, whilst I am not talking for talk's sake, whilst this is the first session of the Government and they have not had much time to go into these things I do hope and trust that when Bills come along like this in the future they will be different and have other clauses than those before us now, clauses that went through in the Buchans Mine and every other Bill because every Bill is copied from a former Bill; agreements are copied word for word from Acts that have gone through before; and I do hope and trust that the Government will take this matter up as the Prime Minister has said and try and evolve something new, try and evolve something to protect the country and prevent these Companies from getting Newfoundland labour as cheap as twenty-five cents an hour.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, this matter has brought forth a very interesting discussion and if we get no other value from the Bill than the fact of this discussion, its introduction has been worth while. The bringing about of the suggestion made would have to be done by a general Act covering all corporations doing business in Newfoundland. With respect to the similarity between this and the Buchans Bill there is a remarkable similarity in the matter of the import sections. I have not heard any major criticism of the Buchans Bill on that point. The major criticism of the Buchans Bill was that it had a twenty year period; this has only ten years; and again a major criticism of the Buchans Bill was that they had an exclusive territory such

that if I wanted to go to Buchans as Prime Minister I have to get a permit to walk over the town. There was the objection of having no competitive sale. These minor things but major from the standpoint of contact with the people caused the outstanding hostility against the Bill. The Bill as a result of those things was not a Bill I think that would have passed this House if I had a seat in it. On this side of the House there would have been an opportunity of pointing out these things and dealing with them very carefully. As far as I would be concerned I would not have fallen in line with the threat of Mr. Harris to drop the whole thing possibly if Buchans were not a closed town. The objectionable things in connection with the Buchans Bill have been entirely eliminated from this. There is not the long period; there is not any territory of great expanse where nobody is permitted except subject to leave of Mr. Harris. There is not any town where nobody can go in and buy anything unless it be from people approved by a Company. I do think the objectionable details have been eliminated as far as it is humanly possible.

MR. PUDDISTER—I want to say to the Prime Minister we are dealing now with a different territory than in the case of Buchans, and if you had to deal with a Company operating in that territory you would have had the same difficulties to contend with as we had; fee simple grant of land concessions given to A.N.D. Co. back in 1905. We objected to a closed town but the concession was given in 1905; they owned the territory in fee simple; and they absolutely hold on to these concessions; and I have nothing to say but condemnation for the principle.

MR. GREENE—Mr. Chairman, before this Committee passes on, I should like to avail myself of this

opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Brown, the Hon. member for Twillingate; the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires, and Honorable the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Alderdice, on the minimum wage question. I feel, Sir, that sitting here in this House as the representative of the oldest and longest working industrial community in Newfoundland, that I should not let this occasion pass without going on record as being a strong supporter of the minimum wage, and as being an ardent supporter of a Minimum Wage Bill being introduced into this House and an act to enforce it being placed on the Statute Books of this Colony.

Speaking here tonight as the Representative of the District of Bell Island, and more particularly as the representative of the miners of that District, and as one of the labor members of the Liberal Party—though I cannot lay claim as our friend from Grand Falls, Mr. Earle, can, to being a labor member in the sense of having come from the classes of labor—I am proud to stand up here to voice the claims and just rights of the Bell Island Miners. I am somewhat proud, Sir, that my selection to represent Bell Island came from miners themselves, and not from any decision arrived at at some drawing room on Circular Road or some lawyer's Office in the City, but by a voluntary petition of some 600 miners who petitioned Sir Richard Squires as the Leader of the Liberal Party to bring me into public life to represent them in the Liberal Party.

It gives me, therefore, great pleasure to be elected representative of these men, and to be elected as a supporter of the Great Old Liberal Party; and it gives me still greater pleasure to be able to speak tonight—this my first speech in the House of Assembly—on a question concerned with labor,

affecting greatly the people whom I have the honor to represent.

During the past month the Government have taken up the matter of the royalties payable by the mining corporation on Bell Island. I congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs for the strong, firm and able manner in which he has handled that matter. We may hear a holler about it. There may have been some queries as to why the ore steamers were held up at Bell Island for some days; but it is gratifying to know that we have a strong government in power, determined to handle this matter in a firm way.

It is also gratifying for the Government to find that they have strong backers on the Island in the miners, most of whom were satisfied if need be—if we have to consider seriously the old threat of closing down the mines—to lose a week or two, or longer if necessary, in order to see that the lawful demands of the Government are carried out. I sincerely hope, Sir, that as this matter of royalty has been brought up that the Bell Island Company will carry out the 1921 Agreement to the complete satisfaction of all concerned.

I also hope, Sir, that the Executive government and the Hon. the Prime Minister will use the same strong and firm hand with the Company when the matter of a wage increase for the miners comes before them in the very near future. The miners of Bell Island need more pay. They need it as quickly as possible and I feel sure the Government will assist in seeing that they secure their just demands.

Speaking on the broad principle here tonight, Sir, of the minimum wage question, we must all bear in mind that in making a scale of wages for the producers and workmen of Newfoundland, we must be guided to

a great extent by the class of labor performed, and grade it accordingly. Just as professional fees are graded according to the work performed, and as the general commodities of life sold in mercantile establishments are graded according to value, so also must the scale of workmen's wages be graded according to the value of the work performed and the hardships endured in the performance. I claim, Sir, and I claim it most emphatically, that a working man like a miner on Bell Island, who, living a long distance from his work, oftentimes during the winter months goes to his work underground by the light of his lantern, who works all day long in the mines by the aid of a carbide lamp in his cap, or by electric light in the main slopes, and who does not often see daylight from Sunday till Sunday, and who daily is required to shovel 17 tons of ore—and I say advisedly 17 tons, because the shoveller to hold his job must shovel 10 boxes calculated to hold 16 tons, tho in most cases the boxes are loaded to capacity, which is 17—I say, Sir, this man is not sufficiently remunerated when he gets 27 or 28 cents per hour, even though there is a small bonus added. We must here call to mind that we pay in this city forty cents per ton to have our coal shovelled into our cellars. That is the condition.

There is a bonus schedule, and there has been lots of trouble in connection with this bonus schedule, which is calculated to suit the Company and not the miners. The men would prefer to have a straight scale of wages graded from three to four dollars per day up, and pay it, but the Company have a sliding scale of bonus based on the output more suited, as I have already said, to help themselves than to help the miners, and this past winter as a matter of fact it came back on their own hands,

when the men of No. 4 Mine closed down the mine on a couple of occasions over this bonus schedule.

It appears that the Company average the output weekly, not daily, for bonus, and when many of the shovelers are off on the sixth day, the output being down the men lose most of the bonus for the previous days. The result was that the men of No. 4 Mine refused to go to work on the sixth day, thereby forcing the Company to average the output by the five days worked, and they made just as much as if they had worked the sixth day.

The Company being forced by the overhead for the idle piling up, adjusted the bonus, and things went on satisfactorily. I do not want to delay the Committee any longer. (The lights of the House here went out and the Assembly was plunged in utter darkness. Several members urging Mr. Greene to carry on, he continued.) I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this darkness is not any index that the mines of Bell Island will be thrown in darkness and closed, as we sometimes hear threatened. But to continue, Sir, I do think that as the Prime Minister has just remarked that if this debate we have had during this Committee stage of this Bill has done nothing else but bring out forcibly the matter of a proper wage for the workingmen of Newfoundland, it has been of value. Legislatures in the past, and probably ourselves this session, have been somewhat lax in giving the necessary attention to this matter. We have to see that a proper wage is paid the labourers of Newfoundland, the producers of our country.

We all realize that the Fisheries must and will remain the mainstay of Newfoundland, but side by side with the fisheries we are having a big industrial expansion, which is going to take concrete form within the next

few years and will be culminated successfully within the next quarter of a century, probably sooner; and we hope that the laboring men will receive proper treatment and their rights will be recognised and that those big corporations will not put it over us.

We hope to see no more such concessions granted, and we hope that we will all see a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. We want to see our Country on a sound basis; we want to see taxation lessened off; we want to see our National Debt paid off; but to accomplish this we must have an equitable scale of wages paid. When I speak of the miners of Bell Island, I do not speak for my own constituents alone, as there are hundreds of miners on Bell Island from other constituencies of Conception Bay. All these miners today are expected to do very hard work and they are not paid well enough. They save no money. The proceedings of the insolvency courts will show that—as my legal friends of this House well know.

I want to tell this House a story, a true story; a rather funny story. When interviewing certain representatives of the Bell Island Company within the past three months in connection with the interest of the miners, this gentleman said to me: "I would like you to understand, Mr. Greene, that our cash contribution to the Government of Newfoundland is in the vicinity of a quarter of a million dollars a year." In reply I said: "Pardon me, Sir; do you see this suit of clothes I am wearing. My contribution to Newfoundland for this suit of clothes is \$25.00. It cost me \$50.00." He tried to impress on me the large amount being paid by his company to the Government, overlooking the fact that the Tariff of the country demanded such payments and overlooking what was taken from the country in return. As

they tried to bluff me, how much more will they bluff the miners; and so have they tried, and will try, to bluff the country and the Government to get concessions.

Since the royalty matter has been brought up certain things have been tightened up on Bell Island. For the past twenty odd years the company used to give out some coal; a quarter of a ton or a half car once in a while to assist the widows of men who were once their employees; but now the Relieving Officer has been notified that in future this will have to be handled by the Relieving Officer of the Government. Can you imagine the cheapness of a company doing that? They say since the government is going to collect royalty they will not look after those people. And then, again certain old men past the age of working in the mines, by way of a sort of pension, were given odd jobs around the surface every Summer, cleaning up, etc., to enable them to earn something. This year many of these old men are not getting these jobs. The Company are curtailing odd jobs on account of royalty.

These men are applying for old age pensions and are already asking to be helped out by the Government by the poor relief. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this, that when a corporation does not realize that it has moral obligations to fulfill, especially in connection with those who have grown old and become worn out in its service, it is time for legislation to be introduced to make them realize it. I shall not delay this House any longer. I realize the fact I am speaking in darkness, and I only hope, Sir, that the miners lot will be improved.

This great industry on Bell Island, established in 1898, two years before the Grand Falls industry, is the oldest operating in the country, and those

men operating it as employees for the Company deserve justice, fair play and due recognition, especially as regards to wages which I feel sure will be forthcoming in the very near future, due to the efforts of the Liberal Party under the Premiership of Sir Richard Squires.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to congratulate Mr. Greene on his speech. It is the best proof of his ability as an orator that when the lights go out he can continue on and finish his speech without any reference at all to notes.

As regards his observations regarding the miners of Bell Island, he has shown us the serious condition of affairs there, and that the Company is apparently not prepared to play the game.

I suggest that as soon as the House closes he submit his suggestions to the Executive Council for consideration; and if, as pointed out, this Company is showing itself so small, they will be weighed in the balance and found wanting when they come to the Government for further negotiations.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, is it the will of Hon. members to continue tonight, or say will we adjourn till tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock?

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I cannot possibly be here to-morrow morning. I must be at my office.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I understand that you can sometimes be spared for fishing trips, but possibly you are too busy now.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I am prepared to come but I understand the difficulties under which my friend Mr. Emerson labours. I, myself, have not had anything to eat since one o'clock to-day. I had to go to my work

and come back here again. I would not like my Hon. friend to be disappointed but if he can strain a point and come I am only too happy to follow the suggestion of the Leader of the Government.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, we will do just as well to-morrow afternoon. It only means two hours and it has to go through another stage. Are you going to put the Bill through under suspended rules as it is a private Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is a private bill in this sense that the clerks will receive their emoluments. It is a public Bill in the sense that after today it will be handled as a measure of public policy.

MR. PUDDESTER—I think we have discussed it fairly extensively to-night and I do not think there will be much more discussion on it. After that there are only a couple of other Bills and we can finish up to-morrow and by the time the Legislative Council is through the Bills that have already been sent up I think we will be well away. As far as I am concerned the only time I can get to my office is from nine till one and I think we can finish to-morrow.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I just want to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister when he hopes to be able to close the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the Inspector General is arranging for his band on Wednesday afternoon. there is usually a flare of trumpets at the opening and the closing of the House. There are several Bills before the Legislative Council but I do not think that such distinguished gentlemen will fall down on their jobs. I agree with Mr Puddester that these matters can easily be handled to-morrow afternoon and be disposed of by to-morrow night as

most of the Bills are before the Legislative Council. I suggest that we might leave this now and let go for second reading in committee stage to-morrow. Then we will adjourn until three to-morrow afternoon.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the Hon. Prime Minister that I do not wish to delay the House unnecessarily. I really looked upon this as being a Bill which has very large possibilities and I would like to consider some amendments which I think could be considered outside the House and accepted by the Prime Minister and presented by him and I would be very glad to give my assistance. As the Chairman knows the members of the Opposition are desirous of closing the House and if we cannot adjourn the House on Wednesday afternoon we can do so at five o'clock Thursday morning. If we can adjourn the House on Wednesday or Thursday we will do our best to do so and the only thing before the House of very grave importance is this Bill that we are considering to-night and during which the Newfoundland Light and Power Company have fallen down on their job. And I think that Bill should be considered here in a select committee or a committee of the Whole. I have never spoken in the dark before, and I do not know whether the members on the other side have, and there is rather a disadvantage but I would like to say that this Bill does need some light on it. If there is any assistance that I can give to the Prime Minister or his colleagues I will be very glad to do so at any time to-morrow in order to facilitate the business of the House. Perhaps we could open on two thirty to-morrow instead of three o'clock, as a rule we are generally a quarter of an hour late in meeting.

Before I leave this point, Mr. Prime Minister, might I ask you why

have 1935 there? That seems to be rather a late date to give them in which to carry out their agreement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is the last date for completion of the contract under which they come under the forfeiture under Section 4.

MR. EMERSON—It seems to be rather a long time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is. This year will have to be lost as it is now nearly June 1st and they will not be able to do any construction work this year.

MR. EMERSON—That applies in the case of all companies when they are seeking concessions, they lose the first year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—And then they come back and ask for another year later on.

MR. EMERSON—There is a more serious question there and that has to do with the fact that you give to the company the exclusive right—I don't mind giving the right—but the exclusive right of smelting, refining, manufacturing, roasting, reducing, concentrating, treating and/or preparing for market ores and mining products. That first part there I don't like. It means that you give them the exclusive right for I think ten years after the first of June 1935 and it seems to me that you are liable to interfere with, first of all, existing rights, rights for instance of the Buchans Mine and also you are interfering with concentrating, smelting or refining plants which may be erected between now and the first of June, 1935.

We are all aware, Sir, that at the present time a number of mines are in the course of prosecuting and developing. A great many of them are in what we call the Buchans area. That area has nothing to do with the Buchans Mine but it is in the area

in the middle of the country that is between Grand Falls and Mary March's Siding or let us say Millertown Junction. These companies are contemplating development of their mines. In some cases they may consider the question of concentrating ore. If the exclusive privilege is granted to this company on the peninsula of Avalon to do their concentrating, reducing, roasting, refining and treating and they cannot use the factory at Buchans they must haul their ore all the way from say Millertown Junction to Brigus Junction before it can be treated in the way in which these people can do it.

If they could hand it over to the Buchans Concentrating Plant they would be able to export it at greater profit and therefore be able to develop their mines in a greater extent and consequently employ a greater number of men.

Now I have no interest in this matter at all but I would suggest to you that the rights of the people who between now and the first of June 1935 starts a smelting or refining plant—I really do not understand the terms—but anybody who starts this business similar to the one contemplated in this Act, should be allowed to deal with ores delivered to them without offending against this Act and I don't think that is unfair.

Just before I take my seat I would like to ask the Prime Minister why in the draft of this Act these limiting terms are used—there may be some reason for it—in the same section 6, "including lead, copper, zinc, silver, gold and other minerals and their constituent residual and by-products under any or all of the chemical electrical and/or other methods now in use or which hereafter be brought into use." Off hand I think that those words do not do the contractors, the smelting company, very much good. It

seems to me they limit rights, but I would like to know whether the Prime Minister can tell us why these words were included because in the beginning of the Bill they have the right to deal in this smelting and concentrating process with all kinds of ores, whereas here the most important ores are said to be included. If they had said they were going to include some non-metalliferous ores like clay and that kind of thing or simply it in a general way I would not have been surprised but here they include the very things in the minerals which are in the Buchans area; lead, copper, zinc, silver, gold. These are the minerals in the Buchans area and it seems to me as if they are making or less a dead set upon the mines which have not been developed there but which are prophesied to exist so as to force them, if they want to concentrate their minerals or treat it for market to come to their plant.

These people who have come here and spent a whole lot of money on their geophysical surveys, in the payments of rent, in prospecting of the areas, in finding out their extent, are now placed in the position where, if they want to concentrate their mineral or develop them for the purpose of export, are forced to come to this company and I don't think that is fair.

I am not making these remarks in any party spirit because I have no interest in this Bill. I simply suggest that to-day we have all these people from Canada and the States coming down here spending money in prospecting and developing of these mines, as we all know it does not pay to export crude ore of this class. It must be concentrated and now, after spending all the money buying up the areas, developing their companies, you are compelling them to send their ore to this company.

Now what does it mean to send the ore to this company? If you have a mine out somewhere in the vicinity of Millertown Junction—I cannot speak accurately but geographically—it means you have to send the crude ore over the line to Trinity Bay. That is the nearest point that I can speak of in connection with this Bill. That means a large freight. You have the cost of loading the cars; you have the cost of unloading the cars into this concentrating plant; then you have the cost of loading the concentrates into the ships. That would, it appears to me, make it practically impossible. I suggest that that will make it extremely expensive for these companies. This business may be very large, I don't know, but I think it will curtail that work if you compel them to employ this company to concentrate their ore. Unfortunately again we have not had the advantage of expert opinion in considering this matter but I suggest to you that you are at least compelling these companies, if they want to export their products in concentrated shape, to send their crude ore from we shall say Millertown Junction to Trinity Bay. You have the handling of it from the mine to the cars, from the cars when it arrives at the concentrating plant and then to be loaded from the concentrating plant into steamers to be taken away. You have handling in one long series imposed upon the ore which is simply unjustified, so far as the country is concerned, unless you can show some reason why it should be done, and I suggest that it is a highly pernicious and objectionable feature of the Bill that you are giving exclusive right to the company to concentrate and treat and prepare for market ores for ten years after the first of June 1935, because no one who has a mine in any part of the country is going to set up a plant that will do any of these things—I am

not going to read them all again—any of the things mentioned in the Act, when he knows on the 1st of June 1935 exclusive right is going to be given to the Customs Smelter.

My objection to the Bill as I say is not a party one, and there are certain amendments that I intend to propose when the Bill goes into Committee. At the present time they are in form of resolutions and I think in the meantime I will probably meet the Hon. the Introducer and ask him to consider them. But the principle at the present time I think is bad because you are tying up the possibility of starting a plant similar to what they have now at Buchans in connection with the development in the centre of Newfoundland which will result in the smelting, refining, manufacturing, roasting reducing, concentrating, treating and otherwise preparing the ore for market, and the result of the Act may be that you will restrict the efforts that are being made by financiers and mineralogists in the centre of the country, which they now hold.

I say that we are not talking about Buchans, I say that we know that there is an enormous amount of prospecting going on in the Buchans area and under this Bill it must all be sent over to Trinity Bay and they can not do it in their area, they can not have a smelter if this Act goes through, there may be a smelter there but they can not have a refining or concentrating plant there, they will have to bring their ore over to Trinity Bay.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Oh, no you haven't, read the latter part of section 6.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Chairman, the Government was after them to erect a smelter and I say that it makes no difference if it is at Cape Spear, I say that it is a move in the right direction.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, this Customs Smelter is nothing new. I know some Canadian mining authorities recommended it before, a central smelter so that the small mines could send their ore there. I think that it is a splendid idea and the erection of smelters in this country should be encouraged to the fullest measure.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter I say that the Buchans people deserve no sympathy, they are competent enough to handle their own affairs. There is another large mineral area in the country which bids fair to rival Buchans, I refer to the LaManche area which is in close proximity to the proposed smelter. There is another matter which should have precedence that is the importance of having an ice free port, if the port is not ice free, you are unable to transport your ore and it is bottled up for the entire winter, that is a valuable fact and should get consideration.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, to whom do I address a question in regard to this Bill in the absence of the Prime Minister?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—To me if you like.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary to extend the period for which they have exclusive rights to 1935?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Because it is calculated that it will take them five years to commence operations.

MR. EMERSON—What do you intend to do after the 1st of January, 1935 in connection with a concentrating plant at Buchans?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—We don't intend to do anything.

MR. EMERSON—Why do you give to the Company the exclusive right to

smelt, manufacture, etc., for ten years? I think the principle is objectionable because it may probably tie up a plant like Buchans. It might also curtail considerably the efforts of men who are at present prospecting on areas in the vicinity of Buchans. Another objectionable feature in the Bill is contained in Section (8) which states that "all machinery and duplicate parts, etc.," can be imported duty free. It gives a concession that has expressly been forbidden in all bills where concessions were granted, and all of which distinctly state that free importation is granted "except in substitution for old." Under this provision of the Bill the Company can import entirely new machinery a second time duty free. Another objection I have to this section of the Bill is that it makes the Company not liable or responsible in any way to any person, firm or company for damage to property or annoyance or inconvenience suffered or occasioned within a radius of five miles from its plant or work by smoke fumes, flames, vapours, etc. There are several amendments that I would like to suggest for the consideration of the Committee and I propose to state them later on.

I want to refer now to page nine of this Bill. It begins:—

(reads)

Now that is a very important section. That is a matter that should be taken into serious consideration. I do not know whether a smelter or a concentrating plant issues fumes, etc., but you are going to erect this plant on that narrow neck of land, the Peninsula of Avalon, and within an area of five miles. I had a case the other day in connection with a whaling factory at Grady Island, and I may say that I was surprised to find in the evidence about affluvia and its effect upon the drinking water and the various other nuisances that were

given off from this factory. Judgment was given on two of the points that we stood upon, and this is a serious matter. And the concessions in this Bill will affect the residents, and the people who carry on business in the five mile radius, which is really ten miles when you come to draw the circle.

MR. EARLE—That is one of the most barren sections of the country.

MR. EMERSON—well, if there is nobody there, why put the section in the Bill. Might I suggest that possibly I would not be out of order if I suggested that we might have a plan of that area on the table of the House. And then there are the fumes that are given off. Would not these effect the running water?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL— These fumes, I can assure the Honourable member would only effect vegetation, not running water especially. Of course there are a large number of men to be employed there, and it is incumbent on the company to provide pure water for their sustenance, otherwise they cannot remain there.

MR. EMERSON—Anyway I think that we should have a plan so that we may be able to see what we are dealing with.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I may say that Trenton has a smelter right in the town and there are houses all around. There is a similar situation existing in Sydney and in neither place are the people operating liable to action through these smelters.

MR. EMERSON—I have no evidence about the growls that may be made in Sydney or Trenton. But I suggest to you that the company promoting this scheme knows that they are going to have odours for three or four miles, if not five miles.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I do not deny that there will be odours from

this smelter. There will be from this. The sulphur from this smelter will give an odour. But if a section of this kind was not included in the Bill every man that had a house or shop within five miles would have an action in law against the company and they would be continually feeding lawyers. This is the idea.

MR. EMERSON—There is no need for you to insult the lawyers.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I am not insulting the lawyers. I don't believe I could.

MR. EMERSON—I would like to hear the Honourable the introducer give his opinion on this point. Supposing that there are people living in that area; and they have their house or land damaged by those noxious vapours, then I think they should be compensated. We do not know in what area that smelter is going to be built, and there may be people there that are going to suffer from these fumes, etc., and if they are going to suffer then this company should pay them compensation, and yet this act expressly says that they shall not have compensation.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Yes. We protect this company from the people who may build within the area of those fumes. There are no people there now.

MR. EMERSON—Then I say that you should insert there the words "Any people who shall thereafter build." If those words were in that section this Bill would go through as far as I am concerned. Now I want to call to the attention of the Honourable member in charge of the Bill. This company is a smelting company. I bring my ore to that company to be smelted. I cannot get it smelted in this country anywhere else because this company has the exclusive right to smelt. Now then what metal has

this company got to export free of taxes, duties, etc.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—What it buys.

MR. EMERSON—And so you mean to tell me that if it smelts my ores it is going to export it free of duty, etc., when I who own those ores cannot do so.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—I am not saying anything about that at all.

MR. EMERSON—But you are saying they can do it. Why do you say that.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—It will depend on legislation.

MR. EMERSON—Well supposing that to-morrow a tax is imposed on zinc for instance, or lead, by the legislature of a dollar a ton.

Now suppose a tax is imposed a dollar a ton. I have a lead mine and am producing lead. I have to pay a dollar a ton export tax. This Company does not own a mine, does not do any mining. They can buy my ore and we both make fifty cents. I sell the ore at the market price less fifty cents and they export duty free. Is that what you intend.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—The intention is to protect the Company from being called on for export tax on ore.

MR. EMERSON—On any ore they buy?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Yes.

MR. EMERSON—I would not mind protection for ore they mine where they give labor, but on ore they buy is an absolute outrage.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—It is just to provide that they be not mulched of any tax.

MR. EMERSON—I rather think the word "mulched" out of order. Possibly we could get an explanation why they want protection with regard to the export of ore they do not mine, do not deal with in the smelter, and only buy. I would like to know what the reason is for it.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—You must remember in the first place you are a little astray because it says nothing about ores; it says metals and finished products. That is not exporting something simply bought.

MR. EMERSON—You said ten minutes ago to protect them in respect of metals bought.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—They buy ores; don't buy metals.

MR. EMERSON—They buy anything they like.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—They can't buy anything else because nothing else is smelted here.

MR. EMERSON—They can buy the products of the smelter from the people who bring ore to the smelter.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—That is not material then that they have not operated on.

MR. EMERSON—The point I make is this. They get paid for smelting ore brought to the smelter. They will take over the ore from some mine and smelt it and they will be paid for that under certain terms and as they have a monopoly terms which will be very advantageous to them, and they then have the right after the ore is smelted and has become metal to export duty free and free of all taxes, whereas the man who has paid them to smelt it may have to pay an export duty.

I think these Resolutions are Resolutions of far reaching importance. They contain sections that should be considerably amended. I did suggest some to the Prime Minister but after discussing the matter now I see even more extensive ones that I consider necessary and I would suggest to the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill that the Committee rise and sit on the matter to-morrow.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, before the

Committee rises I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if on page 9 section 9 where the Company are freed of all assessments, does that include Corporation Tax?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would not take it to mean Income Tax Corporation Tax.

MR. EMERSON—May I ask the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill whether if this Act goes through there is any assurance that the Public Utilities Commission will be able to deal with the matter. What would happen if the Bill constituting that Commission be repealed.

(Reads from Bill re Public Utilities Commission.)

Suppose there is no Public Utilities Commission?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—There is going to be one.

MR. EMERSON—Have we any assurance that there is going to be one in perpetuity?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Do you suppose there is going to be taken off the Statute Books of the Colony the Act constituting a Commission of this kind to deal with things of this kind with this Company and other Companies?

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think the point of the Honourable Member for Placentia East is well taken. We do not know that the next Government may have a Public Utilities Commission.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Any future Government that undertakes to destroy that will have the responsibility to procure a sufficient substitute.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Its existence depends on its usefulness. That has not yet been proven.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Here is justification for it right here. Whether

the Commission will measure up to the standard hoped depends on the personnel. You can always change that.

MR. EMERSON—I think that is perfect folly. (Reads). Now if I go to the Company and say that I want 75 p.c. and I don't accept your assay and I want the balance in twenty days, do I get it? Neither I nor they make money. Now the stuff from my mine is good stuff and yet I have to wait 60 days for the balance, they know it is good ore, they have assayed it before and yet I can't get any better than 50 p.c. down.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—No, you misunderstand, it says not less than 50 p.c. down.

MR. EMERSON—I beg pardon, you are entirely right. Now I am held up for the balance why is this put in? What is the idea of fixing it for not less than one month or not more than three months, this is like a prison business, yes, you have no option of a fine at all

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—These are put in to stop unnecessary delay.

MR. EMERSON—The way I would stop delay would be to pay a certain amount on assay, the rest in two weeks and interest at the rate of 50 p.c. a week. However, I see that we have to go through this sentence by sentence, breakfast is at about nine I think.

I ask why, if you want to make the Bill conform to the previous wording, why not include these words.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—I don't think them essential.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—As there are a tremendous lot of things to be discussed I move that the Committee rise and report progress and sit again on tomorrow.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—I have no objection to the Committee rising, but members on both sides are anxious that the closing be not unduly delayed, I would like to know what the Leader of the Opposition intends to do, if they want to make amendments now or later on, if you are going to make the amendments later on we should take advantage of all the time that we can now.

MR. PUDDISTER—This is a very important Bill and it was only this evening that we got it, as I say this is a very important Bill and should be referred to a Select Committee. I question very much if the rules of the House would not bear us out if we asked for this. I remember last year we brought in a Bill and a Select Committee sat on it for seven days and it was before the Upper House for seven days.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 3 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 28th, 1929.

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

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Stephenville Crossing in

the district of Port au Port asking that a sum of money be allocated for the purpose of building a road in that vicinity. This petition is largely and influentially signed and I trust it will receive that consideration from the Department of Public Works which its importance merits.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the annual report of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Bureau.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend an Act Respecting Patents," in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend an Act Respecting Patents," was read a first time, and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Hon. Mr. Bradley, Hon. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Emerson.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Chairman, this is the section now which we have been discussing for the past week or more, and it has been intimated from this side of the House, several times that we would like a change made. I wonder if the Prime Minister would consider that. Are you prepared to submit any change now that will make it doubly certain that the establishment of a bottling plant will not be undertaken by anybody. All we are

asking on this side of the House is for an amendment to be put into the Bill, to make it certain that nothing can be done in that regard.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, this section as my Hon. friend has just said has been the cause of considerable discussion. I am of the opinion that the construction placed upon this section by my friends of the Opposition, in debate, is not an accurate construction. This section does not bestow any powers outside of the Liquor Control Department, and for the handling of a bottling plant. My opinion in that regard has been confirmed by the opinions of the gentlemen looking after the Bill, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, and other eminent council. Consequently I feel that the section as it stands is clear and definite.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Chairman, as the leader of the Government stated this Bill has been the cause of very considerable discussion. A great deal of that criticism has been directed more towards section three than any other part of the Bill. If we had the wording of that section altered so as to make its meaning clear, I feel sure that this Bill would have the hearty support of every Hon. member of this House. The Hon. the introducer of this Bill said that he did not hope that it would curtail the consumption of alcoholic liquors, that is the legitimate consumption.

But it does aim a blow at the illicit traffic in spirits, and sheebeening. And for that reason we members of this House are anxious to support the Bill, because we on this side of the House consider that these sheebeens are undermining the morals of our young people. They are schools for gambling and immorality. And if people can believe the half of what they are told, we have some unquestionable dives in

our midst. Some of these sheebeens are outwardly respectable. It is to these houses that unsuspecting young girls and men are induced to enter by reason of the apparent respectability of these houses and from there they often take their first downward step.

Now I am not a prohibitionist. But I can promise you this that I am at all times at the service of anyone who can think out a plan for the curtailment of the consumption of alcoholic liquors in this country and as long as it does not interfere with the exercise of man's freedom of action. I am against compulsion in any shape or form. Previous to the late general election I was asked many times where I stood on prohibition and truth compelled me to state that I could not support a prohibition policy but that I would do anything to curtail the consumption of spirits, and I did formulate in my mind a plan which if put into action would be the means of producing great curtailment of the consumption of alcoholic liquors in this country. In any case we have this Bill before us and it is a step in the right direction. It may prove a little irksome to purchasers of alcoholic liquors when they go down to the control department, and it may mean the employment of extra officials, but I think that when all of this is offset by the fact that it is assisting the police department in obtaining clues and evidence against sheebeening.

Now there is a section of this Bill that we on this side of the House are unable to subscribe to, by reason of the ambiguity of the words in that section. It has caused a considerable amount of rumour throughout the city and in fact all over the country. That rumour has been further strengthened by the action of certain members of the Government in their relation to the handling of the Control department. Almost immediately after the

Government got into office, certain members of the Government started to interfere with the management of the Board. When we compare that action with the action of the Monroe Administration and with my Administration, there is a marked contrast. From the time of the formation of this Board under the Monroe Administration until the entry of the Squires Government into office no attempt was made to interfere with the management of the Controller's Department. In fact it was a source of complaint amongst the supporters of the Monroe Party and my party that influence was not brought to bear on Mr. Mifflin that he should give orders for liquor only to the supporters of our respective administrations.

I spoke to Mr. Mifflin once, and once only in my life, and that was in the Prime Minister's office. As he stood up to leave, I said to him "Do you know what I expect you to do. I expect you to run your department as you would run a business. Buy good liquor for the people, and give the country a square deal, and I do not care where you buy your liquor so long as it is of good quality and at a fair price.

Now unfortunately we are drifting back to the bad old so-called prohibition days when the liquor department was exploited for political purposes and for the benefit of political supporters. I am very sorry for this because it is a retrograde movement, and I am very much afraid also that there is a guilty understanding between the Eastern Trading Company and certain members of the Government. However I am not going to discuss that disgraceful business but suffice it to say that the truth, sooner or later, will out and the knowledge of that truth will react on the guilty parties. Hon. members on the other side whether directly interested in this or not are aware of the gravity of the situation. They

ought to have agreed to allow an investigation. This investigation should have been asked by the suspected parties, nay, more, it should have been demanded by them. Unfortunately they were afraid to face the issue. They were afraid that the truth would come out and would prove unpleasant. Now as I say this side cannot vote for this section No. 3 as it stands, and I am also of the opinion that there are many Hon. members on the other side of the House that, had they the courage of their convictions, would be delighted to vote for the elimination of this section. The Prime Minister has intimated it is his opinion that this section is harmless; admitting this is so, it must be there for some purpose. It is not there for the mere sake of its harmlessness. I notice that in section two of this Bill we are going to amend the act because evidently the drafter did not know much about the capacity of bottles for the carrying of rum, and whiskey, the act states 24 ozs., but in actual practice the bottles contain 26 ozs. And in order to make the system and the law conform we are amending the law to a 26 oz. bottle. It is easier to do that than to supply 24 oz. bottles and perhaps disorganize for a time the whole Board of Liquor Control.

There is another example of where we should like to have the system of the Board of Liquor Control and the law conform of each other. I would refer you to subsection D, section four of the Alcoholic Liquors Act. Now the Liquor Control Board have the right, in fact they have not the right strictly speaking, but they are at present running a bottling plant. And they are doing that without any permission under the present Act. It is my idea that just as we have altered the bottles from a 24 to a 26 oz. capacity because we find it easier to alter the law than the system, it seems to me that we should

make Sub-section D, Section 4 of the Act, conform in the same way, and make it legal for the Controller to bottle liquor, and I would suggest and I hope it will receive the approval of the Hon. members of this House, that the words "bottling, packing" be added to this section. Let me read the section as it stands now.

(Reads)

Now to bring the system of the Department into conformity with the law I would suggest adding the two words "bottling" and "packing." It would then read:

(Reads)

Now by the addition of those two words I cannot see that there is anything for anyone to object to. I think it is just a case of bringing the system into conformity with the law just as the drafter of the present Bill in sub-section 2 has changed the legal contents of a bottle to 26 ounces, as was the actual amount sold, and the law before allowing only 24 ounces. I beg to move that section 4 be hereby amended to read:

(Reads)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to submit the amendment to the drafters of the Bill but my temper on the thing is to let it stand verbatim because for the last month this has occupied more attention than matters of the greatest importance. This is a departmental Bill that I am not interested in and the Government is not interested in at all. The Bill was drafted by the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice and the Inspector General, and no sooner was it brought into the House than like all other liquor nonsense it was the subject of criticism argument, debate and I have heard more argument about this than all other business of the Colony. We feel that under section 6 as amended it is more advantageous. The point was

brought up by the Honourable Member for Bay de Verde that clergymen and doctors ought not to have the handling of permits. I took the matter up and gave the suggestion to Mr. Dunfield and the Inspector General and as a result of their activities we have this new section printed. Now if you want the Bill further deferred to be referred to them for this amendment I am prepared to do it. It does not make any difference if the Bill is dropped entirely to me or to the Department of Justice from the standpoint of programme or policy. It does make a difference to the Department and police from the standpoint of making an effort to check shebeens.

MR. PUDDESTER—I might tell the Hon. the Prime Minister that when I discussed these sections with him I discussed Sec. 6 as well as Sec. 3a. Section 6 has been amended to meet with my approval. I think that will suit everybody now and I suppose it makes it easier for a man in the outports to get a bottle of liquor too. But it must be remembered that I also objected to section 3d and no effort whatever has been made to change that section to meet the objections against it, and if that section were changed to add a word or two it would make the Bill perfectly satisfactory. Now if that is done everybody is happy and it can't harm the Bill one iota. As far as delay is concerned the Opposition are not to blame for the Bill being deferred. They might have been to blame up to the second reading, but since that time it has been deferred time and time again by the Government when the Opposition were ready to go on.

M. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Honourable Member for Placentia East drew attention to the words in sub-section A "duplicate parts." Those are not in the Buchans Mine Act. I suppose it is not the intention of the Government to allow them duplicate parts to replace machinery when it gets broken down after use. Anything imported after the first importation of their outfit will be dutiable. There is another matter I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs about.

(Reads Section)

I presume that means trunk lines bringing the wires into the House, but does not mean that they will be able to get electric light fittings and bathroom fittings free of duty. I remember speaking on this same subject in the Upper House when the Buchans Mine Bill was going through. I instanced the fact that the General Manager might get fittings for an elaborate bathroom, marble fittings, silver taps and pay no duty, but the poor labourers wife would have to pay duty if she wanted a slop pail.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is covered by the limitations on page 8. Also you will notice "articles intended for the use of individuals," etc.

On the question of duplicate parts. There is certain machinery when

brought in for which there are naturally and normally spare parts or duplicate parts, for when the machinery is coming in certain particular fragile sections may break or may break immediately the machinery is put in use. It is necessary to have the parts on hand. It will be noted such as are necessary for proper equipment, etc., for original construction not those to be brought in subsequently. It is meant to cover coming in with original installation or within a few days in the ordinary course of transportation.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, we want to help the Government to get as good a Bill as possible, we want to see the Minister of Finance and Customs get all the revenue he should get. We want to see these people get only the concessions that are necessary. We all know that some parts are very fragile and provision has to be made for them, but if the amount of "Duplicate Parts" is in the same proportion to their plant as a fifth tire is to a motor car, well, I am satisfied.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I asked the Prime Minister a few moments ago whether there was any correspondence, in connection with the Minute of Council with Messrs. Hatch and Palmer, and he said "No." I have here a copy signed by Mr. Fox, the solicitor for the Company, as being compared with the original letter and found correct. There are two letters to Messrs. Hatch & Palmer. I asked the Prime Minister if there was any correspondence and he said no.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Except my letter covering the Minute of Council.

MR. EMERSON—You did not say that—you said there was no correspondence whatever. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that on the 22nd of March the

Prime Minister wrote Mr. Hatch two letters, the first is:

(Reads.)

I ask that the Committee rise until the Prime Minister returns. (Waits). What I say is this, I asked the Prime Minister if there was any correspondence between himself and Messrs. Hatch & Palmer and he said no. Now on the 22nd of March there was a letter written by the Prime Minister to Mr. Hatch, which is on file in the Registry and this is a certified and correct copy, certified by Mr. Fox, solicitor for the promoters of the Bill.

(Reads)

Now on the same date there is also another letter on file to Mr. Hatch which says:

(Reads.)

I call your attention to the last paragraph, where did that idea come from, is that a suggestion of Mr. Hatch. Surely that is in writing, and there is not even tabled an acknowledgment of the letter and last night when I put the question to the Prime Minister who was behind the Bill I was told Mr. Osler, the Prime Minister read from some memorandum which he tabled that Mr. A. E. Osler was behind it, while obviously Messrs. Hatch & Palmer are behind it. I asked the question who were behind the Bill, the Prime Minister knew and he did not mention their names, the only name mentioned was that of Mr. Fox, a name which is respected in this House, there was no reference to Messrs. Hatch & Palmer. All I say is that the information was not given to this House that ought to have been given. When we asked the question we were entitled to know who were the promoters and the Prime Minister did not tell us, as a matter of fact the answer the Prime Minister gave in connection with the three names was in answer to questions of Mr. Puddester

and Mr. Alderdice, and the only answer to my question was in reference to Mr. Osler. Before I asked that he had given information about the three firms which I mentioned before and when I asked who were the promoters I was told A. E. Osler & Co. Well, if A. E. Osler & Co. are behind it, be careful, Mr. Osler is the man who was mixed up in the "Teapot Dome" scandal, he bought twenty millions worth of bonds of the Company into Canada for sale. When the Chief Counsel went to Canada to get evidence, Mr. Osler was too clever for him and he got away. If A. E. Osler & Co. are behind the Bill that is one reason why it should be thrown out.

Last night we were willing to proceed with consideration of the Bill in the Prime Minister's absence and a Member of the Executive was left in charge of the Bill. Unfortunately when questions were asked we were discourteously refused information, I think that will appeal to the Prime Minister. When we suggested an amendment we were told by the Minister in charge that he had no power to accept any amendment. Does this House realize that any amendment that is suggested must go through, provided of course it meets the approval of the majority. The only answer is that it must be a Government measure and they won't accept it.

Last night I was asking if there could be produced a plan showing the area which it is proposed to give to this company. Is there a probability of that plan being produced this afternoon. Can we have it before the committee rises. There were certain suggestions I intended to make when I had the plan but I will make them now, and when the plan comes it can be done formally. On page nine there is a section there, sub-section eight, I think which

(Reads.)

It has been pointed out to me since the committee rose that there is a possibility that the fumes from the smelter, (I do not know anything about the technical side of it) with the drainage and seepage might poison the rivers and even the salt water. If this smelter is erected on that narrow neck of the Peninsula, I am only putting it as a question, is it possible that damage might be done to the fishing rivers and waters? What I had in mind was the possibility of the flowage from the smelter poisoning the waters of these two bays. It has been put to me by people who are not interested at all, that is a possibility that should be considered by the Government. I do not know anything about it and that is one of the reasons that I wanted to get the map. We might discuss it later on and I would like to ask the Prime Minister now to rise the committee until we get the Minutes of Council and correspondence.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, with regard to section eight sub-section seven b, a section similar to that is customarily placed into bills of this kind whereby the company may nominate a person. Suppose they have a contractor they could get in goods in his name, but the Minister of Finance and Customs must be notified, provided the goods are used in construction.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that there be inserted "that the company shall not be (reads) described in 1 (a) hereof;"

That is just to protect the people who are living there now. They say there is somebody there now and I think that might recommend itself to the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I will think it over and discuss it with the solicitor for the Company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, who at the moment is not in the House, suggests that this proviso be added:

(Reads

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, might I suggest at this stage that the Committee might rise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I was just going to suggest that we would complete it and go into committee on the Bill and then the records will be ready in the meanwhile.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION— We gave our promise to discuss it during the present stage.

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.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair at quarter to five, until eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at eight o'clock.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION— Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that it will be necessary to take special precautions to prevent out of town purchasers visiting more than one liquor store. They would have to be indentified. Would it not be difficult to trace them?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to Leader of the Opposition I may say that there would be a loophole there, but the Inspector General feels that the cases would not be sufficiently numerous to justify a special section.

I move the following as Section 21.

(Reads)

This is a copy of the section of the previous Act and the Inspector General asked to have it inserted and I am sure that there will be no objection.

There are two other suggestions since we sat this afternoon and I feel that if we sat until Regatta Day it would be impossible to draft a perfect Liquor Bill. Under Personal Permits, if this House were to close in a day or two and this Bill became law there would be a rush on the Department for Permits, I therefore suggest, not that it would make any difference to me however, that we add the following clause 12 to section 6.

(Reads)

This will give the Department time to finish up their business for the present fiscal year.

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 Alcoholic Liquors," 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 certain Resolutions with respect to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the point raised by Mr. Emerson was well taken, Section 9, page 9.

(Reads)

It has been reported that two or three section men and possibly a couple of linesmen live in this vicinity, this section has been redrafted and the following words inserted.

(Reads)

This makes it quite clear that the Company it not relieved from any responsibility in this connection.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, suppose some people own property there, would not its value be affected?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No one owns property there except the Anglo American Telegraph Co. who have some property there for cable rights etc. I have learned from Mr. Downey that there are one or two families residing in LaManche and we are consequently putting in this Section so that it is clear that if any damage is done them they will be protected.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, after leaving here this afternoon I found that I had made a statement that was not strictly correct and I wish to go on record as having rectified that error. I find that the location of the proposed smelter is four or five miles East of where I thought it was going to be. I also stated that there was one house in that location, a Railway Section

house, that is correct but I find that there is also three other residences there.

There are some people there who have what might be called "squatters claims" if such claims were against an individual but the term is not a sufficient period of time to give them valid claims against the Crown which must be sixty years. But I take it for granted that no company would consider putting them out without making fair compensation and these people will in all probability be the first permanent workers of the company and will continue to reside there. At two and one half miles distant from the site of the smelter there are considerable mineral operations at LaManche. I have known for some years there are three residences there and there are to-day besides those three, five dwelling houses, a staff house and sleeping quarters and the cook house of the operating company. Now I am absolutely certain in stating that none of these people are going to object to what we are describing here as to the gases and fumes from the smelter. During the second year of construction work the smelter will be working and if there would be any danger resulting those men would not continue their work. Some years ago I was in Swansea, Wales, and in the hotel I noticed a continuous odor of sulphur and upon making inquires I found that there are two colossal smelters in the city but nobody experienced the slightest inconvenience from these. I may also state that six or seven years back the project was on foot to establish a smelter near the railway station in St John's West. That caused no alarm but two or three individuals who lived near the station asked me if the gases escaping from the smelter would be injurious to their crops. There being no other difficulty one of them asked me if I did not think it would destroy

the flowers in his garden. So as far as I know there is no danger whatever from the fumes from the smelter. There are smelters in a number of cities in the United States of America but there are no serious objections to them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion to make to the Committee. It has been called to my attention by the Hon. Dr. Fosdell, who while not exactly a sport, may be called a sportsman in the real sense of the word. It refers to section eleven.

(Reads)

The theory behind it is that possibly one or more of the rivers in that territory are frequented by salmon and could be used as a sporting river. I desire to make it clear that the company is not relieved from the duty of maintaining the river for sporting purposes. This concerns adjacent rivers.

MR. EMERSON—I asked for the minute-of-council and for the plan showing exactly where this area is.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Will Mr. Downey kindly get the blueprint for us. The minute-of-council and communication to Mr. Hatch is as follows:

(Reads)

MR. EMERSON—Was there any minute-of-council authorizing the Prime Minister to write that letter to Mr. Hatch.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. EMERSON—Is there any reply from Mr. Hatch?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the meaning of the first sentence of the Prime Minister's letter dated March 22nd.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am not in the habit of having people chase me when I am interested in a project of this kind. I chase them. When the Humber came up I did not wait for the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company or the Reids to chase me. I do the chasing. In this case I knew that a group of financiers in Canada and the United States of America and others including Hatch and Palmer in Newfoundland were interested in developing a smelter. In 1911 when I was a member of the Morris Government and sat in a rear seat back there, I was indentified with passing a Bill to establish a smelter. We gave a bonus to a man who mined copper and who would undertake the smelting proposition. During all these years I have been interested in developing a smelter as a prime asset to the country. When I came into office in November I not only got after the idea of a smelter but also telephonic communication, fishery extension, the development of the Gander and a dozen other things that I have got after and will be getting after in the next few months and years, and which will I hope turn out to be satisfactory propositions which I can submit to this legislature. In this I desire to emulate the example of my leader in 1911, Lord Morris. I do not want to take the credit for this idea. If there is any credit coming I want it to go to my colleagues but if there is any blame and the thing goes wrong I am ever ready to take the blame myself. This is an effort that I have chased day and night as I am now chasing and will be chasing a dozen propositions in the hope of getting people interested.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I have no reason whatever to take away from the Prime Minister any credit due him in this connection. I realize

the Government has important matters before it especially in the solution of the labor problem. Last night I regretted that the Prime Minister was not present when I was speaking. I think that I explained my views on the general proposition of the starting of the smelter but if this smelter starts we will still have to think of the results of starting this smelter and the price we will have to pay. I want to point out to the House, and I will say it in passing, that during recess all the papers have been rifled from my desk

My papers in connection with this have been removed from my desk and I have to depend on memory for what I have got to say and that correspondence now placed in my hands by the Hon. the Prime Minister.

In the first place I want to point out this—it is not before me but it is in the records of the Supreme Court—on 23rd of March a company was incorporated by Messrs. Hatch & Palmer. I want to call the date to your attention—which was incorporated for the purpose of carrying on a smelting, concentrating and so forth plant. The firm that performed the work were Messrs. Fox & Phelan, a firm of admired and reputable lawyers in the town, and amongst the papers that were filed was an agreement between Mr. Hatch and his company under which it is recited that he had a concession from this Government in connection with the smelter, and he sold that concession to the company for a certain number of shares which were to be issued to him, and the shares were issued to him for the concession

Now the concession consists entirely of two or three letters and the minute-of-council which the Prime Minister has just read to you. That was the concession.

What I want to point out to you is that the two letters from the Prime

Minister are dated March 22nd, the minute-of-council is dated March 21st, and the company was incorporated and the agreement made on the 23rd. The point I require to know is were there negotiations going on prior to that date.

The Governor-in-Council does not meet and pass a resolution such as just read to us by the Prime Minister and then straight over-night a company which has correspondence in connection with it and recites in its agreement that the company believes that it has concessions from the Government. Therefore, negotiations must have been going on for some time and I would like to know how long they were going on and that is why I asked this afternoon who was behind the Bill. That is why I asked if there was any correspondence between Messrs. Hatch & Palmer and the Prime Minister and I was told no.

Now how did it happen that the Executive Government passed this Minute of Council on March 21st, and on March 23rd Hatch & Palmer incorporated a company which recites that it has concessions from the Government and attaches to an agreement this correspondence as being the concession from the Government? And I think this House is entitled to know why this is so before this Bill passes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland," 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 relating to the establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Grimes 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 the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the establishing of a Customs Smelter in 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.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to a Tax on Certain Timber Lands" was stricken from the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House at its rising do adjourn until Thursday at eleven o'clock in the forenoon I would take this opportunity of reading a telegraphic message which has just been handed to me as Prime Minister.

Mr. Emerson made certain criticism of the firm of A. E. Osler this after-

noon, suprising criticism, because the firm had been reported, and the banks were equally satisfied, when they were referred to as one of the oldest and experienced brokerage houses known and the individual members were all of the highest reputation.

Mr. Emerson's report was communicated to Mr. Hatch at Toronto, who replied as follows:

(Reads)

I feel that in view of this my Honourable friend will be glad to retract his attack on Osler firm that he made this afternoon.

MR. EMERSON—Certainly not. This came from one of the promoters of the Bill. You would not expect him to admit what I said was true.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—So my Honourable friend persists in his attack.

MR. EMERSON—I did not say that I would persist in my attack; I say I am not prepared to withdraw what I said until I get some evidence to prove that what I said is not correct, that will defeat the evidence upon which the statement that I made was based, and I am certainly not going to retract upon a telegram from the promoter of the Bill.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday morning at 11 o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 30, 1929.

The House met at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House at its rising adjourn until Saturday morning next at 11 o'clock. In doing so I take this opportunity to read a telegram from the Toronto Solicitors of A. E. Osler Co. It is ad-

dressed to myself personally.

(Reads)

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, in view of the message as read by the Hon. the Prime Minister, I want to state that I was in error when I made that statement in this House. I do not think that any member of this House should, if he takes advantage of the privilege which he has, make a statement which would reflect on the honesty or the integrity of any member outside of this House, who is unable to reply. The information that I received on that man was from a source which to me was beyond question. And in making that statement apparently I spoke of another firm of Osler Co., that were involved in that scandal, and I want to make it perfectly clear that the A. E. Osler Co. to whom I referred on that occasion, are not that firm. I wish to withdraw the remark and apologise to A. E. Osler.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Saturday morning, June 1st, at eleven o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

SATURDAY, June 1st, 1929.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Annual Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled:

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Public Purposes."

"An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures."

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 23, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in Amendment Thereof.'"

"An Act to Amend 'The Tourist Commission Act, 1927.'"

"An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines." without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled:

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June, 1929 and the 30th day of June, 1930, 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 it had passed the Bills sent up entitled:

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 33, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland.'"

"An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Ass mbly.'"

"An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 5, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 9 entitled 'An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.'"

without amendment.

Mr Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled:

"An Act Relating to the Preservation and Propagation of Deer." with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled:

"An Act further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly and Acts in amendment thereof,'"

with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this amendment be adopted. I understand that it is the effort of the Legislative Council to prevent any members of the House of Assembly acting on this Fisheries Commission whereas they have a perfect right to do so. I intended Capt. Parsons and one or two other members of this House to

act on this Commission together with three members of the Legislative Council whose names I have not mentioned, but the Legislative Council decided that as the Legislative Council is appointed for life and are not responsible to the people of this country who are really its governors, they may accept Government offices on Commissions, etc., but they feel that "Carters Purge" is necessary for this Chamber, I feel that Castoria is necessary for that Chamber. The efforts of Mr. McNamara, who I understand is a successful feed merchant of Queen Street, to prevent Capt. Parsons and others acting on that Commission is not a matter that will be passed over lightly. In the closing hours of this session I move that this amendment be read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER—I would ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to withdraw the statement he made in connection with Castoria.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time that is what I feel is necessary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I move that it be read a second time, not since 1917 has the Legislative Council made itself so ridiculous as it had by suggesting this amendment. I move that it be read a second time

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from

the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled:

"An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland," with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I move that this be read a first time. The Legislative Council is really helpful, the amendments made are beneficial and make the Act more accurate. The first strikes out the last word of the 8th line of the Section which is probably a printer's error. The second inserts "lines" between the words "telephonic" and "cables". The third reads "roads, canals, railways or other important fishery and public services as the Government may from time to time require." Mr. Job felt that a gentleman by the name of Thompson would some day institute a Transatlantic service to the bottom of Trinity Bay and run a railway across the neck of land and so get a speedy service to New York. The fifth provides that Newfoundland workers be employed wherever possible, well, that is advantageous to the Bill. The sixth corrects a printer's error. In connection with number seven there is some doubt in the minds of the Legislature as to whether the Public Utilities Commission had power to deal with all the problems that may arise.

(Reads)

The 8th is renumbered, the 9th is renumbered, the 10th, renumbered, the 11th, renumbered and a change of some importance, under the original Bill the franchise could be sold, now the Legislative suggests that it can be sold only by the authority of the

Governor in Council, this is a reasonable and advantageous change. The phraseology is changed in sub-section 1, but there is no change in effect. It was felt that the Solicitor drafting the Bill did not do it as well as it should be done and that this draft of Hon. Mr. Gibbs is a better draft. The whole of 1 B. is stricken out and the following substituted. (Reads).

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I regret that during these remarks that Mr. Thompson's name has been mentioned in connection with the fog free zone. I have been more or less connected with it and told him plainly that the scheme was not practical. But this year I can assure this House that he has something really practical and if it can be financed it will have larger scope than any proposition we have had placed on the Statute Books, even larger than the railway. It concerns the introduction of cold storage. When it comes to fresh fish I flatter myself as knowing something about it. I have been connected with these propositions and I think Mr. Thompson's proposition entitled to every consideration.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is considering the opening of the district of Placentia West now unrepresented through the death of Mr. Sullivan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the government has no desire to proceed with any indecent haste. It has not even been consider-

ed but I conclude that in the ordinary course of events, within a period of six months the seat will be filled.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I am not desirous of any indecent haste but this is the last opportunity we shall have of asking.

MR. PUDDISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Colonial Secretary regarding the S. S. Susu. The papers have made certain statements. The question has been asked before. Has the Susu been purchased or is she on hire as she is going on route in a few days. We would like to know what is being done.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I have to say in reply that the matter is still under consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have been informed that His Excellency the Governor desires to prorogue this Assembly at three o'clock this afternoon. I would, therefore, suggest that the Speaker leave the Chair till a quarter to three.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair at a quarter to twelve until the afternoon at a quarter to three of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at a quarter to three of the clock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, a circumstance has arisen in connection with this House, which during the thirty years of my experience, from the time when I was a reporter of debates up to the present time, is unique.

Two members of our House of Assembly have been called from human activities during the past six weeks of our term of office as members of this Legislature. One was Mr. Sullivan, a member of this House, one time Colonial Secretary, a gentleman who was my personal friend for almost all that time, in spite of the fact

that we disagreed most critically in politics. Now it is Mr. R. G. Winsor, a member of my own party, with whom I have been associated for many years. In 1919 he was elected as a member of this House. Four times since he has been elected and re-elected by the people of the constituencies he has been identified with, and that is an outstanding tribute to him as a man, citizen and legislator and personally interested in the affairs of his constituency. He has been associated mainly in connection with the Fishermen's Protective Union, which has been one of the most important and valuable factors in the industrial and fishing life in this country.

He was a man of sterling character of sane judgment; a man whose name has been known more intimately than the name of any other, perchance, of the rank and file in connection with modern organization and development of the fisheries of Newfoundland.

It is with feelings of deep sympathy and regret that I mention his name this afternoon and move the following resolution.

The passing within the course of two weeks, of two members of this House, both personal friends of mine, one from the ranks of the Opposition, one from the ranks of the Government, tends to intimate to us the futility of verbal, personal or political combat, the uselessness of that thing which is called hostility.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Mr. F. C. Alderdice seconded the following Resolution, which passed un-animously.

RESOLVED that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death of Mr. Robert G. Winsor for many years a Member of this House.

RESOLVED that the sympathy of this House be conveyed to his relatives in their bereavement.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution proposed by the Hon. the Prime Minister.

Death, the Grim Reaper, has been again in our midst, and, although my experience is short in this House, I am quite sure that in the experience of the oldest members of this House, they have never seen two emblems of death here on the same occasion.

It was only a few days ago since we gave outward expression of our sorrow at the passing away of Mr. M. S. Sullivan; today we have to give expression of our grief at the passing away of Mr. R. G. Winsor.

Mr. R. G. Winsor was a man of strong convictions, never loud in the expression of them but very tenacious in the holding of them. He was of a retiring disposition. He lived an exemplary Christian life. His was the type of life that possibly, more than any other, best serves his country. Law abiding, unswerving in his duty as his conscience dictated.

On four occasions the voters of the district of Bonavista elected him to a seat in this Chamber and although he was perhaps never loud or spoke often on any subject in debate, yet I am quite sure that he had a very deep conviction as to the policy of the measures that were before the House.

He was a strong supporter of the Fishermen's Union, he was a patriotic citizen of the country and he was faithful to his political leader.

I am quite sure, in fact I know, that our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his sorrowing relatives in their great affliction.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I little thought some few days ago, when we listened here to the resolution of condolence on the death of the late Mr. Sullivan, and to the various

speeches that were made in connection with his passing that it would be my sad duty to stand up and support a resolution of condolence to the member who sat next to me, not only in the House, but who has been my colleague in the political life in the North for many years.

I rather fear that Mr. Winsor's death to many of us was not quite unexpected. He suffered very seriously this winter and he was treated by the doctors at Wesleyville. He overcame his illness and came here in the spring but, had he accepted medical advice and consulted his own personal interests he would have gone to the hospital and had an operation, which was very necessary, as we have recently seen. But when the spring came there was a good deal of work to be done in connection with his district; then the House opened and he was anxious to be present and look after the interests of his constituency and was an ardent member of the House to the last. I consequently think that he overdid it; that he did too much—in the interest of his district and not in his own personal interests.

Words fail me to express just how I feel at the passing of Mr. R. G. Winsor. He was associated with the Fisherman's Protective Union before I was. He was interested in its earliest days while I was not associated with it until 1916, but, since I have known him in connection with the councils of that Organization, I have known him to be a man who always tried to put forward some constructive idea making for the uplifting and general betterment of the fisheries of the country and for the men interested in the fishing industry.

The other day we paid a tribute to the late Mr. Sullivan for his expert knowledge of forest matters and tim-

ber affairs, and, no doubt, that tribute was well merited. Now I will pay a well merited tribute to Mr. Winsor. With his long practical experience he was an able authority in connection with all fishery matters. He was a fisherman. Not only was he the sort of man who lives in a fishing district but he had all his personal money invested in the fishing industry. I think he owns two vessels which he supplied regularly for the fisheries and he was always interested in the welfare and maintenance of the fishing industry.

I very much regret that the Usher of the Black Rod has come at this moment as I might say a good deal in praise of Mr. Winsor in support of the Resolution proposed by the Hon. the Prime Minister and seconded by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I might say much more, as I have said, but, as far as I know, he led a good life, and I do not think that we have much need to worry about his future in another world.

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

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May It Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly have voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

"An Act to Amend the Act 19, Geo. V., Chapter 18, entitled 'An Act Re-

lating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.' ”

“An Act authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the Anglo-American Telephone and Telegraph Company.”

“An Act Relating to Air Navigation.”

“An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public.”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of Stamp Duties.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy.’ ”

“An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment.”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs.’ ”

“An Act to Amend 12, George V., Chapter 13, entitled ‘An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John’s.’ ”

“An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending the 30th day of June, 1929 and the 30th day of June, 1930, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.”

“An Act to Amend ‘The War Pensions Act, 1922.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Customs.’ ”

An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third

Series) entitled ‘Of the Registration of Deeds and other Documents.’ ”

“An Act to Amend 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled ‘An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Naturalization of Aliens.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled ‘Of Companies.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Department of Public Works.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of Enquires Concerning Public Matters.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Department of Justice.’ ”

“An Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes.”

“An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 24, entitled ‘Of the Inspection of Ships.’ ”

“An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines.”

“An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.”

“An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures.”

“An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 23, entitled ‘An

Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in Amendment Thereof.' ”

“An Act to Amend ‘The Tourist Commission Act, 1927.’ ”

“An Act Relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula.”

“An Act relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Public Purposes.”

“An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 5, entitled ‘An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads.’ ”

“An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 33, entitled ‘An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland.’ ”

“An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly.’ ”

“An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 9 entitled ‘An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.’ ”

“An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925.”

“An Act Relating to the Preservation and Propagation of Deer.”

“An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.”

“An Act further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of the Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly and Acts in amendment thereof.’ ”

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:

Although of comparatively short duration, the Session of the Legislature which closes to-day has been marked by diligence and earnestness on your part, and an evident desire to discharge your legislative duties with thoroughness and despatch. You will doubtless be pleased to be relieved thus early from attendance here, and be permitted to engage in those various vocations which demand your attention.

In addressing you at the opening of this Session, I referred, with profound gratitude to the recovery of His Majesty the King from the severe and trying illness from which he had suffered. His Majesty's progress towards health had been so well maintained, that the people of this ancient and loyal Colony in common with the King's subjects throughout the Empire will have learned with deep regret that it should have been interrupted by any adverse condition. All will unite in the fervent prayer that the King's restoration to health and strength will be both speedy and complete.

A considerable amount of useful legislation has received your consideration which, I trust, will prove to be of advantage.

The measure relating to the creation of a Public Utilities Commission should be the means of providing for the whole people the fullest enjoyment of present day facilities and conveniences at such rates, and under such conditions as may be considered equitable.

The Highroads policy, inaugurated a few years ago, has proven most successful, and the measures which you have now enacted for the improvement of the existing legislation in respect thereto will doubtless be of benefit.

Bearing in mind the prime importance of conserving the wild game of

this Island, it is gratifying to observe the further provision which you have made to increase the protection already afforded to caribou. I trust that the whole people will aid the authorities in this praiseworthy endeavour.

Unprecedented activities in mining operations have caused my Ministers to enter into negotiations for the establishment of a Customs Smelter. It is possible that the successful inauguration of this venture will act as a further stimulus to mining activities generally.

The Acts relating to several important Departments of the Public Service have for their purpose the better and more efficient administration of those branches.

It is pleasing to note that the Railway, which has for years proven a financial burden upon the Colony, is, by careful management, steadily reducing its annual deficit. As a direct result of the industrial development of the Country it is confidently hoped that the time is not far distant when this great public utility, instead of being a burden, will not only pay its way, but will contribute largely to the ordinary revenue of the Colony.

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

I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have granted for the Public Service. It will be the constant care of my Ministers to secure judicious and economical expenditure with respect to the various appropriations.

Unlike a similar measure enacted some years ago, the new Income Tax will bear upon those best calculated to meet this levy, whilst relieving those of moderate means from a tax which had been considered oppressive.

My Ministers trust, that, by proper methods of collection, the annual amount derived from this source will, to some extent, offset the reduction in revenue arising from the revision of the duty on certain commodities.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

It is gratifying to observe the favorable signs of industrial activities throughout the Country, and the promise of greater prosperity which they represent.

In now relieving you from your legislative duties, I join with you in the confident hope that the objects aimed at by your Honourable Houses in your endeavour for the public welfare may be achieved, and I sincerely trust that an abundant measure of success awaits you in your respective vocations.

After which the Honourable President of the Legislative Council by command of His Excellency said:

GENTLEMEN: It is His Excellency's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be prorogued until Thursday, the 11th day of July ensuing, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

APPENDIX

House of Assembly, Newfoundland,

April 24th, 1929.

Speech of Honourable the Prime Minister in moving Second Reading of the Bill respecting "An Agreement Between the Government and the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, Limited."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of the Bill authorizing the Governor-in-Council to enter into a contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The object of this Bill is to provide for the laying of certain transatlantic telephone cables via Newfoundland. The indenture, or agreement, upon which the Bill is based sets out that:—

"WHEREAS the Government desires that dependable telephone service be established between Newfoundland and the United States and Canada and between Newfoundland and Great Britain and Continental Europe; and

"WHEREAS the Company is engaged in the business of furnishing long distance telephone service by means of its own wire system and the systems of other companies connecting therewith generally throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico and Cuba, and also owns and operates wireless facilities for transmitting and receiving telephone messages to and from Great Britain and Continental Europe and is conducting experiments with a view to constructing and operating a trans-oceanic telephone cable to provide additional facilities for

telephone service between points in North America and points in Great Britain and Continental Europe."

The Government hereby grants to the Company the right to land any of its telephone cables at Newfoundland on terms and conditions which I shall describe in detail a little later. Before doing so, however, I should like to indicate by a review of the progress of discovery and invention in these departments of scientific endeavour, how much the proposed enactment holds out of hope for us that Newfoundland may play a still greater part in the drama of world communication in the future than she has played in the past.

Hon. members in this House, the people of this country, and the civilized nations of the world are now so accustomed to the use of the telegraph and the telephone that these agencies are accepted as among the commonplaces of existence, and when we use them we do so without a thought, in the main, of the scientific marvels which they represent and which are the product of the genius of a few men during the past century. The development of electricity for purposes of communication between distant places through the medium of wires is less than one hundred years

old. The idea of sending signals by wire became a practical proposition through the efforts of Morse, an American in 1835. At first naturally, it was employed altogether on land, the wires, being strung on poles as they are to-day and the employment of this agency being developed as the years went by. Then, when, in the process of extending the wires, bodies of water, like streams and rivers and lakes had to be crossed, other inventive geniuses devoted their skill to the creation of devices for accomplishing this result. Naturally men skilled in electrical science as it stood at this period, realised that to carry the telegraph across such watercourses, insulated wires would be necessary, since water is a good conductor of electricity and if the wires laid in water the current sent through them would pass into the water and be lost. In due course this problem was solved and then it was only a short step onward when narrow ocean channels, like the English Channel and St. George's Channel in Europe, New York harbor and various bays and estuaries in the United States and Canada, were crossed, and communication given between England and the European continent, on the one side, and between various separated areas in the neighboring mainland, on this side. One of the most noteworthy developments at this period of advance was the laying of a cable from Aspy Bay near Cape North, in Cape Breton Island, to Cape Ray in Newfoundland, under these circumstances.

Following Morse's discovery of practical telegraphy in 1835, telegraph lines had spread from the United States into Quebec and down through the Maritime Provinces by 1850. Then another genius appeared, Frederick Gisborne, an engineer employed in extending the telegraphs through the latter area who conceived the idea

of also connecting Newfoundland with the continent behind us. In 1851 he came to this city and submitted his plans to the authorities. He proposed to build a telegraph line from St. John's to Cape Ray and to cross Cabot Strait by carrier pigeons, or by steamer, and eventually, it was hoped, by a submarine cable. The Legislature granted £500 for a survey and passed an act authorising the construction of this line, the company being capitalised at £100,000. With this scheme were associated two others, one for the construction of a telegraph line between St. John's and Carbonear, which was completed in that year and went into operation the following spring, and the other for a steamship line between New York and Galway, Ireland, St John's being the halfway house for eastward and westward traffic. Gisborne completed his survey of the Telegraph between St. John's and Cape Ray in the autumn of that year, and at the next Session our Legislature passed an act incorporating "The Newfoundland Electric Telegraph Company," giving it exclusive right to erect telegraphs in this Island for 30 years, with certain land grants. Work was undertaken in due course but in the summer of 1853 through the collapse of his American agents the whole enterprise failed. In 1854, however, Gisborne succeeded in interesting Cyrus Field, a young merchant of New York who had made a handsome fortune and retired from business. These two developed the larger idea of a cable across the Atlantic. With them were associated Peter Cooper, the famous American philanthropist, Moses Taylor, Marshall Roberts and Wilson Hunt, who were granted a charter by the Legislature that year as the "New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company." It is of interest to note in passing, that the principle of a Government guarantee

for enterprises in this Colony, for which my first Administration was so bitterly criticised both here and in the country in 1923, when the Humber enterprise was set on foot, was not new to us. In that Session, 75 years ago, the Government guaranteed £50,000 worth of bonds for this enterprise, but not one penny of it was ever called for. These capitalists put up £500,000 to lay the first cable in 1857, and when it broke to lay another cable and put up a similar amount to keep the enterprise going until 1866, when the project was eventually successful after a third cable broke in 1865.

In those days, as now, there were people who ridiculed the whole venture, not alone people in this Colony, but people elsewhere. Even the London Times, on the eve of its success, declared that the transatlantic cable idea was a visionary one and an utterly impracticable undertaking, though, of course, the lesser features of the project, a cable across Cabot Strait and a landline from Cape Ray to St. John's, were considered feasible. The landline was completed in the autumn of 1856 and the cable was laid that year,—one of 70 miles, the longest attempt up to then. The first message carried by it was one from J. & W. Pitts of this city to A. & M. Cameron of Badeck, Cape Breton. The trials and tribulations of every new enterprise were not wanting in the case of this Telegraph Company, and the vicissitudes it then experienced were nothing to those which befell it in the next decade, when attempting to span the Atlantic itself. In 1857 an attempt was made to unite this Island and Ireland by an Atlantic Cable. The Governments of Great Britain and the United States were interested and each provided a warship to carry and lay half the cable. The effort that year was unsuccessful but the next year a cable was successfully laid and was

operated for a brief period, when it failed. Another attempt was not made for seven years. Then in 1865, a third venture was essayed, but the cable broke again. The promoters were undaunted, however, and in 1866, not alone laid a cable that worked but they completed the laying of the previous year's cable and got it working also. Since then, 63 years ago this summer, there has never been a break in cable communication between the two continents, while in the intervening period no fewer than 20 cables have been laid between the Old World and the New. Most of these have been direct cables, passing through Newfoundland, which has been found by repeated experiment to be the most successful as a halfway-house. I should explain to Hon. members that the longer a cable is, the less is its efficiency, and some years ago one cable company which had previously laid cables direct to the British Isle as from the mainland behind us found that in spite of the cost of recovering these cables in mid-ocean, cutting them and bringing both ends to our coast and connecting them in a cable station here, it was a paying proposition to do this because of the increased business which could be conducted over them.

In the years between the completion of the line from Canada to St. John's and the linking of the two continents by the laying of the submarine cable, press news from England for the United States was conveyed across the Atlantic in the ocean liners, which made Cape Race their landmark and hove up there and threw overboard casks containing newspapers and despatches. These containers were picked up by a boat's crew maintained at Cape Race for the purpose by the telegraph company, and the contents were then wired to New York by the Telegraph staff, and from these distri-

buted to the press of the United States and Canada. In the reverse way despatches were wired from New York to Cape Race from day to day and put aboard passing liners by the boat's crew and on arrival of the steamers at their English ports these despatches were wired to London and from there distributed to the English and continental newspapers. The company which carried on this service later developed into the Anglo American Telegraph Company, which in turn became associated with the Western Union Telegraph Company, and this is a constituent member of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, the same that is promoting this contract to-day.

By 1870, the telegraph as a land utility was extended everywhere over Europe and North America and the Atlantic Ocean was crossed by two cables giving similar communication, with others being projected and more laid in future years. Gradually in the past sixty years these agencies have spread over the whole globe and have so annihilated distance that each morning and evening we can read in the newspapers of happenings of every part of the world and do business with people through these agencies thousands of miles away from us. The spread of these public utilities during that period has been amazing. Latest statistics in relation thereto are to be found in the New York "World" Almanac for 1929, (page 322), and I give some of them here. The number of telegrams sent in the world in 1927 was about 495,000,000, of which 215,000,000 were sent in the United States. The telegraphs and cable companies in 1922,—the latest year for which full world figures are available,—operated 252,991 miles of pole line carrying 1,843,250 miles of single wire owned and leased, while ocean cables totalled 76,711 nautical miles. Mes-

sages in that year numbered 191,121,333. The income in that year was \$151,858,086, of which \$146,805,215 was from telegraph traffic, the balance being presumably from cable business. The expenses of operation totalled \$127,990,615, including interest and the assets totalled \$459,469,284, of which \$326,661,860 represented plant and equipment. In 1927 there were in the world 443 distinct submarine cables with a total mileage of 261,041, one of the largest companies being the Western Union, connected, as I have said, with the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, and operating 30,300 miles. The telegraph line goes forward with the pioneer into every new country and the submarine cable is the agency by which business is stimulated in the lands that border all of the Seven Seas, though naturally, most of them traverse the Atlantic bed because the growth of the intercourse of the two continents demands them.

As the telegraph became an established agency, based upon the principle of transmitting certain mechanical sounds from place to place over an electrical wire, it was but natural that other men of genius should conceive the idea of transmitting the sounds of the human voice in the same way. The successful development of this idea represents a still greater modern miracle. This is one of the most remarkable, as well as one of the most romantic stories of business growth coupled with achievement in public service which the world has ever seen,—and all within the lives of some of the members of this House. In 1876 the Centennial Exposition was held in Philadelphia. Alexander Graham Bell, then an almost unknown young Scotsman, had an exhibit of a new device called a telephone. It made comparatively little impression until the day the Emperor of Brazil stopped,

listened to an explanation, put the crude receiver to his ear, and then turned to his party, saying in his amazement, "My God! It Talks." From then on the telephone booth was one of the most crowded at the Exposition, and public interest in the new convenience spread rapidly over the world. The growth of the telephone as an accessory to human progress, is, therefore, a matter of the past half-century. Within that time its advancement has been little short of phenomenal. Older members of this Chamber,—and they not so old either,—can recall when the first telephones were introduced into St. John's and trace the growth of the system since. Of late years we have seen the "long distance" system extended to Conception and Placentia Bays, and we look to its further extension in the near future. But its progress here, or indeed, elsewhere, has nothing to its progress in America, where it originated and where it has seen its most rapid and effective extension. The New York "World" Almanac also notes: "Smithsonian officials say that the principle of the telephone was discovered June 2nd, 1875, the first conversation over the telephone was held on March 7th, 1876, the patent was granted on March 10th, 1876. In March, 1898, at New York City at the Centenary dinner of the American Institute, Dr. Thomas A. Watson, the associate of Alex. Graham Bell, displayed the original telephone, which he had constructed in accordance with the instruction of Mr. Bell in 1875, and used to transmit to the audience the first voice ever carried by wire;—that of Alex. Graham Bell, who had said to him, 'Mr. Watson, come here; I want you.'"

While the telephone is some forty years younger than the telegraph its spread has been immeasurably more rapid, due to the fact that it is an

agency that everybody can use, whereas the telegraph requires a skilled operator, and that it has been made an accessory in every business establishment and in nearly every home; while in course of time it has taken first place as an agency in human intercourse.

The method of the progress of the telephone was almost identical with that of the telegraph. First, the connections were made in cities and for business and social purposes in individual communities; nearby cities and towns were linked up. Then as research developed improvements in equipment the lines were extended further afield, and gradually vast stretches of country were brought into direct communication. It was a red-letter day in the history of telephonic communication when London spoke to Paris, for instance, because this involved laying a submarine cable for telephonic purposes across the English Channel, which cable was some 30 miles long. It was an equally notable day when New York talked with Chicago, a distance of 1,000 miles, and a day of phenomenal interest, when not so many years ago, the transcontinental telephone wire was strung across the Rocky Mountains and New York spoke with San Francisco, 3000 miles distant. Still more recently we have been hearing of a still greater marvel,—transoceanic telephony,—and the measure I have the honor to submit to you to-day marks the first step in a further advance in a direction few imagined, vast though the progress of this accessory has been, more especially in later years, as we have seen even in our limited experience in this country.

How vast that advance has been you will best realise, I think, from other figures which I propose to quote you, also from the New York "World"

Almanac. They are on page 322 also and are compiled by the chief statistician of this American Telephone and Telegraph Company which has entered into this contract with us. These are purely telephone statistics and show that on January 1st 1915, there were 5,584,853 Bell-owned telephones and 3,164,140 Bell-connecting telephones in the United States, a total of 8,648,993, with 142,527 employees working 17,475,594 miles of wire, which carried 23,574,000 messages every day, while in 1928 there were 13,726,056 Bell-owned telephones and 4,639,430 Bell-connecting telephones, a total of 18,365,486, with 308,911 employees working 58,822,895 miles of wire, which carried 55,196,000 messages daily. In other words, the number of telephones has more than doubled in 13 years, the number of employees has done the same, the number of miles of wire has more than trebled and the number of daily messages has grown two and one half times in the same period. The United States Census Bureau is given as authority for the following statistics,—in 1902 there were 2,371,044 telephones in the U.S.A., while 15 years later, in 1917, the number had grown to 11,716,520, this being the period of most rapid expansion, while in 1922 the number had increased to 14,347,395. In the latter year salaries and wages paid in this service amounted to \$352,925,570; the revenue was \$684,923,557; the investment in plant and equipment was \$2,205,183,150. The figures of the world's telephones are equally illuminating. In 1927 the telephones of the world numbered approximately—in the United States 17,846,168, Canada 1,201,088, and other countries in North America and West Indies making up a total of 19,130,357. In South America there were 427,746. In Europe, Great Britain and Ireland had 1,534,898; Germany had 2,688,495; France had

818,971, and the total for Europe was 8,080,642. Asia had, altogether, 928,531, of which Japan accounted for 648,991. Africa had 186,546, of which the Union of South Africa had roughly half. In Oceania there were in Australia 403,160, in New Zealand 137,307, in Dutch East Indies 42,899, and others making up a total of 624,608. I would ask the House to remember again that only 50 years before was the telephone invented, and that, broadly speaking, there were in the world in its jubilee year 29,378,430 telephones, that the number of telephone conversations that year were 35,038,736,000, of which 23,700,000,000 were in the United States; 2,283,500,000 in Japan, (which, remote as it is, stood second in the world in the use of this agency), 2,052,351,000 in Germany; 1,844,000,000 in Canada, (although it has a population of less than 10,000,000 people), and 1,500,000,000 in the British Isles; 687,000,000 in France, and 684,000,000 in Sweden, (which has only 6,000,000 people while France has forty millions), and the rest elsewhere. The last annual report of the "A.T. and T." as this company is popularly known, contains "graphs" or charts illustrative of its growth, from which it appears that on 31st December 1928, 59 per cent of the world's telephones were in the United States, 26 per cent outside that country, but connected with the telephone system in it, and only 15 per cent were in countries abroad not connected with American telephones, so that 85 per cent of the world's telephones can be reached from any Bell system telephone, and the "Bell telephone" system is the foundation of the "A.T. and T." company.

Naturally, therefore, the progressive and far-sighted men who direct this powerful corporation, one of the world's greatest and richest, should be in the van of enterprise in pioneer-

ing a new departure,—the laying of a telephone cable across the Atlantic and should turn its eyes to Newfoundland as the half-way house for such a project, just as seventy years ago the founders of the tiny business into which this has expanded chose Newfoundland as the theatre of their original adventure. It has the example of the telegraph cable before its eyes and visions at least as great a success with the telephone cable. To-day there are no fewer than 21 telegraph cables across the Atlantic ocean, of which fourteen go via Newfoundland, and nine of these, including these of the "Anglo-American" system, are owned by the Western Union Company, a subsidiary of the corporation promoting this Bill. These cables have been laid at different times as traffic has warranted, and there are seven other cables via the Azores. Several by both routes have been laid in recent times, some within the past two or three years, a fact, which proves there is no fear in the minds of those operating these agencies that their usefulness will be impaired by competition from any quarter.

In saying this I am not overlooking wireless telegraphy, which has entered the field more recently. From the top of our Signal Hill in December 1901, Marconi received wireless signals across the Atlantic and during the past 28 years the advance of this scientific marvel has been very great. But there is one fact which stands out prominently and that is that wireless has not become the competitor to the landline which the enthusiastic supporters of Marconi predicted when he made his epoch-making discovery. Then it was claimed that in a few years the landline and the wireless would be put out of commission by this newest discovery and would be regulated to the museums for outworn devices. In an address which he

gave at Government House in this city when entertained by Governor Boyle at the time Marconi expressed his belief that before many years he would be sending telegrams across the Atlantic for a penny a word. That has not come to pass, and very real progress has been made by the cable companies in the meantime which have laid many cables since then, and much larger and finer cables than ever before, and have seen their business grow tremendously in the past quarter century. One thing must not be forgotten in considering these various handmaids to human advance, namely, the absolute secrecy which the landline and the cable supply as compared with the publicity, if one may use the term, of a message spoken into the air and broadcast to the four winds of heaven. Wireless, of course, fills a well defined place in the economy of human progress to-day, chiefly between ship and ship, and between ship and shore, and we have seen it find an entirely new place for itself in what we know as "radio" or "broadcasting," an adjunct, it aims to play a still moreness progress which the world's history can show nothing to approach.

In the development of this agency the "A.T. and T." has played a prominent part, but in the development of transatlantic telephony as a business adjunct, it aims to play a still more conspicuous one. Its association with this problem is not a matter of yesterday. As long ago as 1915, during the first period of the Great War, engineers of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company succeeded in hearing at the Eiffel Tower in Paris the words which other engineers of that company were speaking at the naval radio station near Washington, the capital of the United States. That achievement marked a new epoch, but it was not until eight years later, in 1923, that means had been perfected

for carrying on a two-way telephone conversation across the ocean, and it took four more years, until 1927, before facilities could be provided and transatlantic telephone service established by His Majesty's Post Office Department, which operates the telephone in Great Britain, and by the American telephone and Telegraph Company in America.

Of course, wireless, or radio, is used as the medium of trans-oceanic communication at present, but the submarine telephone cable is designed to be a prime factor before long. The last annual report of the "A.T. and T." company says on this subject:—

"The volume of transatlantic business continues to increase and has at times overloaded the radio-telephone facilities. A short wave channel is now in use supplementing the long wave channel.

"The increasing use and further development of transatlantic telephony will require further facilities. During the year the research engineers of the Bell Telephone Laboratories perfected a means of making a transatlantic telephone cable. This cable, when constructed and laid, will not only substantially increase the facilities for transatlantic communication but will also provide a circuit of maximum reliability. In the meantime, radio-telephone transmission is being further developed and more transatlantic radio channels are planned.

"The transatlantic telephone service originally established between the United States and Great Britain, has been extended to Sweden, Norway, Denmark, France, Spain, (including Ceuta in Africa,) Belgium, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, and in the city of Danzig. The Bell system was already connected with the telephone system in Canada, Cuba and Mexico. The 19,200,000 telephones of the Bell

system can thus reach more than 8,600,000 telephones in Canada, Cuba Mexico and Europe, making it possible for any of these telephones in the United States to be connected with any one of 27,800,000 out of the total 32,800,000 telephones in the world."

We are all familiar with the telephone as it is in use to-day in our own communities, but in order to appreciate the advantage which may follow the enactment of the legislation the Government is proposing at this session, I think it would be worthwhile to speak a little of the organization which has been largely responsible for the modern telephone and of the part played by that organization and the telephone service furnished by it and its Associated Companies in the United States.

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, with which the Government proposes to make the contract, is a Corporation under the laws of the State of New York, having its principal office at 195 Broadway, New York City. It was incorporated in 1885, just nine years after the Philadelphia Exposition, and at first was merely an agency to furnish long-distance lines and to do long-distance operating in connection with the transmission of telephone messages between the localities in which local telephone companies had already sprung up. The breadth of vision of those behind the enterprise is shown, however, by the fact that the Company's charter authorised it to construct and operate telephone and telegraph lines "throughout the known world."

Originally its authorised capital stock was \$100,000, but in the intervening 44 years this has been increased from time to time to an authorised capital stock of \$2,000,000,000, of which more than \$1,250,000,000 is issued and outstanding in the hands of some 450,000 stock-holders. These

stock-holders are scattered all over the world, and no single stock-holder owns as much as one per cent of the company's stock. Dividends have been paid uninterruptedly, and since 1920 the dividend rate has been nine per cent. The Company is often called the largest single corporation in the world—certainly it must be regarded as one of the largest.

The following review of the Company's operations is taken from the financial section of the New York Times of April 14, this year:

"A net income of \$40,647,079 after all charges and taxes, equal to \$3.15 a share earned on 12,909,980 average number of shares outstanding during the period, is reported by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company for the first quarter of 1929. This compares with \$33,594,793, or \$3 a share earned on 11,090,515 average number of shares outstanding, in the first quarter of 1928.

"Telephone revenue of the company in the first three months of this year was \$27,696,990, against \$23,762,013 in the first quarter of last year, a gain of nearly \$4,000,000, due to increased use of domestic long distance lines and transatlantic telephones at the lower rates established on March 31, 1928, for both services.

"Dividends received in first quarter from the company's stock holdings in operating companies of the Bell System showed a gain of \$5,400,000 at \$32,935,754, comparing with \$27,511,851 in the first quarter of 1928. This includes the dividend on March 30 of \$1 a share on stock of the Western Electric Company, comparing with 75 cents paid by that concern a year before.

"Interest and other revenue showed a gain of almost \$1,000,000 at \$4,802,787, comparing with \$3,891,290 in the first quarter of 1928. Total income of the company was \$65,435,531, against

\$55,165,154, an increase of \$10,270,377 or 18.6 per cent.

"Expenses and federal taxes were \$18,905,378, against \$16,156,659 a year ago, an increase of \$2,748,719, and interest was \$5,883,080 against \$5,413,762 leaving a net income of \$40,647,079, an increase of \$7,052,286, or 21 per cent. Dividends of \$27,402,512 were paid in the first quarter of 1929, against \$24,952,839 in the same period, of 1928 leaving a surplus of \$13,244,567, against \$8,641,954, an increase of more than 52 per cent."

The history of business development throughout the world, especially in later years, is largely a story of mergers and consolidation. This tendency is reflected in the telephone history of the United States. Scattered local companies were combined into companies operating throughout a State, as the New York Telephone Company operates in New York State, or throughout several states, as, for example, the New England Telephone and Telegraph Company which operates in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. There are twenty such companies whose operations now include 14,000,000 out of the 18,000,000 telephones in service in the United States. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in addition to its long distance operations, owns a controlling interest in eighteen of these twenty companies, and a minority interest in two of them. It is the parent company to the huge enterprise known as the Bell Telephone System. An idea of the magnitude of the Bell System's operations may be gained from the last annual report of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, which shows that the Bell System's investment in telephone plant is the stupendous sum of \$3,275,686,848. During 1928 its local or exchange revenue was more than

\$640,000,000, and its long distance or toll revenues were in excess of \$300,000,000. In the Bell System today are more than 62,000,000 miles of wire built, maintained and operated by an organization of 500,000 men and women. Last year these wires handled a daily average of fifty-nine million individual telephone conversations. Of these more than fifty-six million were local or exchange calls, and nearly three million long distance calls. These great developments should not be passed over without mention of the research and development laboratories of the Bell system—now employing a staff of 4,000 people, more than one-half of whom are highly-trained scientists and engineers. It is their work which is about to bring into being another new marvel, the long distance submarine cable for transatlantic telephony. Experiments are still going on but as the extract which I have just read from its last annual report shows the Company is satisfied that the project is feasible and it is preparing to contract for the cable and the associated equipment. It is expected that when the experiments are finished it will take a year to make the cable and another year to lay it, equip the terminals and place the whole in operation. When that has been done transatlantic telephony should be as sure and as constantly available as is our local telephone service today. The trend of business activity in telephony is to make an increasing use of long distance facilities. The "A.T. & T." Company's last annual report states that while the Bell System's revenues from local services increased \$40,000,000 or 66 per cent over the previous year, revenues from toll and long distance service increased 38,000,000 or 14.1 per cent. It also refers to the same matters thus:

"The most striking development in the telephone business in the United States during 1928 has been the increased use of the telephone for long-distance calls. While this use has been undoubtedly stimulated by general business activity and the rate reductions made in 1926 and 1927, the increased speed and improved quality of service have been the largest contributing factors. The total number of messages handled over the long-distance lines of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company was 18 per cent in excess of those handled in the previous year. For the longer distances, such as between the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, the increase has been 100 per cent. The country is becoming 'long-distance minded,' and is acquiring a new telephone habit. Improvement of service—an essential factor in this growth is long-distance usage—is in turn dependent upon adequate and dependable facilities. With this in mind, the Company began some years ago the construction of long-distance toll cables. At the beginning of 1925 the investment in the long-lines plant and equipment of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company was \$140,000,000. At the end of 1928 the investment was \$262,000,000, and it is planned to spend more than \$80,000,000 for additional facilities in 1929. At the same time that the number of long-distance telephone messages has been increasing, the other services furnished through the use of the long-distance plant have been steadily growing. Chain broadcasting on a national scale, which has become an important factor in the life of the nation, is making extensive use of telephone wires for the interconnection of broadcasting stations located throughout the country. Press associations, manufacturing enterprises, commercial and

banking houses, are making more and more use of net-works of circuits leased for their own exclusive use between widely-separated points. The majority of these circuits are operated as telegraph or typewriter circuits, although many are for telephone use. In eight of the principal cities, offices are maintained for the transmission of pictures by wire, and during 1928 arrangements were made with the telegraph companies by which facsimile telegrams and messages are sent over this telephoto system."

Although the principals of this Company do not commit themselves to any statements as to the future development of such agencies as telephoto and television, it may be assumed that they are not overlooking them. Telephotony is the means by which pictures of printed and written matter can be transmitted long distances and reproduced exactly; in other words, photographs of them can be sent. By means of television equipment it is hoped to be able to utilize electric currents so that people at long distances from each other can see each other, as they speak to each other. Already, as hon. members know, moving pictures, until recently silent, as they are at the various picture houses in this city, are being equipped elsewhere with apparatus by means of which the spoken story is heard by the ear as the picture is seen by the eye. To use the language of the hour, the "movies" are being replaced by the "talkies," and if hon. members were in New York or London today they could enter a picture house and view a movie with speaking accompaniments. Virtually a regular play can be seen through the agency of the screen and talking attachment as one would see a regular theatrical performance. The world has witnessed many mar-

vels in the past thirty years and scientists say that it is only on the threshold of infinitely greater marvels. That those who head the "A.T. & T. Co." have all these matters under consideration I think there is no doubt. Men of the vision and foresight which they have shown in building this vast and flourishing corporation are undoubtedly keenly alive to what the future has in store in these departments of electrical science, and Newfoundland, if my view is right, will profit by many other developments as well as telephonic communication, in the years that are to come.

Moreover, activity as to telegraph and telephone advance is not confined to this side of the Atlantic or to companies such as that with which we are now dealing. Only last month measures were completed by which the leading cable company in the British Isles extending eastward through Europe, Africa, Asia and the Far East, to Australia, China and the lesser countries of the Orient, and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., effected an amalgamation through the agency of the British government, with the object of securing that the maximum advantage may be derived to the British public, and the people of all the countries served by these agencies, through this combination. Heretofore there has been much competition between the "wire" and the "wireless" organizations, competition which was proving hurtful to the companies themselves and equally inimical to British interests. By this consolidation the peculiar advantages of the two systems will be utilized for the common good. There is little doubt that similar reasons are actuating this combination to those which are influencing the company promoting this Bill. The aim appears to be the improvement of existing services, and

to pave the way for placing at the disposal of the people of the Old World, however remote and however backward, the great auxiliaries to human progress which we in this Western Hemisphere are coming to enjoy in a steadily increasing degree.

The new English merger Corporation, to be known as "Cables and Wireless, Limited," is to be capitalized at £53,700,000, say \$270,000,000. It is headed by Lord Inverforth, the principal of the big shipping and mercantile firm of Andrew Weir & Co., of London and Glasgow, who was so conspicuously successful as Minister of Munitions in the later stages of the War and afterwards as Chairman of the Liquidation and Disposals Board, through which all the excess war stores were disposed of. Associated with him are Mr. I. C. Denison-Pender, Managing Director of the "Eastern" Cable Company, and Mr. F. G. Kellaway, Managing Director of the Marconi Company, and a board of directors representing the leading business interests of the Mother Country.

In England the telephone system is operated by the Post Office just as the telegraph is, and "radio" or "broadcasting" is also controlled by the Government through a special agency known as the "British Broadcasting Company." All these are linked up with this new merger through Government representatives on its directorate, the most notable being Lord Clarendon, who is Chairman of the Broadcasting Company, and Sir Basil Blackett, who represents the Treasury or Finance Department.

Progress of telephone business is a feature in this new scheme. The April issue of the British "Telegraph and Telephone Journal" records the continued expansion of the telephone service in the British Isles. There were on December 31st last 1,759,666 telephones in Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, an increase of 125,864 on the previous year's total, the largest increase yet recorded in the country. In five years the total number of telephones increased from 1,148,095 to 1,759,999—an increase of 611,571, and the ratio of inhabitants to telephones improved from 39 to 25.8. During that period the London telephone system increased from 401,065 to 614,183, having added nearly 100,000 telephones to its total within the last two years. Since 1926 Manchester has increased from 50,254 telephones to 57,329, Liverpool from 48,349 to 53,308, Glasgow from 47,649 to 52,249, and Birmingham from 39,642 to 45,898.

At the end of January the number of telephone stations working in the British Isles was 1,730,782—an increase of 8,199 during the month. The increase in London was 3,387 and in the provinces 4,812. The number of inland trunk calls during December was 8,906,427, bringing the total number for 1928 to 107,592,369; this figure represents an increase of 7,613,940, or 7.6 per cent, in the total for 1927. Outgoing international calls made during December numbered 35,325, making the total for the year 421,914—an increase of 101,327, or 31.6 per cent, on the previous year's total.

Of these records the most significant is the latter, which shows that telephone conversation between the British Isles and outside countries increased 31.6 per cent, or nearly one-third, in 1928, over the previous year. This proves that England, like America, is becoming more "long distance minded," and making much greater use of this agency for communication with the rest of the world. It will be through connection between the "A.T. & T. and these British systems that the facilities proposed by the bill now before us will be developed very largely. This telephone cable will connect with the British Post Office system of

telephones for communication within the British Isles, and with it and the telephone systems of the different countries of Continental Europe, for communication with these various countries; and as the years pass, and the system is perfected we may look to see the advantage of this convenience extended to the great Indian Empire and even farther.

The contract submitted to you to-day follows the lines of previous contracts for the laying of transatlantic cables. Under it the company gets the right to land its telephone cables on our shores on terms and conditions as favourable to the company as those under which any other cables, present or future, are granted landing rights in this country. No monopoly, however, is created and other companies will be able, if they so desire, to secure landing rights for similar cables hereafter by making other contracts with the Government of the day.

The Government now undertakes to authorize this company to connect its system with the system in this country for the purpose of transmitting telephone messages to and from Newfoundland, with the provision that the telephone cables may be used for telegraphic purposes to any extent which will not interfere with the telephone service for which they are primarily designed.

The Company agrees to pay annually \$4,000 for each cable, with a maximum payment of \$20,000 a year. A through cable, one section landing in Newfoundland, and the other leaving here, are counted as two distinct cables for the purposes of this tax.

The Government agrees to grant the Company, free of charge, out of any unimproved Crown Lands which may be available, sites for the erection of the Company's station houses and

cable houses; provided that the aggregate of such plants shall not exceed a maximum of fifty acres, and also grants to the Company, through unimproved Crown Lands and the Public roads and highways, (except in the city of St. John's where it must make its own arrangements with the municipality,) the right to construct, maintain and operate poles, wires, cables, etc., for the conduct of the Company's business, such routes to be approved by the Government. There are the customary provisions whereby the Company can enter upon private property, and open public roads for the purpose of laying and repairing its cables, and overhead lines, damages caused thereby to be settled by arbitration in the customary manner in such agreements in the past. It is also provided that all apparatus, tools, and equipment necessary for the original installation of the Company's cables and landlines and which are not manufactured in this country and not available in quality and quantity necessary for the Company's purposes and all spare cable and vacuum tubes needed for the repair and maintenance of the Company's cables and landlines, shall be admitted free of duty. This clause gives the Company fewer concessions in this respect than previous Companies enjoyed and shows that the Government is fully alive to the protection of the Colony's interests.

It is further provided that the rights granted the Company are upon the express condition that when it constructs the section of its cable between here and the mainland, the Company will provide facilities for transmitting telephone messages between here and the mainland, and also provide suitable facilities for connection between its lines and the Government or other telephone systems in Newfoundland so that telephone messages may be transmitted at reason-

able rates between here and points on the mainland and also between here and points in Europe.

Finally, it is stipulated that the Company must begin work within two years and have the cable laid and ready for business within three years, or the contract lapses.

The Contract, in all its features, is virtually identical with those made by previous Governments with the Companies that have laid telegraph cables to our shores, and wherever there is any variation it is in the line of further safeguarding the colony and its rights in the matter.

The construction of the cable will be the first step that will follow the enactment of this measure and I understand that this work will be put in hand very shortly. It will introduce some very striking new features, and represent a marked advance on any now in existence. Last year the Western Union Cable Company, a subsidiary of the A.T. & T., as already remarked, laid a telegraph cable from Bay Roberts to the Azores, 1350 miles, which was entirely new departure in ocean cables. Through the enclosure of the cooper core, (which is the conducting agency in every cable) in a ribbon of what is termed "permalloy" an alloy of nickel and iron developed in the laboratories of the Company, which, under certain conditions is many times more magnetic than any other known substance, the speed of this cable was raised to 2500 letters per minute making it easily the fastest cable in existence. The new telephone cable, I am informed, will possess some even more striking features.

The next step will be the selection of a route for the cable from the mainland to our shores. This will be done by charting a suitable stretch of the ocean bed, where it can be easily laid and yet be some distance from cables

already submerged, so that it may not be injured by repair ships grappling for other cables that may have been disabled. If the same policy is pursued as with several existing cables, it will start from Canso N. S., and probably land in Placentia Bay, a distance of some 450 miles. From there it will be "trenched" or buried underground, across the Isthmus of Avalon and submerged again in Conception or Trinity Bay, whence it would be carried along the ocean bed of the Irish Coast, a distance of 1850 miles, where connections would be made with the European systems.

The cost of this cable will be very large—how great a sum I am not prepared to say. Some existing telegraph cables have cost as much as \$1500 a mile and the possibility is that this may be still more expensive. The landing of it and "trenching" it across the Isthmus will give a lot of labor and a cable station will have to be built, like those at Hearts Content, Bay Roberts, and St. John's, with a staff of operatives, who, I trust, will be mainly Newfoundlanders.

Because of the heavy cost of the cable itself the service that will be given cannot but be expensive, in the very nature of things. Indeed, Hon. members will appreciate that but for the fact that Newfoundland serves as a stepping-stone between the two continents we could not expect to enjoy the advantages of this facility at all.

Some idea of the cost of this service can be gathered from the rates already in use. For a 3 minute conversation, which is the standard time in telephony on this side of the water, the rate from Sydney to Boston at present is, \$2.55 for a day "talk," \$2.10 for an evening "talk," and \$1.40 for a night "talk." In other words, during the day, when the telephone lines are busy, it costs about 50 per cent more than if you have your talk at night,

when business is slack. The principle, it will be seen, is much the same as that of the "night letter," now so popular as a means of telegraphing, the advantages of the telephone being, of course, that one can talk with the party at the other end and do business much more satisfactorily than by an exchange of telegrams. The rates from Sydney to New York are \$3.00 for a day "talk," \$2.45 for an evening "talk," and \$2.10 for a night "talk." From Sydney to Chicago the rates are \$5.00 for day, \$4.25 for evening, \$3.00 for night. Rates suggested for talks between St. John's and Sydney are somewhat higher in proportion, because of the cables that intervene. They are \$2.60 for the day, \$2.35 for the evening and \$1.90 for the night. In the same way the rate from St. John's to Boston would be for the day service, \$5.15, evening, \$4.45, night, \$3.30. Between St. John's and New York rates would be,—day, \$5.60; evening, \$4.80; night, \$4.00. From St. John's to Chicago they would be,—day, \$7.60; evening, \$6.50; night, \$4.90. From St. John's to London the rate would be, it is thought, about \$45 for three minutes. Some people may think these rates high, but sixty years ago, when the Atlantic cable was started, the rate for a message was one pound sterling a word. The majority of people of that day held up their hands in horror at such rates and predicted utter ruin for the Cable Company but, as we have already seen, the cable business grew,

and grew, and grew, until to-day there are, as I have said, 21 distinct cables across the Atlantic and the tentacles of the system have spread over every ocean and brought the remotest portions of the world into close connection; while between Europe and America the growth of business has been such that to-day it is possible to send messages across the Atlantic at as low a rate as four cents a word.

In proposing this contract I have in mind the tremendous trade advantages which are certain to come to all of Newfoundland if we can have telephonic communication with the mainland of North America, and with Great Britain and Continental Europe. It is a great satisfaction to me that we have been able to bring our negotiations to a head with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, an institution whose record of achievement and whose unquestionable financial standing are the best possible assurance that the anticipated facilities will be soundly engineered, well constructed, and operated to provide the high standard of telephone service for which the Bell System is honored throughout the world. I shall not attempt to specify the advantages we will have when we have access to, as we will when the connections contemplated by the Agreement are completed, and direct connections with ninety per cent of all the telephones in the world.

Address of Mr. Emerson in Committee of the Whole House on Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Agreement between the Government and the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, Ltd. (Omitted by error from Report of House Proceedings on April 24th, 1929.)"

WEDNESDAY, April 24, 1929.

MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I should have to rise with the same feeling as expressed by Mr. Puddester. I think that the Speech of the hon. member for St. John's West, Dr. Campbell, was utterly unnecessary. Whatever little enlightenment we got from the Prime Minister, we received nothing from Dr. Campbell, except abuse. And the one point that he did bring out was in connection with our being in this very favorable geographical position. And the Prime Minister goes to seek out somebody to take it from us. He was not sought. This Company did not come to him and ask him to sell them the landing station. He went and sought them. With this Company paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in dividends and profits, we give them this for twenty thousand dollars a year as a maximum, to land as many cables as they like, and the more success they make under this contract, the more we lose, and not content with doing that we offer them the right to bring in goods duty free.

What is the value of the duty free concessions? Nobody knows. Apparently, at least so far as we know, nobody has advised the Prime Minister or the Executive Government on the technical side of this. We have been told by the Prime Minister and the member for St. John's West, that the position is valuable. If it is valuable, why in the name of goodness do we not make something out of it. We have been told that we are going to get \$4,000 per cable. That

is the same tax as imposed on the Commercial Cable Company when the value of the money was about one-third what it is now, and still we stick to the same rate. If it is going to be the valuable adjunct to the assets of a wealthy corporation, as we are told it is, why not raise the rate to equal in money what we are getting from other companies. You cannot increase the rate from four thousand to twelve, but there is no reason why we should go and beg people to come in here and pay us four thousand dollars when they ought to pay twelve thousand.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We can increase the rate if necessary. The contract provides that subject to a change in the Act.

MR. EMERSON.—Then I suggest that you should. But the Prime Minister might have made it clear. So far as I read the contract you cannot charge them more than \$20,000, no matter what we do.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is in comparison with other companies. Provided that it is subject to the amendment of the Act.

MR. EMERSON.—Well, why stipulate this in the contract. Why not say, "We are going to tax you what we like."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You are not considering it intelligently. The contract is that they pay a maximum of \$20,000 a year provided, however, that the Act of the Legislature which has already set \$20,000 as the maximum for a cable coming into the country may be amended, and if it is amended by be-

ing doubled or trebled, they must pay the extra payment the same as any other company.

MR. EMERSON.—It only makes the verbiage of the contract sillier. If we have the right to tax the cable companies any amount we like, why make a contract with a maximum amount in it. And there is another aspect to this contract. We have no information, at least this House has no information, as to what taxation is paid by these companies elsewhere. We have heard all about their great wealth, and in the face of that we are charging them practically nothing, and we are giving away what the Prime Minister and the hon. member for St. John's West have called a valuable asset. Why don't we charge them enough? Because it seems to me that the amount of duty that will not be paid under this agreement will approximate very nearly to the \$4,000 that they are paying us. At any rate we do not know and, therefore, I say that we ought to have more information about the technical and the practical side of the matter, and as to what the duties that they are going to escape amount to and as to what taxation in other countries amounts to. Then again we have no control over the rates they may charge. There is no provision for the price to be referred to the Government and we are entirely at the mercy of this company, as of all corporations that rush contracts through this legislature and perforce we must continue to be in the same position, as of old.

I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a comparison between the words in section three of the resolutions and the words in another Act which the Prime Minister read.

(Reads)

In comparison with another Act that I think you read, sir, the following

words appear, "of companies stations." But in this Act no such words as "companies stations" occur.

In the Act of 1911 after the words "Installation" come the words "Of the Company's Stations."

(Reads)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, we might change the wording and put those words in. I don't know if the end of the telephone line is to be a station.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I don't see why we should give them wider powers than we have given existing companies, and I suggest we should put in those words for the purpose of limiting them when they are importing in connection with stations.

While we are on that particular section. I would like to point out two principles that I think ought to be adhered to by the Government in connection with all such contracts. I don't see in the first place the necessity for a contract. All bills of a private nature should be introduced as private bills instead of by contract. The continuation of following the precedent of introducing such bills in this way is continuing an evil that ought to be checked. The second principle I would like to refer to is that speaking generally we should guard against the granting of concessions. We should only grant concessions when it is absolutely essential for the starting of enterprises.

When we grant concessions in connection with the freedom of duties. The Company concerned should have to pay the duty and get a rebate. That is the only way we will ever know the value of concessions we are granting. At the present time the International Paper Company, the A. N. D., Buchans Mine, Besco, and other large corporations are importing goods duty free. I

assume in their favour that they are importing in a way that is fair and within their contracts; but we do not know the amount of duties they are excused from paying and just what we are losing by allowing those goods to come in duty free. As to the giving of concessions of freedom from duty in the future. I repeat that in every such case the Company should be made to pay the duty and get a rebate afterwards; instead of being free from duty they should obtain a rebate less perhaps one or two per cent to cover the cost of banking or other arrangements.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You wish to have the words “of company’s stations” inserted there. I shall look that up.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the contract now before the Chair, and with regard to contracts put through by this legislature in the past, I spent three or four years over there in the Opposition in practically the same seat as Mr. Emerson and it is nice, I might say, to be over here now and to be able to see those gentlemen who were on this side of the House change their opinions so quickly. They passed the Bill for Buchans Mine a couple of years ago and I notice today when this Bill is going through, which after all is not as important as the Buchans Mine Bill, that they have a different way of looking at it altogether.

At that time when the Opposition asked for the House a statement of just what dutiable articles would be coming duty free, in order to see what the Company was going to get, we were turned down flat and sneered at and laughed at for even attempting to intimate we had rights in the House. I would not speak like this only I went through the mill for

two or three years. This contract here to-day is not a contract for the development of the resources of the country; it is an experimental contract; it is a contract something like what the hon. member for St. John’s West (Dr. Campbell) discussed that Cyrus Field attempted when he put a cable across for telegraph purposes. This Company is making an experiment in the same way for telephone purposes and are using Newfoundland as a jumping off place for their telephone wire as the other company used it for the telegraph wire.

Supposing we said to the Company we won’t allow you to land here unless you pay exorbitant taxes. They would say, alright, we will continue on to the Azores; and we would not even get the \$20,000; we would get nothing. What would the Opposition say in that event? I venture to say every member of the Opposition would come in and abuse the Government because they would not do it; everyone from the Leader of the Opposition down. But it was quite a different matter when the Government of the day came in with contracts for the development of the country, such as the Buchans Mine contract, the Bell Island contract, the International Paper Company contract, contracts that materially affected the future of the country in as much as they mean the development of the country, which this does not. There is no labor going to be got out of this, it is merely the advertisement the country will get that will be worth considerable ultimate benefit to the country. But these other contracts that were passed, they sold out the country. They came in in 1925 or 1926 with the Besco contract, signed, sealed and delivered by the Executive Government, and swallowed it and went out, and it never came off the Order Paper, and gave them free

export, and up to the present time didn't even have the decency to try and collect their back taxes; that is, **allowed them to get away with owing the country \$750,000.**

MR. PUDDISTER.—From 1920 to 1924?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—1919 to 1924.

MR. PUDDISTER.—That was partly during the term of your Liberal government under the present Prime Minister. I do not know that the last government did not collect anything.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—They did not collect anything. What they did collect was spent, \$10,000 passed by Minute of Council for which there is no record; and a further \$6,000, stolen during 1926-27, and slashed around to party heelers, and then they have the impudence to come in and criticise this Government or some other government for errors made in the past. Then the late Government went and took somewhere in the vicinity of ninety or a hundred thousand dollars and tried to buy their way into the Treasury again. Look at the Auditor General's report and you will see how that was done.

I give the Bill before the House my hearty support, and in reference to what the country may lose in the way of duties, I don't see what the country is going to lose in the amount of duties that would have to be spent in building the various cable houses, but anyway there is a benefit for the revenue, particularly in view of the fact that I feel the advertising we will get in connection with this will be of great benefit. In the event of the Company making a success of the transatlantic telephone, it will not alone enhance the value of the company's assets, but Newfoundland will find the benefit. I therefore give this Bill my very hearty support.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is meant by tools, would this cover picks, shovels, axes etc. known as hand tools manufactured in this country and known as goods in common use.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, an army of lawyers would be needed to define "Common Use."

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, would you consider giving them wide open freedom.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would be quite willing to limit the word 'tools' to the extent wished by my friends the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Emerson.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, would they import very much apparatus.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the apparatus would be very great, it is necessary to import the highest quality that the technical and practical world could supply. The apparatus would have to be scrapped every six months or so, not because it would be worn out but because increased scientific development would render it antiquated. Increase in tools too would depend on scientific development. You must remember, gentlemen, that this undertaking is merely in the experimental stages, for instance take the case of wireless, apparatus which was quite up to the minute two years ago is very inefficient to-day, and we cannot expect these people to pay duty on machines which are worthless. We should treat them exactly as we did the Anglo. Of course we will not allow them to bring in doors and etc. as was suggested but merely articles needed to land cables and install machines and appliances necessary for the telephone apparatus.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I quite understand allowing them privileges as regards scientific apparatus and etc., but I would not like to see privileges granted to them which, say for instance, a local company formed with a capital of \$100,000 would not dare to ask for. Let them pay what ordinary individuals would have to pay and give the ordinary man a look in in his own country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
(Reads)

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—This doesn't help the local man very much.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't object very much if it only covered things which could not be manufactured in this country but I would not like to see things such as doors and sashes etc. which can be made here brought in duty free.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am willing to meet the demands of my friends on the other side of the House and we can let the matter stand over so that we can insert words so frank that we won't have to buy any rubbish as may be manufactured in this country.

MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, before we pass on I would call the Prime Minister's attention to that question which called forth his remark so that our combined intelligence may see where a grave error lies and so rectify it before it is too late. The company is limited to paying a maximum tax of \$20,000 and no other. We must face this situation calmly and logically, and I say that this clause was inserted to exempt this company from ever paying from now to Doomsday any more than \$20,000 a year no matter what any other Cable Company in the Island is paying. In my experience the drafting

done by lawyers for a corporation has always been very deliberate.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The International for instance?

MR. EMERSON—Yes, maybe you remember that I was the only one who spoke in public against it.

By the public statute the taxes on this company like every other cable company may be increased or decreased at will. It may be increased from four thousand dollars up or decreased from four thousand dollars down. This resolution states however that the company cannot be charged for more than five cables. If the tax can be increased at will what is the object of stipulating a maximum amount that they can be charged? There is nothing in these resolutions that will permit the company being charged for more than five cables. The question is does the Act of 1905 apply to this. In point of law, as the Hon. Attorney General and my learned friend Mr. Bradley, will fully appreciate, when there is a special statute and also a general statute, and there is a discrepancy between them, the special statute will over-ride the general statute. If this is to apply then I ask that the Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Traffic on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon,'" 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. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, these two acts are correlated. These powers are now in the hands of the Highroads Commission under one Act; under another Act in the hands of the Constabulary, and under another Act in the hands of the Municipal Council. The object of these two Bills, the one amending the Highroads Act and the other the Municipal Act, is to have the general power for all highroads in Newfoundland under the Highroads Commission, in the case of St. John's subject to the approval of the City Council. The only object is to give authority to the Highroads Commission to make regulations for Newfoundland generally on the recommendation of the Constabulary; for St. John's on the same recommendation, approved by the City Council. The section changes the penalties in connection with a person intoxicated in charge of a motor vehicle. It sets out severe penalties for a man driving a motor car while drunk and doing damage.

(Reads)

Section 48 of the general Act provides for a fine of \$10, and also loss of license. If he is merely drunk he is proceeded against under Section 48 and is liable to a penalty and the magistrate has authority to suspend license. Section 73a gives a stringent series of penalties.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I will just give the House some information as to what we are trying to get at by the Bill. Section 4 reads as follows:

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is proposed to eliminate the words "and shall be a prior charge, etc." and substitute the words:

(Reads)

The idea is that there have been in some special cases temporary permits issued by the Customs Department to some persons and then probably something may turn up and they do not pay the proper duty on it and later on they may import some other goods, and this changed Section 4 of the Customs Act empowers the Customs to protect itself by holding this new lot of goods coming in and get the money for the first lot.

Section 34 is amended to read:

(Reads)

Under the amended Section 35:

(Reads)

Some business houses may come down and be without a proper invoice and require their goods in a hurry, and there is authority to pass a Bill of Sight and pay the duty on the Bill of Sight. According to the present Act the importer is supposed to take the bill up in thirty days, but at the present time there is something like \$100,000 in this way in the Customs House. When I went in there was something like \$170,000 outstanding. People passed Bills of Sight and never brought invoices down; the amount goes into a Suspense Account and does not go into the general revenue of the country. This empowers the Customs Office to take that money from Suspense Account and put it into general revenue; because nine times out of ten somebody comes down and passes entries and pays the correct valuation or a little less; if he pays less duty the Customs are out of luck, but if he pays more duty he will come back and get a rebate. Naturally he would do that. But we want to do away with

this and have the person at the end of the thirty days take up the Bill of Sight. This gives power to get after them after thirty days expire.

Section (6) says: "Sub-section (1) of Section 56 of the said Chapter as amended in Section 3 of the Act 17 George V., (1926) Chapter 32, entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of The Customs" is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

56. (1) "Such domestic value shall be the current value of such goods in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptance of the term, and as sold in the ordinary course of trade: Provided that a discount for cash, for duty purposes, shall not exceed 2½%, and shall not be allowed unless it had been actually allowed and deducted by the exporter on the invoice to the importer."

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr Speaker, I am wondering if the Hon. gentleman would embody in this Section an amendment, that is, to increase the 2½ per cent to 3 per cent. I think the English Government have 2½ per cent; the American Government have 2 or 3 per cent, I think 2 per cent for sixty days and in some cases 3 per cent for ten days and there is a half per cent extra on the invoice.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to acceding to the Hon. gentleman's request. When we go into Committee we can have the amendment inserted in the Bill; but I want to point out that there are some importers in this country who are trying to get away with from 20 to 25 per cent. For instance, take motor car importers who get a big discount. They get 20 and 25 per cent discount and they have been trying to pay the duty on the cost of the cars less their

commissions, and this Bill here is a protection against that kind of business.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I think the last Section is the most important one in the Bill and I think it is possible for us to have some provision made in it whereby some good for the country will accrue therefrom. It is a known fact that shoes have been coming into the country that have been invoiced for as low as thirty cents. Now there is no chance for our local manufacturers to compete against that. These goods have been brought as jobs at bankrupt sales abroad and were sold cheaply because the greater portion of them were stained.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I might say that from my experience in the Department what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said is in part correct. Not alone have cheap shoes been brought into St John's, but they have been brought into other sections of the country as well, and to show that I have done the best I could in connection with the matter I sent appraisers to various parts of the country to have the goods valued and if they found the goods when examined under-valued to have the duty collected on them. Consequently, I am having the words "Minister of Customs" as it appears in the old Act eliminated and the words "Board of Customs or any Newfoundland Customs Officer" substituted therefor, because when there is no Minister of Customs presiding the Customs are up against it, but under the new Bill the Deputy Minister Mr. LeMessurier and his assistant can function in St. John's and any Newfoundland Customs Officer in an outport.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I commend the Hon. Minister of Finance for getting this amendment made to the

Act. There is no question about the demoralization that has been brought about over the importations of job lots of goods to this country and the practice has done a considerable lot of damage to local manufactories as well as to proper business men who do their business in a proper and qualified manner. Not alone have shoes been brought in cheaply, as has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, but dry goods of great variety which were purchased by some buyers who happened to be lucky enough while abroad to be on the spot when a bankrupt sale was going on. Another business man buying practically the same class of goods pays the current price for them and he can be undersold to the extent of sixty or seventy per cent here by the man who bought out the bankrupt stock as a job. The trouble is that in the past Governments have not put proper valuation on that class of goods when collecting the duty. Now the Minister's amendment provides against a continuation of that practice and I hope it will be carried into law, because it will protect the revenue of this country. There is no question about it that for several years past the revenue lost a hundred thousand dollars a year on account of the improper valuations being put on imported job goods. It may be said that the consumer pays, but the country loses and the taxpayer has got to make it up in some way. I hope that the Minister will have qualified men on this Customs Board and no doubt the revenue of the country will increase greatly if proper valuations are put on all goods coming in in the way I have described.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—
Mr. Speaker, I have no private motive

in suggesting this matter of the importations of shoes; but we recognize the fact that local industries must get fair and decent protection, if we got to survive. I know of the benefits local manufacturers get and in the main their ambitions are to get sufficient protection to enable them to pay their employees fair and decent wages in order that they and their families may live in comfort and contentment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Dr. Mosdell the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs,'" 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. DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, this Measure has been introduced at the request of the Pharmaceutical Society and the intention, I understand, is to give students of Pharmacy some facilities in respect to a college course as is given to, say, students at law. Thus far it has been impossible for a student of Pharmacy to complete his course except he has had some connection with some druggist. Now, under this Bill, facilities are given for college students at the Memorial College where they have an efficient staff and proper laboratory facilities and the intention is to allow a student to enter the Memorial College and there to use the laboratory to get part of his course.

Seeing that the provisions of this Bill are quite satisfactory, particularly to those who have been watching the progress of Pharmacy in this country, I think the House might accept this Bill as it is and I beg to move the Second Reading of it.

INDEX

APPENDIX

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D
Appendix E
Appendix F
Appendix G
Appendix H
Appendix I
Appendix J

APPENDIX

APPENDIX AND INDEX

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D
Appendix E
Appendix F
Appendix G
Appendix H
Appendix I
Appendix J

INDEX

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D
Appendix E
Appendix F
Appendix G
Appendix H
Appendix I
Appendix J

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D
Appendix E
Appendix F
Appendix G
Appendix H
Appendix I
Appendix J
Appendix K
Appendix L
Appendix M
Appendix N
Appendix O
Appendix P
Appendix Q
Appendix R
Appendix S
Appendix T
Appendix U
Appendix V
Appendix W
Appendix X
Appendix Y
Appendix Z

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY,

- Motion for, 8.
- Committee on, 18.
- Draft, 30.
- Presentation of, 172.
- Governor's Reply, 182.

APPENDIX, 525.

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER.

- On Petition from Port au Port re Timber Supply, 29.
- Potato Question, 52, 90.
- Three Mile Timber Limits, 81, 371.
- Highways Traffic Bill, 113.
- Address in Reply, 137.
- Supply, 207, 214, 415.
- Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, 224.
- Bill Relating to Department of Agriculture and Mines, 334, 419.
- Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 339.
- Retiring Allowances Bill, 422.
- Highroads Construction Bill, 455.
- Customs Smelter Resolutions, 490, 512, 519.

ALDERDICE, MR.

- On Resolutions of Sympathy the Royal Family, 6
- Resolutions of Sympathy Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, M.L.C., 8.
- Motion for Address in Reply, 15
- American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 24, 31, 34, 35, 78.
- Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs Bill, 42.
- Highways Traffic Bill, 55.
- Income Tax Resolutions, 75, 76, 77, 163, 164, 167, 299.
- Address in Reply, 96.
- Bill Relating to Departments under the Colonial Secretary, 136.
- St. John's Dry Dock Development, 162.
- Public Utilities Bill, 169.
- Fire Protection Week, 173.
- Alcoholic Liquors Act, 180, 506.
- Supply, 188, 189, 194, 210, 211, 212, 215, 225, 226, 227, 290, 415.
- Petition re Salmon Regulations, 220.
- Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, 223.
- Ways and Means, 405.
- Loan Resolution Bill, 416.
- Bill Relating to the Department of Agriculture & Mines, 418, 419.

Retiring Allowances Bill, 422.
 Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 438, 446, 448, 449, 464, 468, 469.
 Election of Members to the House of Assembly Bill, 460.
 Resolutions of Sympathy Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 471.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 485, 491, 497, 501, 503, 504, 509,
 511, 519.
 Resolutions of Sympathy Mr. R. G. Winsor, 520.
 "Of the Customs" Bill, 546.

ABBOTT, MR.

On Address in Reply, 87.
 Supply, 217.
 Ways and Means, 389.

BRADLEY, HON. MR.

On Income Tax Resolutions, 167.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 501, 503, 504.

BROWN, MR.

On Election of Members to the House of Assembly Bill, 480.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 490, 492.

BENNETT, MR.

On Address in Reply, 63.
 Supply, 192, 214, 215, 216.
 Income Tax Resolutions, 299.
 Ways and Means, 373.

BYRNE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 64.
 Supply, 192, 203, 213, 214.
 Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 339, 439.
 Ways and Means, 376.
 Tourist Commission Bill, 435.

CAMPBELL, HON. DR.

On Temperance Resolution, 20.
 American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 32, 34, 37.
 Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 335, 336, 337, 437, 439, 468, 469.
 Protection of Caribou Bill, 396.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 502, 504.

COAKER, SIR. W. F.

On Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 447, 448.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.

- On Bill Relating to Departments under the Control of the Colonial Secretary, 116.
- Supply, 200, 201.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 331.

DIVISIONS—

- On Department of Justice Bill, 307.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 332.
- Department of Agriculture and Mines Bill, 421, (2nd reading).
- Legislative Disabilities Bill, 433.
- Legislative Disabilities Bill (Committee Report) 453.

EARLE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 131.
- War Pensions Bill, 303.
- Customs Smelter Resolution, 501, 502.

EMERSON, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 42, 49, 100, 101.
- Income Tax Resolutions, 76, 77, 78, 165, 168, 299.
- American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 78, 79, 540.
- Registration of Deeds Bill, 114.
- Bill Relating to Departments under the Control of the Colonial Secretary, 117.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 161.
- Public Utilities Bill, 168.
- Supply, 189, 190, 191, 194, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 211, 212, 214, 215, 226, 228, 292.
- Bill Relating to Department of Justice, 304.
- Bill Relating to Department of Marine and Fisheries, 307.
- Alcoholic Liquors Act, 308, 314.
- Loan Resolutions, 311, 313.
- Burin Peninsula Electric Light Bill, 352.
- Bill Relating to Department of Agriculture and Mines, 334, 353, 420.
- Wool and Silk Mills Bill 336, 337, 465, 466, 469.
- Protection of Caribou Bill, 397.
- Ways and Means, 402.
- Highroads Commission Bill, 423.
- Legislative Disabilities Bill, 429.
- Highroads Construction Bill, 456.
- Election of Members to House of Assembly Bill, 461.
- Resolution of Sympathy Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 474.
- Customs Smelter Resolutions, 485, 487, 498, 502, 503, 504, 509, 511, 512, 513, 514, 516.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER.

- On Income Tax Resolutions, 51, 75, 76, 77, 78, 163, 164, 166, 177, 298,299.
- Address in Reply, 99, 100, 101, 103, 118.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 161.
- Supply, 173, 189, 213, 214, 227, 290, 415.
- Supplementary Supply, 293.
- Merchant Shipping Service Bill, 181.
- Ways and Means, 233, 412.
- Loan Resolutions, 310, 312, 313, 416, 463.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 325.
- Wool and Silk Mills Bill 337, 338, 444.
- Tourist Commission Bill, 436.
- Resolution of Sympathy Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 473.
- Customs Smelter Resolution, 504.
- American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 542, 543, 544.
- "Of the Customs" Bill, 545.

FUDGE, MR.

- On Motion Address in Reply, 11.

FITZGIBBON, MR.

- On Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 441.

GREENE, MR.

- On Customs Smelter Resolutions, 493.

GRIMES, MR.*

- On Temperance Resolution, 19.
- Election of Members to House of Assembly Bill, 461.
- "Of the Customs" Bill, 545.

GODDEN, MR.

- On Terminal Warehouse Company, 48.

LEWIS, HON. MR.

- On Address in Reply, 124.
- Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 338, 449.
- Recovery of Tenements Bill, 351.

MOTION FOR—

- Address to His Excellency the Governor for Transmission to Secretary of State on address of congratulation to His Majesty King George V., 23.

MOSDELL, HON. DR.

- On Pharmaceutical Society and Sale of Drugs Bill, 42, 547.
- Bill Relating to Departments under the Control of the Colonial Secretary, 118.
- Supply, 191, 203, 204, 212, 214, 235.
- Ways and Means, 385.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER.

- On Inspection of Ships Bill, 91.
- Supply, 206, 291, 292.
- Petition re Salmon Regulations, 220.
- Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, 222, 223.

MOORE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 92, 93.

PRIME MINISTER, HON THE.

- On Resolutions of Sympathy the Royal Family, 6.
- Resolutions of Sympathy Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, M.L.C., 7.
- Motion for Address in Reply, 16
- American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 23, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 78, 79, 525, 541, 542, 543.
- Jude Island Fog Alarm, 25.
- Air Navigation Bill, 40.
- Highways Traffic Bill, 56, 113, 114.
- Companies Bill, 74.
- Registration of Deeds Bill, 114, 115.
- St. John's Dry Dock Development, 162.
- Public Utilities Bill, 169.
- Address in Reply, 170.
- Fire Protection Week, 172.
- Alcoholic Liquors Act, 178, 309, 330, 479, 506, 508.
- Supply, 188, 200, 205, 207, 209, 225.
- War Pensions Act, 289, 290, 302.
- Supplementary Supply, 295, 296.
- Public Enquiries Bill, 298.
- Tax on Timber Lands Bill, 301, 423.
- Department of Justice Bill, 303.
- Department of Marine and Fisheries Bill, 307.
- Loan Resolutions, 312, 463.
- Burin Peninsula Electric Light Bill, 314, 352.
- Bill relating to Department of Agriculture & Mines, 333, 418, 421.
- Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 337, 463.
- Tourist Commission Bill, 351, 434.
- Retiring Allowances Bill, 398.
- Inspection of Ships Bill, 417, 418.
- Highroads Commission Bill, 422, 545.

Legislative Disabilities Bill, 433.
 Highroads Construction Bill, 454.
 Election of Members to House of Assembly Bill, 460, 480.
 Resolution of Sympathy Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 470.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 484, 486, 490, 491, 493, 497, 498, 509,
 511, 512, 513, 514, 515.
 Amendments from Legislative Council, 517, 518.
 Resolution of Sympathy Mr. R. G. Winsor, 519.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, HON. MINISTER.

On Temperance Resolution, 20.
 American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 31.
 Supply, 194, 225, 227, 228, 229.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER.

On District Grants, 93, 94.
 Supply, 211, 213, 215, 216, 217.
 Highroads Construction Bill, 454, 458.

PARSONS, CAPT. JOHN.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 8.

PUDDESTER, MR.

On Petition re Salmon Regulations, 22.
 American Telegraph and Telephone Co. Resolutions, 31, 35, 36,
 38, 40, 78.
 Companies Bill, 74.
 Address in Reply, 100, 138.
 St. John's Dry Dock Development, 162.
 Public Utilities Bill, 169.
 Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 181, 330, 505, 508.
 Supply, 184, 189, 190, 195, 196, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210,
 211, 213, 214, 216, 217, 224, 225, 228, 290, 293.
 Supplementary Supply, 296.
 Loan Resolutions, 311, 312, 313, 416, 417, 462, 463.
 Burin Peninsula Electric Light Bill, 314.
 Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 336, 338, 438, 439, 447, 448.
 Ways and Means, 340, 354.
 Bill Relating to Department of Agriculture and Mines, 353, 419.
 Applications for Timber Areas, 372.
 Retiring Allowance Bill, 398.
 Tax on Timber Lands Bill, 424.
 Legislative Disabilities Bill, 430, 453.
 Tourist Commission Bill, 434, 435.
 Highroads Construction Bill, 454.
 Election of Members to House of Assembly Bill, 458, 462, 480.

Resolution of Sympathy Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 472.
 Customs Smelter Resolutions, 492, 493.

PUBLIC SERVICE RESOLUTIONS—

200, 208, 222, 301.

PETITIONS—

Mr. Godden, 21.
 Mr. Strong, 110, 207.
 Mr. Bennett, 21.
 Mr. Scammell, 183, 400, 475.
 Mr. Quinton, 22, 89.
 Mr. Alderdice, 476.
 Mr. Brown, 29, 183, 288.
 Mr. Abbott, 29, 161, 173, 198, 505.
 Mr. Starkes, 50, 219.
 Mr. Grimes, 50, 300.
 Mr. Earle, 350, 451.
 Mr. Green, 50.
 Mr. Tobin, 160.
 Mr. Emerson, 51, 160, 399.
 Mr. Moore, 198.
 Mr. Winter, 51, 288.
 Hon. the Prime Minister, 110, 161, 229.
 Hon. Mr. Lewis, 474.
 Hon. Mr. Bradley, 89.
 Minister of Agriculture and Mines, 219.
 Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 220.

QUESTION, NOTICE OF—

Mr. Puddester, 19, 28, 50, 89, 112, 172, 173, 183, 199, 200, 289, 309, 451.
 Mr. Sullivan, 19, 24, 28, 173.
 Mr. Emerson, 19, 26, 27, 30, 51, 89, 172, 173, 199, 221, 229, 289, 476, 477.
 Mr. Abbott, 30, 89, 221.
 Mr. Byrne, 19, 89, 221, 229, 289.
 Mr. Quinton, 89, 111, 136, 163, 173, 199, 221, 451, 478.
 Mr. Winter, 19, 27, 30, 50, 51, 113, 172, 221, 229, 289.
 Mr. Tobin, 28, 50, 89, 113, 172, 229, 289.
 Mr. Alderdice, 28, 30, 50, 89.
 Mr. Moore, 51.
 Mr. Bennett, 28, 30, 309, 478.
 Mr. Skeans, 28, 51.

QUINTON, MR.

On Address in Reply, 71, 80, 82, 100, 101.
 Supply, 193, 195, 196, 201, 210, 216.
 War Pensions Bill, 290, 302.

Ways and Means, 361.
Wool and Silk Mills Bill, 467.

RESOLUTIONS—

On death of Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, M.L.C., 7.
To Royal Family on King George's Recovery, 6
On death of Mr. M. S. Sullivan, 474.
On death of Mr. R. G. Winsor, 519.

REPORTS TABLED—

Annual Report of Marine and Fisheries Department for 1928, 30.
Public Account of the Colony, 30.
Report of the Superintendent Poor Asylum, 30.
Report of H. M. Penitentiary for 1928, 289.
Report of Child Welfare Association, 309.
Report of Commissioners on Lunacy, 309.
Report of Newfoundland Board of Health, 309.
Report of Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Bureau, 505.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—

On Opening, 4.
On Closing, 523.

SPEAKER, HIS HONOR.

On the subject of Questions, 24, 26.

SELECT COMMITTEES—

On Address in Reply, 18.
On Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes, 197.
On Petition from Newfoundland Wool and Silks Mills, 229.
Report of Committee on Income Tax Resolutions, 229
Report of Select Committee on Petition from Wool & Silk Mills, 300..
On Act Respecting Patents, 505.

SKANES, MR.

On Ways and Means, 394.

SCAMMELL, MR.

On Supply, 195, 196.
Bill Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 308.
Resolution of Sympathy Mr. R. G. Winsor, 520.

SULLIVAN, MR.

On American Telegraph and Telephone Resolutions, 32, 33, 34, 37, 78,
79.

Income Tax Resolutions, 76, 78.

Tax on Timber Lands Bill, 424.

Legislation Disabilities Bill, 430.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTION—

Citizens' Petition, 19.

TOBIN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 94.

Supply, 213.

Ways and Means, 392.

WINTER, MR.

On Address in Reply, 57.

Supply, 206, 291.

Bill Relating to Department of Justice, 305.

Burin Peninsula Electric Light Bill, 314.

Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 322.

WAYS AND MEANS, 233, 340, 354, 361, 373, 376, 385, 389, 392, 394, 402.

Proceedings

OF THE

Legislative Council

DURING THE

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SEVENTH
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

1929

Proceedings

OF THE

Legislative Council

DURING THE

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SEVENTH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1959

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Legislative Council of Newfoundland.

Session 1929.

WEDNESDAY, April 17th, 1929.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature.

At five minutes to three o'clock p.m. the Council met.

At three o'clock p.m. His Excellency the Governor, Sir John Middleton, K. B.E., C.M.G., etc, having arrived at the Council Chamber, the Hon. the President commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to proceed to the Commons House of Assembly and inform the Speaker and Members thereof "That it is His Excellency's will and pleasure that they attend at the Bar of this House."

The Members of the House of Assembly approached the Bar, headed by the Speaker, Hon. Mr. Walsh, who prayed that the ancient rights and privileges pertaining to the Speakership be granted him, and further praying that His Excellency approve of his appointment. The Hon. President, replying for His Excellency, intimated that the rights and privileges were granted and approval given.

His Excellency then read the Speech from the Throne, after which the members of the Lower House returned

to their Chamber, and His Excellency was pleased to retire.

At four o'clock p.m. the Council resumed proceedings, after the clerk had, "for greater accuracy" read the Address of His Excellency.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received a message from the Speaker of the House of Assembly informing him that the House had passed the following Resolution of Congratulation to His Majesty the King on his recovery from his recent illness, and asking the concurrence of the Council therein:

"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

"Most Gracious Sovereign:—We, "your Majesty's dutiful and loyal "subjects, Members of the Legisla- "tive Council and of the House of "Assembly in Newfoundland, in ses- "sion convened, humbly beg leave "to approach your Majesty with an "expression of profound thankful- "ness that the Almighty Giver of all "Good has graciously given to your "Majesty recovery from your severe "and prolonged illness. In common "with your faithful subjects thruout

“the Empire, we rejoiced at your Majesty’s progress day by day, while in our hearts stirred sympathy for our Gracious Queen. We trust that your Majesty may proceed to complete recovery and the fullness of health and strength. Representing the people of this the most ancient Dependency of the Crown, we invoke for Your Majesty, for Her Majesty the Queen, and for all members of the Royal Family, Heaven’s richest blessings.”

HON. TASKER COOK, Government Leader in the Council, moved that the Resolution be passed, speaking as follows: Mr. President—I have much pleasure in moving that the House concur in the Resolution adopted by the other Chamber with reference to the improvement in the health of His Majesty the King. The people of this, the Oldest Colony, were profoundly affected, like the rest of the Empire, and indeed the world at large, by the news of His Majesty’s serious illness, and rejoiced as he gradually recovered from this trying ordeal, while all through the long period heartfelt prayers were made that he might be spared to his people to remain their Sovereign for many years to come. This malady of His Majesty, and the anxiety it caused in the hearts of his subjects has served to emphasize the important place he now occupies as head of the great Commonwealth of Nations, and is an important factor in strengthening those bonds of a common allegiance to the Crown. He is warmly remembered in this Colony because of his visit here with her Majesty the Queen—they being then the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York—nearly thirty years ago, and those whose official position amongst us has brought them into direct contact with the King and Queen have found that they recall with keen in-

terest the circumstances of that visit and the very hearty reception accorded them by all classes of our people. The Legislature, I am sure everybody will agree, only voices the unanimous opinion of our people in adopting this Resolution and in expressing the hope that before many months His Majesty may be completely restored to health, and the anxiety of his family and his friends be at an end.

HON. MR. BISHOP said he was glad to avail of the opportunity of seconding the Resolution. He felt he could not better express the relief of our people, in common with His Majesty’s other subjects, on the improvement in His Majesty’s health, than in expressing his accordance with what had been said by the Hon. Leader of the Government. All had been anxious during the days of His Majesty’s severe illness, and relieved at the daily bulletins intimating gradual improvement in his condition. He was sure that we all hoped that this improvement would continue until His Majesty was restored to his former good health.

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously that concurrence be given to this Resolution, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Lower House intimating that this Resolution had been given the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

HON. TASKER COOK.—I rise to move the following Resolution:

“RESOLVED: That the House desires to record the sense of the loss it has sustained by the decease of the late Honorable Dr. J. Alex Robinson, who for so many years filled a seat in the Council with much credit to himself and advantage to this Body of which he was an ever zealous and efficient member.

“RESOLVED: That a copy of the foregoing Resolutions be sent to Mrs.

Robinson, at the same time expressing the sympathy of the Council with her and the family of their late brother member in the bereavement they have sustained."

In doing so, I would like to express my personal feelings of regret at the loss I am sure we all feel this House has sustained through his demise. The late Dr. Robinson was a man of very exceptional qualities; a scholar, a thinker, and a man of high principles. Born in the Old Country, he came here early in manhood to engage in the profession of school-teaching. From this, after some years, he turned to journalism, which he made his life work, and in which he earned the respect of the whole country. Whether you agreed with him or differed from him, you had to recognize his fine qualities, and the high level on which his newspaper was always conducted. He had the unique distinction of being a member of this Chamber three different times. He was here as Colonial Secretary, some thirty years ago, and resigned to enter the other House. He was here again about fifteen years ago and resigned to become Postmaster General. He returned in 1923 to us and remained with us till the end came. My connection with him here was confined to the last of these periods, but I saw enough of him then, so true were the estimates I had heard of him previous—of his skill as a debater, of the fine quality of his addresses, and of the high standard which marked his participation in our work.

We all heard with deep regret of his illness last summer, and with relief of the improvement in his condition in recent weeks, only to be shocked by the news of his sudden passing some ten days ago. Outside this Chamber, and apart from his journalistic work, he will be chiefly

and gratefully remembered for his labors in connection with the establishment and operation of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, of which he was one of the founders, and to which he gave the most self-sacrificing services for nearly sixteen years as its honorary secretary. What he has done during this period to lighten the burdens of dependents of those who died from perils of the sea it would be impossible to estimate. But certainly his work was such that his memory will be treasured in the hearts of hundreds, if not thousands, in this country. To his bereaved widow and other relatives sincere sympathy will go out in generous measure.

HON. MR. BISHOP took great pleasure in seconding the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the Government in this House. It was his good fortune to have been an intimate acquaintance of the Hon. Dr. Robinson for the greater part of his residence in Newfoundland. For the number of years that the Hon. Doctor had been practicing his profession of school-teaching in Carbonear, while he (Hon. Mr. Bishop) would not claim to have been an intimate friend, he had been an acquaintance, and when Hon. Dr. Robinson had moved on to St. John's this acquaintance had ripened into a strong friendship. This friendship had been beneficial in many ways. That Hon. Dr. Robinson was an extraordinary man was well known to this House, and he (Hon. Mr. Bishop) regretted greatly that Hon. Dr. Robinson had passed on, for his loss would be great both to the Legislative Council and to the country.

HON. M. P. GIBBS.—I rise to join with others in the expression of regret and condolence fittingly made because of the death of one, who in no ordinary manner graced this Council Room. The passing of the late

Hon. Dr. Robinson removes from our midst one of a type and standard not easily replaced. Following so shortly upon the detailed account of a life so replete with usefulness, it is not necessary that I should recall his many works. His activities did not follow the "narrow round," his enthusiasm led him into many spheres of public service and welfare, and in all of them he exhibited a pertinacity of purpose and lofty idealism which does him credit. His principles were drawn from the standard of another age and because of their usefulness, we admire them and give their exponent unqualified honor.

Principally is the late Hon. Dr. Robinson known as one of the leading newspaper men. That field is a field of wordy warfare and heated controversy. Instances may have been when many may not have agreed with his contention, but there never arose an occasion when anyone denied his candor or admired the absence of the expression of personal feeling. For neither in this nor in other activities did he stoop to the artifices of men of lesser worth.

In the arena of the political life of the country he had a long and varied career. His labors stretch over a period of thirty-six years. During that time he performed many important services and his accumulated knowledge and extensive experience made him a valued asset to this Council Room.

As one of the founders and the moving spirit in the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, he has earned the gratitude of many a fatherless home, and this work alone will gain for the late honorable gentleman the assurance that, in this instance, the good will not be interred with his bones.

HON. MR. ANDERSON was glad to take this opportunity of giving his whole-hearted support of the motion

that had been made. Forty years ago Hon. Mr. Anderson had become acquainted with the Hon. Doctor, and had always held him in the highest regard. His passing leaves a decided blank in this Chamber. Hon. Dr. Robinson was a keen debater, a great thinker, and it would be difficult to fill his place. Hon. Mr. Anderson and the deceased had had many arguments on national affairs, but through it all they had remained the closest friends. Associated with the services Hon. Dr. Robinson had given to this House were those he had rendered to the country at large, and for which his passing would be doubly mourned.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I wish to associate myself with the previous speakers in regretting the passing of our late Hon. member, Dr. Alex. Robinson. Dr. Robinson was a fine speaker, a good debater, an old parliamentarian, and will be a great loss to this branch of our local Legislature. He was a successful newspaper man, and a forceful writer and although a great Imperialist, had a fond place in his heart for Newfoundland, the country of his adoption. His great work for the Permanent Disasters Fund should not, and I feel will not, be forgotten by the people of this country, especially the beneficiaries of this organization. There is one outstanding feature in his career to which I would like to refer, and that is his pronounced success as a schoolmaster. It is well known that our late member taught school years ago in Carbonear, and had such high ideals and regard for honesty and independence that he imparted these virtues to his pupils, so much so, that in our firm's business transactions in that town, we only experienced one unsatisfactory account, and that for a very limited amount, over a period of twenty years transactions. I only mention this fact to show that the good seed sown by

our late member has borne fruit to a large extent, and honesty and independence are now the attributes of most of the Carbonear business people who were formerly his pupils. We can ill afford to lose men of the stamp of Dr. Robinson. I therefore regret his passing and tender my sympathy to his wife and the other members of his family.

HON. MR. SINNOTT said he desired, like the other honorable members, to add brief tribute to the memory of the late Hon. Dr. Robinson. In 1926 Hon. Mr. Sinnott was in close touch with him when they both went as representatives of the Newfoundland Legislature to Australia for the British Empire Parliamentary Conference. Hon. Dr. Robinson represented the Upper House and he (Mr. Sinnott) the other Chamber. They had gone out via Canada and the Pacific and had returned via the Indian Ocean, the Suez Canal, Europe and the Atlantic, and their association, which naturally had been a close one, had been for Hon. Mr. Sinnott one of the most pleasant possible. He had found Hon. Dr. Robinson, under all circumstances, to have a kindly and considerate disposition which won him many friends. The Hon. Doctor was a well-informed traveller whose companionship was always welcome. More than that he had a well-stored mind. In the discussions and meetings of the Conference he made one glad to realize that he was representing Newfoundland. In their daily journeying on that Conference he gained the respect and admiration of his fellow-travellers for his personality and his knowledge. Hon. Mr. Sinnott said he cherished the memory of that association as one of the most enjoyable he had or ever expected to have, and sincerely supported the resolution.

HON. THE PRESIDENT.—Honorable gentlemen, as a fellow-journal-

ist, may I also pay tribute to the late Hon. Dr. Robinson. In the profession of journalism in this Colony he held a high place. I can readily recall his launching in 1894 of the then doubtful experiment of a morning journal. We have seen it grow in a generation to be a powerful organ of public opinion, preserving the ideals and aspirations of its founder. His code of editorial ethics was a strict one!; the strictest, I should think, ever adopted by any local journalist, but he lived up to it loyally. He produced a paper of varied interests, wherein his articles were welcomed no less for their sound information than for their attractive style. His writings always bore the mark of the finished scholar; some of his descriptions of natural beauties of land and sea, enshrined in the volume which told of his visit to Australia, being admirable examples of word-painting of a high order.

In his political career his code of ethics was equally strict and if he could have induced others to view public services as he did and to join with him in his efforts, we might be better off as a country. But he had always the satisfaction that he was true to the principles he advocated and that his conscience approved of his course, which, after all, is the truest reward. I would speak of him too, as a war worker, in which capacity he gave noble service both personally and through his newspaper, during the whole four long years of the great struggle. In his editorials he never showed a faint heart or suspicion of doubt. The note he always struck was that of serene confidence as to the outcome, and when the clouds were blackest the tonic effect of these writings was beyond measure. The war funds his paper launched or supported were many and most helpful, and his personal services on behalf of every patriotic endeavor were

given freely and without stint. In similar fine spirit of labor for the public good was his work during the past fifteen years for the Marine Disasters Fund, which will, I hope, remain as an enduring monument to him. Of his services in this Chamber it is needless to say more than that his guiding purpose was always the public good and that his actions and speeches were always inspired by that motive. Some words used by Premier Baldwin in unveiling a memorial to Viscount Cave, seem to be applicable to our deceased colleague:

"If I were asked to sum up in one word the impression which his character made on those who knew him best, I would say it was his luminous sincerity in all that he did And what we have learnt to revere in him and to lean on, was that luminous sincerity, that integrity that nothing could touch, that loyalty, deep-seated and unchanging, and a quiet courage that nothing could deflect."

The motion being put was carried unanimously, and it was ordered accordingly.

HON. MR. COOK gave notice of a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Oaths and the Administration of Oaths."

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Mr. President. I beg leave to propose a Select Committee be appointed to draft a reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. In doing so, I avail of the opportunity to associate myself with the expression of sincerity and thankfulness on the recovery of His Majesty the King from his severe illness. We are pleased to learn that we can look forward to his again assuming the duties of the high office, for the well-being of the Empire which has characterized his reign.

I desire also to avail of the opportunity afforded to express deep sympathy for the loss which the French Nation has sustained through the death of Field Marshall Foch. The name and fame of this distinguished man while it primarily belongs to the great Republic of France, nevertheless, is, and will be, claimed by all lovers of liberty. There are names which humanity claims as its own. Such is the name of Foch, the great Marshall, fostered and by his assiduous care developed those rare traits of character which are always associated with true greatness. His funeral was a demonstration of love, of admiration and of gratitude. To his ability as a soldier, to his resource, his courage, results give best attestation, and consoling indeed must have been the thought that he lived to see the dawn of that peace for which he marshalled the Allied forces and led them to victory.

I extend to His Excellency the Governor a cordial welcome and express the wish that the happy relations which he has already established with the people of the country may continue.

Since we last met, two Members have been appointed. I bid them welcome and congratulate them upon their appointments and feel assured that as the Session progresses, we shall be the gainers by their experience and knowledge.

The Speech which has just been read by the Clerk contains proposals of an economic and industrial character, which, if handled in the manner which their importance deserve must result in much benefit to the country. I notice in the Speech that a Commission will be appointed to revise the Tariff and in this work, the Government should have the co-operation and support of all intelligent citizens, no

matter what their Party affiliations may be. I know it is a very difficult matter to frame a Tariff that will suit all interests, but I think we must all agree that the Tariff may be so framed as to produce greater revenue. Certain necessities of life are too highly taxed with the result that consumption is restricted and the high rate of duty, instead of producing more revenue, has the very opposite effect.

We are greatly handicapped in the endeavour to formulate economic policies. In framing legislation and revising Tariffs, we have not that expert help and advice which Governments in other countries possess, with the result, through no fault of ours, work in these respects is faulty.

In Australia there is a Permanent Tariff Board and no action may be taken with respect to Tariff without a report and recommendation of the Tariff Board. The members of the Board are carefully selected so as to represent not so much political parties as the different interests normally associated with the industrial, commercial consuming elements of the population. Prompt publication of the findings and recommendations of the Tariff investigating Committee is called for. From this system, we can gather three instructive facts: First, the need of men of knowledge of matters pertaining to the business of the country; Secondly, the need of a permanent fixed body; and, Thirdly, the need of publicity in their findings. The last is becoming a growing factor in the making of Legislation.

In this country we have not adopted a settled program as to the mode of revising a Tariff. Conflicting interests and insufficiency of detailed statistical information, necessitate that we defer a revision until business or revenue warrants a more or less comprehensive revision. I look forward to

the day when uncertainty in these matters will be dispelled by the adoption of the more progressive modes used in other countries and when business men can plan with certainty.

The Speech has reference to a Bill for Taxing Income. I think that a distinction should be drawn between earned and unearned incomes. The unearned income ought to pay a higher Tax than the earned. In the case of a man who saves from his income, the saving is generally invested in the further development of his business and therefore, if this distinction is not made, the man who saves is penalized and the Government and the country lose in the end. However, when this Legislation comes before us, we shall be better able to give expression to the form Legislation of this kind should take.

It is a source of pleasure to learn of the favorable balance of trade for the country, and I think we can reasonably look forward to a continuation of it. The many and promising projects now being developed, point to increased purchasing power upon the part of the people. Trade and industry alike must benefit from expansion, and diversification of earning power, and it behooves us to stabilize laws governing industry and the investment of capital so that nothing will be done to retard development.

Reference is made in particular in the Speech to the increased export of iron ore from Bell Island, and the development of the Lead Zinc deposits at Buchans.

Facts stare us in the face, showing that the wage scale is too low and that living conditions demand immediate consideration. Particularly is this true of Bell Island, and it speaks well for the law-abiding character of our people that they have been so quietly endured. The unskilled worker is paid

in many cases a lesser rate of wages than is paid by the average city employer, while the work is of a more arduous character. The Government, I feel assured, representative as it is of the masses, will investigate these conditions and apply the proper remedy.

It is a source of pleasure to learn that an effort is being made to find a solution for the problem of unemployment. This question seems to be a disease peculiar to Modern Industrialism. To even the most unobservant, it is easily apparent that our city is greatly over populated. Its industries cannot support its numbers. There are at least one thousand families who, since the close of the War cannot from the work obtained earn enough to provide themselves with the commonest necessities of life and the result is poverty and an appeal for Government help. A large percentage are families who left the Outport and came to the City during the War, attracted by high wages and plenty of employment. How to deal with this surplus population is a difficult matter. But the difficulty is evidence of the urgency. Its solution will call for all the resource which human ingenuity can bring to bear.

It is a further mistaken economy to believe that cheap labor pays, and this false economy must ultimately decrease the number of skilled workmen. This irrational desire to hire the man who works two or three cents less per hour is contributing cause to the influx of unskilled labor to our city who form a large part of the unemployed. Contributing causes such as these tend much to aggravate our city problems. At its best, this mode of employment is but a small save, but it carries further burdens which even, upon the individual employer, casts burdens which he is loath to carry and which today, are having a detrimental effect upon his business.

I notice in the Speech that a Commission will be appointed to study problems connected with the Fisheries. If we have the beaten path with regard to this matter, much permanent and lasting good will be accomplished but if the personnel of the Commission be entirely composed of those engaged in the fisheries, I fear that good results will not accrue. While we cannot hope to emulate the prosperity of our neighbours, we can, at least, learn from the results of their economic and industrial life which show that scientific research is and will be the dominant factor.

The problems of trade and industry are not being solved by legislation, but rather by the chemist in the laboratory by the application of scientific research and thought. Recent events in this country afford us a great object lesson. For nearly forty years the existence of a large deposit of ore was known to exist in the vicinity of Red Indian Lake, but because of the complex character of the ore, it was of no value, because the cost of extracting it was too great and I believe, there was no known process by which it could be accomplished. But what has happened within the past few years? The chemist after persistent study and continual experiment, ultimately found a process by which the mineral substance could be separated and made commercially valuable, the result being that this mineral body which was of no value is to-day worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

The chemist in the laboratory has solved the problem, and thereby, injected new life into that section of the country. Can he not likewise solve many of the problems which confront our fishermen- When science can convert into hundreds of millions that which was of no value a short time ago, is it not worth any effort on our

part to apply the lesson to our fisheries and call in the aid of scientific men to create new values out of that which go to waste. I hope to see the day when scientific research will be applied to aid in the more successful and profitable carrying on of the fishing industry.

During the Session, we shall be asked to discuss legislation effecting many and varied interests. It behooves us as members of this House to fashion legislation in such a manner that the ultimate beneficiary will be the country and not private interests.

With the adoption of this attitude, the goal will be within easy reach. The opportunities to attain it are many, and no person knows what he can accomplish unless he makes the effort. The intelligent critic will not look for greater perfection in Government than is to be expected of individuals, but what is expected is that earnest and sincere effort aided and directed by clear thinking and intelligence be used in helping to solve our industrial and economic problems.

HON MR O'DEA.—Mr. President, allow me to express my appreciation of having the honor to second the motion for the appointment of a committee to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, and in doing so would like to refer to a few salient points.

Every Colonial has just cause to feel grateful for the recovery, thus far, of His Majesty King George the Fifth, who has proven himself a wise and good ruler. The British Empire in the last decade and a half, has passed thru the most critical period in its history. During this period European monarchies were overthrown and Republic were established, but when the last shot in the Great War was fired, King George not only remained Ruler of the Empire, but became even more affec-

tionately and firmly enshrined in the breasts of his subjects, and other nations learned, as never before, perhaps, to respect the principles of monarchical government, which, as we know it, and long may it flourish, is no longer incompatible with true democracy, His Majesty's protracted illness has undoubtedly brought us all nearer to a realisation of his true worth and character, and this would seem a fitting time to express the hope that his sojourn at the seashore will restore to His Majesty fullness of health and strength.

A hearty welcome to our shores is extended to His Excellency Sir John Middleton, K.B.E., C.M.G., who arrived in St John's last autumn as the King's representative, to take up the duties as Governor and Commander in Chief of the Colony. This is his first experience as Governor in a Colony with Responsible Government. His educational attainments, together with his vast experience and his splendid record in administrative and civil service duties for a period extending over twenty-eight years in Gambia, Falkland Islands, Mauritius and elsewhere, augurs well for success in his new found land, and may success attend his every act.

It is with deep sorrow that I refer to the death of the Hon. Dr. John Alexander Robinson. Although in failing health for some time, hopes for his recovery were entertained, but an unexpected change brought an honorable life to a close. Hon. Dr. Robinson was prominently associated with the public life of this Colony for many years, and always held in high esteem by his fellow citizens, and the Legislative Council displayed a tribute to his distinction in selecting him as their representative to the meeting of the Parliamentary Association Conference in Australia in 1926. Perhaps there is no

better testimony to the sterling worth of the deceased than his success as a journalist.

Endowed with excellent powers of mind, he exercised his genius to instruct and elevate, and his influence was felt thruout the country, Through the columns of his paper, each and every deserving cause had his vigorous support, and indeed it may be said that Dr. Robinson has left a priceless legacy to Newfoundland in the -Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, for the inception of which he was in a large measure responsible. His self-sacrificing and untiring efforts, given without any thought of self, to the cause of destitute widows and orphans must assuredly leave an indelible impress on our memories. His bereaved wife and relatives have our sincere sympathy.

It is gratifying to note that the results of last year's fishery were fairly satisfactory, the advance in market value being more than enough to offset the short catch; that conditions on Bell Island have improved, the ore output exceeding the previous year by one million dollars in value; and that paper exports also show an increase of one million dollars over last year. The trade balance in favour of the Colony is shown to be five million dollars in excess of 1927. The increase in the revenue of \$230,000 for the quarter ending 31st March, notwithstanding the substantial reductions in the duties on lines and twines, butter, clothing and tobacco, is very pleasing news. A revision of the Tariff is to receive attention of the Ministry.

The increased output of the mills, the development of the lead-zinc deposits at Buchans and the efforts to develop St. George's coal fields are all factors that must help to relieve the labour market.

The Government is to be commended for the proposed substantial increase in the vote for Education.

Re-enactment of the Income Tax is contemplated; the man in the street will have no serious objection to this. It is an interesting fact, and it will surprise many to know, that in the neighbouring Dominion, where the exemptions are \$3000 for married and 1500 for single persons, twelve in a thousand pay income tax. In Newfoundland in 1924 about fifteen hundred or only about six persons in every thousand paid income tax. If the exemptions then in force, viz.: \$2000 married and \$1500 single, be increased the number of persons liable for this tax will be proportionately decreased. This tax is a burden which the wealthier classes, who are the only ones concerned, should bear without complaint.

If the Commission recently appointed by the Government to enquire into the unemployment question can evolve a satisfactory and workable scheme to relieve the distress which is especially apparent during the winter months, a meritorious service will have been performed and the appointments justified.

The Ministry is to be congratulated on the general outlook which is by no means discouraging.

I have much pleasure in seconding the motion, so ably proposed by my honourable and learned friend, for the appointment of a Committee to draft an address in Reply to His Excellency.

SELECT COMMITTEE

The motion that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's gracious Speech from the Throne was carried unanimously, and the following were appointed as members of the Committee: Hon. Messrs. Gibbs O'Dea, Anderson, Steer and Davey.

Hon. the President informed the Council that he was in receipt of a message from the Secretary to His Excellency the Governor to the effect that leave of absence had been granted to the following members of the Council: Hon. Messrs. D. A. Ryan, C. F. Ayre, Sir M. G. Winter, A. Kean and R. B. Job

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTION

Hon. the President then informed the House that on February 28th he had received a letter enclosing the following Resolution. The letter was signed by the Rev. L. Curtis, and prayed that the resolution be read to the Hon. Members.

WHEREAS prior to 1913 practically the whole of Newfoundland outside of St. John's had come under a Temperance Reform Measure known as the Local Option Act; and

WHEREAS on November 4th, 1915, by a plebiscite taken at the Polls, Newfoundland adopted the prohibitory measure making the importation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes after January 1st, 1917, illegal; and

WHEREAS in 1924 the Legislature of Newfoundland, without reference to the electors, and in face of numerous protests, enacted the Alcoholic Liquors Act at present in force; the effects of which have been to produce poverty in the country, destroy the happiness of numerous homes, increase the illicit traffic in alcoholic liquors, and debauch large numbers of our people;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly of citizens appeal to the Legislature to greatly modify the iniquitous Alcoholic Liquors Act of 1924, and restore in some measure to the people of Newfoundland the principle of Prohibition for which they voted in 1915.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of these Resolutions be for-

warded to the Prime Minister, to the President of the Legislative Council, and to the city press.

Hon. the President directed that the Clerk enter this matter in the Minutes of the day's proceedings.

Hon. Leader of the Government laid upon the table of the House the following reports: Annual Report of the Registrar of Births, Marriages and Deaths, Report of the Board of Liquor Control, Report of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Cook the House adjourned until Monday April 29th at four o'clock p.m.

MONDAY, April 29th, 1929.

Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a message received from His Excellency the Governor informing him that the following had been appointed as a Commission of Internal Economy:

The President of the Legislative Council,

Hon. Tasker Cook,
Hon. John V. O'Dea,
Hon. the Speaker,
Hon. H. M. Mosdell,
Hon. F. G. Bradley,
HON. P. J. Lewis.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a message from the Speaker of the House of Assembly asking the concurrence of the Council in an address to His Excellency the Governor dealing with the message to His Majesty the King. This was passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that the Council had passed the same.

HON. MR. GIBBS presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to draft an address in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. The report was received and read a first time, and on second reading.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said I wish to make a few observations on the gracious Speech of His Excellency the Governor, and take advantage of this opportunity to welcome him and Lady Middleton to Newfoundland, and hope their stay will be pleasant and that their term of office will be profitable to this country. Our new Governor, Sir John Middleton, has a good deal of administrative experience and I have no doubt but the fund of knowledge he has acquired from time to time in this capacity will be used by him while here for the best interests of this Dominion.

In common with other loyal subjects of the Crown I rejoice at the recovery of His Majesty the King from his tedious illness, and hope that after a short while he will be restored to his usual health and vigor to continue ruling over the destinies of our far flung Empire.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome the two new appointees to this chamber, Hon. Mr. Sinnott and Hon. Mr. O'Dea.

Both these members are successful, independent business men, and no doubt their experience and wisdom will be an addition to the deliberations of this Council.

I wish to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the Address from the Throne, and feel they did very well considering the poor material they had to work on, as it was quite evident during their addresses that they were straining themselves to say something favorable about a speech that lacked anything of a hopeful character for the country.

I notice in the speech that it is proposed to appoint a Trade Commissioner in London in place of a High Commissioner, and wish to say that there does not appear to me to be as much warrant or necessity for a Trade Com-

missioner in London as there is for a like official in New York.

Nearly all our goods that are shipped to London and Liverpool are for transshipment to European ports and are well cared for and forwarded to their destination by resident agents for our exporters in these cities.

I am convinced that the hope of Newfoundland for its staple industry lies in the development of Trade on the American continent.

Our largest firms have realised that the old fashioned methods of marketing our fish are antiquated and no longer profitable.

Our competitors on the mainland have recently marketed fresh frozen fish in western cities at remunerative prices and several of our large enterprising firms are now engaged in developing this business which is felt to be the economic solution of our Fishery problems. With these facts before us it would seem imperative that we should have a Trade Commissioner in New York to look after this new and important development.

The country had a live representative in New York a few years ago—well conversant with our business affairs and I presume his services are still available and if the Government is in earnest in its desire for Trade expansion there would be no better way to show their sincerity than in reviving the New York Trade Commissionership without delay.

It is alarming to find that reference to the century old sealing industry is confined to fifteen words reading as follows:—"The Sealing fleet still engaged in their arduous work appear to be reaping substantial success."

This brevity is deplorable when we realize that this industry is fast nearing extinction through the apathy of this and preceding Governments. I

spoke in this strain last session on this important matter, and the results of this years sealing voyage fully endorse the fears expressed pointing to the decline in this fishery.

Aviator Caldwell has gone on record after having flown 6,000 miles at the icefields the past five years, that the seals are decreasing in numbers and were only to be found in small patches of 1,000 to 10,000 each, and apparently the main patch exists only in the minds of a few deluded sealing captains.

I claim that it is the imperative duty of the government to-day to establish a close season of five to eight years for this industry, and if necessary pay a dividend of say 5 per cent to the owners of the wooden sealing fleet to represent interest on the capital locked up during the protective period.

The steel fleet under this arrangement need not be considered as they have other earning power outside of the seal fishery.

It is pointed out that a Newfoundland close season would open the door to foreign competition in this industry. My answer to this is that we can follow the precedent of the United States by making an International agreement similar to that enacted at Washington in 1893 to protect the fur seal fishery in the Bering Sea.

It is regrettable that the obnoxious income tax is to be revived. I look upon this measure as class legislation therefore unfair and unjust. Only the few pay the tax while the majority escape it, through one subterfuge or another. Our previous experience of the Income Tax was that only the scrupulous honest person paid any tax at all, and my contention therefore is that the fairest way in this country to collect taxes is through the general revenue at the Custom House.

We are informed in the Governor's Speech that there are five Commissions to be appointed, viz an Unemployment Commission, a Tariff Commission, a Public Utility Commission, a Fishery Commission, and a Commission to enquire into the administration of Hospital and Charitable Institutions.

It strikes me Mr. President as very peculiar that these Commissions are necessary considering that the country at large last October elected a Commission of 29 Members at a salary of \$1,000.00 each or \$29,000.00 per Session to conduct the affairs of the country and why go outside their ranks now to appoint further Commissioners at further expenses to the already overburdened taxpayers.

The only solution I can arrive at is this that the Government have already realised their incapacity and are endeavouring to escape the responsibilities due the Public who elected them.

The Address was then read a second time, a third time, passed, and it was ordered to be presented to His Excellency by a deputation of the Whole House as at time suitable to His Excellency.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read messages from the Speaker of the House of Assembly stating that they had passed the following bills, in which they asked the concurrence of the Council:

An Act Relating to Air Navigation.

An Act Relating to Loan Act 19 George V, Chapter 18.

An Act with Respect to Municipal Affairs.

An Act to Amend the Customs Act.

An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshments.

An Act Relating to the Pharmaceutical Society.

On motion these bills were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT tabled the annual report of the Highroads Commission.

HON. JOHN ANDERSON gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask the Honorable the Leader of the Government in this Chamber to lay on the table a detailed statement of the affairs of The Dominion Co-operative Building Association, Limited, which was recently declared insolvent by the Monroe Government and the Royal Bank of Canada; the said statement to date from the time the said Association's affairs were taken over by the said Government and Bank, also a statement showing on what authority, and from whence derived, the said proceedings were taken against the said Association, together with all correspondence relating thereto.

On motion the Council adjourned until 3 p.m., Wednesday, May 1st.

WEDNESDAY, May 1st, 1929.

The Council met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

AIR NAVIGATION BILL

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to Air Navigation," said: Mr. President and gentlemen, some time ago the owners of the aircraft used in connection with the seal fishery applied for registration for the machine in England. They were refused registration there owing to the fact that they had to register in the country in which the machine is owned and in which it operates. That brought up the question of the passing of legislation in Newfoundland in harmony with Great Britain, Canada and the United States—legislation dealing with the

registration of air craft and the regulations of air navigation. This Bill is not an originally locally drafted bill. Its sections are in most instances a copy word for word, of the Canadian Act. The Canadian Act is entitled "The Aeronautics Act of 1919" and forms part of the recognized Statutes of Canada. Insofar as the act was inconsistent paragraphs or phraseology have been left out or modified. The only section which is a new one is the local conditions. In view of the fact that air navigation has created a new situation, the circumstances and conditions of which are subject to rapid change, no legislation on the subject is specific and definite in character, but it provides authority for the Government in charge to make rules and regulations which they may cancel or change from time to time, as circumstances render necessary, without it being obligatory for them to bring in a new Bill suited to the changed conditions at every session of Parliament.

Under this Act the Minister responsible in connection with aerial navigation, the registration of air ships and of all matters relating thereto, is the Colonial Secretary, and the power to make rules and regulations and to cancel or vary the same is vested in His Excellency the Governor in Council.

This Bill deals with the latest marvellous development of the transport of people, mails and freight by air, and brings to mind the prophetic vision of Lord Tennyson in his lines—

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be;
Saw the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales."

The Bill was then read a second time, passed, and ordered to be submitted to

a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

THE LOAN BILL

HON. MR. COOK in introducing the Loan Bill, stated: This Bill is self-explanatory. There were certain irregularities in connection with the last loan. The Executive Government of that day overlooked some formalities in connection with the matter, or were guilty of some error of judgement in connection with the tenders and matter of rates of exchange. On the 26th of July 1928, they found it necessary to pass the following Order in Council:

"Whereas under the Loan Act, 1928, the Governor-in-Council was empowered to raise a loan upon the credit of the Colony of \$10,000,000.00 or on equivalent amount in sterling money of Great Britain, Calculated at the rate of exchange prevailing at the date of raising same.

"And whereas tenders were invited for the purchase of debentures securing the same Loan at a rate of exchange of \$4.86 2-3 to the pound sterling.

"And whereas on the date of the acceptance of the tender of the Bank of Montreal, the Dominion Securities Corporation, Ltd., and Wood, Gundy & Co., Ltd., the actual rate of exchange was \$4.87 7-8;

"And whereas on the basis of exchange at \$4.76 2-3 the total amount of sterling money tendered was £2,005,400;

"And whereas on the basis of exchange at \$4.87 7-8 the equivalent of \$10,000,000.00 would be £2,050,402. 5s 2d. and consequently an excess of £4,997. 14s. 10d. has been raised;

"And whereas it is desirable to make good the tender as made and accepted;

"It is resolved, and the Governor-in-Council undertakes with the Lend-

ers, that there will be introduced at the next session of the Legislature an Act to repeal Section 7 of the Loan Act of 1928, and to enact a section in place thereof in the following terms or to the same effect:

"For the purpose of carrying out
"The provision of this Act the Governor-in-Council shall have power
"to raise, instead of the above mentioned sum in dollars, an equivalent amount in sterling money of
"Great Britain calculated at the par
"exchange, viz.: \$4 86 2-3."

To carry out that Order in Council the present Government introduced this legislation. Each step in connection with the matter is explained paragraph by paragraph in the Bill itself. This Bill has nothing whatever to do with any new Loan. It deals exclusively with the validity of a certain portion of the old loan raised a year ago by the late administration.

In answer to Hon. Mr. Anderson's enquiry as to how much of the ten million dollar loan of last session had been used, the Hon. Mr. Cook replied that the present Bill had not its object the raising of a new loan, but rather the rectifying of the matter of the rate of exchange over which an error had inadvertently been made.

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

On motion of the Hon. Leader of the Government the second reading of the Municipal Bill and the Customs Bill were deferred until to-morrow.

RESTAURANT BILL

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshments," stated this Bill was submitted to the Legislature by the Attorney General on the special

request and suggestion of the Inspector General of Constabulary. The police have found it difficult to cope with the illicit sale of intoxicating liquors under certain circumstances and to keep under control certain restaurants, several of which are under Oriental management. The Bill gives the police the power that they need in this connection, and is one which had the unanimous support of the House of Assembly.

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

On motion the Pharmaceutical Society Bill was deferred until to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed a Bill authorizing the Government to enter into a contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in which they asked the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion the Bill was then read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Council then adjourned until Friday, May 3rd, at 3 p.m.

FRIDAY, May 3rd, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3 p.m.

HON. MR. ANDERSON requested answer to his question with respect to the Dominion Co-operative Building Association, Ltd.

HON. THE PRESIDENT suggested that the question be deferred for a week or so to enable reply to be prepared.

HON. MR. ANDERSON was not willing that the question be deferred, but desired it left on the Order Paper until the answer was forthcoming.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Relating to Air Navigation." Hon. Mr. Bishop in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment; the report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Loan Bill. Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment; the report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment." Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

RESTAURANT BILL

HON. MR. McNAMARA thought this was an important Bill and stated that he would like to have some information on one or two points connected with it. He desired to know whether this Bill included the closing of shops and stores as well as restaurants, for if it did not it would mean that the evils which this Bill sought to eliminate would be transferred from one locality to another. He felt that the Bill should read that all stores and shops of any kind selling drinks of any kind would be taken to be places of refreshment.

HON. THE PRESIDENT referring to the fines imposed under this Act, pointed out that the Legislative Council has always been opposed to the principle of minimum fines. He suggested that maximum fine of one hundred dollars be included in the Bill, but that the amount of the fine in each case be left to the discretion of the magistrate. It would no doubt happen that there would be cases to which this Act applied to such a min-

or character that a very small fine would be an adequate punishment, and if there were a minimum fine it might work hardship on the offenders. He therefore suggested that the amount of fines less than minimum be left to the discretion of the magistrate.

The Bill was amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Hon. the President. The Committee rose, and reported having passed the Bill with an amendment. The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

THE MUNICIPAL BILL

On the motion for the second reading of the Municipal Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook explained that this Bill dealt primarily with the handling of traffic. It transferred the direction and management of traffic in the city from the Municipal Council to the Inspector General of Constabulary. The change to be effected was being made at the request of the City Council, for in the interests of safety to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic it was felt that the police were the most capable of handling this situation which was becoming more serious every day. The Bill eliminated certain sections in the Municipal Act and transferred the authority under these sections to the Inspector General.

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

In moving the second reading of the Customs Bill Hon. Mr. Cook said that there was very little change effected in the old Act; the alteration was obvious from the Bill before the House and needed no explanation.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be sent to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

THE PHARMACEUTICAL BILL

On the motion of the second reading of the Pharmaceutical Bill Hon. Mr. Cook said:

The Bill to amend the Act regarding the Pharmaceutical Society and the Sale of Drugs was introduced at the request of the Pharmaceutical Society. The purpose of the amendment is to allow students of Pharmacy to spend one year in study at Normal school classes and laboratories instead of putting in their whole time articulated to a druggist. The same latitude in respect to university training is permitted articulated students at law. The amendment in no sense lowers the standard required of those who study for diplomas in Pharmacy; as a matter of fact, the effect is to raise that standard. When the original Act was passed, the facilities provided by the Normal School were not available to students. They have been provided since, and the amendment now introduced gives such students as so desire the opportunity of availing of them. The amendment does not force any student to complete his studies at the Normal School. He can still complete his whole course of training under some registered druggist as aforetime. The amendment simply allows him to choose the alternative method of completing his course. The fact that the Pharmaceutical Board not only approves the amendment, but has asked that it be enacted, is sufficient guarantee that it is calculated to serve rather than to injure the interests of the Pharmaceutical profession.

HON. MR. ANDERSON rose to give his support to the Bill. For the past few days the Imperial despatches had contained accounts of an international meeting of doctors in London, where many questions of medicine and pharmacy had been discussed. He

understood that one thousand were attending the conference. He had endeavoured to find out how many doctors there were in Newfoundland and believed there were one hundred. Our doctors held an annual convention here every year, and one of the most important questions which he thought they should introduce this year was the means of providing a radium fund. Despatches from the Old Country recently told of a thanksgiving offered for the return of His Majesty's good health, and that the form this thanksgiving was taking was the raising of a fund for the acquisition of radium. Radium was very expensive, specks of it costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, but he felt that at the next convention of our medical men this question should be brought up and efforts made to collect a sum sufficient to buy some of this valuable mineral. The Government could be asked to contribute in this way—that it should give an amount equal to that raised by public subscription. If a satisfactory appeal could be made through the doctors' convention and a fund started whereby some of this life-saving substance could be purchased, it would be of vast importance to the country.

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

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH BILL

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Telephone and Telegraph Bill, stated as follows:

More than half a century ago Newfoundland became the stepping stone between the Old World and the New, because of the use by the Anglo-American Telegraph Co. of Newfoundland as a relaying station for its telegraph service between Great Britain and Europe and the Continent of America.

Later, Newfoundland was again used as the transatlantic stepping-stone by Alcock and Brown for their famous transatlantic flight. Newfoundland was the place chosen for some of the original experiments of wireless telegraphy and telephony. This Bill takes Newfoundland a step further and just as the old Anglo-American Telegraph connection made the name of Newfoundland known throughout the telephone world. The telephone world of to-day means all civilized countries, and the telephone world of to-morrow means every race and nation and language of the face of the earth. Every new scientific development makes the world smaller. Distance is no longer measured in miles and space, it is measured by time. When the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires, was in New York in January last he discussed with the representatives of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, Ltd., of New York, the possibility of using Newfoundland in its link of proposed transatlantic cable telephony. As a result of these negotiations the general manager of the long distance lines of the company, and its general counsel, visited Newfoundland a few weeks ago and the resulting negotiations culminated in this proposed agreement. The American Telephone and Telegraph Co., Ltd., is a concern of gigantic magnitude. It is often spoken of the largest individual corporation in the world. Its last annual report shows that its assets as at the 31st day of December 1928 were over \$2,213,000,000. Out of 18,000,000 telephones operated in the United States of America 14,000,000 are operated by this Company. It controls 62,000,000 miles of telephone and telegraph wires and has over 500,000 employees. Its research laboratories employ over 4,000 persons, a large proportion of whom

are trained scientists of high standing and experience. This Corporation has been carrying on the transatlantic Wireless telephone service ever since the idea was inaugurated. When a person in New York, San Francisco or Montreal rings up London, England; Paris, France; or Berlin, Germany, the call goes via the transatlantic cables of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., Ltd. It is well known that as we grow older we become more practical and have not the tendency of youth to see visions. I do not forget however, that the Scriptures tell us that while young men see visions, the old men dream dreams, and it may be that while the young men of the House of Assembly see a vision of future development and progress in this project, so we, the older and more practical-minded men of the Legislative Council may dream about this development and work and pray that it may be expanded with great advantage to this country. The company pays for each cable \$4,000 a year for each landed end, or \$8,000 for a through cable. This is the same as the Telegraph Companies pay. The right of free importation is exceedingly limited, much more limited than the concessions previously given the telegraph companies. The company undertakes that just as soon as the Government possesses a Telephone system in Newfoundland with a sufficiently high standard to make it possible to transmit messages delivered thru its system, or if any company in Newfoundland, whether it be the Avalon Telephone Co., the Telephone system of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. for the telephone system of the International Power & Paper Co. of Newfoundland, or the telephone system of the Buchans Mining Co., reaches the required standard, they will handle the messages. Thus the time may not be far distant when the

fish-seller to St. John's may be able to talk by telephone to his agent or customer in Genoa, Italy; Patras Greece; or Oporto, Spain. The local manager of the Anglo-Nfld. Development Co. may be able to talk to the head office of his company in London; the local manager of the International Power and Paper Co. of Nfld. may be able to do business, voice to voice, with the head office of that Company in New York City. Just as the first Atlantic cable was an experiment, so with this transatlantic telephone cable. I feel just as sure, however, that Newfoundland will be an important telephone centre as the years go by, as we now know that Newfoundland is an important telegraph cable centre. This proposition is no more visionary than the original project of Cyrus Field and his associates in transatlantic telegraphy. I look forward to the possibility of not only one cable connecting Newfoundland with London, and then via London, with Europe generally, but a number of cables, each cable identified with the particular nationality of the people which it serves—a cable service to Great Britain, a cable service to the Republic of France, a cable service to the Republic of Germany, and other cables connected with other sections of Europe and the East, all passing via the shores of Newfoundland, all paying tribute to the Newfoundland Revenue, and all advertising the Island of Newfoundland as a telephonic as well as a telegraphic centre. This Bill represents an important constructive programme for Newfoundland development, prosperity and success, and I have much pleasure in introducing it into the Chamber.

HON. MR. MURPHY considered the idea an excellent one, for it would extend the range of long-distance telephony to countries on European and

American Continents. Residents of Newfoundland would thus be enabled to communicate with relatives in cases of illness. It would also be a boon to business men. No special concessions were to be made, and the privilege was given without any consideration or effort on our part. He heartily supported the Bill.

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

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received messages from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed the following Bills, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council:

"An Act to Amend 13 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) 'Of the Naturalization of Aliens.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. Chapter 24 entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships.'"

On motion the Council adjourned until Monday next, May 6th at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, May 6th, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Council met at 3 p.m.

On motion the Air Navigation Bill and the Loan Bill were read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that same had been passed without amendment.

The Act Relating to Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshment was

read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent the House of Assembly to the effect that the said Bill had been passed with some amendment.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Bill. Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. Committee rose reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

The House went into Committee on the Customs Bill. Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council then went into Committee of the Whole on the Pharmaceutical Bill, with Hon. Mr. Job in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report was received and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the American Telephone and Telegraph Bill. Hon. Capt. Kean in the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB asked the meaning of section 3, whether it meant that no matter how many cables were laid the largest fee would be \$20,000.

HON. MR. COOK agreed that that was the meaning of the section.

HON. MR. JOB raised the point as to reasonable rates, and suggested that now was the time for the setting out of the rates in connection with this telephone service.

HON. MR. COOK replied that the question of rate had been gone into, but that no agreement could be reached. More than that, such rates could only be adjusted after the preliminaries had been completed.

HON. THE PRESIDENT explained that with regard to the cost of the service the greatest difficulty was the cost of the cables themselves and the cost of laying them. Where a land-line cost in terms of hundreds of dollars a mile, cables, with their necessary accessories, cost thousands of dollars a mile. If such a cable were laid it would be laid from Conso, come across the Gulf, and probably terminate in Placentia Bay. It could not be carried across Cabot Strait because of the severe winter conditions and the possibility of ice breaking the cables during the season. The distance from Conso to Placentia would be in the neighbourhood of 450 miles. The original cables between here and Canada had been laid across Cabot Strait, but they had to be abandoned for the reasons given above. The Commercial Cable Company, operating in this city had laid another cable across the same stretch, but had met with the same trouble. So when considering the question of cost of service, one had to take into account a figure that would give some return of the cost of construction. With reference to the question of the rate of \$20,000, that is the maximum figure paid by the Commercial Cable Co. and other companies here, no matter how many cables they bring in. Personally, he thought that if these people came here it would be of great benefit to the country, as it would give labor and put a large amount of money into circulation, besides the immense advantage of the telephone service.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. The report was received, and on motion of the Hon. Leader of the Government and by the unanimous consent of the House, the Bill was thereupon read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that a message be

sent to the House of Assembly acquainting that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

In moving the second reading of the Highway Traffic Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook said:

Collision of power arose as between the police department and the Highroads Commission with respect to traffic regulations thruout the Island of Newfoundland generally, and between these two bodies and the St. John's Municipal Council on the matter of traffic regulations in St. John's. The object of the Highway Traffic Bill is to amend the Highway Traffic Law and provide that traffic regulations in all portions of Newfoundland outside of St. John's should be made by the Highroads Commission on the recommendation of the Inspector General, but in the case of the Municipality of St. John's they will be made in the same way, subject to the approval of the Municipality. To carry out this provision it is also necessary for us to change the Municipal Act, which is done by a separate measure. With respect to the sections dealing with persons being drunk and in charge of a motor car, under the existing legislation a first offence is punishable by the fixed penalty of seven days' imprisonment for the person, without the option of fine. The police have found it extraordinary difficult to secure convictions under this section. A person brought in for an offence under this section naturally takes advantage of every possible ground of defence and aggressively fights the case. The trial magistrate, realising that he has not option of fine, naturally construes the evidence in the most rigid manner against the prosecution and in the most favourable manner towards the accused. It is not considered wise

public policy to have an over severe sentence for a first offence. This is changed so as to provide a substantial fine for a first offence, with the suspension of license. Then there is a provision that if the driver's drunkenness was so bad as to incapacitate him to the point of doing damage, he is liable to the gaol imprisonment without the option of a fine. Likewise in subsequent offences he is liable to imprisonment without the option of a fine. This measure for dealing with cases of this sort was introduced by the Attorney General into the House of Assembly at the request of the Inspector General of Constabulary, who feels that this change of method in dealing with cases of persons under the influence of liquor and in charge of motor cars would be more effective in the public interest. He holds that convictions could be more easily secured, and when the conviction carries with it the cancellation of the driver's licence for a period, the public would have a fuller measure of protection than they have at present. Everybody realizes the difficulty of proving incapacity thru drunkenness except in extreme cases. Under the law which provided for imprisonment with no option of fine, the magistrate would require very clear proof that the driver was in a state of drunken incapacity, while under the modified penalty for the first offence the trial magistrate will be expected to convict and suspend license, as much less evidence of the accused being somewhat under the influence would be required than under the previous law. The actual effect of this change in law, according to the Inspector General of Constabulary, whose expert opinion in such matters may be taken for granted, is that the police under the changed law can be more efficient in the handling of such cases, more convictions will be secured, and that the change will be very

advantageous in the interests of the public. The police feel that under these regulations they will be able to secure first offence convictions and suspension of drivers' licences in case of mild intoxication, while that appears to be absolutely impossible under the rigid penalty provision now in force.

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

ALIEN NATURALIZATION BILL

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Naturalization of Aliens Bill, and explained:

The existing law with respect to the Naturalization of Aliens will be found in Chapter 78. This Chapter is simply an enactment in Newfoundland of the Imperial Naturalization of Aliens Act of 1914, with such changes as could adapt that Imperial Legislation to Newfoundland conditions. For instance whenever "Secretary of State" was the term in the Imperial Act, the words "Colonial Secretary" are used in the Newfoundland Act. The Imperial Act was amended in 1918 and again in 1922. This bill merely brings the Newfoundland legislation up to date and directly in the line with Imperial legislation. The main points changed are as follows:—

Slight change in definition of British subject.

Change of methods by which British subjects in foreign parts can assert their British nationality.

Change in the matter of revocations of certificates of naturalization in proper cases.

Change in the law with respect to the nationality of wives and minor children.

Change in the provisions as to resumption of British nationality by British women married to alien enemies.

It is interesting to note that the Canadian Act is essentially a copy of the British Act. This means that on the passing of this legislation the law of Great Britain, Canada and Newfoundland will be strictly in harmony on this matter.

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

HON. MR. COOK in moving second read of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies.'" said:

Sections 1 and 2 deal with the matter of the creation of the office of Deputy Registrar of Companies. There is a Registrar of Companies under the existing Companies' Law; there is no provision in the law however, for the appointment of a Deputy Registrar. The result is that if the Registrar of Companies is not available for the signature of necessary papers in connection with his department, there is no deputy who can substitute for him and legally sign the papers. The Registrar of Companies is the same person as the Registrar of Deeds; no separate salary is paid. There is under the Registration of Deeds law a Deputy Registrar of Deeds, who can act in the absence of the Registrar. It is proposed that the present law be changed so as to provide that there should also be a Deputy Registrar of Companies, who, as a matter of fact, will be the same person as the Deputy Registrar of Deeds. These two sections place the Companies' Law, so far as the Registrar and Deputy Registrar are concerned, on exactly the same basis as the law with respect to the Registration of Deeds, and is intended to facilitate the general public in connection with companies' searches, company documents and certificates. It does not call for the appointment of

any extra person nor for any additional salary.

Sections 3 and 4 deal with the fees paid by companies. In the past the fees charged have been very small as compared with the fees charged in the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. For instance, companies having a capital of \$10,000, under the Newfoundland law pay \$10.00; under the Nova Scotia law pay \$75.00. A company with a capital of \$25,000 pays under Newfoundland law \$25.00, under Nova Scotia law \$90.00. Capital \$50,000—Newfoundland \$37.50, Nova Scotia \$115. Capital \$250,000—Newfoundland \$137, Nova Scotia \$227. The intention of these two sections is to place the registration fee in Newfoundland upon the same basis as the registration fee in the province of Nova Scotia.

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

In moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents,'" Hon. Mr. Cook stated:

This Bill makes no change whatever in the law with respect to the registration of deeds other than to increase the maximum fee on registration. At the present time the maximum fee is \$500.00, which represents the normal fee on a deed having a consideration of \$250,000. Deeds having a consideration of over \$250,000 are not numerous, but they average eight or nine per year.

It is imperative that the office of the Registrar of Deeds should not only be made self-sustaining, but should have an earning power which could assist in carrying the large overhead of the Supreme Court Building in which this office is situate.

In this situation it was felt reasonable that the maximum to be paid on any deed should be raised from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00. It is estimated that this will mean an increased revenue to the Registry of \$3,000 to \$5,000 annually. It cannot be considered at all unreasonable that on a property transfer in which millions of dollars are involved the maximum fee should be \$1,000.

The Bill was then read a second time, passed, and ordered to be sent to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V. Chapter 24, entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships,'" and said:

By ruling out clauses B and C of subsection 1, Section 2 of this Act, the inspector of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is empowered to inspect the boilers and machinery of all vessels except H. M. Warships, and for this the Department will receive inspection fees.

The result of this is merely that while at the present time ships classed in Lloyd's register, or in any other association for the survey of ships approved by the Governor in Council, are exempt from survey by the Newfoundland Government, under this Bill they will have to be surveyed. Mr. Forbes, our inspector, informs me that this is in accordance with the Canadian and American practice. He has, in any event, to inspect the boilers, and generally does this at the same time as the Canadian and American inspectors, and in practice goes over the whole ship then, but while they charge for the ship's inspection we do not. There is no reason why we should provide an Inspecting Engineer for nothing, and therefore this Bill empowers the Department to inspect the ships and collect inspection fees.

HON. MR. JOB thought that the Act did not sound reasonable. The position of shipping in Newfoundland was very serious and if any expense were to be added to the present cost of maintenance it would be detrimental to the country. It was as much as could be done to hold our own against other shipping at the present time, and if additional costs were charged, we should have less chance of competing successfully. If ships were passed by Lloyds we should hardly expect our inspection to add anything to theirs. A protest had been sent to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and pending an answer, he asked that the second reading be deferred.

Hon. the Leader of the Government stated he had no objection to its being deferred, and it was ordered accordingly.

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a message from the House of Assembly informing the Council that they had passed the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Department of the Colonial Secretary,'" in which they requested the concurrence of the Council. The Bill was read a first time, passed, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT intimated to the House that His Excellency the Governor would be pleased to receive the Address in Reply from a deputation of the Whole House on tomorrow at 4.15 o'clock.

On motion the House adjourned until 4 p.m., Tuesday May 7th.

TUESDAY, May 7th, 1929.

The Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

At 4.15 p.m. the Council proceeded to Government House.

At 4.30 p.m. the House having returned, the Hon. the President reported that the following communication had been received from His Excellency.

Mr. President: I thank you for the Address to the King's Most Excellent Majesty. In accordance with your wishes it will be my pleasant duty to transmit the Address to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs to be laid at the foot of the Throne.

J. MIDDLETON, Governor.
Government House, St. John's Nfld.,
7th May 1929.

HON. THE PRESIDENT also reported that His Excellency had been pleased to receive the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and return an answer thereto in the following words:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council: I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present session was opened.

J. MIDDLETON, Governor.
Government House, St. John's Nfld.,
7th May, 1929.

On motion the Municipal Bill, the Customs Bill, and the Pharmaceutical Bill were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to the effect that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Highways Traffic Bill. Hon Mr. Sinnott in the Chair.

HON. CAPT. KEAN thought members could not vote intelligently unless they knew what the old Bill was and what was the difference between this new Bill and the present law.

HON. MR. COOK explained that it was merely an alteration of the old

Act, and gave the Inspector General certain powers which now vest in the Municipal Council. Hon. Leader of the Government read Section 73, and stated that the new section altered the penalty for an intoxicated driver.

HON. THE PRESIDENT asked the House to follow its hand and strike out the minimum penalty, as the requirements of justice may in some cases be met by a lower fine than that fixed in the Bill.

HON. MR. DAVEY thought that in the case of an intoxicated person there should be a minimum fine, as he was a danger to the general public and should be dealt with severely.

HON. MR. STEER agreed that the penalty for a first offence should be left to the discretion of the Magistrate. He thought, however, that a minimum fine should be imposed.

HON. MR. BISHOP thought the Hon. President's view a right one; if the fine was not more than \$50.00 and not less than \$25.00 it would be the \$25.00 that would be imposed.

HON. MR. COOK said his view was that if the driver knew he would be fined at least \$25.00 it would make him more careful.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT said he did not wish to press the matter, but merely suggested the change.

Committee rose, and reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Naturalization of Aliens Bill. Hon Mr. O'Dea in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Companies Bill. Hon. Mr. Murphy in the

Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Registration of Deeds Bill. Hon. Mr. Bishop in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the Second Reading of the Inspection of Ships Bill was deferred until to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until Monday, May 13th at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, May 13th, 1929.

Council met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a letter from Mr. J. S. Currie expressing appreciation and thanks on behalf of Mrs Robinson for the resolution of sympathy recently passed by the Council.

In the absense of Hon. Mr. Anderson his notice of question was ordered to be deferred until to-morrow.

The following Bills were read a third time:—

The Highway Traffic Bill.

The Naturalization of Aliens Bill.

The Companies Bill.

The Registration of Deeds Bill.

I was ordered that these Bills be sent to the Lower House with a message intimating that the Legislative Council had passed them without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job the second reading of the Bill respecting "Inspection of Ships" was deferred until to-morrow.

Hon. the President then read a message from the Lower House acquainting the Council that that Body had passed the amendments of the "Restaruant's Bill" without amendment.

Hon. the President read messages from the Lower House to the effect that it had passed the Bills recited and asking the concurrence of the Legislative Council therein:—

"An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Merchant Shipping Service and Desertion from the Royal Navy.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stamp Duties.'"

"An Act to provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of prices and rates Charged to the Public."

These Bills were read for the first time and it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Leader of the Government the Council adjourned until 3 o'clock on Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY, May 15th, 1929.

Council met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

In reply to Hon. Mr. Anderson's question re the insolvency of the Dominion Co-Operation Building Association Hon. Mr. Cook stated that all matters connected with this company could be found at the Registry of the Supreme Court. They were too bulky and voluminous to condense and bring into the House. Also such a procedure would be very costly. Under the circumstances the Hon. Leader of the Government suggested that Hon. Mr. Anderson have recourse to the Registry where everything in connection with the Co-Operative Building Association might be reviewed.

HON. Mr. Anderson in answering said that the reply of the Hon. Leader was very unsatisfactory.

On the motion for the second reading of the Bill respecting the "Inspection of Ships."

INSPECTION OF SHIPS

HON. MR. COOK said some days ago when I introduced this Bill into the Council it was deferred at the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Job, who asked for sufficient time to consider its bearing upon transient and other ships which might come into this port, taking as an illustration the case of the visit of the large ship which brought the late Earl Haig and his party for the unveiling of our War Memorial. Under existing legislation the boilers of all ships taking passengers from this port may be inspected by the Boiler Inspector under the authority of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This means that under the circumstances to which Mr. Job referred, that boat might have been delayed for days had the technical law of the Colony been specifically carried out. That has been the law of the Colony for many years. There has never, however, been a case in which the Act has not been administered justly and with abundant courtesy. The principle of the Act, namely, the protection of passengers travelling from Newfoundland, has been read into the wording of the Act, with the result that any recognized passenger ship which calls into this port casually in connection with passenger trade, has not been made the subject of inspection because the very fact that it was a regular passenger ship duly certified as to its hull, machinery, boilers and passenger accommodation by the various countries with which it did business in the ordinary course of an ocean-going liner, was sufficient evidence that so far as Newfoundland passengers were concerned, she was a safe vessel.

The object of this Amendment is to enlarge the scope of the Act so that the Newfoundland Inspectors would inspect and give a certificate as to

machinery and hull in addition to the boiler inspection. At the present time our Newfoundland Inspector goes to New York for the purpose of the examination of passenger ships plying in the New York—St. John's trade. These boats are examined by the Canadian authorities, the United States authorities and the Newfoundland authorities. In the case of the Newfoundland representative, he has power to examine the boilers only. As a matter of fact he might undertake the whole examination with the representatives of the other two countries, but as a matter of law he has no power or authority to do so. This is an anomaly which should no longer continue and I am sure that in this view Hon. Mr. Job will concur with me.

When the points were raised by Mr. Job in connection with this matter I interviewed the Prime Minister on the subject. There was some correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Furness Withy Co. in connection therewith. He immediately arranged for a conference between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. J. P. Carey, representing the Furness Withy Co., and Mr. Brian E. S. Dunfield, the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice. As a result of this conference it appeared that the Furness Withy Company felt that in spite of the fact that their boats had been treated with every fair consideration and courtesy from the standpoint of Boiler Inspection, and although as a matter of fact the Department of Marine and Fisheries had the right to examine their boilers, there were nevertheless afraid that if this larger Act went through it might be put into active operation as against them and also into active operation as against Trans-Atlantic liners calling into this port casually for the transportation

from Newfoundland of passengers. In this situation the Prime Minister arranged for a conference between Mr. Dunfield, the Acting Minister of Justice, and Mr. John Fenelon, who is the Solicitor for the Furness Withy Company, the result of this conference being an agreement between all concerned that an Amendment (which I propose to submit for your consideration) would clarify the position and not only make the situation absolutely satisfactory from the standpoint of this Bill in its relation to hull and machinery but also make it clear with respect to Boiler Inspection.

This Amendment provides that if ever a British registered passenger ship comes to this port in the course of its passenger business, there will be no inspection of hull, machinery or boilers, provided the ship holds an unexpired British Certificate covering these three items. In addition to this the Amendment gives power to His Excellency the Governor in Council to accept the Certificate of countries other than Great Britain when the Governor in Council is satisfied that the system of inspection and survey of those countries is up to the standard of the British system. This new section is merely an adaptation to our Ship Inspection Law in Newfoundland of the Canadian practice, with the difference that we accept the British Certificate without Inspection, whereas Canada does not.

In reply Hon. Mr. Job said that he had no objection to the Bill now that a satisfactory explanation had been given. His only objection in the first place was that this Bill might add to the cost of conducting steamship lines in this country, but as the Furness Withy had in the conference with the Government raised no objection, he (Hon. Mr. Job), found nothing to object to in the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be submitted to Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL

On motion for the second reading of the Merchant Shipping Bill Hon. Mr. Cook explained that this Bill repealed section 4 of the previous Act in this connection. Section 4 provided for the payment of 21 cents by each seaman for hospital dues. The company paid this and deducted it each month from the wages of the seamen. This amount had been paid but the seamen had received nothing for it. This new Bill did away with the necessity of paying this charge. Now if a seaman becomes ill he is sent to the hospital or elsewhere and the expenses are borne by the country, by himself, or the company, depending on the circumstances. Another feature in this regard was that this tax was manifestly unfair as only local ships and seamen paid for it. Foreign ships were exempt. For these reasons the Government had decided to repeal the section mentioned.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be sent to Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

STAMP DUTIES BILL

On motion for the second reading of the Stamp Duties Bill Hon. Mr. Cook explained that this Bill makes very slight changes in the old Bill. It provides for additional stamp duties on certain bills, promissory notes, etc. The alterations were apparent from the face of the Bill and he did not think they needed any explanation.

Hon. Mr. McNamara said he would like to make a few comments, but before doing so he would like to know whether this measure was certified as a Money Bill. On learning that it was not so certified he remarked that it

did not matter a great deal whether it was so signed or not as the comments he would make would not result in having the Bill changed, or the increased changes removed. In Canada and the United States they were endeavoring at the present time to remove taxation such as was before the Council to-day. Such taxes are known in these countries as "nuisance taxes." The charge is raised on a Shipping Bill from 2 to 5 cents. On one such Bill this does not seem very much, but to the business man who does a great deal of shipping this amounts up in the run of a day and becomes a very large sum in the course of a year. By Shipping Bills he meant transportation by every conveyance, all of which was taxable. He contended that this tax should be paid by the drawee or the seller and not by the importer. To-day when a sight draft is presented it includes six or eight different charges, all to be paid by the importer, and this new one adds another. It is difficult for the average business man to continue on "the street" if he is to be taxed in every conceivable way, and unless such taxation is abolished business will not flourish. In conclusion, Mr. McNamara stated quite emphatically that he had no objection to an increased fee on promisory notes. In fact, he would like to see the stamp duty raised to five dollars.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be sent to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion for the second reading of the Public Utilities Bill Hon. Mr. Cook stated that this Bill was self-explanatory. Hon. Members of the Council would realize its nature, so that no further light need be thrown upon it. He would suggest that this Bill be read a second time, and when it was in committee stage it could be

gone into very closely. He added that this sort of Commission was in being in Canada and other countries for the protection of the public.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed to-morrow.

PUBLIC HEALTH BOARD

Hon. Mr. Cook, in moving the second reading of the Bill with respect to Departments under the Colonial Secretary, said:

This measure gives statutory force to a commission issued in 1925 and creating a general Board of Health for the country. The original intention was to have this Board attached to the Department of Public Charities, but the arrangement did not work out well, because the Board was not invested with the powers essential to efficient and economical management of Public Health matters. The 1924 Commission made the Board of Health answerable to the Commissioner of Public Charities and through him to the Colonial Secretary and the Government. The measure now before the Council makes the Newfoundland Board of Health responsible to the Colonial Secretary, of whose Department it remains a sub-department. The declaration of its new status explains the amendments in Sections 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the measure now being considered.

In section 2 hereof, the personnel of the Board is described as consisting of the Colonial Secretary, to whose Department it is attached, the Medical Health Officer and the Chairman of Board itself, who must be a registered Medical Practitioner. The Colonial Secretary and the Medical Health Officer hold their positions ex-officio. The chairman is an appointee of the Governor in Council.

Some weeks ago the Auditor-General referring to Public Health Expendi-

tures wrote the Government that in some respects these were assuming the nature of public scandals. He urged the Government to take some immediate steps designed to check abuses that had grown up under the existing system of administration. The Government at once appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the whole subject of Public Health and Public Charities, to make a report on conditions and to recommend changes calculated to be generally beneficial. Obviously, the scope of the Commission is a very broad one and it is likely to have to devote a very considerable time to its investigations and to the preparation of its report and recommendations for permanent reorganization of these services. As a matter of fact, a general survey of the country will have to be made from a Public Health and Public Charities standpoint, before the Commission can efficiently complete its labours. This, of itself, is a huge undertaking.

In the meantime, matters of Public Health administration have to be attended to. The Government, therefore, decided to make of the Newfoundland Board of Health a separate Department under the Colonial Secretary, make it responsible for all Public Health matters and answerable for all Public Health expenditures. The Board of Health has already succeeded in effecting large economies of public expenditure without impairing the efficiency of this branch of the public service. This enlargement of its scope and of its powers will, it is confidently anticipated, enable it to function even more efficiently and economically. This measure is intended to enable the Board of Health to function to the greatest public advantage possible until such time as the Royal Commission is ready to report as to what firm the

permanent reorganization of our Public Health and Public Charities should take.

The scope and powers of the Newfoundland Board of Health are defined in section 7 of the Bill. Reference to the Act which is being amended shows that the powers herein defined were formerly possessed by the Commissioner of Charities. In this respect, therefore, there is simply transference of administrative powers from one sub-department to another, because the Board of Health is still retained as a sub-department of the Colonial Secretary. The position of the Medical Health Officer as a member of the Board of Health ex-officio brings within the purview of the Board such matters as are administered by the Medical Health Officer under certain Statutes. There has been no interference at all with such Acts as those which deal with the Board of Governors at the General Hospital and other public hospital institutions or with the Act constituting a Board of Commissioners in Lunacy. As a matter of fact there has been a minimum of change made. The Bill is designed simply to enable the Newfoundland Board of Health to function efficiently and economically, as distinct from the sub-department of Charities and as charged with control and administration of general public health affairs. Complete and permanent reorganization in this connection has been avoided until the Royal Commission has had time to investigate matters of Public Health and Public Charities and turn in its Report and make its recommendations to the Government. I, therefore, have the honor to move the second reading of this Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON rose to support the Bill and at the same time to make the suggestion to the Hon. the

Leader of the Government that the name "Poor Asylum" be changed to "West End Home," or "Home" called after the name of some one who had helped the Institution, would be more dignified and more agreeable to those who occupy it.

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

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they had passed the following Bills, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council:

"An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V., Chapter 23, entitled 'An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding and Acts in amendment thereof.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Enquires concerning Public Matters.'"

"An Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes."

These Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until 3 p.m. on Friday, May 17th.

FRIDAY, May 17th, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment Council met at 3 p.m.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Inspection of Ships Bill. Hon. Mr. Bartlett in the Chair.

HON. MR. COOK submitted to the Committee the amendment agreed upon between the Government and the steamship owners, and explained that the clause meant that if a ship is classed as a passenger ship with a certificate from any country whose

standard was up to the British standard that ship would not have to be surveyed.

HON. MR. JOB stated that this would be a great advantage for ship-owners, as it would save them the needless expense caused by an unnecessary survey. He also thought that an extra boiler inspector should be appointed, as there was ample work for another person.

The Committee rose, and reported the Bill having passed with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Merchant Shipping Bill. Hon. Mr. Gibbs in the Chair. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council went into Committee of the Whole on the Stamp Duties Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. AYRE said that apparently no provision had been made for a revenue stamp. At present the ordinary stamp was being used, and this custom was open to abuse, for the stamps were sometimes used again on letters going through the post. The provision of a special revenue stamp would do away with this abuse.

HON. MR. ANDERSON thought that if stamps were put on cheques when they were printed it would be an improvement. The cost would be no more; it meant but the paying of them when getting the book of cheques instead of buying the two cent stamps separately, if the Government could see its way clear to secure the necessary stamp.

HON. MR. COOK replied he would mention the fact to the Premier at the earliest opportunity.

HON. MR. ANDERSON thought unless it were embodied in the Bill it would not be effective.

HON. MR. COOK said that the Government might make it so by Order in Council.

HON. THE PRESIDENT explained that things of this sort could not be done in a hurry; it would take time to arrange for the machinery necessary to effect the change. While the present system lent itself to a certain amount of abuse, it would be a serious inconvenience to people if they had to provide stocks of revenue stamps which would be rarely used. For houses doing extensive business it might be satisfactory, but otherwise the game would not be worth the candle. Abuse there certainly was, but whether to the extent of justifying the Government in providing dyes and other equipment for the making of these stamps, and inconveniencing the people who would have to carry supplies though they would rarely use the stamps, was another matter.

HON. MR. BARTLETT was of the opinion that, while the alteration would work all right in a town like St. John's, it would not suit at all in the majority of outports where the post office was the only place where stamps could be procured. There would have to be a special department at which to get those stamps should the proposed change become law. He had yet to know of anybody using the stamps over again, and thought that our people might be trusted in the matter.

HON. MR. AYRE did not agree with the Hon. Gentleman, for the matter would be entirely in the hands of those who were selling the cheques; the tax would be paid on the cheques and the bank would collect it; there would be no trouble to the customer apart from being a dollar or so out

of pocket. The Government would benefit, and as the interest of the Government and that of the country were the concern of the Hon. Members, anything which contributed to the perfecting of the stamp or other duties was worthy of their consideration.

The Committee rose and reported having passed Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

PUBLIC UTILITIES BILL

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Public Utilities Bill. Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON rose to support the Bill, but added it was being introduced too late in the day. Had it come during the War it would have been of greater service to the people of this country. It might be some benefit now, but, owing to the multifarious commodities imported and the keenness of competition, it was too late for commissions of the sort. He was only too pleased to give it his support. He trusted that the operation of the Bill would be successful, and its result be an improvement in the present conditions pertaining throughout the country.

The Bill was then passed by the Committee without amendment, and it was ordered that it be read a third time on to-morrow.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill respecting Departments under the Colonial Secretary.

HON. MR. JOB asked what was the difference between this and the old Bill—what change did it involve in the Department mentioned.

HON. MR. COOK explained that the object of the Bill was to make the Public Health office a sub-department

under the Colonial Secretary and directly responsible to that Executive head.

HON. MR. ANDERSON referring to the Bill, said that he did not consider "Poor Asylum" a fitting name for the home for the poor in the West End. He thought it should be called "Waterford Home," "West End House" or some other similar name. He also wished to know if the new Board of Health would be a Board to deal with public health matters throughout the whole country.

HON. MR. COOK in reply, said that the new Board of Health would act for the whole country and that the old Board would be incorporated in the new one with any necessary changes.

HON. THE PRESIDENT could see no reason why the hon. member objected to the name "Poor Asylum," as in the Old Country such homes were called Poor Houses or Poor Asylums, and there they had certain laws which were called Poor Laws. He did not understand the objection of the name.

HON. MR. GIBBS said that they had done away with this name in the United States.

HON. THE PRESIDENT doubted if we could afford to reach the same level as the United States. He pointed out that in Nova Scotia there were Poor Houses, and in Ontario Poor Farms. He could see no objection to the name "Poor Asylum"; after all, it was an asylum for the poor.

HON. MR. ANDERSON replied that he supported the Bill, but he did not like this name "Poor Asylum." If the Hon. President and the whole house thought that should be left as it was, it would not alter his opinion on the point. He suggested that it should be called "Davidson House," in memory of Governor Davidson, who had done so much for the inmates of that in-

stitution; or "Harris House," after Governor Harris.

The Bill passed Committee stage without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

SHIPBUILDING BILL

On motion for second reading of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook informed the Hon. Members that this was an Act giving certain bounty to shipbuilders, its object being to encourage our fishermen to build ships in Newfoundland and thus keep in the country money that might be spent elsewhere. There was also a second class of ships on which the bounty would be paid, which class consisted of ships intended for the seal fishery. The dates for building and the number of ships to be built were both limited. He thought it would not be a great tax of the Colony's treasury, as only a certain number would be built. He said this was a good way to encourage the seal fishery, and pointed out that the ships would have to be surveyed by Lloyd's before they could claim the bounty.

HON. CAPT. KEAN stated that he wished to make a few remarks upon the question before the Chair, but before doing so wished to speak of the changes that have taken place since last year. His Excellency Sir Wm. and Lady Allardyce, so well liked and so well known, have left us. In their stead we have Sir John and Lady Middleton, and I want from my place in this House to extend to them a very hearty welcome, and trust their stay among us will be a very pleasant and prosperous one.

Then I notice two vacancies. One has been removed by death; the other for reasons best known to himself, I understand, has tendered his resignation. The former, Hon. Dr. John A. Robinson, I have known for a long

time, and during all that time I have known of no act of his that did not bear upon it the mark of a gentleman. Of Sir A. B. Morine, I think we are all prepared to admit, however, much we may differ from him in politics, that he was a very valuable acquisition to both branches of this legislature. I know of no man that did more during the last forty years than did Sir Alfred B. Morine in making and assisting in making the laws of this country. Many of these laws leave the impress of a very fine brain and great legal talent.

Of the two newly-elected gentlemen it is much more pleasant to speak. The Hon. Edward Sinnott I have known for some years and the more I know him the higher he has risen in my estimation. The Hon. J. V. O'Dea I know only by repute. I have no doubt whatever that these gentlemen will prove valuable acquisitions to this branch of the legislature. Let us hope they will take up the torch dropped by the others I have spoken of and, like them, bring to bear on every question that comes before us their experience, counsel and advice. Last, but by no means least, I wish to mention Hon. Tasker Cook, and through you, Mr. President, to offer him my congratulations on his promotion as Leader of the Government in this branch of the Legislature. It is said some men are born great, some achieve greatness, others have greatness thrust upon them. I do not know how true this last statement is in regard to him but I want to assure him that while he tries to give the satisfaction he has up to the present given, he can always reckon upon my hearty and unqualified support.

Now with regard to the question before the House. The bounty on ship-building in this country has not given satisfaction, and in my opinion

if proper investigation had been made by former governments, it would have been discontinued years ago. The report of Mr. Black, surveyor of Shipping, for 1914, shows there were twenty-two vessels which received bounty aggregating \$3,575.00, and he adds that the vessels were well built and fastened, and had they been surveyed according to the Act most of them would have received the \$8.00 bounty. That would leave the impression that \$8.00 per ton was the maximum limit—a striking contrast to the amount in the Bill we are now discussing.

In 1915 he tells us that ten vessels received the bounty, the total aggregating \$3,681.30. In 1916 he tells us twenty vessels were surveyed for bounty, and out of that number two received \$16.00 per ton. In all \$3,609. was paid in bounty that year. 1917 shows a marked increase. Out of 22 vessels, aggregating 1532 tons, nine received \$16.00, amounting to \$20,232. In all there was paid in that year \$22,250.00. In 1918 the bounty was still on the increase; thirty-two vessels received the bounty, aggregating 4175 tons, twenty-seven of which received the maximum bounty of \$16.00 per ton, amounting to \$75,963.00. In all there was paid in bounties that year \$77,350.00. 1919 shows a decrease. But one vessel constructed received \$20.00 per ton bounty, the first time apparently that \$20.00 per ton was paid. The total paid that year was \$40,836.00. For 1920 Mr. Black does not give the total amount paid for bounty on shipbuilding, but we find that from 1914 to 1919 (both years inclusive) there was paid to different shipyards for bounty \$151,091.00. Now let us look for results. My memory goes back to the report which came back from some of these bounty-receiving vessels. Of three of them

which sailed on their first voyage, two foundered before they reached their destination; the other reached her destination, had considerable repairs effected, but foundered before she reached her second port of call. Another one built in Canada Bay reached her first destination, got a considerable overhaul, went to Spain and took in a load of salt for this country and foundered three hundred miles this side of Spain; fortunately her crew were rescued and brought back to port.

Now, Mr. President, who received this bounty? Some of them are to be classed amongst the wealthiest people we have in this country. Who are taxed to pay this bounty? The most hard-working people in the country, some widows and orphans, and I maintain it is our duty to safeguard the interests of these latter and see to it that if possible their burdens are lessened instead of increased. I, for one, will, therefore, do all in my power to prevent the increase of one dollar per ton on the bounty for ship-building. But besides this, taking into consideration the changes that have taken place in the foreign trade as well as local trade, it seems to me we would be bolstering up a lost cause.

Let me refer to the Brazilian trade. A few years ago it was thought that no vessels could be used for that trade, and if they could, it was argued that unless we had the vessels used in that service to call in at the West Indies on the return journey, we had no way to get our yearly stock of molasses. But notice the changes that have taken place. Steamers are used in the Brazilian trade, and give infinitely better service than sailing vessels, and the Furness Withy boats plying between New York and the West Indies are bringing us molasses in thousand-puncheon lots.

The fish which at one time was shipped in bulk in sailing vessels, is shipped in casks and drums in large steamers, and in these large steamers have put wood vessels of the smaller class, such as could be built here, out of commission.

Now just a word about our local vessels engaged at the cod-fishery. A marvellous change has taken place within the past few years. Many of you can remember the time when we had ship-yards for building vessels all over the country, notably those of Josiah Manuel of Exploits, Frenches and Osmonds of Morton's Harbour, Strong and Murcell of Little Bay Is., and several others in Green Bay. In Bonavista Bay we had several other reputable builders, and Trinity and Conception Bay contributed their share. What has taken place? Not one of these I have spoken of is in the ship-building business to-day. Why? For several reasons. Many people have discovered that the upkeep of vessels in connection with the codfishery is a mistake; that it is better to go down on the coast and settle there and save the upkeep of the schooner.

The Conception Bay people were among the first to make the change. Consequently, when I went over to Bay Roberts last year I was told that a few years ago there were anchored in that harbour eleven foreign vessels and one hundred fishing schooners bound to the Labrador. For the fishing voyage that year there were three ships. Two or three steamers now are taking down to Labrador what the one hundred vessels were taking down a few years ago.

When I first took charge of the "Portia" on the Coastal Service in 1904, Quirpon was not a port of call and was not for several years afterwards; to-day it is one of the most important ports of call in the whole

of the "Prospero's" service. What brought about the change? Men who used to go fishing in schooners are settled down on the coast. The same is true of Fish Road (Fichot) Islands and Grey Islands and other ports in the Straits and on the Labrador. Consequently, the demand for vessels that existed when the old Act was passed does not exist to-day, and to offer an extra bounty for ship-building seems to me like bolstering up a lost cause.

When I looked at the first sections of this Bill I wondered what was the meaning, but when I came to schedule D, "Motor Schooners Suitable for the Sealfishery," my memory went back to a statement made by Sir William Coaker last fall, that if their party got elected he would recommend the building of fifty motor schooners for the seal fishery which could be used afterwards for the halibut fishery. I could then see the fulfillment of that promise. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the old Act to know what the amount of the bounty was per ton, and I think any shipyard in the country would be perfectly justified in building motor schooners for the seal-fishery and claiming the bounty under the old Act until such time as it is repealed, but I do not feel justified in giving my consent to any increase. Fifty motor schooners of 150 tons each at \$30.00 per ton bounty means \$225,000 taken out of the public funds of this Colony for the building of motor schooners for the carrying on of the seal fishery, which for the last one hundred and thirty years has been carried on by private enterprise, and I have no hesitancy in saying that motor schooners can never be a success as long as more powerful ships are used in that service. The history of the seal fishery from the beginning has been that power has been the dominating factor. The Galloper put the ice ships out of commis-

sion. The brigantines and brigs out-classed the gallopers, and the wood steamers practically wiped out the sailing vessels in fourteen years. I take the following from Chafe's Book.

In 1866 we had one hundred and seventy-seven sailing vessels and five steamers. In 1873 there were eighteen. In 1882 there were twenty-five steamers, and at the present time there are twenty-two steamers engaged in this enterprise, and one sailing vessel, the "Island Gem," Captain Martin Sharp, with a crew of 20 men. She sailed on February 27th, went north of Cabot Island and did not get a pelt, and arrived at Bay Roberts on the 1st day of April clean.

The motor schooner is preferable to the sailing vessel, but no better than the small wood steamer as compared with the more powerful wood steamers. I am not classing them with the steel ships, but history goes to prove that the weak-powered wood steamers were a huge failure in comparison with the more powerful ones of their own class. Let me give you a few illustrations. The "Nimrod," which was the most successful of the small steamers, ran forty years and brought in 354,792. The Neptune in forty years brought in 802,179, a difference in favour of the Neptune of 447,387. The "Kite" in forty-one years brought in 181,480; the "Aurora" in thirty-four years brought in 587,374, a difference in favor of the Aurora of 405,894. I could go on until I had named every small steamer in the country, and show that they were hopeless failures. We cannot hope that motor schooners will compete even with the small steamers, for none of them which have been built up to the present are as powerful as the small steamers.

But I fancy I hear some people say that Norway votes yearly thirty mil-

lion dollars for the upkeep of their fisheries. Before proceeding further, I would like to remark that in considering the fisheries of Norway, and comparing the same with those of Newfoundland, one should remember that, in the first place, the fisheries of that great country form just one of the industries of a nation of about two and three quarter millions of inhabitants, with a very old European civilization, and this industry contributes about 35 per cent of its annual exports, while in the case of Newfoundland, the fisheries are the principal of the oldest British Colony, possessing a population of a little more than a quarter of a million inhabitants, which until recently was very little known and very much isolated, and in my mind, from the standpoint of prestige and connection Norway possesses overwhelming advantages over Newfoundland in this respect.

Penney, in his report on the Norwegian fisheries, says:

"There is a system of loans for assisting fishermen to procure motor-boats. The fishermen wishing to take advantage of this scheme, makes application to the Fisheries Department, stating his position, the cost of the craft, the amount he is able to put down toward the purchase or building of such, then the Government appraiser certifies the value of the proposed craft.

"The applicant pays his amount gives the Department a mortgage for the balance, agrees to keep the craft insured and to pay 2 1-2 per cent interest on the loan the second year. The fishermen gets the amount he needs and is allowed 10 to 12 years in which to repay the amount. A scheme to include fishing gear with the schooner is now mooted.

"I was informed that this scheme

"was working well, and there were no delinquents, but the amounts were annually being returned and as regularly going out again in the same channel."

Now, Sir, of the promoters of this scheme would introduce in this bill some such clause as that it would receive my hearty support. Such a scheme as that helps the fishermen to help themselves; but the Bill before us is like the grave—it takes all but gives none. What will be the result if this Bill becomes law? \$225,000 will be taken out of the the public funds of the Colony to help whom? Not the sealers, but the owners of the motor schooners. The men who comprise the crew will get only one-third of their catch, just like those on board other ships. In fact the crews of the motor schooners are denied one privilege of the crews of the larger steamers. Every steamer is compelled by law to have wireless for the protection of the lives of those on board; and each operator has to report to the Minister of Posts every night that the crews are all on board, but the motor schooners are permitted to go without that protection and in fact are not supposed to be subject to any laws, either for the protection of the men or the seals, the owners standing on the technicality that the Act reads "Steamers" and not "Motor Schooners"; so that this Act aims at benefitting the owners of the motor schooners and not the rank and file of the sealers.

These are the facts as they appear to me, and I trust that my remarks will be accepted in the spirit in which they are uttered.

HON. MR. ANDERSON said that he had listened with great interest to the address of the Hon. Capt Kean and wished to support him in the serious view he took of this Bill, and he wanted the Hon. Leader of the Government

to take the same view. He pointed out that if you built a vessel of 150 tons you got \$4,500; if you built ten such schooners you got \$45,000. and for twenty you received \$90,000, and for thirty \$135,000, and if in a successful year you built forty you received \$180,000. The country had to pay this money from some source or another. He knew that his figures were right and he asked the hon. gentlemen to consider seriously where we are going. It would be profitable to build ships, get the bounty, and then sell them instead of going to the seal fishery with them. He would support the second reading of the Bill, but in the meantime would go further into it.

HON. MR. RYAN said that he had listened very attentively to his honourable friend, Capt. Kean, and congratulated him on his able speech. This Bill was one to encourage shipbuilding in Newfoundland. The shipping craft in Newfoundland are disappearing fast; very few are being built each year. He pointed out that the bounties named in this Bill are intended for vessels going to the seal fishery and he thought a man building such a vessel would make a big rake-off because the bounty was too large, but he was in favour of the bounty as paid during the last year. Another thing he noticed in the Bill was that motor engines and accessories would come in duty free, and he did not agree with this, as we have to pay too many taxes because of the great quantity of goods coming in duty free. Last year \$10,102,036 worth of goods came in duty free. while we paid duty on \$17,534,435 worth of goods. This Bill would add more to the free list. It is true that we are all taxed to the same extent, but very few pay. When the income tax was on only one-third of those who should have paid did so. He said he was in sym-

pathy with the bounty of the last few years, but that we could not build vessels like those built in England and Denmark. Insurance on our vessels at Lloyds is 15 or 16 per cent, and on a Danish vessel it is only 7 per cent. We should have more ships built here, as at present men who depended on the Government ships to get to the Labrador and back were much inconvenienced by arriving there too late and having to leave too early, and while there not being able to get from place to place. He was in favor of the bounty as paid under the old Act, but was against the increased bounty and the goods being placed on the duty-free list.

HON. MR. JOB agreed with the hon. gentleman who had shown how much this new bounty was going to cost the country. He would like to have the motion postponed, as he did not know how much the bounty was increased by this Bill. He thought last year's one was an increase of about 25 per cent or 30 per cent, and was too large. He would like to be posted on the difference between this bounty and the old one before they went further.

HON. MR. COOK replied that if the second reading of the Bill were permitted to proceed the information the honorable gentleman sought would be given in committee stage. To this Hon. Mr. Job agreed.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Bill relating to Public Enquiries stated that the object of the Bill was to give to persons undertaking an inquiry under the Public Enquiries Act power to engage technical advice to further their work.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be referred

to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Income Tax Bill, said that an explanation of the Bill was hardly necessary, as every point seemed to be covered by the material contained therein.

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

HON. THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they had passed the following bills, in which they asked the concurrence of the Council:

An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922.

An Act to Amend Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Public Works."

These Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS asked leave to introduce on to-morrow a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act George V., Cap. 9, entitled 'An Act respecting Patents.'"

The House then adjourned until Monday, May 20th, at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, May 20th, 1929.

Council met at 3 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Bill relating to Patents was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Inspection of Ships Bill, The Merchant Shipping Bill, the Stamp Duties Bill, The Public Utilities Com-

mission Bill and the Colonial Secretary Department Bill were read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with a message acquainting that body that the Council had passed the same.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job, the Committee stage of the Bill for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding was deferred.

The Bill respecting Public Enquiries was passed thru Committee and was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council then went into Committee of the Whole on the Income Tax Bill with Hon. Mr. Sinnott in the Chair.

HON. MR. McNAMARA—Mr. Chairman, at the opening of the House last month, I made the statement that I felt that the Bill now before us, the Income Tax Bill, was class legislation, and therefore unfair and unjust.

I pointed out at the time that only the few paid this tax, while the many escaped it thru one subterfuge of another, and further that the only straight, fair way to collect revenue in this country was thru the Custom House at St. John's and the outports. It is a historical fact that the sum of \$54,933.58 remains unpaid since this Act was last in force, and further, that some people, high up in the community, refused or ignored the Income Tax absolutely; and, further still, that only 1,100 people in the community paid that tax at all. Under these circumstances I submit that it is not unreasonable to call this tax class legislation, and therefore unjust and unfair to those called upon to pay the Assessor under this obnoxious measure. The Finance Minister claims that he will collect \$500,000.00 with this Tax and further that he must have this money to square the Budget. I would suggest to the Min-

ister a very simple way to collect this money and square his Budget, and that is, to levy a tax on the Free List. Roughly \$26,000,000 worth of goods were imported during 1927-1928.—we have not 1928-29 figures yet—and out of that \$26,000,000, \$9,000,000 was duty free. The small tax of five per cent on this \$9,000,000 would give the Finance Minister \$450,000 or about the amount he is counting on, and no one would feel it as it would be spread all over the community and would not be a hardship on anybody. Last year when speaking about this duty-free goods some exception was taken to it. I think the President claimed it would not be as easy to collect this amount on goods imported for the use of the Governor and for other purposes. My answer to this is that I would not admit the principle of free duty at all, and would increase the Governor's salary to the amount of his duties, and I am sure His Excellency would promptly pay his taxes as an example to others. Then, again, the duty-free privilege is abused to an alarming extent, and the imposition of duty as mentioned would correct this evil, which is manifestly so unfair to the country. To give you a concrete example of this hardship, I would like to state that there is a world-wide organization operating here and getting everything in duty free, and recent newspaper disclosures have proven that this organization is worth over \$100,000,000, having property and assets all over the world. Still, we are assisting this institution and unduly taxing our people to keep up our contributions. Then there is another big trading organization up North and at Labrador, and this institution also gets everything duty free. These institutions, I admit, are doing a lot of good, but there is no reason why they should have everything duty free in perpetu-

ity. Then there are religious institutions of other denominations, as well as my own, which I claim should not be getting everything duty free at the expense of the whole community. I might go on giving other unfair duty instances, but I think I have stated enough to show that this duty-free vote-catching policy should be discontinued with as little delay as possible.

HON. MR. GIBBS referred to subsection (s) and pointed out that there are a number of corporations in this country which have no connection with Newfoundland, but are merely incorporated here to escape taxation in their own countries. There are twenty or twenty-five of these kind of companies here, and they are only holders of sock for their shareholders who do not have to pay any income tax when the company has paid the super-tax, while in the case of local companies the tax is paid and also the shareholders pay their income tax on the dividends. Take, for example, a man who converts his business into a limited liability company; he will have to pay a super-tax on the earnings of the corporation, and also his income tax on the dividends he will receive.

HON. MR. COOK replied that if income tax is collected from the company, then the shareholders dividends are tax free.

HON. MR. GIBBS showed that if a man received a dividend from his business up to or exceeding \$8,000 he would have to pay a two per cent tax thereon.

HON. MR. McNAMARA pointed out that there was a good deal in what the last speaker had said. In the case of a private company of three or four members of a family, it looked unfair to him that they should have to pay a normal tax and a super-tax. A company such as the Ropewalk or

the Imperial Tobacco Company could stand such a tax, as they had many thousands of shareholders spread all over the country, but he thought it was different with a small private company, and these should have some concessions.

HON. MR. COOK suggested that Hon. Mr. McNamara make his amendments in the correct form, and he would pass them on to the Government for consideration.

HON. PRESIDENT wondered if Hon. gentlemen were aware of what was happening in other countries with regard to escaping the payment of taxation. In England at the present time the wealthy classes were turning their possessions into Limited Liability Companies to escape the death duties tax. For instance, the Duke of Kensington is the owner of 7,000 acres and other valuable property. On his death his estate would be liable to a death duty tax of from 40 or 50 per cent of its value. To escape this he turns his possessions into a limited liability company made up of his own family and relations. He is now taxed only on the income, thereby making a considerable saving. If Hon. Mr. McNamara's suggestion was adopted, we would have the same thing starting here. The fairest and best way was a tax on the income of the company. In regard to duty-free goods, there were millions of dollars worth of goods which came into the country the duty on which was not imposed, the reason being that contracts had been made to give these goods free entry. The case of the United Towns Electric Company illustrated this. Some thousands of dollars' worth of goods was brought in by this company duty free, because of its contract with the government, and the contract could not be broken. The Anglo American Telegraph Co.

was also cited. This company had been in the country for fifty or sixty years and was still getting the goods duty free—yast year to the extent of \$40,000. The contract being in perpetuity, this could not be altered. Case after case of a similar nature might be mentioned. Between five and ten million dollars' worth of free goods was imported each year, and duty could not be imposed on these unless we were prepared to break our contracts, and that could not be done. While no advocate of the Income Tax Bill, if the tax were imposed he would regard the paying of it as a moral obligation. Every country in the world has an income tax bill—even rich U. S.A., and while we persisted year after year in living beyond our means, money must be raised or we must go insolvent. Attention was drawn to the income taxes derived from the Paper Company and the A.N.D. Co. amounting in each case in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 when the tax was imposed. For the past three or four years the tax had been withdrawn. In the case of the A.N.D. Co. when they had to pay it here they did not have to do it in England; and when we were generous enough to take it off here, it was imposed upon them in the Old Country. Why should we not have it as well as the British Treasury? The Hon. Gentleman had referred to a religious organization lately in the public eye, having assets valued at \$100,000,000. The Salvation Army probably was meant. If its property or that of any other church organization thruout the world were estimated is might amount to a large sum, but that was no argument why it should not get concessions. It was just as reserving of concessions as any other. The Hon. President could not agree that the Grenfell Labrador Mission was a money-making concern

He did not know who was making money out of it. Dr. Grenfell could at any time have gone into practice in the Old Country and make more money than he was making in Labrador. With regard to only eleven hundred people paying the tax, that was not the fault of the tax, but of the people who would not pay it. He did not know how the machinery was operated for its collection and maintenance but thought it could be effectually carried out, as in the case of the management of the Liquor Control Department. If the other Departments of the Public Service were managed anything like it was, we would not find ourselves in the predicament we are to-day.

HON. MR. JOB said he would like to make one or two remarks. He had listened to Hon. Mr. McNamara and the Hon. the President, and on the point raised by the last speaker he was of the opinion that assuming only one half of the free list might be taxed and collectable it would mean quite a large amount. In connection with corporations, as set out by the section dealing with ordinary and super-tax on Page 14, the principle dealt with therein was the same as that in operation in England, that is, the average income over a period of three years is taxable. In this country business is of less stable nature than in the Old Country, and more likely to result in a loss. It is more than possible for a corporation in this country to earn a large income in one year and the next lose that same amount. It may be that the Government is considering this, but it is worth a thought. The income tax is the fairest tax, provided you are not taxed by a tariff, but in circumstances such as we have to contend with, it is unfair. The collection cost must be heavy. He would like to see a return

included in the annual report of the Department as to the expenses incurred in the collecting of this tax.

HON. PRESIDENT pointed out that when this Bill was in operation before the expense of the Department came to about \$16,000 and the amount collected was \$500,000.

HON. MR. GIBBS stated that he understood the cost was more in the vicinity of \$40,000.00.

HON. PRESIDENT replied that the cost of the Department was \$16,000, but if one were to include legal fees, then it was possible that this amount would be considerably larger.

HON. MR. JOB thought that it was fair to the public to have some sort of return made showing just what this Department cost, the cost of collection, etc., and that this return be published.

HON. CAPT. KEAN—Mr. Chairman, in looking over the last paragraph of a letter I wrote to the Daily News on the 7th of February on the Income Tax I notice I made the following remarks:

"I hold that the Income Tax, the business profits tax, the surtax, and the sales tax have had more to do with hampering trade and are more responsible for insolvencies and stagnation in business than any other misfortune that has overtaken us, with the exception of the drink traffic, and the Government that has the courage of their convictions and treat them all alike, and bury them in oblivion will be the Government which will be first proclaimed as the savior of their country." Mr. Chairman, my mind is changed on that point.

The following are the Daily News comments: "In many respects our existing system of direct taxation severely penalizes capital investments in this country, places difficulties

and stumbling blocks in the way of new investments, and in far too many instances discourages and prevents such investments and so stops exactly the development we all so ardently desire—the industrial rehabilitation and progress of Newfoundland. Every new industry started constitutes an insurance against unemployment in Newfoundland and secures additional work and wages to the people of the country, results that boost trade and commerce and insure very real and very general prosperity. Anything that hinders such new capital investments and the consequent initiation of new industries prevents such progress, impoverishes the people and stagnates the trade of the country. Persistence in the retention of such of the present direct taxation in Newfoundland has exactly this ruinous tendency and effect. On the other hand, the Government sets out to attract to its treasury four millions of dollars as a loan. It advertises the issue in the local press, ensures an attractive rate of interest and gives an undertaking not to penalize the capital of those who invest in the loan. The man who invests in Newfoundland industries progress has both his income and his profits taxed. He is penalized for his enterprise and his progressiveness. The man who invests his money in government bonds is encouraged with guaranteed interest and exception from the heavy taxation that grinds down the man whose wealth bolsters Newfoundland industries and provides work and wages for Newfoundlanders and ready money for expenditure in connection with the trade and commerce of the country. Surely, such policy is in anything but the best practical and progressive interest of the country.”

I also quote Sir Herbert S. Holt, the president of the Royal Bank of Can-

ada and President Coolidge of the U. S.A. Here is what Sir Herbert Holt says: “The effect of the sales tax on the cost of living of the people is such that a reduction in the rate is very desirable. The bad effect of high income taxes must also be given proper consideration.” Coolidge says: “I agree perfectly with those who wish to relieve the small taxpayers by getting the largest possible contribution from the people with large incomes. But if the rates on large incomes are so high that they disappear the small taxpayer will be left to bear the entire burden. If, on the other hand, the rates are placed where they will produce the most revenue from large incomes, then the small taxpayer will be relieved.” Sir Herbert says again: “Let me emphasize here that it is not the wealthy who are the greatest sufferers from high taxes, but the rank and file of the people who find it difficult to find employment when industry is stagnating, and those who should be investing their money in new enterprises find no incentive to do so. Such a situation can only end in capital leaving Canada to find employment in the United States and elsewhere. In my opinion, not only should the taxes referred to be reduced but a way should be found by all public authorities to lower the taxes on all kinds which are handicapping business. We cannot afford to delay action in the matter.”

Now let me give you some of the experiences I have had in the past, which convinces me that any attempt to tax men of enterprise in this country is a mistake, and in many cases the men who are exempted from these taxes insofar as the reading of these bills are concerned are the men who suffer. I could give you many examples. To prove my case I will

give you three. First, let us take the question of salt. Some business firm on Water Street imports a cargo of salt for the fishermen of this country. Before they can discharge the salt they must get a permit from the Customs. The getting of that permit means that they must comply with the Customs regulations. First, there is the standing rule that no difference what the value of the peseta in Spain the value by the Newfoundland Government is 19c or 19 1-2c. Once when I cleared for a cargo of salt the value of the peseta was, in Spain, 13c. I was charged by the Government 19c. Loss number one. Then for the sake of argument we will add the business profits tax, the surtax and the sales tax. Cheap salt in Spain becomes dear when all these charges are added, and the importer pays the charge. But what takes place when the fishermen come to that importer for their salt? Every one of these charges is added to the first cost of the salt, plus freight and insurance and cost of discharging, and then his profits are added. Who then, I ask you Sir, pays the taxes? The importer first, the fisherman last. Number two. A few years ago the Government charged an export tax on codfish. For a time the fishermen were led to believe that the tax did not affect them, as that was paid by the exporter, but as soon as they were convinced that they got less for their fish and that they were the people who paid the tax they arose in their might and demanded that that tax be removed and the government of that day, without waiting for the legislature to move in the matter, passed a Minute in Council abolishing the export tax. The fishermen not only got paid back the export tax on the balance of their fish which they had not shipped for that reason, but also on the fish they had already shipped. There was also

a tax on seal skins which was abolished by the Executive Government of that day, as soon as they learned that the sealers were convinced that they were the people who were paying that tax. I trust I will not be misunderstood in this matter and that I want to draw the inference that the exporters are making a charge on the common people that they ought to bear themselves. On the contrary, I admit that it is the business principle and there is no other way of doing it. And, Mr. Chairman, everything that I have written and said against the Income Tax is because I believe capital and labor are so closely allied to each other that you cannot lay a burden on one that the other will not be called upon to share. I maintain that the best course for all governments to pursue is not to tax unduly the men in business, because their success is the only hope for the laboring man. No government should clog the wheels of progress, but hold out every inducement for expansion of business. Business will give labor. More labor means more revenue. The more I seek for information on this point, the more I am convinced that I am right in my contention. In conclusion I will quote you an extract from another authority. David Swing says: "Capital is condensed labour; it is nothing until labor takes hold of it. The living labour sets free the condensed labor, and makes it assume some from the utility and beauty. Capital and labor are one, and they will be drawn nearer to each other as the world advances in intellect and goodness."

Let us hope, Mr. Chairman, that the present government and all future governments will do their best to bring capital and labor together, until they become like a three-fold cord that cannot be broken.

HON. MR. AYRE remarked that the Bill made allowances for the sum of

\$5,000 in reckoning annual profits as tax free in the case of small companies, but made no allowances beyond this for large companies, with, say, ten times as much capital. This money was a great benefit to the country and ought to receive some such recognition. If a man goes to the bank and borrows money to run his business, he is allowed to charge the interest thereon as expenses, but if he uses his own money he is allowed no such reduction. You are encouraged to use money borrowed from the Bank, but there is no encouragement to a business man to use his own money. In Canada one is allowed to charge the interest on one's own money and expenses. It seemed only just and right that some such provision should be allowed here. A business man with \$10,000 of capital is allowed \$5,000 reduction and a man with \$50,000 of capital is only allowed the same. He strongly urged the Hon. Mr. Cook to take this matter up with the Government.

HON. MR. COOK said he quite saw the Hon. Gentleman's point, and would take the matter up with the Government.

HON. THE PRESIDENT said the same question had come up some years ago, and on that there had been a split. The two classes of business firms had advocates in the House at the time—the similar ones which borrowed money from the banks, and the older-established firms which had funds of their own. The Income Tax Bill of 1917 was rejected, and the House was prorogued. It was arranged to pass the Bill, and we were deprived of the right to deal with money bills in the future. He suggested that the Committee rise and report progress, and finish the Bill later.

HON. MR. COOK thought it better to go through the Bill and take all

suggestions which hon. members had to make and submit them to the Government at one time.

HON. MR. JOB sought information on Section 8, sub-section (1). He said that the fiscal year of some companies ended on March 31st, and their returns could not be made at the date fixed. What would happen in cases of that sort.

HON. MR. COOK pointed out that there had to be a fixed time, and December 31st was the end of the fiscal year of most companies, but that in the case of businesses which could not have returns in at the time specified, no reasonable request for further time would be denied.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed the Committee stage. It was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

WAR PENSIONS ACT

On motion for second reading of the War Pensions Act, Hon. Mr. Cook said:

Mr. President, the Newfoundland War Pensions Act was passed in 1922. It was based on the Canadian Act. Subsequently the Canadian Government gave certain bonuses, which were given from year to year. The Newfoundland Government followed the Canadian practice and gave similar bonuses, the Act giving these bonuses being renewed annually. The last Act that was passed in the Newfoundland Legislature was 1927. The passing of the Act was overlooked last year. This Act brings the continuance of the bonuses system on the Canadian basis up to the 30th day of June 1928, and consequently covers the break caused by the non-passage of the Act last year, and carries it on to the end of the current year.

A question was raised in the House of Assembly as to whether this Act

should not be made permanent instead of being passed annually, and some of the members thought that the Canadian Parliament had changed the Act from an annual to a permanent one. It was decided in the House of Assembly, however, that for the immediate present it should be enacted so as to cover the situation up to the 30th day of June, 1930, and in the meantime the whole question might be further considered, and next session of the Legislature a decision arrived at whether the present procedure of an annual Act should be followed, or whether it should be made a permanent enactment.

Honourable Members will note that this Bill is a copy, word for word, of the Act of 1927, with the exception of the change of date.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Second reading of Department of Justice Bill.

HON. MR. COOK.—Mr. President, Many years ago the Department of Justice was constituted not merely of an Attorney General, who was the adviser and executive head of the Department, but of an Attorney General together with a Solicitor General upon whom devolved the responsibility of the actual conduct of criminal proceedings before the various courts of jurisdiction of this country. Many distinguished men have occupied the position of Solicitor General, in fact it has been a training ground in the past for Judges of the Supreme Court. The late Mr. Justice Emerson was for some years Solicitor General of Newfoundland, and the late Sir James Winter likewise almost began his distinguished career which culminated as a Judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, as Solicitor General. Under the reorganization of the

Department by the Winter-Morine Ministry of 1898, or about that date, this office of Solicitor General was dropped and since then the work formerly done by the Solicitor General for a stated salary has been distributed to the legal profession as political patronage. This has developed to such an extent that during recent years the expenditure under the head of civil and criminal prosecutions has amounted to about \$25,000 a year. It will be noted that the vote in the Estimates has actually been \$20,000 a year, but year after year Supplementary Supply has been required in amounts in the neighborhood of \$5,000. The handling of criminal and quasi-criminal prosecutions by miscellaneous solicitors engaged for the particular job is an inefficient and expensive method of handling this business. It is inefficient in that the lawyer who has merely the individual job cannot have similar knowledge and experience of a man in contact with this class of work continually. There is no continuity of thought, there is no continuity of practice, no continuity of experience, with the result that in many cases there must be miscarriage of justice attributable to lack of experience in handling such classes of criminal business. These bits of legal patronage usually handed out to junior legal friends of the party in power very often did not go satisfactorily to the Minister of Justice or to the Inspector General of Constabulary, whoever in the particular case happened to be the person taking charge of the prosecution in question. In addition to this serious defect of the patronage system there is the enormous unnecessary expense. A lawyer employed for some little particular job starts out with a big retaining fee for that job. Then he gets his next job and he starts out with

a big retaining fee for that new job, and so on. The records of the last few years show that payments of hundreds of dollars have been made for services, the practical value of which to the colony would not represent more than a few score of postage stamps. The present Attorney General, Sir Richard Squires, feels that much greater efficiency can be secured in the handling of these cases if some one person undertakes that responsibility, and that a saving of \$10,000 a year can be secured thereby. I am not surprised to find that both of the Opposition lawyers, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Winter, in the House of Assembly, aggressively opposed this measure. As a matter of fact when the Attorney General introduced this Bill in the House of Assembly he expressly said that he expected considerable criticism from the legal profession because it meant that there would be ten or fifteen thousand dollars which had been annually distributed amongst junior lawyers for more or less inefficient services that would be saved to the tax-payers of the country.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MR. COOK.—Mr. President, about two years ago it was found necessary for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to take possession of a portion of the foreshore of Bonavista to provide the fishermen with a hauling-up place for their boats. This appeared to be Crown property, was in the main regarded as property of the Crown, and further, had been in use for generations for that purpose by the fishermen. It turned out, however, that a considerable portion

of the property belonged to a family by the name of Brown. An arbitration was held to decide the amount of money that should be paid to the owners. The arbitration was irregularly held in that all the owners were not notified or represented, and the award itself was irregular in that the arbitration awarded about \$15,000 for a piece of property the market value of which would be about \$1,500. When the present Attorney General, Sir Richard Squires, took charge of the Department of Justice, a demand was made upon him in relation to the payment of this sum of \$15,000. He refused to comply with the demand and took the position that the arbitration granting a reasonable award would be required before he would recommend payment. One of the Brown family, a man of considerable aggressive vigor, with years of training in the United States of America, decided that he would forcibly retake possession of the property and fence it. In this situation a general examination had to be made by the Attorney General into the actual procedure followed by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the Department took possession of this property several years ago. Sir Richard Squires found that the legislative authority of the Minister had at that time been exceeded by him, and that as a matter of fact the Department of Marine and Fisheries Act did not include express legislative powers sufficient to enable the present Minister to deal with the case, particularly in view of the tangles which had developed as the result of past irregularities. This Bill consequently provides that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may, when he finds it necessary in the public interest, take possession of property for marine purposes in a similar way and to a similar extent as the Highroads Com-

mission may take possession of property for the construction of highroads and bridges. I call attention to the fact that there is also before this Chamber for second reading a Bill entitled "Of the Department of Public Works." This Bill relating to the Department of Public Works is identical in wording with this Bill to which I have just referred relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the only change being the insertion of the words "Department of Public Works" in place of "Department of Marine and Fisheries." The Attorney General felt that as efficient legislation was being prepared to create and confirm the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, similar legislation might contemporaneously be passed so that there could be no doubt as to the powers and authority of the Minister of Public Works in the same regard.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be sent to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

In moving the second reading of Bill relating to the Department of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Cook stated that he had just explained the reason for this Bill, and asked that it be read a second time.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Council adjourned until Wednesday May 22nd at 3 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, May 22, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 3 p.m.

HON. MR. COOK informed the House of the sudden passing of Mr. M. S. Sullivan, representative for Placentia West, and for years a member of the House of Assembly. He

felt that this sad news would be learned with regret by the whole community, and that the sympathy of all honorable members would go out to the recently bereaved family. As a mark of respect he moved that the House adjourn until Monday next. This motion was carried unanimously.

HON. MR. COOK gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the suspension of the Rules of the House for the remainder of the session.

The House then adjourned until Monday, May 27th, at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, May 27, 1929.

The Council met at 3 p.m.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a message from His Excellency the Governor intimating that leave of absence had been granted to Hon. Mr. Bishop.

The motion for the suspension of rules in connection with Bills now before the House or to come before the House was passed.

The Bill respecting Public Enquiries and the Income Tax Bill were read a third time and were ordered to be sent to the Lower House with a message acquainting that body that they had been passed.

The following Bills passed committee stage without amendment and were read a second time.

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

A Bill entitled "Of the Department of Justice."

A Bill entitled "Of the Department of Public Works."

It was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed the same without amendment

SHIPBUILDING BILL

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the "Shipbuilding Bill." Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB.—An Honorable member of this House a short time ago went so far as to urge the necessity of a complete close season for the seal fishery for perhaps four or five years. I venture to think that in making this suggestion he had not taken into consideration either the correctness of his superficial impressions as to the serious depletion of our sealing herds, nor the very serious immediate consequence to the Colony of the action he suggested. I would like to correct from my own knowledge the statement made by the honorable member referred to, to the effect that Captain Caldwell, our intrepid aviator, has expressed the opinion that there was evidence of depletion.

Captain Caldwell has stated, as a matter of fact, that his flying experiences indicated that patches of seals may be met with anywhere over our oceans of ice, and seeing that our ice-fields comprise an area of at least 40,000 square miles, and that our steamers do not cover probably more than 4,000 square miles, it would seem that there are likely to be many patches of seals which are untouched from year to year, and indeed, the enormous quantities of bedlamers and old seals seen every year tend to confirm this view. Our steamers, more or less follow the line of least resistance in search for seals, and my perusal of sealing logs for the past thirty years induces a belief that many times our captains have been on the track of patches of seals which they have been unable to reach, and from which they have been turned back owing to the impenetrable ice existing in the direction in which they desired to proceed.

I would like all concerned to deeply consider the remarks I have to make, so that damage by possibly well-intentioned but ill-considered

legislation to this important industry can be avoided before it is too late. It would take little indeed to divert the base of this industry from Newfoundland forever. It is a well-known fact that United States interests are at the present time doing their utmost to get their hands on this industry, utilising Nova Scotia as a base. It is therefore most important that every fact in connection with the seal fishery should be carefully studied before any fresh legislation is introduced.

In order to understand clearly this question of possible depletion of our herds, it is very necessary to take into consideration the various breeding grounds of our seals both in Newfoundland waters and elsewhere. There are at least four well-defined locations at which the harp seals whelp annually. They are:

1. Off the North East Coast of Newfoundland.
2. In the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which may perhaps be sub-divided into (a) The vicinity of the Magdalen Islands, and (b) The vicinity of Anticosti and the Mecatina Islands.
3. The district between the Island of Jan Mayen and the East Coast of Greenland, and
4. The district from Nova Zembla eastward and southward to the mouth of the White Sea.

Do seals from the several whelping grounds interbreed or intermix promiscuously in any way? This seems to be a most important question bearing on the industry, as the question arises whether some seals which usually whelp off the Newfoundland Coast may not in some years transfer their presence for whelping purposes to the Jan Mayen or White Sea districts, or vice versa. The answer to this question is merely "We don't know," and without some co-opera-

tion with Norway and the Soviet Republic, and the carrying out of marking or branding experiments over a considerable number of years it would seem to be impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion. The question, however, as to whether the young harp seals around our coasts are becoming depleted, and if so, whether this depletion is serious enough to require energetic action to avoid further depletion, is the main point in which we are interested. Now, first of all, what real evidence have we of the alleged depletion? I say alleged, because, without doubt there exists among certain people in Newfoundland an impression (perhaps quite a superficial one) that there is a depletion. The Hon. Capt. Kean in one of his lectures in discussing the question of the impressions formed on the public by good catches or bad catches of seals, made something like the following remarks, which I thought at the time were very good and interesting and very true. He said that when our steamers return with bad or poor catches of seals, the public immediately cries out, "what did we tell you, the seals are all killed out and we must have a close season." On the other hand, he says, if we return with good catches of seals the public says, "this indiscriminate slaughter of seals must be stopped." How often does one hear it said that the best indication of depletion is the fact that about seventy years ago as many as 500,000 to 600,000 seals were annually killed off our coasts, whereas nowadays there are only about 200,000 seals killed. On reference to Chafe's Record we find that the last catch recorded of over 500,000 seals was in the year 1858, when it apparently amounted to 507,000 seals, but we also find on reference to Chafe's Record that in 1862 the total catch amounted to only about 266,000 seals.

This was prior to the advent of steamers at the seal fishery. At that time there were engaged at the seal fishery something like 350 or 400 sailing vessels, manned by from 12,000 to 15,000 men. Unfortunately there are no reports to show how many of these 507,000 seals taken in 1858 or of the 268,000 taken in 1862 were old seals, but it is known that these sailing vessels followed up the seals till the end of May or even to the middle of June, and that a very considerable portion of the patch consisted of old seals and bedlamers, and it is not unreasonable to calculate that one-third of the total seals killed at these times were old and bedlamers and young hoods, or in other words that not more than two-thirds were young harps. If this is admitted as reasonable, it would place the total catch of young harps in 1858—the last big year—at about 380,000, and the total catch of young harps in 1862 at about 170,000, which is actually about 20,000 less than our catch of young harps this year, 1929.

These 350 or 400 sailing vessels with their 12,000 to 15,000 men, were naturally scattered over the ocean of ice to a much greater extent than today's fleet of 10 or 12 steamers carrying 2,000 to 2,200 men. Moreover, I understand that many of these 350 to 400 vessels with 12,000 to 15,000 men, carried on their operations for from three to four months, whilst our present fleet of 10 to 12 steamers with 2,000 to 2,200 men carry on their operations only for five or six weeks. Do not these facts show the absurdity of quoting the difference in the catch without careful consideration of accompanying conditions, as evidence of declining herds? It is apparently on the evidence of numbers caught that many people form their opinions as to depletion, but even so I fear they don't study the statistics

of catch very carefully. If we admit that it is right to base our views as to this question of depletion upon statistics of the catch, I can only state that the position is distinctly encouraging.

In speaking personally with the honorable gentleman who made some remarks in this Chamber some little time ago on the subject of the seal-fishery, he seemed to be surprised to hear that the catch of seals was larger to-day than it was 8 or 10 years ago. The following are round figures as to the catch of young harps off our east coast from 1919 to 1929 inclusive:

		Men employed
1919	63,600	1572
1920	30,600	1421
1921	81,900	1125
1922	78,600	1061
1923	64,700	948
1924 (plus 40,000 taken by lands- men)	143,500	1008
	—————	—————
	432,900	7135

Average catch of steamers of first five years of this period..... 72,150 seals
Average per man..... 61 "

		Men employed
1925	74,000	1505
1926 (plus 10,000 taken by lands- men)	187,000	1551
1927	156,800	1634
1928	140,000	1860
1929	155,000	1819
	—————	—————
	712,800	8369

Average catch of steamers on East Coast for last six years of this period142,560 seals
Average per man 86 "

The honorable gentleman will be surprised to see from these figures

that the actual catch of seals for the past five years has been very nearly double what it was for the previous six years, and further the average catch of young harps per man, which to my mind is a more convincing way of dealing with this question, is something like forty per cent higher for the years 1925 to 1929 inclusive, than for the years 1919 to 1924 inclusive. The actual average per man in the latter case being 86, and in the former case 61.

I hope the above-quoted figures will at least point to the folly of forming opinions on the question of depletion from merely passing impressions without deeply diving into the true facts.

I now propose to supply you with some little information as to the catch of seals by our competitors, namely, the Norwegians and Russians. In my early remarks I mentioned two areas other than in Newfoundland waters at which the harp seals whelp annually, viz: the district between the East Coast of Greenland and the Island of Jan Mayen, and the district from Nova Zembla eastward and southward to the mouth of the White Sea. It will be a surprise to some to know that the number of seals annually killed in these areas far exceed the Newfoundland catch, as the following details for the years 1924, 1925 and 1926 will show you:—

	Harps		
Norwegians.....	272,767	340,900	258,700
Russians.....	125,000	125,000	125,000
Nfld. includ- ing 40,000 by landsmen.....	154,600	120,400	211,500

	Hoods		
Norwegians.....	21,340	54,500	53,100
Nfld.....	4,000	7,500	30
	—————	—————	—————
	577,707	657,300	648,330

It will be observed that in 1924 the total number of harp seals killed in Newfoundland was roughly 154,600, including about 40,000 killed by landsmen, which is less than thirty per cent of the total combined catch of Norway, Russia and Newfoundland.

The catch of hood seals in Newfoundland in that year was roughly 4,000, which represents less than sixteen per cent of the hoods caught by Norway and Newfoundland combined.

In 1925 the Newfoundland catch of harps was roughly 20,400, which is just about twenty per cent of the combined catch of Norway, Russia and Newfoundland. The Newfoundland catch of hood seals in 1925 was roughly 7,500, which represents a shade over twelve per cent of the Norwegian catch of hoods. In 1926 the Newfoundland catch of harps was roughly 211,500 seals, which is about thirty-five per cent of the combined catch of Norway, Russia and Newfoundland. The Newfoundland catch of hoods that year was about thirty seals, less than one per thousand of the total Norwegian catch.

You may desire to know from what sources these statistics have been obtained. My answer is that as regards the Norwegian figures, I have obtained them from official figures, and in the case of the Russian catch, from figures estimated by the Norwegians. It is not possible to get exact figures from the Soviet Republic, but I have been able to check these figures to some extent from other sources and believe them to be reasonably correct.

Now, I would like to refer also to the fact that the Norwegians prosecute their sealfishery to a much later date than we do ours, and in fact many of their vessels follow up the seals to the Greenland Coast and elsewhere as late as the end of July, and during this time, so far as the hoods are concerned, there is no possible

question that they are killing the hoods that frequent our coast for breeding purposes, and which undoubtedly return afterwards to the East Coast of Greenland.

And now I would like to say a few words about the unwisdom of legislating in a rough and ready way in an industry such as our seal-fishery, and in this connection I may say that these remarks apply to some extent to other fisheries, as development is being very seriously hindered by ill-considered legislation. It is easy to see, for instance, that if we introduce laws prohibiting the killing of seals after a certain date, we are only benefitting the Norwegian ships which prosecute the summer fishery up in Greenland, where undoubtedly our seals proceed after their spring sojourn here.

If the whole object of our legislation is to increase the herds of seals for the benefit of future generations, by all means the best way to accomplish it is to prohibit the killing of them altogether, and the same applies to codfish, salmon and all other fisheries. But, surely, unless we desire to hasten the destruction of this delightful, but I regret to say badly-managed Colony, we have to legislate for the best interests of an industry giving employment directly and indirectly to a very large portion of our population, because it is not only the men employed at the sealfishery who are helped by it, but thousands of others. It is an industry that is distributing in actual cash amongst us at the very least \$750,000 annually. The employment given both in the out-harbours and St. John's is very large indeed, and it is perhaps hard for people not intimately interested to realise that the discontinuance of the sealfishery would eventuate as a real disaster.

And now as to the main question before the Chair, viz: the "Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill." There is provided in this Bill a very large bounty to encourage the building of auxiliary motor vessels for the seal-fishery. In my opinion, if the employment of auxiliary motor vessels at the seal-fishery is an economically sound proposition, no encouragement is necessary, and they will come without the provision of a bounty amounting to nearly thirty per cent of their value.

I would like to offer a word of congratulation to all those, including our outport friends at Port Union, Twillingate and elsewhere, upon their enterprise in connection with these auxiliary motor vessels, and can assure them that I admire their spirit of adventure, and wish them a full measure of success, which unfortunately they have not had this year. But there seems no good reason why the Newfoundland taxpayer should be burdened with a large share of the expense of building up a fleet of these craft. It would take something like 100 of them to employ as many men as are employed by our present fleet of sealing steamers, and assuming that these craft register 100 tons each, the cost of the bounty to the Colony for such a fleet would be \$400,000.

The hundreds of shareholders who have freely invested their money in steamers prosecuting the seal-fishery, the total investment in which must be about \$1,500,000, did so without any request for assistance from our taxpayers, and the auxiliary craft already built have had no such assistance.

I am not in favour of anything but a very moderate bonus in connection with shipbuilding or ship repairing and am of opinion that the measure at present in existence, affords all the encouragement that is desirable, and

that we should not agree to place upon the general taxpayers of this Colony any further burden in this respect.

As regards the question of free admission of motor engines for fishery purposes, or indeed for any new developments, I am strongly in favor of their admission either entirely free, or on the lowest basis of duty of any imports. I make the latter remark because I believe that the whole of the present free list should be subject to a small duty in preference to any direct taxation.

I therefore favor the clause in this Bill permitting free entry for motor engines, but I believe that the best interests of the Colony will be conserved by avoiding the increased bounties for shipbuilding provided for in this Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON took this opportunity of replying to the answer he had received from the Hon. Leader of the Government in regard to his (Hon. Mr. Anderson's) question on the Dominion Co-operative Building Assoc. The answer was satisfactory as far as it went but it did not go far enough. He presumed the Executive Council had framed the answer to his question. Whoever framed it it was not the fair answer and he was not deserving of this treatment. Contrary to the statement made in the answer the records were not voluminous; half an hour's work and one could get all the information needed. In the circumstances the reply was a personal insult. He wished to get at the bottom of the whole matter, and in doing so he desired justice and fairplay. So far as the Bill before the House is concerned he was in favor of it and gave it his unqualified support.

HON. MR. RYAN said that this bounty was too large. By building a 150 ton vessel the builder receives

\$6,000. This would be alright if the vessels were built for the codfishery, but unnecessary for sealing vessels of the auxiliary type. Such motor vessels have a poor chance as witness their returns this season. Who will invest in such craft if the catch is to be as small as it was this year, and it was quite conceivable that it will not be any greater in the future because the heavier and more powerful steamers make a successful competitor. If the bounty were to be reduced to what it was formerly he would support the Bill.

HON. MR. DAVEY wished to make a few remarks with regard to the survey of these vessels when they are newly built. Under this act they have not the proper survey. Under the 1925 Act a rigid and proper survey had to be made. In 1926 an amendment was made which loosened the machinery for this survey with the result as had been pointed out previously a vessel had been lost. He contended that the owner of a vessel was not the proper surveyor. The provisions under the 1925 Act were the best that could be made and he favoured their insertion in this Act. Unless such amendment were made he could not support the Bill.

HON. MR. BARTLETT said he supported this Bill. It was a costly thing to build a vessel. In Nova Scotia fishing vessels had to be more strongly built with the result that they cost about \$140 per ton, in this country they would cost about \$120 per ton. The extra strength required in this Act would add to the cost so that the bounty would really only pay for the engine. He thought shipbuilding should be encouraged. All the money was spent in this country except the cost of the engine. With reference to the survey there are Government inspectors who made three surveys,

one when the keel is laid, one when the ship is about half finished, and the last when the ship is completed. It is the duty of the inspector to make a proper survey and if this is not done it is not the fault of the government.

HON. MR. MURPHY considered that the industry was going down. It was difficult to get the lumber necessary for the building of the vessels, much of the hardwood having to be imported. Regarding the big ships for the seal fishery, he did not see any future before them unless the steamers were done away with.

HON. CAPT. KEAN explained that he had spoken before on the Bill and did not intend to reiterate what he had already said, but he wished to oppose the extra amount for bounty given. The remarks of the honorable gentlemen who had spoken in favour if it would lead one to imagine that there was a demand coming from someone or somewhere for the building of these motor schooners for the seal-fishery. This was not so. It was true that last year one vessel was fortunate, and seven more had been added this year, but the result has not been satisfactory. Out of the two hundred men sailing in these the average amount made per man was only about ten dollars. With regard to the sealfishery, he added, that this industry had been prosecuted for the last one hundred and twenty years by private enterprise and it was the first time a bill of this nature had been introduced. The Imogene had cost its owners \$300,000; other ships of the firm of Job Bros. had cost between two and three hundred thousand. Men up to the present were prepared to place their money in that enterprise and were satisfied with the dividends. He contended there was no need to build the class of vessel refer-

red to, for they were never going to be a success while the steamers were being used; so why should the forty dollars per ton bounty be paid. He refuted the statement that the seal-fishery benefitted only the captains and owners, by stating that the more the captains made the more the crews made. If, on the other hand, the captains and the crews made nothing they at least lost nothing; while the owners stood to suffer a great deal. To gain a time perspective of the returns of the seal-fishery, the statistics of periods must be taken. Consequently without comparing notes with Mr. Job who had taken 11 year periods, he had taken a 12 year period, and the following is the result: From 1918 to 1923 the steamers brought in 595,962; from 1924 to 1929 they brought in 1,078,311—a difference in favor of the last six years of 482,349. If to this you add the amount brought in by the Young Harp and Florencia last year it would swell the amount to practically a half million more for the last six years than the previous six years. Surely that is a proof that the seals are not depleted. Then we take another statement in a letter from a number of men from one of the out-ports, namely, that the seal-fishery is only good for the captains and owners. A glance at Chafe's Book will show that the value of seals brought in during the last six years amounts to \$1,942,353.70. The amount divided among the crews is \$647,353.23. Then when you take into consideration that the time occupied during the six years is only twelve months, there was divided among the crews \$53,946.10 per month during the time they were engaged in the industry, and that at a time of the year when most of these men could not earn a \$5.00 bill. I make bold to say that no industry in the country gave such good results among the people of the country ex-

cept it may be our paper industry. In addition to the amount paid the crew there is a number of men engaged in St. John's in handling the fat and skins, and the business given the trade generally, such as tinsmiths, blacksmiths and carpenters, and the number longshoremen in handling of coal. I know of no industry in the country in the same length of time that gives better returns to the laboring classes than the seal-fishery. And if the people who write on this matter would only take the trouble to state facts, their arguments would not appear so ridiculous as they do now when the searchlight of truth is thrown upon them. Contrary to that, like the unthinking horse, they rush headlong into the battle regardless of figures or facts and apparently without any regard whether what they say will do good or harm.

While the large steamers were being used at the seal-fishery the demand for the motor vessels would not be great enough nor sufficiently successful to warrant the expenditure under consideration, and I therefore am not satisfied to increase the bounty previously given by one dollar.

HON. MR. ANDERSON reviewed the figures given and considered that if the building was to be stimulated and labor given, he failed to see why there was so great an objection to the bounty mentioned in the Bill.

On the vote being about to be taken Hons. Kean, Ryan and Job wished to be placed on record as being against the Bill because of the increased bounty.

HON. THE PRESIDENT suggested that in view of the stand taken by these members he would suggest a compromise and thought the honourable Leader of the Government might arrange something of that sort.

HON. MR. COOK thought that could be done and suggested that a Com-

mittee of the House be appointed to go into the Bill and devise some suggestions.

The Committee rose, reported having made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. THE PRESIDENT appointed the following select committee, viz: Hons. Cook, Murphy, Ryan, Job, Shea, Steer, Kean and Bartlett.

On motion for the second reading of the Patents Bill, Hon. Mr. Gibbs said: Under our present law a patent becomes void after two years from date of issuance unless it is manufactured in this country. This form of legislation is one of the after effects of the War. Each country was endeavoring to secure advantages over the other; confiscation of rights enjoyed prior to the War had taken place and big manufacturing countries were requiring the manufacture of patents within their boundaries. We followed in the footsteps of others and passed legislation of a similar character. Since that time a change has taken place in the attitude of other countries, and this has been followed by a change in legislation. All the great patent-producing countries have legislation similar to this amendment. Our Act was modelled along the lines of Dominion of Canada, and Canada in 1923 repealed the compulsory manufacture of patented articles and enacted legislation similar to this amendment.

The United States whose inventions have increased enormously interfere but very little in the matter of working a patent. There is no compulsory manufacture. All the great industrial countries grant patents but do not require the manufacture of the patented article. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill passed Committee stage, was read a third time and it was order-

ed that a message to the effect that this Bill had been passed be sent to the House of Assembly asking the concurrence of that body.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read messages from the House of Assembly intimating that the following Bills had been passed and asking concurrence therein:

An Act to further amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the vacation of seals in the House of Assembly" and Acts in amendment thereof.

An Act relating to the raising of a Loan of the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.

An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V, Chapter 33, entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

An Act relating to the Establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula.

An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925.

An Act relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures.

An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.

An Act to Amend "The Tourist Commission Act, 1927."

An Act relating to the Departments of Agriculture and Mines.

An Act relating to the Preservation and Propagation of Deer.

These Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT requested that the Select Committee on the Shipbuilding Bill meet at 2.30 to-morrow afternoon.

On motion of the Hon. Leader of the Government the House adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday.

TUESDAY, May 28, 1929.

House met at 3 p.m.

Committee stage on the Encouragement of Shipbuilding was resumed.

HON. MR. COOK presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill. The Committee did not think any amendment just now would be in order.

HON. CAPT. KEAN.—Mr. President, I cannot support the Bill in its present state, and move an amendment that we let the bounty on shipbuilding remain the same as 1928, but that the government will permit all hard wood not obtainable in this country that is desirable to carry out schedule D of this Act, and engines and spare parts for motor schooners, and other articles, duty free, until it reaches a sum equal to the proposed increase in bounty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason I am taking this stand is because when I had occasion to seek for information on this point from a man of authority he convinced me by the argument he used. I quote here from his own words: "One very freely talks of these things as concessions, but they really only mean a consent to waive a charge of an abnormal kind. The taxpayer is not called upon to pay anything extra. The Minister of Finance is not asked to pay anything; the Government and the Colony are simply asked to waive an extra receipt of money in order to get increased revenue from year to year later on."

The very same principle, Mr. Chairman, is behind this Bill. Most members who have spoken on this Bill have done so because they want to encourage shipbuilding but when we look around and see that a great many of our fishermen have abandoned fishing vessels and prefer to settle on the shore, we cannot hope that in the very

near future, at all events, we shall get any demand from our fishermen to build schooners for them. When we think of our local foreign tonnage the thing is more hopeless still.

But when we are asked to build a class of motor schooners to compete with the steamers of to-day, I regard it as throwing good money after bad. I cannot convince people of that, and they are entitled to their opinions as much as I am to mine, and while I am prepared to help these people who I admit while they go on building motor schooners, are giving employment and helping others to live; I do not want to unduly tax others who are not in anyway interested or helped by the building of these schooners.

Now if you accept my amendment you can readily see how a portion of the help we give will come back to increase the revenue. Several persons are engaged in the ship yard at Port Union building those vessels. Many more men are engaged cutting the material for the building of these schooners. The wages which they receive will be spent in this country, and a portion will go to augment the revenue and there will be no extra taxation.

If, on the other hand you increase the bounty fifty or one hundred thousand dollars a year somebody must be taxed to get that amount.

And in this country there are too many taxes at the present day. I sincerely hope that the motor schooners will prosper at the seal fishery, but of this I have great doubts.

The amendment was put by the Chairman and was defeated, whereupon the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with the usual message.

On the motion for the Second Reading of the Bill "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances."

HON. MR. COOK said.— Mr. President. This is the usual form of money Bill which covers by statute the amounts passed in the Estimates as Retiring Allowances for those to whom Retiring Allowances have decided to be given in accordance with an Act respecting the Civil Service passed some three or four years ago.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and passed. It also passed Committee stage without amendment, was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with a message that the Council had passed it without amendment.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of "An Act to amend the Tourist Commission Act," and said:—

Under a Bill passed some two or three years ago a Tourist Commission was appointed for a period of two years. Their Commission expires during the middle of this summer. The Prime Minister felt that as these gentlemen had actually undertaken this season's work it would be discourteous to them and disadvantageous to the general Tourist development to allow their commission to expire during the middle of the Tourist season. This Bill extends the period of the commission to the 31st day of December, and in the future the period for which commissions will issue will be from the 1st of January which is a much more acceptable time for the organization of a Tourist Commission than the middle of the Summer.

The Bill passed second reading and was submitted to a Committee of the Whole House. Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. It was then read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with the usual message.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines" and explained: Honourable members will remember that during the last General Election the Prime Minister, Sir Richard Squires, announced on many platforms his program in connection with the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. This Bill is a carrying out of that public undertaking. It will be remembered that many years ago the Department of Finance and Customs was divided up into two separate divisions, still under the same Minister and with a Deputy for Finance and a Deputy for Customs. As the work of the Deputy for Finance was so entirely different from the work of the Deputy for Customs, it was thought that it could not be reasonably expected that the same man could handle both interests in the best way. A limited day of eight or ten hours could not have crowded into it sufficient work to enable the various problems coming up under two separate headings to be properly handled. In the Department of the Colonial Secretary there is a whole series of departments. The Department of Public Charities, for instance the Department of Public Health, another illustration; the Department of the Government Engineer; the one Minister being executive head of all these departments. It is now proposed to divide the Department of Agriculture and Mines into two groups and to have a Deputy to be the permanent head for that portion dealing with mines, timbers, water-powers, etc., and another Deputy to be the permanent head for the agricultural side of the Department. It is not necessary for me to explain to honorable member of this Chamber the absurdity of asking a man who is a timber expert or a surveyor or a geologist to

deal with matter of practical agriculture. Again, no one can expect a practical agriculturist to be of the office and executive type equipped with expert knowledge, such as would enable him to efficiently handle the problems in connection with water-powers. The Prime Minister hopes that within the next year, or as soon as possible, to secure the services of some able Newfoundlander who has had years of training in some of the various schools and colleges of agriculture in Canada and years experience in practical agriculture in the Dominion and who will be prepared to come back to Newfoundland and take charge as a permanent head of the agricultural branch of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, taking a vital living activity in the interstts of the development of agriculture in our country.

The Bill passed second reading and was referred to a Committee of the Whole House; Hon. Capt. Kean in the Chair.

HON. MR. JOB enquired what the extra services would likely cost.

HON. MR. COOK replied that he would get the information asked for and have it ready for to-morrow's session.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Respecting Legislative Disabilities," said: This Bill was necessiated by the Bill in relation to the Department of Justice with respect to the appointment of a Solicitor General. This Solicitor General Bill has already passed this House and it is now necessary to pro-

vide that in the event of a member of the House of Assembly being appointed to that position he would not have to go back to his constituency for re-election. In the olden days all members who took departmental offices were called upon to go back to their constituencies for re-election. This was the English practice and it was adopted by Newfoundland. Some years ago this practice was changed in England as it was felt that it was unnecessarily upsetting in the organization of a new government and unreasonably expensive to have a bye-election following immediately upon general elections. Some two or three years ago the change was made in Newfoundland and this Bill follows the new procedure adopted by the Newfoundland Legislature at that time.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill; Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said that the measure before the House was a very serious one and should receive the consideration of every member before it was passed. It was he, added, an attempt to wipe out the Act of 1872, known as Carter's Purge. There was no necessity for it, unless to provide a means of getting positions for nearly every member of the Government, and after half a century of higher education, he regretted that such should be the sentiments of to-day. He felt satisfied that the Bill had no other object than that which he had started, and because of that he would not be a party to it; and moved as an amendment that Section 3 be struck out. That Section read as follows:—

'Section 2 (7) of the said Chapter is hereby amended by adding thereto the words 'or for the purpose of enquiry under Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) or otherwise into the administration

of any branch of the public service or into any matter relating to the good government of the Colony.' ”

As the Bill stood it was robbing the Government of its independence.

HON. MR. BARTLETT understood that the section referred to meant that any member of the House of Assembly might be appointed to a position without the need of a bye-election, and considered that if that were the law the independence of the members of the House would be done away with. This being contrary to British practice, he begged to second the amendment before the House.

The amendment, on being put to the House, was passed without a division. The Bill then passed third reading, and was ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same with some amendments.

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Loan Bill stated that it contained merely the provisions in connection with the proposed loan of \$6,000,000. The Bill passed second reading and was submitted to a committee of the Whole House; Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON stated that he wished to make certain remarks concerning the Dominion Co-operative Building Association.

HON. THE PRESIDENT rose to a point of order, the subject of the remarks of the honourable gentleman having no reference to the Bill before the Committee.

The Bill passed Committee stage, was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with the usual message.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill respecting a Tax on Goods and stated that this Bill was

self explanatory. It dealt with the imposition of taxes on certain goods and the lifting of duties on certain other goods. Hon. Members would see its nature readily enough on reference to the measure itself.

HON. MR. AYRE and HON. MR. JOB desired some information relating to the original Bill, and Hon. Mr. Cook asked that the Bill be deferred until that information was obtained. The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. MR. COOK on the motion for second reading of the Bill “An Act for the Preservation and Propagation of Deer,” said I feel that practically every person in Newfoundland, I am sure every member of this Chamber, will agree that the continuous depletion of our caribou herds is a disadvantage to the Colony. Year after year efforts have been made to restrict the slaughter of deer by stringent closed seasons and regulations, as well as strict supervision and warden-ship. In spite of all the efforts of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board and of the Legislature in session in this regard, the deer are becoming rapidly depleted. There is a deer herd in the Peninsula of Avalon, and for the purpose of protecting this herd the Peninsula of Avalon is regarded as a sanctuary with special provisions that the deer shall not be disturbed at all during the mating season.

The Bill passed second reading .

The House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill with Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. MR. AYRE desired to say a few words on this measure. He said it was quite time some such Bill was not only passed but enforced. For some years he had been doing considerable travelling by canoe over the area in question, and time and again he had found evidence that caribou

had been killed in close season. He had reported this and the authorities had tried to do something, but without avail. Unless such a measure as this were really enforced he had no hesitation in saying that in a few years there would not be a caribou left on the Peninsula. He had great pleasure in supporting this Bill, but regretted that it did not go far enough. He felt that beaver should also be included. Of this matter also he had seen direct evidence of the killing of this sort of animal. Because of the nature of the travelling he was doing at the time, the trappers did not realize that their work was being seen. Hon. Mr. Ayre had seen enough to realize that these men were trapping beaver and living on caribou. The Game Association had endeavoured to do something, and had marked off certain territory in this section as closed ground, but their efforts had not the desired success. In a country such as this, caribou and such animals should be an asset, and unless they are protected adequately they will become extinct.

HON. MR. McNAMARA expressed his complete accord with the sentiments of the honorable the last speaker. Hon. Mr. McNamara knew whereof he spoke, because he was one of the founders of the Game Board. This Association tried to do its best, but the great trouble is the "poor settler." In defiance of everything this class of person took and did as he liked, on the ground of his state. During the War, from 1914 to 1918, when this settler was making money and well able to buy his food, he nevertheless killed without regard to law or regulations, and through the influence of politicians and the cry that the settler must live, he had escaped. The man who can restrain the activities of the poor settler in this respect would be a public benefactor.

HON. CAPT. KEAN was surprised to find that the Bill was confined to the Peninsula of Avalon. He did not profess to be an authority, and was not aware that there were deer to be found on the Peninsula of Avalon; usually people went north in search of them. Had the hon. member taken a different route, would he not have found the same thing happening in other parts of the country. Poor settlers, it is true, sometimes urged their plea and got the sympathy of nearly everybody; but he did not know and would like it explained why the measure was confined to the Avalon Peninsula.

HON. MR. COOK said that the request came from the Game and Inland Fisheries Board.

HON. THE PRESIDENT explained that the object was to make the Avalon Peninsula a preserve, which it had not hitherto been; and that no person during the close or open season should have the right to kill or pursue deer in that part of the country. Two amendments were then suggested by the hon. President, which he explained he was submitting at the request of the Board, which had considered the matter since the House of Assembly had passed the Bill.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendment. It was thereupon read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with some amendment.

BURIN ELECTRIC BILL

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Burin Electric Light and Power Resolutions, stated: This Bill deals with the supplying of a public utility, which it is hoped will be carried out by the United Towns Electric Company, to the residents of the Peninsula of Burin. That Penin-

sula is so situated that it has no opportunity of securing lighting facilities except by the utilization of certain water powers in that territory, by the development of which electrical energy for lighting, heating and power purposes can be secured. The residents of this Peninsula have for years been making an effort to interest the United Towns Electric Co., and other companies in such a development. Many years ago a charter was given a company for the purpose of these operations, but the cost of water power development, compared with the scattered population and limited demand, resulted in the failure of the company to get the necessary financial support and their franchise has consequently lapsed. It is now hoped that the work will be undertaken by a company already engaged in electrical light, heat, power and telephone operations in the City of St. John's and its neighborhood, namely, the United Towns Electric Company, associated with the Avalon Telephone Company. The concessions of water power granted in this Bill are only such as are required as reasonably necessary for the further development of the operations of the Company as it extends its service, or as population and industry increase in the Peninsula. There is the usual provision for free entry for material for original construction. It will be noted, however, that this free entry clause is very closely guarded and much more stringent than has been granted in very many previous cases. I feel that members of this House particularly will welcome an activity of this sort, as the application of electrical energy for heat, light and power in any section of the country naturally tends to raise the standard of living, and to produce good business.

The Bill was then read a second time, and submitted to a Committee

of the Whole House; Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair.

HON. MR. BARTLETT wanted to say how gratified he was to see this Bill come before the House. Some fifteen years ago a company had been formed to raise capital to bring electric power to the Burin Peninsula. It was known that the water power was there, but thru some reason or other the project fell thru. He was glad, however, that the United Towns Co. had now taken the matter up, and he was glad to give the Bill his hearty support. People who knew the Burin Peninsula knew how isolated some portions of it are, and this Bill would bring a great blessing to these people. He believed that the Peninsula was in for great development in the near future, and the bringing of electric power would be of great assistance.

As printed copies of the Bill were not ready, the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act for the Ratification of Certain Irregular Expenditures," and explained: On the present Government assuming office it was found that the Auditor General had sent in many reports to the late Government protesting against the irregular and illegal appropriation of funds for purpose other than those for which the funds were especially earmarked. The Auditor General has contended that all cheques issued by the late Government with respect to these particular matters were cheques irregularly issued and did not constitute a valid charge against the funds on which they were drawn. The Government felt that the only satisfactory way to meet the situation was by legislation the effect of this legislation being to legalise certain financial irregularities of their predecessors in office.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House; Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair. The Bill passed committee, was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the Council that he had received a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly,'" in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of the Hon. Capt. Kean, the Bill was read a first time. He stated, on the motion for second reading, that he believed the time was opportune for such a Bill. Under the old law moneys were not spent for election purposes between Nomination Day and Polling Day. Under the Bill it will be illegal to spend moneys after the proclamation for an election is issued. This is a very important provision, and had not come too quickly. For some time past candidates have been pressed to spend money for which little returns have been received. The section which took the voting power from inmates of the Poor Asylum was also a good one. To him, the idea of men waiting at the door of the Poor Asylum on Polling morning was a disgrace. With the section that permitted candidates to provide transportation of voters to booths he was also in accord. There was no reason why voters should not be taken to the booths, as there was no restriction on the way they should vote.

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

The following Bills, sent up from the House of Assembly, were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V, Chapter 5, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Construction and Maintenance of Highroads.'"

A Bill entitled "An Act Authorizing the Governor in Council to enter a contract with the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills, Ltd."

The Public Service Bill was read a first time, a second time, passed committee stage, was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with the usual message.

On motion of the Hon. Leader of the Government the Council adjourned until Wednesday at 3 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 29th, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 3 p.m.

HON. MR. COOK tabled the report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund. In moving the second reading of the Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland, Hon. Mr. Cook gave the following information to the honorable gentlemen who had enquired concerning it:

In the present Tax on Goods Act, Schedule A, the reading is as follows: "All materials for use solely for repairs, upkeep and operations of mills transportation plant and accessories, for the manufacture and conveyance of paper and pulp are free of duty under this Act. The word 'materials' has been interpreted by the Customs as not including fuel of any kind, and disputes have arisen with the importers regarding the meaning of this word. In order to confirm the decision of the Customs Department the Act is amended by adding after the

words 'paper and pulp' the words 'provided (and without prejudice to the meaning of the foregoing paragraph by inference from this proviso) that this paragraph shall not include fuel of any kind.'

Section 2 of the Resolutions is introduced for the purpose of making free the cotton or hemp yarn or twist and the cutch and bark extract for tanning nets, lines and twines. Previous to the taking off of the duty on lines and twines, the raw material was taxed 3 per cent; now that the duty is taken off lines and twines, in order to place the local manufacturers in as good a position as the manufacturer abroad, the raw material is exempted from the duty under this Act as well as under the Revenue Act.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill; Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was then read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Burin Electric Service Bill; Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The House went into Committee on the Bill respecting the Election of Members to the House of Assembly. The Bill was passed through Committee, read a third time and passed without amendment and it was ordered that a message to that effect be sent to the House of Assembly.

HON. MR. COOK moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act Further

to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925," and said that this was a Bill which carried out the program of readjustment of taxation which has been in effect since the resolutions were originally tabled in the House of Assembly some weeks ago. The Bill passed second reading, went through committee stage, and was read a third time and passed without amendment.

HON. MR. COOK in moving the second reading of the Act respecting Highroads, said: It will be remembered that a few years ago this Chamber concurred with the House of Assembly in the enactment of legislation creating a Highroads Commission, the Chief Commissioner being the Government Engineer, Mr. T. A. Hall. The legislation was found to be defective in that there was no person in the House of Assembly directly responsible to the House and to the people for the expenditure of the millions of dollars which were entrusted to the Commission. As a matter of fact, the Colonial Secretary would be the person to whom questions would be directed in that connection, but it is incongruous that the Colonial Secretary would have to deal with matter appertaining to roads and bridges and the like when the Minister of Public Works was the person normally charged with and responsible for such activities. The object of this Bill is to change that anomaly and to have the Minister of Public Works directly responsible to parliament for all Highroads activities in the same way as he is directly responsible for various public works and public buildings which come within the jurisdiction of his office as Minister in charge of the Department and Chairman of the Board of Works. Under this Bill the Commission consists of the Minister who is the Departmental Head responsible to parliament and to the people and who is styled Chief Commission-

er; Mr. T. A. Hall Government Engineer, who is a member of the Commission by statute, who is designated as Deputy Chief Commissioner and Executive officer in charge of the operations. The other Commissioners are at the present moment Mr. Robert G. Reid and Mr. Robert J. Murphy. Mr. Reid's long association with railroad-ing and Mr. Murphy's standing as president of the Avalon Telephone Company and himself a civil engineer suggests that the Government has been very wise in the selection of its men from the standpoint of interest, ability and non-partisanship politically. When the Bill becomes law the Commission will be a commission of five, thus leaving one vacancy on the Board, an appointment to which has not yet been considered by the Executive Government.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill, with Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair.

HON. CAPT. KEAN asked if the section dealing with the vote of the Chief Commissioner meant that that official had two votes. In ordinary cases the Chairman had no vote unless there was a tie, in which case he voted. He presumed that this section besides giving the Commissioner this vote gave him an ordinary vote as well, and he asked the Hon. Leader of the Government if this were so.

HON. MR. COOK replied that the Hon. Capt. Kean was correct. Under this section the Chairman had two votes.

HON. THE PRESIDENT agreed with the honorable leader of the Government that this section gave the Commissioner two votes.

The Bill was passed through committee without amendment, and was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Lower House with the usual message.

WOOL AND SILK MILL BILL

On motion for the second reading of the Wool and Silk Mill Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook stated: This is a Bill concerning which public notice was given some months ago in accordance with the rules of the House of Assembly, as a private measure. It was introduced into the House by petition, the Bill being in charge of Hon. Dr. Campbell. The earnest support given the Bill by Hon. Dr. Campbell, Mr. Fitzgibbon and other members of the House was based in the main on their desire, particularly the desire of representatives for St. John's East and West on both sides of the House, to develop an industry which would help in some measure at least the unemployment curse which rests upon the city. The difficulty with which all governments are faced in handling the question of unemployment is recognized by every member of this Council and any measure which will develop industry so as to give employment to our people, to help raise the standard of living and give a chance not only to the grown up people, but to boys and girls, to earn a livelihood will, I am sure, be welcome to all who wish for the development of our city and the relief of our unemployment situation.

HON. MR. McNAMARA moved as an amendment that the Bill be read again this day six months and in doing so spoke as follows:

I wish to say a few words on this Wool and Silk Mill Bill now before the Chair. Let us analyse this measure.

The promoters of this Bill ask the Government for a six per cent guarantee on \$200,000.00 for 15 years, or in other words, the country is asked to jeopardise the treasury to the extent of \$1,000.00 per month, \$12,000.00 per annum, or \$180,000.00 in all to get this industry started.

Of course, it goes without saying that there are other concessions looked for in the shape of free duty on goods for manufacturing, a privilege denied local factories importing similar material for their requirements.

Doesn't it appear strange that all foreign companies starting anything here always look for protection from the Government while the poor local man has to put up with all the ups and downs of good times and bad times, and sink or float without help and depend entirely on his energy, ability and capacity to make his business successful.

Viewing this project from the standpoint of safeguarding the revenue, what guarantee have we that with a manager's big salary, big directors' fees and big allowances for depreciation, that no matter what success this company may enjoy, I am satisfied these charges will absorb all the profits and the Government will be asked to contribute \$12,000 to this enterprise as an annual donation to Messrs. Collishaw and Company.

Then there is a clause about operating nine months continuously. What does this mean? Does it mean operating all the plant? If it does not we can see how this can be evaded by running a portion of the plant a portion of the time and paying a portion of the running expenses to keep within the Act. Perhaps some of us will remember a similar clause in the late Street Railway Act, which called for continuous running, and we all remember the joke of a horse and sleigh running over the closed track in winter to represent running continuously, as called for in the charter.

Are we prepared to risk another joke to represent continuously running as far as this enterprise is concerned, Mr. President. The Bill is too vague and mysterious to meet with

my approval. The promoters will not give any definite guarantee as to the number of employees likely to be engaged or the amount of the yearly pay roll. Why then, I submit, should the government commit itself to an annual grant of \$12,000.00 to bolster up a doubtful labor-giving enterprise?

Then, again, what effect is this subsidy going to have on the Riverside Woolen Mills so successfully conducted without Government assistance. I imagine it would be very unfair indeed to this locally conducted Company.

I am prepared to vote for anything that will help solve our unemployment problem, but I can't support the measure, as I absolutely have no faith in it and I beg to move an amendment to the motion before the Chair, and I now propose that this Bill be read this day six months.

HON. MR. BARTLETT considered the Bill with its request for the guarantee and concession a most extraordinary one. He doubted whether the proposed mill or factory would be such a labor-giving proposition as it was supposed. He made reference to the knitting mills of Truro and Nova Scotia, particularly to the Stanfield's Factory which had an extensive market and which he thought employed about six hundred people. The proposed mill may employ about two hundred people, for with the machinery, etc., he could not see how more factory operators could be accommodated. The local mills did not ask for any such concessions, and he could not see why they should be given to an outside company. According to the terms of the proposed guarantee in fifteen years the company would have its capital back. There would be poddings and large fees given to general manager, etc., and the need of the Government's guarantee would be shown. He

had expected some other member to second the amendment, as it concerned St. John's more than the outports, but as it was the country's business he would second the amendment moved by the honorable gentleman.

HON. MR. MURPHY asked if another mill were not receiving from the government \$5,000 annually. While he was in favour of starting anything here which would give employment, yet he did not approve of the guarantee. For many years work had been done outside the country by people in England, U. S. A. and elsewhere which could be done by our own people if they were given a chance. The manufacture of biscuit was given as an illustration. There were those who said at one time that a cake of hard bread could not be baked here, and merchants were willing to pay freight on it from Hamburg while our own people were idle here. Not only now can hard bread be made here, but sodas as well. We were anxious to see an industry started among the people and showed that the returns from the electric power meant a great deal to the country even in the purchase of food and clothing of those employed; but it had no guarantees. It had, however, certain concessions. If the Bill had not come up at the last moment of the session, it might have been possible by amending it to find a better way of handling the question.

HON. MR. RYAN while in sympathy with giving employment, yet could not support the Bill in fact of the absurd guarantee asked. He enquired what guarantee the Government was giving the Newfoundland Clothing Factory, the White clothing Factory, or the British Clothing Factory. These companies employed from sixty to one hundred and twenty hands, and for six or seven years in order to get on a better basis did not pay a dividend

and last year when capital was reduced fifty per cent, one went insolvent. Why should these companies have to pay duty from thirty-five per cent upwards on s wing cotton, etc., and work in competition with a duty-free business? Again, if guarantees were to be given why not give them to the merchants who build and supply ships for the fishery, such as Jobs, Monroe, Hickman, Baine Johnston, Bowrings. They had not asked for a guarantee, but our friend from Canada who was anxious to start a factory wanted a Government guarantee in order that they would not come out at the wrong end.

HON. MR. AYRE said that one argument which had been brought forward in favor of the Bill was that it would give employment; and this because such an appeal would meet a response in all hearts. But he thought that argument should be forgotten, for no one was innocent enough to think that this company had only the philanthropic object of giving employment. The terms of the Bill showed rather a hard-driven bargain. The Company was asking for everything that it could possibly get, and were not to be blamed for they would never get the concessions without asking for them. A guarantee for fifteen years was too long. If the industry was honestly trying to start, give them a chance. Give them a guarantee, say for five years, and if the project did not pay in that time it would never pay. In any business a man goes in taking a chance as to winning or losing, but he does not ask for a guarantee against loss. The duty-free section means a loss to the revenue that someone else must pay, and not only that, but the company is given a monopoly for fifteen years, and he did not see why we should tie hands for that period. The company had bought the pre-

mises for a song. Other people had come here to try and operate the same mill, and did not ask for nearly as much as the present company, would pay more for the same building and outfit, and yet were turned down. He was opposed to the passing of the Bill as it was before him.

HON. CAPT. KEAN did not think it possible for a man to discuss the Bill intelligently after the short time the Bill was before the members. He thought the concessions given were unfair. Last year he had been against the shell bill, not against the industry but because it was given unfair advantages over other companies. It was the concessions that he was opposed to. He had known Mr. Collishaw for years; they were good friends and would be equally good friends after this Bill had been disposed of. If any person would come into the House with a scheme that would give employment in St. John's and would ask for free importation of machinery, he would be in favor of giving it to them; he was not scared over allowing machinery to come into the country duty free as long as it gave labor. There were others in business in this country who had borne the burden and heat of the day and it was unfair to them to give concessions to a new company coming in. He was not in favor of giving privileges to one man that would be a burden to others and as there was not sufficient time to alter the Bill, there was nothing left to do but to support the Amendment.

HON. MR. JOB was not sure whether he would vote for or against the amendment. First of all he would like to correct an opinion as to the Riverside Woolen Mills. They were operating under a guarantee but it was a 5% one and it would expire in two years time. The mills had now been operating for fifteen years and in only

two had the guarantee to be paid. The promoters of the present bill had purchased the building for ten or twelve thousand dollars. The machinery to operate it would not cost more than about \$38,000 which would bring the whole outlay up to not more than \$50,000 and he could not see why it was necessary to give a guarantee for more than that amount, not \$200,000. As to the giving of employment he thought that the Mill might employ some men that are at present employed in other factories but he did not think that it would give much new employment. With the bill in its present form he was not quite familiar, as he understood there had been several amendments introduced into it in another House. He had studied the original bill and was not prepared to judge it without study.

HON. THE PRESIDENT wished to point out before he put the motion that the bill had been endorsed by the Speaker of the Assembly as a money bill. Under the Act passed in 1917 if a money bill is introduced in the House one month before the close of the session the Legislative Council had not power to throw it out. However, if the amendment was now passed the bill would be thrown out and the only way to have it passed would be for the House to be kept open for another month.

The motion was put and carried by twelve to two. Whereupon the Hon. the President ordered that this Bill be read six months hence.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council:

An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V, Chapter 9, entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors,"

An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Custom Smelter in Newfoundland.

ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS ACT

The Alcoholic Liquors Bill was read a first time. In moving its second reading, Hon. Mr. Cook said:

This Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly by the Prime Minister, who stated that he was doing so in his capacity of Minister of Justice and for the purpose of facilitating the Department of Justice and the Police in the handling of the unfortunately enormous illicit traffic which during recent years had grown up under the lax operation of the law enacted a few years ago and known as the Bottle a Day Legislation. As a matter of fact the Bill is a result of a report submitted by the Inspector General of Constabulary for the consideration of the Executive Government in dealing with the difficulties which he had to face in handling the liquor traffic. The Prime Minister pointed out in introducing the Bill that he did not anticipate that the reduction of supply from six bottles per week per person to three bottles per week per person would materially reduce the legitimate consumption. It would however, in his opinion as Minister of Justice, and particularly in the opinion of the Inspector General of Constabulary, make the handling of the situation with regard to the illicit sale of liquor much easier. The Bill itself was drafted by the Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Brian E. S. Dunfield, in collaboration with the Inspector General of Constabulary, and was printed and tabled in the House of Assembly some time ago for consideration at leisure. As a result of the various discussions it was felt that the idea of liquor permits outside of St. John's would particularly in its application to isolated sections, be difficult of enforcement

and inconvenient to the public, with the result that Section 6 of the original Bill was stricken out and an entirely new Section 6 inserted in lieu thereof. This new section was printed a week or ten days ago, distributed in the House of Assembly by the Minister of Justice as a suggested substitution for Section 6 of the original Bill, dealing with permits outside St. John's, and was unanimously acceptable to the House of Assembly. I may say that the Bill as we have it before us passed the House of Assembly unanimously. I feel that the members of this Chamber would be glad to support the Inspector of Constabulary in his desire to have vested in the police authorities reasonably full powers to deal with matters concerning illicit traffic in liquor and the suppression of shebeens and houses which, because of the illicit sale of liquor, constitute themselves houses of ill repute. This Bill does not interfere with the liberty of the subject to secure reasonable supplies of alcoholic beverages, whether ardent spirits or beers or wines. On the other hand it does give the Inspector General of Constabulary the powers which he desires to handle illicit and irregular traffic.

The Bill was read a second time passed committee stage without amendment, was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that same had been passed without amendment.

The Custom Smelter Bill was read a first time, and the second reading was moved by Hon. Mr. Cook.

HON. MR. MILLEY had not a copy of the Bill and would like to see one before he considered it.

HON. MR. GIBBS desired to know what was the nature of the concessions asked for and what was the value of them. What was the extent of

the water powers asked for and what was the value of the machinery and the equipment that would be imported free of duty. He would like to know why a monopoly was asked for and why small companies who might want to erect smelters of their own were forced out, or why they could not use other smelters that may be erected if they choose to do so. Mining developments move quickly, as was proved in recent years, and he did not see why exclusive monopolies should be granted.

HON. MR. COOK explained that no company could come in and undertake such a large expenditure without a monopoly. The Bill did not interfere with any company such as Buchans having their own smelters for their own use. The amount of money that would be spent was considerable and it was estimated that the total cost of the smelter would be in the vicinity of four million dollars. The total cost of the three plants would be about \$7,500,000.

HON. MR. GIBBS did not see anything in the Bill to guarantee that the Company would spend a dollar, and he asked if there was anything to provide for this and was the company prepared to put up any guarantee that they would spend any money. As to the water powers he did not see why these should be tied up. At the present time every water power in Conception Bay is tied up and it may mean that this Company would tie up these powers and no other company coming in with the intention of developing it would be given a chance. He would like also to have some information as to the standing of the Company.

HON. MR. RYAN stated that the Bill had just been placed in the hands of members and they had no opportunity of seeing what it contained. It was not fair to ask members to consider

the Bill without knowing what it contained and he would like to have time to consider the matter before voting on it. He moved that the House adjourn until time was given to consider the matter.

HON. MR. COOK agreed.

HON. MR. JOB asked if the information requested by him as to the probable cost to the country of the new Agriculture and Mines Bill was forthcoming. Hon. Mr. Cook stated it would be about \$10,000 a year.

The House then adjourned until Thursday afternoon at three o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 30, 1929.

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

Second reading of the Custom Smelter Bill.

HON. MR. STEER rose to support the Bill now before the House, and in doing so said that it seemed to him that so few arguments can be raised in its favor that much need not be said in its defence, for the Bill most certainly strongly recommends itself.

The clause and conditions leading to its introduction are plainly stated in the first three clauses of the Bill, which read as follows:

Whereas there exists in various parts of Newfoundland deposits of copper and other ores;

And whereas the quantities presently known to exist in any one of such localities are insufficient to warrant the erection of a smelter for the treating of such deposits;

And whereas it is desirable that a Custom Smelter be established for the purpose of handling the product of such deposits;

And to these might be added a fourth:

And whereas the utmost encouragement should be given to any un-

dertaking that gives permanent and remunerative employment to our people. Opportunity is knocking at the door and we should not be slow in taking advantage of it.

The mining boom that has begun calls for the erection of a smelter, and we should indeed be lacking in enterprise and forethought were we not prepared to answer the call. And what is it going to cost us? The company with whom the proposed agreement will be made is asking no greater concessions than have already been granted to other large labor-giving undertakings.

What are these concessions? Free grants of land within specified areas, all mineral rights being reserved to the Crown.

Free uses of water powers, such as may reasonably be required for the operation of its enterprise, subject to all existing rights.

Free entry for ten years, for all goods necessary for original installation and further extension, but not in substitution.

Exclusive right and franchise to smelting and refining, etc., for a period of ten years.

With regard to the water powers, the objection has been raised that we do not know the extent nor the value of the horse-power that might be developed on the three rivers at Bay du Nord, Long Harbor and Piper's Hole. This may be true; but did we know any more about the value of the horse-power of the Humber, the Exploits, the Gander, or any of the other rivers, the rights to which have been granted in the past and was the lack of such information deemed a sufficient stumbling block to the passing of such grants?

These rivers have remained in more or less their pristine state for the past hundred years and more, and is it

reasonable to continue them in their unproductive state for perhaps another hundred years, by turning down this opportunity of utilising them and making them productive.

It is to be noted that with regard to the free entry of certain goods for ten years, reservation has been made of all goods not absolutely necessary to construction and the running of the smelting operations.

The concession giving exclusive rights, for a period of only ten years, the smelting, refining, etc., we surely cannot consider an unreasonable one, and especially so when we take into consideration the fact that it does not interfere with the right that the owners of any mine will have to erect smelters for their own use, and that the large outlay of capital, with the benefits that should be derived by the country in general from which outlay, warrants at least this limited protection.

Objection has also been raised to the clause freeing the company from any liability for any damage, annoyance or inconvenience suffered or occasioned within a radius of five miles from its plant (but not freeing it from liability under the Workmen's Compensation Acts), and while at first sight such objection might be considered not unreasonable, when we take into consideration the fact, which I think we are safe in assuming, that the smelter will be erected on land that may be considered as waste at present, and far removed from any settlement, and that within the radius of five miles would be considered a danger zone into which irresponsible persons could only enter at their own risk, the objection loses all its force.

Now, Sir, here we have a company that proposes to commence, within two years, the construction of a plant,

which is to be ready for operation within five years and which involves the outlay of at least three million dollars, and which may run, according to the figures of the leader of the Government, to a further outlay of three or four millions more, which will furnish an amount of labour which we are in no position at present to estimate, and will supply a need which the mining boom and advancing times and conditions has forced upon us, and which asks for no guarantee.

What are we going to do with it?

Does it seem as though, while at times it may be wise to make haste slowly, we should take time by the forelock and hasten, without any delay, to complete the negotiation for the furthering of this project and especially so when we are faced with the fact that the erection of this plant will take five years for its completion, and that every contingency, as far as can be foreseen, has been provided for in the Bill, and that the probabilities are that the facilities to be provided by the plant will be needed long before they are available. I take pleasure in supporting this Bill.

HON. MR. COOK stated the company would only get as much land as they reasonably required and as much water-power as they may reasonably require. They are given two years to select the land they may require for the work and if the agreement is not finalized in two years, the franchise may be terminated. Engineers are now ready to leave Toronto, they were to leave on Wednesday, but were stopped by the hold up of the Bill in the House. This year would be spent on surveying, plan making, etc., and work would begin next year. This country is teeming with three per cent ore which is unprofitable to ship because of the freight rates, but with this smelter there would be considerable develop-

ment of this ore. The country is not losing one dollar, and stands to gain seven and a half millions. If we are serious about our mining possibilities, now is the time.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said that as the notice had been very short, he had not prepared a speech, but there were a few remarks which he would like to make. While supporting the motion put by the last speaker, he felt that the information which the Hon. Members passed on the Bill of this magnitude was sufficient to enable them to pass it on suspended rules of the House. It was such an important measure that it could not be put thru without serious consideration. The Prime Minister's Speech in introducing it in the House of Assembly was not explanatory enough for such a big proposition. The Bill must be approached with grave suspicion owing to the disclosure shown in the introducing of this measure regarding the correspondence etc. which had already appeared in the public press. This correspondence shows to a Minute of Council dated March 21st, the Premier's two letters dated March 22nd, also the agreement between Hatch and the Smelting Co., dated March 23rd. Under the agreement Hatch sells the concessions. Where did he get them? He did not get them from the Executive; he must have got them from somewhere; he did not pick them up in the street. It appeared to the average onlooker that these concessions must have been arranged with somebody, as the company was incorporated within twenty-four hours. Hatch secured the concessions, which would not be in existence unless they were previously arranged. It was mysterious. He drew the attention of the House to the fact that the Bill contained provisions contrary to the Minute of Council. The Minute of Council read "General

freedom from taxation would not be favorably considered," and yet the Bill called for all kinds of duty-free concessions. Reference also was made to another Minute of Council which called for a three-mile strip of land from Rantem, Trinity Bay, to Southern Harbor, Placentia Bay, to be reserved from grants to speculators for a period of six months from date, pending the developments of this proposition. He had in his possession and showed to the honorable gentlemen, a blue print of the land showing a grant of thirty-eight miles for this smelting proposition. After Mr. Hatch secured these concessions already referred to, he left for Toronto, and it was presumed, interested mining men in this venture. He evidently had pious hopes that these smelting works would eventually develop into a going proposition.

The Lower House were told that there were no rivers that would be interfered with; but any of our local sportsmen would verify the statement that Piper's Hole River, one of the rivers granted, is one of the best salmon rivers in Newfoundland.

While the Hon. Mr. McNamara expressed himself as not being against the proposition, he was opposed to having a Bill of this size rushed thru. The men from Toronto could wait awhile; there was no particular hurry about it. Exception was also taken to Section 8 (a) of the Bill. Why should the privilege of duplicating the machinery be given? In other Acts only the original machinery was permitted to come in free of duty. While being in favor of giving all the labor possible in Newfoundland, he thought there was a possibility of paying too high a price for that labor. With the meagre information at hand he did not feel justified in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. MURPHY did not agree with the last speaker. If we had the water-power and didn't turn it to advantage it was no good to anybody. And unless somebody was prepared to spend a few million dollars on it, development would not take place. Concessions should be given; but the Company need not be let off too easily. Many had come in and spent millions of dollars in the country and had failed. What of them?

If this company were to become a success, the country would profit thereby. If the Company, for instance, made \$10,000, this country would get five, and so on in proportion to the income of the company. On the other hand, this country would not lose anything if the company failed or did not commence operations at all. As for the granting of concessions, Mr. Murphy was of the opinion that the company should be treated with the greatest generosity in this respect, for only in this way can we hope to acquire any outside capital. It is impossible to procure capital locally for he had tried to do it himself when he started his own company. Then, as an inducement to the outside capital, the country must be prepared to grant large concessions. And if the concessions are large it means that instead of having this property lying idle, it is making money for someone, and incidentally the country itself is earning something. There is financial standing behind this company; they have the money to carry out this agreement, and it is up to this country to induce them to carry out this agreement, in any event the country loses nothing but on the other hand if the company goes ahead and has any sort of success, the country benefits. Hon. Mr. Murphy, concluding, said he gave hearty support to the Bill.

HON. MR. JOB said he was in favor

of the principle of this Bill, but he thought it should be given the consideration and deliberation due to it before it was passed in order to protect the Colony's interests. There were a large number of debatable matters in the measure, and he thought these should be thrashed out. It was hardly fair to ask the Council to pass a Bill of this sort in the few hours that remained in the session. He felt that a measure of this sort should be carefully handled and that more information should be forthcoming with regard to the company, its capital, financial standing and the nature of the concessions granted. In the case of Buchans and Grand Falls we knew who we were dealing with and were more assured of the nature of the undertaking and the parties. In this case there is very little evidence of the company's stability of finances. He was not opposed to the Bill, rather he supported it, but felt that certain amendments should be made, and in view of the fact that these could be made in Committee he supported the motion for second reading.

HON. CAPT. KEAN stated that any measure that had for its object the giving of employment to our people had his hearty and unqualified support. His only objection to this Bill was the profound silence that existed as to it until a few hours ago. He could not understand why a measure of this sort should come before the House in the dying hours of the session. The Council should have a great deal of time to give this Bill consideration and thought. It may be that the Government was in possession of facts regarding it that were unknown to this Chamber, but he felt that all information dealing with the Act itself or the Company should be presented to the Council. It should be borne in mind that this Council was not a rubber stamp. He wanted to

know something of what they were doing.

He did not see any reason for haste. If the company could wait for two years before undertaking the operations, we should defer the Bill until next year. During that time we could consider the proposition. There appeared to be nothing in the Bill out of the way, but his haste made the House suspicious, and if the Government intended to force the Bill he would not support it. He supported the motion that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report on the Bill.

HON. MR. COOK replied that if the honorable gentlemen wished time to consider the measure, they could have as long as they wanted. It would take a whole year, however, to survey this property, and if they hoisted the Bill it would simply mean that they put the whole affair back twelve months. The Government did not object to a Select Committee.

Replying to Hon. Capt. Kean, the Hon. Leader said the Government did not wish to rush the Bill thru but negotiations had taken a lot of time, and also the Bill had been redrafted seven times and that was why it came up so late in the session.

HON. CAPT. KEAN said that the Hon. gentleman was a privileged person and he knew all about the Bill. If the House had as much information perhaps all objections would be removed. All that the House needed was information.

HON. MR. GIBBS said he begged leave to support Hon. Capt. Kean's motion. He said the House approved of the principle of the Bill, but was not sure of the conditions under which the smelter would be erected. He thought, however, that the motion for select committee should come after second reading and not before.

HON. THE PRESIDENT replied that the honorable gentleman's motion for a select committee was quite in order. He said that he assumed it was the wish of the House to have a select committee to consider the Bill before the second reading. If such was not the case the motion would come before the committee.

HON. MR. COOK said he would like the honorable gentlemen to have all the time they wished. It was not the intention of the Government to try to hurry or push this Bill thru. It was only thru unavoidable circumstances that the Bill came before the House so late.

HON. MR. McNAMARA said in view of what had been said he wished to withdraw his objection to the second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time. It was proposed that the House resolve itself into Committee of the whole on the Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved that the Bill be deferred to a select committee which should be empowered if necessary to sit out of session; the purpose of this committee being to make enquires concerning the advisability or otherwise of granting concessions stated in the Bill. The vote of the House showed that none of the members were opposed to the establishment of a smelter; all believed its establishment would stimulate trade and industry in the treatment and manufacture of ore. But the information at our disposal was insufficient to warrant our passing the measure at this stage. He challenged the truth of the second "Whereas," and was of the opinion that the promoters of the Bill were not putting all the facts at their disposal in the possession of the Government. A summary of the five concessions asked for were then made and an explanation of each given. Un-

til 1945 the exclusive right to smelt copper ores and concentrate ores and to treat all minerals, to refine them, etc., would, by the Bill, be given to the company. There was nothing in the Bill to regulate the water-power which the company might use. Public Utilities Bill did not control it, and it would require a great deal of research and thought as to whether the Public Utilities Bill had any application to it. Consequently, there would be no control whatever, for upwards of sixteen years, in the prices charged by the company. Reference was made to two parties, consisting of about thirty odd which were leaving for the Labrador, and representing some of the biggest mining concerns in the world. They intended taking out claims.

Should the work of these parties be a success and they found that the copper or other ores needing to be refined must be so treated by erecting a smelter of their own, or else that the ore would have to be brought to Trinity or Placentia Bay for the purpose, was it likely that there would be developments if these restrictions were put on them?

The soil for a great area around a concentration works was rendered worthless, and as operations are to be carried on on a narrow strip of land there was nothing to prevent the seepage getting into the Bays. That would kill all marine life and ruin the codfishery in that part of the ocean. If proper precautions were taken, this may be prevented, but there was nothing in this Bill to make the Company take any precautions whatsoever. He understood that two engineers had been in this territory examining the possibilities, but we did not know if this was the most suitable spot. The Hon. Leader of the Government said that the Company will spend three million dollars, but there is nothing in the Bill to say

that they will spend that or that they will spend a dollar.

Like the other members, he was seeking information with regard to the Bill. In the case of the free list the section was extensive and offensive in some cases, and possibly these may be removed. In Section 8 the Company has the right to import all sorts of things for a period of ten years. The average man importing some of these things, which by the Company are imported duty free would pay forty to fifty per cent. The Council does not know the value of this machinery and articles imported nor does it know how much would be lost in revenue thru this exemption. Hon. Mr. Gibbs enumerated the articles that might be imported under this section which though not having anything to do with the machinery, yet would be duty free. He asked why this Council should be asked to vote on a measure of this magnitude without having some knowledge of just what it was giving away. The value of the articles given exemption may be \$100,000 or \$1,000,000, and before the measure should be passed facts should be forthcoming as to the real position. Section 9 was another equally mysterious clause. It grants the company for ten years after it commences work the right to export free of taxes. There is a difference between "duty" and "taxes." A duty according to the hon. gentleman, was a sum of money levied by the Government on certain articles imported or exported. This company was exempt under Section 8 from this duty. Now the difference between Duty and Taxes was that the latter was a proportional amount of money levied on a person's property or income. Under Section 9 the company would be free from this tax. It would be seen that the Company was taxed in no way whatsoever. And the last Section made it doubt-

ful whether income tax might be levied on this company. All this needed careful explanation, and the Council enlightened.

HON. MR. MURPHY pointed out that if the Company didn't commence work within two years they would lose their privilege.

HON. MR. GIBBS thought we should have a guarantee. This Bill extends to Labrador as well as Newfoundland. If ore bodies are found there, and they are not large enough to warrant the erection of a smelter the company would have to bring their ore right up to Placentia. One hon. member said we had guarantee Corner Brook. Well, we made a mistake to guarantee, and we made a mistake when we took over the Railways and let the Reids keep their land. The country has been shouldering a burden resulting from this lack of statesmanship. On Hon. gentleman said we couldn't ship low grade ore and make it pay. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, because ore containing 3-4 of 1 per cent. copper can be made pay, and all the ore we have here is of a higher grade than that. We should be prepared to do all we could to help this smelter if it is a sound proposition, but we had no evidence to go on. We were the trustees of the country's heritage and we had no right to dispose of it. If we owned the property ourselves would we give it away? Let us apply the same principle to this Bill. He moved that a select committee be appointed with power to sit out of session to enquire into and report back on the Bill.

HON. THE PRESIDENT pointed out that while the hon. gentleman's motion to appoint a select committee was in order that part of the motion giving it power to sit out of session was out of order. It was not within the power of the House to appoint such a committee, said the Hon. President.

In a case such as that the committee would have to be re-constituted and made a Royal Commission under the authority of His Excellency the Governor.

HON. MR. RYAN said he would like to support the bill as it would give employment, but he thought two years was too long to wait and we have no guarantee that the Company would start even then. He objected to the section empowering the Company to assign its privileges. He understood from the Leader of the Government that this proposed company would be of good financial standing, but under this section it could assign its undertakings to anyone it liked, and the Government had no power of not approving. He said he was anxious to get work for our people but didn't want to pay too much for it. If the Bill were passed the company would have two years before it need employ any men. Regarding the getting of things in duty free, it was known from experience that Corner Brook took great advantage of their concessions and got in panels for doors, chairs, bedsteads, etc., duty free. He expressed himself as being strongly opposed except in the case of new machinery to start the industry, of having goods coming in duty free.

The motion for a select committee was carried unanimously and the following were appointed:—Hons. Cook, Gibbs, Murphy, McNamara, Job, Steer and the President.

HON. THE PRESIDENT requested the select committee to meet at 3 p.m. on Friday. Council adjourned until 4 p.m. on Friday.

FRIDAY, May 31st, 1929.

The Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Customs Smelter Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS presented and explained the report of the select Committee on the Bill.

HON. CAPT. KEAN congratulated the Select Committee on the work they had done which only proved that had there been more time, further improvements in the Bill might have been made. In the past few years when important Bills came before the House an effort had been made to have a clause inserted providing that Newfoundland workmen should be employed in the work except in the case of skilled labor which could not be obtained in the country. When the Humber operations were on there were criticisms that Canadians and aliens were employed and the only jobs the Newfoundlanders got were the menial ones, and the same thing applied to Buchans. He was not a member of the select committee and would therefore like to have a clause inserted in the Bill to provide for this.

He proposed the following amendments:

“The Company agrees that in the construction of its said plant or works and the development of its said water power to employ wherever possible Newfoundland workmen except in work requiring skilled or expert workmen not immediately available in the Colony.”

HON. MR. GIBBS agreed with the contention, but felt that in this connection there should be a general law in the country. In other countries such a law exists and no one is permitted to enter the country except to seek for work.

HON. MR. RYAN seconded the amendment proposed by Hon. Capt Kean. He felt that there were too many men imported into the country to take jobs that men in the country could do much better.

HON. MR. COOK did not think there would be any objection, and accepted the amendment.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed with some amendments. It was then read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with amendments.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—Mr. President, before we close, it would appear seemly that we say a word or two of appreciation of our late but absent Leader of this House, Sir A.B. Morine.

Sir A. B. Morine was actively connected with the political life of this country for upwards of forty years, and during that lengthy period was instrumental in putting some very valuable legislative acts on the Statute Books, the benefit of which we are enjoying to-day.

He created great changes in the Customs House and instituted reforms in this department which are in evidence up to the present.

Seeing the great value of our fisheries, he formed the Marine and Fisheries Department, and put machinery in that office which can be advantageously used to foster our principal industry.

In connection with the Reid deal, he was the means of having Water Street paved from the Railway Station in the West End to the foot of Cochrane Street in the East End.

By his tact and good judgment, he settled satisfactorily a serious sealers' strike here in St. John's about thirty years ago.

I believe he is the father of our splendid highroads system, which are already becoming a great tangible asset to the country.

Although we did not always agree with Sir Alfred in his politics, we

must perforce admire his brilliancy, capacity and untiring energy.

Like most politicians, he probably made mistakes in his time, but being always zealous for the welfare of Newfoundland, I am convinced his mistakes were of the head and not the heart.

He has resigned his position in this House, and has decided to live permanently in Canada, and I feel assured that I am voicing the sentiment of this Chamber in wishing him health and happiness in the evening of his life.

HON. MR. SINNOTT would like, before the House closed, to express publicly his sympathy on the death of the late M. S. Sullivan, M.H.A. For ten years the deceased, with Mr. W. J. Walsh and Mr. Sinnott, had together represented the old district of Placentia and St. Mary's, and during that time he had always found the late Mr. Sullivan an ardent worker for his native district and a loyal friend and colleague. Mr. Sinnott knew him well, they were friends and on many campaigns they never had a disagreement on any matter. The appreciation of the people whom he represented was best shown in the large majorities which were enjoyed by Mr. Sullivan in every election. He felt a personal loss in his demise and he would like to go on record as expressing his deep sympathy to the mother, widow and family of the deceased.

HON. CAPT. KEAN concurred in all that the Hon. Mr. McNamara had said about Sir Alfred B. Morine. He did not know the late Mr. Sullivan as well as he did Sir Alfred, but all that he did know about that gentleman had left an impression that he was a man of his word; not a man of "ifs" and "buts," but one who talked straight and who could be appreciated because of that qualification. In the death of

the late Mr. Sullivan the country had suffered a loss it could ill afford; the legislature had suffered and it could not afford to lose such men as this. He knew Mr. Sullivan's aged mother thirty years ago, and after knowing the deceased, he had concluded that he was a worthy son of a worthy mother. In the expression of sympathy voiced by Mr. Sinnott he heartily joined.

Council adjourned until 2.30 p.m. Saturday, June 1st.

SATURDAY, June 1st, 1929.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

His Excellency the Governor having arrived, and being seated on the Throne, Hon. the President commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to summons the members of the House of Assembly to the Bar of the House, and they being there assembled His Excellency was then pleased to assent to the following Bills passed during the session.

BILLS PASSED

An Act to Amend the Act 19 George V., Chapter 18, entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

An Act authorizing the Governor in Council to enter into a Contract with the Anglo-American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

An Act Relating to Air Navigation.

An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public

An Act to Amend Chapter 28 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of Stamp Duties."

An Act to Amend Chapter 167 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Merchant Shipping Ser-

vice and Desertion from the Royal Navy."

An Act Relating to Res'taurants and Houses of Public Refreshment.

An Act to Amend Chapter 43 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Pharmaceutical Society and also the Sale of Drugs."

An Act to Amend 12, George V. Chapter 13, entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal affairs of the Town of St. John's.

An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial years ending the 30th of June, 1929 and the 30th day of June, 1930, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

An Act to Amend "The War Pensions Act, 1922."

An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Customs."

An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Customs."

An Act to Amend 15 George V. Chapter 6, entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.

An Act to Amend Chapter 78 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Naturalization of Aliens."

An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of Companies."

An Act to Amend Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Departments under the Colonial Secretary."

An Act to Amend Chapter 13 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Department of Public Works."

An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

An Act to Amend Chapter 21 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of Enquires Concerning Public Matters."

An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Department of Justice."

An Act Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes.

An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 24, entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships."

An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.

An Act Relating to the Ratifying of Certain Irregular Expenditures.

An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 23, entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding" and Acts in amendment thereof.

An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.

An Act to Amend "The Tourist Commission Act 1927."

An Act Relating to the establishment of an Electric Power Service on the Burin Peninsula.

An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 5, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads."

An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 33, entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Election of members of the House of Assembly."

An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V., Chapter 9, entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors."

An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925.

An Act Relating to the Preservation and Propagation of Deer.

An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Customs Smelter in Newfoundland.

An Act further to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the vacation of seats in the House of Assembly" and Acts in Amendments thereof.

CLOSING SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

His Excellency then read the closing speech from the throne as follows:—

Mr President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

Although of comparatively short duration the session of the Legislature which closes to-day has been marked by diligence and earnestness on your part, and an evident desire to discharge your legislative duties with thoroughness and despatch. You will doubtless be pleased to be relieved thus early from attendance here, and be permitted to engage in those various avocations which demand your attention.

In addressing you at the opening of this session, I referred, with profound gratitude to the recovery of His Majesty the King from the severe and trying illness from which he had suffered. His Majesty's progress towards health had been so well maintained, that the people of this ancient and loyal Colony, in common with the King's loving subjects throughout the Empire will have learned with deep regret that it should have been interrupted by any adverse condition. All will unite in the fervent prayer that the King's restoration to health and

strength will be both speedy and complete.

A considerable amount of useful legislation has received your consideration which, I trust, will prove to be of advantage.

The measure relating to the creation of a Public Utilities Commission should be the means of providing for the whole people the fullest enjoyment of the present day facilities and conveniences at such rates, and under such conditions, as may be considered equitable.

The highroads policy, inaugurated a few years ago, has proven most successful, and the measures which you have now enacted for the improvement of the existing legislation in respect thereto will doubtless be of benefit.

Bearing in mind the prime importance of conserving the wild game of this Island, it is gratifying to observe the further provision which you have made to increase the protection already afforded to caribou. I trust that the whole people will aid the authorities in this praiseworthy endeavour.

Unprecedented activities in mining operations have caused my ministers to enter into negotiations for the establishment of a Customs Smelter. It is possible that the successful inauguration of this venture will act as a further stimulus to mining activities generally.

The acts relating to several important departments of the public service have for their purpose the better and more efficient administration of those branches.

It is pleasing to note that the Railway, which has for years proven a financial burden upon the Colony, is, by careful management, steadily reducing its annual deficit. As a direct result of the industrial development of the country it is confidently hoped that the time is not far distant when this

great public utility, instead of being a burden will not only pay its way, but will contribute largely to the ordinary revenues of the Colony.

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

I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have granted for the public service. It will be the constant care of my ministers to secure judicious and economical expenditure with respect to the various appropriations.

Unlike a similar measure enacted a few years ago, the new Income Tax will bear upon those best calculated to meet the levy, whilst relieving those of moderate means from a tax which had been considered oppressive.

My ministers trust, that, by proper methods of collection, the annual amount derived from this source will, to some extent, offset the reduction in revenue arising from the revision of the duty on certain commodities.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

It is gratifying to observe the favorable signs of industrial activities throughout the country, and the promise to greater prosperity which they represent.

In now relieving you from your legislative duties, I join with you in the confident hope that the objects aimed at by your Honourable Houses in your endeavour for the public welfare may be achieved, and I sincerely trust that an abundant measure of success awaits you in your respective avocations.

The president of the Legislative Council then informed the members of both branches that it was His Excellency's pleasure that the House stand prorogued until Thursday, the 11th day of August next.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

- Motion for, 8.
- Committee on, 12.
- Report of Committee on, 13.
- Presentation of, 26.

ADJOURNMENT.

- On Death of Hon. M. S. Sullivan, 50.

AYRE, HON. MR.

- On Stamp Duties Bill, 33.
- Income Tax Bill, 46.
- Act for the Preservation and Propagation of Deer, 62.
- Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 69.

ANDERSON, HON. MR.

- On Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson 6.
- Pharmaceutical Bill, 19.
- Public Health Board, 32, 35.
- Stamp Duties Bill, 33.
- Public Utilities Bill, 34.
- Shipbuilding Bill, 39, 57.
- Dominion Co-operative Building Association, 55, 62.

BISHOP, HON. MR.

- On Resolution of Congratulations to H. M. The King, 4.
- Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, 5.
- Highways Traffic Act, 27.

BARTLETT, HON. MR.

- On Stamp Duties Bill, 34.
- Shipbuilding Bill, 56.
- Legislative Disabilities Act 62.
- Burin Electric Light and Power Resolutions, 64.
- Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 68.

BILLS, LIST OF PASSED DURING THE SESSION, 81.

COOK, HON. MR.

- On Resolutions of Congratulations to H. M. The King, 4.
- Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. Robinson, 4.
- Air Navigation Bill, 16.
- The Loan Bill, 17, 62.
- Restaurants and Houses of Public Refreshments Bill, 17.

Municipal Bill, 19.
 Pharmaceutical Bill, 19.
 Telephone and Telegraph Bill, 20.
 Highway Traffic Act, 23, 27.
 Alien Naturalization Bill, 24.
 Of Companies Act, 25.
 Registration of Deeds and Other Documents 25.
 Of the Inspection of Ships, 26, 29, 33.
 Co-operative Building Association, 28.
 Merchant Shipping Bill, 30.
 Stamp Duties Bill, 30.
 Public Utilities Bill, 31.
 Public Health Board, 31.
 Shipbuilding Bill, 35, 57.
 Public Enquiries Act, 40.
 Income Tax Bill, 47.
 War Pensions Act, 47.
 Bill Relating to Department of Justice, 48.
 Bill Relating to Department of Marine and Fisheries, 49.
 Bill Relating to Department of Public Works 50.
 Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances, 60.
 Tourist Commission Act, 60.
 Act Relating to Department of Agriculture and Mines, 60.
 Act Respecting Legislative Disabilities, 61.
 Bill Respecting a Tax on Goods, 62, 65.
 Act for Preservation and Propagation of Deer, 62.
 Burin Electric Light and Power Resolutions, 63.
 Act for Ratification of Certain Irregular Expenditures, 64.
 An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 66.
 Act Respecting Highroads, 66, 67.
 Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 67.
 Alcoholic Liquors Act, 71.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 72, 74 76, 77.

DAVEY, HON. MR.

On Highways Traffic Act, 27.
 Shipbuilding Bill, 56.

GIBBS, HON. MR.

On Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, 5.
 Address in Reply, 8.
 Income Tax Bill, 42, 44.
 Patents Bill, 58.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 79.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE, 13.

JOB HON. MR.

On The Inspection of Ships, 26, 33.

Public Health Board, 34.
Shipbuilding Bill, 40, 51.
Income Tax Bill, 44.
Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 70.
Custom Smelter Bill, 75.

KEAN, HON. CAPT.

On Highways Traffic Act, 27.
Shipbuilding Bill, 35, 56, 59.
Income Tax Bill, 44.
Election of Members to the House of Assembly, 65.
Act Respecting Highroads, 67.
Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 70.
Custom Smelter Bill, 76, 79.
Tribute to Sir A. B. Morine 80.
Death Hon. M. S. Sullivan, 81.

MURPHY, HON. MR.

On Telephone and Telegraph Bill, 21.
Shipbuilding Bill, 56.
Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 69.
Custom Smelter Bill, 75, 78.

MILLEY, HON. MR.

On Custom Smelter Bill, 71.

McNAMARA, HON. MR.

On Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, 6.
Address in Reply, 14.
Restaurant Bill, 18.
Stamp Duties Bill, 30.
Legislative Disabilities Act, 61.
Act for the Preservation and Propagation of Deer, 63.
Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 67.
Custom Smelter Bill, 74 77.
Tribute to Sir A. B. Morine, 80.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS,—

Hon. Mr. Anderson, 16.

O'DEA, HON. MR.

On Address in Reply, 11.

PRESIDENT, HON. THE

On Resolution of Condolence, Hon. Dr. J. A. Robinson, 7.
Restaurant Bill, 18.
Telephone and Telegraph Bill, 23.
Highway Traffic Act, 27.

Stamp Duties Bill, 34.
 Public Health Board, 35.
 Income Tax Bill, 43, 44, 47.
 Shipbuilding Bill, 57.
 Dominion Co-operative Building Association, 62.
 Act for the Preservation and Propagation of Deer 63.
 Act Respecting Highroads, 67.
 Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 70.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 77, 78.

RYAN, HON. MR.

On Shipbuilding Bill, 40, 55.
 Wool and Silk Mill Bill, 69.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 72, 79.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRATULATION H. M. THE KING, 3.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE HON. DR. J. A. ROBINSON, 4.

SELECT COMMITTEE,—

On Shipbuilding Bill, 58.
 Shipbuilding Bill, Report of, 59.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 79.
 Custom Smelter Bill, Report of, 79.

SINNOTT HON. MR.

On Resolution of Condolence, Hon. J. A. Robinson, 7.
 Death of Hon. M. S. Sullivan, 80.

STEER, HON. MR.

On Highways Traffic Act, 27.
 Custom Smelter Bill, 72.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE,—

On Opening, 3.
 Closing, 82.

TEMPERANCE RESOLUTION, 13.