

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*During the Second Session of
the Twenty-Fourth General
Assembly of Newfoundland*

1921

PROVINCIAL LIBRARY
VICTORIA, B. C.

UNION PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.

PROCEEDINGS
of the
House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1921

Began and holden at St. John's, in the said Dominion on Wednesday and Thirtieth Day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and twenty-One being in the Eleventh Year of the Reign of His Majesty, Our Sovereign Lord, George, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

—

WEDNESDAY, March 30th, 1921.

His Excellency having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present session of the Legislature at three of the clock in the afternoon of this Wednesday, the thirtieth day of March inst., the Members of the House of Assembly met in the Assembly Room at a quarter to three of the

clock in the afternoon, when Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

At three of the 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. Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, and being returned to the Assembly Room, 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 gracious speech to both branches of the Legislature, a copy of which for greater accuracy he had obtained, and then read to the House, as follows:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

On this fourth occasion of addressing you at the opening of the annual session of the Legislature it is my first desire to express my sincere regret at the loss which has been sustained by the death of a member of the Legislative Council, who, though he was a junior in that body, was one of the most experienced business men and able speakers in this Colony.

The policy of the regulation of the marketing of the Colony's staple product which passed the House of Assembly in the summer of

last year, without dissenting vote, was placed in the hands of the Codfish Exportation Board created for that purpose by the Act. The practical application by the Board of the policy so unanimously adopted has met with difficulties adventitious as well as those inherent in all policies which seek to regulate the trade of nations. I feel quite certain that should the matter come before you as legislators you will approach its consideration with one ambition only, namely, the welfare of Newfoundland, her commerce and her people.

A year ago I called your attention to the fact that the long-standing dispute between the Colony and the Province of Quebec had, by agreement between the parties, been referred to the adjudication of His Majesty's Privy Council. The final agreement to that effect was signed in London by the Attorney General of Canada and my Attorney General in November last, and substantial progress has already been made in the preparation of the Colony's case.

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

The Revenue for the last fiscal year showed a substantial surplus over all expenditures, but it is to be anticipated that the world depression, which we with all other countries must necessarily share, a depression which is the natural aftermath of war, will cause a large shrinkage in revenue for the current fiscal year. The revenue is so largely dependent upon ad valorem duties on imports that, while the finances of the Colony benefited largely by the greatly increased cost of imported goods during the war and immediately afterwards, this present readjustment of world conditions with largely reduced cost of goods must have a corresponding effect in reducing customs returns.

My Ministers have had this necessary readjustment of expenditures to income under careful consideration. The Estimates of expenditures and the Budget for the next fiscal year to be submitted to you will indicate the efforts which my Ministers have made to deal with the financial problems which you have to face in the readjustment of the Colony's expenditures, so that the great annual burden which the war has entailed may be met without curtailment and the necessary public services efficiently maintained. This will necessitate temporary curtailment of certain large expenditures which previous administrations felt justified in undertaking out of the inflated revenues of the war period, and such rigid economy as is consistent with the satisfactory maintenance of the various essential public services.

**Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of The Honourable House of Assembly:**

My Ministers have kept in close touch with the Imperial authorities in the matter of Newfoundland claims against the German Government and I anticipate that certain legislation intended to harmonize the Statute laws of Newfoundland with those of Great Britain in the matter of the collection of the German indemnity will be submitted to you for consideration in due course.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain has expressed his desire to meet the Prime Ministers of all the self-governing Dominions of the Empire for conference in London on important imperial business in June next. My Prime Minister has authorised me to accept the invitation on his behalf. I appreciate the great importance of Britain's oldest Colony being represented at this conference.

You will be invited to consider a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act to permit the exportation of certain pulp wood cut during the past winter, and an important Bill submitted by the Social Service Council relating to the welfare of children.

The Charter for the City of St. John's will, I am informed, be introduced at an early date, so that its many provisions may be fully discussed, and, it is hoped, finally dealt with at this session.

The subject of inland and coastal transportation will come before you, and reports will be submitted in the matter of the coal possibilities of the Island. An important arrangement is under consideration in connection with the exploration of oil areas and it is probable that sufficient progress will be made to submit a Bill in relation thereto within the course of a few weeks.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the regular work of the session, it is my duty to call attention to the irreparable loss the legislature has sustained in the death of the late Hon. W. B. Grieve. In February last Mr. Grieve passed from amongst us and in his passing he has left a place, not only in the Legislative Council, but in the commercial life of the Colony itself, which it will be difficult to fill. He had long been connected with this House, had represented the Districts

of Bonavista and Trinity, while for several years previous to his death, he occupied a seat in the Legislative Council. He had the reputation of being an able and a courteous gentleman, whether in social, business or legislative circles. When the call to arms came, his only son was one of the first of our men to respond, and although the later did not actually lay down his life on the battle field, it was due to the hardships of a soldier's life that he contracted the disease which shortly afterwards termin-

ated in his death, an event which did much to shorten the life of his father. In patriotic work the activities of the late Hon. W. B. Grieve were well known. He was prominently identified with the Newfoundland Patriotic Association and worked indefatigably in that capacity until the end of hostilities. He was a gentleman, not merely in the narrow class sense, but in the broad sense, an educated and courteous citizen and he accepted success and defeat with an equanimity which won for him the admiration of all who had the advantage of knowing him personally.

During his declining months he faced the inevitable with all the joy of one who sees in death no severance of the strongest ties, but rather as one who looks upon it as going to those on the other side who had preceded him years before, his wife and children and those others dearest to him.

Permit me then, Sir, in expressing on behalf of the House our deep sense of loss, to propose the following resolutions:

RESOLVED:—That the House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since last session of the Legislature, of the Honorable Walter Baine Grieve, sometime member of the Legislative Council, and of the House of Assembly

RESOLVED:—That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the relatives of the deceased Honourable Gentleman.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the resolution proposed by the leader of the Government. Being the oldest sitting member of the House to-day, I cannot recall a session but that the leader of the House was called upon to pass such a resolution as has been moved here to-day. In many cases

we have found in the past twenty-eight years experience in this House that two or three members have passed away in the short time from one session to another, and it must strike even the youngest of us not alone the oldest, that our turn must some day come. Since I have had the honor to sit in this House over seventy members now deceased have passed thru the doors of the Upper and Lower Chambers. Many listening to me now might think my time was at hand. Last year I seconded a resolution of this kind relative to the same class of public citizen. The Hon. W. B. Grieve was one of the princes of Water Street, one of the men who put his life and all his best energies into the business of the country. Altho he was seventy-two years of age, he was in this House before, I think some seven or eight years, as an elected representative. He was elected for Bonavista in 1880 and was re-elected unopposed in 1895. He had retired from the House before I had the honor of a seat here. I have known Hon. W. B. Grieve for years here as a politician, but when I got close to him it was after the war broke out in 1914. When the bugle sounded, Hon. W. B. Grieve was one of the first to rush to the Morris government, sinking all differences in politics or in other directions, and placed himself at the disposal of his Country and his King. I was very close to him thru my position in the House, being Finance Minister at the time. Hon. W. B. Grieve came voluntarily to the Morris government and placed himself at its disposal. You will find that that is correct by looking up the records. Hon. W. B. Grieve was on every committee appointed for the recruiting of the sailors and looking after them, as a member of the Finance, Standing, Patriotic Committees, Patriotic Fund and Recruiting bodies,

and was nearly always found to be the first man in his place when work was to be done. Up to that time I knew little of him socially, but during that period I learned to love him. He was an outstanding figure on the Patriotic Fund Committee which was created to deal with the dependents of our soldiers and sailors. He was always to be found on duty there and always erred on the right side, always anxious to do the most for the deserving fighting men. He gave his time, and the country knows he gave much more—he gave his only son at the first call to arms, one who was of the first 500, one of the Blue Puttees that we hear so much of, and who while not shot on the field of battle, contracted sickness while doing his duty that brought him to an early grave. Such was Hon. W. B. Grieve as a man as a politician a true man in every sense of the word. To take him as a politician or merchant would need a better tongue than mine to do him justice. He took charge of a great firm at the age of 21 or 22 and managed it at least 50 years. When one considers the business of the Colony for the last half century one must come to the conclusion very quickly that a man who could manage a business such as Mr. Grieve had charge of must be one possessed of great ability and foresight. Mr. Grieve filled a great position in this country and during the last ten years numbers of young aspiring merchants looked to him for counsel and guidance. He is dead now; gone for evermore. His experience, I take it, was second to none. Go back to last year and consider the interest he took in the fish business. The war was over; we were supposed to be back to normal conditions and all were wondering how we would fit in financially. Mr. Grieve then, in my opinion, was right in every sense of

the word. I remember meeting Mr. Grieve after his return from England a few months ago and talking over the fish situation. He naturally loved to talk of fish. That was the first time I spoke to him. In leaving, his last words were: "Cashin, you will find that in Newfoundland by the first of May we will have financial paralysis." How many here to-day can contradict that statement. Mr. Grieve was all that has been pointed out by the Prime Minister this evening; he was even more. I feel sorry that I did not know more of him. His firm if looked up, will be found to be the first to prosecute the sealfishery with steamers. They tried other ventures—the herring fishery, for instance, which was taken over without compensation from the government—and brought out steamers with drift nets, but lost considerable money in that direction. We have seen the last of Mr. Grieve on earth. I will not delay the House further, but leave him with God, who, in His great mercy, will deal kindly with him. May his soul rest in peace.

It was moved by Mr. Scammell and seconded by Capt. Jones, that an Address of thanks be presented to His Excellency in reply to the gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present Session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such Address in Reply.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of proposing the appointment of a select committee to draft an address in reply to the speech which His Excellency the Governor has been graciously pleased to deliver to us to-day. And, first of all, Sir, I desire to add a personal word of regret on the loss this City, and this Country, has sustained by the death of the Hon. W. B. Grieve. The Hon. W. B. Grieve, as has been

stated here this afternoon by the Prime Minister, and the Leader of the Opposition, stood out pre-eminently in the social and commercial life of the country. He was a man whose vast experience and sage counsel the country could ill afford to dispense with at a period of doubt, uncertainty and hesitation in our commercial affairs, such as the country is facing at present. The Hon. W. B. Grieve has left a name that will be a memory fragrant of refinement, charity and fair dealing, and his passing leaves the community the poorer.

My next duty, Sir, must be to welcome to this House the gentlemen who have recently been elected to serve as representatives for the historic district of Hr. Main and to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition and his party on having retained these seats, although perhaps the contest was in a great measure a victory for the Government in as far as the Government received a greater vote by ten per cent than it did in the general election of 1919.

To turn now, Sir, to the matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne, I think it will be agreed by all that the reference of paramount importance is to the Fishery Regulations. No policy has excited more controversy during the past season than the Fish Regulations. No subject has been discussed with more prejudice and bias by its opponents in the press and before the public. Much of the criticism hurled at the regulations has been of a highly destructive nature, undeserving and unfair. The evident design, and the ultimate result of it all, was, and has been, to render their operation less efficacious. It will be remembered that at the last session of this House, two acts of vast importance in relation to our staple industry were pass-

ed without dissenting vote. I refer, Sir, to the Codfish Standardization Act, and the Act in relation to the export of Salt Codfish. The first of these acts provided the means whereby rules and regulations were drafted, having chiefly for their object the improvement of our cure of Fish, providing for a standard cull as between fisherman and buyer, and the proper inspection of all cargoes destined for the foreign markets. It was felt by all that in view of the very keen after-war competition we were facing in the markets, the time had arrived when it behooved us to put our house in order, and to take steps to improve our cure if in the face of such competition we were to expect anything like decent prices abroad. We are pleased to-day to be in a position to state, that to the call of the need for an improved cure the Fishermen have responded nobly. There has been indeed a marked improvement all round and we have ample evidence that the result has been taken due cognizance of by our customers, has been favourably commented upon and has reacted largely to our benefit in the markets.

The regulations framed under the Exportation Act were primarily designed with a view to the sustaining of prices abroad, and consequently ensuring to our fishermen at home the minimum price with which they could possibly decently exist, having regard to the fact that there had been no appreciable decline in the prices of supplies and commodities. We may hold divergent views, Mr. Speaker, as to whether that object has been consummated, but as an individual representative entitled to an opinion of my own, I wish to place myself on record as being strongly of the opinion that had there been no such regulations this season the fishermen of this country would not have received for

their fish this season the prices they did by as much as three or four dollars per quintal, and I know whereof I speak when I state that in that opinion I shall have in agreement with me thousands of fishermen from all parts of this Dominion.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to discuss these regulations further just now. They were drafted from time to time as circumstances and conditions demanded by the Codfish Exportation Board under the chairmanship of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It cannot be said that the composition of the Board was partisan either from a political standpoint or from the views held by the Members as to the advisability of Regulations or otherwise.

I am sure, Sir, we all regret that the Minister is not with us to-day, and I feel that further discussion of this subject is therefore superfluous until such time as we are in a position to hear from him.

Mr. Speaker, another matter of country wide importance referred to in the Speech from the Throne is the Labrador Boundary question. I wish first of all to congratulate the Attorney General in having so successfully completed the case for presentation. I understand this subject has been under discussion for many years, and it is gratifying to all of us to know that we have been successful and that the case is now nearing an end. We all are aware that until this matter is finalized and adjudicated upon the development of our resources in Labrador must be held in abeyance. We all know the untold possibilities of our water powers, mineral and timber wealth there and the great future for employment that awaits us in that dependency.

Then the Speech from the Throne has the usual paragraph addressed to the members of this House with regard to the financial position of the

Colony. No one anticipates or expects to find the actual facts and figures there relative to our financial position. That will come later. It is encouraging and gratifying, however, to know that we are in a position to round the corner safely as at the end of the fiscal year June 30th, 1921. I should like to refer to that portion of this paragraph from the Speech outlining the necessity of adjusting our expenditure to our income and for the practise of rigid economy. I have had the opportunity of visiting several sections of the country recently, and I can safely say that any policy of economy or retrenchment undertaken will receive the approbation and support of the country as a whole. Our financial position to-day is largely due to the fact that during the years immediately following the war the prices of goods and commodities generally were on the upward grade instead of on the downward grade, and business people anticipating this laid in large stocks and on that account a larger revenue than was normal was derived for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1920, so that had conditions been normal the same result from revenue would have obtained at the conclusion of the fiscal year June 30th, 1921. With the decline of prices abroad again must come a decrease of the revenues largely derived from ad valorem duties. Again the purchasing power of the people was lessened by the almost absolute failure of the shore fishery and these are largely the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we are going to experience financial difficulties. I wish to reiterate what I said before, and that is than any policy of economy which the Government undertakes will receive the unqualified support of the country.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the passing of legislation in conformity with English legislation with regard to the paying of the German indemnity of

our share of losses sustained during the war. I feel sure that any legislation of this nature which will come forward will receive the support of the whole House, as we are all anxious to be recouped as speedily as possible for the losses we met and the expenses incurred by our share in the struggle.

I desire to congratulate the Honourable the Prime Minister upon his invitation to attend the Imperial Conference in June next. I think it is a sign that although we may be small and insignificant, we are not overlooked by the Imperial authorities and that it is only our due right and privilege to be represented at the Imperial Conference. I am sure that in the Prime Minister we have an able representative, who will at all times advance and protect the interests of Newfoundland, and see that we receive our just due.

I am pleased to note that the Government contemplates passing an act to amend the Crown Lands Act dealing with the exportation of pulpwood cut for charitable purposes during the winter, and I may say that I am personally interested in this subject. As I said before the shore fishery last season was an absolute failure and to obviate actual starvation the Government was faced with the possibility of having to dispense poor relief on a tremendous scale or the alternative of providing employment. After much serious consideration it was decided to allow the cutting of pulpwood in the areas suffering most, and this was largely the case in certain sections of the district of St. Barbe. Peace and plenty have been brought to many a home this winter as a result of this action, where otherwise I fear dire distress and destitution must have prevailed.

There is another matter referred to in the Speech from the Throne which perhaps interests the members of St. John's more than those representing

outport constituencies, and that is the contemplated passing of a Bill dealing with delinquent and neglected children in St. John's. This bill has been drafted under the guidance and on recommendation of the Social Council, an organization that has the support of all religious denominations. The bill referred to in the Speech is modeled and styled after the English Acts 1906-8 and partly after Acts of the same nature passed by the Provincial Parliament of the Province of Ontario. I feel that it will be received quite favourably by the whole House, and we anticipate no captious criticism of its provisions. Those of us who have lived in St. John's, even though for a short time, must of necessity have recognised the pressing need of passing some sort of legislation giving properly authorized persons authority to deal with delinquent and neglected children. It will make for the moral well being of the youth of our city and in the end react to the social benefit of the whole country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that we all ought to take due cognizance of the causes for the difficulties confronting the country to-day. We in Newfoundland are only bearing our fair share of the depression which is affecting the whole world as the aftermath of the war. A country like an individual does not live to itself and we cannot have depression in the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States and European countries, with all of whom we trade and not experience depression in Newfoundland as well.

But I have travelled around the country a great deal during the past year, and I would like to tell the House this evening, that there is not in Newfoundland to-day anything like the destitution and privation that one might be led to think exists as a result of all one reads and hears. I wish to congratulate the Government

of which I am a supporter and a member, upon the able manner in which it has grappled with the serious situations which have arisen this year. We are passing through a period unprecedented in the country's history and the Government is indeed confronted with serious problems, but I feel that we have reached rock bottom and that things will be better and brighter from now on. It may be with me the optimism of youth that inspires this feeling, but I think that if we all put aside political differences and personal animosity and stand together in service to the country that we shall very soon see the light of a better day and become more than ever a happy and prosperous country.

It therefore, Mr. Speaker, gives me much pleasure to move that a Committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

CAPT. GEO. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion so ably and eloquently proposed by the Honorable Member for St. Barbe, namely that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious speech of His Excellency the Governor at the opening of the session.

In doing so, I ask the indulgence of the House, while I make a few general observations regarding the subjects touched on in the Speech, subjects that are vital to us all. Mr. Speaker, as we meet for the second time under the present Administration, we are confronted with the fact that this Dominion is passing through strenuous and troublesome times; but, we also realize that those times and conditions are not of our making. In common with all the world we have to suffer from the after effects of the war; the period of depression we are passing through is world wide; things over which we have no control whatever have brought about present conditions, all of which goes to prove that we do not live unto ourselves, and

that our interest is identical with the interest of the rest of the world. Although our little Island home is so insignificant compared with the great world, yet we are part of it, a unit in the general scheme of things, and not only in community life, but in national life, the conditions that prevail so act and react upon each other that our interests become common to all.

After all, could we expect anything better than we are getting after a time of wholesale destruction, after years of great wantonness and waste, and so many of the world's producers engaged in that great destruction and carnage instead of production? Is it to be wondered at that we should be faced with hard times and difficult problems in the way of reconstruction and bringing order out of chaos and ruin? Shall we not look forward to the time—we trust in the near future—when order has been restored, when the industries and business of the country shall be rebuilt on a more solid foundation than ever before, and out of the seeming evil times that have befallen us, we shall emerge financially stronger than ever before, because neither men nor nations are made in the easy times when everything is going fair and smoothly. It is in the hard times, the times of adversity, when everything seems going the wrong way, when the difficulties we have to contend with call for the very best that is in us, when we have to fight for our lives—those are the times when we develop such qualities as endurance, perseverance, the ability to successfully grapple with the great difficulties that confront us; so that it often happens that what we thought would bring ruin crushing defeat to us, has in the long run worked for our greater well being and prosperity.

With regard to the Labrador Boundary question it is with pleasure that we learn that steps are being taken that will speedily bring about a final

settlement of that long standing dispute. Labrador, with its vast timber areas, water powers and mineral wealth, developed as it undoubtedly could be, would certainly be a great source of employment for the people, as well as of revenue to the country.

The returns to our people from the fisheries last season were not very satisfactory; either as regards catch or price; not that the price was small when you compare it with what we used to get years ago, but when you consider the cost of outfit, as well as the cost of living generally, it was small, so small, that many fishermen found it difficult to pay their bills. I believe that the fishermen profited by the Fish Regulations, by getting considerably more for their catch than they would have got if there had been no regulations.

The action of the Government, in providing for the exportation of pulp wood, I believe to be a wise one. Surely, this is not a time when it would be advisable to stick to the strict letter of the law, when by giving permission to export pulp-wood would provide a means of livelihood for a large number of people who, otherwise would be destitute. I feel sure that in some of the districts where this wood is being cut, the people appreciate the action of the Government in granting this permission. What would have been done in some places without it, is hard to contemplate.

Surely, it would be a great thing for Newfoundland if the oil wells that are to be found, could be opened, so that we could produce our own supply of oil, and perhaps a great deal more for export.

Recent operations have proven beyond any doubt that there are very extensive coal deposits in Newfoundland, and I can see no reason why coal boring on a very large scale could not be carried out.

So, with all this great wealth lying

at our feet, just within our reach, awaiting the investment of capital and enterprise to develop it, there appears a much greater and more prosperous future for Newfoundland. With the great wealth in timber, water power and mineral of Labrador, and the oil and coal deposits of Newfoundland, developed as they could be, may we not hope that the time will soon come when we shall not be so entirely dependent upon the fisheries for our support. I trust that the time may soon arrive when the fishery, with all its uncertainties of catch and price, will not be practically the only great industry of Newfoundland. In the meantime we must do all possible to develop our fisheries, because we cannot get away from the fact that at present we are depending on them; nor can we neglect the old industry that has been and is the mainstay of our industrial life.

The coastal and inland transportation service is a very important matter; it is a very difficult problem to give satisfactory and efficient service along our coast, the people being so scattered, the harbors, coves and arms winding in and out, making it almost impossible to give complete satisfaction. When you get on a coastal or bay boat on some parts of the coast, you find that after a good day's work steaming and landing mail, passengers and freight, you are almost at the same point you were in the morning, but as time goes on, we are looking forward to much improvement in this branch of the public service.

It is gratifying to hear the encouraging reports from the sealers, and trust they will secure good trips, return safely, and that the sealing voyage will be the beginning of a good and prosperous year for Newfoundland.

May we not look forward hopefully to the time when the sunshine shall have chased away the shadows, and the sun of prosperity will again shine

upon us, and we shall be living in the enjoyment of peace and plenty.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion that a committee be appointed to draft a reply to the gracious speech, with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this session of the Legislature.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The mover indeed I certainly feel that I must congratulate. It strikes me that he was the right man for the job, as he has made a very good case out of nothing. He was selected by the Government, I presume, for special pleading this evening. Never, Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, was there such an absurd speech read by the representative of His Majesty, and handed down to the House. I know that the gentlemen will hang their heads when I make this statement, but it is perfectly true. What is there in it? Not a ray of hope, not one statement telling us what has been done in the past twelve months or what will be done in the next twelve months. It strikes me that it is about time for Newfoundland to wake up. We are here this evening to know something, we are waiting for this House to open to tell us the condition of the country, not to come down here with a document like this in an endeavor to camouflage it. You are only the trustees of this country. The people in the gallery and the people outside the House are the real rulers of the country; you are only sent here to represent them. Are those the true facts given in that speech to-day. The Labrador Boundary, pit-props. We don't want to know about the Labrador Boundary. What is troubling you on the other side of the House is not the Labrador Boundary, it is whether you can get clear with

your political perfidies; it is whether you will not have to hand the country over to England or Canada. I, know you are troubling a lot about the Labrador Boundary. It is a piece of impertience to come down with that speech to this House which is supposed to be composed of intelligent men.

We are told that this House passed Fish Regulations last year. It is true we did pass them, but what happened after they were passed, that is not told, it is too long a story for this evening, but it will be told before this House closes. The Regulations were passed, but they were carried out as passed. We agreed to give them a chance, but we also agreed that if they were not the right and proper thing that they were to be cancelled. A commission was to be appointed of men of good standing, men who knew the business of the country, and after consultation with the Governor, a proclamation was to be issued appointing these men.

Was that done when the House closed last year? I am not going to talk behind the honorable gentleman's back, but I have to mention his name. Did he not, the Hon. W. F. Coaker, go to his Department and take charge of the whole fishing industry of the country?, irrespective of everything and everybody else? How many men from the West and North were appointed, and how many fishermen from the city were appointed, and where is the recommendation that appointed them. The whole thing, I repeat, was taken charge of by one man and the story in connection with the matter is a very long one. After the House closed last year the Leader of the Government left the country and left it in charge of that one man and did not return for four or five months. But we hear nothing in the Speech from the Throne about that. What are you members doing on the

other side of the House? The people elected you and the Prime Minister to this House to safeguard their interests. In what way was the Prime Minister to this House to safeguard their interests? In what way was the Prime Minister looking after the country during his long holiday abroad.

And then we are told by Mr. Scammell this evening that there was not enough fish caught in Newfoundland last summer. Was Mr. Scammell in this House last year when the statement was made by Mr. Coaker that the more men that went out of this country the better it would be for the country, and that the less fish caught the better it would be? Did Mr. Scammell's leader make that statement in this House last year? Still there are thousands of quintals of fish held by the fishermen of the country to-day that are unsaleable. Do you know, Sir, that there are over half a million quintals of fish in this Colony to day unmarketed and some of it will have to be thrown over the wharves? Mr. Scammell told us something about the North. Yes, they got a fair price North for fish; but was not some of that money wrung from the taxpayers of this country. He says fish would be only three or four dollars a quintal only for the Regulations. He should have said fish would be three or four dollars only for the money was taken from the treasury and the taxpayers of the country have to pay it back to reimburse the Government. But there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne about that. Again, there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne telling how Labrador fish was sold and paid for.

We were confronted eighteen months ago with the Prime Minister's manifesto and there was great beating of trumpets and everything that

the Government of that day was doing was wrong, and we were all blacklegs and pirates. Detectives were brought here from abroad, as everybody knows, to find out the alleged wrong-doings and to judge the out-going government, but there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne showing how many went to jail; nor is there anything in the Speech from the Throne telling the House what we handed over to the present Government. Well, I am going to tell the country this evening, thru the reporters' box, that we handed over four million of dollars as surplus and that there is not a cent of it in the treasury to-day. We hear nothing about that in the Speech from the Throne. Now where is that four millions gone? In the Prime Minister's Manifesto and in the Speech from the Throne last year we heard a lot of railway work that was going to be done. We passed a Loan Bill in this House last year. After the Prime Minister had got off a spiel denouncing the contractors and the railroad he introduced a Loan Bill asking for one million and a half dollars at six per cent interest, one million of which was to go to repair the railroad and put it in shape, and a half million for coal. Has that money been raised? Was work done? Who authorized the work done? When was the work done? Did the House authorize it? Was any measure put before the House to carry on that railway policy? No; the same thing happened with the railroad that happened with regard to the Fish Regulations. After the House closed last year a man called Coaker took charge of the whole outfit and he gave the Prime Minister a long holiday.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I have to call you to order. The gentleman you refer to is an honorable member of this House and Minister of Mar-

ine and Fisheries and should be referred to as such.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The man is called Coaker, is he not?

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I think it is distinctly out of order.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I disagree with you, Sir. I stand to be corrected, but Coaker is his name. I was going on to say that this same thing happened with the railroad as with the Fish Regulations. When the House closed last year the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines were given a long holiday and a so-called Railway Commission was appointed, the chairman of which was an individual named Coaker. They took over the railroad from the contractors who had an agreement with this Colony to run it for fifty years. We are not told anything in the Speech from the Throne about that this evening. What authorized the taking over of the railway and how many people in this country know the story about it? I stand by what I have already said that the same thing happened as with the Fish Regulations. One man took control of the whole thing and took over the railroad from the Reid Newfoundland Company, but we have to find out before this House closes the whole story in connection with those transactions; we have to drag from the members of the Government how the money was spent and how much it cost the Colony to operate the railroad, and why the one million dollars was not raised to pay the bill. What happened, in my opinion, is that the Government could not raise the money but took it out of the public treasury, and we will find that before the House closes that the Railway policy will cost the Colony from two to two and a half million dollars for the operation of the railroad up to June

30th next, yet we find a Loan Bill still on the Statute Book and the money never raised. Now, in view of that, I think I was justified in making the statement this evening that railroad matters were handled on the same principle as the Fish Regulations.

Getting back to Mr. Scammell again. He told us that there was not enough fish caught in this country last summer. Well, all I can say is that Mr. Scammell must have been out of this Colony for a long time. There are a half million quintals of fish in this country to-night that is unsaleable and I know of a number of fishermen who have from ten to fifty quintals of fish each in their possession and who have to go to their neighbors with hat in hand and beg to try and support their wives and families, and I know of some of them who cannot get a barrel of flour advanced them on their fish. I know that 260 quintals of fish came into St. John's from my own district by the last train that came over the road, belonging to four or five fishermen, who were endeavoring to get the wherewithal to support their families. After tramping all over the town they could not sell a quintal of it, nor could they raise enough money on it to buy a barrel of flour, but thru the kindness of Sir John Crosbie and others, that fish was put in the store of Sir John Crosbie, who advanced the money to those poor people. That fish is still in Sir John Crosbie's store, and Mr. Scammell may have it to-morrow if he wants to buy it, and at a very low figure, too. Still we are told in an entertaining manner here this evening by a supposedly intelligent man like Mr. Scammell, that there was not enough fish caught in Newfoundland last summer. He must be dreaming. Let him go to Water St. and find out how many thousands of quintals of fish there are that can-

not be marketed. But that is not all. The worst is yet to come. The great trouble is where are we going to get the wherewithal to supply the fishermen the coming year. The Government know as well as I can tell them. The Government to-night is in the worst predicament experienced since Responsible Government was granted us. I make this statement without fear of successful contradiction. There are not five merchants in the country to-day ready to supply for the fishery and not one merchant to buy a quintal of fish. Imagine a man coming here after holidaying all summer, surrounded by sane, intelligent people, and talking now about the Labrador Boundary, under present circumstances. Why it's a lot of tommy rot. There are parts of the world where, if our financial matters were thus dealt with we would be tied to lamp posts. Cannot we have common sense. We on this side of the House do not want the government, but we want to preserve the independence of the country. We were born here, we live here, and we want to die here. We do not want to see it financially strangled in this fashion.

As I have already said, when we handed over the government about eighteen months ago there was an overflowing exchequer of practically four millions of dollars, and I make the statement to-night for this country, that when all the bills are paid now by the present Government not one cent will be left.

How that money was spent is another story that will have to be told. Newfoundland to-night is not in as good a position as it was in 1894, the year of the Bank Crash. Our revenue then was about one and a half million dollars, our expenditure an equal amount and our population was something smaller than it is at present. Now what is the position of the

country to-night? Last year the Receiver General asked for \$11,400,000 revenue. He estimated expenditure was something in the vicinity of \$10,500,000. I take it that after putting in his supplemental supply and other amounts that his expenditure will be brought up to an amount equivalent to his anticipated revenue. Now where is he going to get his revenue for this year when the purchasing power of the people of the Colony is twenty-five or twenty-six millions of dollars less than what it was last year. I do not suppose that there was more than five millions of dollars paid from fish this year. What are you going to get your revenue on?

It is on its purchasing power that a country has to depend for its revenue and if you lessen that purchasing power by forty per cent where are you from a standpoint of revenue? How are you going to supply for the fishery the coming season? You have to supply on the expectation of getting \$4 and \$6 for fish, an average of certainly not more than \$5 per quintal, and against that you have flour at \$14 a barrel, molasses at \$1 a gallon, and everything else accordingly, and would you call it a fancy investment to supply for the fishery under these circumstances? Now, Sir these are but a few of the small proofs of the truth of what I have said this afternoon, and I fear no contradiction to these statements. It is said that the revenues at the end of the fiscal year will \$3,000,000 short.

Last year the government asked for eleven million dollars and they have to get that on a falling market. When we handed over the administration of affairs to the present government the imports were \$26,000,000 and now they are reduced to seven or eight millions. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is plain to all we are up against almost insurmountable difficulties. Take, for

instance a man who last year had a thousand dollars with which to buy his supplies and this year he goes down with two hundred dollars requiring the same amount of goods. That is the position of Newfoundland to-day and it is the first and only time that we have ever found ourselves in that position.

To get back to the Bank Crash, the revenue that year was one and three quarter million dollars while flour was three or four dollars per barrel against fourteen dollars now. Molasses was then twenty-five or thirty cents a gallon where to-day it is \$1.00 a gallon. We were then in a position to increase taxation, but are we in the same position to-day? Our purchasing power has declined by many millions of dollars and we are in no position to further burden the people. I think that in bringing down this Speech from the Throne the government has made a great mistake. If they told all the facts, they would have a very different story to tell. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the time of the House this afternoon as it is not usual on opening day, but when I read that Speech from the Throne I was so disgusted that I could not refrain from making some comment.

To get back to the fishermen, where is he going to get his supplies this spring? Is any sane man going to give supplies for fish that are still swimming in the water? Another mistake was made with regard to our fisheries last season was in the matter of cure. The cure last year was much worse than for any previous year in my remembrance. Go down and ask any merchant how much West India fish he hand handled. I know hundreds of men who did not have 500 quintals of Merchantable fish out of 2000. I admired Mr. Scammell when he struck off from the subject and said that he would leave it to the

House; he very carefully avoided going too far.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that the Government still have something up their sleeves to tell the House and the country as to how they are going to get out of the mess they are in to-day. Will the Prime Minister tell us how much relief was asked for during the winter? The western fishery amounted to practically nothing while the fishermen of Placentia, Fortune and other districts in that section cannot get supplies this season. I hope when the House meets again we will get or perhaps the Prime Minister will get up in his place and give us some information on these points. When we went out of power we handed over a surplus of something like four millions of dollars with all bills paid. Now take the daily papers and compare the insolvencies of the past year with those of any of previous years. We have been told we are to take off the export duty on pit props. That's a case of "killing the goose that lays the golden egg." If that is the only thing you will have to tell us. It strikes me that you have a very incomplete programme.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I want that to go down through the reporters' box into history. That was Mr. Grieve's statement. I have decided to wait the next two months and believe that will be verified. I apologize Mr. Speaker if I'm a bit out of order. I congratulate the mover of the address and in looking through the government ranks I can see no other who could put it so well, not even the Prime Minister himself.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I desire to join with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in his courteous references to Mr. Scammell, the member for St. Barbe, who in such an eloquent manner moved for the appointment of a committee to draft the Address in Reply to the Gracious

Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature. He is one of the youngest members of the House and one of the most eloquent. I feel sure every person who heard him this afternoon expect from him much excellent work in debate during this session and a brilliant political future. Captain Jones, of Little Bay Island, one of the members for the important constituency of Twillingate, made a most excellent address. He has not had the platform experience which Mr. Scammell has had, but his utterances bore the hall mark of the firmness of character and sincerity of purpose for which Captain Jones is well known. I heartily congratulate these two gentlemen on their efforts.

The observations of the honourable leader of the Opposition on the Speech from the Throne interested me very much, for it gave me an opportunity to judge the sincerity of his attack. I looked through several of the addresses he made on public matters last year. I read some of the speeches he made some years ago when he was a bitter antagonist in this House of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond, P.C., K.C.M.G., the great Liberal chieftian and successor to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Whiteway. Some of the most vigorous pronouncements he made this afternoon are practically a verbatim copy of last year's attack. Some of his vigorous attacks upon myself personally are mild replica of his attacks of a few years ago upon my distinguished predecessor.

My honourable friend has assured the House that this is the worst speech with which a Legislature has ever been opened. He discussed the fact that there were many things in which various sections of the country were interested, which matters were not referred to in the Speech from the Throne. The fact is there are many matters, some of considerable import-

ance, which have no reference made to them in the Speech from the Throne. As a matter of fact, it is not the custom here or in the old country to put a multitude of matters in the Speech from the Throne, but matters of major importance only. My honourable friend has ridiculed the idea of referring to the Labrador Boundary dispute. My honourable friend may regard this matter as insignificant and of no importance.

Certainly the fact that the area in dispute is estimated at three times the area of the whole Island of Newfoundland is naturally not known to the honourable member. He frequently boasts that he has spent twenty-eight years in this House, yet he is presumably not aware that area is of any importance to Newfoundland, and the question of the ownership of an area three times the size of our entire Island is of no importance. Sir Michael evidently has the size of mind to appreciate a speech if reference were made to rabbit and deer regulations, and it is a worthless document if it does not say whether legislation is contemplated about the closing or opening of a partridge season and does lay stress upon the international matter, in the decision of which an area twice or three times the size of Newfoundland is involved.

Referring to the Revenue, my friend opposite pointed out that the customs revenue was falling. I presume he desired to suggest that he was responsible for the large revenues of war years, and I am responsible for the fact that Customs Returns are now falling. Was not my honourable friend sufficiently long in the Department of Finance and Customs to know that our Customs Revenue is dependent upon an ad valorem duty on imported goods. Inflated prices of imported goods meant inflated revenues. We are anxious that prices should decrease and that must mean reduced

customs returns. Taxation on the country was exceedingly heavy during the war because of inflated prices.

On the inflated price there was put by our system of ad valorem customs revenues an inflated taxation. Prices are going down; revenue is going down, and the problem of readjustment has to be faced at this session of the House. Taxes during the war were approximately three times as much as before the war.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I admit that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Thank you for that. Every man is glad to see a reduction of prices but the readjustment of world conditions must necessarily mean a falling in the Customs returns. That's a fact that must be faced. Reference has been made to the Budget of last year. It contained certain figures of expenditure—

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You didn't propose much in your Manifesto. If you keep on as you are going you won't be long in power.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—If I keep on as I am going it is evident I will be here a long time. The estimates of last year were different from the estimates of the year before mainly in the fact that they were honest estimates, giving the salaries which the officials were receiving and not, as the estimates of my honourable friend opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, giving fictitious salaries as voted and saying nothing about the large supplemental amounts which a multitude of officials were receiving. In some cases the salaries as voted last year in the estimates were smaller than the salaries which the honourable Minister of Finance and Customs had been previously paying.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Especially the sessional pay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The sessional fee was increased at the last session of the Legislature to

\$1,000. Every member of the opposition supported the increase. I have not yet heard that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, returned his cheque because it was too large. As a government we were unfortunately situated in finding ourselves compelled to adopt the inflated expenditure. Some salaries were, as a matter of fact, undervoted.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Can you quote one?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Yes, Messrs. Martin and Doyle, the Registrar and Deputy Registrar of Vital Statistics. Their salaries were increased in our estimates, but as voted were less than the salaries which they were actually receiving prior to the supposed increase.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—What was your predecessors', such men as Bond and others got less. And then there are your extra amounts besides.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I receive \$4,000 a year as Colonial Secretary, and \$4,000 as Prime Minister. My predecessor, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. F. Lloyd, who was the leader of the party which the honourable the leader of the opposition supported, was Prime Minister and Attorney General. The salary which he received for these two offices was the sum of \$5000.00.

As to my salary of \$8,000, if the honourable the leader of the opposition will ask any one of the several lawyers of his party, he will be informed that my earning capacity as a professional and business man, entirely outside of any political associations, is more than twice that figure. I am here, not because the office pays me a wage, but because it is a joy to fight on behalf of Newfoundlanders against such people as constitute the opposition. No prime minister under present conditions or under past conditions could occupy the office and support and maintain himself and his family upon the income received from public

sources, unless he received money in the way that some of the honourable members of the opposition received it during the war, namely, because of contractual relationship with the government.

The sum of \$8,000 a year voted in the estimates as a salary for the Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary is not as great as the amount of money which some of Sir Michael's colleagues when he was in charge of affairs drew out of the public funds per month. Certainly they drew the money in a way which could not be seen in the estimates. The transaction was of a contractual nature with the government of which they were members.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Sir Wm. Whiteway and Sir E. P. Morris lived on it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Sir Wm. Whiteway and Sir E. P. Morris did not live on it, nor did Sir Robert Bond or Sir James Winter live on it, I do not know the details of the financial affairs of these gentlemen, but I do know that when Sir James Winter who was the leader of the Newfoundland Bar, Attorney General for many years and prime minister of this country, passed away, his estate was not sufficient to pay his liabilities. His income was barely sufficient to support and maintain himself in comparative penury for a man of his standing and to educate his children.

Sir William Whiteway was another outstanding case, in which that gentleman, who was an outstanding statesman, a man whose name is indelibly written in the political history of Newfoundland, after a life of rigid economy, died a pauper, leaving his widow and children practically penniless. The Rt. Hon. Sir E. P. Morris, when he became prime minister of this colony, was a man of substantial wealth, but when he retired from the position of prime minister, he was a comparative poor man. Take the case of the Rt.

Hon. Sir Robert Bond, it cost him many thousands of dollars a year out of his own personal wealth to live as prime minister of Newfoundland. Sir William Whiteway was the most lamentable case of all.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You know his friends called him Money Bags Whiteway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Quite right. And they had just as much reason for calling him Money Bags Whiteway as you have for your discourteous reference to me in a similar connection a few minutes ago. Sir William Whiteway was a statesman and a gentleman, a man who lived the rigid economy, and even then could not leave an estate sufficiently large to provide his widow with a living income.

Before the honourable the leader of the opposition was pleased to interrupt me I was pointing out to this House that the seriousness of the situation which we have in this country is such that the time of this House should not be wasted in lengthy and acrimonious debate on the Address in Reply. This session is called for the despatch of business and not for the display of oratory. As representatives of the people we must look the facts fairly and squarely in the face.

Our customs revenues are based almost entirely upon ad valorem taxation. Prices have been and will continue to be tumbling. That means that our customs revenue has been tumbling, and will so continue. The late administration found enormous revenues blowing in, because of the increased price of goods, it being upon that increased price of goods that the ad valorem taxation brought such inflated revenues. Our predecessors made no effort to conserve to Newfoundland these revenues. They increased salaries and expenditures in all directions, and by the building of two new wings to the Lunatic Asylum

and a huge addition to the Sanitarium, placed upon this present government not only the expenses of paying a large share of the cost of the buildings which they started to construct, but the expense of equipment and outfitting of these large additions and of the staff, upkeep, maintenance and supplies. Salaries have been enormously increased. A half million dollars of the money which came in easily in ad valorem duties because of the increased price of goods was scattered around the country as the famous corruption fund with which they attempted to secure their return to power in November, 1919, an expenditure for which not ten per cent. value was given.

As I shall have many occasions of discussing these various matters during the course of the session, I shall not, on this, the occasion of the formal opening of the House, further detain you, but I cannot sit down without impressing upon each honourable member present necessity for serious consideration of the grave problems which Newfoundland must face in this after-war reconstruction period. The fact that we are politicians is a mere incident to Newfoundland; the fact that we are Liberal or Tory is also a mere incident to Newfoundland. The important point to Newfoundland is that we are Newfoundlanders, and we perform our duty to ourselves, this Chamber and our country only insofar as each member of this Chamber, whether Liberal or Tory, devotes his very best effort to the solution of the problems of the land of our birth.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that it is not customary on the opening day to refer at length to the Speech from the Throne, especially by others outside of the Mover, the Seconder, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government, I think this occasion the most important one

in the history of our country and I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a word or two with regard to the seriousness of the situation we find ourselves faced with. Before doing so, however, I wish to associate myself with the expressions of congratulation which have been tendered the Mover and Seconder for a Committee to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and I would also wish to associate myself with the resolutions of sympathy which were so ably proposed and seconded by the Leader of the Government and my Leader, Sir Michael Cashin. The death of the Hon. Walter Baine Grieve means a distinct loss to both branches of the Legislature. Without attempting to reflect on the ability of any man who holds a seat in either of these Chambers, I think I can truthfully say that the late Walter Baine Grieve was one of the most brilliant orators that it was my lot to ever hear speak in this country and we have ample proofs of his great wisdom. If his advice had been taken at the last session of the Legislature conditions that now exist in the country to a great extent would not be. By the passing of the Hon. Mr. Grieve the mercantile community of Newfoundland suffers a severe blow and the district that I have the honour to represent will be one of the greatest sufferers, especially now when our people are so sorely in need of financial assistance, so that they may be able to carry on the fishery during the coming season. During the past four or five years we have been called upon to record the deaths of some of our mercantile men whom the country could ill afford to lose. The death of the late John Harvey was a serious blow, and that followed in the wake of the loss sustained by the death of the late John S. Munn of Bowring Bros., then the

loss of Mr. Goodridge, whose name was a household word, especially in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, and all of these men and others, including the subject of the resolutions before the House are men, whom the trade of this country cannot be carried on without. I am glad of this opportunity on behalf of the people of Placentia and St. Mary's to add a few words to this resolution and through you, sir, I wish to tender to the relatives of the late Walter Baine Grieve, on behalf of the people of the district I have the honour to represent, as well as on my own behalf, my sincerest sympathy.

Now sir, with regard to the Speech from the Throne, I would first say that I feel sorely disappointed with the emptiness of this document. It is not the kind of programme that the people of this country were expecting at the opening of this Legislature. There is so little of substance to be found in this document that one would have to look elsewhere to find material that would be worthy of discussion in this Chamber. It has already been held up to so much and such well-merited criticism and contempt by Sir Michael Cashin that it is almost unnecessary for me to go into detail. One thing I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that this country is now passing through a period of depression and destitution as was never before experienced in our history. When the people of this country are given an opportunity to read and digest the contents of this document, I have no hesitation in predicting that they will be amazed. It will be poor consolation to the tens of thousands of our fellow countrymen who are this very evening perhaps without the ordinary necessities of life, to find out that the Labrador Boundary question occupies a prominent place in the Speech from the Throne. It will be

poor consolation to the half hungry men, women and children who are existing to-day in some cases on pauper-dole to know that the Hon. the Prime Minister is drawing down a salary of \$8000 per year besides pickings and picnics galore; it will be no consolation to the people of this country to know that the Hon. Mr. Warren, the Attorney General, has commissioned himself to take a slice out of the tax-payers of this country for his services in connection with the Labrador Boundary question and that already according to the Auditor General's report, \$20,000.00 has been paid to some seven or eight firms or lawyers in connection with this Labrador Boundary. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the worst scandals, one of the most vicious pieces of political graft and corruption that has ever been perpetrated in this country, and if conditions are allowed to go along as they have been in the past eighteen months and expenditures are allowed to be made to party heelers, and ignorant interference with the legitimate trade of the country is to be continued by the powers that be, it will be a matter of indifference to the people of this country whether our claim to this disputed territory is justified or whether Canada wins out in the case before the Privy Council. Because in my opinion before six months have passed our financial condition will be such that we will be compelled to go with our hats in our hands and our fingers in our mouths so to speak and plead with Canadian statesmen to take us in holus-bolus. So not only will Canada get the Labrador but the city of St. John's and every town and village in the country, and every man, woman and child in the country will be owned body and soul by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if it is not the intention to sit tonight I have much

pleasure in moving the adjournment of the debate.

The following Select Committee was appointed, namely:—Mr. Scammell, Mr. Jones, Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Targett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Lewis.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Women's Patriotic Funds Trust Act, 1920."

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Sheep Farming."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of Enquiry'."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act, 1920."

Mr. Higgins gave notice of question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Dr. Jones gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Mr. Lewis gave notice of question.

Mr. Sinnott gave notice of question.

Mr. Fox gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, April 4th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 4th, 1921.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to a most unfortunate matter which appeared in the organ of the government on Saturday last and of which we desire to register our disapproval. I have here the article in question, printed in the Daily Star on Saturday last and which reads as follows:

"GAMBLING FOR A GRAVEYARD"

It is with deep sorrow that The Star is compelled to express its opinion on the horrible desecration of the name of Beaumont Hamel by the occupants of Government House. The public remembers Beaumont Hamel. With the best blood of our boys was that field enriched. There is no more precious spot in God's Universe to a Newfoundlander. With bloody sweat and agony at home has the name been consecrated.

After July 1st, 1916, our boys' bodies lay on the oozy soil in the scorching heat and nightly dew and then became a part of Mother Earth. Truly, it was earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. No burial was possible. Nature herself provided interment, and the roar of battle was the requiem they had.

More than a year ago the Government arranged through the Department of Militia to purchase the entire field and keep it sacred as a bit of Newfoundland in France, in fact, the

richest bit of Newfoundland in the world.

By what authority then did His Excellency the Governor have a card and pool party at Government House on Thursday night last to raise money by a big social function and gambling for the purchase of this burial plot? If the Governor felt that the taxpayers of Newfoundland were too callous and poor to provide their own shrine and sacred burial plot, then his action might be pardoned, though because of its nature it could never be justified.

The Governor would not have invoked the gambling table of Government House to provide funds for Beaumont Hamel if his boy had sunk into the moist clay to become a part of mother earth with resting place unmarked and untraceable. Supposing the editor of this paper had no sensibilities and no sense of propriety. Supposing he put up a wheel of fortune and had a dance in The Sar office to get money to bury the body of the Governor's boy. What would the Governor think about it? What difference is there between that crude illustration of callousness and the action of the Governor in running of a gay function with draw poker on terms that all the money won at gambling that night should be used to buy the beloved burial plot of Newfoundland?

If money has to be secured by private subscription for this purpose it should be given with prayer and devotion, and not through the excitement, glamour and hilarity of the card room or the ball room, not even if Government House sets the pace.

Let Beaumont Hamel rest in peace.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, give notice of the following Resolution:

RESOLVED:—That this House before proceeding with the consideration of the Address in Reply, feels called upon to place on record its indignant and forceful protest and emphatic con-

demnation of the article in the "Daily Star" newspaper of Saturday last entitled "Gambling for a Graveyard" This article constitutes a brutal and uncalled for attack upon His Excellency the Governor, in regard to a purely personal matter and one, which in the opinion of the House, in no way warrants the criticism directed at it.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to rise for the purpose of seconding the resolution proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The subject is a most painful one and in my opinion it is desirable that it be debated as little as possible. A more unfortunate article never appeared in a local newspaper. Where it emanated from or with what motive it was written I cannot say, but the fact of it being in a government organ makes it all the more serious. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg to second the resolution just proposed.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the leader of the Opposition has thought fit to bring the matter in question before this House. What any newspaper might do is no matter for this House. I was one of those present at the party referred to and I participated in that session or whatever it may be called. I brought the matter to the notice of the members of the Government and knew nothing of it. I don't think it should be brought in here at all and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his resolution.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot see eye to eye with the hon. gentleman. Doctors differ you know, and patients die. It is a well known fact that the Prime Minister is the owner of the paper in which that article appeared.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That is not true.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I hear that for the first time. Everybody believes

that you are or at least that you are the controlling spirit behind it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I am a substantial creditor, that is all.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is merely splitting hairs, sir. It is well known that you control the Daily Star.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That does not happen to be the case.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It is public property all the same that you do control it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—It is not true.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There is not a man in sound of your voice who does not believe that you are the owner or at least that you have the controlling interest in that paper and many question the writer of that article, indeed many are uncharitable as to blame you for it. Then when we come in here and express our disapproval of this beastly, contemptible treatment of the king's representative a minister of the government gets up and tells us the matter is not one for the house. The resolution has been moved and seconded in the regular way and it will stand. The prime minister admits that he is a shareholder.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I am not a shareholder, and the government knows nothing of the article in question. I stated that I was merely a creditor of the Daily Star, as no doubt Sir Michael Cashin is of many similar concerns.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—And still after that article appearing in the Daily Star, he goes down and dines at Government, House Saturday night. He says he is not the owner of that paper but he is not in a position to go down and dismiss Dr. Mosdell if he wishes to?

Now I don't want to critic Dr. Mosdell, he is open to criticism where the war is concerned, and was one of those who took to the woods when the war was on and his paper was closed up

for sedition. Then you came out and told the country you would stand by The Star politically and financially and your brother member now asks to have this resolution withdrawn. The article was rotten in every sense of the word. There is no reason to withdraw the resolution and he gave none. It should be the first duty of the House to pass the resolution condemning the article.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The leader of the Opposition is right in saying he is within his rights in bringing the matter before the House, but notice must be given of question and none was given in this case.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That's only quibbling.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I do not like that remark and it is not so. The rules of the House are there and if you want to debate it—and I say right here that I wish to disassociate myself with the sentiment of the article—you should give notice of question for to-morrow.

MR. HIGGINS:—I think you have lost sight of the point and look upon this as a vote of censure on the government. It seems that the government side wishes to take all the claim for loyalty. The leader of the Opposition instead of moving the adjournment of the House to discuss the question, as he might have done and as in the practice in England, did ask the indulgence of the House to deal with it. I believe that both sides of the House will go on record in support of the resolution. We have every right to demand that this be dealt with at the earliest possible moment and to go on record as legislators in deploring it. I think it very unfortunate that this should be asked to be left stand over for debate. None of us desire to debate it; I have memories of Beaumont Hamel that prevent me wishing to discuss it. As to what paper it is in is only a matter of incident. I should be condemned, in whatever pa-

per it might have appeared and I think we would be unworthy of ourselves if we failed to go on record as opposed to such an attack on His Excellency. If the desire is to have a dress debate I regret it as there is so much to be said in connection with the matter. In justice to those coming after us we should keep the House clean. This is not a party measure and is not raised in a partisan spirit. It is not raised as an opposition measure and it is this spirit I support the resolution.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I speak that the indulgence of the House. The paper referred to happens to be an organ of the government but I wish to disassociate myself with the sentiment of the article. When the opposition leader got up he left the impression it was a party measure as he stated the article was in the government paper, but I'm glad to hear such is not the case. I don't know what is in the article but think we should follow the regular parliamentary procedure and notice be given of the question for to-morrow. The leader of the opposition might have adjourned the House for consideration of the question but I think it should be left over till to-morrow.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I would like to express myself in favour of the view of the Hon. Minister of Justice and before voting would like to have the privilege of reading the article over. Otherwise I would be voting for something I know nothing about and should like to be able to see it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I agree with some of the observations of my learned friend Mr. Higgins but disagree with the working of the resolution and expressions of the leader of the opposition, if a suitable resolution were moved by Mr. Higgins I believe it would pass unanimously. It is unfortunate that attention was called by the News in the morning and The Star

in the afternoon to the incident at Government House.

Sir M. P. Cashin tabled the resolution.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on the accounts of the Colony for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1920, and also his special report under Section 33B of the Audit Act.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to ask the leader of the House if the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be deferred until to-morrow, till we get the answers to some of the questions asked. The reason for this request is that anything that I have to say on the Speech from the Throne, I want to be able to say intelligently, and this I cannot do without some of the information asked for in the questions of the previous sittings of March 30th. Now that the report has been received, I would ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if this motion might stand until to-morrow. The information in particular that I would like to have is in connection with the railway policy.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, with regard to all questions addressed to myself, with the exception of Nos. 6 and 7 which have already been dealt with, the typewritten answers have not yet arrived but will be here some time this afternoon. That applies to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, No. 7 excepting statement of accounts, Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21. Having been in the reporters' box myself I know the difficulty of reporting these answers, and I am therefore having them prepared in writing, and will be in a position to deal with all of them during the afternoon.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, having already said a word or two in relation to some matters now before the House; having already extended my congratulations to the mover and

per it might have appeared and I think we would be unworthy of ourselves if we failed to go on record as opposed to such an attack on His Excellency. If the desire is to have a dress debate I regret it as there is so much to be said in connection with the matter. In justice to those coming after us we should keep the House clean. This is not a party measure and is not raised in a partisan spirit. It is not raised as an opposition measure and it is this spirit I support the resolution.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I speak that the indulgence of the House. The paper referred to happens to be an organ of the government but I wish to disassociate myself with the sentiment of the article. When the opposition leader got up he left the impression it was a party measure as he stated the article was in the government paper, but I'm glad to hear such is not the case. I don't know what is in the article but think we should follow the regular parliamentary procedure and notice be given of the question for to-morrow. The leader of the opposition might have adjourned the House for consideration of the question but I think it should be left over till to-morrow.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I would like to express myself in favour of the view of the Hon. Minister of Justice and before voting would like to have the privilege of reading the article over. Otherwise I would be voting for something I know nothing about and should like to be able to see it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I agree with some of the observations of my learned friend Mr. Higgins but disagree with the working of the resolution and expressions of the leader of the opposition, if a suitable resolution were moved by Mr. Higgins I believe it would pass unanimously. It is unfortunate that attention was called by the News in the morning and The Star

in the afternoon to the incident at Government House.

Sir M. P. Cashin tabled the resolution.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on the accounts of the Colony for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1920, and also his special report under Section 33B of the Audit Act.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to ask the leader of the House if the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be deferred until to-morrow, till we get the answers to some of the questions asked. The reason for this request is that anything that I have to say on the Speech from the Throne, I want to be able to say intelligently, and this I cannot do without some of the information asked for in the questions of the previous sittings of March 30th. Now that the report has been received, I would ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if this motion might stand until to-morrow. The information in particular that I would like to have is in connection with the railway policy.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, with regard to all questions addressed to myself, with the exception of Nos. 6 and 7 which have already been dealt with, the typewritten answers have not yet arrived but will be here some time this afternoon. That applies to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, No. 7 excepting statement of accounts, Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21. Having been in the reporters' box myself I know the difficulty of reporting these answers, and I am therefore having them prepared in writing, and will be in a position to deal with all of them during the afternoon.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, having already said a word or two in relation to some matters now before the House; having already extended my congratulations to the mover and

seconded of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech from the Throne and having already associated myself with the Resolutions of sympathy passed the opening day, it is scarcely necessary for me to go back over the same ground, but I also intimated to the House at the opening that I would avail of the first possible opportunity to deal at greater length with the very important matters that are holding a prominent place in the minds of the people of this country at the present time. Now, I might say at the start that I do not at all approve of the attitude of those Ministers on the other side of the House from whom we have to try and glean all the possible information we can get, so that we can deal intelligently with the conduct of the present administration for the past twelve months. It seems to me that the set policy of the papers supporting the Government is to attack the members of the Opposition and hurl at them the vilest kind of personal abuse so that they may be frightened from asking questions that would expose the conduct of their bosses. But I want to serve notice on these literary assassins that any reference of theirs in the public press will not prevent me from turning the searchlight on the ecations of the Government for the past eighteen months. When I asked a question yesterday, a question that in my opinion is one of the most important that will possibly be put on the order paper, I am the subject of a bitter attack through the columns of the Evening Advocate, the official organ, of the Hon. Mr. Coaker and his associates in the F. P. U. The question referred to was as follows:—

"I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask the Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House a statement

showing if the F. P. U. or any of its, subsidiary companies owe any money for bonds at the Custom House."

To-day when I took up a copy of the Advocate I was unmercifully attacked because I had dared to ask such a question. Whil'st I have no personal desire to enquire into the private affairs of any private concern, nor have I any desire to in any way injure the legitimate actions of the F. P. U., or any of its companies. I have also a desire and a firm decision that I am going to safeguard in so far as I can the interests of the other sections of the country that are not represented in this House by the F. P. U. nor its officials. No sane man can argue that the F. P. U. can be regarded as a private enterprise. It must be conceded by all intelligent people that the Fishermen's Protective Union is the biggest political and mercantile corporation that Newfoundland has ever had. As for its political powers one has only to look across the House and there you can find eleven men who came here representing the business and financial interests of this corporation and it is for this reason and this reason alone that I must demand to have any questions that I have to ask in reference to this organization answered promptly. Inotice by the Auditor General's report that \$500,000 was taken from the treasury and handed over to the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is President of the F. P. U. and Managing Director of its commercial enterprises, to be used in the purchase of fish. The motto of the official organ of Mr. Coaker is "Suum Cuique" which means equal rights to all. Well Mr. Speaker, I ask you in all seriousness, is this practising the doctrine of equal rights? This \$500,000 was a part of the surplus left by the Government of Sir Michael Cash-

in. It was owned by the tax-payers of this country, no particular section of them. The men of Placentia and St. Mary's Bays, the men of Fortune Bay, the men of Burin District and the men of Conception Bay and the people of this city had just as much claim on the Treasury of this country as had the men who are represented by Mr. Coaker. But the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whom nobody would dispute is the dictator and who was acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Mr. Squires last year, was apparently given carte blanche by the Executive Government to handle this \$500,000 as he saw fit and then when one comes in here and from his official place in this House makes a query as to the expenditure of the money, he is held up to ridicule by a section of the press. I find that a large amount of that money was spent to purchase fish from a certain section of the Island. I deplore the attitude of the Members of the Government who are not representing F. P. U. constituencies, who will sit by and allow the interests of the districts they represent to be sacrificed. I am sorry to make this statement that we have in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's to-day no less than 20,000 quintals of fish which at the present moment you could not get twenty cents a quintal for and the poor fishermen who had to toil from morn to night to procure that fish have had to appeal to the Commissioner of Public Charities for support. During the seven years that I have had the honour of a seat in this House as a representative for this important district to my certain knowledge there was not altogether during these seven years \$700 worth of poor relief sent to the district, but unfortunately within the past two or three months there has been thousands of dollars worth of provisions doled out in the usual

way. It is a stigma that the people of this historic old district abhor and resent. It is a stigma that was placed upon them not by their own actions but by the insane legislation of an incapable administration. If the men who are holders of this fish were able to market it as they would have been able to do had the trade not been interfered with, they would be in a position to-day to be able to outfit for the coming season. But it is ancient history now what has happened to our foreign markets and I doubt if the tens of thousands of quintals of fish bought by Mr. Coaker from his friends and from himself in some cases and in the districts which he politically controls at the present moment will be ever utilized as an article of food. By bull-headed interference and undiplomatic actions the Italian market has been destroyed and this fish, which is a perishable article, is now lying around St. John's in stores and with the warm weather approaching, I predict that by the middle of the summer it will have to be shovelled out and carted away to some of the farmers in and around St. John's. The whole procedure is a piece of vicious class legislation and I predict that when the people of this country find out what has really happened there will be an uprising. If for no other reason than this, it is quite sufficient that the present administration will go down in history as the most dishonest and most incompetent administration that ever controlled the affairs of this country. It may be alright for Mr. Jennings or Mr. Coaker or any other Hon. gentleman who holds a seat in this House to do their best for this particular constituency but the other sections of the Island should not be sacrificed. All I would ask for is a square deal and as the Fishermen's Advocate says "to every man his own." But the

attitude of the Government in connection with this fish business is not in accordance with this motto. Personally I have nothing but respect and sympathy for any number of the fishermen who banded themselves together for the betterment of their homes and surroundings. I am in sympathy with the F. P. U. as an organization if its activities were confined to the original intention, but when the F. P. U. or any other corporation tries to control the Government of the country then it is about time for someone to step in and say "Thou shalt not pass."

Mr. Speaker: What the fishermen and laboring men of this country are interested in at the present time is what is the Government going to do to find employment for the tens of thousands of our people who are today alarmed at the serious situation. They want to know what programme the Government has to relieve the tension. They want to know what proposition the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has with regard to the prosecution of the cod-fishery the coming summer; they want to know what is the Government's programme for the opening up of new avenues of employment which are daily referred to in the papers supporting the Government and which were outlined in the Manifesto of the Leader of the Government when he appealed for votes. The public are anxious to know what is being done with regard to Bell Island, and whether that antagonistic spirit which I presume is responsible for the tying up of this important industry, is still in evidence. I say it is the duty of the Leader of this House and every individual member in the House irrespective of where his desk may be located, to see that these matters are ventilated properly. Cheap personalities and camouflage should be abolished. Every question

that is being sent across to the Government benches by the representatives of the Opposition is a fulfilment of our duty. We are here as the safety valve of the whole machinery which operates the Government and the country who are watching our actions today and are demanding that our queries be answered by the proper men. It is quite true that these questions sometimes cause bad feeling and uneasiness in the ranks of the Government, but we care not who is hurt. We are bound to do our duty. If the members of the Government did not regard these queries as being detrimental to a continuation of their receiving high emoluments, they would have freely handed back answers, but it is because they know that the country is determined to know the true situation that they are complaining about our questions. But the public know and the Ministers of the Government know that there is sufficient ability on this side of the House to be able to force the information no matter how much the Government supporters may wriggle.

Yesterday for a few minutes I dealt with one or two subjects that I found in the Auditor General's Report. I also dealt with the Labrador Boundary question; I do not propose to deal with it any further this session. I found an amount in the Auditor General's report paid to the Price Waterhouse Company of \$10,546. I presume this Company is the expert auditors who were brought down here a little while ago so that they may be able to turn the X-ray on the actions of Sir Michael Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Woodford, the ex-Minister of Public Works, and other gentlemen who were associated with them in the late Government. It is quite alright apparently to spend \$10,000 to compile a report to try to put one of these gentlemen in an awkward position. They never

did hope to convict any of these gentlemen and send them to prison as they published broadcast through their filthy papers, but they thought they might be able to get something which would be sufficient to belittle Sir Michael Cashin and his associates in the eyes of the public; and the result is that the tax-payers of this country are called upon to pay \$10,000 for this report, and the report itself is one of the best possible compliments that could be paid Sir Michael Cashin and his associates for their honesty, integrity and ability during their term of office; and the men who were responsible for these dirty insinuations, the men who were responsible for bringing these sleuths from America to this country to make this report are not possessed of sufficient manhood to get up here in their place in this House and apologize to Sir Michael Cashin and his associates whom they so foully charged. When Sir Michael Cashin and his Government went out of office in 1919 their story, Mr. Speaker, had been told several times and in several places, but I think the time is quite opportune to repeat this story from my place in the House. I say when Sir Michael Cashin went out of office in November, 1919, he handed over to the Exchequer of this country the magnificent sum of three and a half millions of dollars as a surplus. He handed it to the Hon. Mr. Brownrigg, who, by the way, I regret, is absent from his place in this House. I regret that he escaped my memory on the opening day, and if I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, I would avail of this opportunity to express my sincere regret at his absence, and I hope and trust that the time is not far distant when my hon. friend will be restored to his former good health. Though the Hon. Mr. Brownrigg and myself have agreed to disagree so far as politics are concerned, I regard him

as an honorable man, and I regard him as a good citizen. We all hope that before the session is very far advanced that he may be able to take his seat.

To get back to the matter I was speaking of, Mr. Speaker, I say that the enormous sum of three and a half millions of dollars was handed over by Sir Michael Cashin to his successor, the Hon. Mr. Brownrigg. This money was given in trust for the people of this country, to be put aside for the unfortunate rainy day which any man with the slightest sense of vision or foresight could see must be the inevitable outcome of the termination of the Great War. The present Government, under the leadership of Hon. R. A. Squires, went to the country in 1919, and they presented to the electorate a very attractive programme. I have a copy of the Manifesto in my hand, and after perusing it very carefully, I cannot blame the larger number of people all over the Island who spontaneously responded to the appeal sent out by the Leader of Government. I say, sir, that this little document, if it were written, as I have no doubt it was written, in sincerity, could hardly fail to secure sympathy and support. Were any of the promises embodied in that Manifesto carried out? I say no, Sir. Despite the fact that the sum of three and a half millions of dollars that was earned by Cashin and his associates and handed over to Squires and his associates and used by the Hon. Mr. Squires and his followers in most cases for their own personal benefit. So far as I can see there has been no attempt made to carry out any of the claims contained in this Manifesto. In this little book a very attractive policy is outlined. The wisdom of being conservative with regard to public expenditure is interestingly portrayed: the erection of public utilities in various

parts of the country which requires them is promised. Increased votes for public charities and all the various subjects dealt with in this Manifesto were entitled to sympathy and support of the country, if one believed that the man who made them intended to carry out his promises.

I do not care to unnecessarily prolong the business of the House, but I would say before going any further that I have no fear of what construction may be put upon my attitude by those who are anxious to injure me, politically or otherwise; but I have sufficient interest in the people who sent me to this House to show up as far as I can the misdeeds and broken faith of the Hon. the Leader of the House and his associates. With this intention in my mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to review for a few minutes the actions of the Government during the past eighteen months. Let us examine how conservative were those who had charge of that three and a half millions of dollars which was handed over to the Treasury by Sir Michael Cashin when he relinquished power in November, 1919. Let us see how conservative the present Government was with his political friends and supporters. Let us see how honorable the present Government has been with regard to the poor widow and the orphan; with the old, worn-out fisherman or farmer, or cooper, or miner—with the poor man, no matter what his calling may be. A prominent place is to be found in the Manifesto for promises that every old worn-out fisherman would receive the pension. Sufficient money is promised to give every old man who has passed his three-score and ten, fifty dollars each. Not only this but the Hon. Mr. Squires went one better than Sir Edward Morris, to whom, by the way, this country is indebted for this pension scheme; Mr. Squires in his Manifesto promised

that no matter what the age of the person if he were incapacitated by sickness or infirmity and were in need, they would be entitled to this pension. Not only this, but besides giving the pension to old worn-out fishermen, old women who required assistance would be also given a pension. The fee of the widow and the orphan was to be largely increased. There is only one answer, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, to these promises made by the Premier: no attempt has been made to give to the poor old worn-out fishermen this well-earned recompense for their long and faithful services to their country. Down in the office of the clerk in charge of this department you will find hundreds of applications from fishermen all over the country. The office is worn out from the visits of representatives and clergymen and other friends who go there to secure the aid of Mr. Woods to try and get this pension for those poor old men. But they are met with the answer that there is no increased grant and those three and a half millions of dollars have been squandered on wildcat schemes and picnics and the poor old worn-out fisherman is allowed to die in hunger and want. This promise was made deliberately to catch votes and now when no election is pending no consideration is given to these poor men.

I do not care, Mr. Speaker, to burden the House with a perusal of the Manifesto at this particular time. We will have ample opportunity to deal with the broken promises before the close of this session. I think that the burning question at the present time is the financial condition of the country, and what has brought that condition about. I think the matter of Government purchase of fish is perhaps one of the most serious questions that we are confronted with and one of the most important mat-

ters that we as an Opposition as well as representatives of the Government in this House will have to contend with this session. I think perhaps that I may be pardoned if I again revert to this important subject. It seems almost incredible that a Government which has as its Prime Minister a representative of the city of St. John's, the Receiver General also representing St. John's, the Hon. Minister of Shipping representing a Conception Bay constituency, the Hon. Minister of Education, representing Harbor Grace with a seat in the Executive Government, the Hon. Mr. Foote another Executive Member representing the important fishing district of Burin, which embraces Grand Bank, Fortune and other important shipping centres, the Hon. the Attorney General who represents the old historic district of Fortune Bay which is one of the most important banking centres in the Island, and the district of Burgeo and LaPoile represented on the Government side of the House; I say it is almost incredible that these hon. gentlemen will allow half a million dollars of public money to be handed over to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be manipulated by him in the interests of himself and his political associates and the commercial enterprises over which he presides at a great sacrifice to the other sections of the country which I have named. I may tell you frankly, Mr. Speaker, that if I were a member of the Government and such legislation was attempted, I would immediately resign my seat. Whilst I am prepared not only to give but to assist in securing for the districts that are represented by F. P. U. men 100 per cent. of what is due them, I am not prepared to allow them to get 1 per cent. more than their due. I think this is a sound principle, and it is a principle which I have no doubt would be en-

dorsed by the Hon. Mr. Coaker were he present in this House this afternoon.

In the early part of November when I heard that Government assistance was being given to a certain section, I wrote a letter to the public press over my own signature and denounced such a procedure. In one paragraph of that letter I claimed in the following words:

"If Government assistance is to be given to fishermen, it must be country-wide. The men of Placentia Bay, St. Mary's Bay, Conception Bay or any other section of the country have an equal claim on the Treasury of this Dominion, and unless the same privilege is extended, the same proportion and assistance given to all fishermen, no Government should be allowed to vote one dollar in the House of Assembly that would be a discrimination against any particular section of the Island."

I think this is also a sound principle. If it is correct that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been given half million of dollars of the people's money to purchase fish from any particular section of the country, the offence is of such a nature that His Excellency the Governor should immediately demand his resignation. If this is not Star Chamber legislation, then I do not know what is meant by Representative Government. The man who would sit at an Executive Board and allow this discrimination against the men who sent him to this House to safeguard their interests, is in my opinion not fit to represent any constituency. Where do the electors of and fishermen of the District of Ferryland come in for their proportionate part of that half million dollars? Where do the electors of Bay de Verde, which is so ably represented by the Hon. Mr. Cave, who draws a salary of \$5,000.00 from the tax-

payers of this country, and his colleague, Lieutenant LeGrow, our latest agricultural expert, who draws a salary of \$4,000.00; I wonder if the people of Bay de Verde who honored these gentlemen with their votes have received their proportionate part of that \$500,000.00. I wonder if my gallant friend Mr. Small, who is ably representing the District of Burgeo and La Poile, has seen to it that the fishermen of Burgeo and La Poile are to get their proportionate part of this money. I feel sure that my friend the Hon. Mr. Foote has seen to it that Burin's interests have been safeguarded.

There is a story going around that at least one of the representatives for Conception Bay, Mr. Gosse, has been successful in selling his fish to the Government at a fair price. Of course I feel sure that Mr. Gosse saw to it that the fishermen of his constituency who placed him in the House of Assembly sold their fish also at just as good a price, and it is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Messrs. Cave and LeGrow, the Hon. Mr. Warren and Mr. Foote, Messrs. Gosse and Barnes and their associates did not possess sufficient liberality in their make up to do unto others as they would others do to them. They should have remembered that there are just as good men living in the districts that are not represented by the Government side of the House as there are in these districts that are so represented. They should have remembered that the men of Placentia Bay, Trepassey Bay, St. Mary's Bay were just as much entitled to this Government protection or assistance as the people of their own districts. Now I am presuming that these gentlemen who represent Western districts have seen to it that the whole expenditure did not go to the North, but I have been told that such is the case. I met a gentleman

this afternoon who comes from Fortune Bay district, which is represented by the Attorney General. He told me that there is a large amount of fish still on hand in sections of Fortune Bay and that not one dollar of Government money was paid for any fish in that section so far as he knew. Well, if this is so, it makes the case ten thousand times worse against these representatives who are not followers of the Hon. Mr. Coaker and his political organization. The amount of money involved in this expenditure is so large, Mr. Speaker, and the principles involved of so much importance to the future conduct of this Legislature, I think that the matter is of too much importance to pass over lightly.

It is in my opinion absolute proof that we can never again have in this country Government of the people, for the people and by the people, whilst the Hon. Mr. Coaker or any other Hon. man is wielding such large influence in the affairs of the Government. I have no objection to the people of the North getting their share of what is going. As a matter of fact I have a certain amount of special sympathy for some of the Northern districts. I spent sixteen years of my life in the North and perhaps know as much about conditions there as most of the Hon. Gentlemen on the other side of this House. I had the honour to be a resident of a part of the district of Twillingate for sixteen years. Naturally having spent sixteen years of my life, closely associated with my fellow residents there I know something about conditions. I have nothing but sympathy for the people of that district or in fact any other district, but I believe that my Hon. Friend the Minister of Public Works has so ably and well represented the district referred to is broad-minded enough and honest enough to admit that when the expen-

diture of half million dollars is made that the people of the south, the west and the East are just as much entitled to their share of it as the people of the north. I believe that my friend, Mr. Jennings will agree with this principle. Personally if I were representing the north that would be my attitude and I want to state here that if I had been holding a place in the Government when this expenditure was authorised by the Government to the district which was not represented in the Government required the encouragement and protection that was being offered to my district and the representative of that district came to me and asked me to use my influence to relieve the situation that existed in his district I would be quite prepared to see that equal rights was given to all districts or I would be no party to this class distinction and I further believe that if the members of the present Government had been consulted before this monstrous piece of corruption was perpetrated there are men I think on the other side of the House who would not stand for this Legislation. They would not be satisfied to hand to one man half million dollars to be spent as he wished for his own interests and for the interests of the Companies that he was financially interested in. It is in my opinion the duty of the Members of this House to denounce and condemn in the strongest possible language this spending of public money by any individual or any corporation when it is at the expense of other sections of the country. The Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries is we all know, human, he is only an ordinary human being like most of us, he is to be complimented upon the success he has met with in regard to the formation of the F.P.U. But I think it is fortunate that Mr. Coaker and his F. P. U. enterprizes

should have such political power which in my opinion is detrimental to the best interests of a free Government. Whether he is Leader of the Government, Attorney General or whether in the Government or not, whilst he controls in this House eleven seats he is seriously interfering with the principles of representative Government. The present Government will never be of the people, by the people and for the people whilst any one man controls eleven seats in this House, whilst any man who so controls is head of a corporation or the magnitude of the F. P. U. I sympathise with the Leader of the House because of the unfortunate position in which he finds himself. I do not believe that the Leader of the Government was the introducer of that minute of council which hands over half million dollars of public money to be spent at the wish and whim of Mr. Coaker and his associates. I believe if the Leader of the Government found himself in the lead of a party affiliated with the F. P. U. Reid Nfld. Company, Grand Falls, Bell Island or any other corporation he would not be a party to any such transaction. It is common knowledge what led up to this unfortunate expenditure. Everybody is familiar with the doctrine preached by the President of the F. P. U. and his associates during the past eight or ten years the price of fish is what Mr. Coaker makes it, the law of supply and demand has been relegated to the back-ground and the price of fish is nothing more or less than Coaker makes it. This was in the days before my friend the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had this title placed before his name. I am sorry that the Hon. Gentleman is not in his seat and no doubt I will be told to-morrow that I availed of this opportunity to attack Mr. Coaker in his absence, but if he is not in his place

in this House it is through no fault of mine and he is not absent from this House on any mission that I am responsible for. It is his duty to be here and I am not going to be debarred from making the reference that I intend to make his public actions by his being absent. I say sir, that when the Hon. Mr. Coaker was plain Mr. Coaker, President of the F.P.U. we used to have the price of fish dished out in this Chamber in all kinds of ways by this gentlemen and his followers. We used to have it in this House for breakfast, dinner and supper. When the price was high, it was that Mr. Coaker made it, but now that the price is low it is because of the hanger-downs, the wooden heads, who are represented by Cashin, Crosbie and the rest of us, who are associated with these gentlemen on this side of the House. It is now ancient history that last autumn the men of the North who were guaranteed they would be given \$10 for fish came on here to St. John's in large numbers, they found that they had been fooled and that there was no such price offering. They held public meetings here in the city and passed resolutions condemning the action of Mr. Coaker and his associates. The result was that Mr. Coaker and his associates became scared and he was forced to use the powers that he held in the present Government to force through the Executive Council a minute or arrangement whereby he would be able to come to the rescue of his followers whom he had deluded, arrangements whereby he would be able to keep or nearly keep the promises he had made them, the whole section of the coast from Baccalieu to Cape John.

It was then that the Hon. Mr. Coaker and his associates had placed before them in no uncertain way that the price of fish was controlled absolutely by supply and demand. There

is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, knowing the ability of Hon. Friend both in business and in politics that half a million dollars will be spent to the best advantage of Mr. Coaker and the F. P. U. both politically and commercially. Before leaving this subject I wish to again enter my strongest protest against this travesty of public funds. Is it not reaping the whirlwind when we find the people on the verge of revolution. How can they be blamed. The attitude of the Government with regard to this transaction is only in accord with their actions with regard to every public matter they have dealt with. In season and out of season, through the public press and from public platforms the Reid Newfoundland Company was denounced by the leader of the Government and by the Hon. Mr. Coaker and their associates who claimed and shouted persistently that if ever they were given power they would see to it that the Reids were made toe the line. After all not a few will believe this and it gives a ring of sincerity to the arguments handed out by the Daily Star as to putting the Reids in their proper place. The country will unfortunately find that these people who made these statements, the Leader of the Government who sandbagged the Reid Nfld. Co., from his place in this House a short year ago, the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries who through his paper and in every conceivable way attacked and denounced the Reids and all associated with them are the very men who have scandalously betrayed the trust of the people and have relieved the Reids from all the obligations to this country and have placed further burdens of taxation which I am afraid will be the last straw that broke the camel's back. No sooner was this House of Assembly closed last session, the ink was scarcely dry which

reported the famous denunciatory speech against the Reids that the Executive Government met in solemn conclave and entered into an agreement with Reid Nfld. Co. which will cost the taxpayers of this country, millions of dollars. To-morrow I will be told by members on the opposite side of the House or through the Press that I am taking advantage of the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to vilify him. I am not doing so. I told the Hon. Minister from my place in this House one year ago that I was prepared to give him a chance and also served notice on him that if I discovered that he was attempting to treat the people false I would have no hesitation in calling a spade a spade and I would not be deterred from denouncing him in the strongest language at my disposal if I found him acting dishonestly by the people. I owe no allegiance to any newspaper, I owe no allegiance to any corporation or political organization or no man inside or outside of this House, but I do owe allegiance to 20,000 people who reside in the district I represent and sent me to this House to safeguard their interests and while I hold my health and strength which is fairly good, at the present moment, barring my hearing, I will do all I can to defend the rights and privileges which in my opinion are being at the present moment by the present Government deliberately sacrificed. I am an admirer of the industry of the Hon. Mr. Coaker, but I have no hesitation in denouncing him in his political capacity, when he attempts to manipulate an important department of the Government for the selfish interests of himself and the commercial enterprises with which he is closely identified. In that decision I think I will be sustained by friends on both sides of the House and by the Leader of this House if he has not changed,

his opinion since 1918 when I had the honour to hear him give expression to the very same sentiments that I am preounding here, from his seat in the Legislative Council.

To get back to the subject of the railway is perhaps the most important matter that this House will have to deal with. I have to anticipate what is going to happen on the 30th of June when the agreement which was entered into by the Executive Government and the Reids. I have not sufficient information before me with regard to the handling of the railway during the past ten months to be able to deal intelligently with the matter, but I cannot be blamed for insinuating wrong-doing when we recall the attacks made upon the Reid Nfld. Company by the Leader of the present Government a few short months ago, and now we find that the Hon. Mr. Coaker is chairman or boss of the Reid outfit. One cannot be blamed for having these thoughts when we go to the railway station nearly every Friday evening when the Hon. Mr. Coaker is in town, and find that a palace car is placed at his disposal and cooks and stewards and well-stocked larders are placed at his disposal for his week-end trips to Port Union. I wonder if this expenditure is a tax upon the F.P.U. corporations or whether the taxpayers of the country are being bled for this recreation of the Hon. Minister. I notice Mr. Jennings, the Hon. Minister of Public Works, has fallen asleep. I was not aware that the sleeping sickness had struck this country.

MR. JENNINGS:—Mr. Speaker, I think it is out of order for the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's to remark whether my eyes are closed or open.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I must remind the Hon. Mr. Jennings that I am not at all particular whether his

eyes are closed or open, but what I am particularly interested in are his ears. I want him to keep them open and hear what is being said. Now I think we had better see how far we can get along with this debate before tea. I want to refer to a question which has occupied a prominent place in the public mind the past months. It has also found a place of notice in the Auditor General's report and I believe has found a place in the Speech from the Throne, the question relates to Sugar. This matter has been handled very intelligently by my friend Mr. Bennett in his magnificent address of yesterday. It was equally as well handled by him a year ago in this House and if his sound advice which was given at that time had been taken by the present Government this country would not be called upon to pay a loss of \$200,000.00 and the public be led to the tune of twenty-five to thirty-five cents per pound for sugar which we should be able to purchase to-day for ten or twelve cents per pound. The man down in Twillingate who has to go to Ashbourne or some other dealer and pay thirty cents per pound for sugar wants to know why it is so. As there was a Food Control Board under the old Government and when there was a suspicion that things were not being done just right by that Board, the Hon. Mr. Coaker, the Hon. Mr. Squires and my friend the Minister of Public Works, had no hesitation in denouncing the conduct of that Food Control, but now because the personal of the present Food Control Board is friendly disposed to the present Government and because merchant friends of the Government were contributing large cheques to the party funds are interested in the further control of the price of sugar, the hardships that the people are called upon to suffer are winked out of sight. I wonder

do the gentlemen on the other side of the House know that fresh meat is being brought into this country to-day which is invoiced at eleven cents per pound is retailed to the people of this country for forty-five and fifty cents per pound. Can the gentlemen on the other side of the House tell me why this is so? Do they know that men who are closely connected with this Food Control Board are financially interested in the importing of this commodity. I commend this information to the Hon. Attorney General for his enquiry and I seriously request that the Department of Justice enquire into this matter and if this statement is correct, this kind of thing should no longer be tolerated.

The public at large have no confidence or no sympathy with any further interference with the legitimate trade of the country. The Food Control Board, like the War Measures Act and the Act Regulating the Exportation of Codfish should be immediately repealed and taken from the Statutes Book. If we are to make a serious attempt to retain our position as an independent colony, a policy of retrenchment will have to be adopted. I do not mean retrenchment with regard to the lessening of the salaries of the minor civil servants, but a policy of retrenchment will have to be adopted and the first place that the weapon should be used is right in this Assembly. We should as patriotic Newfoundlanders commence by chopping down our own salaries. We will have to get back to 1914 salaries. Any sane man with a cord eye can see that we cannot meet an \$11,000,000 expenditure with a \$6,000,000 revenue. Consequently our expenditure will have to be almost cut in half. To do this a policy of heavy retrenchment will have to be undertaken. We will have to recall our unnecessary fish Commissioners who are at this moment wallowing in

luxury at the expense of a half-starved public. We will have to discontinue our elaborate educational programme, which is, in my opinion, characteristic of the trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse. Before bringing my few observations to a close there are one or two other subjects I should like to touch on briefly. True I may occupy little more time than some, but it is because I am performing a duty which I owe to the district which I represent, a district which the present administration hears more about than any other district in the Island, because in spite of the threats that have been made in the Press to try and drive me from public life I anticipate that if I am allowed to retain my health and strength, I will be found on the floors of this Assembly when those who are now trying to hound me down will have gone into political oblivion and will have been numbered in the Limbo of forgotten things. In the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, there is not a single ray of hope held out to an anxious public. Instead of the promises of the Prime Minister in his Manifesto to reduce taxation we are now assured that there is to be a further burden placed upon the backs, of those who are already groaning under the load which they are called upon to carry. I notice in his manifesto of 1919 a gloomy picture is printed of the heavy burden that poor Newfoundland was called upon to bear. He says that every man, woman and child in this country is taxed \$34 per head and if I and my Government are returned to power I will see to it that there is a reduction in this enormous taxation. Now let us see what this reduction amounts to. Mr. Squires promised reduced taxation in 1919. In 1921 after having squandered three and a half millions of dollars which was left in trust for

the people by Sir Michael Cashin and his associates we find that not only is taxation not reduced, but instead of \$34 per head which the taxpayers had to pay in 1919 under Cashin, \$49 per head of the total population must be paid in 1921 under Squires and Coaker. Mr. Speaker, this is reduced taxation with a vengeance. Instead of a revenue of \$9,000,000 which was wrung from the taxpayers in 1919, a revenue of eleven and a half millions of dollars is being wrung from the taxpayers of this country in 1921. Instead of a salary of \$2,000 paid Sir Michael Cashin as Prime Minister in 1919 a salary of \$8000 is being paid from the taxpayers in 1921 to Hon. R. A. Squires. Instead of \$2600 of a salary being paid me as Minister of Agriculture and Mines in 1918, a total salaries amounting to almost \$3000 is being paid to Hon. Dr. Campbell, my successor in office in 1921. And so we might go down through the long list of the patriotic Ministers who comprise the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, the working class of this Island are at present very much alarmed. You take a man with a wife and five children, for the purpose of argument; this man is called upon to pay nearly \$50 per head out of his annual income, and there are numerous men, family men, east, west, north and south of this country, who cannot see where they are going to make \$300 altogether next year, and despite the fact that these circumstances must be well known to almost every member on the Government side of the House, enormous amounts of money, money that was not earned by the present administration but which was left by Cashin and the other members of the late Government to be kept in the interests of the people; it was handed to the members of the present Government to be safe-guarded by them; they were the custodians. But this

overflowing Exchequer which was given in trust has been recklessly squandered on high paid officials, picnic trips, legislation of a discriminating character, railroads, sugar blundering, aeroplanes useless steamers and God only knows how many other wild cat schemes that one would not experience in any other congregation of sane men. Let us have a peep at the reform which has been introduced into the Department of Agriculture and Mines. A vote of \$50,000 for a model farm was forced through this House at the last session. The Government side of the House voted unanimously for this amount, and I am glad to say every individual on this side of the House protested against it. This \$50,000 was handed over to Dr. Campbell, the gentleman who is Minister of Agriculture and Mines, a gentleman who cannot hold a seat in this House and 99 chances out of 100 he never will hold a seat in the popular branch of this legislature. He went on a visit to his native Canada last year and for months nobody knew his whereabouts, until he suddenly turned up at Toronto at a cattle-show. It is unfortunate that we have not a statement of Dr. Campbell's expenditure for stock and expenses during his picnic tour to his native home. I venture to predict that that \$50,000 is another dead loss on the tax-payers of this country. When this amount was voted last year, I appealed on behalf of my constituents for support so as they may be able to obtain sufficient seed potatoes to put in the ground, even if they were only loaned the money or the seed; but my request was given the deaf ear. What matter if the residents of Placentia and St. Mary's or any other section of the Island were not in a position to purchase potatoes to put in the ground in the spring, Dr. Campbell's idea of a model farm could not be interfered with, and after the strenuous work performed by him during the fall

election and bye-election last winter, he was entitled to a trip to his native country, hence this expenditure of \$50,000. Take again this enormous expenditure of nearly \$10,000 for snow-shovelling in the District of Hr. Main. I say, Sir, that we are a quiet people if we are going to countenance this kind of corruption, and this is a grave reflection on the honesty and integrity of the present Minister of Public Works. By this expenditure the Hon. Mr. Jennings has branded himself a political hypocrite of the deepest hue. Mr. Woodford or any other Mr. who preceded him as head of this Department never stooped to a lower degree in the administration of this Department than Mr. Jennings by his countenancing this corruption. Money could not be found last winter to be used in other sections of the Island for legitimate work. Applications were sent to that Department for the cutting of material for repairs to bridges and roads, but no money could be found. But when votes were to be bought and the proper general, Dr. Campbell and his able assistant, the Member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, made the request, the goody-goody Mr. Jennings fell from grace. I wonder what defence the Hon. Mr. Jennings will put up with regard to this expenditure? How much money did Mr. Jennings send to Twillingate District last winter to shovel snow? How much money could be found to shovel the thoroughfares in and around the city of St. John's last winter? How much money was sent to Placentia, Burin and Fortune Bay and Hr. Grace or to any other district? None, because there was no election pending. This is the most rascally piece of political corruption that has ever been recorded in the history of responsible Government in this country. The unassuming Mr. Jennings is called upon to play the leading role in this damnable drama, and, Mr. Speaker, we are asked and expected not to be too severe

in criticising the doings of the present Government and not to be so particular in turning on the searchlight of enquiry.

Another matter that was going to be dealt with was the appointing of a Department of Labour. When the different labour organizations in this city banded themselves together all kinds of promises were handed out by the present Government to try and capture their political support, but this is the second session of the present Government and though strong appeals have been sent from this side of the House on behalf of organized labour, no attempt has been made to render any assistance. It is true that the Prime Minister promised me at the last session that the matter was having his consideration and that he intended to create a Labour Bureau which should be attached to some Department which is already in existence; but so far as I know nothing has come of this promise.

I wonder does the Prime Minister know that an attempt is being made at the present moment to reduce the price of labour? A notice has already been served in some sections of the labouring classes that after the first of May they will be reduced 25 per cent. of their present earning power. I want to say that I, as a friend of labour, offer my strongest objections and most strenuous opposition to any such attempt, especially until the cost of living is reduced to a similar amount. The laboring classes of this town and every industrial section of the Island are taxed to the utmost at present wage to be able to meet their bills and if the earning power is to be curtailed and the cost of living to remain as it is, those men will not be able to exist. It is the duty of the Government to immediately take this matter up, because serious consequences may result.

One does not have to be an accomplished philosopher to see the trouble

that is all over the world today with regard to the high cost of living. In almost all of the countries of Europe strikes are the order of the day, and whilst I am not in sympathy with this method of preserving the rights of labour, if there is not sufficient sympathy to be found in the make up of the present Government to be able to come forward and assist labour in getting justice, I for one will be prepared to advise the working man to use any weapon that may be put in his reach if he is being treated unfairly. It is a well known fact that certain business interests in this country are allowed to profiteer. Exorbitant prices are accepted from the people on almost every commodity. Even the Government has been put on record as being one of the biggest profiteers in the whole country. They have bled an already suffering people to the tune of \$200,000 to repay their ignorant bungling and impertinent interference with legitimate trade on sugar. They are allowed to profiteer on fresh meat and almost every other article of food and of wearing apparel. The public are being bled white and now the working man gets his ultimatum that after the first of May his wages are to be cut by 25 per cent. I am prepared to support the labouring classes through thick and thin, and I think in this I will be backed up by the whole Opposition. It is not only St. John's that is interested in this matter. As I have often pointed out before, it is time that a Department of Labour be established, and we should have at the head of that Department a man who is able to sympathize with the ideals and aspirations of the men of honest toil. I have also pointed out on several occasions the absolute necessity for having an Inspector of Mines appointed. Our mineral resources are at a stand to become a very important factor in our future existence, and if the Department of Agriculture and Mines is

properly looked after and the programme which was outlined by the late Government carried into effect, a competent geologist attached to that Department so that a thorough survey of the Island may be undertaken immediately so that English and American investors who have money to invest may be able through their experts glean all the information that is required before any large amount of money is expended in this direction. A thorough knowledge of the geology of the country may be placed before them. I am a strong believer in the future of our mineral resources. I have had several years of experience in this direction. I have had some experience in other countries than Newfoundland as well as in the different parts of the Island in which this mineral is to be found, and it is because of this practical knowledge and because I have had close association with men who have had more experience than myself that I am convinced that one day Newfoundland will acquire the position that should be hers as a mineral producing country.

It is unfortunate that the important ore mines of Bell Island are not giving this country the credit and support that should be derived from such a valuable deposit of mineral. Bell Island has one of the finest iron ore mines in the world and if we were getting what is due us, this industry should be giving employment to at least 20,000 people. If we have the coal on the West Coast, which I firmly believe we have, this iron ore should not be exported to build up Canadian countries. It should be manufactured right in our own country.

Right in Conception Bay, Harbour Grace or some other suitable seaport over there should be the scene of a great smelting works; steel railways, should be manufactured and even it would not be at all impossible to have a larger shipbuilding plant than

Scotland in operation right at our own doors. Of course the absence of those found on the Clyde in this industry I do not blame the present Government for, but all Governments are more or less responsible. It may be said of me you were Minister of Agriculture and Mines why did you not inaugurate those great reforms. My reply, Mr. Speaker, is this, I entered the Department of Agriculture and Mines in June, 1919. I drew up a programme which I submitted to Sir Michael Cashin August 1919, and as a general election was then approaching, which took place two months after, Sir Michael asked me to defer any programme I had until after the election when he assured me that these suggestions would receive the consideration that this important department deserved. Unfortunately our Government was not successful at the polls and both my programme and myself had to vacate this Department on November 15th. So I had no time to be able to bring about any set programme, but the time may not be far distant when it will be my good fortune to return to that Department, and if I do, I can assure those of my country, men who are interested in this particular branch of our industries that no stone will be left unturned by me that may tend to the proper development of this valuable part of our industries.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two on behalf of those who in my opinion are entitled to the best consideration of every member of this House, I refer to the returned men. I understand that the Royal Naval Reservists who enlisted at the outbreak of the war and spent four years, most of them exposed to the storms and hardships and dangers of the North Sea, men who closed the gates of Dover Straits, men

who manned the watchdogs who prowled in these waters which were charged with mines and other deadly weapons, men, sons of the fishermen who made England the Empire that she is to-day; I understand that a request has been made by these men for their share of prize money. They have not received it, nor a satisfactory statement regarding it. Now I trust Mr. Speaker that the promise in the manifesto of the Hon. Leader of this House when he refers to these gentlemen as "Our Boys" meaning the Army and Navy, I trust that this will be one of the first that will be kept. I hope that our two representatives who occupy seats on the Government side of the House will see to it that their comrades will receive just compensation for what they have done. Some of these heroes have returned to us broken in health, some of them did not return to us at all. Some of them are buried beneath the waters of the North Sea, others found graves on the shores of England, Scotland or France and their dependents at home are looking to us to see that justice is done, those who gave their all in our defence. Some did not receive the gratitude they deserved and many I am sorry to say are to-day living under a foreign flag some perhaps have already foresworn their allegiance to the flag under which they fought so bravely from 1914 to 1918. If it is correct, and I have no doubt it is that this prize money has been paid by the Imperial Navy to the Newfoundland Government than it should be immediately distributed amongst the men to whom it belongs. In this I believe I will be supported by a great majority of the Members of this House irrespective of where they may sit. I have not had time in this short address to deal with all the subjects on which I would like to speak, but other opportunities will arise during this session

and at some future time I trust that I will be allowed to return to the subjects which I have not had time to deal with in this case.

FRIDAY, APRIL 8th, 1921.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker: I have a few brief remarks to make, but I can assure you that they will be made without any undue delay to this House. I will try to come to the point. I do not intend to be personal in my comments, and it is not the intention of the Opposition to be personal in any way towards the members on the other side of the House, but I feel it my duty to criticise the actions of the Government in their conduct of the past twelve months. At this stage we are dealing with the Address in Reply and to say that this document is disappointing would not be conveying the attitude that those inside and outside of this House feel towards the Government for a declaration of policy which fails to convey to us any solution of the problem to deal with the unfortunate condition of the country to-day. I shall await the arrival of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries before dealing with his Department, with regard to Fishery matters, but I shall say here that the policy of Mr. Coaker respecting the fisheries has done much to bring about the present deplorable conditions in trade throughout the whole Dominion. When the Minister of Marine & Fisheries arrives I shall take this matter up and deal with it in full.

I shall now touch upon the actions of the Minister of Education and the Minister of Justice during the past year. I may not permit this session to pass without touching upon the conduct of yourself, Sir, and of your connection with the Government, but I shall leave that comment about you until the House is in Committee when you shall have a chance to reply.

Let me first associate myself with those members on this side of the House, who congratulated the Mover and Secondor of the Address in Reply, on opening day. I regret that the Speech from the Throne was of such a nature as to place those gentlemen in the awkward position of having to say so much about nothing; but after listening to the speeches of both those gentlemen I have come to the conclusion that they have exceptional ability in being able to entertain this House in the manner that they have on a speech, which, in my opinion, is the weakest that has ever been handed to the Speaker of any Legislature. It opens with a funeral and ends with a prayer. I regret as much as anyone the lamented death of the Hon. W. B. Grieve. He was a particular friend of mine, and I often went to secure his opinion and sound advice on matters in connection with the public policy of this country and I feel that if the Government had taken his advice with regard to the Fish situation, we would not now be where we find ourselves to-day. The closing paragraph of the speech is as follows:

(Reads paragraph)

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the Railway policy of the Government; and it would have been an interesting moment, if we had been present at the Executive meeting when the Minister of Education, Mr. Foote, Hon. Geo. Shea, and the Hon. Dr. Campbell signed away the rights of the people of Newfoundland by selling their constituencies. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice were not in the country at the time and we may not directly connect them with that deal; but in as much as the Executive Minute had been prepared by the Hon. Minister of Justice and that the Prime Minister had insisted that he take any responsibility in the preparation

of that Minute; therefore it is quite evident that both those gentlemen were aware of what would be done after their departure from the country. They left here on the 3rd of August 1920, and the Minute of Council was signed on the fifteenth, but its preparation had been agreed on before the 3rd of the month. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice went to England to settle the Labrador Boundary question. This question has been settled several times, but it crops up again at every opportune moment when members of the Government feel that they require a health trip to the Old Country. They were over for five months, and during the most of that time their constituents or many of them were on the verge of starvation. The Minister of Justice left without anyone to look after his district. He left them to the mercy of those who were not particularly interested in their affairs at a time when the district of Fortune Bay was as much concerned with the Fish Exportation Act as the districts of the West Coast and in the actions of Mr. Coaker in forcing upon those people a measure which prevented their doing their business according to their own ideas, and naturally we find that not alone has Fortune Bay suffered by the Minister's neglect and lack of independence in not combating Mr. Coaker's actions in this regard; but from the Auditor General's report we find that several thousand dollars were paid him on account of legal expenses in connection with his trip abroad. I find from this report that ten thousand dollars were paid on account of legal expenses. This is what is contained in the report.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I had a retaining fee of twenty-five hundred dollars, and twenty-five hundred dollars were paid for travelling expenses.

MR. MOORE:—You went away and left the country in the hands of one who has ruined the fishing industry of the country, by the absolute sway which he had in its affairs during your absence. The Hon. Minister spent five months in England when his work could have been completed in as many days. The Attorney General of Canada did not arrive until late in the Fall, and it was not until he arrived that the Minister of Justice was able to sign the document which affected the Quebec Boundary question.

It is evident that the Minister was not entirely concerned with this question, or he would have informed himself when the Minister of Justice of Canada would reach London, and could have made his trip at the same time, and could have saved the country a great deal of expense in connection with travelling expenses. He was bent on having an outing at the expense of the country. He will not go back to his district next year. He will find that the people of Fortune Bay will not endorse his conduct in leaving them to Mr. Coaker's mercies, to have their industry destroyed while he was picnicing in Europe. Twelve months ago he sent the police to the district of Ferryland to take back from the people the money allocated for expenditure in that district. He did not consider it was right that public monies should be allocated for roads and bridges, but still he permitted the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take the sum of a half million dollars from the public Treasury to be handed over to the F.P.U. and their friends for the purchase of Labrador fish. Now is he prepared to put the police after Mr. Coaker in connection with this expenditure. If it was wrong for us to allocate those sums to the people of Ferryland it is a greater wrong for Mr. Coaker to take from the public Treasury money

which belongs to the people of other sections of the Island as much as to the Northern districts, but Mr. Coaker is a great power in the Government, and none can dare defy any action which he undertakes. Mr. Coaker left here last Fall twelve months and went across to Europe. Then the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice went. They were hardly on board of the boat when the Hon. the Speaker hiked it off; Dr. Campbell packed his trunks and left for Canada, and on his return Mr. Coaker started off again on a pleasure jaunt. I would like to ask what benefit those men or their trips have been to Newfoundland. Mr. Coaker will soon return and will be taking his place in this House. We shall then be in a position to enquire from him what he has done to justify his absence from the country at the country's expense during the past few months.

Dr. Campbell went to Canada with fifty thousand dollars of the public money and brought back some scrub cattle, and two or three horses. The cows he imported are giving less milk daily than those already in the country, particularly at Mount Cashel. Evidently the cattle he imported are inferior to those already here, and there is no point in introducing low-bred stock into this country. The fifty thousand dollars which was voted here last year for this purpose is now spent, and we will wait until we have the facts before us in full before we criticise the actions of the Minister in this regard.

The Member for Bay Roberts smiles, probably because his present income for sessional allowance has been raised to one thousand dollars a session. This amount was probably the price given him for betraying the interests of his constituents, but there was a man in this House two years ago, representing that District, who did not

sell them so readily. I refer now to Mr. Piccott who never turned his back upon the people of Bay Roberts. I understand that they got no part of the half million dollars used to purchase fish, but were entitled to it as much as the others who did get a part of it.

In the District of Ferryland I find that education is not receiving the attention which such an important matter calls for. I find that the school inspector has not visited the district for several years, and now that he is Deputy Minister of Education he will probably be able to do more than he has done in the past. Were it not for the Convent schools and the interest taken by the various clergymen, education would be at a very low ebb, and I contend that the amount of money voted for education, is not being spent in the best interests of education in the outports. If, instead of the present school inspectors, they were to appoint lady inspectors for this work, we would get much better satisfaction at a less cost. We were told that the inspectors are those who do not inspect. They have not for years gone beyond the smoke of their own chimneys for fear they would miss an invitation to Government House.

Last evening in this House Mr. Vinnicombe referred to the business in which he was engaged for some time, and accused the Minister of Public Works of being in the liquor business. I am now going to tell you a story relative to a little affair in connection with the Public Works Department after the present Government came into office. Mr. Jennings had been appointed Minister of Public Works. Some few days after his appointment a man called at his office, and asked if Mr. Woodford was in. Mr. Jennings replied, "No, and I do not think he will be for some time." The man then asked if he could get a script. Mr. Jennings informed him that he did not deal

in scripts. He replied: "If Mr. Woodford was here he would not refuse me a script under the circumstances, as I require it for medicinal purposes." Mr. Jennings absolutely refused to have anything to do with a script, as it was totally against his principles at that time; but a change seems to have come over him during the past year, as we find that he is ready to sit with the Government and endorse the conduct of a member of the Government who not alone deals largely in scripts, but is able to distribute with a free hand throughout the District of Harbor Main unlimited scripts for intoxicating liquors. The man whom I referred to as seeking a script from Jennings came from the head of Conception Bay as his wife was dying and he wanted some stimulant to help her. Being unsuccessful, he went home without it, and she died without any stimulant. This is the story as I got it from her son. It was told me on Nomination Day in the District of Hr. Main. I know Mr. Jennings and Mr. Winsor are total abstainers, but why should they allow liquor to be handed out to a few and not to the hard-working fishermen.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, to which I shall call the attention of the Minister of Justice and it is this: The other day eight hundred this: The other day 800 quarters of beef were imported into this country costing twelve and a half cents per pound, and today I was informed that beef is being sold in this town at fifty cents per pound. Is it right that butchers should be profiteering to this extent when the people who need food are starving because of this extortion? In the Canadian Provinces the best beefsteak today is selling at twenty-five cents a pound; but here, because of a meat combine and of the incompetence of the Food Control Board, meat is selling at the enormous price of fifty cents per pound. I think that the Minister of

Justice should take the trouble to look into this matter.

Mr. Jennings seems surprised that I should refer to a Road Commission some time ago. Might I ask the hon. gentleman where the ten thousand dollars in this connection was spent?

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS:
—Some of it was spent in Hr. Main, two members of the Road Commission had all to do with it. I will get the necessary information.

MR. MOORE:—The money has been spent in Hr. Main, but none in the District of Ferryland. I understand that most of this money has been spent in and around Kelligrews, the home of the Hon. Member for Fogo. We never deprived Hr. Main of any money for the use of Ferryland. We are leaving that position to be taken by the Government. The Member for Fogo thought he had the election of Hr. Main in his pocket. He figured out that he could purchase the district by expending public moneys in one settlement of that district, but during the campaign another newspaperman put it all over him. He told a story about the Minister of Justice staging a meeting at Foxtrap when he came back, about the man who rushed out in a shower. Having no place to go, he ran up a tree, and when he got there he found that he could not get out. He felt that his end had come, and he prepared for the worst. He thought over the sins of his past life which came before his mind, and the greatest crime he had committed was that he voted for Cashin. He thought that for this sin there could be no forgiveness, and the thought of his future condition became so desperate that he shrivelled up and fell out of the tree. I remember a time when the Minister of Justice had a very different opinion from that which he now expresses of the Leader of the Opposition, and I feel that if the Minister were to express to this House his real opinion of Sir Mchael Cashin in this

House, it would be very different from that which he has expressed since the opening of the House.

With regard to Mr. Hibbs, I know he has the right to publish any book he likes provided the Government has not to pay the cost of it, but this one is carefully gotten up and one part of it reads as follows:

(Reads.)

The Hon. Member went to Hr. Main and promised sixty thousand dollars from the Motor Association for the improvement of roads if the people of Hr. Main would vote for the Government candidates. He promised that this sum of money would be spent in the district for the improvement of roads and bridges. If that be his intention, I will not personally contribute any more to the Motor Association.

MR. HIBBS:—I will go to your office off the stage, of one thing I will explain how you are wrong.

MR. MOORE:—You probably will try to explain it, but what about you when you come to Ferryland to fix up the roads there. Every second leaf of this report is a boost for the Government. Instead of being a road booster, it appears to be a Government booster. Every person has his own method of advertising himself. Lipton crossed the Atlantic and entered into a race to advertise his business. We know of a man Gray in London who had his name on jam crocks; but Mr. Hibbs' name appears on every second leaf. Listen to this:

(Reads)

He did not get paid this year yet, but he probably expects he will be paid in the near future. You have done nothing to improve the roads in Ferryland District, and it appears that you have not any intention of making improvements there. You follow the precept of Mr. Jennings, who, although inclined to waste money in Hr. Main, is very much offended when he finds that money from

other districts has been allocated to Ferryland. I would not follow this line of action because I consider it small and mean to do so. You refer to the part which I take upon the stage, but whether I take part on or off the stage, of one thing I will assure the Hon. member, I would not find any class of work, which he would be qualified to perform. I will return to this matter in the very near future when I expect we shall have more time to take the matter up in detail as the House will not likely close before August, as it will take until then to straighten matters out.

What are we going to do about the fishermen of the South and West Coasts, who have so many quintals of fish which they are unable to dispose of, and how are we going to supply the fishermen of that section of the country for the fisheries. Are they to be supplied or is their fish to be paid for out of the public Treasury? If this radical idea is followed it will lead to Anarchy and we shall have the red flag down Water Street and over the Parliament Building. The two gentlemen who have the honor to represent the district of Hr. Main, and who have recently been returned to that important constituency will be heard from during this debate, and I am sure I need not mention that both these men are qualified by knowledge and experience of the country's condition to give a good account of themselves.

Capt. Lewis is exceptionally qualified to deal with the fishery perhaps in all its phases; and Dr. Jones, I am sure, will be able to tell this House a very interesting story of how the Government supporters in the recent election tried to defeat him, but were unsuccessful.

MONDAY, APRIL 18th, 1921,

The House met at three of the

clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

1. MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education if any contract has been entered into between the Government and the Supervisors, who are now training abroad; and if so to furnish a copy of the said contract or agreement.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION tabled a reply.

4. SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education if his absence from the Colony for a period, since the last session of the Legislature was on private or public business, and in the latter case what was the nature of the said business and what amount, if any, did he receive for the performance of the same, and to lay on the table of the House a copy of any report made by him in relation to such business and if no report has been made is it his intention to make one and if not why not?

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I beg to say that my absence from the Colony was entirely on private business. No amount was paid to me on account of my expenses.

5. SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister:—

(a) If it is intended to reorganize the Public Health Department and to appoint the present Public Health Officer, Dr. R. A. Brehm, to another position; and if so what is the nature of the proposed appointment, what will be the salary attached to it;

(b) If it is intended to appoint Dr. H. M. Mosdell as Public Health Officer or to some other position in

connection with the Public Health Department, if so what duties are to be assigned to him, and what salary is he to receive.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER:—The matter of the reorganization of the Department of Public Health and the appointment of Dr. Brehm to another position has not been considered by the Executive Government.

The matter of the appointment of Dr. H. M. Mosdell to the position of Public Health Officer or to any other position in connection with the Public Health Department has not been considered by the Executive Government.

7. SIR M. P. CASHIN:—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to a statement in The Evening Advocate of Wednesday last, April 14th, contained in a contribution by Hon. W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, entitled: "Notes of a Trip to Europe" in which Mr. Coaker reveals the fact that Mr. George Hawes is planning to establish cold storage warehouses and proposing "to introduce into Greece the same system of consignment which prevails in Spain and which has turned out such a curse for Newfoundland shippers"; if this is the same Mr. Hawes on whose advice largely the Government adopted the policy of regulations after taking office in November, 1919; if this is the same Mr. Hawes who visited Port Union at that time in connection with Messrs. Job and Barr and outlined cer-

tain schemes of dealing with our cod fish exports; if this is the same Mr. Hawes with whom our codfish exporters were required to deal entirely to the exclusion of the other mercantile firms in various European countries with whom these exporters had been doing business for years previously; if this is the same Mr. Hawes who has acted more or less as a Government representative in regard to transactions in our codfish in Southern Europe for the past eighteen months, and if so how does it happen that the Government trusted the working of this new fishery policy and the fortunes of the people of his country to a man who is now described by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as being practically a menace to the future fish trade of Newfoundland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, my attention was not called to the statement referred to in the question of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I know of only one person by the name of Mr. George Hawes. Mr. Hawes did not have a conference with the Government. I do not know whether he was at Port Union.

HON. PRIME MINISTER, in reply to question of Mr. MacDonnell, No. 8, on Order Paper of April 15th, 1921: Mr. Maurice Hayes of Petries, Bay of Islands, is not in the service of the Customs Department. He was engaged as a Supernumerary Tidewaiter for one month only.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House for any length of time. I intend to briefly explain. With regard to the Regulations, it appears to me that everything that has gone wrong in Newfoundland has been blamed on the Regulations. All the troubles we have been enduring and all the difficulties we have had to contend with, the Opposition has tried to trace to the Regulations. I might say that the

troubles the Colony has now to contend with are not the result of one year's work but the result of many years. What had the regulations to do with the fifty thousand quintals of fish that were shipped in 1918 on which the trade here lost \$1,250,000. There were hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of fish shipped in 1918 that never returned a cent's value to the people of Newfoundland. What had the Regulations to do with the fall of the Italian dollar to twenty-five cents? What had the regulations to do with the bringing down of the Portuguese dollar to eight cents? What had they to do with the exchange in Greece where the value of their money was cut in two? Each of these countries are up against serious reverse exchange. You cannot blame the regulations for these conditions, yet they have enormously affected conditions here. The world is in a state of chaos; if you had travelled in Europe as I have you would find conditions as bad, as horrible, as depressing as one could imagine ever existed. The worst conditions in one hundred years are now prevailing in all our fish markets. Millions of men are out of work and employment and countries who in the past few years derived great benefits from war demands are now depressed and insolvent. The great commercial banks in those countries are holding tight and expect at any moment a crisis. Those conditions affect us and the sale of our fish. In Italy there have been four Governments since Peace was signed. In France the people have changed their Government four times, but all to no effect, depression and insolvency grow more alarming month by month. Billions of dollars have gone up in smoke because of the War and the people have got no results from that enormous expenditure. The money was completely wasted. It has all disappeared and all over the world great depression prevails.

In the United States of America over a million men are looking for work. Thousands are idle at New York and in Boston the same conditions prevail. The merchants handling fish in Nova Scotia have experienced the same deplorable conditions as we have experienced in Newfoundland. Fish

there has been sold with tremendous losses and firms are on the verge of insolvency; and as my friend, Sir John Crosbie, said, they have sent five cargoes down to Brazil on consignment. This is the best proof of their position for unless compelled they would not ship five cargoes any where on consignment. They have got the fish, they have to get clear of it, and have to take what they can get for it. Those are the conditions of affairs prevailing in Nova Scotia where no regulations exist. What brought cod oil from three hundred dollars per tun to eighty dollars per tun, for cod oil was not protected by regulations? All because there was no use for it but perhaps when the spring opens there may be a want for it. All the tanneries were closed last fall and consequently there was no demand for cod oil, hence low prices. Scotch herring dropped from twenty-five per barrel to ten dollars per barrel. Were the regulations to blame for those losses and the injurious results entailed? Were the regulations to blame for the Norwegian Government dumping fish caught in 1917, 1918 and 1919 upon all our markets last year giving it out to dealers on consignment to sell at any price, often as low as the cost of the freight? Norway lost hundreds of thousands of dollars by buying the fish from their fishermen because of war conditions and by dumping it on our markets at one-third of the price we required this had much to do with conditions we are now facing in this country. To-day we are suffering some because of the regulations I will admit but the way in which they were carried out is the real cause. In the Act we were not given the necessary power to have them properly carried out. The strong opposition and the clamouring Opposition Press helped to impede their operation. If instead of opposing all had acquiesced, I venture to say the results would have been entirely different and very satisfactory and no shippers would have lost money by them. While they were in force the F.P.U. shipped thirty-five thousand quintals to market and we made a little profit on every quintal but since January we have shipped about the same amount and we have lost on every quintal. The regulations have been im-

perfectly carried out by some and ignored by others and that is the chief cause of any evil effects that have resulted. When the regulations were in force many profited somewhat but since they were lifted all have lost heavily. Nothing could be gained by lifting them in January which is practically what was done by the exporters; as soon as regulations were lifted down came the market—smash everywhere—no one would buy as all expected a big slump and consequently bought from hand to mouth until rock bottom prices were reached which was low enough to almost ruin those who had sent fish to market.

You know the people here would not pay fifteen dollars per barrel for flour if they thought the price will soon come down to ten. Therefore no big stock of fish was handled in any markets from January to March. The reason is obvious. I repeat that if there had been an united endeavour to put the regulations into effect properly there would have been no losses to shippers. I know it would be folly to continue them. But I think that if we had not had the regulations the conditions we are facing now would have been staring us in the face a year ago. I know they kept the price of fish to ten dollars and Labrador to eight dollars and gave the fishermen four million dollars more for their catch last year than would have been received had no artificial prop been established by the regulations. The Revenue has benefited \$1,500,000 by the regulations. If the exporters are losing, the fishermen and revenue have gained twice as much as the loss that shippers will experience. If they had not been enforced the earning power of the fishermen would have been lessened and the revenue would have lost considerably and we would have had a greater deficit to face.

What did I say in my speech one year ago at the Conference held in the Fishermen's Institute. Here it is:—

“You will remember that when the Government came into power in November last they passed Rules and Regulations dealing with the export of codfish. Those who are interested in the export of codfish have various opinions regard-

ing those rules and regulations. Many claim that they are most beneficial; others contend that they are injurious. Since those regulations became effective in November last, two bye-elections have taken place in Newfoundland, and on each occasion the fishery rules have been made the sole issue of the election. Even here in St. John's where we would not expect the body of the people to be very much interested in the exportation of codfish, so far as rules and regulations are concerned, the bye-election fought in January was contested solely on this one issue, and the result was that the Govt. won. In Bay-de-Verde the election issue was simply and solely the Fishery Regulations as inaugurated by the Government. The result of that election was a sweeping majority in favour of the Government—a majority such the District never before piled up in favour of any party. The Government therefore take it that on those two occasions those opposed to the Fishery Regulations placed them on trial and on each occasion the Government's position was sustained. We therefore consider them as part of our policy, and we are agreed that there must be no looking back. The position is that we have placed our hand to the plough and we will not waver until this struggle as to whether these regulations which we have introduced are good or bad shall have had time to be fully tested. The Government consider that this year at least we should enforce the regulations according to the policy inaugurated last November, in so far as possible, and this season will prove whether they are valuable or valueless. If, after giving them a fair trial, it can be shown that they are injurious or not beneficial, then we shall only be able to say that we have tried and have failed, and therefore we will forego any further attempt to control the fixing of prices of fish for the foreign markets. That is the position of the Government."

That was the position I placed before them. I contend the people endorsed the policy in both bye-elections. The trade adopted the policy almost unanimously. Had the exporters refused to believe in control last Oct. it would have been impossible to enforce control. What has been done has

been the result of the advice of the exporters and the Government is not to blame. It was utterly impossible to enforce the regulations and fix the price of fish unless we have an undivided trade and Government and Opposition behind such regulations. We cannot succeed unless we have unity and co-operation amongst all. The Act as it is is utterly valueless. There is no power to punish and the only power we were given was to cancel a man's license. That is no punishment. I may have my license cancelled to-morrow and then have my assistant manager get a license the next day and have him ship my fish. The Act is absolutely useless for the purpose it was intended for and it is the intention of the Government to introduce at once a bill to repeal the Act.

Let me explain a little further. Last September the fish exporters formed themselves into an association and all but three joined the association. The resolutions as passed by them were not always what I wanted or what the Government wished. At their meetings whenever they required me I attended. No regulation was amended or established last fall that was not first approved by the Exporters Association. The Board were all expert exporters and every regulation recommended by the Board to the Governor in Council was the result of an unanimous opinion on every occasion. I repeat, every rule passed by the Advisory Board was at the request of the Exporters Association. I repeat the whole Board was behind every regulation enacted. The Government as a Government had no more to do with the regulations than they had to do with the making of the moon. The fish exporters ought to have known what they wanted and if they cannot be relied on I am at a loss to know who were to advise us. They have to take the responsibility. If the trade had said in October what they did in January, the Government would not have dared to keep them in force.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I may say I was on the Exporters' Association and because we passed a minute as to the regulations I was accused of politics and had to retire.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:

—The regulations are of no use as they are and cannot be carried out without a united trade. We who are to live here must see that the best price is got for fish. We cannot stand with our hands behind our backs and do nothing. This is a most serious question. I believe that we would be doing a great thing if we had only one body here to do the exporting. This would mean the keeping up of prices and something like two million dollars per year would be turned in to the fishermen. If we must go on in the beaten cow-track as we have been doing for 200 years, getting good money from the banks to buy fish and then shipping to people on the other side to do as they please with and to pay us what they wish, nothing but disaster can result and no country can ever properly progress. Surely this is not to be allowed to happen. I had personal reasons for the regulations because of the treatment I had received from men on the other side. Let me tell you that even this year I and others shipped fish to Spain, and while one shipper received 90/— others received 110/— for the same grade. That is the result of consignment. It happens often that when a man goes into one of these stores to buy fish the dealer offers to give him 10 casks at 90/— if he will take ten of the other at 110/—. My fish at 90/— sells the same grade fish for another more highly favoured at 110/—. Who amongst you would not attempt to provide a remedy for such conditions. Will the day ever come when we will have only one agency to do the exporting, or will we nationalize the business, when the Government will do the buying and selling? The fishermen must live and for them the highest prices must be obtained. They comprise 70 or 80% of our people, they must not remain with a chain around their necks or be left to the mercies of men on the other side in the fish markets. I am interested in the fishermen; I have given the best 10 or 12 years of my life to their interests and with others have tried in this to do the best to their advantage.

We tried to meet the reaction which we knew was inevitable after the war and the people and country have not sustained the losses they would otherwise have met had no

effort been made to help out the fishermen. I do not doubt but two millions may be lost on the marketing of the voyage for 1920, but the country has benefited twice that sum paid to fishermen last year owing to regulations. It has not been all loss. Most of the exports up to the end of last year were sold at some profit. The big cut came by lifting the regulations and removing the artificial prop. I would like to appeal to Sir John Crosbie, as we have worked together and know each other's minds, and I want to say that something must be done to nationalize the industry or establish one agency that could gather the fish from all quarters, ship it to market and all share the profits. At the end of the season they could make up their books and pay the shippers in the association their dividends. How can I or any other be expected to get money from the Banks to buy and ship fish to Italy, Portugal, Spain and Greece on consignment? Once even when the times were good I had to pay back 25|— a qtl. as the loss on one cargo that I had an advance on. The export of fish on consignment if persisted in will always be the means of bringing about periodical depression and hard times. If consignments can't be cut out the future is hopeless for the fishermen of this country. Surely as time passes some effort will be made to eradicate this great evil; if not there can be no hope in the future for those who earn their living as fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing some discussion on the salt landed at Port Union. Last June the Trade was consulted re future supplies for July and August. No supply was available from Spain or Portugal. No salt had been ordered for July or August supply. We at last got an offer of a cargo from Hamburg at 12|— below Liverpool price. This was accepted; the cargo was for Port Union and St. John's if so required. The Government ordered it and paid for it before it left the other side. The cargo arrived in July. The fishery was almost a blank North; no one wanted salt. There was no hope of selling it

under the circumstances; the trade here did not want any. It was stored at Port Union for the Government—very little was sold—as the F. P. U. had purchased large stocks in June and as fish was scarce the stock had not been used. Some salt was sold and an amount of \$4,400 paid. The salt will be taken over if desired at the new price for this season when the price of the new salt is established by the Government, which will be done when it arrives next month. There may be considerable loss on the old salt as the new will likely sell at about \$2 a hogshead, but the reduced price will be a benefit to the fishermen.

As to the buying of Labrador fish last Fall; everyone in the business knew there was a crisis coming owing to supposed surplus catch. The Exporters invited me to meet them and brought up the matter of providing for purchase of their fish, knowing there was going to be a big surplus on hand. They were not prepared to buy and if they were the Banks would not advance funds. I suggested that they appoint a committee, consider carefully the matter and make recommendations to the Government. The committee was formed, met daily for a week and sent an informal draft to me outlining what had been discussed. I have that memorandum. An effort was made to form a syndicate to purchase the surplus fish, but nothing materialized. An effort was made to arrange to buy through banks, which was also unworkable. The Government felt that it would be a disaster to permit the price of Labrador to fall to \$4; 250,000 qtls. had been shipped and the most of it was unsold. Had a \$4 cut been made on that fish a million dollars would be lost by such a reduction, as all markets would know of the slump and every shipper would have to sell his highly priced fish at the rate offered for the cheap. Every effort therefore was made to protect the 250,000 qtls. shipped and bought at \$8 and \$9 per qtl. Every effort had to be made to protect the 100,000 qtls. still in fishermen's hands. 70 vessels arrived and were unable to sell. Two weeks passed

and no one would purchase. Political intrigue began its work and men were influenced to hold meeting. The Governor was kept fully informed of the Government's intentions. When it was seen that Labrador fish was unsaleable the Government stepped in and bought 35,000 qtls. from fishermen who had no fish merchant. While this 35,000 qtls. were being purchased the supplying exporters took in about 60,000 quintals, and the congestion was removed and the situation saved. The men who were supplied by firms like Ayre, Steer, Knowling, Rendell, and independent fishermen who fitted out their own schooners were unable to sell, as it was unreasonable to expect that the exporters would purchase fish which they had not outfitted for. These men were in a desperate situation. We decided to buy. We decided to keep the fact secret in order to protect the Colony as far as possible. Had it been known every exporter would have refused to take their dealers' fish and the 100,000 qtls. would have been pushed on the Colony's hands. While Job was buying the 10,000 qtls. he took for the Government, he also took 5,000 qtls. on his own account from his dealers. While Sellars and Murray were buying the cargo for the Wakely they bought and stored 20,000 qtls. on their own account. While Mr. Sellars purchased the Coaker cargo at Port Union, the Trading Co. took 7,000 qtls. on its own account. The Trading Co. purchased 12,000 qtls. Labrador at Port Union outside of the Coaker cargo. The buying of 25,000 qtls. by Job and Sellars meant the buying of over 30,000 qtls. by Job, Sellars and the F. P. U., side by side with what the Government was doing. If I had any influence or could help, it was then it should be used and a way found out of the crisis. The way was found.

You, gentlemen, may think we were wrong. But I am head of the Union and am in the House with eleven of their representatives behind me. Who could they expect to help them at such a time but Coaker and the Government. They could not go to the merchants of Water St., who had their

hands full to handle their dealers' fish. In this matter I consulted with His Excellency the Governor and took his advice in many ways. I do not think the men of the North will condemn me because I got clear of their fish for them when there was no one else to buy it from them at a time when disaster faced them and their suppliers. You will notice that Sir M. P. Cashin stated the other day that the right value of the fish was \$3. What would have resulted had the fishermen been compelled to sell 100,000 qtls. Labrador at \$3 per qtl.?

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Why did you take the money to buy the fish without calling the House together?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—We were up against a crisis. The men came to me in their trouble and we bought only Labrador fish because Shore was in demand and all offering could be sold at a good figure. The merchants reckoned on a catch of 500,000 quintals for Labrador, and the only one course was to do what we considered best. You may think what you like, but when you come to dissect and analyse this step, you will find the men who sent me here to represent them will back me up with more determination than ever before.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I am not disputing that.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I would like to say a word more of the serious situation of the country. We are up against such conditions as no men ever before had to face.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You brought them about.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I am not saying who is responsible. It is no good talking of what has been done; the question now is, what is to be done, and in my opinion the situation financially and politically is as serious as ever a Government had to face. This is no time for thrashing the matter out day after day in this House; the fishermen will soon be coming here for their supplies. Unemployment is increasing daily and something must be done to meet the situation. I understand that in the West and

North, supplies are not being given out as the merchants are not in a position to do so, and if nothing is done we will be 25 times worse off by the Fall than we are now. For what I am responsible I am ready to take my medicine; and if there have been errors, they were errors of judgment only and made in an effort to do the best possible for the fishermen and country at a most critical period. I have not been lazy or indolent: I have toiled night and day, and if my work is not acceptable to the people of the country, let them say so. It is up to the House to say if we are to debate this matter day after day and waste valuable time. The Opposition with their many speakers and so much material available, can easily delay practical business till August if they like. What is wanted is action, not talk. Can't we unite and place country first and make an united effort to do the best possible.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Why insult us with such a Speech from the Throne?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:— I was not here when it was prepared. I say again it is time to place country first and party anywhere. The question of the country comes first and all other considerations must follow that. What I want done is that which is best for the country, and I will do all in my power to assist in bringing that about. If we persist in only debating while unemployment is increasing and fishermen are without supplies, we are hastening the day when Confederation will be staring us in the face. I repeat again, it is time to get down to business and do something and help out the country all in our power. Upon the House rests the responsibility, and if nothing is done, great will be the consequence.

HON. MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all were pleased to at last hear from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in relation to the various matters that have recently been taking up the consideration of the people generally. I cannot say that I congratulate him on his defence of the record of himself and his depart-

ment. When he arose to address the House, we expected to hear something that would justify the Government and particularly his own department for their conduct of affairs during the last 18 months. But his speech in its emptiness was equal to the Speech from the Throne given out on the opening day and devoid of anything

that might give satisfaction to those who have gone through anxiety, loss and suffering since last we met. It is alright for him to say his conduct was prompted by good intentions, but that is not enough for a country and a people that has been beggared and put out of business almost completely. It is not today that he was warned that his policy was a suicidal one. When he introduced his fish regulations last year, I advised him to go slowly, and pointed out that this was the time of readjustment and not one for experiments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. gentleman in his opening remarks said that conditions in Europe were responsible for the depression here and the conditions of our local market. He spoke of exchange in European countries and how their money was discounted, but, Sir, such an explanation must not be accepted as either a reasonable or sufficient excuse for the fact that our fish has been a drug on the markets and for the unprecedented conditions with which this country and her people have been faced for the past year. Exchange is, of course, a factor, but when we look back upon the inauguration of these regulations and when we come to regard the initial stages of their working and when we further come to regard the unholy alliance that was formed, we find another, and I say, Sir, the real reason of their failure and the consequent disaster to the trade of the country. When we remember that the one and only Mr. Hawes was made the channel through which all our foreign fish business had to be carried on, and that no business man was allowed to use his own knowledge or judgment in the handling of his affairs in these markets, then we find where the disaster that came upon us had its beginning. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries enforced regulations that made it necessary for every man doing business to go down

to his department and give him in detail the information which was their own private business, the giving of which placed them entirely in the hands of the Minister and entirely at the mercy of one who was himself an exporter and consequently a rival in the business.

The principle was wrong from the very first and when a principle is wrong from the beginning, nothing can make it right, nor can anything that is based upon it be right. The thing that doomed the Fish Regulations from their inception was the discriminatory powers that were given to the Minister. Discrimination was rampant throughout, and the Minister of Fisheries could give privileges to those who found favor with him and refuse them to those who did not.

If exchange was against us in Europe, was it also against us in the United States? All are aware that it was not, and yet did not Americans place hundreds of thousands of dollars in the banks here for the purchase of fish and they would not be allowed to purchase or export until they went into the Supreme Court and secured a Mandamus to enable them to do so. We have heard of Mr. Hue having had an opportunity to dispose of ten thousand quintals of fish and perhaps more at a price which would have given the seller a fair profit, a price at any rate that was entirely satisfactory, and when Sir Michael Cashin asked in this House for an explanation of why he would not be allowed to sell, he was told that it was against the law.

Now, Sir, could anybody imagine anything more ridiculous? Like Sir Edward Morris said on one occasion when something in the Audit Act prevented him from doing good for the people, that the Audit Act should be torn up if it meant that the people starve. I say that the law in this case should be torn up also if the peo-

ple are starving. Is that answer a sufficient explanation for the deplorable conditions that exist today on the West Coast? The Honourable Minister takes five hundred thousand dollars out of the Treasury to purchase fish which he says was in St. John's and for which the fishermen could only get four dollars per quintal, but all the fish purchased out of that five hundred thousand dollars was not in St. John's, because the President's schooner left Port Union with seventy-five hundred quintals of it. Mr. Coaker sold Mr. Sellars seventy-five hundred quintals of fish at nine dollars.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—At eight dollars and one half.

MR. BENNETT:—Very well. But the Minister no doubt purchased that fish for six or seven dollars.

THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES: I paid eight dollars for it.

MR. BENNETT:—Have you any proof of that to give us? But in any case I will take your word for it. The point is that the price paid by Mr. Sellars was eighty-fifty, while the fish was purchased by others for eight dollars. It has been pointed out that before this money was taken out of the Treasury to be used in purchasing fish, it would have been an easy matter to have called the House together to enact legislation for that purpose. When this was done for the fishermen of the North something should also have been done for the people of the West Coast and if Mr. Cheeseman and his associates knew that this money was being taken and made no protest against the discrimination that was being practised against the districts they represent, then they are not worthy of the name of men to come in here and continue to subscribe to that policy. Is not the man who fishes on the Grand Banks as good as the man

who goes to Labrador, or is not the man who fishes in Petty Harbour or around St. John's as good as the man who fishes in the Northern Bays? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a condition of affairs that the people are not going to stand for. The letter read by Sir Michael Cashin from Captain Hollett from Burin, voices the sentiments of the people of the whole West Coast, which has been brought from a condition of smiling prosperity to the verge of bankruptcy and destitution. The Honourable Minister has said that Newfoundland must have experienced these conditions in any case. But Newfoundland during the past twenty years was a country of happiness and prosperity. What better demonstration could we have that the men represented by Messrs. Foote and Cheseman and others in that section experienced an era of great prosperity during all these years, and the fact that from their fishing boats as ordinary fishermen they rose to be successful business men who were able instead of catching fish, to export it themselves, until Mr. Coaker's great reform, the fish regulations, brought them to the terrible condition in which they find themselves to-day. The very rocks are crying out in protest against them. The children on the streets are cursing the regulations. We should never have been brought face to face with what has crippled our trade and left prosperous business houses on the verge of disaster. I am prepared to say that the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done great things for the fishermen of this country, and I remember that when the men associated with him took their seats in this House, I thought it a happy augury that the fishermen were at last to have direct representation in the Legislature. I say representation, Sir, but not control, and I think that it was deplorable the

Hon. Minister should have attempted to dominate the whole government of the country in the manner in which he has since coming into power. It was most deplorable when he went down to the Treasury and took out the sum of \$500,000 of the people's money for the purchase of fish from the fishermen of one particular section, wholly on his own responsibility. I don't think that even the Prime Minister was taken into his confidence and when he did this he established a precedent that was vicious and most unfortunate. If it was right to take this money to purchase fish North, why was it not right to use the same money to purchase it in other sections of the country? And if it was right to purchase fish at all in this way why was it not right to purchase other things in the same way? Why should that money be used to keep the fishermen from starving any more than others who were similarly situated. Surely that money could have been used to better advantage to help tide the country over the frightful situation in which we find ourselves today.

The resolutions before the Chair will, I believe, Mr. Speaker, receive the approbation of the whole House. No time should be lost in removing from our Statute Book an Act legalizing these Regulations which have been the cause of so much havoc to our trade and thereby giving the country a chance to recover itself before it is too late. In supporting the resolutions, I do so with a feeling of gladness that the Hon. Minister has already accepted them in so far as he has expressed his willingness to have the Regulations abolished for all time. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the House any longer than is necessary. The situation has already been reviewed very thoroughly, but since I last spoke so much light has been

thrown upon conditions by questions asked in this House that a worse state than even we had believed possible is revealed. Supporters of the Government in this town are putting up the plea that similar conditions exist elsewhere and it is all due to the war, this is absolutely incorrect, our condition is entirely different. What happened here has happened since the war and not as a result of it. The Cashin Administration was in charge when the war ended and when we went out of power we left a surplus of 3½ million dollars which should have been sufficient, if properly expended, to tide the country over the period of reconstruction and readjustment that was to come. We saw that shrinkage of prices was inevitable, we knew that as a result, our ad valorem duties the revenue must consequently drop and we knew that our purchasing power must go down. Our soldiers were being paid off and the money which was formerly being paid them would no longer be in circulation. In short, we realized that the rainy day was at hand and we left 3½ millions of dollars in gold intact in the treasury in preparation for it. But what do we find today? Every cent of that money has been squandered, it has been thrown to the four winds with no returns for it whatever. That is the charge and you gentlemen are in the dock while public opinion is the jury by which you are being tried. We, the Opposition, are here in the people's interest and every act of yours will have to be laid bare so that you may be judged accordingly. We had an instance in Newfoundland some thirty years ago when the Bank Crash came of certain gentlemen who were appointed the trustees of the share holders and depositors and note holders in face of the whole people. The people gave their money into the care of these gentlemen, but they

failed in their trust, and those whom they had betrayed woke up one morning to find themselves beggars. Their money was gone and the Bank itself was bankrupt. It was argued in extenuation of their act that they had taken the money and used it for commercial purposes, that they had put it into their own business and lost and that on that account they should be excused. But the moral law could not excuse the taking by anyone of what was not theirs; there could be no justification for despoiling the widows and the orphans and other innocent victims of their all. The law stepped in and these men were hailed before the bar of justice to answer for their deeds. The same thing applies in this case. The Government are the trustees of the people and the money they have squandered is as much the people's as if it had been placed by them in the bank. Instead of being faithful to the trust reposed in them they have knocked the bottom out of the whole thing. They are like directors of a company who are responsible to the shareholders, the people of the country; and the shareholders' meeting will soon take place, when it will be found that the result of the directorship has been nothing but outrageous failure. The gentlemen on the other side of the House will never dare to look the country in the face again because of their callousness in dealing with public affairs and the absolute indifference they have displayed in regard to the people's interests. It is useless for me to repeat the scandals that have marked their administration—the salt scandal, the sugar scandal, the railway scandal, the shipping scandal, the Lobelia scandal and all the others—the people already know about them and when the time comes they will have the remedy in their own hands.

I do not want to be looked upon in this country as a blue ruinist, and I join with the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he says that Newfoundland must be placed first. I never felt more like a Newfoundlanders than I do this session and I do not say that the country is irreparably lost because of what she has gone thru. She may have been run on the rocks and her bows stove in but I feel certain that we shall get her off and I hope that Sir Michael Cashin will be at the wreck when we do. I do not subscribe to the statement that in a few months we will be going to Canada asking to be admitted as a part of the great Dominion. I say that the country can be saved by the right administration but that administration is not in power today. It must be one that has the confidence of the people and if we are to retrieve the leeway that we have made in the past eight or nine months, economy must be practiced and trade must be given a chance to recover itself. There is plenty of money in this country if the right way can be found to bring it into circulation, but our people are not going to invest their money, they are not going to fit out for the fishery while conditions remain as they are to-day and while an antagonistic policy is being pursued towards our customers. We should make every effort to court custom rather than put obstacles in the way of business. It is absurd for people with an article to sell to go out and catch by the throat those in whom they hope to find purchasers. Rather should it be their policy to go out and use every power at their command to persuade those people that what we have to sell is the best and then get their trade. I say Sir, let those men of the West Coast who know how to manage their business do so in their own way.

Let those men on the West Coast like Mr. Samuel Harris and Mr. Cheseman, and all the rest of them, do business in their own way, and in the way they have been used to doing it and see if you don't have a marked change and a new era for Newfoundland generally instead of the dark cloud that has been cast upon the greater portion of this country by the fish regulations. I don't see, however, why we should have to take a too gloomy view of things, but let us take our places as men and stand by our country and bring her to the position that she formerly occupied. If unfortunately we have to go into Canada or elsewhere for assistance we shall go there with clean hands, and as free and independent people. But we won't have to go there. That will be the last ditch and the last resort that I know of, for the intelligent and independent people of Newfoundland, because we have something to-day worth fighting for; something like what Ireland to-day is fighting for and something that we, as independent and free people, are going to have and enjoy, and that is the administration of our own affairs. Once we go to Canada we lose our independence and can never more be called independent subjects of Newfoundland. I am prepared Mr. Speaker, as one who loves his native country, and I am sure all true Newfoundlanders are, to sacrifice almost anything to aid Newfoundland in her present crises, not alone for our own sake, but for the sake of our children as well, and I hope that they will enjoy the freedom that we have to-day all their lives, and, if possible, maintain the integrity and independence of Newfoundland with good, sound, clean government on behalf of a trustworthy people.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, whether I shall speak at any length or not will be easily disposed of if the

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be good enough to answer a question, which I shall put to him, through you. Before putting it I want to assure him and assure the House that it is put after having given it very mature thought for the past hour; it is put with a full consciousness of the ways that sometimes people may think they can dodge issues; it is put to him with the full realisation that we on this side of the House have only one weapon left and the use of that weapon is—as has been so aptly described by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself when he paid us the compliment of having a considerable amount of debating ability amongst us—going to be put into effect according to the answer I get to that question. If the answer is going to be in the affirmative, I shall resume my seat immediately, and I feel sure that the same attitude will be taken by the rest of the Opposition; but if in the negative, I propose to say a few words. We are not here in any other spirit than in the spirit that prompted the Minister to be here and prompted his deliberations and his statements. Those of us who are rearing families here, who want them brought up just as we were brought up here, and who want them to act their part when they come after us in the same spirit as we are trying to act ours, approached this session with the full consciousness of avoiding any ordinary petty or smart-aleck tricks; but because certain proposals came from the Opposition, it must not be taken for granted that a certain attitude must be taken by honorable members on the Government side. In other words I put the position plainly: we have moved in this House—and the proper place for such a motion to come from is from the Opposition—an amendment to the Address in Reply. That amend-

ment exactly spells in words the utterances of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries today. Now previous to his utterances today we had moved an amendment that in the opinion of members of this House the policy of the Fishery Regulations ought to be abandoned and must be abandoned. The Minister has got up in his place and has said, as the "father of the thought" and the one who has been mainly charged with any defects that the Regulations possessed and the one who I always credited with being big enough to act as he did today when he said place the blame on him, if there be any blame. The Minister came in today and told us his finding. He was going to repeal the Regulations, lock, stock and barrel. Now are you, Mr. Minister, are you, or are you not, going to vote for the amendments, yes or no? Is the Minister big enough to tell me that it is his intention personally to vote for this amendment?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I told you that it is our intention to bring in a Bill repealing the Regulations.

MR. HIGGINS:—The trouble is that we have been depending too much on good intentions. I only want one word in answer to my question, yes or no. I want to tell you that my conduct as regards expediting legislation largely depends on your answer.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I am not the Leader of the House.

MR. HIGGINS:—I am asking you as regards your own personal vote. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the man who said that the Fish Regulations are coming off. Now I want to make myself understood. This matter is not, as the Prime Minister is so fond of thinking, staged. As far as I am concerned, I would ask any gentlemen here, who are outside the Bar of the

House, to reserve their applause until the conclusion of this debate, and I would like Mr. Coaker to answer that question.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—With regard to the position put up by my friend Mr. Higgins, I would like to say, that I have stated here on behalf of the Government that a Bill will be introduced to repeal the Fish Regulations by me. The notice of the Bill is there on my desk now to be placed before the House tonight. There is no necessity for an amendment because the Government has promised to bring in this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS:—I know all about the Bill, but I would like to ask the Minister to say whether he will vote for the amendment or not. Yes or no. I have faith enough in the Hon. Minister to think that whatever way he votes a large number will follow him. Mr. Coaker will bring in a Bill on tomorrow. Well, "live horse and get grass. There is no man on the other side of the House can take objection to the amendment, and I think that any man who has read the English language, even the gentlemen who have been referred to as being capable of making figures speak ungrammatically, will not misunderstand this amendment, which is that the Speech from the Throne be added to by the following words.

(Reads paragraph.)

Paragraph 1 is an absolute statement of facts, literally and critically correct. Paragraph 2 is: (Reads.)

That is a claim which has been made by the Government, and read by the Chief of the Government this afternoon in his Speech to the fish exporters. Paragraph 3: (Reads)—literally and critically correct.

Now, what is asked in the amendment? It is significant that the words of the local Excellency were at one with the words of His Excellency,

who arrived afterwards from Europe. The Governor told us that we should consider whether the policy was in the best interests of the Colony, her commerce and people.

"Be it resolved, therefore, that it is the opinion of the House that this policy is not beneficial to the country." It cannot be beneficial, because if it was the Hon. Minister is too good a Newfoundlander to repeal the Fish Regulations Act. (2) "It is not for the public good." (3) "The uncertainty is bad for trade." This is literally and critically correct. Now what man on the other side of the House will deny that position. Now then there is the amendment proposed to the Address in Reply, and you would think that the Address in Reply was the Government's reply; it is not, it is the reply of this House. Don't think that the Government form the legislature. The Governor opened this House, and there are no parties here as far as the Address in Reply is concerned, and we want to tell you what we think of the Fish Regulations. Now then, I again ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an answer to my question, yes or no. Let us all vote together, every man, and let us show the country and the people that we can unite on this question without a dividing line between the Government and the Opposition. If the answer is yes, the session will start in the proper way; if the answer is no, then it will be a question of Government versus Opposition. I ask this question to the Minister as the only man who has risen to give us any information, as the man who is bringing in a Bill to repeal the Regulations. I would ask the Minister yes or no. Then do I take it that you will not vote for the amendment? Then all I can say is that the attitude taken by the Hon. Minister is inconsistent with the attitude he took here a few moments

ago. He comes in here and cries "Kamerad." He says "I admit I have made a mistake, but let me have another chance. Forgive all the things that have been commented on here." He asks that in one breath, and in the next he refuses to vote for the amendment because it is an Opposition measure. Does he think that we are such fools on this side of the House, with not a stroke of business done, and the conditions today, not to understand that the Government are raising a party line. He said to the Opposition "we want your help." "Come with us for the sake of our common country," and the man who asked that has not enough pluck, enough courage, to get up and say: "As I have run things as I like in the past, so I will vote now as I like. Do you think that is the way in which this session should be started? As far as I am concerned in this House I have never troubled about how or why a man should talk, or when he should talk; I have always tried to deal with principles, with questions in a big way; but I want to tell the Minister that for the first time he has missed the point. The Opposition could take a certain attitude to facilitate public business without bringing in amendments. Now we will have to go through the whole process. Day by day we will decide the attitude of the Government. Just as surely as the Minister has been forced to bring in a Bill to repeal the Regulations, just so surely will the same power of the Opposition to impress the position upon the Government be exercised until we have abolished the Food Control Board, the War Measures Act, and all other things of a similar nature. This is the kind of thing which arouses public feeling. Why don't the Government members stand up and say, I will vote for the amendment? Give notice of a Bill and the Bill it-

self are two different things. Why not end the matter right here and now. Why not answer Mr. Holland's letter in the proper way.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Notice of this Bill is an answer to him.

MR. HIGGINS:—A notice of a Bill that may never be introduced. When the Hon. Minister comes here and asks the co-operation of the House he should not start out with this kind of little cheap stunts. Not big enough to say I will vote for the amendment, he says, I will not vote for it because it comes from the Opposition, but I will do the same thing tomorrow which the amendment asks. Isn't that ridiculous? Just so sure as the Government are reading the signs wrongly when through their papers they slander the people because they give evidence of their sentiments, just so surely are they sewing the seeds for their own eternal damnation. Just so surely as people, formerly independent, have to come here day after day because they have no work, they would go cracked if they had nowhere to go—just so surely as it is a vile slander to refer to these people as hooligans, does this kind of conduct bring its own damnation. We knew you would give notice of a Bill. You had to. We knew you would give notice of this Bill when Sir John Crosbie sat down, because it was only a question of time when you would have to. We tell you now, that just as you had to give notice of this Bill, so will you have to give notice of all the other bills, and the quicker you do it, the sooner will the House close. We have been dragging information out by questions. We have found out that twenty-five thousand has been spent here and two hundred and fifty thousand there. Why not let us see just where we are. Don't think that you will keep the Sugar Control, you never will. Don't think you will

keep the War Measures Act in force, you never will, and I say here with a full sense of the importance of making my attitude clear to the members on the other side of the House, that the quicker that you put in your notices of bills on the Order Paper, and the quicker that Government by Executive Council is through with, the quicker this House will close. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries gives notice of a Bill to repeal the Fish Regulations. All I have to say is, small thanks to you for it. You had to do it, you could not keep on the Fish Regulations because you would lose your men from the West. You say that your people in the North thanked you and hailed you, and well they might, when you gave them a half million dollars of our money for their fish; but the men from the West don't thank you. Ask Mr. Hollett (whose letter was read by the Leader of the Opposition) what he thinks of the Fish Regulations. Mr. Coaker cries "Kamerad," because he had to because his own crowd made him, and now that they have broken you and tamed you a bit, and put a bit in your mouth, I hope that they will use the bit, and haul you up to your knees and see that you don't go down again till these other things are remedied.

It is a proud day for us to see that at least one thing has been accomplished by the Opposition so far. This wild horse has been broken, his Regulations have been a failure, and he has been now taken charge of by the men from the West, but they have to go one step further and then they will be the proper class of men to represent that part of the country. They are not directly responsible to any organization such as some members on the other side of the House, they are men who are themselves typical of the class of men they represent the people of the West Coast. It is up to these four men to

stand up and say yes, I will vote for this Amendment. These men on the other side think that we are very anxious to disrupt the Government, but we don't, that would have been easy if we wanted to. The best service we can do is as an Opposition to find out the state of affairs as they are, and try to get the Government to pay the conscience money they owe the country. We want to clean out the stable first and when she is properly cleaned we have a very good horse to put in there. I am very sorry indeed that Mr. Coaker has ended a day which began so well in such a manner. I thought he was taking the chance to save his unfortunate reputation. He brought in this Bill because he was afraid not to, he was afraid he might be ordered out. How times have changed? I never thought to see the day when Mr. Coaker would be afraid to join his vote with the Opposition, that is something which I did not anticipate, and I regret that he said No. I regret that we are looked upon by the Government as an Obstruction Opposition. You will repeal the Regulations because you have to. The ship is dead, the crew is dead, and there remains now but the burial, and that will be in short.

MR. LEWIS:—Mr. Speaker: I rise to make a few observations on the amendment before the House. I must say that I feel rather disappointed at the weak defence put up by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the Regulations which he claims, of course, he was father of. The Minister began his remarks by claiming that exchange was responsible for the great calamity that has befallen Newfoundland and he claimed that the Fish Regulations would have been alright if they had been carried out in the proper spirit by the people of the country generally and the fish exporters in particular. The fact is

that the Minister knew in 1920, when he was enforcing those Regulations and forcing the merchants in Newfoundland all round to pay a certain figure for fish, that it was only in keeping with what he had promised the people north in his election campaign in 1919. He promised that, if elected, the fishermen of the north would receive \$12 per quintal for their fish. On that promise the Minister came back to power, put in force those drastic Regulations and used force in carrying them out. He did not have any mandate from the people of this country to enforce the Regulations, but it was because he was flushed with victory over his election and to justify the promise he had made the northern people. At that time people were not much better off than they were in 1920.

To get back to the main point of the argument regarding the Regulations. The Minister forced the purchasers of fish in this country to pay \$11, \$10 and \$8 a quintal for fish, whereas he knew at the time that the purchasers of our fish abroad and the people who were consuming our fish were very poor and he knew that they could not afford to pay eighty-two shillings and six-pence a quintal for Labrador fish. This is one point that the Minister was entirely in error over, and that is one of the notorious wrongs that he committed. Is this not a ridiculous position? The Minister fixed the price, as he had the power, to enable some of his own friends and exporters to put fish into the foreign markets at a profit of from two to three dollars on every quintal; whereas in the past, before the Minister undertook to buy fish and before he knew what a codfish was, merchants in this country exported fish and were fully satisfied with 50 cents profit per quintal. Why the oldest established firms in Newfoundland made money and kept the

business of this country running at a margin of 50 cents profit on a quintal of fish. The price of fish could have been much lower in the foreign markets and the fishermen would have received the same prices as they got last fall, if the Minister and some of the exporters had not demanded, through those infamous Regulations, such outrageous profits. It is true, that last year the fishermen had to pay high amounts for their outfits and supplies, and it was necessary for them to get remunerative prices that would be commensurate with their outlays, but \$8 a quintal would have sufficed; but to the detriment of Newfoundland and to the fishermen of Newfoundland the highest prices were maintained in the foreign markets, thereby giving the exporters, including the Minister's self, an opportunity of raking in all the profits. Why was not the Minister and his friends satisfied with one dollar profit per qtl. instead of trying to make a fortune in one year? The answer is obvious, because after all it can be easily seen why the Regulations were conceived in the first place, and their enforcement is the cause of our downfall and collapse.

Then the Minister went on to say that he was compelled, in the interest of the north to come up here and purchase thirty-five thousand quintals of fish with Government money—money that really belonged to the people all over this country. I say, without any fear of contradiction, that if it were not for the regulations, that fish would have arrived in St. John's and the greater portion of it would have been consumed in Italy. It was because of the Regulations that Italy was closed to us, notwithstanding all that has been said of the Consorzio. I can prove beyond all doubt that if a reasonable arrangement had been made with the Consorzio that the fish could have been

sold in Italy. I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that returns will come back for the five hundred thousand dollars that he gave to some of the merchants, who would not have been able to buy the fish that they did, but for the taking of this large amount of money from the Public Treasury of the Colony. Then again look at our American markets closed to us. In the year 1919, when the Minister resurrected the War Measures Act, there were four hundred and fifty thousand dollars in American money placed in our Banks here preparatory to buying our codfish and shipping it to market. It is a matter of indifference where our fish goes, so long as it goes out of Newfoundland and we get paid for it. That fish was not on consignment either, I may tell the Minister. It did not suit the Minister and his friends and admirers of the Regulations, because that fish was to be transhipped from the States to some port in Europe, and he forthwith put his foot on it. The matter was thrashed out in the Supreme Court and a writ of mandamus was granted to the American buyers, who applied for it. What was the result? The Hon. Mr. Coaker, through the medium of the War Measures Act and the Regulations, had the law made so that the American buyers would be shut out, and in consequence the American markets were closed to us and to our Labrador fish ever since. Still I hear his pitiable tale in the House this evening. I deplore hearing such a story from the Hon. Minister, after eighteen months in office—and deplorable and disgusting it is to every man, woman and child in the country—that we are on the rocks and on the verge of insolvency. What brought that insolvency about, if it was not the mismanagement of the Government? I might say that mismanagement is not a strong enough word in

denunciation of their conduct of public affairs. The people of this country have been badly deceived by the present Government. Not a greater piece of deception was ever practised on the people of Newfoundland than has been practised by those who are in charge of the Ship of State at the present time. They have squandered money right and left. When all business men and financiers all over the world were economising, the Hon. Mr. Coaker and his colleagues came forward and took the money from the revenue—the people's money—with which to buy fish and salt. When was that ever practised before? The war was over. I say Sir that the revenue of this country should not and cannot be used in such a way, and it goes to show that our very constitution is being demoralized. I question if there were any more than a quorum in the Executive at the time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to take that five hundred thousand dollars out of the Treasury. And you know, Sir, that the men of Bay de Verde, Hr. Grace and the men of the West Coast had just as much right to a part of that money as the fishermen of the North. I say, Sir, it is wrong in principle, and if it is not nipped in the bud we will have no country in a short time; for the same principle might be applied to the selling of the country, we might go to sleep some night and wake up some fine morning and find ourselves part and parcel of Canada, because seemingly we have nothing to prevent us from being sold, lock, stock and barrel just as Nova Scotia was sold a few years ago to Canada. If any individual or any few individuals can go to the Treasury at will we are not safe. I repeat that this practice is just as wrong in principle as the transferring of the railroad was. In 1893, as is well known, we were faced with the transferring of

the railroad. There was a sentiment prevailing all over Newfoundland that spoke in no uncertain manner when that even happened, and I was surprised then why the people did not rise in their might and hurl from power the men who transferred this railroad to Reid, without leave or license, just as much as I am amazed now that the people do not rise in their might and hurl from power those who comprise the present Government. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter and the excuse given to this House this evening by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the plundering of the revenue of this Colony within the past eighteen months is not good enough; nor is his explanation good enough regarding the Fish Regulations, which have been the means, to a large degree, of bringing this country down to a state of depression that has not existed in Newfoundland during the past forty years.

We are told, and on good authority, that pauper relief is being given out all over this country to-day. There is an excuse given in the way of cutting pit props and pulp wood. That is merely given out to enable the people to keep from starvation. I remember in 1898 there was a lot of timber cut to help relieve the people in their distress all over the country, and which later rotted and the Government had to stand to lose \$150,000 on account of pauper relief. The same thing might happen to-day with the money that is being distributed all over the country to help the poor and the needy. It is necessary and alright to help the people, but the Government should discharge their duties properly and see that this timber that is being cut now will be sold, and see that the money goes back to the Treasury, and not let the country suffer, as before.

What brought about so much dis-

tress all over the Island, is the Fish Regulations, because last summer when the fishermen lost confidence in the Government, they hauled up their boats and said that they were not going to catch any more fish to have it sacrificed. And if it was not for the Regulations we would not have nearly five hundred thousand quintals of fish in the country today unsold, because of the keeping of too high a price in a market where people were too poor to buy. I venture the assertion this evening, without fear of successful contradiction, that the enforcement of the Fish Regulations has done more to injure the trade of Newfoundland than anything else since we had Responsible Government. We were told, and it has been admitted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he actually refused to sell ten thousand quintals of fish last fall, through an agent in Montreal, because the price did not measure up to the strict letter of the Regulations. That amount of fish would have meant one hundred thousand dollars to this Colony, and would be a material help to the trade of the Colony. Now, that fish will likely be sold for West India, and at a much smaller figure, because Labrador fish at this date in Newfoundland must be made and properly cured, and now it can only be made West India at best, and will probably fetch three or four dollars a quintal to buyers of fish other than the Government. I presume the Minister holds twenty thousand quintals of that fish purchased by the five hundred thousand dollars. Well that fish will not go more than four dollars a quintal now, so that the country will stand to lose on that transaction, because the Minister admits having refused \$55 per cask for fish because the Regulations called for \$65. Was it not better to get \$55 for them then, perhaps, have it thrown to the guano heap?

The quicker and sooner that these Regulations are removed from the Statute Book, the better for all concerned. We should have independence in this House, and it is up to this House to see that we do not keep on the Statute Book any law that will interfere with the chief and staple industry of this Colony, and not give any one man the authority, such as the Minister had, of purchasing fish for his Northern friends.

As has been explained here, all the fish that was purchased by the Government money was not for the poor fishermen of the North. Mr. Coaker himself made a sale of a cargo for which he received 50 cents more from the Treasury than the fishermen received. Now, why should Mr. Coaker receive more money for his fish than the fishermen got? I say that it is wrong in principle, and if Mr. Coaker or any other Mr. Coaker persists in playing ducks and drakes with the public monies of this Colony, we will soon have no country at all left.

In conclusion I would like to say that the Minister of Marine's intention regarding the Regulations were alright, but that it worked out very wrong. However, as he tells us, he admits that the country is in a bad state, and I, as a Newfoundlander, am prepared to stand and help relieve the situation and help to place Newfoundland on a firm basis once more; and if the country is in that deplorable condition that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it is, then it is about time that we should be up and doing, and about time that we should have a new captain and crew put in charge of the Ship of State, men who understand their business; to take her off the rocks and not allow her to make any more lee-way. I don't propose to take up any more of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, on this subject, but I hope the Minister will see his way clear to

take off the Regulations and give us free trade again.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, In answer to my friend the Member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, I would say that the position is this. His amendment was brought in before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries arrived, or rather he arrived the same day. The Government had to decide upon the policy in consultation with him, and the Government decided to repeal the Regulations. The Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, was speaking then, and Sir John Crosbie followed him. Mr. Coaker said that as a Minister of the Crown and on behalf of the Government he would bring in a Bill to repeal the Regulations, and therefore there is no necessity for the amendment; and not only that, but if he did not keep his word, any man on the other side could bring in the Bill. Mr. Higgins put another phase on it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries on behalf of the Government says that that act will be repealed. Mr. Higgins says "we do not believe you; vote for this amendment and we will believe you." That is a position which I will not and cannot accept. If I thought that—if I promised to bring in a Bill and the men on the other side of the House would not believe me, then I would take that as a vote of want of confidence in me and I would get out. That is the position. As a Minister of the Crown I join with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and to ask me to vote for that amendment is to tell me that you do not believe. I cannot accept that position, and I have no alternative but to vote against the amendment. Nothing can be served by prolonging the argument.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—That is childish.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Higgins says

he does not believe in our intentions.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You must remember that you are the men who closed the House last year, and the day after put the War Measures Act in force.

MR. WARREN:—That may be so, but I have stated my position, and I cannot withdraw from it.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts.'"

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal the Act Geo. V. Cap. 25, entitled, 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish.'"

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, April 19, 1921.

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

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of the settlement of Highlands of Bay St. George. This petition has reference to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, regarding an Agricultural Society. The people of that section for a stretch of about 25 miles attend the one Agricultural Society at the Highlands. They are now asking that there be two Agricultural Societies instead of one for the convenience of both sections of this

long distance. It is signed by everybody in the settlement, and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the Department to which it relates.

Also I beg leave to present a petition from the same settlement regarding a bridge across Highland River. This section is not in direct touch with the railroad, and the coastal boats do not call there. They have to cross this bridge to get to the railroad. Year after year this bridge has been repaired, but it is now in a state of total disrepair. They ask, with a view to economy in the future, that concrete buttresses be put at both ends of the bridge, and that it be supported by concrete pillars. If that had been done years ago it would not have cost nearly as much as has been spent in repairs. They ask for the sum of \$2500 for the purpose of this bridge.

I would like, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to say that the members on this side of the House, and I presume members on the other side also, would like to see some system for keeping check of the petitions that are presented. Petitions are presented; they go to the Department to which they relate, I presume, and eventually they find their way into the newspaper basket. It is not fair to the members who present these petitions, and it is most unfair to the people who send the petitions to their representatives.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I might say that the practice is for the Clerk of the House to gather the petitions together and send them to the Deputy Heads of the various Departments to which they relate. They do not go to the Administrative Heads; the Deputy Heads are responsible for them.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, just a word on that point that has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. George's. It seems to me that if the

Prime Minister could see his way clear to issue instructions to the Deputy Heads to inform members as to what happens to the petitions presented by them, it would clear up the matter. In many cases the members are out of town, and have no means of finding out what happens to their petitions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I would say that in connection with petitions such as those for bridges, roads and the like, they go to the Department of Public Works and are held there until the representative goes to discuss the matter with the Head of the Department. It is then determined whether there are funds belonging to the district which can be used for the purpose of the petition. The same things applies to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and other departments.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Red Island, Placentia Bay. This petition is signed by John Reading and about one hundred other voters. This petition has been presented at least seven times. I have been in this House for the last seven years, and every session I have had the pleasure of presenting this petition. The petition asks that the dredge be sent there to dredge out the harbor. This is one of the most important settlements of the whole district. There are about 100 voters, and last year there were 100 boats, large and small, fishing out of that harbor. Now, Mr. Speaker, even though this is the seventh time this petition has been presented I hope it will get the consideration that it merits.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition that has just been presented by my colleague, Mr. Walsh. It is very important that Red Island Harbor receive attention. The people there are prosecuting the fishery under most hazardous circumstances. There is no

safe harbor on the whole Island. It would not take the dredge very long to do the necessary work there to make Red Island a very good harbor. About 15 years ago they managed to get the dredge there for one day. We had a promise last year that the dredge would call there on her way back from Grand Bank, but evidently the Member for Burin had a greater pull than we had. I trust, Sir, that it will not be necessary for the people to present a further petition regarding this very important matter; but that it receive the consideration that it deserves from the Department to which it relates.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in giving the petition that has been presented by my hon. colleague my hearty support.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—With regard to question two of to-day's Order Paper, I wish to say that the Auditor General told me this morning with reference to this question that he had written me a letter bearing on the matter and up to the time of leaving to attend the House I had not received it.

Concerning question three of to-day's Order Paper, I beg to state that the amount received by the Treasury for Motor Car Taxes for the calendar year 1920, totalled the sum of \$5,690. The exact figure was \$5,693.16. It was paid over to the Department of Public Works.

As for question four of to-day's Order Paper, I have to inform the House that the Government did not authorise or despatch either Mr. Devine or Mr. E. Collishaw in connection with the matter to which reference is made in this question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—We are entitled to more information than that.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—The question asked whether Mr. Devine or Mr. Collishaw

proceeded to Washington on behalf of the Government to represent Newfoundland in the fishery situation. I have to say that they were not authorised or despatched by the Government to Washington. Some two or three months ago when the Minister of Finance and Customs was in New York ill. I received a cable from some Newfoundlanders then in New York saying that a deputation was being sent from New York to Washington to look into the matter connected with the duty on fish and other matters in which Newfoundland was interested and enquiring whether Mr. Devine might or might not accompany the deputation.

I cabled back that Mr. Devine might accompany the deputation as one of its members if it was going on its own account. There was no correspondence whatever only the private wire received by me and the reply sent back. These I will be only too glad to table if so requested. Very well I will table them.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—This information seems to be poorly tabled from my point of view. Why did the honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries send Mr. Devine or Mr. E. Collishaw to Washington to represent us in a vital matter such as a fish transaction. Who is this Collishaw? Have we not got Newfoundlanders with sufficient intelligence to go to Washington to represent us. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries got authority to do all these things he ought to be here to answer the question. I have no doubt that at least Mr. Collishaw will be paid by the Government for his services in this matter. We should have more information and I as a member of the Opposition demand more information and demand that all correspondence be tabled, the message you sent Mr. Coaker and the reply. This was

asked for in this question but it was not tabled.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—No, pardon me. That was not asked for in the question. It reads as follows. (Reads). My answer was that the Government did not authorise or despatch these gentlemen to Washington.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—It seems to me as if two or three are running this Government.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—I enlarged the question and in reply said how I received a wire and telegraphed Mr. Coaker when he was in Washington asking him to look into the matter.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—Mr. Coaker is back here now over a fortnight and if he sent Devine or Collishaw to Washington he ought to know it and be here to answer the question. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be here this afternoon can any one tell me? Can you Mr. Halfyard?

THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS: I do not know. I think he will be away.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—I am sorry for that as he is the Government and we will not be able to get any information. In the meantime I think it is better that the information stand over. I protest against Devine or Collishaw proceeding to Washington to discuss the fish situation. There should have been some one belonging to the Government who was capable, the Attorney General or someone else who would be a responsible representative.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I wish to say something with reference to this question. I think the limit has been reached when one Collishaw is sent to Washington, the Capital of the United States of America, to represent Newfoundland in the fish sit-

uation, I think the best man in Newfoundland would hardly be capable for that position and duty. Do you not remember when Sir Robert Bond made a study of that to select a special man to represent Newfoundland in the fish situation, and now we are told this evening that Mr. E. Collishaw is now at Washington fiddling with the principal industry of our country. He would not be able to distinguish a codfish from a rabbit. What in the name of common sense does Collishaw know about codfish. This man struck this country a few years ago. He may be an alright man in his way, but what does he know about codfish? And this evening the Prime Minister tells us he is at Washington representing us in a fishery matter.

This is the worst insult Newfoundland was ever subjected to if I know anything about it. I suppose the Government would look with scorn upon Captain John Lewis, but a man like Collishaw is up at Washington now in no less a place than the Capital of the United States of America representing Newfoundland in a fishery matter. No wonder we would be in the mess we are in today. What has Captain John Lewis got to say about this? Now Mr. Speaker I ask your pardon for taking up the time of the House but I will again speak on this matter.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—The Government intend to maintain the Revenue Protective Service on the South and West Coasts this year. The steamer is being prepared for this work and had to be docked, which has delayed her outfitting. The whole West Coast has been without any protection whatever. It was the custom in the past to get a schooner away in January to do this work. The whole of the West Coast fleet has gone for over a week from Grand Bank to St. Pierre

to get supplies, to obtain sugar for eight cents per pound not twenty-five cents, and take salt aboard, and this ship which the Government proposes to send, has been lying at Bowring's wharf for some time with the crew walking the street all the time under pay. Are we going to abandon the Custom House? I was surprised about the motor cars and the taxes thereon but you did not tell us about the amount of duty unpaid on motor cars. From Cape Race to Bonne Bay there has been no cutter and the people are doing what they like. There is free trade as far as St. Pierre is concerned. The whole fleet has gone into St. Pierre for their blocks, sails and supplies and on all this no duty had been paid. What is going to happen Newfoundland if this is allowed to go on? How long are we going to stand for this?

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — The following is the reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 10, on Order Paper of April 19th, 1921.

The amount of collections made by Duncan Collins, Sub-Collector on the Labrador Mail Boat during last year was \$23,769.00. He was paid as follows:

Salary	\$1150.50
Commission	169.50
Travelling Expenses	407.65

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — The following is the reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 13, on Order Paper of April 19th, 1921.

A statement of the quantity and value of the imports of intoxicating liquors by the Controller's Department is in course of preparation, and will be furnished in a few days.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have received the following answer to question 14 of Sir M. P. Cashin:

Clergymen are exempt from taxation under the Income War Tax Act.

I have never received instructions, verbal or otherwise, that clergymen

should be exempt from Income Tax, and forms were sent out under the 8th Section of the Act in the same manner as to laymen whose returns had not been sent in, in accordance with the 7th Section of the Act.

JOSEPH O'REILLY,
Assessor.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Reply to question of Mr. Moore No. 11, April 8, 1921:

Mr. Foote's bill for entire services in connection with the purchase of Sudbury Property for the sum of \$29,000.00 amounted to the total sum of \$336.35. That covered negotiations for purchase in which Mr. Foote saved the Colony many thousand dollars, miscellaneous cash disbursements, professional fees for service, preparation of documents, necessary searches at registry office and competition of title to the property in favor of the Government.

Mr. Foote's bill went to a taxing officer of the Supreme Court for examination in due course and was taxed and allowed in accordance with usual procedure. The amount paid to Mr. Foote was the sum ordered by the Taxing officer, namely the sum of \$336.35.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following financial statements:

Statement of Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland for the year ended 30th June, 1920.

Statement Public Debt, June 30th., 1920.

Death Duties Account, 1919-20.

Surplus Trust Account, 1919-20.

Balance Sheet of Treasury Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1920.

Teachers' Pension Fund.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a word in support of the amendment now before the House. I hope I will be pardoned, however, if, first of all, in order to refresh the memory of hon. members, I read again the amendment.

(Reads amendment.)

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend, I might say in commencing, to unnecessarily detain the business of the House in dealing with these matters that are included in the amendment, especially in view of the announcement made yesterday afternoon by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I came to the House with one intention and one only and that is to rise to the occasion which now presents itself and to do all I can to assist, in my own small way, my fellow countrymen to bear the load which is weighing them down. I think you will agree, Sir, that these are decent sentiments, but what do I find on taking my seat here this afternoon? I have to follow the example of the previous speaker, Sir John Crosbie, and denounce an attack which has been made upon me, not in the same dirty rag that he has had cause to complain against, but against the equally filthy Advocate. In that paper are a set of resolution condemning sectarianism and making an unjustifiable and low-down attack on me personally. Now, Mr. Speaker, with that portion of these resolution concerning sectarianism I am not going to deal, but I want to assure the boss of that dirty rag and those associated with him that I am prepared to vindicate myself against those dirty, filthy charges. The closing paragraph of the resolutions in question reads as follows:

"Before closing we cannot desist from expressing our avowed disapproval of the reprehensible conduct of W. J. Walsh on the floors of the House of Assembly, in probing into the private business of the Union Trading Company. We are glad to know that the poisoned arrow failed to accomplish its mission. Would Mr. Walsh dare to enquire into the private affairs of any other company at St. John's? Would his despicable conduct be tolerated by the directors of

those companies? Those 'kill Coaker' and 'kill the F.P.U.' cries are wasted on the fishermen of the North. We reiterate our determination to stand by the F. P. U. and our President, the Hon. W. F. Coaker.

"Signed on behalf of Port Rexton Council: James Butler, Chairman; Robert Plowman, Deputy Chairman; Garland Bannister, Secretary; Wm. Thos. Randell, John Stockley, William James Rex, Peter Rex, Sr., Wm. F. Barbour, Robert Rex, Hezekiah Randell, George Bannister, Robert Bannister, Abram Bailey, Robert Rex, Jr., Joseph Mate, Kenneth Ploughman, Benjamin Bailey.

"Port Rexton, April 9th, 1921."

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the matter of my probing into the private affairs of the Union Trading Co., and to my questions having failed in their effect, as I've already stated, I have no desire to pry into the private affairs of any private concern, but I have convinced myself and any man with even a cord eye can see that the Union Trading Co. is not a private corporation, but a concern whose workings affect a very large portion of the people of this country. Why, Sir, out of the thirty-six members of this House, at least eleven of them are the sworn followers of the head of that concern. I came in here and asked if the F.P.U. or any of its subsidiary companies owed money on bonds given the Customs for duty, and I might say that I was glad to find that they did not, according to the answer tabled. But what about the fifty or sixty thousand dollars taken from the Treasury to pay for salt? Are we doing our duty to the people we represent if we allow this to go unchallenged? Is any hon. gentleman either on this or the other side of the House doing its duty in allowing private companies to owe so much money to the country when the country can so ill afford it? I am sorry the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fish-

cries is not in here this afternoon. I should like to see him in his seat up beside the Minister of Justice where he should be, but as he is not here I shall say what I have to say anyhow although, no doubt, I shall be told in The Advocate tomorrow that the cowardly, sneaking Walsh attacked Mr. Coaker when he was not in the House to defend himself. Mr. Speaker, I am here as part of the safety valve which controls the business of this House and thereby protects the interests of the people; I am here as one of three representatives of one of the largest and one of the most important fishing districts in the country to fight for what The Advocate has for its motto: 'To every man his own.' To every man his own, indeed. The motto in that paper should be "Unto the F.P.U. all." It is regrettable, Sir, that the Hon. Minister had not the courage or the manliness to support this resolution, instead of being so small as to oppose it because it happened to emanate from this side of the House. But of course the principle is that nothing good can emanate from the Opposition, nothing good can emanate from a man like Cashin. The sentiments expressed in the resolutions are identical with those to be expressed in the Bill which the Hon. Minister will bring down for the repeal of the Regulations, and by supporting the resolutions the Government would have saved all this debate, but still they had not the manliness to support them. I remember when in 1914 a new government came into power and Mr. Coaker for the first time occupied a seat in this House, we were, if my memory serves me right, in committee on an important measure. A gentleman at that time associated with Mr. Coaker and sitting on the Opposition side had pluck enough to cross the floor and vote with the Government because he was convinced that it was the right course to pursue. The gentleman to

whom I refer is Mr. John Stone. He had the courage of his convictions and after voting with the Government on that measure he returned to his seat on the Opposition side. He showed that he was not too small to do the right thing and that he was not to be swayed whatever way the wind blew and he was all the more respected for it. I am particularly interested in one or two aspects of these resolutions, and I shall deal with these, Mr. Speaker, from three points of view. It has been said that I supported the Regulations when they passed this House, and the three positions from which I shall deal with the matter are, first, my position then, secondly, my position now, and thirdly, why.

In 1919 when Sir Michael Cashin's Government went down to defeat, we came back here and the two, three or four parties that constituted the Government lined up together and Mr. Coaker intimated that he was going to place on the Statute Book an act to regulate and control the export of codfish. It is well known that what Mr. Coaker said he was going to do was as good as done so far as that party was concerned; he was the whole Government. Sir Michael Cashin realised that we had to make the best of a bad job and that all we could do was to get in as many amendments as possible so that these Regulations would not lean too hard on the people of the country who would be most affected by them. It was a foregone conclusion that Mr. Coaker was the dictator, and that whatever he said was law, so we offered no serious opposition. We were given to understand that we would have an Export Board, but we were not given to understand that this Board would be composed of men like Mr. Collishaw or a man named Brooks or Mr. Geo. M. Barr or a young lawyer named Dunfield. Sir M. P. Cashin apologized to you this afternoon, I think, Sir, for occupying so much of

the time of the House in asking questions, but I think I am safe in saying that the country will demand no apology from him for his action in this regard. Rather do they owe him a deep debt of gratitude for turning the searchlight on the deed of the Government and bringing before them the true facts of the misconduct of public affairs the past twelve months. There must be a feeling of shame in the hearts of all Newfoundlanders to learn here this evening that a man named Collishaw is now in the capital of the United States representing this country on important fisheries matters. What an insult to the people to have a fellow who drifted in here from God knows where, who came here as an oil agent and accumulated wealth which it is questionable how he attained, taken by the hand, and by the dictator again of course—the man who should be in his seat in this House this afternoon—and sent to the American capital to transact our business for us. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time for us to shut up shop, to turn the key in the door of this House and hand the whole thing over to Port Union and Mr. Collishaw. And then they will have the audacity to tell you that everything they did was quite alright; they ask for mercy and they hold up their hands and tell you that the country is on the rocks and they practically say, come over Cashin-Crosbie-Bennett and company and lend us a hand and take her out of the wretched condition we have forced her into by incompetency, corruption and dishonesty. It will be remembered that when everything was going along smoothly in this country and when prosperity reigned all over the land there were people who gloried at the name of Coaker and pilloried the names of Cashin, Crosbie, Bennett, Piccott and others who were associated with the Government in those days. I have vivid recollections of how The Advocate used to thunder

forth on the ministerial benches of the Government and charge the occupants thereof with all kinds of fancy accusations. They never made any attempt to justify them, nor did they have the manliness to go to their newspaper office and instruct those whom they had hired to do their dirty work to make an open apology. They had not the manliness to stand up in their places in this House and offer an apology for the deliberate misrepresentation that they practised during the days they were in Opposition; but now when they find they have made a mess of things, as a result of which children unborn in this country are going to suffer and thousands of men, women and children in this country are suffering untold misery tonight, they cry "Kamerad."

While I am speaking I hold in my desk the names of 500 people belonging to the District of Placentia and St. Mary's and 490 out of the 500 people who have been bled, beggared and ruined through the incompetency and by the discrimination practised by the present Government. We have here resolutions pouring in from all sections of the Island. This is not the class of resolution that I read from. The Advocate this afternoon and which draws the proverbial red hering across the trail to try and get people to forget for the time being in an endeavour to put class against class and creed against creed and to try and get people to forget that this country was put in such a serious position through the inability and corruption of the present Government.

We have another class of resolution, which, however, differently worded, comes from a class of men who are no different in their avocation to the men in the north. And I believe that there are as good and as fair-minded fishermen to be found in the northern section of the country as there are to be found in any other, except that they allowed themselves to be made tools

of by unscrupulous politicians; and I think if I had an opportunity to meet an audience from any district in the north that I would be in a position to justify and vindicate my character from any of those foul charges made against me in the Advocate. Here is a resolution, though, perhaps, I may be charged with discourtesy by reading it to this House. I regret that the Hon. Mr. Foote, member for Burin, and his colleagues, Mr. Cheseman, are not in the House, but I have no doubt that both of these gentlemen will be honest and candid enough to see that this resolution—I understand they have copies of it—goes through the proper channel whereby they may be able to be of some assistance to the Opposition in the forcing of the Government to lift the Regulations. I say that deliberately, because I am convinced, as the great majority of the people throughout the country are convinced, that the whole credit for the lifting of the Fish Regulations is due to the Opposition led by Sir Michael Cashin. The Resolution reads as follows:

Reads Resolution

Now Mr. Speaker, a half million dollars is a large amount of money. It is sufficient money, if handled properly, to be able to eliminate entirely and to prevent the awful stigma that has been placed on our people during the past few months. Five hundred thousand dollars—and I challenge successful contradiction—have been stolen from the "Public Treasury" of this Colony by one individual. Would we as members of the various constituencies, who sent us here to safeguard their interests, be doing our duty if we did not expose this corruption? And I venture to say tonight that there are very many honest, industrious, hard-working and deserving fishermen in Bonavista, Trinity and Notre Dame Bays who did not receive a solitary farthing of

that half million. 'I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister, the Attorney General, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the Minister of Education and the other gentlemen who comprise the Executive Government—and even His Excellency the Governor—should be held responsible for the taking of that money, and if every man here were of my mind they would not allow one measure to go through this House until these men would be called upon to open their own purses and place back in the Treasury the five hundred thousand dollars that was stolen and deliberately stolen by them. Now that is a kind of strong language, but desperate diseases require desperate remedies, and I, in my own way, tho my language may not be as choice and as flowery as we heard sent forth from the other side of the House, want to assure you, sir, that my honesty of purpose cannot be questioned by any member or any individual in this House or outside this House. While I hold a seat in this Chamber I want to see that splendid motto of the Advocate lived up to—"To every man his own," and I want to see it carried out to the strictest letter of the law. As far back as August 1920 when I went through the district of Placentia and St. Mary's I could easily predict what conditions were going to be like if high prices were not paid for our products. On my return to the city I dared to go through the public press, because the House was not open and the press was the only available means of voicing the sentiments within me. I wrote a letter to the Daily News pointing out that if \$10 per quintal for talqual was not given—and that was what was promised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last session—that conditions would be serious throughout the winter which we have just passed over. I even went to the ex-

tent of saying that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, at that time, along with members of the Export Board were at variance with other indifferent members of the Board of Trade and others outside the Board of Trade, as there did not seem to be any set policy,—and who had all the machinery at his disposal, who had scores of Agents in the European markets and had all the information that any out reasonable man could have relating to the conditions existing in the foreign markets; and that if there was a deliberate attempt being made by a section of the mercantile community, according to his own statement, to keep the price of fish down although the foreign markets warranted \$9 or \$10 locally, but owing to political and commercial intrigue he was not able to obtain that price locally, and that he was convinced beyond all shadow of doubt that \$10 should be paid for fish locally, I pointed out that he, in my opinion, would be justified in utilising the funds of this Colony, pay for the whole catch, market it, pay the fishermen \$10 per quintal for it and any balance he had to put it to the credit of the Colony. Of course I did not expect that my suggestion or any suggestion coming from such a desperate character as Walsh would be seriously considered by the Minister and his associates. Later on when it was first mooted that there was an attempt being made to raid the Treasury of this country by the political boss and his associates I wrote another letter to the press. And I want to state here that any letter that I write to the press is not signed by any non-deplume. I never write unless I think the subject is of sufficient importance and that it may be considered by some of the people, and I always sign any article I write over my own signature. This letter was dated Nov, 23rd last and I crave the indulgence

of the House to read it. I do this, because in itself it will be sufficient proof that my attitude here on the 19th of April is not the spontaneous decision of some people who have tread on my corns, but that certain honourable gentlemen who love this splendid educator will not accuse me of taking this attitude in the way I was attacked in the Advocate this evening. This letter appeared in the Evening Telegram and reads thus:

(reads)

If you will notice, Mr. Speaker, on that date, Nov. 23rd, the people, at least I did not know, and a large section of the Island did not know that the Prime Minister, the Attorney General, the Minister of Education and the Hon. Mr. Foote had given their support and backing in the Executive to Mr. Coaker and Mr. Halfyard and their other associates who are mixed up in those F. P. U. enterprises for the taking of five hundred thousand dollars of our money for the purposes of buying Mr. Coaker's own fish. The resolution that I read here this evening that came from the Burin Board of Trade, dated the 5th of April, and its only supposed im that resolution that a large amount of money had been taken from the Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or some other person for the purchase of Labrador fish. Then there is another resolution from Grand Bank which is practically identical with the Burin one. It is pointed out by the farmers of the Grand Bank resolution that the associations represented therein are non-political. I do not think that any member of this House will question the veracity of that statement. I have the honour to know personally and intimately some of the gentlemen who are associated with that resolution on the West Coast. The name of Mr. Samuel Harris is a household word from Pla-

centia to Cape Ray; and there are none of the fishermen at this very moment in Placentia Bay but whose last prayer before they close their eyes in sleep each night is that conditions may right themselves so that the old reliable firms of Samuel Harris, Ltd., of Grand Bank and the Marystown Trading Company may come to their rescue and hold out to them the barrels and the boxes and give them the material they require to carry on their arduous avocation. Mr. Harris is a man, who, in his early days went out in the stormy deep in a small punt. By his ability and energy that punt became a jack. Gradually the jack was succeeded by the fore-and-after. From the fore-and-after he acquired the banker and from the banker to the foreign going vessel. From the ordinary common every day fisherman Mr. Harris rose to be one of the most prominent and influential men in the Dominion. He was one of the largest contributors to the Profits Tax Act in 1919. He did a business that was unsurpassed by any other firm in the Island. I think that he was the largest exporter of codfish in 1910 also. The same might be said of other firms in Grand Bank such as the Buffets, Patten and Forsey, Forward and Tibbo; and the Holletts, Bartletts, Bishops and Inkpens of Burin; and the Moultons and the Smiths and the other business men along the South West Coast, and the Wakleys, and Warehams of Placentia Bay. Those men built up their own businesses; they were not heritages handed down to them. Those men were interfered with by the Regulations to the extent of driving them to the wall. Take the case of Mr. George Penny, of Ramea—a glaring case of discrimination on the part of somebody, and I am going to lay the blame at the door of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. After all he is only one

man, and the men who were prepared to sit at the Executive Board and say Amen to his actions will be held just as much responsible by the people of this country as the Minister himself. Mr. Penny loaded a cargo of fish last June and had a market secured for it at a profitable figure. When he applied for a clearance it was refused and the vessel was held up at his wharf for three or four months in the hot summer weather and any man who has any knowledge of such matters can understand what sort of a condition that cargo of fish was in after being held up for so long a time at that particular season of the year. The consequence was, I am informed, and I think I am informed rightly.

The firm of Geo. Penney of Ramea have not yet received one cent for that fish, and all the time that these conditions were being forced upon the people, the Prime Minister and the Attorney General were abroad, and even thought these gentlemen were in a more congenial climate, and probably association with larger men from a financial standpoint, it was their duty to go to the office of the Nfld. Commissioner and find out what was happening in Newfoundland from day to day. I give them credit for having sufficient interest in those men who sent them here to do that, but if they knew that Coaker was running at large here, if the Attorney General knew that the firm of John Smith, Rose, Hugh Cody, and others were being driven to the wall by the mad policy of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries and his associates in the Executive, who were prepared to give him all the rope he wanted, I say that it's nothing to the credit of either of these gentlemen for allowing these conditions to go so far. I have a certain amount of sympathy for the position that the Prime Minister finds himself in, I am not so

dense that I cannot appreciate the unfortunate position, and perhaps if the Minister of Marine & Fisheries this House and if the Prime Minister had come from the Polls with sufficient votes without the F. P. U. the dictatorial policy and the resulting conditions might have been avoided. I see the position and I am not unreasonable enough not to give expression to these thoughts, and my feelings from my place in this House, but where I do find fault with the Prime Minister is that he did not see from past experience of the Leader of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Bond, the inevitable outcome. He was forced in 1913 to associate himself with Mr. Coaker who was then only Mr. Coaker, President of the F.P.U. Bond associated himself with Mr. Coaker and he was sent back by the loyal old Liberals of Twillingate with a large majority. What happened? After that election he never took his seat in this House, and on opening day his colleague Mr. Clift, intimated officially that he had received a communication from Sir Robert Bond resigning his seat in this House as a protest against the actions of Mr. Coaker and his associates. He pointed out that it would be just as consistent for Angus Reid or Bob Reid, Wm. Crawford, or Paddy Lee, the Conductor, to come here in this House representing Reid Nfld. Co., as for Mr. Coaker and Mr. Halfyard and his friends down the line to come here representing the F. P. U., and I am prepared to accept the decision of Sir Robert Bond, and I think that the majority of the people of the country will accept his decision, in preference to the decision of a man who may be styled an ultra Coaker man. With his position to a great extent I sympathise, and I do not wish to individually or personally attack Mr. Coaker or Mr. Jennings, nor any of the other gentlemen on that side

of the House, but we are dealing now not with personalities but with an issue, and one upon which the future prosperity and independence of this country must largely stand or fall. What right had Mr. Coaker, Chairman of the Railway Commission, Managing Director of the Companies of the F. P. U., to purchase fish from himself, because it was from himself. He is financially interested in the Trading Co., and there is here a little matter I would like cleared up with regard to the 'President Coaker.' I am surprised, and no doubt a great large majority of the constituents of some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who are not associated with the F. P. U. will be when they read for the first time of this frightful prostitution of public moneys. In the old days when my friend Sir John Crosbie sold a Marconi Station to the Government, when Sir Edward Morris, was leading the Government, he was abused by the Public Press, and a man was led to believe he sold a piece of wood, and Woodford who was driven from his place in this House by political intrigue and he was not fit to have anything to do with public money because he bought a few splits from the poor people in his district and gave them five or ten cents too much, or because he gave twenty cents a barrel too much for potatoes.

Now we find that three and a half million dollars has been wasted and a half million of that is taken and placed to the credit at the banks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to purchase fish from the men of the North, and we are supposed to have Responsible Government. Would it not have been the decent thing if an extraordinary position arose of this kind to have the House convened, and bring the matter before the House? No, it was unnecessary because Mr. Coaker, who was the controlling

spirit in the Government because of his enormous power to control one-third of the votes of the country. He had promised his people that he would give them ten dollars a quintal for fish. They had been told through the official organ of the F.P.U. and from the platforms of the F. P. U. lodges that Mr. Coaker could make the price of fish what he pleased. Now last autumn Mr. Coaker realised and we all realised that after all the price of fish was regulated by supply and demand. Men came from the North with schooner loads of fish and went to Bowrings and Barrs and Jobs and Crosbies and other places and were told that owing to the interference of the man who introduced the Fish Exportation Act that the particular market for that kind of fish, Italy, was almost destroyed. They went back to their friend and as was only natural, they told him the story. He saw then that conditions were getting serious. He saw then what he saw a few days ago in this House, when Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie and the other men on this side of the House arose and demanded that the Fish Exportation Act be abolished; he saw all this and he knew that some means must be found to get him out of the awkward position. He went to his colleagues, all who were in the city, the Prime Minister and Attorney General were not here; he called sufficient together, and it was agreed to by the Government that the pledges made by Mr. Coaker to his men of the North would not be broken, the men in Placentia Bay, Ferryland, St. John's East and West and Port de Grave, had to be bled so that his friends of this section might be able to prosper.

Now then, if that is the true position, and I think it is, although there are men who would use different language, more elegant expressions,

as a Newfoundlander I say that the men who permitted that are not doing their duty to the people who sent them here or to the country. When a man comes in here as Leader of the Government or Leader of the Opposition or otherwise, his aim and object should be the betterment of conditions for the people of the country, not for a few of them. Now then, I don't think that there was ever such a thing done before, and the Government have to accept the blame for the misappropriation of funds, especially to such an amount, when we are passing through an era which makes the time of the Bank Crash seem prosperous in comparison with present conditions. The total expenditure then was only two or three million dollars; today the work ingmen of the country, the farmer, miner, fisherman, etc., are called upon to pay forty-six dollars per head. The total expenditure in 1919 was only thirty-six dollars per capita. These are figures in the Manifesto of the present Prime Minister; in 1919 thirty six dollars per capita, today forty-six dollars per capita; in other words the burden of the people has increased during the past eighteen months ten dollars per head, and this is the action of the Liberal Reform Government. I say that the matter is very serious, and nobody inside this House or outside of it, but must realize that the best ability to be had in this country should be got and quickly. While I was here yesterday in my place I was listening to the weak defence of the actions of Mr. Coaker. I had heard he was suffering from ill-health. I am not surprised, because although we all know that there were great blunders made, and we know that we have to pay our part in making up for these blunders; none of us are so unreasonable but we will admit that Mr. Coaker had lots of energy and though he blundered seri-

ously we can sympathize with him; but it is not good enough for a responsible Minister of the Crown to come here and in giving an account of his stewardship to say that his intentions were good. There is an old saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and it is not good enough when such a large portion of our people are driven to the wall, and now nearly the first of May and none of them getting ready for the fishery. My colleagues and myself have at least between us one thousand applications, and that is a large amount. On my desk alone there are at least four hundred letters from good, honest, industrious, energetic fishermen, who never before had to write to their member, to find out where they would get supplies for the fishery, but this is the deplorable condition we are in today, and when one realises the seriousness of these conditions, one can hardly credit the report of the Auditor General in which he tells us that the enormous sum of a half million dollars has been taken from the Treasury and handed over to one section of the Island to be dealt with as a Minister of the Crown saw fit. I do not think that if the Prime Minister, if his constituents made an appointment with him tonight and put before him the fact that they had an enormous amount of fish drums which they could not get clear of, they could not get the proper price, I don't think that he would go to the Council Chamber and ask his associates to vote him a half million dollars to go up to these people and buy up their stock and save the situation politically for himself. I don't think he would do that, but that is what happened with regard to the half million dollars.

Some people may say that the situation is not so serious that Walsh should get up here and waste time

talking about this half million dollars, but to me it is very important. At this particular time it would greatly assist the people all over the country to live, whereas only a few were allowed to benefit by it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I will go further and say publically, although it may be used against me in the future I will say it, that if a similar condition occurred in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's and the people came down here and demanded that money be taken from the public treasury to buy their fish, I would not give it to them, unless every corner of the country shared in the transaction. These are my sentiments, and these are the sentiment of the people who sent me here. There is an old saying "to the victors belong the spoils," and to a certain extent that is true, but it is not true to the extent of half a million dollars. Now that the Attorney General is back in his seat, I would say that I would not like to be in his shoes when he would go back to Fortune Bay and the people would ask him if he was a party to giving the people North that half million dollars. But the chances are he will never go back. He will be afraid to go back.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I could speak for two hours more on this subject, without touching another matter. The subject is of supreme importance. Never before was such a blunder, such wholesale discrimination, committed by any Government of Newfoundland; and I blame the Executive Government. I do not blame the private members on the other side. I do not believe they knew anything about it until they came in here. I believe that there are men on the other side who are Britishers enough, who are fair enough, to see the wrong in this transaction, and who will see that it is not repeated. But the Executive

Government cannot absolve themselves from the responsibility for this unparalleled blunder. No matter how many flowery speeches are made by the Leader of the Government, no matter how many soothing letters are written by the Attorney General to his constituents, I think this transaction in itself should be enough for the people of the country to rise up in their might and demand from His Excellency the resignation of the Government. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people all over the country will be relieved when they know that the Opposition have succeeded in forcing from the Statute Books the obnoxious Fish Regulations. There is yet other bad legislation that must be removed, but no chance will be taken by the Opposition. That old worn-out War Measures Act will not be allowed to rest. God knows who will want a slice next. Maybe Mr. Collishaw a timber area or some other special consideration. The only consolation that the people have now is that the three million surplus is gone. But, Mr. Speaker, that War Measures Act must go, and the Food Control Board must go. I understand that certain rumbling noises have been heard in certain sections of the inner circles of the Government, and some of them are honest enough to admit that the conditions are serious. I personally do not care who gets the credit for the removal of the Fish Regulations. The people who sent me here will know that no opportunity was lost by me in upholding the interests of the people who sent me here. I say that all this vicious legislation, this obnoxious and ignorant legislation must be wiped out. The men who are squandering the country's money in the United States and other countries as so-called Commissioners, must be called home. This cannot be allowed to continue. It must not be allowed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to another subject relating to the amendment. When I asked a question in the House the other day, I did so in the interest of all sections of the country. Because I dared to ask a question I was slam-banged, and subjected to all kinds of abuse by the press. Personally I do not care. I am somewhat of the material that Sir John Crosbie says he is made of.

Some people may think that I should not be permitted to speak without a veil. I am not responsible for my personal appearance, but if any person can point out anything wrong with my public conduct, I will immediately hand in my resignation. I have used absolutely no discrimination in my district. Many of my strongest supporters do not kneel at the same altar that I do. They know me, and know that I do not discriminate in any way.

Now with respect to that octopus discrimination which we have in the salt situation. That cargo of salt was brought out here and sold at a loss to the country of \$73,000.00, which was paid out of the surplus which Cashin and Company had saved up. The salt was handed over to a firm at its original cost. The firm is not mentioned, but it is stated that the firm owes this country over \$61,000.00. This information comes from the highest authority. We have it in the Auditor General's statement. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was told by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the salt was stored by him, and that some was sold. That is a pretty story. Both of these transactions are sufficient to make every man on that side of the House ashamed of this whole despicable piece of conduct, and so much so that he would never appeal to his constituents again. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the hour will come when the Attorney General will not smile

at this matter as he is smiling now, and I would advise the Attorney General that if he anticipates taking a trip to his district that he do not go through Placentia and St. Mary's. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries avoided the demonstration which awaited him at Port aux Basques by coming direct by the Kyle. Here we have a direct loss of \$16,000.00. I wonder if the Hon. Minister displayed the same ability in buying for the F. P. U. firms that he displayed in this matter. I think not. Three and a half million dollars gone from the public treasury in 18 months. When this amount of money was accrued times were prosperous, and the man at the helm was capable. He knew his course. But now that era of prosperity has passed away, and we are confronted with a condition of affairs to which the bank crash was not parity. I would be glad to congratulate the Hon. members on the other side if I saw any honest attempt on their part to overcome the situation, and to help the country. But when one sees how they throw away \$10,000 in one place and \$50,000 in another place it is time that we should arise and call a halt. Now the Government comes in here and cries "comrades." They say "we surrender." The Minister of Marine & Fisheries pleads for mercy, and then his filthy rag comes out and tries to fool the men of the north. Then they expect men of ability on this side of the House to go to their assistance. If an attack is made on Sir John Crosbie there is an apology forthcoming immediately. There may be an interesting story that Sir John can tell. I don't happen to know it, Perhaps there may be a reason for staving off these attacks, but when the ugly, unrepresentable Walsh gets up and expresses a sentiment he is ridiculed. Who told him to speak? Did His Excellency tell him what to say?

I want to serve notice now, Mr. Speaker, and I mean it, that the time may come when I will go down to the Advocate office and there is a man down there by the name of Mews. His head is red now, but before I am through with him some other parts will be red also. Then there is the Daily Star. I would suggest that the Prime Minister convey my compliments to these gentlemen also. That may seem a joke and said in a jocular manner, but I mean it. The owners of these papers say they know nothing about it. I am sick of that; fed up with it. So far as the effect politically is concerned I don't know but that I should send them a check if I could afford it. There is no public man who wants to go home and his children say to him "daddy where is the paper"; I have six of them, thank God, and that is what they say to me, and I have to look over the paper first to see if it is fit for them to read. This thing should be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, as it is 6.30 I move the adjournment until to-morrow.

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

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Public Accounts, 1919-20.

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, APRIL 20th, 1921

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

Mr. Bennett gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move that a Select Committee of this House be appointed with power to send for persons, papers and things, and to

take evidence on oath to enquire into the proceedings of the Food Control Board so called, and especially into the purchase of sugar, and contracts for sugar whereby certain persons, firms, and companies were relieved of onerous obligations and heavy losses which they would have incurred, but which were imposed instead upon the taxpayers of the Colony.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in reply to Sir Michael Cashin's question (No. 4) on Order Paper, dated April 21, 1921, tabled the following: Mr. J. H. Scammell, M.H.A., during his recent tour, was not engaged in carrying out any work for the Government or for any department thereof.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to Sir M. P. Cashin's question, I beg to table the following report of the Auditor General:

Auditor General's Office,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

In reply to Sir Michael Cashin's question, I beg leave to state:

When, last summer, I applied at the Treasury for information as to the payment of \$61,000 from the Surplus Trust for a cargo of salt, I was informed that the said cargo was sent down to Port Union and taken delivery of by the F. P. U. Company and the money would be remitted to refund to the Surplus Trust for the amount expended. This information was furnished me orally as there was, so far as I am aware, no Minute of Council authorising the transaction. I was fully convinced from the information thus received that an outright sale had been made of this salt, and in January last, when I wrote my report, I fully believed this to be the case, and, acting on that

belief, I reported what I considered to be the fact to the Legislature. Up to the time of the writing of my report no repayment had been made to the Treasury on account of this salt. A few days ago the sum of \$4,400.00 was paid into the Treasury on account of this salt.

I need hardly say that, had I not fully believed that there was an outright sale, I would not have used the expression "be repaid by the firm to which it was sold." I have never, in any of my reports, made a statement that I did not honestly believe to be correct.

I respectfully request that this special report be attached to my report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, or, if it is the desire of the House that my reports be printed, then the last mentioned report can be corrected in accordance with the facts.

(Sgd.) F. C. BERTEAU,
C. and A. G.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table the following reply to question of Dr. Jones, dated April 7th:

(a) The number of applications for old age pensions on file on February 1st last was as follows:—

District:	No. of Applications:
St. John's West	—
St. John's East	—
Harbor Main	75
Port-de-Grave	21
Harbor Grace	32
Carbonear	9
Bay de Verde	17
Trinity	2
Bonavista	12
Fogo	1
'Twilligate	45
St. Barbe	1
St. George	1
Burgee & La Poile	1
Fortune	—
Burin	3

Ferryland	26
Placentia and St. Mary's	54
—	
Total	300
—	

(b) The number of applications received from the District of Harbor Main from February 1st last to date is as follows:

Name of Applicant and who recommended by:

Philip Whealan, Holyrood. Recommended by Rev. W. P. Finn and Rd. Dwyer.

John Doyle of John, Avondale N. Recommended by W. T. Cullen and Geo. Kennedy.

Patrick Walsh, Avondale. Recommended by Martin Moore and Rd. Baker.

Daniel Kennedy, Avondale. Recommended by M. F. O'Toole and P. F. Griffen.

Nathaniel Bishop, Long Pond. Recommended by Rev. H. W. Facey and F. F. Furneaux.

John Rideout, Long Pond. Recommended by Rev. H. W. Facey and F. F. Furneaux.

John Batten, Foxtrap. Recommended by Rev. H. W. Facey and F. F. Furneaux.

(c) None of the latter applications have since been granted.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table the following answer to question of Mr. Bennett of date April 14th:

The Food Board has bought to arrive by this "Rosalind" 1250 barrels of sugar, purchased from Willett & Gra, New York, at 6.84 per pound, F. O. B. New York. Other firms had been asked to quote.

The reason for the Sugar being imported in 1921 is as follows:—

When the Board found that owing to restricted consumption, the Board's stock of Sugar would not be exhausted last year, instead of bringing in the sugar from Canada, and having to pay storage, etc., it sold a certain

quantity in Canada, thus obtaining about fifteen cents for sugar which could be imported from the U.S.A., for ten to twelve. This saving enabled the Board to reduce sugar prices last fall. It must be noted that no more sugar has been imported than the stock held by the Food Board last Fall.

The sale in Canada naturally was at a loss accounting for balance shown in Auditor General's Report, so that the sugar now being imported costs every cent of the price at which it is sold. Taking the rate of consumption at that of the winter months the sugar stocks should be finished before the end of June. At the meeting in February, sugar dealers were informed that thirty days' notice would be given of decontrol.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In addition to the answer already tabled in reply to question No. 6 on Order Paper of April 15th, I beg to now table a copy of a letter of today's date from Mr. H. B. Gillis, Superintendent of Mines and Trains of the Dominion Iron and Steel Co.:—

Crosbie Hotel,
St. John's, Nfld.,
April 19th, 1921

Hon. R. A. Squires,
Prime Minister.

Dear Mr. Squires:

In reference your note of today covering item No. 6 on the "Order of the Day" April 15th, the following is submitted.

Previous to your interview in Sydney it was our intention to operate only No. 4 Mine at Wabana. After coming here with you in December and investigating conditions at Wabana it was decided to increase our program to include operating No. 2 Mine three days per week.

Under the original proposal we would have employed 380-400 men each day, or 2280-2400 days per week. Under the present operating schedule

we employ 380-400 men for three days per week, 1140-1200
 Plus 650 men for three days per week 1950-1950.

Total days work per week.. 3090-3150

This is approximately thirty per cent more work than the original program called for.

(a) Operations on an enlarged scale will depend largely on market conditions. The curtailment at Sydney during the past winter, and the consequent decrease in the consumption of ore at the furnaces leaves a large reserve of iron ore in the Sydney stockpiles. The tonnage stocked at Wabana is greater than ever in the history of the mines. The Dominion Company has approximately 725,000 tons; the Scotia company has approximately 400,000 tons.

(b) Some small sales have been arranged and operations will be continued to make up the wastage in stockpiles on account of these sales. If additional ore sales can be arranged or orders for steel obtained work will be pushed vigorously at Bell Island. From present indications it appears that the present forces of the two companies will be maintained.

(c) The Company in view of the uncertain conditions at Wabana have decided to give Port au Port quarries the entire limestone requirements of the Sydney plants for blast furnace flux. This entails closing down its quarries in Cape Breton and employing about 350 men on the West Coast. Under this arrangement there will be approximately as many employees of the Dominion Company in Newfoundland as in normal years, even if Wabana conditions do not improve.

The above outline will, I believe, cover the points raised in question No. 6, but if any further information is necessary I will be glad to supply it. I may say that our Wabana pro-

gram during the past winter was not justified by the industrial outlook and was followed to prevent hardship among our employees. The work was divided as our management considered most advisable to prevent want; the head of the larger families received as a rule the more days' work each week.

Yours very truly,
 (Sgd.) HUGH B. GILLIS,
 Supt. Mines and Quarries,
 D. I. & S. Co.

M. Walsh asked the Chairman of the Railway Commission:

- (1) What individual member of the Commission furnished the press last August with the report claiming that the portion of the coal areas being opened up by the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., was principally on the Reid Co's land.
- (2) If that statement is correct, what steps have been taken to have these titles corrected.
- (3) If that statement is not correct, what steps have been taken to indemnify the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., for this piece of gross misrepresentation in the public press.

Mr. Walsh asked the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines:

- (1) If a certain Geological Expert by the name of Dowling was procured from Canada last year, and if so for what purpose?
- (2) What areas of the mineral resources of the Colony were visited?
- (3) If any local parties accompanied him, and if so to give names?
- (4) To table the separate reports furnished by the expert containing the expert's signature.
- (5) What were the amount of expenses and to itemize them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have asked the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines to prepare the

information, and as soon as I receive it I shall table it.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Shipping if the steamer Clyde was taken off her regular route, namely the North Side of Notre Dame Bay, last September and ordered to sail from Port Union to LaScie, and if so why, also how many trips did she make on that route, and is it correct that the instructions issued to the Captain were that she was only to call at ports having Union stores, what was the approximate cost of the number of trips made by this ship on that route, and if the Prospero and Home were, during all that period, serving the same sections and would it not have been to the greater advantage of the Northern Districts if the Clyde had been maintained on her regular route.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In the absence of the Minister of Shipping, I may say that this matter has been referred to the Secretary of the Department of Shipping.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. Michael Power is chief fishery inspector under the Fish Regulations now in force, and if so what compensation he is being paid for his services in that capacity, or what compensation it is proposed to pay him.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table the information.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct and has his department ordered a fish inspector to proceed toward Belleoram for the purpose of inspecting fish on the West Coast after notice of a bill was granted to repeal the Fish Regulations.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I understand that information will be tabled on tomorrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to procure from the Auditor General and lay on the table

of the House a special report explaining and justifying his statement in his general report, that the salt now at Port Union had been sold and that a large sum was due and unpaid thereon by the purchaser.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That matter has been referred to the Auditor General for report.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

- (a) If the cargo of the "President Coaker" was purchased by Joseph Sellars, Esq., from the Union Export Company, Ltd., or the Union Trading Company, Ltd., or directly from individual fishermen, and if the latter, for a statement showing their names, the quantities purchased from each, and the amounts paid them, and at what price per quintal.
- (b) Whether the cargo of the said schooner was paid for by Mr. Sellars in cash, or by cheque, and if the latter, the amount of the cheque and the name of the payee,
- (c) If Mr. Sellars made the charter of the "President Coaker," with whom, when and how, and by whom the rate of freight was arranged, and what are the terms of the charter as to demurrage?
- (d) Has any part of the freight money been paid, and if so how much, by and to whom, and the dates of payment, and by whom is the "President Coaker" owned; if the said vessel is registered in the name of Ellison Collishaw, as owner; whether he is in fact the owner, or merely holds the vessel as security for some person or Company, and if so for whom or what?
- (e) Where the cargo of the said vessel and vessel herself now is?
- (f) Whether any offers for the said cargo have been received, from whom, and how much, and what is now being done with or about

the said cargo, and under whose control, outside this Colony, the disposition of the said cargo now is?

- (g) What amounts have been paid out of public moneys to the said Joseph Sellars for fish, and freight and charges thereon, or for other purposes connected therewith, and by whose authority and by whom such payments have been made, with amounts and dates of the payments?
- (h) If other fish than the cargo of the said vessel has been purchased by Mr. Sellars on Government account, and if so from whom, how much, and at what cost, and where the said fish now is, and what charges, if any, are now being incurred thereon.
- (i) For copies of all correspondence and accounts in connection with Purchased by Mr. Sellars on Government account, and the originals or copies of all cheques issued by or to Mr. Sellars connected therewith, and of the charter party of the "President Coaker."
- (j) Whether he personally arranged with Mr. Sellars to buy for the Government, and for the sale of the cargo of the "President Coaker" to Mr. Sellars, and if he personally arranged with Mr. Sellars for the charter of the "President Coaker," and the advance of money on account of freight, and whether in all the transactions between himself and Mr. Sellars, in this connection he acted as Minister and also President of the Union Trading or Union Export Co., and if not to inform the House who did act for the Government and the said Companies, or either of them respectively, in each of the above-mentioned transactions, and to give the answers hereto in writing.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER:-

The reply to this question was tabled yesterday, and the department is now endeavouring to get a list of those who sold fish to Mr. Sellars.

Mr. Fox asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of all cables passing between the Marine and Fisheries Department, the Hon. W. F. Coaker, and for the Advisory Board, and each and all Newfoundland Trade Commissioners abroad since November last, together with a memorandum showing the total cost of said cables and instructions under which they were sent, etc.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have a memorandum from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries and which I beg to table, in the absence of the Minister.

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing:

- (a) The number and cost in detail of all radiograms, cablegrams and telegrams passing between him and the Marine and Fisheries Department from the time of his departure from the Colony in January until his return last week;
- (b) Of the same between himself and his department or any of its officials;
- (c) Between himself and the Codfish Exportation Board or any of its officials;
- (d) Between himself and the Trade Commissioners or any of the parties purporting to act in the Government's interest and the Fisheries Department, the Codfish Exporters Board or any other persons or organizations, and to accompany this statement with copies.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That information is being prepared.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Martin Gosse, brother of Geo. Gosse,

M.H.A., for Harbor Grace, was employed by the Fisheries Department as an inspector of fish at Dark Tickle, Labrador, last summer; if so, how much was he paid for his services; also if the said Martin Gosse in such capacity inspected fish belonging to the firm of G. & M. Gosse, in which his brother and himself are partners, and if so, how much; also if it is the policy of the Fisheries Department to permit a member of a firm to inspect its own fish and if he considers that certificate of inspection issued under such conditions are of any value whatever.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That information was tabled yesterday.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay upon the table of the House an answer to a question of Mr. Walsh on Order Paper of the 19th.

At half past three of the clock a deputation representing the workmen appeared at the Bar of the House, and through their Chairman, Mr. Edward Whitty, presented a petition and resolution, which were presented to Mr. Speaker, who directed the clerk to read it to the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, that every member of the Legislature sitting on both sides of the House, extends to the representatives of the workingman now at the Bar of this House, a hearty welcome, and not only a hearty welcome but a sincere appreciation of the interest they are taking in the problems affecting the Colony today. Those of us here, members of this House, are representatives of the people, who go to the polls every four years for re-election to office. So the people of this country, the working man and every other man and perchance some day the woman, have the right and I am glad to see them availing themselves of the opportunity, to express their opinions upon the policy and programme of those gentlemen who occupy seats in this chamber. Not only every four years do we go to the polls, but we

as legislators are ever desirous of getting in touch with the sentiments of the working man and all others and being at the same time representatives of various districts, we keep in touch with the sympathies of our constituents so that they may be properly represented and their welfare safe-guarded in this chamber. It consequently gives me great pleasure, being the senior representative for St. John's West, to find that the gentlemen present are constituents of mine and to hear their expression of opinion but the deputation means more than that. These gentlemen present at the Bar of the House are the representatives of a large number of working people who are keenly interested in the subject matter of this petition and secondarily although it is not referred to in the petition, directly yet indirectly the question of unemployment is discussed. In extending a warm welcome to those present at the Bar of this chamber, I desire not only to include the working man but also the distinguished presence of a lady as one of the delegation awaiting upon us in connection with this matter. I extend the privileged welcome to this lady because the problems which affect the working man, affect the woman and necessarily the home. The working man is the husband and to get back to the old Anglo-Saxon expression, "the man has bound the home together, and by his efforts and by his chance of remuneration, the woman and the child must necessarily benefit or suffer. So I am glad and proud to see a lady identified with this petition. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to the recitals but will go to the request directly. First it is asked that the Fishery Regulations be repealed. With regard to the policy of the Government in this connection I will not discuss at the present time. The deputation present is of a non-

political character but the Fishery Regulations have been the source of prolonged political debate in this House and therefore I will only refer to the fact that the Cod Fish Exportation Act which was passed during the last session of the legislature and under which the Regulations became law, is to be repealed as will appear from a notice of a Bill for second reading in to-day's order paper. The second part of the request deals with the repeal of the War Measures Act. The War Measures Act should have gone out of force upon the proclamation of peace, but a latter act was passed continuing the War Measures Act for a further period of six months after the proclamation of peace. I propose to give notice of a Bill during the afternoon amending the subsequent act so that the War Measures Act will go out of force immediately. The War Measures Act during the last six months was used for two purposes, and two purposes only. As there has been a considerable appearance of a great lack of employment both in St. John's and in the Outports, it was proposed to give employment, and in so doing it was necessary to invoke the aid of the War Measures Act in this that to cut pulp wood upon Crown land it was absolutely impossible to do so except under this Act and it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act confirming the action of the Executive Government and thereby making it possible to cut pulp wood and have it exported. The other purpose for which it was used during the past two months was with reference to the seal fishery. An act dealing with the Seal Fishery did not permit steamers to sail except under certain circumstances and on certain dates. This had been necessary because steamers such as the Florizel and the Stephano prosecuted the fishery. These were high pow-

ered boats, the like of which we have not to-day participating in the voyage. With the disappearance of such high powered ships it was necessary to make a change in the law dealing with the date of sailing and the Executive Government could only exercise this power under the War Measures Act. It is proposed to introduce a measure amending the sealing law so that the Governor in Council shall have power to deal with this matter without the aid of legislation passed here. The third matter to which reference is made is the abolition of the Food Control Board. It was appointed under an act passed in this legislature in the year 1917. That act was amended so that the constitution of the Board may be enlarged from three members to six. In the year 1920 the constitution was enlarged from three to six members. In its inception the Board consisted of Sir P. T. McGrath as chairman, Mr. George Grimes and Mr. H. LeMessurier together with the other members of that Board. By the Act passed during the last session of the legislature the number of the Board was enlarged to six and the Board as then re-appointed consisted of Mr. Alex. Mews as chairman in place of Sir P. T. McGrath, who was not removed by the Government but who resigned, Mr. H. LeMessurier continues on, Mr. Grimes who had been a former member had left town and he resigned. Mr. Noel was appointed in addition to Mr. McGrath, then President of 'Longshoremen's Union, and the ex-President of the Board of Trade was appointed a member. That was the Control Food Board in existence during the current fiscal year. In December and January last I was asked to look into the sugar control. And I called a meeting at my office at the Court House, and there attended at the meeting a large number of persons interested in the

handling of sugar, together with the members of the Control Board. Every man who was handling sugar in lots of ten barrels made it his business to attend.

What was the personnel of the delegation or committee at the meeting I do not remember, but the sugar dealers were well represented. The N. I. W. A. as well as other extensive divers interests were also fully represented. The matter was fully discussed, and it was decided that if the Regulations were taken off the Colony would have to face a substantial loss on sugar account. The meeting was of the unanimous opinion that the attempted policy of the control of the food prices in the declining market could not be satisfactorily handled by the board. It was said that it was hard enough for the business men who devoted so much of their time to the question and got little result even under the best circumstances. The board fully realised that those who handled the sugar question in Canada and in the United States had to adopt certain measures, and every one lost when the big slump came, so they came down to the point whether it would be better to keep on the sugar regulations and work them out so as to prevent any loss to the Colony or as little as possible, or whether it was advisable to remove them, and then the Colony, being confronted with a big loss on the transaction, introduce legislation to recoup the loss. The matter was discussed at considerable length. The decision was this. I might say first that the public were asked by the Government to discuss frankly and wholeheartedly as business men and as representative citizens the sugar question and consequently the welfare of Newfoundland, and give opinions as to the wisest course to pursue at that time. The unanimous decision was this, that in the interests of the Colony and in the interests of the community that the

sugar regulations should be maintained. Various arguments why they should be so were advanced. The object of the board was to keep the prices down, which would mean that the individual consumer would just save in proportion to the amount of sugar he consumed and this kept the prices down more so than if another and different policy had been pursued. So if the policy worked out successfully the consumer would save in proportion to the amount of sugar he consumed, and if the policy worked out unsuccessfully the result was that the consumer would bear his loss in proportion to the amount of sugar he consumed. And there have been losses. This could be done in two ways. Either the regulations could be kept on or have the people pay a small tax on sugar so that in any case the loss would be borne in proportion to the amount consumed. But the argument reached the point when the ex-president of the N. I. W. A. took the floor and stated that the best course to follow in the interests of the people he represented and with whom he worked, and with whom he was identified, was to have the operation done with and have it over and have the regulations maintained until they worked themselves out, and it was estimated that would be some time in June. Therefore those who consumed a large quantity would have to bear a large loss and those who consumed a small amount would only have to bear a small loss, while those who consumed none at all would have no loss to bear at all. The decision was not final, however, because I was not sufficiently satisfied owing to the situation developing among the poor which would make it impossible to carry out the programme successfully, so the decision of the members of the board present was that the regulations should come off at any time on a thirty days notice. The reason of this thirty days notice was this: The sugar dealers

would have an opportunity to have their sugar stocks distributed through out Newfoundland by the time the regulations were lifted. The sugar dealers were not prepared to carry stocks unless this was complied with, unless they had a guarantee that the regulations would be maintained for a sufficient number of days to enable those who had quantities of sugar to dispose of the same. So it was accordingly decided that a thirty days notice would be given. At the request, Sir, of the gentlemen, if I may also refer to the lady in this instance as a man, who constitute the committee representing the workingmen of the city, the Government has determined that the thirty days' notice shall be given, announcement of which fact I am informed has already been made in the newspapers.

Consequently, Sir, it gives me very great pleasure to inform the committee through you that the entire matter covered in the resolutions that have been so courteously presented to this House this afternoon has not only been considered but has been acted upon.

We are happy, Sir, to find so many representatives of the workingmen of the city gathered together here under the flag that stands for so much and is so dear to all of us. We are glad that they have so well succeeded in laying before this House a plan for dealing with a situation of such vital importance to all, and two points of which have already been carried out. That \$50,000 for the Long Bridge is a specific vote for that purpose to work in conjunction with the municipality. It was my intention, with the concurrence of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Jennings, with whom I did not have the opportunity of discussing this matter before, and he hears it now for the first time, and I trust he will pardon me, to ask the Public Works Department to permit the expenditure of that money jointly by the

City Engineer and by the Government Engineer, and to permit that money to be made immediately available for any wages as were found necessary to be paid before the Royal Bank of Canada will be able to finalize its loan proposition. Thus my answer to the first question is that \$50,000 is put to the credit of the Department of Public Works, and which I know will have the personal attention of my friend, Mr. Jennings, who I am sure will see that it is judiciously disposed of in the way indicated. The \$150,000 will be met, principal and interest, in the way required by the manager of the Royal Bank of Canada and in accordance with the procedure which always has been followed in connection with such guarantees.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 6, Geo. V. Cap. 4, entitled, 'An Act to Amend the War Measures Act, 1914.'"

Sir J. C. Crosbie moved, and Hon. the Prime Minister seconded the following resolution, with unanimous consent of the House:

"RESOLVED: That this House desires to place on record an expression of its disapproval of the article which appeared in 'The Daily Star' newspaper of April 19th, under the heading, 'The Book of Habakkuk.'"

This resolution was carried unanimously.

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

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, In rising to support the amendment now under discussion, I do so, Sir, for the purpose of putting on record my position in connection with this matter, and my desire to have the Fish Regulations stricken off the Statute Book for all time. They were given a trial far beyond their merits. It was seen from the start that they were going to cause considerable loss, and that they

were going to have disastrous results. The predictions that were made, particularly by members of this side of the House, have been fully borne out, and far-reaching and disastrous results have followed the enforcement of the Regulations. I wish to point out that no personal or abusive tactics will be used by me in discussing this matter, and I trust that hon. members on the other side of the House will feel that anything I say does not refer to them individually; but it refers to them collectively; it refers more to members of the Government than to members of the party. The criticisms that I am about to make are based on information which has been tabled in this House since this Legislature met three weeks ago; and I think, Sir, we are fully justified in criticising the members of the Government on their record for the past eighteen months.

Before I go into the thing fully, I would like to refer briefly to the speech which the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made in this House the day before yesterday. It was published in his official organ, "The Evening Advocate." In reading over the Minister's speech there are several points that struck my notice, and some of them are very applicable to conditions in this country today. I notice, Sir, he says that in France the people changed their Government four times since the war. Well, if conditions in France were anything like the conditions that we are up against here in Newfoundland, I do not wonder at the Frenchmen having changed four times; and the only thing that surprises me is that we have not changed this Government twenty-four times.

Mr. Coaker gets off a lot of hot air in his speech. Whether it is for the purpose of bull-dozing us or whether he thinks that the members on this side of the House and the country generally are not as conversant with public affairs both here as well as in

the Old World as he is, I do not know. He asks we very plausibly and very diplomatically were the Regulations to blame for the Norwegian Government dumping all the fish caught by the Norwegians during the years 1917-18-19 upon all our foreign markets last years and given out on consignment and at any price. No, Sir, we do not propose to say that the Regulations were responsible for this; but, Sir, that is what I call blind-folding the devil in the dark. Why did not the Minister tell this House and this country what was responsible for the low price for Norwegian fish? He knows as well as you do, Mr. Speaker, that the Norwegian catch for 1917-18 was not disposed of, he knows that the British Government bought that fish and paid for that fish to keep it from going into German markets. That is why the Norwegian Government dumped their fish and undersold us; but they did not lose anything like what the Minister would try and have us believe. The Minister says that they lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Well, he is either mistaken or he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Coaker goes on to say in his speech that the reason we are suffering in Newfoundland today is because of the way in which the Fishery Regulations were carried out. Yes, he is quite right in that assertion. We are suffering because of the Regulations and are suffering a great deal more because of the way in which the Regulations were carried out. If all one can hear is true, there was rampant discrimination practised in the carrying out of the Regulations. One man could inspect his own fish and have it passed, and another man had better fish turned down; one man could get a permit to ship his fish to the foreign markets, and another had his fish held up for months. Mr. Coaker also says that the Act was not given the necessary power for enforcement. He took good care to have all the power he

wanted to have them enforced, and he enforced them until the exporters would not stand for it any longer.

There is one thing in his speech that I must say I agree with to a great extent, and that is the statement that nothing could be accomplished by lifting the Regulations in January last. I agree with that as far as Portugal was concerned, but only as far as Portugal was concerned, because, Sir, the men who advocated the lifting of them in Portugal went against the advice of the men who had staked their all in that market. I made this same statement here last Monday week in speaking on the Speech from the Throne. The men who had fish in Portugal controlled ninety per cent. of the fish there. The Minister and others who owned 90 per cent. of the fish in Portugal begged the individual members of the Government to prohibit the exportation of any more fish to Portugal until the 3rd of April; but no heed was paid by those members of the Government who knew nothing, and cared less, of the conditions that existed in Portugal; and they sacrificed such men and firms like Mr. Samuel Harris, the Marystown Trading Company, Mr. Joseph Sellars and the Union Export Company, who were the people who owned ninety per cent. of the fish that last were sold at a profit. Well if those all-wise people in St. John's lifted the Regulations. I do not know whether they were trying to get back at Mr. Coaker or what was their intention, but evidently Mr. Coaker was knifed. These firms that I referred to had their fish sold, provided there was no other shipments made from this country before the 3rd of April. What happened? Those buyers in Portugal, when the information was flashed over the cables that the Regulations had been lifted—those people who were prepared to pay a high price for our fish—said no, we are not going to buy now at your price, we are going to

wait, as there will be lots of fish over here in a little while, and we are going to buy at our own price. The consequence is that four firms dropped hundreds of thousands of dollars over that transaction, and these firms will be considerably hampered from outfitting and supplying fishermen the coming season for the fishery. I would not like to have to face the contingencies that some Hon. members in this House have to face. Some of them will not have the nerve to go back for re-election, because they know what is before them. Mr. Coaker further said in his speech that the Act is utterly valueless at present. Yes, and the Government is making a death-bed repentance by having it repealed at this late date.

Mr. Coaker tells us that most of the exports of codfish up to January last were sold at a profit. Well if most of the exports were sold at a profit, why all this outcry? Why this tale of woe that we have been listening to—Why those rumours of insolvency on Water Street? There is something wrong somewhere. If all the sales of fish made up to the end of January last were made at a profit surely things cannot be so bad with the merchants as one is led to suppose.

Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refers to salt again. So far as stocking salt previous to this year is concerned there may be some excuse, but there is no reason why it is necessary for the Government to go into the sale business again this year. Surely after looking over the record of the big muddle made on importations last year, and recognising the fact that there is any amount of salt around the country, and recognising the fact that there is no likelihood of a shortage, what explanation can the Government give for buying five thousand tons of salt recently on the other side. It would

be all very well while the war was on, but now the war is over. We want the merchants of the country, to carry on the business of the country and we do not want any interference from the Government. Later on Mr. Coaker went on to say that he did not think the men of the north would condemn him, because, as he says himself, I got clear of their fish for them when disaster faced them. He is quite right. He took jolly good care of his own supporters in the north who had Labrador fish to sell; but what provision did he make for those fishermen north who had shore fish to sell and what provision did he make for those who had shore fish to sell on the West Coast, the South Shore and all the other districts. I want him to forget that when he comes into the House of Assembly that he does not really represent any one constituency alone; he does not represent Twillingate or Bonavista or Trinity, but he represents with the rest of us, the people of Newfoundland. He seems to have lost sight of that fact, that they are all his people. We are members of the House of Parliament of Newfoundland, not members of the House of Parliament of Trinity, Bonavista or Port Union.

Then the Hon. gentleman comes in here with his appeal after what Sir Michael Cashin had told this House. The Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries had stated that we are up against conditions to-day which we never had to face before, to which Sir Michael Cashin replied, you have brought them on yourself. The Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries went on to say, it does not matter who is responsible, it is of no use talking about what has been done, but what is to be done in the future. This is not the time to be thrashing this matter out in the House, the Fishermen will soon be coming here for

supplies. Then he goes on to say, for what I am responsible I am ready to take my medicine, but I don't think that the Hon. gentleman can be sincere. He wants us to carry on with the business here. As there was no mention of abolishing the Fish Regulations in the Speech from the Throne, we brought in an Amendment to that Speech to compel the Government to abolish them. When Mr. Higgins was speaking here the other day, he asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries if it was his intention to vote for this Amendment. After the question had been put to him ten or fifteen times, he said No. Does that show that he was sincere in his wish for us to get down to business. We were prepared to put that to the vote at once, but for some reason, best known to himself he refused to vote for that Amendment. This Amendment would have the same effect as the Bill which the Government are going to introduce, then if the Hon. Mr. Coaker was sincere in his statements why did he not vote for it. Why didn't his supporters vote for it. Those men knew that their leader was knifed while he was on the other side over the fish deal with Portugal. Now why don't they insist that the right thing be done in this matter.

Now to get back. I listened with the closest attention to the remarks of the Hon. Minister, the father of the Regulations, the man who had staked his all on them, and I must say that he has been man enough to get up and admit that he has made a mistake, and he has given a pledge to this House that the Regulations will be repealed, and he has given notice of a bill for that purpose, and that bill is now to be tabled. His reply, sir, to the criticisms of several speakers on this side of the House who have been denouncing the policy of the Government for the past three

weeks, is not the speech that one would have looked for from him. The weak excuse put forward by him in no way palliates the criminal waste, folly, and extravagance, and lack of statesmanship as shown by the Government now in power. His excuses, his pleas for mercy will not bring back to the people of the country the hundreds of thousands of dollars lost to the country because of the enforcement of the Fish Regulations. We expected him, sir, to put forward some plausible reason, which would account for the conditions now in the country, we expected him to make some pronouncement as to how they were going to get us out of this hole, in which the mad policy of the Government has placed the country, but there is nothing doing. We have waited in vain, Sir, for the Prime Minister to make some statement and give us an outline of his intended policy, if policy he has, and show this House and the people of the country how he expects to avoid the breakers ahead, and in fact all round us. I do not want to be personal in my remarks. For the Hon. the Prime Minister in private life I have the highest respect. He is an educated gentleman, and one who could uphold his position anywhere, but as a politician he is a misfit. He lacks the statesmanship and ability which he thought he had. He fails in leadership, because a man who cannot control cannot lead, and I am sure it has been proven to one and all, that the Prime Minister has had no control, of the Government. He has allowed himself to be dictated to in the interests of certain sections of the country, to the great detriment of other parts of it. With reference to the policy of the great Liberal Reform Party which has been going on since you took office. You have, sir, gone into it with your eyes open. You know

at the last session of this House, it was pointed out to you from this side that you were going to jump too fast, that we were going to pass through a very trying time, the aftermath of the War, you would be faced with a greatly depleted purchasing power, a drop of from twenty-three to twelve million dollars, surely it was unnecessary to tell you that with your purchasing power dropped to that extent there must be a falling off in the Revenue, it was impossible to get a revenue like the preceding years. Our predictions on this side of the House, have been verified. Instead of a revenue of twelve million dollars which you anticipate, or perhaps you only anticipated eleven, your revenue to-day or rather on June 30th will not exceed seven million dollars, and when you come to realise that it is necessary to have twelve million dollars to carry on the country a child can see what is before us. With a large falling off in the Revenue, a loss of one hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars on Sugar, a loss on Salt, and a loss of one million or one and a half million dollars on that pet scheme of the Government, the Railway, you can realise where we are and where we are going. You gentlemen who compose that Government, members of the Executive are you not proud of the position you are in to-day? Will you be able to say to your constituents, we have come back to you, judge us on our record? You can imagine what will happen you. They will not say, "Well done good and faithful servant." No, I know what they will say and so do you. Never in the history of the country have conditions been so bad, so appalling as today. You members of the Government, great big men who were going to do wonders came into power eighteen months ago, with everything possible to have in your favour. You

came in here with the confidence of the people of Newfoundland, backed by a great big overwhelming vote, you came in here with an overflowing Treasury, a big surplus of $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 million dollars which you could draw on. Where is that surplus to-day? I am up here now and I am criticising you but I can sincerely say in my heart of hearts I am sorry for you reformers, sorry for you, because you have the people of the country down on you. It is not local, it is not only in St. John's, but all over the country. You came into power, sir, when the people of the country, were contented, peaceful, prosperous and happy.

You came in as Trustees of that surplus, which I referred to before. If your leader, Sir, had been a politician he would have been more conciliating, but he was a big man at that time he had a country behind him, and he thought he could attack with impunity the men on this side of the House, he thought his Organ could say what they liked about the men here, if they dared to open their mouths. If a man made an error, of grammar he was sneered at. That may be politics but it is not the kind that I want nor the majority of the men on this side or the other side of the House want either. If we opened our mouths we were sneered at. If the Hon. the Prime Minister had adopted different tactics he would have the men on this side of the House standing by him to-day, and helping him to take the country out of the rotten condition that his mad-cap policy has brought it into. Now, Sir what have you reformers done in your eighteen months of office? Can you show one measure beneficial to the country, a measure that will have for its aim and object the betterment of the masses. What have you done for the stimulation of Trade? That was what the country

needed what the people were looking for, what they expected from you reformers. What really happened? Whenever it was possible to do the wrong thing you did it every time, with your Fish Regulations, Sugar Regulations, Railway deals, Salt deals. You have proceeded at a head-long gallop to bring this country as low as it is possible for a country to go, and yet recover. I do not say it is hopeless, but we have made a bad start and what we need is harmony and unity, whether that harmony and unity can be acquired by the present Government composed as it is, I have no doubts. Men on both sides of the House realise that we are in a very awkward position, and it will require the best brains and ability of the public men of Newfoundland to deal with it, if we are going to be kept off the rocks. You gentlemen on that side of the House, you have to face a terrible indictment. You are here giving an account of your stewardship, and that stewardship is one that you cannot be very proud of. What has brought about this change in the people? The people are awake, they realize where we are going and whither tending, and they realize the criminal waste, and folly, and extravagance of the Government, are responsible for the conditions we are now up against. There is want all over the country, and I heard Sir Michael Cashin state to-day that there are people starving all over the country. I will tell you of an incident that occurred in my district. While we were here yesterday a telegram was placed on my desk stating that a young man in Placentia Bay had just died of starvation, and want of proper clothing. Isn't that something for the twentieth century? Isn't that a record we ought to be proud of, and that is only one instance. When I spoke here after my return from England, I said that a woman on the

West Shore of Placentia Bay had died of starvation last winter, now we have a young man of nineteen years of age who died from the same cause. Look at what happened here today. Hundreds of men and women coming up here and pleading for work. Never since I have been in public life have I seen anything like it, and it should not be. The surplus which you had left to you, you have wasted and you cannot give the people employment because you have no money to carry on the public works. Now, Sir, with reference to the statement made here this afternoon by the Hon. the Prime Minister, that the Fish Regulations were going to be abolished, and the Sugar Regulations would be abolished, and that the War Measures Act would be abandoned or amended, it is quite clear to the men on this side of the House and I think to the people of the country that up to a few days ago the Government had no intention of abolishing the Fish Regulations, or the Sugar Regulations, or the War Measures Act, we come to that conclusion by its omission from the Speech from the Throne. The Prime Minister knew that the people were up in arms over the Fish Regulations and the Sugar Control. Then if it was the intention of the Government to abolish these Regulations, don't you think that they would have taken the first opportunity of telling the people of the country so. The people of the West Coast, and the South Coast were up in arms over these matters, and the people of the North although they were paid for their fish with Government money, many of them were opposed to the Fish Regulations. The reason they were taken off is that the men on this side of the House backed by the people insisted that they be taken off. Your policy, Sir, has been one of strangulation of trade instead of stimulation as we expected. Now,

Sir, as I stated before we are here as representatives of the people, not one section of the country but the whole country as every man in this House should be. We are criticising your extravagance, your failures, and as we made you repeal the Fish Regulations and the Sugar Regulations, so surely will we see to it in future that you carry out a sound and sane policy, and we will keep you from going outside this House and on Executive responsibility wasting the finances of the country. We will see that in future if an extraordinary emergency arises that this House be convened immediately to deal with it, and get proper authority from this legislature for any course of action to be adopted, and not to go away and take over the Railway on Executive responsibility as you did last year a few days after the closing of the House, not to take a half million dollars from the Treasury to purchase Labrador Fish from a certain section of the country, to the detriment of other parts of the island. Now while I am on this matter I would like to refer to a few replies which I received in answer to questions asked. I might say for the information of the men on both sides of the House, that at the last session my colleagues and myself received a pledge from the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he would erect a Fog Alarm in St. Mary's Bay. The people there for many years have been crying out for a fog alarm. It is only a few years ago a boat was lost, on one of the docks in St. Mary's Bay and if the fog alarm had been there then those men would be alive to-day. The answer I got is as follows: That the Government had decided to erect a fog alarm, but in view of the detrenchment policy the Government feared they would be unable to carry out their pledge.

That is the kind of stuff we have to

put up with. A half million dollars can be taken out of the Treasury to buy Labrador fish from a certain section of the country, and we cannot get one or two thousand dollars to put up an aid to navigation, and not alone would that fog alarm be a benefit to St. Mary's Bay, but to every man who follows the sea for a calling, and when the Estimates come in my colleagues and myself will have something to say about this matter.

Another thing, last year we read about a most important thing. There was going to be a directional wireless station erected on the South Coast. I wish the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was here, and he would endorse everything I say about that wireless station. In reply to my question of what the Government intended doing with reference to establishing another directional wireless signal station, the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries informed this House that negotiations were going on, but that nothing definite had been decided. Well, it is time something was decided about this important aid to navigation. Are we to wait for another marine disaster before the Government wakes up and realises the importance of this matter? It was only on our trip down from Sydney that we realized the great value and importance of the wireless directional station. With the assistance of a wireless directional station a ship can come into St. John's even if she has been out in the fog a month. When we were coming down on the "Kyle" we got out of the ice some distance south of St. Pierre, and in a dense fog. We got in touch with the wireless directional station at Canso, and later got in touch with the station at Cape Race. When we heard the horn at Cape Race it was direct ahead, as the captain told us it would be. If there was a directional station on the South Coast no more ships with a wireless outfit would go ashore.

Now just a word for the Minister of

Posts and Telegraphs. There is no excuse for him whatever. There is every reason why there should be a telegraph office and telephone communication at St. Shott's and Cape Pine. We left the poles there all ready to be used, and we left the money to do the work. Now after eighteen months in office the Minister comes in here and says that the work has not been completed. Then he goes on to say that the people at St. Shott's objected to the line taken to St. Shott's and wanted it to Trepassey instead of Peter's River. Surely, Sir, we do not have to stand for this. I have gone to the Minister several times, but I hope, Sir, that it will not be necessary for me to go again.

Now, Sir, regarding the sugar business, I see the regulations will be lifted the 20th of May. On the 29th February, according to the Auditor General's report, we were out \$195,000.00, nearly \$200,000.00, and I doubt if the amount is much smaller now. We are going to lose at least \$100,000.00. Is not this sufficient evidence that the Government ought to go out of the commission business? I would like to have a statement tabled showing how much the Government has lost on sugar, how much was lost on the amount purchased in Montreal, and the amount of 50 tons bought from a friend in New York.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the Comptrollers and Auditor General's Report. It is an eye-opener. I believe there are members on the other side of the House and even members of the Executive who have not seen this report yet. They told us last year that there would not be a big supplementary estimate ever brought in again. Now look at this. In the first place there are 65 new appointments and salaries. What do you think of that? Perhaps some of the gentlemen on the other side can tell me who some of the gentlemen are as we come along to them. The Posts and Telegraphs De-

partment shows an expenditure of \$107,000. The amount asked for and voted in this connection was \$50,000, thus showing an expenditure over the amount voted of \$57,000. Then we come to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This you must remember is only up to the 29th of February. Inspectors' salaries, \$32,794.30; general expenses, \$8,557. Then there is the lobster propagation. The amount voted was \$23,000, and the amount expended was \$34,000, an increase of \$11,000. If that, gentlemen, is not criminal waste, I don't know what is; \$34,000 for a few lobsters, or giving a few fellows a job. Now listen to this, gentlemen. See where your money goes: Furniture for the lunatic asylum, \$31,449; furniture for the sanatorium over \$48,000. Salaries and motor services for where? over \$21,000. Consolidation of the laws over \$17,000. Gentlemen, isn't this great? Then there is the coal exploration, pit-prop account, and the airplane account.

I saw here somewhere where we were paying someone to take care of the Carbonear fire hall. What have we got to do with the Carbonear fire hall? That should be paid out of the road grants.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the course of his remarks stated that the Regulations were an artificial prop. But he did not state in what way they were a prop. What has been propped up by him? The Fish Regulations, Sir, have done one thing: they have succeeded in alienating from us our fish markets, and it will be a long time before we get the good-will of those markets again. But the country will be thankful that the Opposition have succeeded in getting the Regulations removed from the Statute Books, and before we are finished we are going to have other obnoxious legislation removed also.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, may I, Sir, once again crave the indulgence of this House for a

few minutes. In doing so, Sir, I feel very sad, very sad indeed, that there is an attempt being made to bring about in this country a split between man and man, and he who is guilty of that thing will find that one day it will fall on his own head. I am not referring very much to the Daily Star of today, but to yesterday's. In the editorials of yesterday one Dr. Mosdell, assisted by one Anderson Squires, I have no doubt whatever about that, refer to my threat on that paper, that if I did not get satisfaction by appeal to the owner I would get it in another way. I did not appeal to mob violence to shut up the Star. That could be done by the simpler method of issuing a writ, and I understand that a writ for about \$6000.00 has already been issued.

Hid away in a corner of yesterday's Star is an article which is a standing disgrace. An honest attempt was made by the members of the Opposition to help the country, but if any man on this side of the House after the appearance of that article, except Mr. Bennett, co-operated with the Government in any way I would consider that he did not have a drop of good blood in his veins. It is full of blasphemy, and is the vilest stuff that has ever appeared in the public press of this country. This is not good enough from you, Sir, and I am not going to stand here as a Protestant and take it from you, by jingo. I am tired serving notices on you regarding the rotten stuff that has been appearing in this paper, and a man who is Prime Minister of this Colony assisting with a rag of this kind.

It is one of the most disgraceful articles ever written. You may sit with your eyes closed, Mr. Squires, but you know about it and you stand in my sight today as the most condemned man who ever sat in the Premier's chair. Now I will appeal to Mr. Warren and the other Protestant

gentlemen opposite. Criticism is alright, but the man who gets down to such depths as to blaspheme the religion to which he belongs is a cur. I would like to have the Hon. Mr. Foote and other members here to hear this article read. Instead of having to deal with such filth, this House should be getting down to business and trying to save the country from ruin. We are faced by a serious problem to-day, the Government cannot save the situation and when such articles as this appear, how can they expect this side to help them. This article is indecent, dirty and low and I don't think there is one member on the other side but will hang his head in shame when he hears it. There is only one place for the writer, jail. The one who sits down and writes such stuff is a cad and a scoundrel. Listen, gentlemen, and tell me or the country afterwards what you think of the man who issues a paper, the mouthpiece of the Government, and which goes forth broadcast to stir up religious bickering and strife. It is written by a hand which is cloaked, but is used to the business.

(Reads a paragraph).

Gentlemen, how long are you going to stand that kind of thing? How long is Mr. Warren going to stand it? Will it be for any length of time? Is this article intended to try and stir up strife among the city men. If that be so the young Tribune will find they are different from the rest. I am here, as a Protestant to-day, say this is not in the interests of friendly feeling and good-fellowship. It is the deed of a warped mind.

(Continues reading).

"Will drink Protestant rum." Was there ever such a thing written in the history of the country before. Can we stand idle and let it go by? I appeal to all who know right from wrong, is this to be permitted. Every

citizen has certain rights that should be respected.

(Continues reading).

Isn't it lovely Scripture to go forth to the world and broadcast thru the Island. Have we so far forgotten ourselves and fallen so low as not to protest. I won't stand for it even if I have to do the trick myself.

(Continues reading)

I take it as Mr. Warren apparently does and consider it both contemptible and cowardly. He, like myself, realizes these writings must come to a stop.

(Continues reading)

"Smacks were exchanged." I know nothing about them.

(Continues reading)

Oh, gentlemen, isn't this beautiful literature for a man to bring into his house and lay before his children; and the one responsible for it hangs his head in shame.

(Continues reading)

What beautiful sarcasm on Scripture to those who know what is right. But there is something more serious behind this than some may think. The country is being sacrificed to-day through the stirring up of petty religious feeling. I appeal to the gentlemen opposite to oppose this to the best of their ability. If it continues something is going to happen and no man can tell what. If ever a blasphemous, scurrilous article appeared this is the finish. After reading this I can understand why the Government is gone.

Mr. Speaker, you are in a most unique position to-day to have to sit here under the most scurrilous article ever read in the House, and I am sorry to have been the one to bring it up. Now what do you say Messrs. Winsor, Abbott, Jennings and the rest of you. There are lots of things done by a man in the heat of a political fight in order to gain votes that I hold nothing against him

for. But when things have settled down, why should every one opposed to him be subjected to dirty attack and held up to ridicule. Why was this done all through the year in the Star. Has it been done in the Telegram, Advocate or News? No, and the only reason it was carried on in the Star is because the great stock in trade of Robert the Tribune is to make Catholic hate Protestant and Protestant hate Catholic. That's your stock in trade, Sir. I have been appealed to by members of the Government to help them out of the present situation, out of the difficulties into which they have plunged the country. But I would prefer to get out of the House for ever and ever than be here debating writings so despicable that the Prime Minister himself is ashamed of them. I want to say to you, men in the gallery, that while the country is going to the dogs we are kept here dickering over this filth and trash.

Can you expect me or Mr. Bennett or any of the Opposition to help the Government out of its serious situation? They can't get help from me, nor I think from Mr. Bennett. No man should be guilty of allowing such articles to be written. I asked you, Mr. Premier, a few days ago to have them stopped. The people came here today to ask for bread, to have obnoxious regulations lifted, and to the best of your ability you are going to do it. Still you allow this stuff, which takes up so much time in debating, to be published. Why not rise above all this contemptible stuff, say: "I am the young tribune," go up to your office and perform the work which the people expect. But no, your brain is warped. I am as responsible to the people of my district, to the Catholics as well as Protestants, as you are to those of yours, and they want something practical done. Why can't you stop this thing? When I forgot little

differences and sat in a chair near you, things were alright, but now I have to stand here and defend myself against charges of the lowest kind. The attack is made that I fought a strike here, but I never did it with the object of hurting the people. What I did was to fight for the power to discharge a man, and that was only fighting for my rights as an employer. That's the fact, and I don't care who knows it. My opponents tried to defeat me in the last election in Port de Grave by influencing the Catholic vote, but they could not do it. If a woman comes to me and asks for charity, I do not question what denomination she belongs to—all churches are alike to me in such a case. If my associates are prepared to stand for it, I am not going to have it, and am ready to stand alone. But they will not allow it to go on. Mr. Squires, can't you help in this matter and do something to save yourself? As sure as you continue these tactics, your crowd will desert you as they do not like your tricks. The fishermen today are asking for supplies, and we want no more of this stuff, which delays the business of the House. You want the hand of fellowship from me, but still we can't do anything because we have to deal with this trash. Why are the South and West Coasts sacrificed while we are doing nothing? Was there ever such an article written before? I realise fully as does the writer that the "hand above" will make him suffer for this. Would to God the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were here to listen to some of my stories, and I can tell you where the Prime Minister would be tomorrow. Men on the other side will agree with me that this is a matter clear of politics, and I believe they will not stand for it any longer. I don't want to go forth to my fellowmen with inflammatory speeches calculated to create the spirit of ill-feeling and spilling of blood, but I ask

them to do right. I recall the Government cannot do everything, but the man responsible for this article is a disgrace to the country he was born in. I do not think I feel this situation more keenly than do Mr. Warren and Mr. Foote. For heaven's sake help your leaders to save them from themselves. Look at me, you representatives of the men from the North as well as the West. I am prepared to help in the present crisis, but cannot help feeling that this is the most scurrilous thing ever written. What are we going to do about it? One word I would like to say to Mr. Squires: cut out this stuff. I will have more to say if it is not stopped, as patience will cease to be a virtue. I ask the Attorney General and all others on the opposite side: do you want a fight from me and Mr. Bennett, or assistance? Issue the word, and this House goes no further. I am on my own responsibility today, and I say that nothing more will be done here than I can help, if this trouble is not stopped. I know that the Prime Minister has many troubles, but I will not help him till these attacks cease, or leave the floor till something is done in the matter. Sir M. P. Cashin may be a bull, or I may be a bull, but the Prime Minister has never seen my horns yet. I will stop the business of this House no matter what happens or what the results may be to me. I ask you now, Sir, coolly and calmly, to stop this thing. I say to you, gentlemen in the gallery, that this speech is made with the object of stopping this writing and in order to help the country, and I hope you will go away without any ill-feeling in your minds. I sincerely wish that Mr. Squires will see his mistake. I cannot stop any writings in "The News" or "Telegram," I have no power over them; I am only one man. But I ask you now to cut out this appealing to religion and sectarianism,

to take the hand of fellowship and see if we cannot do something to save the country; help the people and quit yourself like a man. If the thing I complain of happens again, the row will begin.

MR. MACDONNELL:—I did not see the article in question at all, but my reason for making a few remarks is this: Any person in politics is apt to be blessed, or cursed, with political god-fathers. In yesterday's "Advocate" I saw that the people had sat in solemn conclave, in Port Rexton, a place I have never visited, discussed my affairs and decided to act in that capacity to me. Their intention was, because of some things I was alleged to have said, to drive me out of public life, as some years ago they did the present Prime Minister. Now, gentlemen, this is the august body which poses as judges of what has been appearing in the papers. I suggest to Messrs. Halfyard, Targett and Guppy to send them a copy of "The Star" at their next meeting and bring this article to their notice and let them pass judgment on the one responsible as they did on us.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I crave the indulgence of the House to follow the last two speakers. Like Mr. MacDonnell, I have not seen the article in question; I may say that I am not a very careful student of the press. I give all my support to Sir John Crosbie in his criticism of this article, as its style is blasphemous and its form such as to tend to the stirring up of strife in the community. All his observations are justified in full by the article as read. I am sorry, however, that he should preface his remarks by the suggestion that I was the writer or knew anything of the article. I don't think he meant just that, but having to denounce it and being indignant and somewhat excited, let himself be led away in his form of expression. I am not respon-

sible for it. I stand up for anything I do. I do not think he intended to convey the impression that I was responsible when he stated so. His reference here is something like that to the \$6,000 claim. It has always been in my power to liquidate my claims, and I hope to meet all others. That this claim will be liquidated I have every reason to believe. Beyond looking to my own responsibilities, however, as a creditor of "The Star," my duties end in this direction. My further connection with the paper is due entirely to my personal friendship with the editor and many of the staff. I have known Dr. Mosdell and Mr. St. John for years, and have every faith in their ability to control the paper well. As to the matter that goes in the paper, I know nothing. Sir John Crosbie a few days ago referred to an article in this paper, and I agreed with him that personalities were no part of real politics. Such are a fight among the newspapers only, to make a holiday. Legislation benefits nothing by it, the members are hurt and the reputation of the country abroad is damaged. Go to Boston, New York or London and you will find the papers there ahead of you saying one set of men are great fellows and the other a parcel of rogues. The papers on the other side of politics simply reverse the process and have the first set as rogues and the others as fine men. The result is that all are discredited, while this personal abuse and vicious attack goes forth in the press. Here in the House, however, when such is done, the man guilty generally takes steps not to have his name appear in the Hansard. Everyone who has heard the article in question read, must regret that it should have been published, and particularly do I resent the fact that my name has been treated lightly and joked with in a paper which I have been blamed with con-

trolling. This paper is not a Government one, and may oppose it in a fortnight's time if the owners and directors are so concerned. I do not wish to suggest that the editorial writers will change their opinions over night. Sir John Crosbie must have heard me wrongly the other day.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—My impression was that you ran "The Star" but you say you do not own it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I could as a creditor proceed to wind up its affairs.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—This kind of thing must be stopped, and I am going to move a vote of censure that if these articles are continued all Government printing be taken from "The Star" and all perquisites from the Government to Dr. Mosdell be stopped.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I second the motion, if it amounts to a vote of censure on that article. I entirely agree with the sentiment expressed, and the sooner such writings are stopped the better. I am of the opinion that the country is being damaged by them. Last year this House lost night after night, and this year, too, hours have been spent in debate relating to personal matters. In my own case the dictionary has been pruned for words and expressions to use in connection with me and all my affairs. On my own part I have not used offensive language to anyone in the House. I am prepared to be aggressive but have always made it a point to show courtesy to opponents and not go beyond the point where references were fair or impute imbecility, clownishness, etc., to them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You brought it on yourself. I can't listen to your hypocritical talk and will not listen to this. You are a political hypocrite of the worst kind

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I was stating that in any debate I had not been personally impudent to anyone here.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is my feeling: that you are a hypocrite and I won't listen to your bluff. You will have to cart me out of here. You brought it all on yourself.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Ways may be found of getting you out all right. I did not, Mr. Speaker, on any occasion interrupt my honorable friend.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You were too great a coward. But you went to your dirty rag and attacked even my child. Sit down—you can't cure what you have done.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I am not responsible for what appears in "The Star." I concur with Sir John Crosbie that as far as the article in question is concerned it should be condemned.

MR. BENNETT:—I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the resolution and to briefly express my views in relation to this article. I only heard part of it as read by Sir John Crosbie. I think the House will commend the action of Sir John in bringing this matter up as his doing so has gone far to remedy a state of affairs in this country that for years has been damaging us at home and abroad. We all must live here; we have all a stake in the country and to progress properly we must have common interests. If a wedge is driven between the people and encouragement given from any quarter to the passion and prejudice that has been apparent the last 7 or 8 years a man will not be judged according to his abilities but by the altar at which he worships. I ask you, gentlemen, if I have not always put my face against this cursed sectarianism. I have been associated with members of all denominations; I have been closely identified with Lord Morris, a Catholic,

and I will not take second place to any man in the country on this question. I know as much, or more, of this matter than any man in the House as I have been connected with both Catholics and Protestants—and I have always deplored the efforts of some politicians to stir up religious feeling which has ever brought condemnation on the heads of the perpetrators. We are now in a position from which it needs the best of all to free us. This is no time for personal abuse, misrepresentation or blasphemous writing that has nothing but an injurious effect on the people. Let us be Newfoundlanders first, then Catholics or Protestants and we will be doing our duty by the people. We have a country worth fighting for, a country which is a pride to the Empire, a country whose name has been emblazoned high on the roll of honor by the blood of our sons, and are we to disgrace the fame these gallant lads won for us. Let an effort be made to cleanse the Press and make it fit to enter the homes of Newfoundland. Let the Prime Minister, who has influence with the Government press through the patronage on which they largely depend, serve notice on them to-morrow that nothing detrimental, such as the article complained of, is to be published by them. Let the Leader of the Opposition, if necessary, do the same with the other papers. Let the prestige of this House be felt throughout the land and then it will be possible for us to get down to legislation and secure the integrity of Newfoundland. I want no dirty line of ill-feeling and sectarianism while there are important questions to be solved. The present difficulties are so enormous, the responsibilities so great that any man may well shudder to face them. This was demonstrated this very afternoon when the hundreds of unemployed sent 10 or 12 orderly, dignified men to the Bar of this House

with their message. It is unfortunate it is true, that this was necessary but we must take things as we find them. Hundreds were outside the building, but there was no dissension, they waited patiently to hear what steps were to be taken to relieve the distress among the people. Is this our response to those who sent us here to cure their troubles to relieve their wants? Must we be compelled to waste our time discussing blasphemous writings such as read here this afternoon. The Prime Minister in seconding the resolution has taken responsibility for this thing and it must be stopped. If that is done we will do everything possible to help the Government in forwarding legislation but we don't want to go to our homes after the House closes and pick up papers that are traducing us and holding us up to scorn before our families. They have even gone so far as to reflect on the physical defects of ourselves or children. Mr. Walsh referred to this kind of thing yesterday. This is not good enough and I appeal to the men of both sides to let this be the last of it and when each goes to his altar let him go, remembering he is a Newfoundlander, and God bless him.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I think the House will be unanimous in passing this resolution. I feel that Sir John Crosbie has done a service in bringing it in and that Hon. Mr. Squires in seconding it has expressed the sentiments of his party. I assure the House that as far as lays in my power this line of abuse and starting of sectarianism will be stopped. It is enough to drive one out of political life and I feel like retiring if it continues. The handling of this article may be a lesson to those who may think they can edit a paper in violation of all rights and proprieties.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I have no use for personal abuse in or out of a paper. When any

objectionable article appears in the Star or Advocate I claim it does not represent the Government and the quicker it is stopped the better. I am prepared to vote for the motion and give it my heartiest support. I recognize it is a time that demands all our powers to get over and I took no notice of articles in the press as far as myself was concerned. I see, however, that others take them seriously and it is time for us to go on record and let the Press and public know we do not want it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE then moved the resolution which was carried unanimously as follows:

(Reads Resolution)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Cap. 18, 8, Geo. V., entitled 'The Food Control Act, 1917,'" and Acts in amendment thereof.

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.

THURSDAY, April 21st, 1921.

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

Petitions were presented by Mr. Scammel from Horse Island re Coastal Service. From La Scie re Postal Building.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Minister of Posts & Telegraphs if any negotiations are in progress between

the Government and the Commercial Cable Company with a view to the use of the Port aux Basques Canso Cable, and if so to lay on the table copies of any correspondence or other documents in relation thereto.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries:

- (a) If a cargo of fish was exported from Port Union talqual during the last few months contrary to the act providing for the Standardization of Codfish.
- (b) If this shipment was made by the direct instruction of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries and was justified on the ground that through a defect in the Act the export of fish talqual was not prohibited?
- (c) If this was the reason to lay on the table of the House a copy of the opinion of the law officers of the Crown or other competent authorities responsible for that opinion.
- (d) If no such legal opinion was obtained to state on whose authority the conclusion was reached that the Act permitted the export of codfish talqual.
- (e) By whose authority the necessary permit was issued by the Fisheries Department by virtue of which the officer of Customs at Port Union or Catalina cleared the vessel.
- (f) Of the quantity of fish composing the cargo of the said vessel?
- (g) The name of the said vessel and her destination, and if the cargo had been sold as required by law before she left?
- (h) If so the price for the said cargo?
- (i) If not why a permit was granted to her and if such grant was in defiance of the law?
- (j) And if so the reason for violating or disregarding the law in her case, and to lay on the Table of the House copies of all corres-

pondence and other documents in relation thereto?

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries if Mr. J H Scammell, M.H.A., in his recent tour of the country in the interests of the F. P. U. has been engaged in carrying out any work for the Government or for any department thereof, and if so what was the nature of such services and what payments have been made or are to be made to him in respect thereof.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister what steps he is taking to make good the promise in his Manifesto to the electors issued in October, 1919, wherein he declared that he proposed to undertake a policy which will develop in Newfoundland a healthier, better educated and more prosperous people with improved public services efficiently operated and maintained.

Sir M. P. Cashin drew the attention of Hon. the Prime Minister to the statement made by Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries at the annual convention of the F. P. U. at Port Union last fall against the policy of having departmental officers in the Legislative Council, and ask if it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation of the character indicated by the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries at that time which would make such a practice impossible in future.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Public Works if Mr. John Davey is employed by the Board of Works, how much salary he has received since November 15th, 1919 to date, and a statement of all monies paid for motor cars and cabs by him.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 6 Geo. V, Cap. 4, entitled 'An Act to amend the War Measures Act'" was introduced and read a first time and

it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal, Cap. 18-8, Geo. V., entitled 'The Food Control Act, 1917' and Acts in amendment thereof, was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MACDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, just a word or two on the Amendment before it goes through. I think, Sir, we all remember the position and the circumstances surrounding the Bills regarding the regulation of codfish, the exportation of codfish and standardization of codfish that went through this House last year. We recognized at that time and the country recognized—and we recognized since—that Mr. Coaker, with the backing he had in the government, was able to pass any legislation he wanted to in this House. In fact the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Coaker) intimated to us here that he was going to put through the Regulations whether we liked them or not. The Opposition in this House did not adopt any set policy. Every member of the Opposition did just as he thought was best with regard to any legislation that came up for discussion, and, I think, that the same spirit actuates them at the present session. When I realized that the Regulations were going through I made the best argument I could for my constituents. During the operation of that Act and during last summer, I have to say, in justice to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that when I pointed out to him exceptional cases in my district he gave me special consideration. No matter when I approached him regarding the export of fish to Halifax—very often the fish was being sold for less than the regulated price—after I had showed him the circumstances connected with our trade he did not refuse to give a permit to have the fish shipped. For this I give him credit. But I object to the principle of being put in the position of having to come to ask Mr. Coaker for a permit. I pointed out last year that it was a dangerous practice and a dangerous precedent to hand over our powers as legislators in this House to any man or firm. I forecasted that the Advisory Board could make any regulations they liked, but that they would never represent the whole country and that they would be fraught with disaster. Mr. Coaker took the whole thing to himself, notwithstanding all the danger pointed out to him by the members on this side of the House. He said "it's my Bill, I believe in it, I am sure. I will take full responsibility for it and it's going through." In that he was perfectly sincere. The other day he told the story in plain and unvarnished words of the absolute failure of the whole scheme. He admitted here a few days ago what I forecasted a year ago. I viewed this matter in a somewhat different light, perhaps, than those who spoke before me. The whole policy of the Government last year was based on its fishery laws. It was the one big thing for you; or, as Mr. Coaker characterized it the other day, it was an artificial pron to sustain the trade of the country. The natural law was supply and demand. Therefore, because the Regulations were an artificial pron and because they interfered with the natural working out of things and particularly because the strongest man in the Government came in and admitted that the whole thing was a failure, well then I draw this conclusion that the Government as a whole has failed. When the main spring of a Government's policy is gone the rest does not matter, and, I think, Sir, that I voice the opinion not only of men on both sides of this House, but of the great majority of

the people of this country, that when the Government has come to face that it can no longer be of any service to the country. When a Government has come to a stage that it has to abandon its policy that it set out to accomplish and that it comes to a point after having accomplished nothing, I think, Sir, it is time for them to get out. I take Mr. Coaker's statement as a complete abdication on the part of the Government. I am sorry that Mr. Coaker undertook that policy that caused such untold injury to this country. Strange though it may seem, perhaps, after all he is the man who tried to do something and even he kept on doing it when he found it wrong, so there is some sympathy from every member in this Chamber for a man who has tried so much and has failed so miserably. I trust that the Government has a thorough realization by this time of the failure of its policy, because its policy was simply and solely the remedy of fishery matters, for, as has been pointed out in this House, eighty per cent. of the country depends on the fishery. Well, if eighty per cent. depended on your policy, which has failed, do you think, Sir, your Government is doing justice to this country and doing justice to their constituents by remaining in office. Are they behaving themselves as men, honoured by seats in this Legislature, by holding on to power and allowing twenty per cent. of the people to live on the policy on which they embarked.

I have no intention to delay the House unnecessarily, but I should like to see the Amendment voted on in order to get down to business. I appeal to the Government before they drift too far that if they have nothing new to advance and no new policy to enunciate that they will no longer occupy the seats that they do, but will transfer them to those who may be able to take them out of the mess.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, I have

no desire in any way to delay this debate, but merely to place myself on record as being in favor of the Amendment proposed by the Hon. leader of the Opposition. I am sorry that the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice, a few evenings ago, did not allow the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that he supported these Resolutions and thus have spared themselves a lot of unnecessary delay.

I think that the Prime Minister has something else to tell with regard to the unemployed of this city. If he has I hope that he tells it as soon as possible, because, I am sure, that all of us, particularly the Opposition, are only too willing and pleased to have those unfortunate people, who approached the Bar of this House yesterday, looked after. As I have already intimated, I have no intention to further prolong the discussion; but to register my unqualified support to the Amendment now before the House.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few remarks on the subject matter now before the House. It is not my intention to delay the business of the House by any extended remarks. It is certainly within the knowledge of the members of the House that the question has been thoroughly thrashed out, from one side of the House at least; and all that can be said regarding the policy of the Government, and what the Speech from the Throne did not contain respecting public matters, has been fully ventilated. The Opposition has strong debating power, or to be critically correct, strong talking ability. There is one bench over there that I cannot help referring to. I think it makes no difference who is occupying it, he will talk. There seems to be a kind of infection or germ there that will cause men to talk. I for a number of years, occupied the chair next to that now occupied by

Sir John Crosbie and I had to do my part then just the same as the Opposition is doing their part now. I had to talk and talk and read and read so as to keep the thing going until we found out what the Government intended to do. That happened more particularly in the year 1917 when we held up the business of the House for a long while to find out from Sir Edward (now Lord) Morris, who was then Prime Minister whether he intended to go to the polls in the fall of 1917 or not. Very often during our hot talk some unparliamentary things might have been said which for lack of experience on the part of junior members might be excused. An unparliamentary reference used in the heat of debate is excusable, but there is no excuse for anyone who offers a discourteous or insulting remark that is studied. The audience and those particularly opposed to the present Government must be satisfied with the scathing indictment meted out to us. Unfortunately for the country the Opposition in their anxiety to make political capital threw discretion and fair play on one side. They misrepresented the actions of the Government which under present depressing world conditions may be regarded not only as regrettable but injurious to the best interests of the country.

I hate to refer to the Fish Regulations for certainly everybody must have a surfeit of the debate on that question. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave his side of the question the other day, but, of course, that is not accepted by those who are prejudiced and will not accept. Mr. Fox this evening tore to shreds, literally, the Speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and said that everything we did was meant to deceive the general public. The Hon. gentleman by his extravagant and inflammatory remarks, destroyed his case inasmuch as he overdid the thing, and thus in-

jured his own cause. If I had no other reason for speaking this evening, I should speak in self-defence and because of the not very complimentary manner in which members on the Opposition side of the House referred to F.P.U. men. I am perfectly willing to take my medicine for anything I have done in a public way, but I do not want to be anathemized and misrepresented when I do not deserve it. To get to the point. With regard to myself, personally, it was said by the Leader of the Opposition that I should not occupy the position in the Government that I do because of my relations with the F.P.U. Since 1917, when I was made Minister of Agriculture and Mines by Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie, I can honestly say that I do not know any more about the management of that business than any other man in this House to-day. When I took a Ministerial position in the National Government I severed my active business connection with the Trading Company. When I held the position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines one of my friends said to me, why do you want to give up your position with the F.P.U. The Department of Agriculture and Mines is not a very onerous position, there is not much to do, and you can go to the office for a few hours a day and that will be sufficient. This was the opinion of some of my friends.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Who said that to you?

MR. HALFYARD:—There is no need for me to name the person, but it is quite true.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Was it the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

MR. HALFYARD:—No! it was not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The business of the Union Trading Co. was moved to Port Union, and therefore I could have no connection with the management of it.

In January, 1918, Sir Edward Mo-

ris left the country. Sir William Lloyd was asked to form a Government, but Mr. Bennett, Mr. Squire and Mr. Gibbs refused seats in the Lloyd Executive. Mr. Woodford was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Sir Edward Morris. Some person was wanted for Colonial Secretary. I was asked by Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie to resign my position as Minister of Agriculture and Mines in favour of Mr. Clift, and accept the position of Colonial Secretary.

I was Secretary of the F.P.U. at that time and my friend Sir Michael and Sir John did not think there was anything of the blackleg about me at that time, when they honoured me with one of the most important positions in the gift of the Government. As Colonial Secretary I certainly was in a position to have a knowledge, not only of one department of the Government, but the whole public business of the Colony. I cannot think that Sir Michael Cashin really meant what he said when he delivered him of this about me: "The Minister of Posts is a shipped man himself. He is Secretary of the F.P.U. and it is not decent for him to hold his present portfolio. He is Secretary of that Corporation and still he has the cheek to come in here and take \$5,000 a year from the taxpayers as a salary. He and his like are case hardened and devoid of common decency. In his position he can know what every business man in this country is doing and can take advantage by reading the telegrams that go through his office of every competitor of his Company in the country."

The name of God has been taken in vain very often during this session. Well in the name of God does he and his associates think that I could be guilty of such contemptible conduct? Have I nothing else to do but read telegrams going through the Postal Telegraphs?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—It has been done.

MR. HALFYARD:—Before I would take advantage of my position to gain a knowledge of any man's business, I would rather cut off my right hand. I would not think of going into the Operating Room to inquire about any messages passing through from any business man or anyone else. I am not supposed to do it, and I could be ordered out by the Superintendent of Telegraphs. I don't suppose he would do that, but if he knew that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs was doing something he should not do, he should bring him to book. I do not think that Sir Michael Cashin, who is a friend of mine personally, would believe me guilty of such contemptible conduct. There is another matter I want to clear up. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been accused of doing something which as far as my knowledge as Colonial Secretary goes he had nothing whatever to do with and to which no reference should have been made and that is in connection with the cargo of fish that went over on the Escasoni. Sir Michael Cashin said that eight thousand quintals of fish belonging to the F.P.U. went to Rumania on that boat. That is not true. That fish was landed at Greece and sold there. The F.P.U. had no interest in the cargo that went to Rumania. Their interest in it ceased when it reached Greece.

While I was Colonial Secretary, we had a meeting one night at Government House, and Sir Michael Cashin who was then Minister of Finance and Customs, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Clift and Mr. Lloyd were there. This was a very important matter in connection with the trade of the country, and there was a million and a half dollars in connection with that cargo of fish, for which the merchants wanted credit to their accounts at the banks and nobody knows more about

this matter than Sir John Crosbie, who was then Minister of Shipping, or a member of the Tonnage Committee. He was the man who was making a fight for the trade to try and do something, and the matter was brought up and the question asked. What could we do? Can we guarantee the bonds so that credit will be placed to the accounts of those men at the banks, or can we get the Home Government to guarantee them, and we talked about it, and simply dispersed and nothing was decided.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—But if I had agreed to it the country would have read that we had another million and a quarter added to the debt.

MR. HALFYARD:—Quite right. That is so, but it is not because we talked about a thing and came to no decision that you should for political reasons to injure a political opponent, falsely misrepresent the incident. I was in Trinity in 1919, and when the message containing your statement was flashed over the wires I was in a position to contradict it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had nothing to do with it.

Referring to the Fish Regulations. We all thought that the Fish Exportation Act passed unanimously, but the Opposition say it did not because it was not put to a vote. Well according to that there is no Bill that passed through this House on which a division has not been asked which can be regarded as having been adopted unanimously. There were dozens of bills passed in the same way as that Bill.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I do not interrupt, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to make it clear, that I have never been in favour of that Fish Exportation Bill, and I protested against it last year.

MR. HALFYARD:—That is correct. The only man who was out of the House at the time the Bill was passed was Sir John Crosbie, who had not

supported the Regulations when he was here, and who as far as we knew was not in favour of them, but the Opposition knows the reason the vote went without division, they were afraid of disruption in their own ranks. There were certain men in the Opposition who felt strongly on the matter and thought this Bill would be all right. Therefore the Bill passed unanimously. Now then they say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should take the blame for its working out. He says that he should not. There is one thing that I think we should all agree upon, and that is that the Regulations did not get a fair trial. It is not quite fair when you are trying to do a thing to have three or four others trying to tear down the structure as fast as you build it up. The Regulations were fought against from the start and they could not be enforced effectively, therefore without the support of the country and the trade the measure could not meet with full success. When people sold their fish in spite of the Regulations, that caused a weakening and the whole thing slumped. People say that they could have sold their fish at a certain price. When the Regulations called for 80s a quintal they could have got 75s, but if there was not a standard price of eighty they would not be offered seventy-five. As soon as the Regulations were lifted the price went down to thirty shillings a quintal. A merchant on the West Coast told me last September "That he knew the condition of the Oporto markets, that the people there could not pay a big price for fish, and the idea of giving nine, ten and eleven dollars a quintal for fish was madness. The only reason he supplied at all was to accommodate his customers. He had made money in buying and selling fish but he did not expect to make any this year," and further he said, "if I could buy all the fish in Newfoundland for

five dollars a quintal he would not touch it." That is what he told me last September. Mr. Fox said that this Act was made in the interests of the merchants. Admitting that for the sake of argument, what is in the interests of the merchants regarding prices is in the interest of the fishermen. Don't think that the fishermen believe that what is in the merchants' favour is against them. They have lost that idea. Nobody in the House can say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was unmindful of the fishermen when he introduced that Fish Exportation Act. We have been told that our very existence as a country depends upon the fishermen, and if that is so, we must be worse than imbeciles if we vote for any policy disadvantageous to the fishermen. No, Sir, by that Fish Exportation Act the fishermen received a price of two or three dollars more for their fish than if there had been no such Act.

MR. MACDONNELL:—Without wishing to interrupt I would like to ask a question. When the Hon. Minister speaks of the people who were offered seventy-five shillings when the price by the Regulations was eighty and who were not allowed to sell, how is it that when the Regulations were lifted that they did not get more. The reason Sir was that the Regulations were kept on until there was no longer a demand for fish. I would like him to explain that.

MR. HALFYARD:—In reply to Mr. MacDonnell, if there had been no Regulations, the first two or three cargoes going over to the other side would have demanded a fair price, and after that the price would have dropped. As the season advanced our position became worse owing to the rate of exchange. It is not my intention as I said before to delay the House, but we have been told that we have been catering to one section of the country, because of the buying of thirty-five thousand quintals of fish

last fall. That happened to come from the north, but it was only an accident. If it had come from the West Coast we would have had to do the same thing. None of my colleagues in the Executive since 1917 can truthfully say that I have used my position to advance the interests of any one section of the country more than another. Take the F.P.U. In 1917 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a big project of building a town at Port Union, he wanted a spur line about a mile long to give railway facilities in connection with the various industries. He went to Sir Edward Morris and said he was building a town down there and why could they not get a railway, and I understand that the men who voted for that concession were not the men of the Liberal party, Mr. Clift and Mr. Ellis, but Sir Michael Cashin, Sir John Crosbie and Sir Edward Morris. I do not know that you can point to anything else which may be regarded as a concession to any place north. Take what happened during the past twelve months. It was thought that if Argentia was made a terminus that it could be made a safe winter port, and would avoid the haul over the Topsails during winter, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Chairman of the Railway Commission, caused a railway to be built to Argentia.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I would like to call the Hon. Minister's attention to the fact that he should call Mr. Coaker by his proper name, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. HALFYARD:—Argentia is not north and building that railway gave employment. It has cost up to the present time about two hundred thousand dollars. If that was done down north what would the Opposition say about it? Take Fortune and Grand Bank. It will cost fifty or sixty thousand dollars for a harbour at

Fortune, and \$150,000 to make a harbour at Grand Bank.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—That was voted in the House.

MR. HALFYARD:—We are treating everyone alike, there is no discrimination. We opened the mine at Branch in St. George's District and it is a source of employment. We did not care what district it was in, and we are hoping that we will get good results from it. We are not as black as we are painted. After all our first consideration is to do something for the betterment of the people no matter what part of the country the people may happen to reside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to present hour conditions. It is said that present conditions are all brought about by the Fish Regulations; but I want to point out the the Fish Regulations had nothing to do with anything except the codfishery, and the price was kept up to the fishermen, remember that. Mr. Coaker went over to the other side, used every bit of energy he had and all the influence that he could bring to bear to sell the fish. But his plan was frustrated, frustrated by the people who thought more of their own political interests than they did of the welfare of the country. There has been a sectional feeling against the interests of the country because to the country that we have had to run off three bye-elections. Those who would otherwise have come together have been kept apart by them. There would have been an entirely different feeling if the bye-elections could have been avoided. During the last few weeks we have heard a lot about poverty in our outports, but do you not see that but for the price that the people were able to get for their fish because of the actions of the Government there would be much more poverty? And do you know that in the important district of Trinity a very large percentage of the people

are not affected by the price of fish this season. Many of those who went fishing did nothing last summer, some of them didn't put out their traps at all. My colleague, Mr. Guppy, didn't put his traps in the water for the summer. Many of the men had to leave and go to Grand Falls and other places, and that applies to the south as well as to the north side of the Bay. It was the worst codfishery in the history of the district; and the same thing applies to the west. This meant less income for the people. They did very well on the fish they caught, they got a very good price in most cases, and now you come in here and blame present conditions on the Regulations. But the trouble was the people did not get the fish. They got a better price than they otherwise would have received with no Regulations. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, gave the prices of the various fish products for the past two years, and he showed how the prices had come down. The products of labor in other directions have come down also. People cannot get the prices for their labor. I am talking now of the depression at the present time, not of the matter of supplying next spring.

I could elaborate on that by reference to that iniquitous thing we did in buying the fish. I might say that when that proposition was first suggested we regarded it as absolutely out of the question. I said we cannot do that.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Why did you not call the House together?

MR. HALFYARD:—You know very well, Sir, that that could not be done. You know that if we started out, and it became known that we were buying fish, we would have to buy all. That was unnecessary. There was a demand for Shore fish, but no demand for Labrador fish. None of the fish had been sold, and where the merchants have lost some money they

would have lost many times as much. Indirectly, we have saved the country at least a million dollars.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the terrible conditions in this country. Why if any of you were to take up an English magazine, the Daily Mirror, or some other magazine, you would soon find that we are in a much better condition than they are in the Old Country. In November it was estimated that there were about a quarter of a million unemployed in England, and in January there were over a million unemployed. What put three million people out of employment in the United States? Was it the Fish Regulations? It is ridiculous to blame the Fish Regulations for the unemployment amongst us.

"The following appears in a recent number of the 'Round Table.'" "Since the last number went to press a remarkable change has come over the industrial situation in the United Kingdom. The depression in trade, of which the first signs appeared in the late summer has deepened into stagnation and we have seen a rapid extension of unemployment and short-time working. At the end of January 1,060,000 were registered unemployed. In addition 450,000 work people were registered as working systematic short time." The question was asked, "Is there any escape from the financial and industrial chaos into which the war has thrown half the world?"

"It is not difficult to see why such questions are being asked. The cessation of demand and the depression in industry follow a period of unique prosperity. After the fitful fever of the war came eighteen months spent in a vain struggle to keep pace with the world's needs. Prices rose, but no price seemed high enough to deter the buyer. Manufactured goods of all kinds were absorbed as readily as though they had been flung into a bottomless pit. Men lost the habit of unemployment, perhaps the temper to

endure it. Certainly there were few to warn them of rocks ahead. Politicians, employers, leaders of labor united in what the future historian will regard a wild and universal conspiracy of optimism.

"The economic disturbance is not limited to this country. It is worldwide.

"The United States, the one country in the world which seemed to have emerged from the war wealthier and more powerful than before is passing through every phase of the crisis in which Great Britain is involved.

"It has, or has had very recently, three million unemployed.

"When the malady is universal, any one country must be relatively powerless even to effect its own cure. From South America, the Far East, India, the British Dominions, comes the same story of financial stringency, industrial depression, difficulties of exchange."

Everybody spent money madly, and when the collapse came there was no money and now everybody is realizing where the mistake was made. The Government thought they should accede to the demands of the people for increased salaries to meet the high cost of living. Sir Michael Cashin knows that what I am saying is correct.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You came in under false pretences. What about the promises in your leader's manifesto?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I do not think that we came in under false pretences. We came in by the wish of a greater majority of the people than has ever been given to any party in Newfoundland. We went out under false pretences in the spring of 1919. There was something either false or deceptive about it, but we came in as a result of our going out. The people of Trinity District stood by me because

I stood by my guns. They appreciated me because of my action. The present leader of the Opposition knows what I did on that occasion. I do not think the break was brought about by the leader of the Opposition. We might have been with Sir Michael Cashin to-day only there were influences brought to bear by men who thought that it was foolish to think of getting seats in St. John's with Coaker in the party. Coaker and his crowd were thrown out, and they united with certain other elements. I am finding no fault. Things have worked out alright, and we have no fault to find. Do you think that it was merely the F.P.U. that gave us such a big vote in Trinity District. The Prime Minister was there himself in 1913, and the people said we have to vote for you because of Mr. Squires. They think a lot of the Prime Minister in Trinity District.

MR. MOORE:—What do they think of him now?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—They think more of him now. Our leader is all right. I have the greatest regard for him. He can take his part anywhere. He can play the part of a gentleman, an educated gentleman. He will be a credit to his country wherever he goes, and I admire him for his sterling ability as a speaker and courteous gentleman.

MR. MOORE:—What about Mr. Coaker?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I did not think Mr. Coaker was so popular until he went down to Port Union. They gave him one of the greatest demonstrations of welcome ever given a public man in the history of the country.

Mr. Speaker, if I go on much longer I will make a speech, and I did not intend doing that. It is interesting to read some of the old Hansards. I was wondering what became of the

Temperance Resolutions that were presented in 1915, when we were on the Opposition side, and I came across a speech of Sir Michael Cashin. I didn't think that conditions were so bad in 1915. Sir William Lloyd, who was leader of the Opposition at that time criticized the Government very harshly, and said there would be a deficit of \$800,000 at the end of the fiscal year June 30th, 1915. The Minister of Finance then the present leader of the Opposition, who always tried to keep up his end of the plank, in reply to Dr. Lloyd is reported in the Hansard of 1915 as follows:—

“The position of this Colony to-day is no worse than that of any other British Colony in the Empire. Look around you at the depression which is in evidence all over the world—in Canada, in the United States, in England for the last twelve months. Why take Canada the most prosperous country in the world. Last year they had a surplus of \$30,000,000, and the Finance Minister in his statement the other day told the House that this year he will have a deficit of \$10,000,000. How has that come about? Was not it due to the depression which has been felt in Canada during the present year. This is not the first time we have had deficits in Newfoundland, and we will have them again, but the blue ruin that has been painted here to-night is not going to happen. The truth of the matter is that this Colony is in as good a position as any other Colony in the Empire—is better off than any other Colony. There are people in this House that are prepared to give the Colony a black eye, why should we send out to the world to-night that we will have a deficit of \$800,000.00 at the end of June. As I have stated before depression is all around us,—in Canada, America and every where else, but they are not painting blue

"ruin in these Countries. The Minister of Finance of Canada painted "no blue ruin, when he made his statements the other day that he expected a deficit of \$10,000,000. He "didn't say that Canada was lost and "gone forever as we have been hearing from the other side of the House. "I am tired and sick of hearing the "story that is being told by the other "side of the House by men who should "have more interest in Newfoundland "than to be speaking in this manner, "and sending the story of blue ruin "broadcast as they are doing."

Well now we find that all the Opposition has been doing since the House opened is preaching "blue ruin", as blue as blue can be, but the condition of the Colony is just as good as the conditions anywhere else, and much better than in most places. But that is the position the Minister of Finance took in 1915, and there was a big deficit. There can be no doubt that the old ship will right herself. This is not the first time, as we can see by those speeches in 1915, that conditions have been bad.

After I read Sir Michael Cashin's speech I was interested in going further. Mr. Morine said in part:—"One of the biggest merchants in the Upper House gave his opinion that fish prices cannot be expected to continue as high as at present. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Harvey. We must provide for a stormy day. I presume Mr. Harvey was speaking the opinion of merchants as a whole, and that he of party politics. It has been a curse was chosen by the Government to make that speech.

"Of late there have been speeches "in the Council on the Labrador fish "prices Bill which I had the pleasure "of introducing. The opinion expressed in these speeches was that the "outlook for Labrador was very poor, "and every merchant said that the out-

"fit would be smaller this year than "ever before. A certain merchant had "refused supplies to seventy crews "whom he had supplied last year."

Mr. Speaker, from these speeches delivered in this House in 1915, we find that a very gloomy view was taken of the prospects for supplies for the summer fishery. The situation was extremely depressing. There were no fish regulations in 1915. Now when the outlook for the fishery is not as good as we would wish we are told by the Opposition that the Fish Regulations is the cause of all our troubles.

The sane sensible unprejudiced men of Water Street, who are not dependent on the Banks to finance their business so as to make it possible for them to supply for the fishery, will tell you that what they have to consider from a business point of view, is, will it pay to outfit for the fishery this year? It is only natural that the price of fish will proportionally decrease in value with all other commodities, hence the chief reason why merchants are not very anxious to invest in the fishery this year.

We are better off to-day comparatively than most other countries, but we have to sit here and listen to blue ruin speeches by members of the Opposition. I thought last year that we would not have the same thing repeated, but here we are in our second session, and the old party strife is being kept up in every possible way. We find the Honorable members of the Opposition fighting just as strongly as if a general election was being staged to take place next month.

To get down to the amendment to the Address in Reply. In 1913 Mr. Hickman the then member for Bay de Verde District who had a seat on the opposite side of the House, introduced a set of Resolutions dealing with Prohibition. There was at the time much sentiment in favor of

Prohibition on both sides of the House, and it was such a question that Sir Edward Morris the shrewd politician that he was, seeing there may be a division in his ranks sized up the situation at once and intimated to the House that he intended to bring in a measure embodying the resolution before the Session closed. The question was debated for a long while by both sides of the House and resulted in a strict party vote, and the resolutions were voted down. The Government voted down these resolutions giving a reason that they intended to introduce a bill embodying them. Here we are asked to vote for the amendment when it is obvious we are bringing in a bill covering everything the amendment calls for, you notice it on the order paper to-day for second reading therefore we are not voting for the amendment and we have a precedent from the Morris Government for not doing so. For these reasons I cannot support the amendment to the Address in Reply.

THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I wish to make a few remarks on the subject before the chair and to use the customary phrase I do not intend to delay the time of the House. I make that statement sincerely but if I could collect all the thoughts that have been running through my mind in connection with matters talked about in this House during the last few weeks, I would delay the House for a considerable time. I do not suppose I shall collect half or one quarter of those thoughts but I would like to make some remarks with reference to statements made by the other side of the House and with reference to the trend of the speeches delivered by them. Yesterday this House passed a vote of censure on an article written in what was supposed to have been a Government paper. That vote was passed unanimously. I think if we

passed a vote of censure on unparliamentary language and insults coming from the other side we should have not gone too far. I remember that about eight years ago when I first attended a session of this House, it was under the leadership of Mr. Justice Kent who was then a member for St. John's East. I have to say we were initiated into parliamentary procedure by a gentleman and I think I can say on behalf of the F.P.U., that we have endeavored to follow in his footsteps the example as shown to us when he graced the chair the leader of the Opposition now occupies. He was not a member of the denomination to which I belong but I must say that I have as much respect for that gentleman as I have for any other man in the country. He was honourable and upright in his conduct. He proved himself and acted the man. I cannot say the same of some of the members on the other side. A few of the speeches from the other side have been fairly decent, and I consider Mr. Higgins to have driven his nail fairly well but many of the others hammered the nail on the head till they split the board in pieces and spoiled his work. An argument followed by insult had no effect. The same applies to an article written in a paper. I wish to tell this House something about the junior member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, who posed before this House as an advocate of economy in the conduct of the public service. Possessing as I do some knowledge of that gentleman in connection with a firm doing business for the Government under various contracts I cannot take the positions he advances as being sincere. It pleased him to resurrect a story I told last year in this House and he certainly finished it up with a very tragical ending. He wanted to leave the impression that because Jennings was Minister of Public Works instead of Mr. Woodford that a woman died at Harbor Main be-

cause her husband called at the office of Public Works and could not get a script to procure a bottle of spirits. I know I spoiled Mr. Moore's story by asking where the man got what was inside of him, and I here assert the fact that he had drunk enough spirits before calling at the office to enable me to smell it half across the office is sufficient proof to me that whatever happened to the poor wife was not because the husband could not obtain spirits from some source and I certainly do not hold myself responsible for the tragical ending of Mr. Moore's story. But this by the way. I want to deal with Mr. Moore as an economist in the expenditures of public money.

This is the man who for seven years as a Government contractor never paid a cent duty on material imported for these contracts, and this in spite of the fact that every contract made was to the contrary. I have been assured by the chief officials in the Public Works Department that they never knew a contract drawer excluding duty on material required. During these 7 years this must have amounted to a considerable sum and the only way Mr. Moore could get the rebate was with the connivance of the Minister of Public Works and the consent of the Minister of Finance. Where, oh where was Mr. Cashin then?

This economist also was authorized by the then Minister of Public Works Woodford to import a mangle for the Sanatorium with a 25% profit on the gross cost. There was no consultation between the Superintendent and it appears on other opinion was asked. Mr. Moore, of course, purchased the most costly machine he could get as every \$100 it cost meant \$25 to him. The machine cost the Department over \$6,000 and we had to build a house to put it in costing about a thousand more. The Superintendent of the institution gave as his opinion that a suitable machine for their pur-

pose could be purchased for about \$350 and Mr. Moore had no more practical knowledge in connection with the purchase of a machine of that nature than any of the ordinary officials in the Department. No, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member does not like this talk but I would advise him to sit still and take his medicine. He evidently made good for himself when he had the chance and is reported to be worth about two hundred thousand dollars to-day.

It is certainly a paying job to get Government contracts under certain conditions, but when such men pose as purists it is going the limit, and, Mr. Speaker, a few matters of this kind go to prove that there is a sprinkling of political hypocrites on the Opposition side of the House.

As late as March this year this gentleman presented another bill to the Dept. of Public Works amounting to between \$5,000 and \$6,000. Now in respect of presenting bills, Mr. Moore has a perfect right to present a bill to the Public Works Dept. for what he is owed as well as any other Contractor. The bill in question was in connection with a rise in wages induced by a strike of the Plumbers during the summer of 1919. We asked for the correspondence in connection with the whole affair, and found among the rest a minute of Council signed by the late Govt. on November 14/19. (The late Government must have spent a very busy day on that date judging by the numbers of minutes of Council that have come to light since then, as having been signed on Nov. 14th.) This minute of Council granted Mr. Moore an increase in his contract price equal to the wage increase. According to the correspondence that increase amounted to \$1.00 per day, and to that amount Mr. Moore was justly entitled, but when he presented his bill he had an increase charged of

\$1.80 per day, and also dated the increase from the 1st June instead of the 15th July, (which was the date in the Notice from the Plumbers Union) and had straight time for the 18 months without any reduction for holidays. We objected to the increase beginning before the date set by the Plumbers Union, and also called Mr. Moore's attention to the fact that no reduction in the time had been made for holidays; he met our wishes in this respect, but when we called his attention to the 80c per day over and above the increase in the wages, he claimed this was for overhead expenses. Now although an "imbecile" it struck me quite forcibly that Mr. Moore had no right to that 80c per day for overhead expenses, as it was only an increase in wages and not an increase in work that this matter concerned, for that reason we have refused to pay the bill, and it is lying on my desk today. The last letter I received from Mr. Moore in relation to the bill was that he placed the matter in the hands of his Lawyer. Reading between the lines it appears that if the Minister of Public Works did not pay this bill, he would have to appear before the Court. Now I wish to inform the Hon Gentleman and this House that if Mr. Moore wishes to collect that bill for its present amount, he will have to collect it through the Courts or not get it at all. We are ready to pay what is honestly and justly owed him, but why does Mr. Moore, who is so anxious at this time for the welfare of his country, send a bill to the Public Works Dept., for almost double the amount that was legally due him, through which even a so called imbecile could see through at first sight.

There is another Gentleman occupying a seat on the other side of the House, who comes in here blessed with the privilege of education and

birth, born with a silver spoon in his mouth, but who uses his abilities to despise and insult the men on this side of the House who have not been as fortunate in those respects, as himself, but I think he outdid himself in a statement that he made to this House to-day and excelled anything that I heard during my eight years experience in this House. I took down the statement as he made it, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read it to the House. "He said while discussing the effect of the Fish Regulations in certain sections of the West Coast that if it had effected St. John's East in the same way, he would have headed a procession to go and tear the heart out of the man who did it." The Gentleman says he did say it and will stand by it. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell this House that in making such a statement he discredited and disgraced himself, as a Newfoundlander, and as a citizen of St. John's, he is a discredit and a disgrace to the party to which he belongs, and a discredit and a disgrace to the seat he occupies in the House, and my advice to him or any other person with such rabid intentions to obtain a Passport and emigrate to Russia at the earliest possible moment. This statement will look pretty bad in black type to-morrow. He was pleased a few days ago while addressing this House, to compare the F.P.U. men to a crowd of imbeciles, who would not know the truth when they heard it, but I want to tell this gentleman that the F.P.U. men whom he had addressed in those insulting terms represent about 90,000 people in this House, and that the fishermen of the North will send us here just as long as they want to, regardless of any opinion that the member for St. John's East may hold, he can go on and antagonize Green Bay, Bonavista Bay and Trinity Bay if he will, but you will find that St. John's

will make a sorry showing without the trade coming from those bays.

Mr. Fox:—Coaker said he was going to have the grass growing on the Streets of St. John's.

Minister Public Works:—I am not aware that Mr. Coaker ever made such a statement, but the member for St. John's East is doing more toward that end by his attitude and statements in this House, than any other man in the country that I know of. Now Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss the abilities of this gentleman from another viewpoint, the viewpoint of the producer. Now what is the value of this remarkable gentleman to his country, has he ever produced a dollars worth toward its wealth, has he ever caught a dollar's worth of fish? Has he ever manufactured a dollars worth of lumber, has he ever dug a dollars worth of vegetables or mineral from the earth? No sir, he is simply a Lawyer going into court and collecting legal fees. Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the producer is the back bone of any country, and one of the things of which I feel proud is looking back over my past life, is that I have contributed in my humble way towards the wealth of the country in which I live, in common with other of my fellow members, who I have no doubt possess a record in many cases far beyond my own. For fifty years of my life I have caught fish, built the boat in which the fish was caught, made the traps or the seine used in the taking of the fish, built the shack which I occupied as my home, and placed the products of my labor on the markets of the country in fairly good condition. Now Mr. Speaker, I will ask a question of this House which class can this country afford to do without best, the class represented by the member from St. John's East or the class represented by the F.P.U. The decision certainly is in favor of the latter.

Mr. Fox interrupts.

Mr. JENNINGS:—Sit down and take your medicine like a good little boy. Where would the lawyers collect their fees if there was no one to produce the wealth of the country. I do not wish this House to understand that I despise the legal profession, it is quite necessary to have a few of them around, but when they come to dispise the men on whom this country depends, it is another question. His statement that the Government has spent \$500,000 of the country's money in buying fish, is altogether incorrect, as Mr. Halfyard has just proven, but the statement is made from the worst unworthy motives. In order to paint the things in its blackest colors. It looks as if that this little talk of mine is getting inside the skin of the gentleman in question, but what I have said to him is not one quarter what we have had to take from him and his associates.

In regret that in this statements my honorable friend does not play the gentleman. He shoots off at a tangent and says things that I believe in his saner moments he would wish unsaid. I once thought of suggesting that if he selected a coat of arms that he choose as his selection a hatchet and scalping knife as quite in keeping with his attitude at times in this House. I think that the business of this House would be far better conducted if all personalities were left out and a man treated as a gentleman though he may have a rough exterior.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Your advice is cheap.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I don't think you will say though that it is not sincere.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I'm getting doubtful about you.

MR. MACDONNELL:—I would like to rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A few days ago Sir John Crosbie

and Mr. Hibbs were cross-firing for half an hour and you did not bring them to order.

HON. MR. SPEAKER:—I did call them to order, sir.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I next propose to make a few remarks on the Fish Regulations. I supported these Regulations because I believed they were necessary to the prosperity of this country.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Because you had no sense.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I have never pretended that I held a premium on knowledge or common sense, but I have tried to use the learning with which the Almighty provided me for the betterment of my fellowman and not to abuse any privilege in so doing which I may possess. When the leader of the Opposition uses the privilege of this House to make such imputations, he abuses his privileges and shows that he at least is endowed with one particular quality which is best defined by a word which begins with an I. (ignorance.)

I was going on, Mr. Speaker, to refer to my experience as a fisherman. I began at the age of 10 and have gone through most of the phases of the industry as conducted in Newfoundland. Looking back over these years I can easily recall the uncertainty and dissatisfaction existing among the fishermen chiefly owing to the fact that they never knew what the value of their product would be. There was not alone the uncertainty of the catch but the uncertainty of the price which very often was the merest pittance and I can well remember in the fall of 1908 when fish was absolutely unsaleable at any price. To hear some people talk you would think there was never any trouble with Newfoundland fish before the advent of the Fish Regulations. Only the men who were directly concerned in the fisheries knew

the difficulties in making ends meet and procuring anything like a decent living from such an uncertain source.

This feeling in the Summer and Fall of 1919 reached a higher crisis probably than ever before. The price of provisions and outfits in 1919 was so high that the puzzle with the fishermen was, "How are we to continue the business and conduct it so as to assure ourselves a living wage?" That was the position and that was the reason the Fish Regulations were introduced and why I supported them. When the Regulations were passed everyone thought they were safeguarded in every respect. It was the work of the Advisory Board and the Exporters Association to submit the best rules possible for the benefit of this country, and if this thing has not been conducted properly, on them let the blame rest. I state the Regulations have not been given a fair test at all. By a certain section of the press they were bitterly opposed and editorials were written day after day till they became a sing-song. On the other hand what no one in Newfoundland could foresee was the amount of fish the Norwegians had to place on the markets abroad, and I don't think it is fair to overlook this tremendous disadvantage. Everyone knew the British Government had bought Norwegian fish for three years and had sold it back to Norway again, but nobody knew that the Norwegians had all this fish on hand and were putting it on the European market and were ready to sacrifice it at any price. This is one of the greatest causes, helped and intensified by the attitude of the Press, why the Regulations did not succeed. However, it was understood that they were not as the laws of the Medes and Persians that could not be changed, but could be taken off if they did not work. I think this, the members of the Government clearly understood, was to be done early in

this session and would have been done but for the delay of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, through causes over which he had no control, in getting home after his visit to the foreign markets. A lot of argument has been produced to show that all the trouble and misery of which we hear so much is due entirely to the Regulations. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not the Regulations that have left the Lunenburg bankers, with one exception, unable to pay off their crews after the season's work. I have the information from a thoroughly reliable man that only one crew in Lunenburg was paid their wages and that social and church work in that town was practically at a standstill owing to shortage of cash for which this fact was chiefly accountable. Was this due to the Regulations? According to what we have been told they should be better off because we had regulations and they didn't. Again, take the position of the small millowner, was it the regulations that put him on his back. The mills went flat in the district of Twillingate, but that was not due to the regulations. In connection with the buying of the Labrador fish which has been pronounced such a great crime and which Mr. Fox termed a robbery. What about it? I want to say that not one dollar of that money went to Twillingate, but I have no doubt that if the men of that district were here at the time and could not dispose of their cargoes they would have been dealt with the same as the others. You may say it was unconstitutional to buy it, but what was the wisest thing to be done? Was it to leave these men to return to their homes with their fish unsold left in their vessels' holds, with no money and no provisions for themselves and their families for the winter and eventually to face starvation or able-bodied relief, or to buy the fish

through the source it was arranged and so enable these men to provide means for their families through the hard winter and spring. I am quite certain what the Leader of the Opposition would have done if he had to deal with it. He would "d— the law" and everything else that was in the way.

Many charges have been made in this House in connection with the Union Trading Company and Mr. Coaker's position as a merchant. The different Companies of the F. P. U. are made up of about 4,000 shareholders, almost all of whom are fishermen, and made what little money they may possess through the fishery. Mr. Coaker's position is Manager of those Companies for which he is paid a certain salary to conduct the business of the different Companies. He is not a merchant in the sense of the term that he is in business making profits for himself. As a matter of fact profits or losses made by the business belong to the different Companies, and not to the manager. Mr. Coaker could resign his position when he chose, leaving the F. P. U. to select another manager. What I state in connection with those matters are perfectly correct in every way. As to the insinuations about the F. P. U. men in the House of Assembly being hirelings in the pay and the pocket of one man, they are absolutely incorrect. I know only two of the F. P. U. men in the House of Assembly who are receiving a salary from any of the F. P. U. Companies. I have been connected with the F.P.U. for about ten years, during six months of that time I was in the service of the Trading Company; the rest of the ten years I have held my own row, and the most of the other F. P. U. men stand in the same position. We come here as independent as any person who occupies a seat in this

House, and it is not because we listen to the low down insults and insinuations that we are guilty of the charges made against us. The F.P.U. did not choose their men for the House of Assembly because of their education or oratory, but for their honesty and desire to stand by righteous principles, and they will send their men to the House of Assembly as long as they carry out their wishes in this respect, but when they fail to do so they will turn them down, and I for one, when I fail to carry out the principles and wishes of the men who sent me here, I am willing to accept my defeat.

MR. CASHIN—When you got money enough made.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the Leader of the Opposition is measuring me in his own bushel, but I would like to inform him that Twillingate District is a poor place for wrecks. Now to listen to the statements made in this House, you would be under the impression that all the plums were given to the North—what about the District of Ferryland and the Railway which covers that section of the country, a Railway which has been a financial burden to the country, not only in its construction but also in its maintenance, and this was well known before the first sod was turned; but it happened that the present leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, was a member for the District of Ferryland, and held a prominent position in the Morris Administration. He wanted that Railway probably for his own convenience, and I can imagine him going to the Government, and demanding that he get it. I can picture him putting the proposition to his leader, Sir Edward Morris, and in his well known bullying way, saying: Morris, I want that Railway, and you must give me that

Railway, I am going to have that Railway, if not I will bust up your Government. And he gets the Railway, no doubt, on those terms, but the country both North and South had to bear the burden of its construction and also its maintenance. What about the Argentinia terminal? A considerable amount of money, so we were told, has been spent there in labor. Would not this amount to Placentia's share of help from Govern- ment funds, as there is no doubt what- ever, a great portion of the outlay was paid in wages to labourers who would feel the benefit of it in helping to provide for the wants of their families.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Say, what about the Port Union Railway.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—

The story has been told in connection with this Railway and it appears that the present leader of the Opposition was one of the strongest supporters toward granting that concession to Port Union, and believed at the time that it was quite justifiable and only right and proper that a business of the proportion which was carried on at Port Union was entitled to a spur line from Catalina. I well remember that last year the leader of the Opposition charged me with being a party to a bargain in this connection, as my price for joining the National Government. I want to state again what I said at the time the charge was made, that I know nothing, what- ever, about any such concession being asked for, and it had no influence whatever on my action in consenting to the National Government. The late Government has been trying to blow their trumpets to the country in relation to the Surplus Funds on hand when they went out of power, to my mind there is no credit, whatever, due to them for having a surplus. It is quite true that during the war this

country prospered, prices went up, and revenue increased accordingly. It was simply a question for the Government at the time to collect the revenue and spend it, and it looks to me that it was more of an accident than anything else that a surplus was left, as there did not appear at the time any particular object for which it could be reasonably disposed.

In relation to the Fish Regulations, I believe it was understood by the members of the Government side of the House that they were to be taken off. It was unfortunate that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not here at the opening of the House, and it was clear to any reasonable man that the Government was not justified in dealing with this matter till he arrived, but I am of the opinion that if Mr. Coaker had been present in this country when the House opened that the leader of the Opposition would have never had the chance to introduce his amendment. I believe the chief object in introducing this amendment was to embarrass the Government, believing this, and knowing that the Government intended to introduce Legislation to the same effect, I am not prepared to vote for the amendment before the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled, "An Act to amend the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920," without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until

Monday afternoon next, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 25th, 1921.

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

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Jamestown in the District of Bonavista asking for telephone communication. I might say, sir, that this petition is very largely signed by the inhabitants of Jamestown and Portland and moreover this is the seventh or eighth time that petitions have been presented from this part of Bonavista Bay on the same subject. I trust that the Government will now be able to see their way clear to grant the prayer of this petition and I ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WINDSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of that petition.

Sir John Crosbie gave notice of questions, 11.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Dr. Jones gave notice of question.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question, 1, 2, 3.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move that a Select Committee of three be appointed to confer with a Committee of three from the Great War Veterans' Association in the matter of Pensions and Gratuities to Newfoundland Soldiers and Sailors who served in the Great War and their dependents.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to read to the House a set of Resolutions that were sent to me for presentation

to the House of Assembly from the Burin Board of Trade. They read as follows:

To the Honourable House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened.

Gentlemen,—

At a meeting of the Burin Board of Trade held at Burin on April 14th, GALLEY—59

1921, the following resolutions were passed:—

THAT WHEREAS there is an Act on the Statute Book entitled "The Codfish Exportation Act" and

WHEREAS the provisions of the Act have acted injuriously on the fish exporters of the South West Coast, and the present deplorable conditions existing are due to the operation of the said Act,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Board of Trade request the repeal of the said act, in all its provisions as pertaining to the Exportation and Standardization of codfish from this country; and

WHEREAS it has come to the knowledge of this Board that in November last the sum of \$500,000 was appropriated for the purchase of Labrador fish by the Government, and that this sum was placed at the disposal of certain persons,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Board emphatically protest against the discrimination in trade against one section of the country in favour of the other, and this Board foresee the grave danger of outfitting fishermen for the coming season, in view of the fact that the same discrimination may be used again, and hereby wish to register our protest against the use of public funds of the Colony for individual purposes; and

WHEREAS the present Government has taken advantage of the "War Measures Act" to keep in existence the Food Control Board, and has prohibited the importation of sugar into

this Colony to the detriment of trade, and added to the cost of living.

BE IT RESOLVED that this Board request the removal of the restrictions and the abolition of the Food Control Board, in the interests of the country in general; and

WHEREAS we are in possession of facts to show that salt was purchased last year in St. Pierre and elsewhere and taken to St. John's and sold at a loss to the country, and which loss is chargeable to the public funds of the Colony.

BE IT RESOLVED that this Board again protest against such action by the Government, and request the collection of any amounts that may be owing to the Treasury by private individuals on account of salt purchases; and

WHEREAS it has been repeatedly brought to the notice of this Board, through the captains of our foreign-going vessels that the Trade Commissioners appointed by the Government are, firstly, lacking in knowledge of the language of the people with whom they have to deal, and secondly, are lacking in business ability to handle business entrusted to them.

BE IT RESOLVED that we protest against the keeping in office of persons, who are paid from the public funds of the Colony, and from whom we derive no benefit;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor, the Legislative Council, the Leader of the Opposition, S. J. Foote, M.H.A., and J. T. Cheesoman, M.H.A.

Burin Board of Trade,

GEO. A. BARTLETT,

President.

Burin, Nfld., April 15, 1921.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice who is the Doctor Killam who appears to have got

seven hundred and fifty dollars from the General Contingencies Account under the heading of "Magistrate, Labrador," and for what services he received this money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In the absence of the Minister of Justice I may say that that information will be available tomorrow.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a copy of the report of Mr. J. M. Forbes on ore taxation, and a detailed statement of the items making up the sum of \$1,575.00 which he was paid in relation thereto.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I have asked the Deputy Minister of Finance and Customs to furnish that information.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the declaration of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. W. F. Coaker, to the Annual Convention of the F. P. U. opened at Port Union on Thursday, November 27th, 1919, as reported in "The Advocate" of that date, in which the President of the F. P. U. declared that "the expenditure of public departments of the Government for the past ten years will be investigated by competent men and a general clean-up will, I hope, result"; if it is the intention of the Government to carry out such investigation, and if not, why not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to that question, I might say that my attention to that declaration has not been called by my colleagues, and the matter has not at any time been considered by the Executive Government.

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the quantity of flour,

pork, beef, tea, and other foodstuffs, remaining in the stores of the Furness Withy Co., Harvey & Co., and other steamboat premises in this city with duty unpaid; also the names of the importers of the same; the period for which each shipment has lain there; the amount of duty unpaid thereon; and what steps have been taken by the Government to enforce Sections 28 and 29 of the Customs Management Act in regard to the same, and if no steps have been taken, why they have not been taken?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have asked the Deputy Minister of Finance and Customs to prepare a statement, and I judge that it will be ready tomorrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table the information, which is as follows:

Mr. Moore asked the Prime Minister who are the censors of moving pictures, if they are paid any salary, and if so, how much; and to table a statement showing all amounts paid to these parties for services in said capacity from the first of January, 1920, up to date.

The names and salaries of the moving picture censors are as follows:

Name	Salary
W. J. Carroll	\$375.00 per annum
T. D. Carew	\$250.00 per annum.

Payments made to these gentlemen in respect of services from January 1st, 1920, to March 31st, 1921, are as follows:

W. J. Carroll	\$526.53
T. D. Carew (from October, 1920)	\$124.98

MR. FOX:—Asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary, or other proper official head:

(a) How many barrels of flour, gallons of molasses and pounds of tea have been issued in the District of Burgeo and LaPoile as Poor Relief, permanent, casual or

- emergency, from March 1st, 1920, to March 31st, 1921.
- (b) Have the Relieving Officer's signed returns of all such Public Charities, covering the period named above, for the said District, tabled, and
- (c) The names of the merchants supplying such flour, molasses and tea, and the prices charged therefor by the said merchants, individually.

MR. LEWIS:—Asked the Hon the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenses for which the Hon. Dr. Campbell appears to have been paid \$2,000 "for travelling expenses to Canada," whether there is any foundation for this allegation, and if so what steps the Government is going to take to deal with this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have called the attention of the Deputy Minister of Finance to that statement and if there are any details they will be furnished to-morrow.

Mr. Lewis asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing for what Dr. Mosdell received the sum of \$875.00 on account of General Contingencies in connection with the hand book; and to lay on the table of the House copy of the same.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The Deputy Minister of Finance is going to let the House have a memorandum in reply to that question.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that a number of people in the District of Harbor Grace who sold their fish to Mr. George Gosse, M.H. A. for that district, have been unpaid, and if any of this fish was part of the stock of 66 casks which Mr. Gosse sold to G. M. Barr a few months ago and for which he received cash; and

if any of this fish was taken by Mr. Gosse from these people and not paid for, will the Government intervene to see that they are paid; also if a number of men of Bay Roberts sold or put off their fish to Fradsham & Co. Ltd., or were employed by the said Company in its fishing operations on Labrador and remain unpaid for their fish or their services; if Hon. R. A. Squires was a partner, guarantor, creditor or mortgagor of the said Company, and if so what is the relation of Hon. R. A. Squires thereto, and if it is possible for the Fisheries Department or any other department of the Government to secure that these people shall be paid the amounts due them by this firm, and if so will he take steps to see that they are paid, as they are represented to be in great need at the present time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—As soon as the reply comes it will be tabled.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if the distribution of able bodied relief has been suspended in Harbor Grace proper while same is continued in all the outlying settlements such as Island Cove, Bryant's Cove, and Spaniard's Bay, and what is the reason for the suspension or cutting off of Poor Relief in Harbour Grace proper at the present time; also who is the Relieving Officer in Harbor Grace and if his action has been taken as a result of instructions from the Poor Commissioner here, or on his own account, and if in the latter case, to lay on the table a copy of any report or letter from him justifying this action.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The attention of the Commissioner of Public Charities has been called to that question, but no reply has yet been received.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has

been called to the declaration of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. W. F. Coaker, to the Annual Convention of the F. P. U. opened at Port Union on Thursday, November 27th, 1919, as reported in "The Advocate" of that date, in which the President of the F. P. U. declared that more stringent laws should be enacted respecting bribery and corruption at elections, coupled with a charge that "clergymen, as well as fishermen were in some cases open to the influence and intimidation that flow from receiving public grants and special favors."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—With respect to that question, I would say that my attention was not called to an observation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made on November 27th, 1919. I did not see a copy of the paper to which reference has been made, nor was the matter referred to Council or considered by them at any time.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister who is E. S. Hennebury, who appears to have received a pension of \$1,249.98; what department he was connected with, and what salary he received before being pensioned.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table the information.

Mr. E. S. Hennebury was formerly telegraph operator and cable repairer at Beaverton, N.D.B. After being connected with the public service since the year 1868, he was pensioned from the 1st January, 1920, upon an annual allowance of \$1,000. Previous to being pensioned his salary was \$114.25 per month.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing for what the Hon. S. J. Foote was paid the sum of \$10,371.12 in relation to an ac-

tion between the schooner "General Currie" and the s.s. "Portia"; to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence in relation to this matter, and to furnish detailed statement of the items making up this amount.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That information will be forthcoming during the afternoon.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing for what the Food Control Board was paid the sum of twelve hundred dollars; all correspondence and documents in relation thereto, and a statement showing the items making up that amount.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have a memorandum from the Deputy Minister of Finance and Customs who is preparing that information and will have it ready tomorrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the declaration of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. W. F. Coaker, to the Annual Convention of the F. P. U. opened at Port Union on Thursday, November 27th, 1919, as reported in "The Advocate" of that date, namely, "That the Minister of Fisheries has appointed Mr. George Hawes, of Alicante, to be his consulting agent at Europe, as Mr. Hawes is probably the most experienced man procurable, having conducted a big fish business on behalf of the Newfoundland trade in Spain the past ten years which has proven successfully"; and if this is the same Mr. Hawes who was described by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in The Advocate newspaper last week as being a man who was doing irreparable injury to our fishery trade through his practise of handling fish on consignment; and is Mr. Hawes still acting as agent for the Newfoundland Government, and if he is,

does the Government propose to continue him in that capacity.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—My attention was not called to the article in question, nor was the matter referred to the Executive Government at any time. I know but only one Mr. Hawes, the fish agent.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I would like to know if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the country, and if he is too ill to come back again. I am not going to take this method of answering.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I understand that he has been ill for some days.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—He should be in his place in the House and not have debate going on in this form.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, what the nature of the coal investigation for which the Anglo-American Development Co. was paid \$7,347.78 from the Account of General Contingencies, a copy of any report made in relation thereto, and a detailed statement of the items making up this amount.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines is preparing the information and I will have it to-morrow.

Mr. Moore asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the consumption of "splits" during the calendar year 1920 and to show the saving, if any, to the Colony in material and value.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—That information is being prepared.

Mr. Moore asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the total amount paid by the Government Departments for advertising in a book on the Road Commission by Mr. R. Hibbs,

M.H.A. for Fogo, during the last year, and to state what value, if any, the Government expected to receive from advertising in this publication.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table that information: The total amount paid by the Government Departments for advertising in the Road Commission Book, issued last year, was \$80.00.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. the Premier if it is the intention of the Government to introduce Bill to repeal:

- (1) The Imports and Exports Restriction Act, 1918, under which the import of sugar was recently prohibited.
- (2) The War Measures Act, 1914.
- (3) The Food Stuffs Act, 1914.
- (4) The Articles of Commerce Act, 1916.
- (5) The Food Control Act, 1917.
- (6) Section 259 of the Customs Act, empowering the Governor in Council to prohibit, amongst other things, the exportation of fish.
- (7) The Fish Regulations Act, 1920.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any arrangements have been made by him on behalf of the Colony or by the Government by which Mr. George Hawes is to receive any financial compensation for alleged claims by him against the Colony arising out of the operation of the fishery regulations and if any contracts or agreements oral or in writing have been entered into between Mr. Hawes on the one hand and the Minister of Fisheries or any other Minister on behalf of the Government on the other hand with that object in view, and if so to lay on the table of the House a summary of the same.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I would ask that that question remain until to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay upon the table of the House

a reply to question 11 on Order Paper of the 20th.

1. Yes, to examine the coal areas owned by the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd.

2. Coal deposits near Howley.

3. William Noel, Thos. J. Freeman, P. Furlong, J. M. Forbes, G. Hudson.

4. As the report deals altogether with the deposits on the private property of the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., it is not considered advisable that it should be published.

5. D. B. Dowling, report and

Investigation	\$1,500.00
Reid Nfld. Co., fares	19.15

\$1,519.15

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Prime Minister what has been done in reference to the recommendation made before the Bar of the House last week in relation to the raising of certain money on Government guarantee from the Bank for the unemployed of St. John's? Has any guarantee been given the Municipal Council or has anything been done outside of what we saw in the papers over the expenditure of that fifty thousand dollars that was passed in this House and appropriated last year for the re-building of the Long Bridge? I presume it is alright; but there must be some guarantee given by the Government before they can advance one hundred and fifty thousand dollars more to the Municipal Council. I would like to know the negotiations concluded in this respect?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker: For the information of the House I will relate the circumstances in so far as I have personal knowledge of them. On Saturday of last week I had an interview with Mr. Ryan, City Engineer, and Mr. Mullaly, the Acting Chairman of the City Commission. As it had been represented by a workingman's committee that great poverty existed in St. John's among the different artisans

and laboring class of people generally, I asked Mr. Mullaly or Mr. Mullaly asked, me to meet a committee of Council on Monday at noon. I met the Commissioners and the proposition was discussed as follows: Mr. Ryan suggested to have 100 men employed by Wednesday and increase that number by 100 men per day up to Saturday and by Monday of this week to have 500 men employed. But he also pointed out that it was necessary for the Council to telegraph to New York for certain water pipe, without which the work could not progress to any considerable extent; also he said that it would be necessary to make arrangements with the Government to get 1,000 feet of 6 inch water pipe to cope with the new water connection in Water Street West and thus ensure a satisfactory supply of water to the Poor Asylum. On that occasion the City Engineer overlook the fact that it would not be possible to start work until he had possession of the lands the pipes had to go through and in order to do this proper notice had to be given and plans had to be drawn. With the result that on Saturday after noon no further steps were taken, but I understand they were to be taken this morning.

Regarding the fifty thousand dollars for St. John's West in connection with the construction of Long Bridge it is the intention to build a new bridge of steel construction that will be about twice the size of the present one. and the new water main of the city will be laid under the river, because the City Engineer thought the vibration of the bridge might be the cause of injury to the main pipes and the disrupting of seams. Mr. Ryan told me that it is the intention of the Council to put a new main across the Bridge, and the question was being debated as to whether that should be done in conjunction with the bridge or tunnelled in. The work is in the hands of the Government and the City Engineer

rather than the Department of Public Works as it was thought that if the Department of Public Works had control, it might give a political significance to the work.

With respect to the loan necessary I went to see the Manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce and he has communicated with Head Office, who, naturally, decided to take a little time to consider the matter, and the Manager told me this morning that he had received a reply which he considered favourable, but that he was awaiting answers to certain other messages, and he would give me a definite reply to-morrow morning. The Government has given the Canadian Bank of Commerce all the security they require for the loan. On Monday there was a morning session of the Municipal Council and Mr. Ryan, the City Engineer, told the Council that he anticipated that on to-morrow he would have twenty-five men on preparatory work, fifty more on the Parade Ground, and fifteen men in at the Sandpit on Topsail Road, making a total of ninety men, and that by Wednesday he hoped to increase it by fifty more, and so on until all the unemployed were working.

The registration list of unemployed shows a total of four hundred and twenty-two, a number of these being single men, but some of them married men with large families. The Chairman of the Council told me this morning that he would have a conference with the three leaders of the Workmen's Council, and that they would go over the list together, so that the most needy cases might be selected for employment first.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation and I think the appreciation as well of my colleagues of St. John's East, that something is being done to relieve the present situation. There were rumors around town regarding the moneys for this purpose, and I am glad to

know that the banks will advance the necessary money to the City Council. I intended to give notice of a resolution in this connection. What we want to do is to look after the people who are hungry and needy, and I hope those in charge of the work, when using discrimination, will use it with mercy, and not turn a man down because he has not a large family. There are many young men today in just as bad circumstances as married men. I hope that the Government will continue in this project and that the necessary money will be forthcoming tomorrow, and that there will be no delay with regard to this work, and I request that the Hon. the Prime Minister see that something tangible be done to employ any man who proves himself worthy of consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that the men of St. John's East and West will appreciate the public spirit of Mr. Bennett with regard to this matter. I did not say that the bank had guaranteed the money, but that the Manager had received a satisfactory reply from head office and that he would let me know definitely tomorrow morning. I may say that in discussing this matter with the Council that I told them that if the Canadian Bank of Commerce refused to give this loan, I would submit to the Legislature the necessity of getting a loan for this work.

Mr. Bennet moved and Hon. the Prime Minister seconded the following resolution:

"RESOLVED: That a Select Committee of this House be appointed with power to send for persons, papers and things, and to take evidence on oath to enquire into the proceedings of the 'Food Control Board' so-called, and especially into the purchase of sugar, and contracts for sugar, whereby certain persons, firms

and companies were relieved of onerous obligations, and heavy losses which they would have incurred, but which were imposed instead upon the taxpayers of the Colony."

This resolution was carried un-animously.

Notice of Motion

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving a Resolution, and, if you will permit me, Sir, I will read it for the benefit of the House, as this matter is a very important one, and I trust that it will receive the consideration that its importance warrants. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was in the early part of last week that I first gave this notice of question. On Thursday last the Prime Minister stated that he was having some enquiries made into the matter and he asked to have it deferred until today. The Resolution is:

"That a Select Committee of this House be appointed with power to send for persons, papers and things, and to take evidence on oath to enquire into the proceedings of the Food Control Board, so called, and especially into the purchase of sugar, and contracts for sugar, whereby certain firms and companies were relieved of onerous obligations, and heavy losses which they would have incurred, but which were imposed instead upon the taxpayers of the Colony."

In moving this Resolution, I desire to impress upon the House that it is not done for any partisan object. This is a question that has been agitating the public mind for a considerable time past, and in view of circumstances that arose recently. Following a question asked the Prime Minister by me, a statement appeared in the Auditor General's Report showing that a loss of between \$190,000 and \$200,000 was sustained on this article, and that amount not ai-

together on sugar handled in Newfoundland at all, but rather on sugar that never reached this country. I submit that that is an important and far-reaching statement, and one that calls for an unusual investigation, not alone in relation to this point, but in relation to the whole work of the Food Control Board since its inception. It is an admitted fact that considerable hardships have been suffered by the people, and considerable losses have been incurred on account of sugar, and it is only right and proper that this House should be in possession of all the facts. I do not in any way impute any wrongdoing to the members of the Food Control Board, as individuals. They are all estimable gentlemen as far as I know; but through some means, either by an error of judgment or bad judgment or bad business tactics or short-sightedness or that they were badly advised, this Colony has been subject to a considerable loss. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that if a committee of five members of this House, I submit to your decision, were appointed, and on which I think it would be advisable to have a couple of legal gentlemen who are capable of examining under oath, to conduct the fullest investigation, that it would be received by the whole community with acceptance. This question has been agitating the public mind so long that it is about time to have it cleared up. Therefore, I have much pleasure in moving the Resolution.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion made by my hon. friend, the Member for St. John's West. As has been said by Mr. Bennett, the question of the conducting of an investigation of the Food Control Board is not a partisan one, because the Board comprises a body of representative citizens, who were appointed in accordance with an Act passed in 1917.

A year ago the Board was enlarged, by an Act passed by the Legislature, from three to five or six members. Its former constitution was the Hon. Sir P. T. McGrath, Editor of "The Evening Herald," as Chairman, Mr. Le-Messurier, Assistant Collector of Customs, and Mr. George Grimes. Mr. McGrath resigned and in his stead was appointed Mr. Mews; Mr. Le-Messurier remains a member of the committee; Mr. George Grimes resigned, and in his stead was appointed Mr. McKay, who, I think, was then the immediate ex-President of the Board of Trade. The powers of the Food Control Board were enlarged to include representatives of the 'Longshoremen's Protective Union and the Newfoundland Industrial Workers' Association, and, if I remember rightly, Mr. McGrath, who at that time was either the then President or ex-President of the L. S. P. U., and Mr. Noel, who was either the then President or ex-President of the N. I. W. A. were appointed additional members of the Board. The Government welcomes the fullest investigation as to the conduct of the Food Control Board, appointed as they were by the Government under an Act passed in 1917. I feel quite certain that the investigation, whatever it discloses as to judgment or business capacity, will evidence to the House and to the country one thing, and that is the untiring efforts on the part of those gentlemen who comprise the Board to do the best they could in accordance with the interests of the whole country. Might I suggest that a committee of three be appointed for a start. Later, if necessary, an enlargement could be made.

MR. BENNETT:—Might I impress upon the House how essential it is to have legal gentlemen on the Committee. If the Government is nominating a legal man, I would suggest Mr. Higgins from this side.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Three representatives would probably be sufficient, and as we go on the enlargement of the committee could be considered.

MR. SPEAKER:—The committee will consist of Hon. S. J. Foote, Chairman, Hon. J. R. Bennett and Hon. Dr. Barnes. The committee will have power to add to their numbers.

Mr. Speaker appointed the committee as follows: Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Bennett, Hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker: It is not my intention to delay the House in regard to this Amendment, but I consider I should be recreant in my duty to myself, and to the party with which I am associated, if I were to sit in my place and allow this vote to proceed, without replying to some of the insinuations and innuendos that have been thrown across to us from the other side of the House during the course of the debate.

I may say, Sir, that when on opening day I moved the appointment of a select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I had no idea that the debate on the Address in Reply would take the acrimonious turn which it has taken, or that we would witness such events, such scenes as we have witnessed in this House during the past fortnight. As far as gentlemen on both sides of the House are concerned, I want to make my position clear, and that is, that coming here for the first time, I regret the events which have occurred here since the opening of the Session. I do not propose to lay the blame on any individual member of the House, or any particular body of men, but in my humble opinion the Legislature by these events has been shorn of every ounce of dignity and prestige with

which it has been vested from its earliest days.

As I stated here in my maiden speech last year, we expect the Opposition to criticise our efforts and our actions as a Government, but one thing stands out more than anything else during this debate, and it is that despite all the matter with which the Opposition has treated this House, we fail to see in it all one suggestion of constructive criticism. I expected our actions would be criticised, but I also thought that the Opposition where we had failed would be able to point the way, and that we might expect from them some constructive criticism at least. Now, Sir, the speeches of the various members of the Opposition contained nothing of that nature. I will go farther and say that from my experience of the people of the country, I do not think that these speeches reflect any credit upon themselves either as individuals or as a party.

Now, Sir, the first thing with which I must concern myself this afternoon, is what I consider to be a personal insult. The F. P. U. members have been called dupes, imbeciles, ignoramuses by Honourable gentlemen opposite who should and do know better. They have been told that they are unable to take care of themselves and that they are at the beck and call of one man. I would like to crave the indulgence of the House, while I lay my position as a member of the F. P. U. before this House and the country.

I am an F. P. U. man, it is true, but I did not go to Mr. Coaker and beg him to employ me, nor did I ask him to take me into his party. I went to him on his own invitation. I was sent for by Mr. Coaker, and as far as the statement goes that I am dependent upon the F. P. U. for a position, that is absolutely false. I held a good position in this country before perhaps the inception of the

F. P. U. and anybody who knows my family will assure you that we have never had to depend upon the Government, the F. P. U. or any other Company or Corporation for our support or well being.

I am as free, Sir, to quit Mr. Coaker tomorrow as I was to go with him, but I should be unfaithful to my district and to the North were I to do such a thing. It is because I know that the F. P. U. has revolutionized conditions North, and has proved to be the greatest benefactor the fishermen North ever had that I stand here today an F. P. U. man. I know the North. I have lived among its people. I know what conditions North were fifteen years ago, and I know what they are to-day. A transformation has been wrought, and our people are in the main prosperous, happy and independent. They are masters of the situation every time. They are neither ignorant, bigoted nor gullable, but their sympathies are not to be alienated from an organization that has done so much for them. It is useless to go North and attempt to destroy this Union. I regret that some Members opposite should have so insultingly referred to this organisation. The one result of this bitter attack will be to cement our ranks and leave us stronger than ever before. The gauntlet has been thrown down to us and we accept the challenge. The man who throws down the gauntlet to fight an organisation such as this really challenges the right of labour to organise.

However the F. P. U. has come to stay and I venture the prediction, Mr. Speaker, that the F. P. U. will be a power North, when some of us here today are no longer known.

Now, to turn again to the debate on the Amendment. The Opposition, as in Duty bound, have lost no opportunity, spared no pains to lay bare the sins of the Government, either real

or imagined. But, Mr. Speaker, throughout their attacks there has been one characteristic evasion, and it is that in discussing conditions as we find them in the country today, they have studiously avoided any reference to world conditions generally. And, Mr. Speaker, it is these world conditions, the aftermath of the war, which are largely responsible for many of the difficulties we find ourselves in today. Their causes are not attributable to Newfoundland any more than conditions in other countries are attributable entirely to these countries.

Take Great Britain as an example. Recently there was a debate in the British House of Commons on an Unemployment Bill and the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, in the course of the debate took the position that conditions there were not attributable to Britain entirely, but were the result of world conditions very largely. I have here the report of his speech, and this is what he says:

"The Prime Minister observed that unemployment was suffering which seemed to him inseparable from the trading activities of the world. The question had been treated rather as if it were something attributable to causes which were confined to Great Britain; that was not the case. With the exception of France every country in the world was suffering from unemployment."

And also:

"The present period of unemployment was undoubtedly due to the fact that the War had impoverished the world. Their customers were insolvent, and Europe could not buy. She was bankrupt. She could hardly feed herself. Until Europe started again, until Europe was able to buy, the prospects would remain very serious."

The same is true of us in Newfoundland, only in a greater degree and not

at all due to any action of the Government, wise or otherwise.

Now, Sir, in discussing the financial position of the colony, the Opposition has charged us with squandering and dissipating the \$4,000,000.00 surplus left in the Treasury by the late Government. They have harped on this to such an extent that it looks very much like an appeal to the galleries rather than an attempt to indulge in honest criticism of our actions. Let us have criticism by all means, but at least let it be fair and honest.

Granting that the \$4,000,000.00 was there, why can't the Opposition be honest with themselves and with the country, and tell the country that it took nearly half that surplus to pay debts and bills which they themselves incurred and left unpaid as a legacy to us when they went out of office. That is the true position, Sir, and the sooner the country knows the truth the sooner it will be in a position to place the proper value on the charges of the Opposition against the Government.

Then, there is the charge against us that we took \$500,000.00 to buy fish. That was a crime, wasn't it? The Leader of the Opposition says, "yes, it was." Then, all I have to say is, that the man who takes that position is looking at it absolutely from a local point of view. We did no more than the British Government did, when they subsidized the coal miners of England. The market price of coal did not warrant the mine owners in paying the wages compatible with the cost of living. The Government stepped in and subsidized the miners, and it is because that subsidy is now to be removed that we are witnessing this gigantic strike of the miners.

If that fish had not been bought we should have had forty or fifty thousand quintals of Labrador fish with us unsold which would have meant starvation and destitution over large areas north. The Honourable Member

of St. John's West, (Mr. Bennett) asks what about the West Coast. I maintain that the purchase of this fish tended to keep prices up on the West Coast, and it also did much to sustain prices of our fish on the other side, and en route. It is said we used the \$500,000.00 to buy fish from our own supporters North. That is untrue. Out of the 6,000 shareholders of the F.P.U. I venture to say that not ten sold their fish under this arrangement.

The Leader of the Opposition asks what about the fish on the "President Coaker?" My answer is, that the fish on the "President Coaker" may have been from F.P.U. men or it may not. When a man comes to Port Union to sell fish, if we are prepared to buy we do not ask whether he is an F.P.U. man or not. We treat all alike.

Now, coming on to the Fish Regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I stated here on the opening day that the Regulations had benefitted the fishermen to the extent of between two and three dollars a quintal. I am still of that opinion, and I believe in a very short time we will have some of the very strongest opponents of the Fish Regulations coming to us and asking that they again be put in force. But, notice has been given of a bill to repeal the Regulations, and as at present enforced and constituted they will have to go.

Now just a personal reference in conclusion.

The Honourable Member for St. George's stated that I would not be received very royally in Bonne Bay if I went there now. Well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I admit the people of Bonne Bay are not very demonstrative as a rule, but I want to inform the Honourable Member also that on the day he made that statement I had in my pocket four telegrams, from business men and others of Bonne Bay, assuring me of the

support of the people there and on the coast.

I was just in the act of concluding my few remarks on the amendment to the Address in Reply when the Honourable Member for St. George's rose to a point of order. I was about to conclude by saying that I could not find myself in a position to vote for the amendment for the various reasons outlined by Mr. Jennings the other day. The amendment arose out of the fact that there was no intimation in the Speech from the Throne that the Codfish Exportation Act would be repealed. There was no such intimation, there could be no such intimation because the responsible Minister was not in the country. As soon as he arrived notice of a Bill to repeal the Act was given, and therefore I cannot see the consistency of supporting the amendment.

These are my remarks as far as this matter is concerned and I have tried to answer the many criticisms thrown across from the other side in a fair manner and I have tried to conduct myself in such a way as to reflect credit to the Party I am with on this side of the House as well as to the district I have the honor of representing.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jennings in his able speech of Thursday last, stated that when in Opposition, the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, now Judge Kent, trained them to obey the rules of debate and to observe and follow along the lines of parliamentary procedure. I am sorry, Sir, that the present Leader of the Opposition has not followed the example of his predecessors. Sir Michael has invariably interrupted the different speakers: he has abused us collectively and individually, he has appealed to the galleries; he has over-ruled the Speaker's decision, and conducted himself in such a manner as to bring discredit

upon himself and the party which he now leads.

As a young and "impertinent" (if you please) member of this Assembly, I wish to remind him that most of us, and I believe Newfoundland in general, wish to see this House conducted decently and we are still duty bound to help maintain here that honor and dignity handed down to us from the Mother of Parliaments.

It appears to me that many of my honorable friends opposite are fighting a political campaign rather than taking an interest in discussing the legislation for which this country now hungers. We have been informed several times that we have spent three or four weeks here in session but have not yet accomplished anything. Who is to blame for this state of affairs but the Opposition? They have exhausted themselves in debating the Speech from the Throne, and then framed up an excuse in the shape of an amendment in order to get an opportunity for sending across a second gas attack. Upon reference to past governments, we find that when a Bill covering the demands of an amendment has been presented, the amendment has been immediately withdrawn. In this instance, such is not the case, but the Opposition, who are posing as the saviours of the country, have taken full advantage of an amendment in order to prolong the debate.

Mr. Speaker, is such conduct honest? Is it parliamentary? Is it patriotic? Such conduct at the present time when we should get to business as speedily as possible cannot be pleasing to the intelligent supporters of our friends opposite. We expect and welcome honest criticism. It is essential to good legislation, but we abhor and resent dishonest criticism and personal abuse; and, Sir, I now wish to take this opportunity of hurling back in the faces of those

who so ungentlemanly and wantonly insulted us, their insults and their scorn.

Much has been said about the Fishery Regulations. Some, who know the least about them, have said the most. Some of those who scarcely know a codfish from a squid have been ready to enforce their views upon this Assembly as being the only right and proper course to pursue. I think there are but two members of this House who have any practical knowledge of the marketing of fish abroad, and unfortunately these two gentlemen disagree in their ideas. Most of us, however, are aware that the Fishery Regulations were introduced at a time when the markets were exceedingly poor and when gentlemen who had a greater love for party politics than for country used their influence to defeat them. The plea has been put up by some gentlemen opposite that they voted for the Regulations because they knew the Bill would be passed in any case. Is not this a petty excuse, seeing that the same may be said of any Bill which the Government brought forward.

Mr. Coaker (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), in putting the Regulations into effect carried out the wishes of the Exporters' Association and of the Advisory Board, yet, because they have not been wholly successful, the entire blame is laid on the Minister, and despite the fact that Mr. Coaker was spoken of in such glowing terms last year by the majority of the Opposition, he is now, according to the statement of one of the Opposition, a criminal. The Opposition have been trying to impose upon an innocent public the fact that all the depression, all the poverty, all the lack of employment, all the fish now left unsold are due to the Regulations. This, Mr. Speaker, is political camouflage! What about herring? Are they in de-

mand today? Is this due to the Regulations? Sir Michael Cashin stated a few days ago that the seal-skins and oil of last year were not yet disposed of. Is this due to the Regulations? What about the decrease in the value of lumber? Is this due to the Regulations? What about the lack of employment on Bell Island, at Grand Falls, and even at St. John's? Is this due to the Regulations?

The one thing that surprises me is that some member opposite did not have the audacity to try to impress upon the public that the excessive fall of snow in St. John's last winter was due to the Fishery Regulations.

Mr. Speaker, we are in as good a condition as other countries which knew nothing of Regulations. The conditions which we now have to face in common with other countries are not due to the Regulations, but it is our legacy of the Great War.

The F. P. U. Members have been termed hirelings, told that we are controlled body and soul, that we have no independence whatever. I wish to inform the gentlemen who are responsible for these charges that the F. P. U. members are just as independent, just as ready to fight for the right, and just as loyal to the voters who sent them here as any of the members of this Assembly.

Mr. Fox has informed us that he has taken off his coat to fight the F. P. U., or words to that effect. He has thrown out the challenge and we accept that challenge. The conduct of himself and others during this session has been such to bind the F. P. U. stronger than it ever was before.

I venture to predict that he will never be strong enough to tear the heart out of Coaker and that long after he and I have passed into the Beyond, the F. P. U. will remain a living memorial to its founder—"that man Coaker"—who has given and is still giving his ability, his energy, his

all, for the uplifting and independence of the toiling masses.

Mr. Speaker, we admire the manner in which our leader, the Premier, has conducted himself during this most contemptible form possible, he has played the part of a gentleman, session. Although attacked in the and we feel sure that when his turn comes, he will do himself justice.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in opposing the Amendment.

A disorder having arisen, Mr. Speaker in consequence, left the Chair at a quarter to five until six o'clock.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. MacDonnell 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, APRIL 26, 1921.

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

Mr. Vinicombe gave Notice of Question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice, Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Hon. the Minister of Education seconded "That a Select Committee of three of this House be appointed to confer with a Committee of three of the Great War Veterans' Association, the Board of Pensions Commissioners and the Chief Staff Officer of the Department of Militia, in the matter of Pensions and Gratuities to Newfoundland Soldiers and Sailors who served in the Great War and their Dependents."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, the notice of motion as printed on the Order Paper is not exactly as I desire to have it. It should read as follows:

“That a Select Committee of three of this House be appointed to confer with a Committee of three of the Great War Veterans' Association, the Board of Pension Commissioners and the Chief Staff Officer of the Department of Militia, in the matter of Pensions and Gratuities to Newfoundland soldiers and sailors who served in the Great War and their Dependents.”

In moving the appointment of this Select Committee I would observe that some days ago I was approached by the G.W.V.A. asking that a Select Committee of three be appointed by the Legislature to look into certain alleged irregularities in connection with certain pensions and gratuity cases. I understand that the G.W.V.A. has appointed or propose to appoint a committee of three, and the Select Committee of the Legislators, together with this committee of three of the G.W.V.A. will form a representative body for a conference with the Board of Pension Commissioners and the Chief Staff Officer of the Department of Militia, so that any alleged irregularities may be satisfactorily investigated. The work of the Board of Pension Commissioners has been exceptionally arduous, and it is not to be expected that every one of the thousands of cases with which they have to deal would be dealt with in a manner satisfactory to everybody. I feel, however, that the Board of Pension Commissioners themselves heartily welcome the presentation to them of any complaint and will be happy to look into any alleged irregularities or injustices which may be supposed to have occurred. So far as the Government is concerned, it regards with pleasure the action of the G.W.V.A. in this connection and I have much

pleasure in moving the appointment of a Select Committee.

DR. BARNES:—I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion proposed by the Prime Minister.

This motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker thereupon appointed the Committee as follows: Mr. Small, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Sullivan.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of the House:

- (1) A detailed statement showing all cattle purchased by the Agriculture & Mines Department peddree, etc., and cost of same.
- (2) A detailed statement showing the cost of keeping said cattle since arrival to date; how many men are employed at same, and who is in charge.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, to lay on the Table of the House the cost of his trip to Italy; what amounts he has been paid; is it his intention to put in any bill for his services; and on whose authority did he proceed to Italy?

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of all monies paid in connection with forest fires during the past twelve months

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of what poor relief has been sent from St. John's since September 1st, 1920, to date, and the names of the firms who have supplied same.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Hon. the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House what was the total amount paid for the hire of the S. S. Diana last season, also how much was paid per day

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any decision has

been arrived at by the Government, in connection with a Company to be formed here relative to working the Grand Lake and Humbermouth proposition; and to inform the House what policy they intended to pursue?

(1) Is it correct that this country is going to be asked to guarantee the principal and interest up to \$25,000,000 to carry on this work. If that is not correct to inform this House what are the actual facts, and to lay all correspondence in connection with same on the Table of the House.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries if these Fish Inspectors have been employed the past few days, and if so what for; also if Mr. Stephen Bradbury has been sent to the West Coast to inspect fish, and what is the intention of the Government in the future re inspection of fish for the coming season.

Mr. Moore asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement of the quantity of liquors of all kinds supplied by the Controller's Department to Messrs. Stafford, druggists, from Nov. 15th, 1919, to March 31st, 1921, and the value of the same, specifying the quantities of the different kinds of liquors, beers, etc. supplied.

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, what is represented by the following two items in the General Contingencies Account:

Smith Traverse, coal boring expenses, \$14,261.74.

Smith Traverse, coal boring expenses, \$2,835.54.

and to furnish a detailed statement of the said expenditure.

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the

Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what is represented by the item in the General Contingencies Account, "Daily Star, \$600.00," and to furnish a detailed statement of same.

Dr. Jones asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman of the Railway Commission, if there is in his possession or in that of any Government Department, a report on the coal boring explorations under way near Grand Lake for sometime past, with particular reference to an alleged discovery last fall of a new seam which was represented by Railway Commission in newspapers as being exceedingly important and likely to be able to supply the needs of Grand Falls, if this seam is now being worked, and if so to what extent; and if it is not being worked, why not; and to table also a statement of the expenditure on the said coal boring experiment from the 15th of November, 1919, up to date.

Mr. Sullivan asked Hon. W. F. Coaker, Chairman of Railway Commission to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing:

- (1) The cost of operating the railway from July 1st, 1920 to March 21st, 1921.
- (2) The earnings of the railway from July 1st, 1920 to March 31st, 1921.
- (3) The amount of snow-fighting last season.
- (4) The amount lost in operating the railway and steamers from July 1st, 1920, to March 31, 1921.
- (5) What further amount over revenue will be required to operate the railway and steamers from March 31st, 1921, to June 30th 1921.
- (6) If it is the intention of the Government to continue to operate the railway and steamers under the Commission after June 30th, 1921.
- (7) If it is not their intention to do

so, then to inform this House at once what policy they intend to pursue in connection with our inland transportation and coastal problems.

- (8) The amount expended to date improving the terminal at Port au Basques, and the cost of the Argentinia terminal to date.
- (9) To inform the House how many box cars and flat cars have been completed to date, also the price paid for the new locomotives which were imported recently.

Mr. Sullivan asked Hon. W. F. Coaker, Chairman of the Railway Commission, to inform the House what amounts, if any, is still due the Reid-Nfld Co., for repairs to steamers and what claims there are against the Railway Commission in connection with the operation of the railway system and the coastal service.

Mr. Sullivan asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to inform the House what time it is proposed to hold the arbitration in connection with the land which was taken over for terminal facilities and right of way at Argentinia?

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House:

- (1) The exact cost of the S. S. Watchful, also contracts and vouchers for all monies paid out for repairs or to be paid out.
- (2) The exact cost of the S. S. Sebastopol, also contracts and vouchers for all monies paid out for repairs or to be paid out.
- (3) The exact cost of the S. S. Daisy, also contracts and vouchers for all monies paid out for repairs or to be paid out.
- (5) The exact cost of the S. S. Malakoff, also contracts and vouchers for all monies paid out for repair or to be paid out.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minis-

ter of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House a full detailed statement of the \$11,000 due by his Department to the Treasury for salt, as stated in the report of the Auditor-General.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs, to lay on the Table of the House the Revenue for January, February, March, and April, 1920, and the corresponding period for 1921.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, to inform this House what quantity of pulp wood has been cut on Government account up to date, what the total quantity will likely be; also what amount of wood cut on Government account has been sold to date; if none has been sold, what is the intention of the Government in connection with the matter?

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a report if any has yet been made, on the herring fishery of the West Coast during the past winter showing the quantity and value of herring taken at the various centres of activity there and the quantity and value of the same exported together with a comparative statement of the quantity and value of the exports for the previous years, and to say why there has been such a falling off in the industry and what steps, if any, he is taking to revive it and make it the valuable feature in our fishing industries—that it was in the past.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister if a meeting was held Thursday last between the Government or representatives thereof and the Managers of the Banks in St. John's, what was the purpose of the said meeting; what propositions were put before it by the Government, and

what by the Bankers, and what was the outcome of the meeting; and to lay on the Table of the House copies of any correspondence or other documents in relation thereto. Also, if there was a meeting on Friday night last between the Government, or representatives thereof, and merchants, fish exporters or other parties, and if so, what was the object of the same, what propositions were put before the meeting by the Government and what was the outcome of the same? And to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence and other documents in relation thereto.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines:—

- (a) What practical results ensued from the use of the airplanes at Botwood this Spring in assisting our sealing steamers to locate the seals;
- (b) How many trips were made by the airplanes?
- (c) The total period they were in the air and the total mileage they covered, if they got out of sight of land, and if not, why not.
- (d) If they ever reached any areas where seals in large quantities were visible and if so when and what was the result;
- (e) If they were ever in touch by wireless with the sealing steamers;
- (f) If they furnished the sealing steamers with any information of any kind whatever, and
- (g) What was the total cost of this experiment to the Colony?

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs, if Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines—Hon. Dr. Campbell, in his capacity as Health Officer to the ports of St. John's, actually visits incoming steamers to give them a

Health Certificate, as required by law, and if not why not? If in cases where he does not visit the ship he collects the fee for said visit and certificate and if so, why? And to lay on the Table of the House a statement of all the ships actually visited by him from the first of January of this year up to date, endorsed by the certificate of the proper officer certifying the cases in which such visits were made and the cases in which they were not made.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if the six motor cars to which reference has already been made in this House as having been delivered to Importers on temporary permits without duty being paid, have been attached by the Department of Customs as security for the duty thereon; if the advertisement by a City Auctioneer recently, of having cars for sale has reference to these cars; if in the absence of invoices when the cars were brought in a Bill of Sight was tendered or accepted on said cars as is usual in such cases; if in the absence of such Bill of Sight the said cars were sent to the examining store or valued by the Customs' Examining Officer, and duly tendered on his valuation, and if not, why not, and also to ask where these cars are at present, and if the Customs' Department has any deposit or security for the said duty thereon, and if none of these steps were taken why was a different practice followed in regard to these cars than what is usual in other cases?

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what is represented by the item in the General Contingencies Account—"Newfoundland Fishery Board \$746.42"

Sir M. P. Cashin drew the attention of Hon. the Premier, to the statement of the Auditor General, in a report laid upon the Table of this House, by the Premier, and will ask him to obtain further special report from the Auditor General explaining:

- (a) What Treasury Officials or Officials informed him of the facts he reports as to the salt cargo landed at Port Union?
- (b) In what manner money was obtained from the Surplus Trust Fund in the Bank of Montreal, if there was, as far as he knows, no Minutes of Council authorizing the transaction.
- (c) If there was a special warrant signed by the Governor for the issue of the amount expended, as required by the Audit. Act, Sec 335?
- (d) When and by whom and in what form, the sum of \$4,400.00 was paid into the Treasury on account of this salt, and if by cheque to attach the cheque or a copy thereof, to the special report?

And further that I will ask the Premier:

- (a) If there is any correspondence or any documents in relation to this matter, of any kind, whatever, and if so to lay copies thereof on the Table of this House especially, of the charter party of the ship which brought the salt to the Colony, and of the correspondence relating to the purchase thereof?
- (b) Whether the purchase or disposition of the salt was known at the time thereof to the Governor-in-Council, or was negotiated by any minister, and if so, by whom, and with what authority.
- (c) If the Government propose to take any proceedings in the Supreme Court to test whether a

sale of the salt to the Union Trading Co., Ltd., was or was not made, and to recover the balance due if a sale was made, and if so, when such proceedings will be instituted, and

- (d) If no such proceedings are intended, does the Government accept the position that the salt now at Port Union belongs to the Government, and if so, what costs connected therewith are being incurred, what provisions as to its care and custody are being made, at what rates is it to be sold, and by whom, and how and by whom will the price be collected, and at present current rates, what will be the approximate loss on the transaction in case of such sale on behalf of the Government.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if any arrangements have been made by him on behalf of the Colony or by the Government by which Mr. George Hawes is to receive any financial compensation for alleged claims by him against the Colony arising out of the operation of the fishery regulations and if any contracts or agreements oral or in writing have been entered into between Mr. Hawes on the one hand and the Minister of Fisheries or any other Minister on behalf of the Government on the other hand with that object in view, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a summary of the same.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that a number of people in the District of Harbor Grace who sold their fish to Mr. George Gosse, M.H.A., for that district have been unpaid, and if any of this fish was part of the stock of 66 casks which Mr. Gosse sold to G. M. Barr a few months ago, and for which he received cash; and if any of this fish

was taken by Mr. Gosse from these people and not paid for, will the Government intervene to see that they are paid; also if a number of men of Bay Roberts sold or put off their fish to Fradsham & Co., Ltd., or were employed by the said Company in its fishing operations on Labrador and remain unpaid for their fish or their services; if Hon. R. A. Squires was a partner, guarantor, creditor, or mortgagor of the said Company, and if so, what is the relation of Hon. R. A. Squires thereto, and if it is possible for the Fisheries Department or any other Department of the Government to secure that these people shall be paid the amounts due them by this firm, and if so will he take steps to see that they are paid as they are represented to be in great need at the present time.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Minister of Public Works to furnish a statement showing in detail a complete list of all goods supplied by W. J. Scott, Esq., S.M., when he took up his residence at Curling and at any period since.

Mr. Vinicombe gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I beg to table a reply to questions asked by Mr. Fox and Mr. Walsh.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to table a reply to a question asked by Mr. Fox yesterday.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, on yesterday's Order Paper the following question was asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Sir M. P. Cashin, to ask Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that a number of people in the District of Harbor Grace who sold their fish to Mr. George Gosse, M.H.A. for that district, have been unpaid, and if any of this fish was part of the stock of 66 casks which Mr. Gosse sold to G. M. Barr a few months ago

and for which he received cash; and if any of this fish was taken by Mr. Gosse from these people and not paid for, will the Government intervene to see that they are paid; also if a number of men of Bay Roberts sold or put off their fish to Fradsham & Co. Ltd., or were employed by the said Company in its fishing operations on Labrador and remain unpaid for their fish or their services; if Hon. R. A. Squires was a partner, guarantor, creditor or mortgagor of the said Company, and if so what is the relation of Hon. R. A. Squires thereto, and if it is possible for the Fisheries Department or any other department of the Government to secure that these people shall be paid the amounts due them by this firm, and if so will he take steps to see that they are paid as they are represented to be in great need at the present time.

The answer was satisfactory inasmuch as Mr. Gosse did not receive any fish from the gentlemen referred to here. Yesterday I did not have in my possession the letter which I just got today and which I shall read to the House. (Reads letter.)

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to introduce bills to repeal:

- (1) The Imports and Exports Restriction Act, 1918, under which the import of sugar was recently prohibited.
- (2) The War Measures Act, 1914.
- (3) The Food Stuffs Act, 1914.
- (4) The Articles of Commerce Act, 1916.
- (5) The Food Control Act, 1917.
- (6) Section 259 of the Customs Act, empowering the Governor in Council to prohibit, amongst other things, the exportation of fish.
- (7) The Fish Standardization Act, 1920.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In answer to the question of the honorable member for St. John's West, I

would observe that the Imports and Exports Restriction Act, 1918, was passed by this Legislature at the suggestion of the Imperial authorities. So far as the policy of the Government is concerned, the Act may be immediately repealed, but in view of the circumstances under which it was passed I feel that the Imperial authorities should be consulted before any action is taken.

With respect to the War Measures Act, the Food Control Act, and all other specific war legislation, the policy of the Government is that these Acts should be repealed so far as special powers and responsibilities are vested in the Executive Administration by virtue of them. I think it will be found that some of these Acts do not require any special repealing legislation, as they automatically elapse after the proclamation of peace.

As to Section 259 of the Customs Act, that is not war legislation. It has been the law of the Colony for many years, and in the opinion of the Minister of Finance and Customs is a necessary precaution.

The matter of the Fish Standardization Act is one of policy and is now before the Government for consideration.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER:—

The reply to question of Mr. Bennett, No. 9, on Order Paper of April 26th, 1921, is as follows:

A contract was entered into between the Government and the Smith Travers Company, dated 2nd August, 1919, to drill 3,000 feet at the rate of \$6.00 per foot, for the purpose of defining the boundaries of the coal measures in the vicinity of Howley and Sandy Lake, and the existence of coal in this locality. On the completion of this contract, as the Government was advised that while this drilling had resulted in the delimitation of the boundaries of a portion of the area underlain by these measures, further work was necessary in order to arrive at a

definite result, a new contract was made on the 5th October, 1920, for the boring of 10,000 additional feet at the same rate, viz., \$6.00 per foot.

The following are the details of the two amounts in the General Contingencies Account, namely, \$14,201.74 and \$2,835.54.

Diamond drilling for coal near Howley Station: Sept. 30, 1920, Hole No. 1, from 0 to 556"	556" at \$6.00	\$ 3,336.00
Allowance for road construction		1,500.00
		<hr/>
		\$ 4,836.00

October 30th, 1920, Hole No. 2, from 0 to 435 435"		
Hole No. 3, from 0 to 130 130"		
		<hr/>
	565"	
565" at \$6.00		3,390.00
November 30th, 1920, Hole No. 3, from 130" to 557" 427" at \$6.00		2,562.00
December 31st, 1920, Hole No. 4, from 0 to 556" 556" at \$6.00		3,396.00
Cost		17.74
		<hr/>
		\$14,201.74

January 31st, 1921, Hole No. 5, 0 to 472" at \$6.00	2,832.00
Cost	63.54
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,835.54

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

The reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 24, on Order Paper of April 26th, 1921, is as follows:

The sum of \$746.42 paid from the vote for General Contingencies to the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd. (not Newfoundland Fishery Board as stated in question), was made under the provisions of the Act, Chapter 30 of 1917, entitled "An Act to amend the Act 10, Edward VII. (1910), Chapter

31, entitled 'An Act respecting Cold Storage.' Under the provisions of this Act, authority is given to the Governor in Council for the payment of a bonus not exceeding 1c. per pound on certain kinds of fresh or frozen fish exported. Attached hereto is a copy of the account of the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Limited, which gives the details making up the above amount paid them in respect of bonus:

St. John's, Dec. 2, 1920.

Messrs The Nfld. Government,
Treasury Dept.
To Nfld. Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd.,
Head Office, St. John's, Nfld.
To Bonus on Fish shipped during
period 1917-1919.

S. S. "Payano, November 25, 1918—
650 boxes Haddock116,000 lbs.
138 " Salmon 38,475 "
29,467 as per Re-
port Outwards,
10 " Turbot 2,000 "
2 " Flatfish 320 "
10 " Caplin 300 "
5 " Wolffish 1,198 "

158,293 lbs.

At ½c. lb. \$791.46
Less, overclaimed on Sal-
mon at ½c per lb 9,008

149,285

\$45.04 minus \$791.46 equals \$746.42.
As per Cold Storage Act passed
August 8, 1917.
Certified correct at \$746.52, Charge
to General Contingencies.

(Sgd.) F. C. BERTEAU,
C. & A. G.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the cost of his trip to Italy; what amount he has been paid; is it his intention to put in any bill for his services; and on whose authority did he proceed to Italy?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—
No statement of costs has been pre-

pared. It is not my intention to put in any bill for services. I proceeded to Italy as Prime Minister of Newfoundland, and with that authority. When I was in London I gathered that there was some friction between Newfoundland and Italy because of the fish situation, and I went to Italy to see just what the trouble was, and, if possible, to clear it up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege of asking the Prime Minister a question now? After the Prime Minister's return last fall it was rumoured around town that while he was in Italy messages had been shown him by the President of the Consorzio that had been sent to him by people here, and I understand that there were messages from me advising him not to submit to the Fish Regulations. I would like to ask the Prime Minister now if, while on his visit to Mr. Ragnoli he had seen any messages from me regarding the Fish Regulations.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—
When I was in London I found that there was a great "blue ruin" campaign being conducted, to the effect that Newfoundland was in trouble in disposing of her fish. I made an effort to find out the source of this propaganda. I was interviewed by a certain influential financial gentleman. He asked me for my opinion of this rumor that was current in London. I said that it was a matter of party politics,—the Opposition papers say that the country is in a bad financial situation, and the Government papers say that the financial situation is good and that the Fish Regulations are working for the benefit of the country. I told him that I did not ask him to accept my statements, but that I would give him a certified copy of the country's trade for the past year. I took care when leaving Newfoundland to take with me such papers as may be necessary

for this purpose. I later was waited on by a strong newspaperman. He said he had received a copy of the Daily News, apparently from the Daily News Office, with the editorial which was particularly damaging to the interests of Newfoundland, blue penciled. He said that had it appeared without the blue pencil marks it would undoubtedly have been used in the regular course, but as it appeared with blue pencil marks he thought there was something peculiar about it. I asked him to show me a copy of the paper, which he did in a few days. Then I was told that there was an organ on foot to buy Newfoundland fish if the Fish Regulations were repealed, and contemporaneous with that I found that it was rumoured that if Italy declined to buy Newfoundland fish other markets would be flooded. Mr. Ragnoli told me that he was of opinion that Newfoundland was fighting her political battles in Italy, and he said that he had been advised that if he would hold off fish at a much smaller price. He said, "Mr. Squires, if you could sell your fish somewhere else and get a shilling more for it that is where you would sell it," and I am bound, in the interests of my country, to buy at the cheapest price it can be obtained." Mr. Ragnoli was wise enough not to tell me who had sent the messages.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Prime Minister has seen fit to answer me in that way. He didn't have the common decency, the fairness, to answer my question as I put the question to him. Now, you know there is a time when you feel sad for a man, and I really feel sad for him to-day. He has fallen down in his position. I asked him a straight question, and I want it answered. I asked him whether my name was mentioned.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—No names were mentioned.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—That is what I wanted to know. Now as far as the "Blue ruin" is concerned I have no hesitation in stating in this House what I stated here a year ago that the condition would be another "Black Monday," and the condition to day is worse than "Black Monday." Are we going to stay here without doing anything. With regard to the disturbances in the galleries, I want to say that I am here to state my own opinion. I think this House of Parliament has sunken to its very lowest depths. There was a man in the audience yesterday supposed to be arrested, and he was taken to the lock-up, and there was found on him an order for a bottle of rum from Dr. Campbell. It is better for you in the interests of the country to close up the House and let somebody else come in and run it. I want to say also that one of the door-keepers on the door yesterday was as drunk as any man that came in, and that is the condition that we have to stand for. Now if it is a row they want, they can have it, I can incite it in a very quick time. If I cannot get a hearing I will move that you clear this House. I now move that this man Cullen be cleared from this House. Now I want to know what you are going to do about it.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to inform this House what quantity of pulp wood has been cut on Government account up to date; what the total quantity will likely be; also what amount of wood cut on Government account has been sold to date; if none has been sold, what is the intention of the Government in connection with the matter?

No pulp wood is being cut on Government account. Permission has

been given to parties to cut and sell or export specific qualities of pulp wood, but the Government has no interest in the matter unless and until the parties who obtained this permission notify them by the first June next that they have been unable to dispose of timber cut by them.

As the Government has no interest in this pulp wood at present, no measurement of it has been made for this Department.

No notice has been served on the Government to date as to whether the wood being cut has been sold, or not.

If notice of the failure of the parties cutting to sell their wood is received by the 1st June, the Government is liable for the purchase of the quantity unsold at the rate of \$6.00 per cord.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Mr. Speaker: Just a word. Mr. Gosse misunderstood me yesterday when I asked that question. I simply asked it because I was requested to do so. I have the proof here in a letter from his district asking me to take the matter up in the House of Assembly. They stated that they have written Dr. Barnes and that he has not thought it worth his while to answer them. They put him in here as Minister of Education. They went to the Labrador and worked hard and when they came back they couldn't get money for their fish, and now they have to live on Indian Meal and Molasses, and he has not interest enough in the people who elected him to answer that letter. Mr. Gosse contends that he is a very innocent man and that he was roped into politics, but he forgot to tell us that he is a very cute man. Mr. Gosse last year got a tip about the price of fish, but he didn't pass it along to his neighbors. With a show of great independence he gets up and tells us here that he never owed a cent to any man, and that he is a very much wronged man,

but I disagree with his statement in view of the manner in which he got rid of his fish last year. He is not as innocent as he pretends to be. He sits there supporting a Government that took a half million dollars out of the public Treasury to buy fish, and he sold his fish to the Government and got part of that money for it. Mr. Coaker without the authority of this House or even the authority of the full Executive took five hundred thousand dollars of the public funds, and he got part of that money. Then we have him calling up to the clouds that he is an honest man. I say he is not an honest man. A man who would take that money in payment for his fish could not be honest. I make the charge here now that it was criminal to take that money from the Treasury, and he is one of criminal gang who took it. Mr. Coaker is to blame for it. In his last agony to get himself out of a nasty hole he took that money without the authority of the Prime Minister or Minister of Justice and placed it to his own account at the Bank of Nova Scotia. Is that honest?

This thing has got to end here and now forever. The whole thing is a scandal and you know it. Take the salt scandal, the fish scandal, and all the other scandals, and then the Hon. member gets up here with an attitude of holy horror, and asserts his independence and honesty in face of this letter from eighteen starving men of his district, who put him and Dr. Barnes in here, the latter Minister of Education at a salary of five thousand dollars a year which he is not energetic enough to go out and earn. That is the position and it is the greatest imposition on Responsible Government since it was known in this country. I have taken every man on the other side of the House individually and put him in his proper posi-

tion, and I am prepared to do it again. There is not a particle of independence in the honorable member or he would not be sitting where he is.

We do not want the Government. Who in the name of God could wish me any worse evil today than the Government. I would sooner have an infection. The Government is gone, there is no Government. It is absurd to think that we want the Government. We don't. There is no Government to-day, only a crowd of pawns, with no independence of action. You placed heeled in the gallery yesterday, but the Prime Minister overdid it. He ordered them too much stimulant, but no matter who is here or otherwise, while I have a seat here I will stand by my constituents and people of the country. It is disgusting to have to listen to the member for Harbor Grace, Mr. Gosse, and then read this letter from eighteen men who first wrote Dr. Barnes, who had not the decency even to answer them. He proclaimed my name in Harbor Grace. He held me up to ridicule and now I am here to meet him. I can answer him that Dr. Barnes will never be faced with a letter of this kind from Ferryland. That is the position I take in this House. We don't want the Government. It is in a deplorable mess, and there is only one way out of it to go out and say to the people who sent you here that you don't know how to represent them, if not you will be fired out when patience ceases to be a virtue, as it will soon.

What has the Prime Minister done in answer to some questions asked as to where the fishermen will get supplies for the fishery this year? When will we hear the answer in the House? As I said the other day "How long, Oh Lord, How long." Men are coming in here looking for bread. What have you to give them, a stone? Then

we come here and the Prime Minister sends hoodlums here to interrupt us, but I serve notice on him, that I don't care who comes here I am going to say what I have to say in criticism of the Government's policy. That is the position and when Mr. Gosse stands up and talks about his independence it is enough to give you the blues. He is not independent, if he were he should go out of the House.

MR. GOSSE:—I am independent, and I did not make any money out of the Government.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Never mind about that, we are here to set the position right and to tell the whole story and compel the Government do their work properly, and that is the reason I read this letter here this evening. Why wouldn't I read it coming as it did from eighteen fishermen who sent him and Dr. Barnes here to look after their interests.

MR. GOSSE:—What had those men to do with me?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You are trying to evade the issue now. Those men sent you here to look after their interests, and as long as I am here, when I am asked to expose wrong doing, I will do so.

MR. GOSSE:—You are talking rot.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I am not talking rot, if I were you would not feel the sting so thoroughly as you do now. According to the state of excitement you are in now it does not appear as if I were talking rot, I will put you in your place before I am through with you.

MR. GOSSE:—I am in my proper place now.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You are in a sorry place now after selling your fish and taking the people's money in payment for it, the money which you were sent here to safeguard and look after.

It was this letter, Mr. Gosse, that I

promised to table for you today, and this was the letter that prompted me to put that question on the Order Paper. It is a matter that concerns your district alone, and it is nothing to me.

MR. GOSSE:—What have these men who were attached to Fradsham & Co. to do with the firm of G. & M. Gosse? I understood from you yesterday and this House also understood that there were eighteen sharemen, who claimed that they had not been paid by G. & M. Gosse.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You misunderstood me if you thought that was what was said.

MR. GOSSE:—You wanted to know if any of the fish which I sold to Barr represented any of the fish which these men were not paid for. Now what possible connection could those men who were attached to Fradsham & Co. have with G. & M. Gosse? I would like, Sir Michael Cashin, to make this point clear, because I never owed a fisherman five cents in my life, nor a farmer, nor a merchant. Never since I was born have I owed any man five cents. If I had any bills I paid them when they came due. It was thoroughly understood here yesterday that Gosse, M.H.A., and G. & M. Gosse, which is the firm, owed eighteen sharemen for their trip. That was the impression given honorable members in this House that eighteen men wrote Sir Michael Cashin saying that Gosse had not paid them for their fish, and I would have been delighted if Sir Michael Cashin could have presented a letter from Bay Roberts, where I have thirty crews, or eighteen sharemen in Harbor Grace who were not paid for their fish by me or my firm, and I understood that I was going to get a letter presented to me by Sir Michael Cashin to that effect, and I am very sorry I did not get it, because I thought I was going to get one in on somebody. I knew that there was nobody in Bay Roberts or Span-

iard's Bay or in any corner of the world could say to me that I never paid him what I owed him, therefore when I understood from Sir Michael Cashin yesterday afternoon that I was going to get a letter from eighteen sharemen saying I had not paid them, I was delighted.

Now, I am very sorry that I should be connected with the Fradsham Co., of whom I knew nothing whatever, but it seems that it was a fixed up thing that Gosse should be lined up with the Fradsham Co., who went up to the spout. The firm of G. & M. Gosse is one of the most independent firms in the country today, Sir, and while I stand here in this House of Assembly I don't want any hon. member to bring my private business into this House, and as far as I know it is not right nor parliamentary to do so.

I have been in this House now for three weeks or more, and I have heard the Opposition rake up every business firm from Cape Ray to Cape Race, take the private firms, and tell their financial difficulties in every shape and form. If I were doing business in this country, and I happened to get into financial difficulties, if I were let alone it may be that I could come out of it, but if my business is dragged into politics, is put in the public press, is sent broadcast over the known world, and when it is openly stated that I am insolvent, it gives me no chance, then, Sir, I think that we are going too far, and politics is not what I thought it was at all. I entered into politics and I took the side I thought best for the country, and that was all, but I promise you that when I go out into politics I can fight politics and on political lines, too. I have never, and I would not be so mean and low and contemptible, as to interfere with a man's private business for the sake of political ends. I can live without politics today. I am fifty-six years of age and I never owed a man a cent. I always lived before I went into

politics, and I never got five cents from the Government, and I am absolutely independent of any man on either side of the House, and I don't care anything about any man.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that my name should ever be brought into the House of Assembly, and into the public press to the effect that I could not pay for the fish I contracted for, where I have always done so. I paid for every quintal I took from my crews last year. In my small way I fitted out thirty crews for the Labrador fishery last year, which was more than lots of men who could better do so, and had more cash than I, would do. I fitted these crews out and the prospects did not look very good, and when they came back, to every one of these I paid eight dollars a quintal for their fish, sharemen, planters, and the servants I paid their wages, and now I come in here as a youngster to try to do some good for the country, and to try to learn something which perhaps I couldn't learn outside and amongst men who have been politicians for thirty or forty years, and I can go into the backwoods and learn more than I can here in the House of Assembly. I have sat here and listened to the speeches of the Opposition, and I must say that I don't give them much credit for their tactics. I realise that the Opposition is badly beaten, and I also realise that the Opposition want the Government, that they want to smash the Government, and if they sit here until Doomsday they will never do it, with their tactics.

DR. JONES:—I have no intention of delaying the House, but I cannot let this opportunity pass by without saying a word or two with regard to the amendment before the chair. We have been accused of unduly delaying the time of the House, but I think any right-thinking person will agree with me that the time which we have spent up to the present has not been wasted, because much desirable information

has thereby been elicited which otherwise would have not. We have in that manner disclosed to the public the doings of the Government for the past year, and surely that is our duty here. As far as the Fishery Regulations are concerned, I feel like my friend, Mr. Halfyard, I hate to speak of them for various reasons. He had one particular reason for not so speaking, but I have one quite the opposite. They were brought on by the Government and an attempt made to justify them, but whether they deserve any credit at all, I am not in a position to say. However, from my side of the House the Regulations have been blamed for having caused a great deal of discontent, unlimited disturbance and many financial disasters. In the first place it is my opinion the Government should not have interfered with the trade of the country. The time was inopportune. The Regulations were enforced just as our markets opened to our competitors. They were not impartially put into effect, as is witnessed by the condition of the West Coast. There was no certainty about them, and the exporters did not know from day to day what was ahead. The Prime Minister yesterday said that similar regulations were enforced in other countries to control the trade and various industries, and he referred for an example to the apple growers of the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia. But that industry only concerns a part of the Province of Nova Scotia, and any bad result would not affect the whole of the province. But in this country the regulations affected the whole of it, and if good results were the outcome, the whole of the Colony would benefit, and if bad the same extensive effect would be felt.

I am glad to see that certain members on the other side of the House got up and declared their independence, and I refer to the members representing the F. P. U. I am glad if

they are in a position to assert their independence. I am not in a position to discuss the Constitution of the F. P. U., as my knowledge of it is very vague, but I remember that a few years ago a member of the Local Council of that organization in Avondale, after having held a Convention at Bay de Verde, awaited upon me at Avondale, asking me if I would stand as a F. P. U. representative for the District of Harbour Main, and at the time this Council, which consisted of five men, submitted to me the following oath:

"I..... a selected candidate for the Fishermen's Union political party for the District of..... at the next forthcoming elections, solemnly vow and declare that if elected I will be true to my party and the principles and policy of the Fishermen's Union, will never receive a bribe from any source, and will resign my seat when called upon to do so by resolutions of my District Council, so help me God."

There is undoubtedly the substance of what a proposed representative of the F. P. U. has to do, and if the gentlemen on the other side who are F. P. U. men had to take this oath and be controlled by their Councils, I cannot see how they are independent representatives. Imagine placing myself as representative of the F. P. U. and being under the dictation of those five men and having to take such an oath as this one, and, think of it, that at any time I may be recalled by these five men.

Mr. Jennings a few days ago pointed out to the House how dangerous it was to set the North against the South. I agree with him for it will be a sad day for Newfoundland if we are split up into sections along denominational or any other lines. I regret that the Prime Minister did not take Mr. Jennings's advice, and not set about appealing to sections of the country in particular, which is cal-

culated to and intended to do unlimited harm. If the country is split up into, North, South, East or West, or into religious bodies it would be a calamity and render us powerless to do any good for the country as a whole, as we would be wasting our efforts in strife. We cannot look forward with any degree of confidence with regard to any public matter if such were the lines along which we worked. It is time we forgot those things and get down to work and do something for the country's good and if we are to get to do the work for which we are sent here, we must disregard our differences to a large extent. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Coaker said here on Monday, and I am sorry that I was not here to hear his confession, that he is sorry for the errors of his ways, but it is not always wise to forgive because he makes a confession, for something else is necessary. He must be made to do penance, otherwise he will commit the same errors again and relapse quickly. We usually judge a man's sincerity by his frame of mind and judging from Mr. Coaker's notes in the Advocate last week, that regulations framed from the experience of last year are necessary, yet he has confessed the regulations have failed and that he will repeal them, Government interference in the trade of a country is never justifiable except in time of war or great national disturbance. I do not doubt the wisdom of some form of regulations as regards the time and place to make shipments, but when a Government attempts to interfere between a merchant who buys fish and the party to whom he is selling that fish and tries to dictate the price to be paid for it, it goes beyond its legitimate sphere. But this Government has gone beyond the limit. You have played right into the hands of our rivals and you are

responsible for the disorganization of the trade. During the past year we have had several forms of Government. First Government by Executive responsibility, next Government without any responsibility, and finally Government through intimidation. The men of the North last year by sheer intimidation forced the Government to buy their fish with the Public Funds. Seeing the effect of mob effort the men of the South quickly learned the lesson and within the past fortnight have forced the Government to promise to withdraw the Codfish Exportation Act, the War Measures Act, and the Food Control Board by force of what is called public opinion but which is really another name for intimidation. It has come to this now that if you want to learn what the Government intends to do about anything you must learn it on the street. We learn that a duty of one and a half cents per pound will be placed on sugar to recoup some of the loss sustained through meddlesome interference on the part of the Food Control Board. It has come to pass that the mob rules, and that is not good enough for this Country. Our people have always been law-abiding and do not want that sort of thing. The very people who have compelled you to yield do not want it either, and they have only contempt for your weakness and lack of courage. This sort of thing should be unheard of amongst us; we should get down to business and I can say for the Opposition that they will help to the extent that your programme is reasonable and good for the country. A lot of information must yet be obtained to learn the real condition of the country; we must see the country's balance sheet; to learn the particulars of the railway deal, and other matters. I have much pleasure Mr.

Speaker in giving this amendment my hearty support.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, as there does not appear to be any other member ready to address the House on this subject, I should like to make reference to a few points which arose in the course of the debate on this matter. It is not my intention to refer at length to the personal discourtesies which have been so frequently directed at me and the other gentlemen of the Government from those on the other side of the House. I feel that the people often, in the heat of debate or under the enthusiasm of the galleries, say things which they do not want to see in print and there will be plenty time for the honorable members to approve of their remarks as published in the Hansard. It is with much regret that I must, however, refer to one matter which has been given so much prominence during this session, that is the pointed discourtesy which has been shown to outport members. I am a bayman and have the natural aspirations, association of ideas and feelings of all those born in the bays of Newfoundland. While the baymen may not usually kick up a fuss over the insults offered them, they nevertheless usually remember them. The city of St. John's is not a city, and its members are not the proper ones to offer discourtesy to the outports. As a representative of St. John's West I deplore the discourtesy shown to them. I was standing by the door of this House a few days ago, asking that room be made for the Speaker to pass and as the Hon. Minister of Public Works, Mr. Jennings, and the Hon. Minister of Shipping, Mr. Cave, went by, the lowest, vilest remarks, couched in corner-boy language were passed, even as to their religion, and insults were hurled at them by those gathered there. I would like to say

right here that when the day comes that a representative of the South or North has to be insulted by those in the gallery here, that day spells the downfall of St. John's. Water St. is not paved with St. John's money but with the money from every part of Newfoundland. Take all the great public buildings, this House of Assembly, the Court House, the General Hospital, the Post Office, the Custom House, the Lunatic Asylum and all the others; these are not built with St. John's money but with Newfoundland money. St. John's represents only one-seventh of the people of the country, yet into it is poured a vast amount of money among its large number of public servants and it handles seven-eighths of the revenue. Some imagine that St. John's owns all the freight, all the bags and barrels that are handled here, but 4 of every 5 packages have as their ultimate destination some outport. It is the people of Newfoundland today who are held responsible for the interest on the debt on the city. Last year St. John's was given a special vote of \$50,000 out of the funds of the country and only to-day we had to give it a loan of \$50,000 to pay for city labour. And still when a man like Mr. Jennings, a man who has built his own boat, caught and cured the fish, passed through every phase in the principal industry of the country and worked up to his present important position by his own ability and integrity and can come in here with such a vigorous speech as his, he is subjected to insult. I deplore the day when such a man was ridiculed about his religion and the fact that he came from an outport as he was when he walked into this room the other day. I would like to say to the people in general in the name of the coopers, shoeworkers, factory hands, laborers and others, don't allow the day to come when the

representative of such a wealthy district as Twillingate, is to be insulted here. I do not believe there would be a factory in St. John's to-day as big as a village schoolhouse if it were not for the people of the outports. The plants are not much good today as the outport people are not buying their products; it is on them the factories depend for their operation. The manufacture of all the lines, twines, biscuits, boots, woollens, etc. in St. John's depends on the outport men who come here in their schooners and take these products to their homes at the North or South. I sincerely hope the day will never come when discourtesy will be developed by the men who should be glad to welcome the baymen.

Take the business men along Water Street. Among the leaders are outport men. Take Sir John Crosbie, take Mr. Hickman. Are they not outport men. I do not know where Mr. Barr comes from; but I have never yet heard of anyone refusing his labor either on his wharf or in his office. The Hon. Mr. Coaker comes from St. John's West, the district which I have the honor to represent. He was born and reared on the South Side, but went to live at the North, where by his industry and enterprise he became head of a great organisation which owns a huge premises and does an enormous business. As a Minister of the Crown he has won the esteem that should be accorded him. St. John's, I repeat, the cooper, the laborer, shoeworker, factory hand, fish handler, the man who makes the woollens, all depend upon the outports. Take their support away and St. John's would be little better than a village. My object is to get every dollar and every form of employment I can for the District of St. John's West. But the principal industry on which the country depends is the fishery, and very little fish is caught by the people of

St. John's. If the brains of a St. John's man, Hon. Mr. Coaker, did build up the North, his work is a credit to him. St. John's has not insulted the men of the North, but hooligans and heelers did so. I heard the insults myself and will not forget them. As the great Persian poet, Omar Khayyam, has it:

"The moving finger writes, and having written, moves on."

While the things said to the Bayman may not be resented at the moment, it will be later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the attacks made on the Hon. Minister of Public Works re the expenditure for snow-shovelling and relief work in Harbor Main. Despite the fact that an election was on at the time, the number of dollars spent there did not amount to one cent more than was spent through Mr. Bambrick in my own district; it was no greater than was expended in St. Mary's Bay either. Every discourtesy too has been hurled across the floors of this House at my friend, the Hon. Dr. Campbell. I know Dr. Campbell as a courteous and considerate gentleman whenever called upon to perform a public or private service. When any man goes to his surgery for script treatment any other treatment or no treatment whatever, he will find that he is invariably treated with courtesy. He was attacked on the ground that he is not a Newfoundlander, and it was hurled across the House that he was not here "a dog's watch." I know one thing, he is a gentleman, and I would take his word on any proposition before that of Mr. Morine, who is also a foreigner. I am not attacking Mr. Morine because he is a foreigner, for in a sense we are all foreigners. We are all descendants of the Scotch, Irish and English, and beyond an occasional one with a touch of Indian blood, there are no aboriginals in the country. We all stand on our own

record and as to what we are prepared to do for the betterment of the country in which we live. All are welcome here and are judged by the record of what they do.

I want to make brief reference as promised, and to put in skeleton form a few remarks, as to the statements made by the Opposition, and I will have an opportunity later to see them in cold type after they have revised them to send out of the country, and to deal with them more fully. As to the sugar situation, I will deal with it again. I know this is an unpopular subject, and I am not standing here to shirk responsibility or to shift the blame, if any there be, to other shoulders, or to deal with whether I was present or not at a meeting of the Control Board. The local Board did far better than the Canadian refiners or the Board in England did for themselves. I want to tell you, gentlemen, that the sugar refiners of Canada, who are the most skilful business men and represent the greatest financial intelligence of that Dominion, lost 17 million dollars in the market collapse in which we lost \$150,000. The Board here consisted of Hon. A. W. Mews, Mr. J. J. McKay, ex-President of the Board of Trade, and Messrs. T. Noel, President of the N.I.W.A., and Jas. McGrath, of the 'Longshoremen's Union, who were added to the membership by special Act of the Legislature last year so as to enable the Board to be representative of the people, with Mr. H. W. LeMessurier, C.M.G., Deputy Minister of Customs. They acted on the best obtainable advice, after consultation with the best business brains of Canada, and after all made only the same mistake as they did. If we lost \$150,000, the refiners of Canada, with the most expert knowledge of the markets behind them, lost 17 millions.

MR. BENNETT:—What is the com-

from this fact the same general advantage to the country and the taxpayer as would be the case had we not our war liability to pay. The war cost Newfoundland something like \$16,000,000 and besides this the amount of pensions that must be paid to those who fought on Land or sea and who returned home maimed and injured or to those who became sick while in the service as well as to the dependents of those who lost their lives in the service of the Empire, is half a million dollars per year. Added to these things we have the maintenance of institutions that were established or enlarged during the war when revenues were large and money was plentiful. In the course of the time of which I speak there was built in the western section of the City a wonderful institution from which incalculable benefits have been derived, the Sanitarium; then there are the two wings added to the Lunatic Asylum, a wing to the Fever Hospital and others, all of which, established as they have been for the general welfare of the country, must be maintained and kept in proper order now and on a falling market. We thus find ourselves faced with increased responsibilities of maintenance while we no longer have the advantage of war revenues wherewith to meet them. But Sir, the suggestion that Newfoundland is facing financial ruin is not merely the view taken by a pessimistic mind. It is not the outcome of a fair and impartial consideration of the facts as they really exist, but it is thrown out for deliberate political propaganda purposes with no other object in view than to injure the Colony's credit in the eyes of the outside world. Even if the suggestion were backed up by the merest shadow of truth we should all do the very best that was in our power to cover up the fact and show to the world the best front we can

so that we keep our escutcheon unblemished and our stability unquestioned. Looking at the London Times all I can find is that Newfoundland's revenue will be terribly low this year; take up another copy of the Times and the same thing is to be seen and all these stories, politically concocted for the sole purpose of damning Newfoundland, are emanating from Opposition circles. I am in possession of the name of a man who is known to be connected with the Opposition and who sent to the Canadian Press a message, the contents of which are not only grossly wrong but are a reflection on the good name of the country and the people of this City in particular. This message has been circulated throughout Canada, finding its way, through the service to which it was sent, into hundreds of papers all over that country and I hope that in three weeks or thereabout I will be in a position to make public the name of the person who was responsible for sending it. The article in question is as follows: (Reads article)

SIR M. P. CASHIN:— You have no proof of who sent that message.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Sir Michael Cashin says he is prepared to pay for it. No doubt he can, I wish I had one tenth of Sir Michael's wealth.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:— You have no proof of who sent that message.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:— I have already stated that I hope to have permission in three weeks to make the name public. It will be remembered that last year a statement containing utterly false information was sent from this City and later given publication in an Almanac in England. It took me three months to trace the identity of the sender of that information but I succeeded in doing so with the assistance of a detective agency in London.

parative price of sugar between Canada and here?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I do not know the comparative price, but I do know that it bore heavily for some time past on my purse. In England the price of sugar was kept up until recently just as it was done here. In Cuba the export of rice was prohibited till they got rid of their surplus stocks of sugar. In England the Board of Food Control kept the price of bacon at 20c. and ham 6c. higher per pound than the regular market value; lard was 10c. and butter and cheese were also in advance of the market. Why? Because when you are trading on a falling market you must keep up the price or meet with loss. We had to keep up the price or suffer the loss to the revenue and take it out of the pockets of the people. I think that with the fact of the Canadian loss before us, the handling of the situation here is no discredit to us. With the price of bacon kept at 20c. per pound higher than usual, and other commodities also at an advanced rate under the Board of Control in England, what could we be expected to do here. As to the loss or otherwise sustained in the handling of sugar by Messrs. Harvey & Co., that can easily be ascertained, as on motion of Mr. Bennett, which I seconded, the Hon. Mr. Foote, Hon. Dr. Barnes, Minister of Education, and Mr. Bennett have been appointed a commission to look into the accounts of the Food Control Board and see if they can explain where the losses, if such there be, did occur. I would like to explain that Mr. Bennett deferred his motion in this connection a day or two ago so that I could consult with Hon. Mr. Mews, Chairman of the Food Control Board. When I spoke to the latter, he said "Certainly, go ahead; we have not taken advantage of the situation to the value of a two-cent postage

stamp." Nothing will give me greater pleasure, Mr. Speaker, than to see the report of this commission, as at present constituted or with an enlarged membership, tabled, and I am perfectly sure that it will show not even the suggestion of dishonesty on the part of any man on that Board.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Why not get down the New York auditors?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That is not necessary, as there has been no suggestion of corruption.

It will give me great pleasure to meet any of my friends from St. John's West at my office in the daytime, and believe me, I have one or two friends in that district yet, despite all the fuss that has been made over the sugar situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to our financial situation. We today are trading on a falling market. When a pair of boots, for example, cost \$10 per pair, with a duty of 45 per cent, they brought in \$4.50 to the revenue, but today we get only half that amount as their price is only half the rate paid during the war. It has been stated in my hearing by some of the leading business men that this year 70c. will be as good in purchasing supplies for the fishery as \$1.00 was last year. The cost of living is going down, and the figures given out by the trade show that by the autumn 65c. will buy as much provisions for the winter as \$1.00 did last year. While this reduction will be an advantage to all in enabling them to run their households much more cheaply, it will be detrimental to the revenue which we derive from an ad valorem duty. While the war is happily over, it is still on in the sense that the toll of money, instead of blood, is being taken to meet our war debts.

Altho prices may be coming down and may continue to have a downward tendency, we cannot hope to derive

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Tel us something about the Colony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Sir M. P. Cashin wants to know something about the Colony. The point with which I was dealing was the cause of the trade depression from which the country is now suffering and in a large measure it will be found to be the propaganda to which I have referred. It has done incalculable harm to Newfoundland and I have had three letters from Newfoundlanders in the United States deploring the stories of hard times that are being sent from here. I have in my office an article of this kind over the signature of Newfoundlander who should be ashamed to be guilty of such conduct. Even if these things were true they should not be spread broadcast because for example, if a man's next-door neighbor is poor that man does not go around telling the world of his neighbour's poor circumstances. Such an act would scarcely be considered manly.

My friend outside the Bar asks what about the damaging statements, but if he has, then I say that he should be run out of the country like all the others who have been guilty of the same conduct.

Referring again to the general depression in trade, I repeat that altho the war is over we are still paying for it in money just as during the conflict we paid for it in blood, and not only this country but the whole world is paying in money, but thank God we have not been reduced to the condition of stagnation to which other countries have been brought. While I was in Italy I witnessed scenes that made me feel proud that it was not my native land, and again when I was in London I saw evidences of depression and general stagnation of poverty and unrest that I was thankful once more that this was not my native land. On visiting Montreal and New

York I was also confronted with the same conditions of poverty and depression of which this country knows practically nothing.

Naturally there will be trade depression for a time, in this country as elsewhere and indeed it is doubtful if we are experiencing this to anything like it is being felt in other countries and in this connection I would like to refer to an article from a Canadian paper dealing with the subject. The article says:

(Reads article)

The prices of things in Europe, because of exchange conditions, are so high as to render them altogether inaccessible, in the main, to the average consumer and Canada has lost her best markets for most of her principal products because foreign exchange has made prices prohibitive for the poor who are the largest consumers, and there you have a touch of what this country has experienced with regard to the fish situation. In Italy where before the war the lira was worth twenty cents it is now worth only four or five cents and from this it can be seen what these people must pay to give us anything like an average price for our product. Suppose, for example, that the price of our fish was \$10 per quintal, that would be a normal figure for the Italians to pay were their lira worth twenty cents but by the time they had paid four or five liras for every one that would have had to be paid formerly, the quintal of fish that would bring our shippers \$10 would cost them \$40 or \$50. That is, for Newfoundland to get \$10 for her fish in London, the Italian buyer must pay forty or fifty dollars in their own money so that it will be readily realized that it is not in the power of these people to buy much of our fish. That, Sir, is part of the solution of the fishery problem. Solve the exchange question and the fishery problem will also be solved.

This brings me to that horrible

nightmare, the Fish Regulations of which so much has been said and I want to say at the outset that I do not mean to shirk one iota of the responsibility for them. The policy had my entire approval when it was first adopted and it has my entire approval now. I know that such a state ment does not tend towards popularity that perhaps nine tenths of the people of the country are, and have been, opposed to them, but whether that is so or not, I am prepared to hold to that attitude. Before going further I want to draw the attention of Sir John Crosbie to an incorrect statement made by him in discussing this matter a few days ago. He said that the Speech from the Throne declared the measure to have passed this House unanimously, but that is not so; Sir John could not have read the Speech correctly. The statement was that the Regulations passed the House without a dissenting vote which was strictly correct. To give Sir John his due, he was the one man on the other side who stood four square on the Regulations. He was opposed to them from the start but when the measure was put to a vote he was not in the House and when those opposing it were asked to signify their stand by saying "nay", there were no nays. Sir John was not present and the vote went through without a single dissenting vote.

Now, Sir, I will tell you why I am in favor of Regulations for the export of our codfish; not these particular regulations but any that would be carried out properly and without prejudice, and I may say here that had the Regulations the past year not been under the control of a number of gentlemen on Water St. who had not the leisure to attend to them, the results would have been different from what they were. Undoubtedly the policy behind the regulations was right. Suppose we want to buy a cargo of flour and there were a dozen

vessels in port with cargoes sent here on consignment with brokers going around from store to store beseeching business people to buy from them, is it likely that we would pay them prices we now have to pay? But it is well known that before you can get a cargo of flour in Canada or the States you have to pay down your good money for every barrel of it, and it is on just such a sane, sound business basis that we want to place our fish exports if we want to get the best possible results. As things are now, anyone can send any old kind of fish across in any old kind of vessel on consignment and depend on a broker to go about from place to place trying to get some buyer to take it off his hands. Now, can we expect to get good prices for our fish while this sort of thing goes on? Suppose Canada and the United States exported their flour, their beef, their sugar or any of their other numerous products according to this principle, do you think they would get the same good prices that these articles command in the various markets to-day? No, while we continue to export on consignment and pay enormous commissions to brokers we cannot hope to obtain good prices for our fish. Why was it that one business house in this city built up a fortune on cattle during the past few years, why? because all sale made of the cattle imported were made on commission and there was no possibility of loss to the seller because he first sold the cattle and deducted his commission before he paid the shipper for them. He had no losses because if losses did occur they had to be borne by the man who owned them. Go to Portugal, Spain, Italy or any of the other fish buying countries and you will find that the men who have been selling our fish in the past are wealthy and why? If you were to go down on Water St. you would find from the West End to Maggoty Cove there are premises

bearing the names of firms who did business there twenty-five years ago, but they are no longer there and, Sir, the explanation is identical with that which accounts for the wealth of the foreign brokers who sold their fish for them on commission. That explanation is to be found in the damnable consignment policy. The Regulations tried to put our fish export trade on a basis that would go far to remedy this evil and it was with this object and no other that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries put them in force, but eternal defamation will attach to the men who, as soon as this House closed, went out and used every disreputable plan at their command to nullify their good effect on the general fish trade of the country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that while there is on the Order Paper an Act for the repeal of the Fish Regulations, the day is not far distant in my opinion when the people will be clamouring to have just such regulations as these enforced to save the trade of the country. As an instance of what can be accomplished by the regulation of exports we need only take the case of Annapolis Valley where at one time the people were almost beggars because of the fact that they had no system in the export of their apple crops. They sold on consignment and were forced to take what they could get but when they introduced their apple regulations things changed immediately for the better and homes that had been reduced to poverty, farms that had so far fallen off as to be practically in disuse became prosperous and flourishing and anyone who passes through that district now as I had the pleasure of doing some little time ago, must admit that it would be difficult to find greater evidences of prosperity anywhere, and all this was due to the change from selling their apples on consignment to the present business-like and properly regulated manner. The same condition of things

confronts us to-day as confronted the farmers of Annapolis Valley several years ago and we should look the thing in the face and make up our minds that the sooner we apply the remedy that is in our own hands the better. While I say this I realize that it is by no means a popular pronouncement and that objections, political and otherwise, will be raised by perhaps seven-eighths of the people of the community.

As it is now getting on for 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House much longer, but there is another matter I should like to refer to before taking my seat. There is an institution in the city known as the Bust Factory. With the matter of who is running this institution I am not at present going to deal but that those connected have been kept pretty constantly employed there is no room for doubt. When we were elected in 1919, the prediction was that we would not find it possible to form a Cabinet, but we did; the next prediction was that we would not close the House but again we did.

While I was on the other side, bets were freely made that I would not be Prime Minister when I came back, and I have in my possession a bet made by a person connected with the Opposition that was written on the back of a Bank of Montreal note. We've heard of the Government being "busted," we've heard time and again that the House wouldn't be opened by us, then that it would not be closed by us, and the last limit that was given for the Government to hold together was ten days. In connection with these things I merely want to say that from my association with those in the Government as Chairman of Council, I have never seen in any government greater indications of union or solidarity. It has been a matter of great regret to me to find those outport men who are my colleagues abused in the manner they

have, and I can only say that those responsible for it will have much to regret also. As to the abuse that has been directed to me personally, I consider that, because of its source, an asset rather than anything else. As to the stability and unanimity of the present Government, I can say with perfect confidence that there is not a man in the whole administration, whether he be in the Council or outside of it, who would not take full responsibility for everything that has been done since we came into power.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is poor satisfaction for the tax-payers.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That is not poor satisfaction for the tax-payers, it is the very best satisfaction to them, and that brings to my mind another point or two on which I had not counted on touching. The first of these is the railroad programme. I might say that I am not personally responsible for any particular wording of any particular minute of council in connection therewith, but the facts are these. The railway had utterly collapsed and the Bank of Montreal would not give the Reid Nfld. Co. one cent more to continue to carry it on. We realised that we could not allow the service to close down in June, as it was the only resource of its kind that the Colony had, so the only thing left to do was to take it over and run it. The best possible was done under the circumstances, and while it may not have been very good, it was at least better than nothing. No one pretends that the members of the Commission were expert railroad men, and altho Mr. Coaker undoubtedly knew more about running a railroad than Mr. H. D. Reid, he did not profess to be perfect in that direction. We were faced with a problem that required immediate solution and the best possible in the Colony's interests was done.

I want also to refer to that won-

derful matter of the half million dollars that was taken to purchase fish. I might say that I was out of town when that was done, but if I had been here I would have done the same thing, because I know that it would have been the right thing to do. Not only was the price in the local market likely to fall to a considerable extent, but there were huge quantities of fish on the way across the Atlantic or already arrived in the foreign markets, and if the price here fell to four dollars per quintal before that fish was put into consumption, the price in these markets would take a corresponding drop and enormous losses to the exporters and to the country would have resulted, so that it was imperative that the price should be maintained here at that time at all costs. Then I ask why should St. John's object to the use of this money for the purpose to which it was devoted? The money was spent on fish that was handled here in St. John's thus giving employment that would not have been obtainable had the fish in question not found a market and it will be remembered that the previous government did not object to take half a million dollars of the people's money before the general election with which to buy votes. If Mr. Coaker had wished he could have brought that money to Port Union to spend it instead of spending it here and giving that much extra labor to St. John's. Most of the laboring class of people in St. John's are dependent on the outports for labor. When fish is brought from the outports to St. John's for the St. John's merchants to buy it, the merchants then give the labor to the St. John's man.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is not true.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That is mostly true. The men who give the St. John's mechanics and the

St. John's labourers employment are the St. John's merchants through the outport fishermen who bring their products here; and if you take the outport schooners out of St. John's in the spring, you will have the harbour as barren of trade and the docks as barren of employment as you have them in the month of January.

MR. BENNETT:—That is what you got today.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Exactly. That is why so many insults are being handed out to the outport people. Now with respect to the three hundred thousand dollars that was paid for fish. Why should the Newfoundland people howl about a thing of that sort when the same thing is done in connection with other industries? The Bell Island Transportation Company of St. John's East are the trustees every year under the revenue of the Colony with a guaranteed dividend of five per cent. The Floating and other Docking Companies around the Island get a percentage every year. I am not in a position to say whether or not the Floating Dock has drawn substantially on the revenue within the past year, but I am in possession of correspondence to show me that they get at least \$600 last year, which is the difference between what they made and the five per cent. on their capital.

MR. HIGGINS:—The Bell Island Transportation Bill was passed here while the House of Assembly was in session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Yes. As the Hon. Member for St. John's East says, it was passed while the House of Assembly was in session; and it was passed with the knowledge and concurrence of the whole House so that every outport member who was in St. John's at that time voted unanimously for the measure that was brought before the

House by the party that was then in power.

Let me point out, 'Mr. Speaker, that the Norwegian Government had to buy thirty million dollars worth of Norwegian fish to help out the Norwegian fishermen, which fish is now being turned into guano. Instead of the Norwegian Government standing behind their fishermen as we did, they back them to the extent of thirty million dollars. Did not the British Government stand behind their herring catchers and bought eight hundred barrels of herring at fifty-five shillings a barrel and which herring is now thrown on the dump? The British Government, I might say, lost every dollar on that transaction. Well, if the Norwegian Government managed to stand behind their fishermen to the amount I have already stated; if the British Government stood behind their herring catchers, and if the British Government stood behind their coal miners and offered to pay up the difference in the operations of the mines in order to get a decent wage for the miners, surely goodness the Newfoundland Government can be asked to stand behind the Newfoundland fishermen.

I do not feel that I should detain the House at any great length. There is a multitude of matters upon which I should like to dwell, this afternoon, but I shall refrain, as I do not want to deal with them until I view actually in print the observations of the members opposite so that there can be no possible misunderstanding, and I do not want to deal with them until I see their revised speeches published to the country in the official debates. I am glad there is a motion before the House for the adoption of the report of the Committee; there is also an amendment before the House, moved by Sir Michael Cashin, Leader of the Opposition, and seconded by

Sir John Crosbie. The amendment is an attack upon the Fish Regulations; the amendment contains the same tenor and the same falsehood and the amendment alleges in effect an absolute failure in connection with the Fish Regulations, but does not attempt to suggest anything other than that the policy was wrong; which policy I believe to be right. Consequently, I propose to vote against the amendment, and I ask those who are supporting me in this House to do likewise.

MR. VINICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and I do so in all sincerity. I have listened attentively to the remarks of the different speakers on the Government side who have told us and told the country that we, on this side of the House, are not sincere. Well all I can say is that the people outside who represent a greater majority than the few supporters the Government have in the galleries know differently. We have no particular fondness for holding up this House; but, if we allowed business to go through without prying into the public affairs of the country in the way we did, we would not have found out the vast amount of information, which was not contained in the Speech from the Throne, that we have, and the longer we are here the more dirt and scandal we expect to hear about the Government.

I must congratulate the Prime Minister on his appeal here today; but his plea was pitiable because of the "bust office" that had cropped up in the Government. The Prime Minister must have heard the rumour that the Government was going to be "busted" and that is why he started in to run down the people in the district of St. John's West who elected him. He eulogized the people from the north.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Hear, hear, I am one of them.

MR. VINICOMBE:—You did not say that a few years ago when you were driven out of Trinity Bay. You see the sign of the times now in St. John's West and you know you cannot go back there. You want to try and get in with Mr. Coaker, the man who called you the "black rascal." You came here and made out that Mr. Jennings was insulted and you left the impression that he was insulted by some of the followers of Sir Michael's party. Were you in this House yesterday when one of your followers named Hookey called out for three cheers for the Newfoundland disaster as Capt. A. Kean was coming into the House? I think, sir, that expression was a disgrace and unbecoming any civilized man. Now I am going to call a spade a spade. I am somewhat like Mr. Gosse. I am independent, even though I cannot say that I do not owe a cent to any person.

What did the Prime Minister say in his manifesto to the people? Did he not condemn the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries that is occupied by Mr. Coaker today? You said in your Manifesto. (Reads from Manifesto). Mr. Coaker is Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day, I repeat, and the Prime Minister is the man that said he should not be holding the position. But that is only one item in which the Prime Minister fell down under, according to the promises made in his Manifesto. He fell down on the question of taxation also. Last year when we had taxation reduced on Bologna Sausage I remarked that the members of the Government would be coming back this spring like Germans from eating Bologna Sausage. No doubt they came back alright like a crowd of whipped Germans.

The mere mention of the Fish Regulations prompts me to recite a pas-

sage with apologies from the elegy of Sir Thomas Moore:

"Not a drum was heard, not a funeral
note

"As his corpse to the ramparts we
hurried,

"Not a fisherman discharged his fare-
well shot,

"O'er the grave where the Regula-
tions were buried."

When Mr. Coaker arrived on the scene, which was thirteen days after the opening of the House, Mr. Samson, the strongest man of the Government party, got up and asked a question, as did also another member of that party. I must say that the Prime Minister or whoever was directly interested in those questions showed poor courtesy to Mr. Samson, Mr. Jennings or whoever the gentlemen were that asked the questions by not insisting that the answer be forthcoming to these gentlemen.

MR. TARGETT:—Mine was answered. You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. VINICOMBE:—I know; but many are called but few are chosen. My colleague, Mr. Higgins, while talking on the Regulations a few days ago, asked Mr. Coaker if he intended or not to vote for the Amendment that was moved by the Opposition. I do not believe here to-night what the Prime Minister said, namely, that Mr. Coaker was going to take off the Regulations. I believe that it was only after he found that we had brought in an Amendment that he decided to repeal the Regulations, because Mr. Higgins put it to Mr. Coaker straight and asked him for the sake of Newfoundland to bury all differences and to vote on the Amendment as his conscience dictated. I pity Mr. Coaker and I say here now that I really thought Mr. Coaker was sincere when he brought in the Regulations. If the Regulations were right and prop-

er, as the Prime Minister said they were, why repeal them?

I am sure that Mr. Jennings made a good case for himself with the northern people when he told that he had been insulted because he had not received a first class education and because he had to build his own boat, his own house and what not. That came, sir, with very poor grace. If Mr. Jennings continues much longer to tell how he built his boat and his house, the latter will become as famous as "the house that Jack Built." As to his honesty of purpose, the people of Twillingate district will be able to judge, despite what he said about education. Any man who starts in to sign cheques for snow shovelling to the extent of over seven thousand dollars like Mr. Jennings did for the district of Hr. Main is not honest. Imagine \$7000 for Hr. Main district while such larger districts like St. John's East and West did not get as much as \$300. I hope my friend opposite, who is known as honest John Abbott will never take a ministerial position in the Government because he might fall in like Mr. Jennings did.

The Prime Minister went on to tell us in his speech about the way that insults were hurled at the men of the north. As I stated here a few weeks ago, it is no use for any man or men trying to put St. John's against the north. Before ever Mr. Squires was in St. John's I refer to the time of the sealers' strike, what about the unity that existed then? It is only a politician who has had his day that would try and break this unity. Judging by the speech of the Prime Minister today, he sees his evitable downfall in the district of St. John's West, and he is fishing to get into the bosom of Mr. Coaker.

Speaking of Ad Valorem duty reminds me of the promise you made to the country in your Manifesto in

1919. When you made that statement you were either insincere or incompetent. Surely sir you must have known the depression that was to follow the war. Not so with honest Cashin, however. He told the people candidly that he could not reduce taxation, as it would be impossible then to promise such; but if times turned out alright he would reduce it. It may seem strange to the members of the Government side of the House, but Cashin and his associates would not like to be in charge of the ship of state to-day. I am going to say one thing before this House closes and that is that I am going to get more interested than ever in that "bust office" or "bust factory," referred to by the Prime Minister in his speech. If any "bust" does take place, I can assure the Prime Minister that we will not be looking for that side of the House. We are going to get to that side when we go to the country two and half years time. We have heard a lot about Cashin and graft, but the answers to the questions that we have asked in this House have shown that the present Government have committed the greatest scandals ever perpetrated in Newfoundland. Now Mr. Jennings has fallen into the ways of the politician as well as the rest of his associates. He knows he cannot go to Twillingate district and give an account of his stewardship like he did after last session. Seemingly from the speeches made by the different members opposite they all fell for what Mr. Fox said about the heart of Mr. Coaker. Personally I thought that Mr. Coaker didn't have any heart, at least, I heard that he had lost it. Mr. Jennings fell for it too for the purpose of getting votes in the future, I presume. He said that the northern men will resent such an insult. I know that on the eve of the next election his stock in trade

will be what Mr. Fox said about hauling the heart out of Mr. Coaker for doing what he did. Even Mr. Squires and Mr. Hibbs fell for it. No doubt they will all make that their political platform next time. What about the insults hurled at the people of St. John's West today by the Prime Minister? I wonder if he knows about the depression prevailing in St. John's West today? The coopers are the greatest sufferers there and I would like to know what they think about what the outports are doing for them.

Another matter I would like to refer to Mr. Speaker, is a statement that appeared in the 'Daily Star' stating that Vinicombe was Higgin's errand boy, who was going around bringing fellows to the House; but I would be better satisfied to be Higgin's errand boy than to be the Prime Minister's Chief Secretary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I never invited you.

MR. VINICOMBE:—No, you would be afraid to trust me because you might fear I would find out too much about you. The only man I ever brought into the House is a supporter of the Prime Minister's. He asked me and I brought him in.

Getting back to the Fish Regulations again. On that issue I am something similar in my attitude to my colleague, Mr. Higgins. I am prepared to stand for one common cause—our country—but when the situation was put up to Mr. Coaker he was not big enough to give a straight-forward answer; but inferentially said that because we brought in an Amendment that he was going to bring in a Bill repealing the Regulations. That was the day that he should have proved himself a man—and failed. Then you will say why do we criticize the Speech from the Throne. I think it was Mr. Jennings said that Mr. Higgins had the material and he drove the nail that

some of us split the board; but I think that the Regulations split too much fish last year for the benefit of this country. As I take it, Sir, we are all here in the interests of those people who sent us here and to try and do the best we possibly can for the good of the country, but do you think that any people sent us here to read the Speech from the Throne and to let it go through the very next day. No, Sir, I think we would be lacking in our duty if we did such a thing, despite the fact that supporters of the government are saying that we are using hang 'er down tactics. The longer we are holding up the business of the House the more disgusted the men on the other side of the House are getting with themselves.

Another matter, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to draw your attention to is the statement made by Mr. Coaker at his Convention. In telling what the people of the North had accomplished, he said that the Union men were to have charge of three splendid departments.

He was appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries; Mr. Halfyard, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and Mr. Jennings, Minister of Public Works, also he pointed out that the expenditure of public monies by the public departments of the Government for the last ten years will be investigated by competent men and that he anticipated that a general clean up would result. I hope and trust that when the accounts are brought down here that it will be seen that the money spent during the past year was spent in a competent way; but I am afraid that some of it was squandered in a way that did no credit to the present administration, and that it may prompt those at their next Convention to extend the investigation to twelve years instead of ten, as I believe that it will be more necessary for a clean up for the last two years than for the

other ten. Mr. Coaker also stated at his Convention that had the Cashin party been returned to power at the last general election for four years that the House of Assembly might just as well be abolished and the Auditor General dismissed because Cashin had broken all laws with contempt and interfered with the business of the Governor when it suited him. I would like to ask Mr. Coaker if he really meant what he said at his Convention about Sir Michael Cashin? I do not think he did. If he did mean it, well then it was only what Mr. Coaker did himself, because with his Fish Regulations he did not recognize Governor, Prime Minister or anybody else, for he acted in every capacity himself. Evidently Mr. Coaker waited for Mr. Squires whom he knew was going to act as his scapegoat and take all the blame for him; but, as I remarked before, Mr. Squires is fishing now for a seat north from Mr. Coaker, though Mr. Squires did not act likewise when the railway deal was being put through. As it is now half past six Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I would like the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take a suggestion I have to offer. I would suggest that all public monies, which shall be voted within a few days, such as main line grants, local grants and marine grants, be sent out immediately. At the present moment—I do not know what the circumstances are like in other districts—I know that these monies would be a welcome guest in the district that I have the honour to represent, as they would go a long way towards relieving distress in that section. Quite recently I have been literally besieged with telegrams and letters from clergymen of various denominations on this same subject matter. Only today both my col-

leagues and myself were in receipt of three telegrams. I will not mention any names, but one of the telegrams contains four hundred words. Now I would like to have this matter seriously considered both by the Prime Minister and the heads of the different Government departments.

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

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27th, 1991

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

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present from the inhabitants of Fogo asking that a sum of money be granted to erect a Half Way House between Fogo, and Seldom-Come-By. There was one there some years ago but it has blown down, and there is no house there now. I might say that the distance between the two places is ten miles, across bleak country, and several people have lost their lives during the past twenty-five years travelling over that bleak country in snowstorms. On December 28th last year Wm. Snow lost his life in a snow storm on that route. The country is very bleak and there is no protection, and the people are complaining very much of the risk entailed because of the lack of a Half Way House.

The petition is largely signed, and I would ask that it be referred to the Department to which it belongs, and receive the consideration of the Government.

I also wish to present a petition from the inhabitants of Joe Batt's

Arm, asking for the sum of one hundred dollars to erect a public road around the Plant. This is a very important centre, and the people are greatly handicapped because of the lack of the good roads, and I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs and receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Safe Harbor asking that that place be made a port of call for the Bay Boat or Coastal Boat, not only for the benefit of that settlement, but Till Cove and other settlements. They have no connection with neither the Bay or Coastal Boats, and I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs, and be given due consideration.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, Mr Winsor.

MR. TARGETT:— Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hant's Hr. for the sum of sixty dollars to repair roads. I would like to say that this money is very much needed, and I trust that the petition will be referred to the Department to which it belongs, and will receive due consideration.

Mr. Vinicombe asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the manufacturers of the city have made representation to the Government for increased duties or further protection, and if the Government before considering the matter will obtain from them and lay on the table of the House a statement showing the dividends paid by these companies in each of the past ten years, the bonuses paid, or increases in capital of stock made in each of the ten years and the amount of reserve maintained by each of these companies at the present time.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister

of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a report of the work done by Mr. John Davey, for \$2,815.00.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if Mr. E. Collishaw imported into this Colony, within the past few months, a number of rifles or guns; if he obtained possession of the same on a free entry or temporary permit, and if so, why; who signed the temporary permit and his reason for doing so; what is the value of the articles imported and the value of the duty, and what steps the Government proposes to take to collect the same.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines:

- (a) If the Government has had any relations, either directly or as associated, with the owners of the sealing steamers with Major Clayton Kennedy in regard to the operation of airships, and what has been the outcome of the same?
- (b) If the said Major Clayton Kennedy secured a contract from the Government or the owners of the sealing steamers, or both, to maintain and work the airships for seal-fishery and survey work, and if so to lay on the table of the House a copy of the same.
- (c) If the said airships were a gift from the British Government to the Colony, and if as part of their equipment there was a motor lorry, and if the same was sold by Major Clayton Kennedy in London, and if so what became of the proceeds?
- (d) Did the Government either directly or as associated with the owners of the sealing steamers pay Major Clayton Kennedy the sum of \$2,000 after attachments had been laid on that money by due process of law, and if so what department paid it to him?
- (e) Did the Government either directly or as associated with the owners of the sealing steamers pay the hotel expenses at the Cochran Hotel in St. John's of Capt. Williams and Mr. Tippen on the occasion when they stayed there?
- (f) Did the Government either directly or as associated above, pay to Mr. Skeleton a sum of money due him on his contract with Major Clayton Kennedy, and if so, what sum was paid him, and why?
- (g) Are any members of the party of British mechanics, brought here by Major Clayton Kennedy or others connected with him, still in the city, if so, are they owed any money, and if so, how much?
- (h) If they made representations to the Government for the payment, of the same, or for help otherwise.
- (i) Has any money been paid them, and if not, why not?
- (j) Does the Government owe any money on account of this enterprise, and if so, how much; and does the Government propose to take any steps to assist these men, who came here in good faith, to return to their native country?

Sir M. P. Cashin called the attention of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to an official statement of a meeting of the Commission published in the newspapers, September 11th, 1920, wherein the following announcement appears:

"The cutting out of the section across the Topsails during the bad weather was decided upon, and trains will run from St. John's to Millertown Junction, and from Port-aux-Basques to Humbermouth, the necessary equipment and plows to be arranged for at each end before the weather gets bad."

And to ask him the reasons for deviating from this policy and operating the trains across the Topsails during the whole of this winter, and an estimate of the cost of the same, and of the amount that would have been saved to the Colony if the trains had only run to Millertown Junction on the one side and to Humbermouth on the other, and to ask him if the continuance of the cross-country service through the winter months was arranged between himself and Mr. E. Collishaw to facilitate the latter in moving pit props which he had sold to the A. N. D. Co., and why such a heavy expenditure should have been imposed upon the Colony for the benefit of Mr. Collishaw.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the receipts and expenditures each month from July 1st, 1920, to March 31st, of this year, during which period it is understood the railroad was operated by the Railway Commission; and also the receipts and expenditure for the same nine months, 1919-1920, 1918-19, 1917-18, during which periods the railroad was operated by the Reid Co.; also to show in the statement the receipts from passenger traffic, freight traffic, mails and other sources in each month of each of these periods, and a similar statement of expenditures showing the cost of:

- (a) Maintenance of line, building, etc.
- (b) Making and repairs of engines.
- (c) Repairs of cars.
- (d) General expenses.

Sir M. P. Cashin called the attention of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an official announcement in the issue of his organ—"The Advocate" of Wednesday, December 1st, that on the previous evening, the Railway Commission sat for four hours and dealt with many important

matters, among them being that "A General Manager for the railway system had been secured and was to arrive in a few days," and to ask him if such general manager has arrived, if so what is his name, what are his credentials, what salary is he receiving, and for what period has he been engaged, and if he has not arrived why not; also if a gentleman, understood to have been selected for this position arrived here some three or four months ago and departed again after two or three days; if this gentleman came to look over the Railway and allied properties before assuming the position and if he refused to assume the position because he could not secure any guarantee that he would be able to operate the Railway along business-like lines and without interference from inexperienced people like the Minister and others; if he regarded the Railroad as being in a hopeless condition and the Chairman of the Commission and others as unsuited to direct it and if not why he left; and if there is any correspondence between that gentleman and himself or the commission or any member or officer of the Commission, to lay copies of the same on the Table of the House.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines to lay on the Table of the House copy of the reports made by the Canadian Geological Surveyor whose services were obtained by him from the Dominion Government last summer to report upon coal areas on the West Coast and elsewhere, and also a statement of any amounts paid that gentleman for his services and expenses, giving specifically the amount for services, and a detailed statement of his expenses.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture &

Mines, if it is correct that certain, of what are known as the Cleary coal areas on the West Coast are partly on the Reid-Newfoundland Company's lands, and if so how this comes to pass; and to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the report of the surveyor who made this rectification of the line and whether the Government is satisfied that the said rectification is correct.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries what agreement, if any, he has with Mr. Hawes, who has been acting as his representative and the agent of the Colony in certain European markets; and if Mr. Hawes has no agreement with him, what motive is prompting him to undertake the work of looking after the interests of this country in these markets for nothing; also to table statement showing who are Messrs. Hawes & Co., Ltd., who are the shareholders in this firm, its directors, and the number of shares each has, and if any of the gentlemen actively promoting the Fishery Export Regulations have any interest in Hawes & Co., Ltd.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a report on the water works laying pipes, etc., in connection with the sanatorium, and who is superintending such work, and what amount said superintendent has been paid to date.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 25, on Order Paper of April 26th, 1921:

(Second portion of question) Copies of Order in Council, correspondence and Charter-Party on file in Department of Colonial Secretary, tabled herewith.

Dept. of Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Nfld.

April 22, 1921.

Sir,—I have the honour to enclose

herewith, certified copy of Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council directing the opening of a credit for the sum of \$10,000.00 in the Bank of Montreal, in respect of Messrs. Rolfe & Company, Ltd., for account of the Salinera Espanola Company, Torreveja, for a cargo of salt. I have written the Manager of the Bank here asking him to open the credit. The amount will come from Surplus Trust Fund. Will you kindly take the necessary action.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS.

Deputy Colonial Secty.
John S. Keating, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

COPY OF MINUTE OF COUNCIL:
(Dated April 21, 1921.)

WHEREAS it was necessary to provide for a supply of Salt for fishery purposes;

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he was in London, arranged with Messrs. Rolfe & Company, Ltd., for a supply of 5,500 tons from the Salinera Espanola Company, Torreveja, at 10 pesetas cash;

It was ordered that there be opened in the Bank of Montreal, a credit of \$10,000.00 in favour of Messrs. Rolfe & Company, Ltd., London, against Bill of Lading, the said amount to be taken from the Surplus Trust Fund. The proceeds of the sale of the Salt when received, to be deposited to the credit of the said Trust Fund.

Dept. of Colonial Secretary,
St. John's, Nfld.

Sir,—I have the honour to enclose herewith, certified copy of Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council, directing the opening in your Bank, of a credit for the sum of \$10,000.00, in favour of Messrs. Rolfe &

Company, Ltd., London, for account of the Salinera Espanola Company. Torrevieja, payment to be made against Bill of Lading of the amount that will be actually due in respect of the said cargo of Salt.

Will you kindly wire your London Office, intimating that this credit has been established, and asking them to notify Messrs. Rolfe & Company accordingly. Kindly carry out the above this afternoon as the ship is now ready to take in her cargo, and the Government desire to avoid demurrage charges.

I have the honour to be.

Sir.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS.

Deputy Colonial Secty.

J. A. Paddon, Esq.,

Mgr. Bank of Montreal,

City.

Charter Party Salt

London, 2nd April, 1921.

It is this day mutually agreed between A/S D/S H. Lund; (W. Gilbert) Bergen, owners of the good steamship "Henrik Lund" of the measurement of 2532 tons net, 3903 gross register, classed 100 A I, Lloyd's, and carrying not exceeding 5500 tons cargo, now on passage to Alexandria with cargo, where due to discharge 4/5th April and expected to enter upon this charter-party about 22nd/25th April, 1921, and Ministry of Marine and Fisheries, Newfoundland Government, charterers

(1) That the said ship being tight, staunch and strong, and in every way suitable for the voyage, shall, after discharge of present cargo, sail, and proceed to Torrevieja or so near thereto as she may safely get, always afloat, and there load from the charterers or their agents in the customary manner where and as ordered by them, and which the said charterers bind themselves to ship, a cargo of

salt in bulk and/or bags not exceeding 5500 tons, and what she can reasonably stow and carry over and above her tackle, apparel, provisions and furniture, and being so loaded shall forthwith proceed to Saint John's (Newfoundland) and there deliver alongside any wharf, or vessel, or craft or warehouse as ordered, or so near thereto as she may safely get, always afloat, and there deliver the same as customary, where and as directed by the consignees, being paid freight at and after the rate of Twelve Shillings and Sixpence (12/6) British sterling per ton of 2,240 lbs. gross weight delivered.

(2) At Torrevieja shippers to disburse all port charges, including agency, stevedoring, pilotage, winchmen, dues, duties and ordinary gratifications, in consideration of being paid One Shilling and Sixpence (1/6) per ton on the quantity shipped in full, unless if sailing at night-time, in which case extra pilotage if any to be for owners' account. Should steamer enter loading port with any cargo and/or with one or more passengers on board, the owners to be responsible for the payment of any anchorage duty levied by the Spanish Government in consequence, under the Navigation Law of 14th June, 1909, steamer to pay consular fees (if any) at loading port and all expenses appertaining to the vessel at discharging port as customary. Owners agree to indemnify charterers for any claim arising in consequence of any accident to any of the men engaged in loading the steamer, just as if the men or men were directly employed by the owners.

(3) The act of God, perils of the sea, fire on board, in hulk or craft, or on shore, barratry of the master and crew, enemies, pirates and thieves, arrests and restraints of princes, rulers and people, collisions, stranding, and other accidents of navigation excepted even when occasioned by neg-

ligence, default, or error of judgment of the pilot, master, mariners, or other servants of the shipowners. Not answerable for any loss or damage arising from explosion, bursting of boilers, breakage of shafts, or any latent defect in the machinery or hull, not resulting from want of due diligence by the owners of the ship, or any of them, or by the ship's husband or manager. The steamer has liberty to tow and be towed, to call at any ports in any order for coal or other supplies, to sail without pilots, to tow and assist vessels in distress, and to deviate for the purpose of saving life or property.

(4) The cargo to be shipped at the average rate of 500 tons per clear working day (weather permitting), Sundays and National and Custom House holidays excepted, and to be discharged at the average rate of 400 tons per like day, always provided that steamer has adequate facilities for loading and discharging at these rates. Strikes of workmen, lock-out, accidents or stoppages at any of the works or salines from which shippers may receive the whole or part of the cargo, epidemics, riots, war, insurrections, quarantine, stoppage of trains, want of trucks, tides, floods, earthquakes, intervention of sanitary, Customs and/or other constituted authorities, or any other cause beyond the personal control of shippers, charterers or consignees which may hinder the loading or discharging of the steamer, always excepted, and in these cases lay-days not to count and demurrage not to accrue.

(5) Lading time to count from 6 a.m. after ship is reported at Custom House and due notice given in writing during usual office hours of the steamer being ready for loading, whether in berth or not, and for discharging from 6 a.m. after ship is in every respect ready in free pratique, as per custom of port, written notice of such readiness being given to consignees during

usual office hours. In the event of charterers being able to arrange to load and/or discharge the ship on Sundays or holidays, captain to allow work to be done; such time used not to count, but charterers to pay any extra expense incurred.

(6) Time occupied in loading to be agreed at loading port, and NOT to be reversible with the time occupied in discharging. Demurrage to be paid at and after the rate of One Hundred Pounds (£100) British sterling per day, and pro-rata for parts of a day, payable day by day.

(7) Ship to work day and night if required to do so, and to give use of cranes and/or winches with necessary gear, steam power and hands. Extra expenses in connection with night work to be paid by charterers. Ship to keep steam winches in good working order.

(8) The freight, less advance, if any, to be paid, on right delivery of the cargo, at the current rate of exchange for good and approved Bankers' Bills on London at 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ days' sight without discount or allowance. If required by captain, necessary money for ship's ordinary expenses at port of loading, not exceeding one-third of the freight, to be advanced by charterers' agents on account of freight, subject to 6 per cent., to cover interest, commission and insurance.

(9) The holds to be properly cleaned and made ready for cargo before loading begins, otherwise the charterers not to be bound to commence loading until the holds are in such conditions as not to damage the cargo. Owners to properly line the holds with mats, or whitewash, at their own expense, to the satisfaction of the shippers.

(10) The cargo to be brought to and taken from alongside the ship at merchants' risk and expense, where she can lie always safely afloat. The consignees' stevedores to be employed for discharging, the steamer paying cur

rent rate per ton and also providing steam winches, with the requisite steam, gear and winchmen. Stevedores to be under captain's supervision and charterers to be in no way liable for improper stowage.

(11) The captain to call at the office of the agents of the charterers when requested and sign Bills of Lading for the number of tons shipped; weight and quality unknown, freight and all other conditions, including negligence and average clauses (Nos. 3 and 13) in accordance with this Charter-Party, and to endorse on such Bills of Lading freight (if any) received at loading port, or in default charterers not to be responsible for any detention of steamer occasioned by captain's omission to do so. Charterer's responsibility ceases as soon as cargo is loaded and advance of freight (if any) paid, the captain having a lien on cargo for his freight, dead-freight, demurrage, and average.

(12) The captain to apply to and employ charterers, or their nominees, at ports of loading and discharging, for custom house business on the usual terms, say Fifty Dollars (\$50) at St. John's, but free of charge at Torrevieja.

(13) Average, if any, to be adjusted in accordance with York/Antwerp Rules. 1890. In case of jettison, the captain to report same to consignees immediately on arrival at port of discharge.

(14) Lay-days not to commence before the 22nd April, and charterers have the option of cancelling this Charter-Party if the steamer is not ready to load on or before the 10th May, 1921.

(15) The vessel not to take any salt other than for charterers' account.

(16) Ship to apply to Salinas de Torrevieja for cargo, and captain to telegraph them (telegraphic address, "Salinas, Torrevieja") and also to 'Salinera, Palmademallorca' the steamer's sailing for loading port, falling to

do so the charterers to be allowed one day extra for loading.

(17) Penalty for non-performance of this agreement, proved damages not exceeding estimated amount of freight.

(18) The brokerage of five (5) per cent. on the gross amount of the freight, dead-freight, and demurrage is due by the steamer in London on shipment of cargo, steamer lost or not lost, to Rolfe & Co., Ltd., London and MacIntyre & Co., London.

(19) That all disputes arising under or in connection with this Charter-Party shall be referred to the arbitration of two arbitrators (not lawyers) in London who are conversant with shipping matters, one to be appointed by each party, in the manner provided by the Arbitration Act, 1889.

(20) The brokerage of 2½ per cent. on the gross amount of freight, dead-freight and demurrage is due on shipment of cargo to Japp, Hatch & Co., Ltd., for division with the Bergen Agent A/S.

For and by cable authority of the Honorable W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Newfoundland Government, ROLFE & CO., LTD., (Sgd.) W. A. ROLFE, Director, as Agents only.

For and by authority of the Bergen Agent A/S., for JAPP, HATCH & CO., LIMITED, (Sgd.) WM. MUIR YOUNG, Director, as Agents.

The original Charter-Party is in the possession of MacINTYRE BROS. & CO., London.

Hon. Prime Minister the Reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 3, on Order Paper of April 27th, 1921 is as follows:

Mr. E. Collishaw has not imported into this Colony within the past few months a number of Rifles or Guns therefore he did not obtain possession of them upon a free entry of temporary permit.

Answer to question No. 1, order paper April 27th, Mr. Vinnicombe:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The manufacturers of the city made representations to the Government recently, alleging that in view of the decreased cost of foreign articles and the probability of such dumping of cheap foreign goods in Newfoundland which would go into consumption in competition with home-made products, and in view of the fact that they were continuing to pay wages at the same rate as during the War, they should receive certain concessions from the Government in the form of tariff protection or a reduction in duty on the materials which went into the manufacture of their goods.

The whole question is under the consideration of the Government. In the event of any proposition being brought before the House with a view to giving special protection to the manufacturing industries, the private information referred to in this question will be available and may be the subject of discussion in the course of debate; otherwise the information would be of a private nature relating to the financial arrangements of the various companies, and would not be the subject matter of discussion.

Answer to question No. 3.—Sir M. P. Cashin—Order Paper, April 27th:—

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. E. Collishaw has not imported in to this Colony within the past few months any rifles or guns.

Mr. HIBBS:—I suppose like many other members I have to begin by saying that I intend to preface my remarks by stating my intention to be very brief. I notice that some did not keep their word. I am at any rate going to keep my word. I am conscious of the fact that the country does not expect me or any member of this House, no matter on what side he is, to be debating on the address in reply or on any amendments thereto up to the twenty sixth session

since the opening of the House and I feel my responsibility in this respect. However it has been the prerogative of the Opposition to speak at some length in this matter but I must congratulate some of them on the very fine effort they put forth and the vim with which they expressed their opinions and I hope with some degree of earnestness. I have to say that I cannot support the amendment before the chair for the following reasons. In the first place, I think it would be very strange and culpably insincere and absolutely unnecessary for me to do so as there is a Bill before the House embodying the substance of the amendment. At the same time in concurrence with many preceding speakers, I feel that the country is passing through an unprecedented period, which has never before been witnessed in the history of this country and I hope we shall never have a recurrence of it again. I do not think that all the argument used by the Opposition has been what it should have been. I like them to criticise the Government and put up a stiff fight and I for one am prepared to take my medicine. I have to say that some of the argument advanced by the other side went a little too far. I deplore the blue ruin propaganda supported by blue ruin speeches. Now we are told that this country is bankrupt and every firm on Water street is on the verge of collapse. I want to ask the honourable gentleman who uttered those statements, in what way they can help Newfoundland by making such remarks? Just imagine the responsibility on the shoulders of those who made those statements. These gentlemen are not thus calculated to do much good for the cause. If a member of firm on Water street doing business, went around and spread broadcast the news of the financial condition of his firm, that it was on

the verge of insolvently, what would his partner think of him? The same applies to our country. Do you think it would be better for that firm or not to keep, such news to itself so that they may be able to get credit to finance their business. Why as soon as the outside world would get a hold of such information what will happen the credit of the firm? Of course we are suffering financially and I am aware that the revenue will be two and one half millions short but we must not forget that other countries as well are suffering the same as we are. The Canadian revenue is one hundred and sixty millions short and I do not think that the members of the House of Parliament in Canada are announcing to the world that she is on the verge of bankruptcy. Nor is the Canadian press doing it. It is very poor policy. The general trend of the argument put forward by the other side indicates that they are anxious to help us. We do not want them to come over and help us.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The only person to help you is God and God alone.

MR. HIBBS:—Yes, Sir Michael, even God wants us to pull together. If I am going to appeal to any one on the other side it is Sir Michael Cashin. But there are some times he is a little too hasty and acts rather out of order. But however we have all got our faults. I think we should get down to business and do some thing practical. You are asking us what are we going to do, and yet the most of the time you are merely holding up the House. Is that sincere? The galleries have been appealed to on more than one occasion by the members opposite and some of them interrupt the gentlemen on this side when they are speaking which is not proper. The Opposition has shown the same enthusiasm as

that evidenced in the gallery, and I think it is deplorable that the dignity of this Chamber should be so reflected upon those who know better. But some of them went further and talked directly to the persons in the gallery and then we are told by the members of other side that we are only doing very little. How could it be otherwise? I have sat down in my seat and enjoyed some of the speeches when they were not personal, but there is a limit to every thing. It is not fair if there is a lot of unemployed in this city, when there are many problems to be attacked and solved, and in which we are all interested, for the Opposition to accuse the Government of not attempting to do some thing when especially for a period of three weeks they have been talking against time. Now there is one aspect I would like to call the attention of the House to. And it is this. The other side has pictured blue ruin unlimited, that the firms along Water street are on the verge of insolventy, that the Government is in distress financially, but do they realize that most of the business houses over the country do business with the outside world chiefly on credit, sometimes sixty days or ninety days, and that if the press here and politicians do their utmost to show to the foreign markets that Newfoundland is on the verge of bankruptcy, how is a hundred thousand dollar order going to be treated? It would be certainly turned down. Now I want to say right here it is time that the Opposition cut out this business of insincerity and blue ruinism. If you are earnest do something serious and assisting. Now I wish to refer to a matter which has been discussed very much and that is the Fishery Regulations. Every thing under the sun which has not been successful has been attributed to the fishery regu-

lations. I do not know if the fishery regulations will get the credit for the fine weather we are now enjoying but I suppose the members on the other side will say that the weather is fine because they are on the point of being repealed. The principle of those regulations I claim was good. We did not get the necessary assistance from the men of all shades of politics and I am of the firm opinion that if they were given a fair chance some good would have resulted. I remember that two years ago Sir Michael Cashin very successfully raised a big loan. It was the biggest financial achievement in the history of the country. But I think Sir Michael will remember that the press and all men of the various shades of influence and opinion were behind him and for that reason the loan was raised so successfully as it was. Now in the same courtesy and the same assistance had been given to this fishery scheme the regulations would have worked out advantageously. It was impossible to enforce the regulations from the day they were put on the statute book and finding fault seemed to be the chief hobby of the opponents of the Government. It will be remembered that during the bye-election in St. John's West the Fishery Regulations were the chief plank in the platform of the Opposition. However the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs were returned. Around this period the Regulations were pronounced upon very much, yet the Opposition came into this House defeated. However, some of the Opposition supported the Regulations, particularly Mr. Walsh, who was always admired by me because he always worked for the poor and for the widows and orphans. In this respect we are kindred. But the reason, as I said before, for the defeat of them was the lack of unanimity. I remem-

ber Mr. Fox, while not going so far as Mr. Walsh, yet he eulogises Mr. Coaker, particularly in connection with this measure. I could not use the language he used at the time, as he is well known to be a great orator. He said that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the greatest benefactor for the people of our country in the history of Newfoundland. But I am sorry he has so changed his views. I am sorry he has changed so far as to say that the heart should be torn out of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because of his conduct towards this country. But I venture to say that if Mr. Fox had those statements back he would never have used them. I feel he is sorry for saying that about the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I would like the honorable gentleman to get up here and say to the House that he is very sorry for uttering such words. I wish to say also that I remember that some time ago Sir John C. Crosbie while in company with his political associates after their defeat with his usual big heartedness said "Look here, boys, thank God sincerely that we are defeated because that lot elected has the greatest problem in the history of the country ahead of them." And Sir John was quite right; but I think if he was serious and sincere and wished to be consistent he would not now be making the problem more complicated and always be throwing obstacles in the way. But owing to the shortness of time and as there are others to follow me, I have to leave untouched a lot of important matters which I would like to refer to. I would like to say that the other side has seen fit to throw across the insult that I am a pawn, but I take it that it was said with a serious insinuation. It has been said by the Opposition, from Sir Michael Cashin down to the last man, that we are a pawn, so that I think I should not

take it serious. The people of Fogo who sent me here, did not send me here to be a pawn. I have my own opinions, and I am going to hold them when I see fit. I am going to use my intelligence to best advantage to my country and to my district. I want to say as one of the eleven men representing ninety thousand of the people of this country, that North of Baccalieu the people do not want us to slight the finances of this country, and I want this House to understand that the people of the North are big enough and independent enough to get along without discrimination in their favor, and I want to say that I know that I would not be worthy to represent Fogo if I was so small and narrow-minded that to think I represented only the District of Fogo, but I realise that I am one of the thirty-six men representing the people as a whole. I am interested in the South Coast and the West Coast as well as I am interested in the Northern coasts.

It has also pleased Mr. Moore to repeatedly refer to me in connection with the Road Commission. Well the crime he has referred to will be committed by me every three months for the next few years. He sneered at the pamphlet I wrote with regard to road building. Well I call it a booster. Well I would like to say that the brains of one of the greatest road engineers in Canada helped to compile that little booster. It showed the difference between a good road and a bad one. And I wish to particularly mention that I sent copies of it to the Road Board in Ferryland District. I must admit I did get a few ads from the Government, but they only amounted to eighty dollars, and in fact I came out of the proposition twenty-six dollars on the wrong side; but I can assure you the next time I will be on the right side, and if necessary I believe Mr. Moore will give

me an advertisement. I am sorry he is not at present in his seat.

It is not good enough for this country to be here in the fifth week of the session only as far as debating the Address in Reply when there are so many serious problems ahead to be discussed; and I hope in the future that the severity of the debate from the opposite side will lessen and more co-operation and unity will be in evidence. We cannot hope to have the business of the House transacted when especially the feelings of those on this side are hurt sometimes when the Leader of the Opposition, with his usual characteristic fight, criticises us. However, I hope after all he did not mean to go to the point of hurting the feelings of those sitting on this side.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, Sir, it was not my intend to speak on the amendment before the House, but as one who sa down here and listened to the speech of the Prime Minister, the villification and abuse of the people of St. John's, I would be lacking in my duty if I did not reply. I represent St. John's East in this House, Sir, and I represent St. John's West in the Municipal Council. I thought that abuse came with poor grace from the Prime Minister. I think, Sir, he must have had a fight the night before with Mr. Coaker, and he wanted to make good. I want to say for myself that I have never fung any abuse at anybody, and I wish to be very clear on that matter. The Prime Minister said that the Northern members had been insulted as they came in and went out of the House. I want to ask Mr. Jennings if he heard any insulting remarks, if any one referred to his religion.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I might say that I have not come into this House or passed out of this House at any time during the past week without being insulted.

I heard several remarks about my religion.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as far as I am concerned I have no use for any man who will cast reflections on another man's religion. A man is a man, and I don't care what religion he professes. I want to say that if any man in that audience casted a reflection on Mr. Jennings' religion, the Prime Minister should know that man. He is pretty well acquainted with the people of St. John's now. He should not have insulted all the people in St. John's because of that. The Prime Minister is a fine speaker and all that, but I think it would be better for himself if he couldn't speak half as well. If I went to Harbor Grace with Mr. Archibald and the people elected me, I would not throw dirt in the eyes of the people of Harbor Grace. A word of cheer should come from your lips, Sir, and not abuse on the people that elected you. I thought it my duty to the people of St. John's that I should express resentment of the vilification by the Prime Minister. Mr. Samson said he congratulated the Leader of the Government. With regard to leaders I don't know where you are, there are so many of them.

MR. SAMSON:—We have but one leader the Prime Minister.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—But you had another leader when the fishermen of the North came up here with their fish and could not dispose of it. They went to see Mr. Coaker, the President of the F. P. U., and Mr. Coaker of the F. P. U. got in touch with Mr. Coaker, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Then Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries got in touch with Mr. Coaker, the Prime Minister of Newfoundland. Then Mr. Coaker, the Prime Minister, called Mr. Shea, Mr. Foote and Mr. Halfyard together and an order was obtained to take a half million dollars from the Treasury of the country to buy the fish that those

fishermen had. Mr. Speaker, if you will notice I am addressing you personally. I say "Mr. Speaker" once in a while, and that is more than the Prime Minister did yesterday. You wouldn't know but he was making a speech in the Casino. I think he was a bit excited. There must have been a row in the camp, and he was trying to make good. They say we are talking about the busting camp and everything else. I want to say to the Prime Minister that no one wants to bust the present Government party. He has made his bed, and now let him lie on it. We are going to see that it will not burst, but the only thing that I am sorry for is poor Newfoundland.

I thought, Sir, that I ought to speak after what the Prime Minister said here yesterday. Although I cannot speak as well as the Prime Minister I can speak sincerely, but I do not believe that the Prime Minister is sincere in half he says.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—The crowd now in power said the other Government had no laws with regard to profiteering. That was preached all over the country. They brought in a bill last year and made it criminal for anyone to do anything in the line of profiteering, but I would like to ask them is it a crime to be continually robbing the poor of this country. No, this law they enforced or rather placed on the statute book was mere camouflage. Now I want to say that when I got up here I did not intend to speak so long as I have but when once one gets to his feet many things come to his mind and especially when we have such a Government occupying the seats on the other side. If it was a decent and properly constituted and properly managed many things would necessarily be left unsaid. But there is nothing but corruption and stagnation exhibited on the other side. I have much pleasure in supporting

this amendment, but Mr. Coaker and Mr. Squires have fallen down on it. Yet we have a bill on the order paper repealing the Codfish Exportation Act, but I know quite well if this amendment never saw the light of day this bill would have never shown itself. In the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday it was clearly evident that the Regulations would never have been lifted but for the people on this side of the House, and it is attributable to this side of the House that Bill for their repeal is now on the order paper. Of course the people of the West Coast and the City have in no small degree forced the Government to repeal them. They were playing auction forty-five but they went in the hole, but the people of this country will not have a hole to crawl into soon if things continue as they are now. Mr. Speaker, when this matter comes up again I will have a word or two to say.

MR. SINNOTT:—In rising to support the amendment before the chair I would like to express an outline of my views of the present condition of affairs. The condition of the country today is deplorable and particularly so in my district of Placentia and St. Mary's. In the history of that district never have the people suffered so badly and unfortunately the outlook for the coming years is not too promising at all. And regrettably nothing is being done by the Government to remedy matters. The destitution in Placentia and St. Mary's is unimaginable and all of it is due to the fact that those blameable regulations. Of course the present Government is responsible for the enforcement of those regulations. And the Government has not any time been too friendly towards this district. The district of Placentia and St. Mary's never got one cent of the five hundred thousand dollars spent by the Government in buying fish discrim-

inately. If it was right to buy fifty thousand quintals of fish at eight dollars per quintal in the districts of Placentia and St. Mary's, the district of Burin and then Fortune Bay? But the people in those sections did not want the Government money to buy their fish. They wanted to sell theirs in the right way and through the customary channels. Although it was Mr. Coaker who made the Government purchase the fish it bought yet we are informed that the Government turned down an offer of ten thousand quintals of fish, good Labrador, at ten dollars per quintal, and this is an offer they might never get again. And perhaps we may find the United States soon passing restrictions on our markets which would prove to be a serious matter. For the first time in the history of the country the Government has entered into the commission business. It started on sugar but the public has had to pay twenty-five cents per pound for the very necessary article used by poor and rich alike. And in face of these conditions the Government still refuses to lift the regulations until the deputation the other day awaited the Government here in this chamber, and asked them to do so. The people have suffered tremendous losses on sugar alone. But still the present administration is styled the Reform Government. They were elected to save the country from ruin. To-day the consequence is that the fishermen are without friends and without supplies for the coming fishery, the staple industry of the country is paralyzed, the business houses are bankrupt and the trade of the country is destroyed, and like the unemployed, has never before been witnessed, and all this have taken place in the course of one short year. But I fear still worse things are ahead of us and unless there is some radical change brought about to help matters the present

difficulties will be still more complicated and much more felt.

DR. JONES:—I have no intention of delaying the House, but I cannot let this opportunity pass by without saying a word or two with regard to the amendment before the chair. We have been accused of unduly delaying the time of the House, but I think any right thinking person will agree with me that the time which we have spent up to the present has not been wasted because much desirable information has thereby been elicited which otherwise would have not. We have in that manner disclosed to the public the doings of the Government for the past year and surely that is our duty here. As far as the Fishery Regulations are concerned, I feel like my friend Mr. Halfyard, incompetent to speak at any length on them for various reasons. He had one particular reason for not so speaking, but I have one quite the opposite. They were brought on by the Government and whether they deserve any credit at all I am not in a position to say. However from my side of the House the regulations have been blamed for having caused a great deal of discontent, unlimited disaster and many financial break downs.

In the first place, it is my opinion the Government should not have interfered with the trade of the country. The regulations were enforced just as our markets opened. They were not impartially put into effect as witnessed by the condition of the West Coast. There was no certainty about them and the exporters did not know only from day to day what was ahead. The Prime Minister yesterday said that similar regulations were enforced in other countries to control the trade and various industries, and he referred for an example to the apple growers of the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia. But that industry only concerns a part of the

Province of Nova Scotia, and any bad to the fact of those blameable regulations of the province. But in this country the regulations affected the whole of it and if good results were the outcome the whole of the Colony would benefit and if bad the same extensive effect would be. I am glad to see that a certain portion of the other side of the House got up and declared their independence, and I refer to the members representing the F. P. U., I am glad most of them were in a position to assert their independence. I am not in a position to discuss the constitution of the F. P. U. My knowledge of it is very vague. I remember that about one year ago the local council of that organisation in Avondale after having held a convention at Bay de Verde awaited upon me at Avondale asking me if I would stand as an F.P.U. representative for the district of Harbor Main, and at the time this council which consisted of five men submitted me the following note, (reads). There is undoubtedly the substance of what a proposed representative of the F. P. U. has to do, and if the gentlemen on the other side who are F. P. U. men had to take this oath and be controlled by the council in question I cannot see how they are independent representatives. Imagine placing myself as representative of the F. P. U., and being under the dictation of those five men and having to take a sort of oath as this one. And think of it at any time I may be recalled by these five men. Mr. Jennings a few days ago pointed out to the House how dangerous it was to set the North against the South. I agree with him, for it would be a sad happening for Newfoundland if we were split up in sections along denominational lines or any other. I regret that the Prime Minister did not take Mr. Jennings' advice and not set about appealing to sections of the country in particular

which was purposely intended to do unlimited harm. If the country were split up into North, East, South and West as religious bodies that would be a very bad change and not tending to do any good at all. We cannot look forward with any degree of confidence with regard to any public subject if such were the lines along which we worked. It is time that we get down to work and do some thing for the country's good, and if we are to get down to do the work for which we were sent here we must disregard our differences to large extent. Mr. Coaker has said he is very sorry for the errors of his ways, but it is not always wise to forgive because he makes an open confession. We have to compel him to do penance other wise he will commit the errors just the same. He will relapse very quickly. We usually elicit the frame of a man's mind from the manner of his speech, and Mr. Coaker has said that a change in the form of the regulations were necessary, and still he persists and says that the present regulations are good for the country. I do not doubt but some form of regulations would be good, but we should stop short when we interfere with those men who buy and sell fish. But the Government of Reform has gone beyond the limit. You have played right into the hands of your rivals, and you are responsible for the disorganization of the trade. During the past year we have had 3 forms of Government, first a Government with responsibility, a Government without responsibility and then a Government by intimidation. The people of the South West Coast have been clamoring for the repeal of the regulations and they have won by intimidation. The same has happened with regard to the sugar regulations. But we have been told a duty of one and one half cents is to be imposed to recoup a loss incurred on sugar ac-

count. If the Government had intended to do away with the regulations it would have appeared in the speech from the throne. But like the Exportation Act and the Fishery regulations they have or are to be repealed merely by intimidation. It has come to pass that the mob rules. And that is not good enough for this country. The men of the North tried it last Fall and they succeeded, and now why should not the others try it also, That is the way the matter stands, But this sort of thing ought to be unheard of and we should at once get down to business and I think the Opposition will help to the extent that your programme is reasonable and good for the country. A lot of information is yet required of you to show us how the condition of the country is progressing, or if not progressing in what way is it tending, We want to know how the balance sheet is going to be. I have much pleasure Mr. Speaker in giving this amendment my hearty and sincere support.

On motion for the adoption of the report of the Select Committee in reply to the Speech from the Throne, Sir M. P. Cashin moved and Sir J. C. Crosbie seconded the following amendment:

WHEREAS: "The policy of the Regulation of the marketing of the Colony's staple product," referred to by Your Excellency was first put into force in November, 1919, by means of Rules and Regulations made and proclaimed by you, with the advice and consent of your present Executive, and subsequently declared illegal by the Supreme Court, but remade and re-proclaimed under the pretended authority of the War Measures Act;

AND WHEREAS: Your Ministers claim that the aforesaid policy and rules were the sole issue at two bye-elections to this Assembly, held be-

fore the first session and were approved thereat by the electors;

AND WHEREAS: The measure under which the so-called Rules and Regulations were made in 1920, and indifferently enforced until quite recently, was introduced into this Assembly as a Government measure;

AND WHEREAS: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, speaking on behalf of the Government, declared to a Convention of Licensed Exporters, so called, in September, 1920, that "we consider these rules a part of our policy" we will not waver (in their enforcement) until there has been time to test whether they are good or bad, for this season will prove whether they are valuable or valueless" and "if (after trial) it can be shown they are injurious, or not beneficial, we shall say they have been tried and failed, and we will forego any further attempt to control the fixing of the prices of fish for the foreign markets";

AND WHEREAS: As the result of experience gained in 1920, the licensed exporters have unanimously requested the repeal of all the Rules and Regulations, and the Codfish Exportation Board, so called, has recommended the repeal, and they have been repealed accordingly by you;

AND WHEREAS: Your Excellency, speaking for the Government, admits that "the practical application of the policy has met with adventitious as well as inherent difficulties" and has asked us as legislators to consider that policy in the best interests of the Colony, her commerce and people;

BE IT RESOLVED: That we are of opinion:

- (1) That the policy has not been beneficial;
- (2) That any attempt to continue it would be detrimental to the public good;
- (3) That uncertainty will be most hampering to trade;

(4) That while the measure authorising the making of Rules and Regulations remains unrepealed, the suppliers and exporters of the Colony will be disinclined to adventure into the fishing business as fully as they otherwise would, and

(5) That, therefore, in our opinion "The Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" should be immediately repealed.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment: Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell and Mr. Lewis; and against it: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, (17), so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for adoption of the report was put, when there appeared for it: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, (17); and against it: Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, and Mr. Lewis, (13); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Commit-

tee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend Chapter 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of Enquiry.'" .

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act, 1920."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I proposed to amend this Bill somewhat. Last year legislation was passed ratifying the contract with the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. and allowing the importation free of duty of material used by the Sulphite Co. for the material for their packages. It had been asked by Mr. Sullivan that this concession be cancelled, and it was done, but when the Acts were published this clause somehow was omitted. The Act was published in the original form. I do not know how this mistake occurred, but it is now necessary to re-enact the decision of the House at last session.

MR. BENNETT:—Who is the engaging clerk?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mrs. Earle. To make it clear that we are not interfering with the Act a year after it has been passed, I am drafting a preamble which I will submit to the House covering the mat-

ter and which I will now ask the Clerk to read.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918," was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Law relating to Lotteries" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—

In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to make an explanation. Up till 1903 lotteries were held freely in connection with church bazaars, educational affairs, etc., but then the power to grant permission for the same was taken from the magistrate, and it was supposed all were prohibited. Sweepstakes, however, on the sealfishery, etc., were held openly, and not only for charitable purposes, but to make money for those who promoted them. Few bazaars were held that some small article was not raffled and few indeed were the events of this kind that did not profit by the same. This is not a party measure, and it is up to the House to support it or not as honorable members think fit. Section 6 is hereby repealed as above. Despite the law, men of St. John's East have been drawing for trap berths, and I hope to see this covered. Numbers of charitable organisations here

are assisted by lotteries and no one taking part is demoralised, and I see no reason why such should be restricted. Still I see no reason why any man who gets up a lottery should take half the proceeds for himself should not be prohibited from doing so. In order to keep in touch with the matter, the magistrate has been ordered to give to the Department of Justice the names of those granted permission to hold a lottery. The man who gets up a lottery for the benefit of his own purse alone should be condemned, and in connection with this the law of evidence is to be amended. All persons getting up lotteries will be liable as under the amendment above. Affairs in aid of churches or educational objects are alright, but not the others, and I do not think respectable people will be guilty of offences. If necessary for the prosecution the law ought to be made so that a witness will give evidence to condemn offenders.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, it is about time that this anomalous state of affairs was handled properly. We hear a whole lot of talk from people opposed to these lotteries, and now it seems we are to develop into a crowd of hypocrites through the laws of the country. This amendment is alright and puts the matter on a proper basis insofar as it deals with the cases in which wheels of fortune, etc., are a help. I shall have something later to say on this matter when it reaches committee stage, and now wish to remark that I do not think it wise to give effect to Section 2. I am more than surprised to see it in the Bill, and particularly coming from one whose general make-up is not in line with its tenor. It is not in accordance with the principles of British law and opens up an opportunity for semi-social enthusiasts to get in their work. No man likes to be an informer and to

go down to posterity branded with this name. In my own experience I have seen cases where perjury was committed by a witness rather than that he should be counted as an informer. This is said as a result of experience in court work and with full knowledge of the ill effects of this kind of legislation which I intend to condemn later, as I will show when the prohibition measure comes up. This is not a party measure, but we have arrived at a stage where some people are anxious to obtain their ideals without seeing the ill effects on the other side. I am dealing now with the law only, not with prohibition itself or with those sincerely behind the movement. I am dealing with the powers given to men who are not responsible for their conduct in carrying them out. The police force had not lost their name as one of our finest bodies of men with reputations unscathed till this law was introduced. When I condemned them in open court they admitted their guilt in rigging the most contemptible schemes in order to secure a conviction and that the force might benefit by the fines. One even stooped to promising to share the fine with a man whom he got to assist him in securing evidence against another. If loopholes for this sort of thing are made by the law, we are destroying one of the characteristics most valuable in our police force, and I hope and trust this objectionable legislation of Section 2 will not be allowed to go through. We had a case here a little while ago where two recruits were sent out rigged with a yarn about being travellers and through the means of a kindness which was extended to them as such, they managed to bring a charge against the person whose hospitality they had accepted. Now, is that the way we are going to enforce the Prohibition Act? The same

thing will apply to the Lottery Act; if we are going to have lotteries, let us have them, but it is no use to make the thing a greater farce than it is already. Look at the amusing incident that occurred in the Speaker's home town recently when that gentleman himself was before court for purchasing a lottery ticket. I am glad to say that you yourself were convicted, Sir, and I am also glad to say that though you were, it resulted from an act that showed your heart was in the right place. The more I consider this matter, the more convinced I feel that we should not bring in legislation to satisfy people who will stay up all night to see people in trouble. This amendment to the Lottery Act will at least have the effect of removing some of the most objectionable features of the Act as it now is, and in supporting the second reading of the Bill, I congratulate the Government on bringing it in and at the same time I ask the consideration of the hon. introducer to the matters to which I have made reference.

MR. FOX (Continued):—This time last year I regarded Mr. Coaker as a man inspired with sincerity, and one who was ever attentive towards the uplifting of the people of Newfoundland generally, but his record for the past year does not entitle me tonight to re-echo that sentiment, and that is why I lay at his doors tonight most of the evil that is rampant in Newfoundland today. I am doing it, because my opinions have consistently altered, but because his record for the past twelve months convinces me that my statements are correct. That is just the position. The Prime Minister may or may not have attempted to divert the attention of the people from the real issue, which is that there is not any antagonism existing between the outports and St. John's, but that there is rather an objection

to any one section of the country controlling the destinies of the whole country. And we in St. John's have not that spirit because we are St. John's men no more than the gentlemen opposite have that spirit because they are outport men, but because it has come down to us through British ancestry that we are free men that we do not want to be tied to the yoke. We want to think our course, as we in our own consciences see right to do; and, in particular, we want to see a Government govern us according to British constitution; and Newfoundland tonight is not governed according to British constitution. The thing has been going on for the past eight years, ever since Sir Robert Bond, great man that he was, saw the evil that was facing Newfoundland. Sir Robert Bond, great man that he was, saw the evil that was facing Newfoundland. Sir Robert found himself helpless when it came to the grip of the mighty corporation. We are now reaping the fruits of that position in Newfoundland and the fruits are that we have no longer a Government for the people, by the people and of the people; but we have a Government of twenty men, eleven of whom represent one big corporation, known as the F. P. U. We have the position facing Newfoundland tonight, namely, that Newfoundland is governed through the voice of her representatives in the House of Assembly; but she governed through the dictates of a corporate body, and that is why I for one am going to protest and publicly protest against the continuance of that iniquity—because that is all it is. It is absolutely iniquitous for any corporation to think that, because of its vastness, because of its numerical strength and because it controls so many seats here, that it can stalk through this House and control the destinies of the country of which it represents only a fraction. Have we

not got our rights south of Baccalleu as well as people north of Baccalleu have theirs. I would like for F.P.U. members to remember that, if they represent 100,000 people, there are 150,000 whom they do not represent. Of that 150,000 I am one, and I tell you tonight that it is not in accordance with the constitution under which we live to have the destinies of Newfoundland controlled by any corporation or by any group of men, if we are to be governed in freedom and by men who owe no allegiance to anybody, except the whole people of Newfoundland. I object to the principle of allowing any corporation, such as the F.P.U., to take Newfoundland by the throat and telling its people that it must do as they want them to do. That is not good enough and it is not Government. And when I object to that principle I echo the thoughts of thousands of people in this country tonight, and in particular, Sir, I echo the thoughts of the people in my own district, because that big constitutional principle, which should be regarded, if our Government is to govern as it should, has been wantonly and outrageously violated. Freedom of thought and action is what every man should be allowed to exercise. When any men come here bound under pledges to observe the dictum of a corporation I say that they are not representative of that Government of which they are a part. That is my one big objection to the Government tonight, apart from its own record. It is not a Government. It consists of some men and a corporation. Now, as regards the members of that corporation, I have no objections to them as individuals; but I do object to the principle or corporate control of any Government in a country of which I am a part.

Of course, the eulogizing I got in the Government press the past week

for taking this stand is almost too insignificant and too ridiculous to take notice of. It is rather amusing, however, to think, perhaps, tonight while I am addressing the Chair what the "Advocate" is thinking about regarding that blood-thirsty villain Fox's speech. According to a late edition of the "Advocate," I am the man who is seeking to tear the heart out of Coaker; and I am the man who is stalking around shouting fee fi fo fum I smell the blood of a Union man, also, after listening to some of the men opposite, particularly Mr. Jennings, one would imagine I was one of the heroes of Jack the Giant Killer. No one but myself was out seeking to dismember Mr. Coaker. It is indeed gratifying that the gentlemen who control the Advocate has seen well to circulate among the northern districts that Fox is seeking to tear the heart out of Coaker, and that that paper have put it up to ninety thousand fishermen north to protect the sacred person of Mr. W. F. Coaker against the terrible blood-thirsty villain, C. J. Fox. I feel that I have been paid a great compliment to think that any man who has been protected against me by a body-guard consisting of not less than ninety thousand men.

MR. HIBBS:—Personally I regard your statement a rash one.

MR. FOX:—When I am finished you may go on. If you want interruptions, I can put you in a place where you have no right to interrupt and, unless you don't care being dealt with without gloves, you may chime in again. Now let me take up the trend of my story again, as I want to say why I set out to fight that principle of corporate control and why my remarks were directed against Mr. Coaker. This is a fight for men, not one for children. Mr. Coaker, whether for good or for evil, is the outstanding figure in the Government, as

is well known to the whole country. Now when I seek a man to fight I want to get the biggest figure in sight. I don't go baby-snatching; and the reason I direct the order to Mr. Coaker is because there is not on the other side now a foeman worthy of my own steel. I am looking for the man that is controlling the whole country opposite, whether you like it or not. As regards the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself, I might say that there is no personal animosity existing between us, as the Advocate would have it said. As a matter of fact, if that gentleman asked me to do anything for him tomorrow in a personal way, I would be at his command; but I tell you, Sir, that why I oppose him as a public man is because he is the personification of the principle that one small group of men is controlling the freedom of the country that I live in, and while he represents that principle I will fight him; but not personally. Mr. Coaker knows that I am fighting him openly on principle; he knows anything coming from me is not done behind his back, and that is more than he can say of certain gentlemen associated with him in the Government tonight. I have absolutely no personal grudge or no personal feeling against Mr. Coaker whatever; but, his principle, in my opinion, is obnoxious and disadvantageous to the people of Newfoundland generally. I am opposed to the principle enunciated yesterday by the Prime Minister.

The principle is not whether St. John's East or St. John's West is to be antagonistic to the outports or whether the outports are to be antagonistic to St. John's; but it is as to whether the whole country should be controlled by any corporation, be it F. P. U. or the Reid Newfoundland Company, the bugaboo of Mr. Squires and Mr. Coaker before they took

charge of the Government, because it must be remembered that all down through the years before the F.P.U. got in the saddle the one thing used as an election kite in Newfoundland was the octopus that was strangling the freedom of Newfoundland. But you forget that now. There is a bigger quarry. It is no longer the Reid Newfoundland Company; but it is one more dangerous, namely, the F. P. U., which is powerful and vast enough to send eleven men to this House who are pledged to do as Mr. Coaker tells them, under pain of summary dismissal.

Every piece of legislation passed for the past eighteen months, since this Government assumed office, has had only one object, and that is the furtherance of the interests of the F. P. U. It has not dealt with the welfare of Newfoundland as a whole, but solely for the F. P. U.; and when you gentlemen opposite saw well to go to the Treasury and take five hundred thousand dollars, you had not in view the betterment of Newfoundland, but you had in view the betterment of the fishermen North who were members of the Union. Therefore, Sir, I raise my protest against you on that score, because you had no right to do that, but that is only one instance of many that I could enumerate showing that this Government—not alone in law but in fact—are the F. P. U. There seems to be no intention on the part of the Government for the betterment of Newfoundland here as hereafter, but the sole desire appears to be the advancement of co-operative interests—the interests of the F. P. U. Let the Prime Minister carry that away with him and deliver it to the people whom he discourteously attacked here yesterday. The Prime Minister not alone paid a discourtesy to the district that elected him and which he represents in this House, but he

made an attempt to line up the outports against St. John's. Every member recognises that every district is entitled to fair representation, but no ten should control the Government of Newfoundland. The whole thing is unconstitutional. Again I oppose the principle of an outport district controlling the freedom of St. John's East or St. John's West equally as strong as I oppose the principle of St. John's controlling the outports. I trust that the Prime Minister will take this message away with him this afternoon and see it delivered properly.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in reply to the junior member for St. John's East, though I do not propose to answer all of the arguments put forward by him. Not being a foeman worthy of his steel, I do not suppose that he will take much notice of my remarks. I think that the thing he laboriously tried to prove was the menace of the F.P.U. corporation to the Government and its control. Now I think that it is generally conceded that the Executive of any Government is really the Government. The personnel of the present Executive Government, consisting of nine men, five of whom belong to St. John's and are living here, namely the Prime Minister, Hon. Dr. Campbell, Hon. G. Shea, Hon. Mr. Warren and Hon. Mr. Brownrigg. This terrible, awful, political menace the F. P. U., has but two representatives on this Executive, viz., Mr. Coaker and Mr. Halfyard. The other two making up the nine men are Dr. Barnes from Harbor Grace and Mr. Foote from Burin. The total representation then on the Executive Council from the F. P. U. is composed of two men. Now, according to Mr. Fox's long explanation today in trying to climb down from an awkward position he put himself in the

other day, these two men are controlling the Government, and that is the cause of his extremely hostile attitude to this organisation. Now I must confess that in view of the above situation I am unable to swallow the fanciful story.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for an adjournment, I would like to take this opportunity of occupying the attention of the House for a few moments while I refer to a matter, which, in my opinion, is one of the most important matters that could be brought up here. Now that we have spent nearly a month debating upon the general policy of what might be expected from the Government, I would like to see both sides of this House unite, at least for a short period, to try and effect some remedy for the frightful conditions facing this country at present. I hold in my hand four or five telegrams which I received from reputable people in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's. One of the telegrams is signed by a reputable Justice of the Peace in a section of Placentia Bay. It is unfortunate for any man to have to bring before the House and the public the wretched conditions that exist. The telegram points out that there are one hundred families at this very moment in a state of starvation. I have another telegram from a reverend gentleman in another section of my district, pointing out similar conditions. I have another one, containing 140 words, from another clergyman, and so on. My colleagues and myself have received between us about a thousand letters from various parts of the country telling of the terrible conditions that prevail among the poor people. We all realise that we cannot have continued the pauper dole that is being dished out. It is now nearly the first of May when most of our people should get supplies or be in a position to get supplies, if they are going to

carry on the fishery. Consequently, it behoves every man in this House to rise to the occasion, and, I predict, that if an invitation is extended in the proper way from the Government to the men on this side, that is if the assistance of the latter is considered worth while, that they would be big enough to rise to the occasion; and I believe also that all the big men are not confined to any particular section of this House. This matter is not only an important one; but it is a sad one and distasteful to commence with. I do not have to get up here and depict the terrible conditions that exist for the sake of advertisement. It is unfortunate for any man to have to do so. I have no doubt but that conditions are even worse than what are represented in the documents that I have already referred to. Therefore, it is the bounden duty of every member of this House to put aside every other issue for the present moment and try and devise some means whereby our people will be able to prosecute the fishery the coming summer. I will have great pleasure in handing these documents to any committee appointed in this House to look into this matter. I feel sure that this matter will elicit, at least, the earnest and sympathetic support of both my colleagues and other members on this side of the House.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the conditions that exist around the country and which were more particularly brought to our notice from our own district. I would like to point out that as far as I can judge that this relief business has been going on for some considerable time past. On the 25th of January last my colleagues and myself discussed this whole matter so far as our district was concerned. We knew of the circumstances of our district and knew of the destitution that prevailed there, and we knew that

there was to be a great deal of public work to be done over there.

On the 25th of January my colleagues and myself wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, and I would like him to refer to that letter now. We wrote this letter, signed by the three members for Placentia and St. Mary's, and made certain suggestions to him. At the time some discussion was on about having pulpwood cut with a Government guarantee behind it. In the district of Placentia and St. Mary's it was possible to cut pulpwood in only two places. We arranged to get a contract in Salmonier, St. Mary's Bay. We tried to get one on the West Shore of Placentia Bay. Contracts were offered to two or three men, but they could not take them, because they had no way of getting the necessary supplies. In our letter to the Prime Minister we told him all this and we brought to his attention what was required in our district. Wherever there were wharves or bridges to be repaired we told him and asked that instead of the Public Commissioner of Charities doling our money to those people, that the control of that money be given to the Chairman of the Road Commission to spend on the public works. No notice was taken of that letter. I know that thousands of dollars of poor relief has been distributed in the outports for which we have got no return whatever, but if the Prime Minister had accepted our suggestion, we would have got a great deal of return for the money spent in this way. It is not too late even yet. I believe that in the next two months that a lot of money will have to be spent on Pooi, Resef, and I think that some work should be done on the roads in return for it. It is too late, unfortunately, to get the necessary timber for marine work, but we can still go ahead with other work. I trust that this matter will receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sullivan, who have preceded me in what they have said with regard to the distressing conditions in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, and impress up on the Government the necessity of taking some immediate action to cope with these conditions. The people of Placentia and St. Mary's are, and always have been, an independent class of people and they do not want Poor Relief doled out to them through the Commissioner of Public Charities, and I endorse the suggestion of my colleagues that this money be given in a way which will enable them to give some return for it, and still retain their independence. This can be done by giving them work upon the roads through the Chairman of the Road Commission. I trust that the Government will give this matter due consideration, and will see their way clear to accept this suggestion.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House 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.

Sir J. C. Crosble gave notice of question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, APRIL 28th, 1921

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

Petitions were presented by:

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the

inhabitants of Long Harbor, Placentia Bay, asking that telegraph communications be extended to this important settlement. Petitions have been presented on this subject during the past twelve years. Some time ago I presented one signed by His Grace, The Archbishop. The Prime Minister knows about this. No better time than the present time could be found to do this work. People are out of employment, and many of them in absolute want. This very important work could be accomplished and at the same time the people could be supplied with food.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition that has just been presented by my colleague, Mr. Walsh. Long Harbor is one of the best herring centres in Newfoundland, and it is very important that there be telegraph communication so that bankers may be able to get supplies. I might say that Mr. Walsh and I made arrangements some time ago to have telegraph connection made with Long Harbor. One at North Harbor has been opened since this Government took charge, and I hope that this one will be opened as soon as possible.

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

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's, B. B., asking for the sum of \$350.00 for the purpose of repairing a bridge. I beg leave also to present a petition from the same place asking for the sum of \$200 for the purpose of repairing a road bank.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Winsor.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Flat Rock on a sub-

ject which at this particular time I would ask the particular attention of the Minister of Public Works. The petition asks for a sum of money to build a road connecting the Main Road at Flat Rock with Seal Cove. Quite a lot of agricultural property could be opened up by the expenditure of a small amount. I support this petition because the people of Flat Rock are among the most industrious fishermen in Newfoundland, but it is quite possible that during the coming season it will be necessary for them to get every thing they can in other ways to augment what they might earn from prosecuting the fishery. I would ask the Hon. Minister to kindly take this matter up and get in touch with the Road Commission.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. The road referred to leads to good agricultural land. The people are a very industrious class, and if this small amount were spent for the purpose of building this road the people would quickly make the land productive.

CAPT. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from St. Patrick's asking for a sum of money to repair a wharf. The wharf that is there is a very old one, and as it is the only landing place, it is very necessary that it should be attended to.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague, Capt. Jones.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave notice of question.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. Higgins gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave

to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act, 1920."

Mr. Moore asked Hon. the Prime Minister what expenditure has been made in connection with the laying of a water main from Long Pond, Petty Harbor, to supply the Lunatic Asylum and Government Sanatorium, and what will be the total cost of the completion of this work.

Mr. Vinicombe asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how it happens that in view of his claim in by-gone years that he could raise the price of codfish, seal fat, and other products of the country, he was unable to obtain for the men engaged in the seal fishery this year a higher figure than four dollars a quintal.

Dr. Jones asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any notification has been given to the Reid Newfoundland Company by the Government with a view to terminating on June 30th next the present arrangement whereby the railroad system is operated by a Commission, and if so, to lay a copy of same on the table of the House, and if not, does the Government intend to give such a notification, seeing that we are now within two months of the expiry of that period.

Mr. Lewis asked Hon. the Prime Minister if, in view of the fact that there is a reduction in the cost of living in other respects, it is the intention of the Government to require that the increase of one cent per mile imposed on railroad traffic last year shall be abrogated as from the first of July next, and if not, why not?

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing how much fish was exported from this Colony by the F.P.U., or subsidiary Companies, from the first of July, 1920, up to date, giving the names of the vessels conveying away the same, the quantities on board, their destination and whether the F. P. U. or its subsidiary compan-

les, has made application for permits for further cargoes, and if so, the quantity of fish comprised therein and the destination of the same.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he is taking any steps to organise banks amongst the members of the F. P. U. or others, in view of his claims recently that the banks now doing business here are not sufficiently liberal in their advances to their customers, and if he intends to organise such banks, if he proposes to apply for incorporation of them at the present session of the Legislature.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (as I understand that he made the arrangement for Mr. E. Collishaw to visit Washington when he saw him in New York recently), if Mr. Collishaw has returned to the Colony, and if so, has he made a report of his mission to Washington, and if so, to lay it on the table of the House, and also a statement of any remuneration or expenses, or both, claimed by Mr. Collishaw on account of the said trip.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

- (a) On whose advice or suggestion he and his Advisory Board decided last fall to create a grade of fish known as white nape fish, and to make it the highest grade of fish recognized for export?
- (b) If it was discovered shortly afterwards that this white nape fish was unsuitable for the markets for which it was destined and proved unsaleable?
- (c) If large quantities of this white nape fish is still in the possession of those who caught it, or of parties who advanced them money on account thereof, and
- (d) If, seeing that the Government last November undertook to buy fish from a number of Northern planters and others with public funds, if he (the Minister) will not

undertake to recommend to the Government that this white nape should be purchased also, seeing that the people who made the fish in this way did so in response to Government instructions, assuring them of a high price for this article and therefore have a moral claim upon the Government for compensation for the losses.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any written representations were made to His Excellency the Governor by the Acting Prime Minister at the time when it was proposed last November to set apart a sum of \$500.00 from the public revenue for the purpose of buying Labrador fish, or if representation to His Excellency the Governor in that regard was made orally, and if any written statement was made to lay a copy of the same on the table of the House.

Dr. Jones asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House the original returns covering the expenditure of \$1,675.00 by Barnes and Bursell, and H. K. Bursell, re Topsail wharf during 1920.21.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the table of the House what amount of hire has been paid by the Railway Commission for the s.s. "Diana," and from what date her service began and when ended.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The following is the reply to question of Sir M. P. Cashin, No. 25, on Order Paper of April 26th, 1921. Attached hereto is a statement from the Auditor General with respect to the first four subsections of this question:

Auditor General's Office,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
April 27th, 1921.

In reply to Sir Michael Cashin's question, I beg leave to state:

- (a) The Deputy Minister of Finance

gave me in July last, I think, the information contained in my special report of the 21st instant, and, in justice to him, I wish to say that he said nothing beyond that nor anything that would in any way influence me in the direction of the conclusion at which I arrived. The information I gave is all that I received up to the time of writing my report, save that on several occasions when I asked Mr. Keating if anything had been repaid on this cargo, I received a reply in the negative. If my conclusion was wrong, the blame is entirely mine. I can only repeat that at the time I wrote my report I was honestly convinced that the statement I made was correct.

(b) The payment for the salt was made by a cheque on the Surplus Trust Fund. Mr. Keating was instructed to draw a cheque to cover the cost of the salt. It was paid into the Bank of Montreal to cover the cost of the salt ex s.s. "Tuckahoe." I did not become aware of this payment until after it was made.

(c) There was no special warrant issued in connection with this matter.

(d) The sum of \$4,400 was received on the 18th instant in the form of a cheque of the Fishermen's Protective Union. It was deposited in the Bank of Montreal on the same day by the Deputy Finance Minister to the credit of the Surplus Trust Fund.

F. C. BERTEAU,
C. and A. C.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The following is a reply to question of Mr. Bennett, No. 5, on Order Paper of April 11th, 1921:

Memorandum of expenditure of \$400,000.00 paid to Department of Militia from Surplus Trust Account, 1919-1920.

Regimental pay and allotments	\$ 36,256.77
Separation allowance	20,402.33
War service gratuity	11,971.00
Equipment	1,804.11
Transportation	84,436.23

Board and messing	487.30
Hospitals	52,191.25
Printing and stationery	1,678.64
Advertising	84.50
Fuel and light	173.72
Telegrams and telephones	351.70
Office equipment	302.00
Salaries (civilian)	2,204.98
Estates of deceased soldiers	\$17.06
Civil re-establishment	87,246.98
Incidentals	1,249.39
Rent and insurance	517.20
Forestry Companies, sep. allowance	1,909.34
Royal Naval Reserve, Aug pay	11,251.04
Civilian clothing	3,727.54
Sep. allowance	32,856.25
War service gratuity	40,233.70
London	7,846.88
	<hr/>
	\$400,000.00

J. M. HOWLEY, Major,
Paymaster.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The following is the reply to question of Mr. Moore, No. 1, on Order Paper of April 25th, 1921.

Statement regarding cost of water main from Long Pond, Petty Harbor, to supply Lunatic Asylum and Sanitorium:

Expenditure to date	\$39,468.46
Total estimated cost for whole work	55,000.00

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The following is the reply to question of Mr. Bennett, No. 2, on Order Paper of April 25th, 1921.

Copy of the Report of Mr. J. M. Forbes with respect to Ore Taxation is tabled herewith. By Order in Council of August 6th, 1920, authority was given for the payment to Mr. Forbes from the Vote for General Contingencies of the sum of \$1575.00. This amount was in payment of travelling and board expenses, of which no details are available.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of enquiry'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act 1920" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the encouragement of Sheep Farming."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Before this Bill goes any further, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Attorney-General a few questions. I should———this Bill to allow lotteries to go on for charitable purposes and in the securing of trap berths but it seems to me that the latter point has been forgotten. As a matter of fact I think it should be wiped out altogether; I don't see what it is good for. I can't see why a man can't lottery his horse to-morrow if he wants to. This law applies to only some and not to others. If John Smith, of Victoria Village or some other place, can't sell his horse to-morrow he gets up tickets on it the buyers are fined for taking them. I think he should be allowed to do what he likes with his own property and to raffle his cat if he wants to. I ask that the old time seal fishery sweepstakes be allowed as they will be carried on anyhow and are really a long-known pleasure to all. The Lottery Act is a farce and the amendment will only make it more awkward of enforcement. I fully agree with Mr. Higgins that this will make the informer more obnoxious even than before. Wipe it out and let things go on as before it was ever introduced. The whole commercial life of the Colony to-day is really only a lottery. I can buy 5 or

ten thousand qtls. of fish and it is only a lottery whether I will be able to sell it or not. Treat all alike and give the people the freedom of action they always had in this respect.

MR. HIGGINS:—I rise Mr. Speaker, to support the sentiments expressed by Sir John Crosbie in this matter. Yesterday, the honorable members will remember, I suggested that this Act be repealed. It is a joke as far as being carried out is concerned, and the worst feature of it all is that it encourages men to degrade themselves and play the hole of informers. Today many people hold the idea that one can run off a sweepstake or lottery on the quiet and pocket the proceeds, taking the position that the one victimized cannot take legal action. I ask the mover of this Bill to give this his fullest consideration and the House to support my view as the very evil which the 2nd Section is supposed to prevent is due entirely to the Act itself and would not be on the Act at all if all were treated squarely. Sir John Crosbie is perfectly right in saying that all business is a lottery; all that happens in this world is but the play of fate. If ever there was a time when we should recognize we are in the hands of the Gods it is now. The fishery is a great adventure. Ninety-nine of every hundred sweepstakes got up are for a good purpose—to help some poor fellow who is up against it, or in the case of one who in trying to carry on works of charity is not located where those about him can give big donations. The object of this Bill seems to be to provide jobs for men who have nothing to do; the Police Force in this city are certainly not overworked, as all are fully aware. This Act, however, would provide the machinery for their operations. The Magistrate would be continually called on and a new de-

partment under the Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister would be needed to keep track of all the lotteries. If John Jones from Spoon Cove comes here and expects to raffie a piece of china at some garden party he will have to be dealt with and kept track of. If he does it without a license some informer may hear of it next day and get him into serious trouble. I think it high time now as the Act has been on the statutes for years and has been proven to be only a joke, to simply say we are going to repeal it. What is the good if it anyway. This is how it works out in actual fact. Under the common and English law we have the remedy for such happenings, but it was never intended to go to such extremes or to ask a struggling clergyman to state before a Magistrate whether he had a guessing competition on a bottle of beans or could buy a ticket on a cushion or other article from some girl. About the only thing we have left coming to us as things are today is the girl and I sincerely hope that she will not be taken from us and that the Act will be repealed altogether.

I support the suggestion of Sir John Crosbie with a great deal of pleasure. I think the thing to do is to bring in a Bill repealing the act altogether. The Bill that we now have under consideration only means that the Act as it stands today is unworkable and can never be applied in such a way as to achieve the results that the framers of the Act had in view. An instance of what is possible to be done as it stands now was furnished in Carbonear when the enemies of the Speaker landed him for buying a ticket in a lottery, a ticket which he bought to help out a poor man. Now if that is the kind of justice; if that is the kind of law we are letting ourselves in for; if

that is the kind of duty for which we must maintain our police, then I say that we are letting ourselves in for something that may have very unpleasant consequences. The whole thing is hypocritical in the extreme, and if the crowd outside is hypocritical it is nothing but pharisaical for us to pander to their weakness in this respect. This is not the kind of thing that my hon. friend, Mr. Jennings, agrees with, but the whole thing as it is today is a joke and should be wiped out.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of endorsing to a large extent what has been said by Mr. Higgins with regard to this Bill. I endorse the sentiment that the Lottery Law is a "delusion and a snare," that it is an absolute absurdity, observed in the breach rather than in the observance but at the same time I am not sure that the right thing to do would be to eliminate the Act altogether. Under the provisions of this amendment it will be possible for our people to have free license to promote lotteries for garden parties and other social or charitable affairs of the kind and it is only reasonable that clubs and societies should also have lotteries for similar purposes, while those interested in the seafishery will want to get together and have a little gamble on the result. There is no reason why that should not be allowed, but I should not like to see the door left open for people to come in here from anywhere and start a system of indiscriminate gambling. If the Act were wiped out altogether there would be nothing to prevent such people coming here and setting up a regular Casino or a second Monte Carlo.

MR. HIGGINS:—That would be against the Criminal law.

MR. BENNETT:—Nevertheless, we would be giving people the oppor-

tunity to come in here and fleece the people by games of chance such as have been known here before. I am afraid that to act on the suggestion put forward by the previous speakers, we would be defeating the end we have in view. I recognize the hypocrisy of having on our Statute Book an act that is observed only in the breach, but I do not think that we should be well advised to abolish the Act. In the old License Law there was a section that prevented gambling on premises where liquor was sold, and as can be seen, that was done to protect the people against themselves. I think that it is better for us to take the middle course and so amend the Act as to make it workable rather than to take the radical step and abolish it altogether and so leave the door open for all who feel like entering upon indiscriminate gambling. Lotteries are all very well in moderation, but I should be very sorry to see it made possible to carry the practice to extremes. I am prepared to vote for the Bill as it now stands.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, while I quite agree with what has been said by Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Higgins, I am not prepared to take the responsibility of repealing the Act. I brought in this amendment with the object of carrying out the idea suggested by Mr. Bennett, and I think a sufficient remedy for the present situation will be found therein. As I previously pointed out, under the Act as it stands at present, no lottery whatever is allowed. The reason given by Mr. McKay for the Amendment made in 1903 was that some years ago during Christmas and other times it was customary for articles such as turkeys and geese to be lotteried on the wheel of fortune or raffled and it was found that many families suffered in

consequence. Geese and turkeys were put up and men who had money in their pockets tried their luck at getting a goose or a turkey for a small sum, but as fortune refused to favor them they kept on trying with the result that they usually returned home with neither the turkey nor the money. Now what happened in this way on a small scale could, if there were no act, happen on a much larger scale. As the Act will now stand, any poor person can, if necessary, lottery anything that he has to dispose of or lotteries can be held for charitable, educational or church purposes by the simple means of going to a magistrate and getting a license. If a man has a horse to dispose of that he cannot sell he can go to a magistrate and get a license to lottery it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Can he go under this Bill?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Yes, the Bill reads:

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—A man lotterying a horse may not be considered charity by the magistrate to whom he applied for the license. He may go to the magistrate in Carbonear and be refused.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—He can then go to the magistrate in Hr. Grace or St. John's. The Act says any magistrate and that is why sub-section B is put in. A magistrate here might give a Hr. Grace man a license to hold a lottery and a prosecution might later be taken against him in Hr. Grace. That is why a record of the licenses issued is to be kept by the Dept. of Justice. As I have said Sir, I am not prepared at the moment and without consideration to repeal the Act, but I think this Bill will meet the case.

MR. HIGGINS:—Just a word Mr. Chairman, before the Bill goes thru. I do not want to press my point. In effort it will be the same, it will go

on as usual. However, I appreciate the position of the Hon. Minister and I merely want to suggest that the word "athletics" be inserted in sub-section 3. The Hon. Minister himself is aware that in the past sweepstakes and other games of chance have been instrumental in keeping sports alive in this city. Take the Regatta for example; the different boat clubs have by this means been enabled to place boats on the Lake as they have raised sufficient funds to keep them in proper condition and find equipment for them. The same applies to other sports which are all amateur and bring in little or no money and it has always been found necessary to get up sweepstakes to make it possible for the various clubs to procure the necessary equipment and meet other expenses.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that my point was this; I don't think it is likely that anyone will come here to start a Monte Carlo. There is only one Monte Carlo and that is in France where no doubt those interested will be content to let it remain. My whole idea was merely to get equal rights for all, a thing that cannot be hoped for under this Act as it is now, and my only reason for raising the point was to have the thing made as broad as possible. However, if the legal light of the party, Mr. Higgins, says that it is alright I take off my hat to him, but I still insist that any act that causes as much trouble as this is likely to cause should be entirely wiped out.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if the word "magistrate" in this Bill covers Justices of the Peace?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—As it stands there, it does not.

MR. WALSH:—In my opinion it is not the man who will not issue a license who is going to cause trouble so much as the man who would issue

it to a friend while refusing it to others in his particular district, or another point is that there may be a large section where there are say three clergymen of different denominations who would want licenses to hold lotteries for church purposes and the Magistrate, if he were a Catholic for example, might be only too anxious to give a license to his own clergyman. The Bill reads:

Now I think that it may be hard to remedy that but as I read it, I see this section bristling with difficulties and loopholes by means of which discrimination could be practised. I cast no reflection, of course, on the framer of the Bill. With regard to the whole subject, I endorse the contention of Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Higgins that the whole thing is a farce. Life itself is nothing but a gamble; our very seats in this House are a gamble, so is the fishery and in fact every thing connected with our daily lives. It is unfortunate that the whole House could not be unanimous in having that Act stricken from the Statue Book.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, I find myself in rather an awkward position with regard to this matter, but looking at it from the standpoint of a layman, the arguments advanced by some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side do not impress one with the weight of their logic. If every law was repealed because it was broken, then we would be doing nothing else, as a matter of fact, it would but be reasonable to look for the repeal of the Ten Commandments.

MR. BENNETT:—These are not broken deliberately.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I am afraid I cannot agree with my honorable friend. I supposed at the time when this Act was introduced, there was very good reason for bringing it in. I have, it is true,

no personal experience of gambling nor of lotteries, and must therefore take my information from those who say it is a farce. The reason why this change is being made, as I understand it, is to make it possible to get convictions under the Act, a thing that I am told was next to impossible before. The funny position I find is that some of our people seem to stand higher morally than others.

However, it is not impossible that if the amendment does not work out as expected something else can be done at a later session, possibly next year. I rose to my feet for the specific purpose of referring to sub-section A of section 3 of the Bill. I think I can understand that the honorable introducer of the amendment desires to be liberal but I fear that if any magistrate is empowered to issue licenses for any place it is going to lead to very grave difficulties. For example there may be a very small section of a large community desirous of having a lottery and the majority of the people may be against it and altho the magistrate refused the license, that small section could send to another district and secure the license thus making friction inevitable. Even if 95% of the people of the place were opposed to a lottery, the other 5% could send away and get a license in defiance of the popular wish. I just want to make my position clear on that point.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I am rather glad to hear my friend, Mr. Jennings, on this matter, as he and I are very close together on some things. He says that he has no personal experience in lotteries, but surely he knows all about drawing for trap berths, and if that is not the greatest lottery of all, I don't know what it is. The hypocrisy in this thing does not appeal to me. I have seen men at a temperance lecture who wouldn't touch a drop of liquor while anybody could

see them, but nevertheless they went straight from the lecture and had their drinks. As for the Ten Commandments, they were broken before we came on the scene, and they will be again after we are gone. A few years ago it was considered wrong to dance or to go to a theatre, but now it is only a matter for your own convenience. Times are becoming more modern now, and people are coming more and more to rely on their own consciences as to what is right and what is wrong.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, in rising to make a few observations on this Act, I would say that I am fully in accord with the views of Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Higgins. This bill, to my mind, is on a par with some of the bills that are now adorning our Statute Book, such as the Prohibition Bill, for instance; and it is on a par with what is known as the Blue Law that exists in the United States at present. To give one a knowledge of how this bill works out, I have to say that I have had the advantage over my friend, Mr. Jennings, in that I participated in sealing sweepstakes, belonging to St. John's promoters, as I went through my own district, but, unfortunately, I was not lucky enough to win a prize. The Lottery Bill will be like the Prohibition Bill—more honored in the breach than in the observance. Further, Sir, I want to say that anything decent in ethics, morality or religion does not want the support of a Statute Law, as anything decent in either of these branches has the moral support of the majority of the people and that is sufficient, because anything not decent in ethics, morality or religion will not live by it, backed up by any Statute Law of any country in the world, provided you can get legislators hypocritical enough to do so. I wonder what the people of the country, the great mass of the people whom we represent, would say—although I know that there are a

number of people in the country who have not or would not take a ticket in a sweepstake—if we, as legislators, passed a law prohibiting the public from taking part in lotteries and privileging ourselves, because I am certain that all of us in this House today, whether through short-sightedness or by accident, have participated in them? Now that is the actual state of affairs. If we take tickets ourselves, have we the unmitigated gall to deprive the rest of the country from doing likewise? If we do as we please, can we sit down here with sad faces and decide not to allow our neighbor to do as we did? I can understand a man who never did take a sweepstake or who never did play a game of cards supporting this Bill absolutely and voting for every section of the Bill; but I have nothing but supreme contempt for the man who exercises his own free will and who dictates to the rest of the country and says that they cannot exercise their free will and cannot enjoy the same personal freedom as he does. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to all matters of this kind on principle. Remember that there are countries and states in the world that have people equally as intelligent as ours and people whose history can go back much farther than ours. Not only did they tolerate lotteries, but they have organised state lotteries, which have been found to work out well and without any sad results. I am of opinion that the further consideration be deferred, if possible, as it may be deemed advisable to have another Bill introduced by somebody in this House to have the Lottery Act wiped off the Statute Book altogether. There is no compulsion on the populace of Newfoundland to take part in a game of chance. Nobody forces a man to take a ticket. He exercises his own free will. Because twenty-five or thirty people in a settlement wish to have a lottery amongst themselves, there is

no reason to suppose that the rest of the people will be contaminated thereby. There is no reason at all for thinking that you can interfere with the natural law of things or with the natural propensities of the people. The state interference suggested in this Bill I am vigorously and uncompromisingly opposed to. State interference has been found the world over to be unworkable. On that question I shall have something more to say when we come to another Bill this afternoon. Cranks, who were pillars before the state, were known to have found legislators foolish enough to carry the whims and the theories of those cranks into execution. If we allow any such policy, which is not sincere, to be practised here and which the people of this country do not want, I say it would be better to have it dropped at the outset. What we want to do is something that will restore the confidence of the people in us in this House.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, like Sir John Crosbie and other previous speakers I would wish to have a word or two to say on this matter. I, for one, do not agree with having a Lottery Act on our Statute Book at all, because I believe it is only a farce in its entirety. There is not a man in this country but who knows that this Bill, if enforced, will never be carried out. I think I can remember the year the Lottery Act was first introduced in this House; it passed the Legislature by a very small majority. I think that the introducer of this Bill now, the Hon. Minister of Justice, who was a sitting member at that time, also remembers the occasion. When the Act was introduced years ago, nobody ever thought that it was going to become law; but it did, and after it was carried the legislators of that time were severely criticized; it was the talk of the town for years after

and even up to the present time it is a public eyesore. Now, Sir, just to show the House that this thing is a farce I might relate that the Inspector General of Police, Mr. Hutchings, in the early part of this year, issued a Proclamation, which was published in the daily papers, bringing the public to order and cautioning people against taking part in sweepstakes. Being an athletic enthusiast, I visited the Prince's Rink last winter to witness a hockey match. While there I was asked by a member of an athletic club to take a ticket on the number of goals to be scored. I replied it was against the law to do so; but I noticed that one of the first names that the young man had on his book was that of the Inspector General, who was down for two tickets. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this will suffice to show that the whole thing is a huge farce; and I say that it does not become us, as representatives of the different constituencies throughout the Island, to come here and make laws telling the people what they must and must not do against their own free wills, because I do not think that the rights and liberties of the people should be taken away by mock legislation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the contention of Sir John Crosbie, namely, that the Act should be taken off the Statute Book altogether and because, in the first place, it only got there by an accident. Further I think it would be wise if the Hon. Minister of Justice adopted the suggestion of Mr. MacDonnell and consider the deferring of the Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman: I do not think that anything will be accomplished by deferring the Bill, because I think it is good enough now to meet the situation and because there is nothing to prevent any other member from bring-

ing in another Bill at the next session.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Or this session.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I am not sure whether it would be right in practice to have another Bill brought in at this session. With respect to Mr. Vinnicombe's statement regarding the Inspector General, I would say that from what I know of the Inspector General I doubt if he put his name on the sweepstake list himself.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Well, Sir, I am not in the habit of making statements that are untrue. To substantiate my statement I might say that I was approached by a member of the Feildian hockey team and asked to take a ticket. I told the young man that it was against the law and that he was likely to get himself into trouble, if caught. On opening his sweepstake book he showed me the name of C. H. Hutchings for two tickets. Further, the hockeyist told me he owed Mr. Hutchings fifty cents, and Mr. Hutchings told him to put him down for 2 tickets in next sweep.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In that case I take back what I have said though I am very much surprised.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I have no doubt that he is not the only one of that type, although he is quite right, for he knows himself it is a farce and he didn't mind treating it so.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he participated in any lottery this year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I always did until this year. If the Proclamation had no other effect this year, it kept me from going into sweepstakes.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman: I would

like to see the Lottery Act repealed altogether, but I suppose, under the circumstances, it is better to have a half loaf when you cannot get a whole one. Might I suggest to the Minister in the point I raised yesterday, the striking out of the words in the old Lottery Act having reference to the giving part of fines to informers. The practice of giving half of fines to informers has a tendency of turning a section of our community into modern Judas Escarlots. Under the original Act anybody who sustains a prosecution is entitled to half the fine and the other half goes to the department of Customs. I think that if we, as legislators, are going to undertake the job of making laws that will well compensate informers, there will be the tendency of demoralizing the whole community. Personally I do not see any serious harm to the community by allowing sweepstakes to go on, rather does it afford amusement.

I would again ask the Minister to consider the point that I raised.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—Mr. Chairman: I think that it is due the whole House that I should make some explanation because of my connection with the law on the Statute Book at the present time. In view of the circumstances today, I think I would like to be in a position to give the Bill now before the chair the six months hoist in order to give the Act now on the Statute Book greater power, and, perhaps, to have some greater penalty imposed on those who broke it. As to the giving discretionary powers to Magistrates in the enforcement of that Act, I might say that I would never be a party to placing discretionary powers within the province of any Magistrate. Some months ago a man who was trying to get rid of a pony asked me to take a ticket in a lottery, which was used

for the disposal. He had a book and some tickets. I said you are breaking the law my man, I said I will give you the 50c., but I don't want your tickets or your pony. My name evidently appeared on the man's book with the names of the others, and I was summoned before His Worship at Carbonear. I told the story of my connections with the transaction, but the Magistrate apparently did not exercise any discretionary powers in my case, but fined me two dollars like the others, and costs. I think you will find also that a great many of the Acts on the Statute Book are being violated time and again. In my own home town of Carbonear there is a Proclamation issued by the Magistrate every spring and fall prohibiting goats and pigs and other animals roaming at large on the public highways. Still, despite the law, one cannot go up or down town even in a vehicle without endangering yourself as all sorts of animals are continually roaming the streets. If the enforcement of one law is left at the discretion of a Magistrate and it is violated in that way that I have cited, then I say it is time to take away such discretionary power. In the light of the discrimination that is likely to be displayed and in the light of the trouble that may be caused by this Bill, owing to Magistrates in many cases refusing to issue licenses—and as there is a fraternal feeling existing between the Minister of Justice and the Magistrates—and because of the fact that some Magistrates will not give permits because they are against the lottery law, I take exception and would be pleased to give the Bill the six months hoist.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr Chairman: I am prepared to accept the amendment made by the Hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox. I was glad to hear the explanation of

His Honour the Speaker about the occurrence in Carbonear. I must say that I got a shock when I first saw the list of prosecutions that came from the Magistrate of Carbonear, and I took the earliest opportunity to write to the Speaker, advising him to pay the fine so that we would not have an opportunity of seeing him shovelling snow during the winter around Government House grounds.

MR. JONES:—I take it that the Minister does not intend to include Justices of the Peace in that section that I have already referred to.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—We do not intend.

MR. JONES:—I would merely say in reply that, as far as myself and the people are concerned, that it matters nothing to us whether the Act is or is not enforced any how; but I serve notice on the Minister that no licenses will be applied for in my district, but the lotteries will go on just the same.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Prime Minister what the constitution of the present Board is, and if Major Parsons is still a member of that Board?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

Yes, Major Parsons is still a member of the Pensions Board. The arrangement made was that, as he was in his new position as Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, that he should receive a stipulated sum only as Pension Commissioner instead of the full salary, as ordinarily voted, and that he should remain as Honorary Secretary of the Board. His services were eminently satisfactory. There was another arrangement made whereby Mr. Oake, his acting secretary, should have a slight increase of one or two hundred dollars. This means a saving of \$1200 on Major Parsons' salary as well as getting Mr. Oake to give more of his time specifically to secretarial work so that Major Parsons will be able to spend a couple of hours a day in the department and in that way work in conjunction with his duties at the Lunatic Asylum, and thus give both institutions the value of his experience. Consequently, the whole arrangement means a total net reduction of one thousand dollars.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear that Major Parsons is retained in this respect, because I have good reason to know that the work performed by him has been of the highest value. Of course, we do know exactly what the material effect will be on the administration of affairs at the Lunatic Asylum, particularly when the new wing is opened; but I suppose he will be able to devote more time than to the Asylum as the work of the Pensions Committee will be gradually smaller as time goes on. Indeed, I am very glad to know that Major Parsons is still attached to that Board. I presume Mr. Clift is the Chairman.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—He has already been formally appointed Chairman by Minute of Council.

MR. BENNETT:—I have no objection to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled, "An Act with respect to Delinquent Children" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole tomorrow.

HON. THE MINISTER JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I may say that it has been introduced at the request of three reverend gentlemen, Rev. Hemmeon, Rev. Dr. Jones, and Rev. Dr. Greive, who have been working for some time past with a view to making things a little easier for the children of the country. The first part of the Bill is practically a copy of the English Act, the Childrens' Charter. The first fifteen sections are modelled on the English Act, and the latter part on the Ontario Act. The main object of this Bill is to provide that when it is necessary for children to be tried for some offence that they shall not be tried and handled the same as adults who commit offences, that they shall not be tried in the ordinary Court House, but privately in some way to be specified in the Act. I don't know that I can say much more, but when we go into Committee on this Bill, Hon. members will be able to express their opinions on the various sections as they arise.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss this Bill just now, but as I understand that it is at the second reading, that we admit the principle of the Bill, I would

like to make a few remarks. The Hon. Minister of Justice has said that the first fifteen sections are taken from the English Bill. I think that when we examine closely the working out of the English Bill, the very fact that this Bill is modelled on the English Act will be an all-sufficient reason for its rejection in this House. I have been reading up some of the statistics with regard to this English Bill, and I find that the Act provides for Probation Officers or Cruelty Men among the poor people. That is the kind of official we are going to bring in here, who because of their activities in the Old Country were the cause of the working men and women coming together and organising themselves into what was known as the Mothers' Defence League. This was forced upon the people as far back as 1919, and it spread from London right through the whole of England, and last year had considerable prominence in Scotland. That some provision be made for delinquent and neglected children I quite agree, but I think that there should be no other official than the police constable. The Charter of this League announced that they would fight against the militarism of these officials. We heard a lot of talk five or six years ago about the danger of militarism, and the same legislators who decided to make war upon Germany because of their policy of militarism, think it desirable to have this same principle encouraged in England. I wish to give notice that in the committee stage of this Bill, that as far as I can I will fight this provision to the limit, and endeavour to show to the members of this House the danger of this legislation. In the propaganda of this League, they say that the poor people are up in arms because of the impertinence of the drawing room class who take it upon themselves to dictate to people who are up against

what they shall or shall not do with their children, and how they shall conduct their homes. Now, just imagine introducing this principle into this country at a time which everybody will concede is a time of stress and privation for people of all classes. Then consider how much more active than usual those officials would be, the cost of living driving working people to look for increased wages; increased wages leads to increased prices, and that leads to the fact that working men and women have to neglect their homes through no fault of their own. I submit that we are in this position as a Government that we are responsible for having brought about those conditions to a large extent, for putting the people of this country in the position they are into today, and now we ape the policy of the British Government in penalising the victims we have made ourselves. That is a statement of the case. We have been told here in this House, and we are glad of it, that this is a crimeless country, that there is no great work for our police force. Why then bring in a set of busy-bodies who can break into a man's house with all the rights of a policeman with a search warrant and dictate to him how he shall run his own household. We are seriously asked to do that. I doubt if there are many people in this country today in the medical profession who are capable of telling us what is the cause of delinquent children. This is a point which has caused a lot of discussion in England among specialists as to what is the cause of a child being mentally deficient. I do not know anyone in this House, with the exception of my friend, Dr. Jones, who is competent in any way to judge legislation of that kind. It does not follow that because the parents of the child are mentally deficient that the child must be so, nor is the antithesis cor-

rect. We have to go very slowly, if there is such a thing as cruelty, we have the law to have it prevented and the official punished. We don't want a host of spies and informers buzzing around like mosquitoes interfering with the people of the country. The people will not stand for this kind of thing. Take a recent case in Fife-shire, Scotland. Forms were sent out to the parents of the children to sign and certify that because of poverty or ill-health they could not look out for their children, as they had always done previously. The parents indignantly refused to have anything to do with such forms and decided to fight against this interference and to keep their children away from school altogether, and two or three thousand were kept away from school in consequence. A Bill like that, if we did not have the absolute failure of the English bill as an example, might pass as harmless, but if we with our eyes open and knowing the facts of the working out of that bill in England allow this to go through, we are taking a great responsibility upon our shoulders; we have no right to sew the seeds of dissension and trouble. It is the people with the smug faces who make trouble when they try to impose their fads and fancies upon the working people of the country. We have no right to impose upon the people something they don't want, and that is what we do when we make it law. We have had experience in this House before of turning over to outsiders to boards or commissions, the rights of this House as legislators and it should not happen again.

I will go more fully into this matter tomorrow. In the meantime I would ask every member to make himself acquainted with the working out of that act in England before we vote upon it.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND

FISHERIES:—If the conditions are as stated by Mr. MacDonnell, the only solution is to arrange to have the Bill rescinded and not brought forward any further.

MR. FOX:—Might I ask that the Bill be deferred till tomorrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I may say that personally I know very little of the conditions referred to by Mr. MacDonnell. I was asked to bring in the Bill by the three gentlemen I referred to previously. In view of what has been stated, I think it right that the second reading should be deferred, and I ask Mr. Fox to move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow.

MR. FOX:—I move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to provide for the High Commissioner. It does not state any fixed salary to be paid him, but it is similar to the Canadian Act. The 2nd section is the same as the Canadian Act. I am bringing it in at the request of the present High Commissioner. He asked me to introduce this last year, but I forgot to do so. He thinks that the Legislature should provide for the standing High Commissioner.

MR. BENNETT:—The High Commissioner is supposed to make an annual report, is he not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have received no report for the past year, although there is really supposed to be one sent in.

MR. FOX:—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that while the Bill deals

with the salaries of minor officials, it does not deal with a salary for the High Commissioner. Might I ask that that be put in tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— It was not intended that any salary be fixed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and The Dominion Iron & Steel Company, Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Ltd." was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— With respect to the second reading of this Bill, I suggest that as probably members will wish to debate this Bill we proceed with the second reading and have the debate in the committee stage of the Bill.

MR. HIGGINS:—I think it would be better to leave the second reading until tomorrow as we would like the opportunity to discuss it amongst ourselves.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I merely wish to have the formal 2nd reading and have the debate in the committee stage.

MR. HIGGINS:—I think that that will be alright.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I move the second reading of this Bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for Special Purposes" was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a copy of the contract entered into by the Government in the Agriculture and Mines Department. The Government has guaranteed to take over such

wood cut as is passed by Government surveyors as suitable for tide ways, and notice of the liability of the Government must be given before the 30th of June. This Bill is for the purpose of confirming arrangement made under the War Measures Act of 1914 and 1916, to permit the export of pulp wood cut and place upon it an export tax of one dollar per cord. This was made necessary because of the lack of employment caused by the partial failure of the fisheries, particularly in St. Barbe Twillinga'e, Bonavista, Placentia and sections of Burgeo and La Poile. I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. SCAMMELL:— Mr. Speaker. Before this Bill, (The Exportation of Pulpwood) passes to the second reading I should like to avail of the opportunity of setting forth my reasons for supporting it.

Early last summer I was made aware of the fact that the Fishery in the White Bay and on the Treaty Shore looked likely to prove an absolute failure. We were faced with the problem of what to do for the people to keep them from starving during the winter months. If no employment could be procured, then we were faced with the alternative of administering poor relief on a tremendous scale.

I brought the position to the attention of the Government, and pressed for a solution.

I state this because at the time the Opposition papers were stating that I was not interesting myself in the matter. Eventually, the Government decided to allow the cutting of Pulpwood for export, and agreements were entered into.

In my district contracts were made for something like 16000 cords, which meant an expenditures of \$64,000.00 in supplies. That tided the people over the winter, and relieved the distress which otherwise would

have prevailed, because, taking the coast into consideration it would have been a very difficult matter to have distributed relief adequately or efficiently.

The loading and shipping of this Pulpwood during the Spring will mean the expenditure of another \$24,000.00 and help the people over the dull months immediately preceeding the fishery.

I have much pleasure therefore, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to repeal 10-11 Geo. V. Cap 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in the second reading of the Act. I am not called upon to say much now, but I will make more lengthy remarks in the committee stage. Sir John Crosbie, so Mr. Halfyard has informed me, referred to a message I received from Italy. I received a message from Lt.-Col. Bernard to the effect that Italy was not buying any fish, and would not be buying any for a considerable time. The Government took the matter up with the British Ambassador, and has not taken it up with the Colonial Office. Any pressure that we can bring to bear on the Italians will be influenced in our behalf.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Minister what he intends to do about the Standardization Act.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—It is not the intention of the Government to repeal that Act, but they will not be enforced the

coming season because there is no money to enforce it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Are the inspectors to be called back? Here is a chance for the Government to save some money at a time when it is badly needed. The inspectors should be called back without delay.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Is it the intention to remove the exportation tax?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—It is not the intention to remove the exportation tax because the Government needs the money. Some of the Commissioners have done good work and should be kept on, and the money has to be found to pay them. It is probably this year that the Government will put aside twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars for this purpose.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Isn't thirty cents a quintal too much to charge on fish today? It is a great hardship on the fishermen. That is over seven per cent. I sold fish today for a poor man, and got \$2½ for good Brazilian fish. If some of the Commissioners are good they are all good, and if one is bad they are all bad.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I think I agree with Sir Michael on this question. In view of the hardship on the fishermen this exportation tax should be repealed. The merchant is not going to pay this tax out of his own pocket, it is the fishermen who are going to pay it. I can appreciate the attitude of wanting the revenue, but there must be due consideration to the fisherman. The commissioners are all alike to me no matter who they are. I understand there is a commissioner in the West Indies. That is money thrown away. The same thing is true of Oporto and Malaga. These are the little things that we can cut off, that will bring in the revenue. In a meet-

ing the other day the Board of Trade took the attitude that the Commissioners were no longer needed.

The Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 2nd, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 13th, 1921.

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

SIR J. C. CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Salmon Cove for the sum of \$500 to complete a public wharf, and ask that it is referred to the Minister of Public Works for his consideration.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I beg leave to present a petition, signed by about 150 people of Fox Harbor, P.B., on the subject of a road. This is an important settlement, there is no steam communication and the people have to depend entirely on the railway. For many years they have been trying to get communication with the railway at Ville Marie and a further sum of \$2,000 is needed to complete it. I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates and I believe the Minister of Public Works will support it.

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

MR. SINNOTT:—I also beg to support it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The reply to question of Mr. Bennett, No. 5, on Order Paper of April 13th, 1921, is as follows:

Most of the information required in this question was furnished in the reply to question of Mr. Higgins, No. 22, on Order Paper of April 5th, which was tabled on the 11th instanc-

copy of which is attached hereto. The additional information now required is in course of preparation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The reply to question of Mr. Lewis, No. 7, on Order Paper of April 13th, 1921, is as follows:

Charles Hynes is tidewaiter at Kelligrews and was appointed 28th February, 1920. He receives as salary \$750.00 per year. He receives no commission; as Kelligrews is a transfer office for Bell Island, the officer is subject to the Sub-Collector at Bell Island; whatever business is done goes through the Bell Island office. He has been supplied with a uniform, it is the regular practise to supply tidewaiters with such. Mr. Hynes succeeded Mr. Frank Tilley.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the names of the legal men inside the Colony and outside who at present hold retainers in connection with the Labrador Boundary, the amount paid them on account for their services, and if it is intended to employ any other lawyers in this work, and if so, who are they?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I beg to table the information.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the names of the parties from whom Messrs. Job Bros., G. M. Barr, and Joseph Sellars bought fish on Government account last fall, the quantity purchased from each person and the amount paid therefor, and whether in each case it was in cash or part cash, and in the latter event, what proportion was paid in cash and what in truck; also a statement showing the expenses per quintal which increased the quantities purchased by Joseph Sellars by one dollar a quintal over that pur-

chased by Messrs Job Brothers and Mr. Barr.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The information is being prepared.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity as Chairman of the Railway Commission, if the Government or the Railway Commission is a participant in the present venture of the steamer Sagona at the seal fishery, and if so whether altogether or on joint account with the Reid Company, and in the latter case to what extent, and whether, seeing that the Sagona's catch was insufficient to make the venture a paying one, the Government or the Railway Commission lose anything by the venture, and if so how much?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. gentleman I might say that the Sagona in the present venture at the seal fishery had no connection whatever with the Railway Commission nor was the Railway Commission in any way responsible for any loss that might have been incurred. I am tabling a letter from Mr. Hall which will fully explain the matter.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The reply to that question requires the preparing of some statistics which will take a day or two.

Mr. Higgins asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing:

- (a) The cost of all repairs to the house occupied by District Inspector Sheppard, Harbor Grace, since November, 1919, and to whom any amounts were paid.
- (b) The cost of all repairs to the Goalers' residence, Harbor Grace, and to the Court House at that place since November, 1919, and to whom any amounts were paid.
- (c) The cost of coats, hats and boots,

supplied the Volunteer Fire Brigade, Harbor Grace, with the names of the parties supplying the same, and the amounts paid the different parties.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I beg to table the reply.

Mr. Higgins asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he recently purchased five thousand tons of salt for the Government in Europe; where and from whom and at what price the said salt was purchased; where is the salt to be delivered, at St. John's or Port Union; and to table copy of the telegraphic and other correspondence between the Prime Minister and himself in relation to the purchase of the same.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I beg to table the reply.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE asked the Hon. Minister of Shipping

- (1) What insurance is on the hull of the S. S. Portia; what rate of premium and who did the insurance?
- (2) What insurance is on the hull of the S. S. Prospero, what rate of premium, and who did the insurance?
- (3) What insurance was on the hull of the S. S. Watchful on the voyage from England, and what premium; what amount is at present on said hull, and who did the insurance?
- (4) What insurance was on the hull of the S. S. Daisy on the voyage from England, what premium, what is at present on said hull, and who did the insurance?
- (5) What insurance was on the hull of the S. S. Senef on the voyage from England or United States, and what amount is now on hull, and premiums paid; who did the insurance?
- (6) What insurance was on the hull of the Sebastopol on the voyage

from England or United States, and what premium was paid. What amount is now on hull, and premium paid, and who did the insurance?

- (7) What insurance was on the hull of the Malekoff on voyage from England or United States, and what rate of premium; what amount is at present on said hull, and rate of premium, and who did the insurance?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I beg to say that the insurance on the Portia is £32,000.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—I'd like to have the reply tabled in writing.

Sir John C. Crosbie asked the Hon. Minister of Shipping:

- (1) Who supplied the s.s. Prospero with groceries, provisions, etc., and to lay on the table of the House the said accounts.
- (2) Who supplied the s.s. Portia with groceries, provisions, etc., and to lay on the table of the House the said accounts.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—The hon. gentleman will understand that my department is very busy just now and it would entail considerable work to have these accounts copied, while it would scarcely be safe to let the vouchers go out of our hands without having copies of them. If it would suit the hon. member's convenience to call at my office, I should be glad to give him access to the accounts.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—The only objection to that is that other members might want to see them.

Sir John C. Crosbie asked the Hon. Minister of Public Works what the cargo of anthracite coal imported by the "Herbert Warren" last fall, on Government account, cost? Please lay full detailed statements on the table of the House.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS:—In tabling the reply to that ques-

tion, I would like to say that at the time that cargo of coal was purchased it was almost impossible to get this kind of coal, and as it was a serious matter to run the risk of having the Government institutions without fuel, and as this opportunity was then offering, we felt that the chance should not be lost.

Sir John C. Crosbie asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries at what date Captain Gosse was paid for the thirty-six casks of Labrador codfish.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that this reply will be ready tomorrow.

MR. LEWIS asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the steamer "Senef" is being employed to freight to Harbor Grace seals which are the property of the crews of certain of the sealing steamers, and if so, has the ship been hired for the purpose and at what rate, or is she being donated by the Government or the Fisheries Department for the benefit of these people, and if so, what is the estimated cost per day of her maintenance.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—There is no steamer employed to convey seals to Harbour Grace.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Yesterday I outlined the railway situation as it appeared to me. and I hope within the next few weeks to hear from the Government side of the House in reference to this matter. But it is hard to get away from the fish business, as I told you yesterday, hard to get away from that half million dollars. I was twitted in one of the papers a few days ago about a shipment of fish from this country while I was a member of the late Government. That shipment of fish went out from here by a ship called the "Escasoni"; that shipment of fish was valued at something like

\$1,250,000. I shall tell the story myself of that "Escasoni" shipment. The merchants of Water Street owned that fish, the merchants of Water Street purchased that fish, they speculated and purchased that fish, and intended to make money on it. Fish was away up in the air at the time, three years ago. After purchasing that fish they sold it on the other side in the Mediterranean. They chartered the "Escasoni" and she took across something like 40,000 quintals of fish. When the fish got over there it was thrown up. The fish was ordered on up to Greece and from Greece on to Rumania. Every cod's tail in that ship was owned by Water Street. The F. P. U. had 8,000 quintals of fish in that ship. They denied having 8,000 quintals of fish in that ship because they had sold it to somebody else and put it on board like Mr. Gosse sold his fish to Barr. But, just the same, the eight thousand quintals of fish belonged to the F. P. U. originally. That fish was taken up to Rumania. It was two or three months on the passage. Arrangements were made with Mr. Hepburn, of the firm of Baine Johnstone and Company to go over and look after it at the end. He went over there and he went up on that ship to Rumania, and when he got to Rumania with that fish the fish was rotten, the pickle was running out of it. They were pumping the pickle out going up the Mediterranean and when they got to Rumania, it is very easy to imagine what the fish was like in a hot climate. Mr. Hepburn sold the fish under very backward conditions, but not for cash. He sold for bonds. The Newfoundland merchants would have to take bonds for that fish. That news was sent over the cables to Newfoundland. The Government was approached on the matter, as nearly

every merchant on Water Street had a little fish in that ship. The Government were approached to know if they would guarantee those bonds, if the merchants of Water Street would take the Rumanian bonds. Then the Government, being approached, refused to do it. The British Government then was tackled. They refused to guarantee the Rumanian Bonds. After they refused, the owners of that fish on Water Street came back on the Government again, and the Government of that day were called to Government House with Sir William Lloyd as leader of the Government, to discuss the matter. I was the Finance Minister at the time and when I went to Government House I did not know what I was going up for. When I got up there the proposition was put before me: were we as a Government prepared to guarantee to the merchants of Water Street the Rumanian bonds for the fish purchased by Rumania. If so the merchants would be in this position, so far as the Banks were concerned, that they were prepared to advance them in any way with a Government guarantee behind them. We discussed the matter at Government House. Mr. Coaker wasn't there, no, but here's the reason Mr. Coaker wasn't there, he was at Port Union for three or four months sulking.

MR. HALFYARD:—He wasn't in the country.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I beg your pardon. He was at Port Union for four months, never came near the Executive Board, and the reason he didn't was that he couldn't have his own way; he was turned down, and that's the reason he didn't come to the Executive Board. He was in Port Union sulking at the time and Dr. Lloyd—Sir William Lloyd of today as we know him—was the man

who was made Premier by him, and he was sent to Government House to get that guarantee on Rumanian bonds, but I am proud to say that I am the man who turned Coaker down and turned Coaker down and turned the whole thing down. You were there as Mr. Coaker's Secretary and you were there as Colonial Secretary. You were up at Government House as Secretary of the F. P. U. and Colonial Secretary of the Colony looking for a guarantee for those Rumanian bonds.

MR. HALFYARD—It is not correct.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Well you know what I am saying is correct. Go over and ask the Governor. I am going to dinner tonight at Government House and if you are going I will be happy to ask him in your presence.

I was the Finance Minister at the time. What was my answer? The Hon. W. J. Ellis was there, Mr. Cliff was there, Sir William Lloyd was there, you were there, Sir John Crosbie was there. Sir John Crosbie is here now and when I sit down he will get up and tell you that I am the man who turned down those Bonds.

MR. HALFYARD:—I hope he tells the truth.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—He can't tell anything else. He is remarkable for telling the truth, and the truth is better in this House. But here's what I am going to tell this House. I was asked to guarantee that million and a quarter Rumanian bonds. If I had put my pen to paper as Finance Minister that night or the next day, what was I doing? I ask you now what would I be doing? Give us an honest answer now.

MR. HALFYARD:—Do you want a reply?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Yes.

What would I be doing if I put my name to that guarantee?

MR. HALFYARD:—Without question you would be doing a very heroic thing. You would want to be a very wise man to do it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—None of your trimming. Would I not be putting this Colony in this position that I would have to go out as Minister of Finance of the Colony and pay the Merchants on Water Street the money for those Rumanian bonds that are down in the Bank to-day no good. Isn't that the position? Now, Mr. Halfyard isn't it true that I would have had to hand out a million and a quarter dollars to pay merchants on Water street who speculated their own money and when they lost it wanted the Government to pay them. Isn't that the position I would have been in? Don't you know that Water street is owed today by Rumanian one million and a quarter dollars. What would I be doing?

MR. HALFYARD:—You would make an awful mistake.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—But you were wanting me to do it. You say now that I would have made an awful mistake, but, thank God, I had sense enough not to make the awful mistake then. I can tell the country to-day that when I was Minister of Finance I safeguarded its interests jealously and you and your associates since have tried your best in every direction to bring a blush to my cheek for the way in which I managed it, but you can't do it. In twenty minutes I can make the whole of you blush. Now you brought this on yourself. The Department that you are head of to-day is owed fifty or sixty thousand dollars from a certain source. Did you collect it? No, Sir, you did not collect it? Do you know how to collect it? Get up and tell me that and I will sit down. You are owed, or this country is owed,

seventy or eighty thousand dollars to-day in that Department, and you are chief of that Department, but you don't know the first thing about it, you don't know where to begin, you don't know who to appeal to, and there is not a man in your Government knows how to go out and get at that money. That's a broad statement for me to make, but you know that it is correct. Haven't you sense enough to know that this country is in need of every dollar it can get to-day. With sixty thousand dollars you could go out and double the pauper's dole that you are paying to-day. You are chief of that Department and if my statements cannot bring a blush to your cheeks there is no blush in you. You can't get up and tell me how you can collect that money.

MR. HALFYARD:—When I get an opportunity, I will tell you.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I give you the opportunity now while these gentlemen are listening.

MR. HALFYARD:—I won't now.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—No because you can't. You are not attending to your business. You are secretary of a large corporation; how can you look after a vast Department like the Posts and Telegraphs. You are only human. You are trying to do both, but you can't. This \$60,000 is increasing at the rate of two or three thousand dollars a month, and you don't know the first thing about it; worse than that, there is no man on the other side knows any more than you do. Now, don't you think it would pay that Government to have me come over there and collect that money. Sure, and not alone that, but I saved a million and a quarter dollars to the country by not signing for those Rumanian bonds. We left Government House and we never talk Rumanian bonds after because you would have been minus M. P. Cashin

and you could not afford at that time to be minus M.P. Cashin.

Nw I am going to tell you another little story. That eighty thousand dollars I have told you about. Do you know what happened the other day? I asked a question here as to when the interest on our British bonds was sent to the Old Country and at what period within the last three months of the year was exchange lowest. I got an answer back saying that they knew nothing about the exchange, but that the money was paid on the 20th of December. That would be ten days before it was due. Well, here's what you could have done. Do you, as Postmaster-General of the Colony, know that there is such a thing as exchange at the present time, that between here and the Old Country in the month of October the pound was down to \$3.34 in New York, it was down to something like \$3.47 or \$3.48 here. You could have gone to that Surplus and taken the \$500,000 that you paid for fish and sent it to England in October; £95,000, I think, was the interest, somewhere around £100,000. You could have sent that at the rate of \$3.35 or \$3.40 early in October to the Old Country and you could have six per cent. compounded on that monthly up to the end of the year. But at the end of the year, when you sent over your money, exchange was up to between four and four-twenty. You had to send it on December 20th, because it was due at the end of the year to the bond holders in England, and if you knew your business you would have sent it three months previous to that. You would have had it over that at six per cent., you would have had \$4.86 $\frac{2}{3}$ over there for \$3.40, and you would have made \$60,000. You knew nothing about that? How many men on the other side do know? Did Mr. Gosse? Did Mr. Winsor? Did you, Mr. Jennings? No, you were saving on splits. Down in the Finance

Department you were paying out thousands and thousands of dollars while you were squeezing the lifeblood out of the Topsall man and the Kelli-grews man who come in to sell you a few splits. Now that's the Government that is representing Newfoundland today. But this is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. The Post Office, as I have already stated, is owed \$80,000, and the \$60,000 in the Finance Department would make \$140,000, and the \$200,000 that you hold in bonds given by your supporters and duties that you didn't collect, would be nearly half a million dollars. Don't you think it would pay the Government to have me at a salary of \$50,000 a year? It is too much to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are running for the rocks. Never since Responsible Government has Newfoundland been cursed with a Government like the present Government. The proof is all around. The simplest school child can see it. Take the Manifesto of last year, take up the Speech from the Throne today, then think of the revenue that we left after us when you came into power, think of the surplus you had when you came into power, and then think of yourself with only a revenue of three or four million dollars today. You are short two millions now and you are short \$300,000 in bonds. The Auditor-General's Report here tells us that you closed your books in October last with \$60,000 in bonds due. When I asked the names of those bond holders here the other day, it was no etiquette to tell me. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries comes down a few days after and asks a question about bonds that were due while we were in power and gives us the name of the party. It was etiquette for him to tell that party's name, but it was not etiquette to tell the names of the men who helped you get into power, who are allowed to go down to the Treasury and pass on goods and sell them to the poor man with forty per-

cent. gain on them that they have never paid. There is not a Government department today but is being robbed of thousands and thousands of dollars. Take the Auditor-General's Report. Take the Estimates when they will come down and see the evidence, see the enormous number of officials you have tacked on to the Civil Service, thousands and thousands of dollars going out to people whose names you have to twist your tongue three times to pronounce. We never heard of them before, all new men brought into the service.

Then, this Government is run principally by two or three men who are heads of a large corporation business of this Colony. I cannot get away from that, ruining the whole business of this Colony. As I have told you before, before this House closes the Fish Regulations must come off. The country is in a terrible condition, north, south, east and west. These Regulations must come off, because they are a scandal of the worst kind. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, chief of the greatest corporation we have in the country, uses the private information of each and every individual in the fish business in this country for his own ends. Are we not a patient people to stand it so long?

Next on my list is aeroplanes. Now, it is not necessary for me to occupy the time of the House to talk on aeroplanes this evening. Didn't we all read a report last year that the Prime Minister was in England and that he had arranged with the British Government to send out to this country a number of aeroplanes to forward the sealing fishery of the country. We all thought it was only necessary, when we read this report, to get ready in the Spring of the year, that aeroplanes would be flying around up in the Heavens pointing out the whitecoats to Abram Kean down below and to Billy Winsor and

others. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent on aeroplanes. These arrangements were made by the Prime Minister when he was over in Sunny France, where he was clear of the fogs and ice of Newfoundland. He forgot that the aeroplanes had to come to Newfoundland and go down to Green Bay in March with the wind to the North-west, when you couldn't put your nose outside of a cap, let alone your eyes. Then we read in the public press of England, and of Canada, that a revolution was going to take place in the seal fishery of Newfoundland, aeroplanes were to be sent out, but what has happened? The story of the aeroplanes most likely will be told before this House closes. Another thirty or forty thousand dollars gone in that direction nothing less. Still we keep on.

We have asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the number of Trade Commissioners that we have abroad. Do you know, sir, that we are paying over \$100,000 to-day to Trade Commissioners. Some of them are spending as high as twelve thousand dollars a year. May I ask the Prime Minister to tell the House if these Commissioners have been recalled. We cannot pay them, we have no more money to pay them, the Government has no money to pay its debts. You can't pay the interest on your money on the 30th of June next if you pay your bills in the meantime.

What is your position to-day, Mr. Prime Minister! If you take your financial statement and go abroad to look for a loan what kind of a story would you concoct? You would have to tell that your purchasing power is gone, you have no industry only the seal fishery and the cod fishery, that we are practically carrying all our eggs in the one basket. The fishermen can't live on five dol-

lars for fish paying fourteen dollars for flour. You told in your Manifesto last year that the per capita tax of this Colony was \$36 per head. To-day what is it? Didn't you put ten dollars more on each head last year? To-day it is \$46. You were going to make it 26 when you wanted votes.

I wonder what are you receiving from the tax. Have you forgotten like Mr. Halfyard has forgotten to collect the money due the Post Office, to collect it? Are they paying anything? Why haven't you collected the quarter of a million dollars off the Nova Scotia Steel Company? I collected it off the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and I was collecting it off the Nova Scotia Steel Company when I left. I suppose you haven't taken that matter up yet. It is only a quarter of a million dollars. They were making twelve million dollars yearly out of Newfoundland and they owed Newfoundland a profit tax. We compromised with the Dominion Iron and Steel and we took a quarter of a million, we would have taken the same from the Nova Scotia people. You are in power nearly a year and a half and you haven't done anything. Why don't you go around to the different Departments and weed them out? There is not a Department in the Civil Service to-day but is a disgrace to the Civil Service, a disgrace, mark that down. Snow shovelling \$8,000 in Harbour Main. Where did you get that money. Did it come through your Department, Mr. Chairman of the Board of Works? I asked you last year about two or three hundred dollars in your District and you promptly got up and told me that I took money from Green Bay the previous year that was voted in this House. Now if you are the honest good man you say you are you will tell us. You have the same fashion as the other members on your side, you hold the paper over your face.

You are a political hypocrite, a man who preaches one doctrine and then turns around and practises another. You handed out \$8,000 for snow shovelling in Harbour Main, the people's money. For what? To keep you in power, that's why you handed it out. Where is your work to-day? Can you find it? If you went to Harbour Main to-day would you find eight hundred dollars worth of work? It is gone, the snow is gone, the roads are there and it will take another eight thousand dollars to repair them in order to carry traffic.

We heard something about a German indemnity. All very well. That's a case of live horse till you get grass. I hope we will get an indemnity, we are entitled to it, because we have paid the price for it. The only hope you have to hold out to the people is the indemnity you will receive from Germany.

What about the State Bank? We heard a lot of talk in the papers during the past six or twelve months about a State Bank being established in Newfoundland. Now let us see where we are. I am sorry another gentleman from the other side of the House is not here. I would like to have a word or two with him, the little shipped man who got off his speech on opening day, but he is also a schoolmaster and knows something about gathering money around this Island. I will postpone what I have to say to him as he is not here. I will talk to him about the State Bank later on.

Where are we with regard to ship-building in this country? That was one of the things that was promised last year. What is going to happen in that direction? How many millions of dollars is Newfoundland going to lose, Mr. Speaker, in that direction. I am not going to discuss it this evening as the Minister is not here.

Coal and oil boring. Didn't we hear a lot last year about Coal and oil boring. We passed a Loan Bill for half million dollars for that purpose. Where are we today? We have no report before us. They were going to have trucks over the roads brought up to the Railway track last Winter. They were going to mine that coal and they were going to supply St. John's, and they were going to supply the coastal boats. We haven't heard a word about that in the Speech from the Throne. They are ashamed to tell the story, ashamed to tell the story of what is going on down there, thousands of dollars being spent and no return. I would like to find out from the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, how much it cost per ton to mine the coal they have taken from the mine, and how much of it has been mined during the Winter.

What about copper mines? We have been told that a great industry is to take place in regard to copper, the great starting place will be on the West Coast, and great operations are to take place in Bay of Islands. Nothing at all about what is going to happen during the next six months, only one or two things that will never materialize. As to coal mines, they pop up every now and again at a certain season of the year.

Last year we were treated in this House to a Housing scheme. Now what has happened the housing scheme. Nothing in the Speech from the Throne this year about it. Will the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice tell us anything about it? Here's what happened the housing scheme. A certain amount of money was given by philanthropic citizens here last year to buy houses. They went to work and built the houses and they proclaimed to the country

that they could build a certain number at a certain figure, but what happened? The houses cost double the money and the people who advanced the money are going to sell out the houses. Is that the position? The houses that were supposed to be built for a thousand or twelve hundred dollars cost over two thousand, some of them up to twenty-five hundred I understand. How many poor working people can buy a house that cost nearly three thousand dollars to build? Some of the philanthropists are now going to sell the houses at auction to get their money back. How many longshoremen are living in those houses on Freshwater Road? How many men from Harvey's or Job's or Bowring's? I go further, how many clerks have you in the houses? You built those houses for people who can't afford to pay for them.

Proclamation of Lands. How many of you remember that proclamation last year? A young soldier is attached to the Agriculture and Mines Department at a salary of \$3700 a year. Now I don't begrudge it to him in one way but in another I do. I hope he will get up and tell us what has resulted from the proclamation that was issued by your Government last year granting so much land to the soldier and sailor from the Agriculture and Mines Department. How many soldiers partook of the offer? How many took over the land and started farming and building houses? How many went to the West Coast, how many took over the lovely fertile land North, how many are in the interior of the country along the railway? I would like that young fine-looking Commissioner to get up and tell us. I am not criticising your job. You have \$3700 a year. You did one good act. You are entitled to your job. You are only entitled to it because you went

and fought for Newfoundland while others who remained at home received more money than you are now receiving. Therefore I bow to you you are in your proper place.

Before closing my remarks, I wish to go back to a little matter. The other day in this House I moved a resolution condemning certain references to His Excellency the Governor in "The Dally Star." I was attacked by that paper immediately after. It is not necessary for me to read any of the articles, but I want to tell the Prime Minister that he contradicted a statement I made in this House that he was the owner of "The Star." He told me he wasn't the owner of that "Star," but that he was a creditor of that "Star," so I took the trouble to find out who the owners of that "Star" were by going to the Registry Office. I just tell this for what it is worth, and to just show how the Prime Minister can talk here. Down at the Registry Office "The Star" is registered in the names of three men. The capital is ten dollars each, thirty dollars, that is the capital of the great big "Star." But ten dollars is sufficient to carry out the law. I stated in this House that "The Star" is owned and controlled by the Prime Minister. Now I prove it. It may not be the proof that is necessary, but it will serve the purpose of showing to the country that the Prime Minister is the man who is handling "The Star" and handling all the filth and dirt in that paper. None of it can go in without his permission, and there is no man in this country he lavishes more of this dirt on than myself. I tell him right here that he is the owner of that "Star," he is a creditor of that "Star," in fact that "Sar" owes him so much that he owns "The Star." "The Star" is not owned by the three individuals in whose names it is registered, these are only three men he is using for a purpose, just the same as Mr. Coaker is

using other gentlemen in this House. The Prime Minister is the man who owns "The Star," he is responsible for that insult to the Governor. The Prime Minister is the man who pays the bills of "The Star" and pays the employees at his office weekly. He is the same man who quibbled in the Woodford affidavit and would not allow counsel, he is the man who splits hairs on every occasion, and then he had the cheek to come in here and tell me that he wasn't owners of "The Star."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the amendment to the Address in Reply. I moved that amendment a few days ago in all earnestness. I moved that amendment for the welfare of Newfoundland. I moved that amendment because we, as fishermen of this Colony, received proof positive that the Regulations have served to put Newfoundland in the unfortunate position she is in today. I look upon it as my duty, as a member of the House of Assembly, to see that those Regulations are removed from the Statute Book of the Colony. There is no fisherman in the country who is not crying out in a loud voice to have those Regulations removed, to give free trade once more to Newfoundland; give each and every fisherman in the Island who is independent enough to export his own fish a chance to do so; abolish the coercion that you have been practising for the past twelve months. The amendment that I propose will help mend the situation that we are in today, because no matter what is done the fish on hand is going to interfere with the sale of the new catch when the new catch comes in. I ask each and every member in this House, every true Newfoundlander, to forget that he is here for pay and that he has an obligation to perform. You must not turn down that amendment. If you do turn it down then we will take other means to see that it is passed. An enraged people

will come in here and make it pass. Do you mean to say that people are going to put up this year with what they had to put up with last year, export fish under the supervision of W. F. Coaker and the Fish Regulations No. You must vote for that amendment. You may quibble and say, "oh, we will bring in another Bill that will serve the purpose better." That amendment I propose fills the position, and I ask you as men to bury all differences and remember what we owe to this country. Remember the many families that are tonight destitute. Forget your own interests and go like men and vote for the amendment. I ask you to vote as one man on the other side of the House for it. When these Regulations passed this House they were tried in the law courts, and it was found they could not be put in force. Mr. Hickman took a case into the Supreme Court and a decision was given against them. Then the War Measures Act was dug up and those Regulations were put into force. The Minister held a pistol to the heads of every exporter in Newfoundland, and today the country is demanding that those Regulations be removed, so therefore it is your duty.

I have much pleasure in proposing this amendment.

Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 15th, 1921.

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

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Presenting Petitions.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise with your permission to present a

petition from the residents of that section of St. John's East in the vicinity of Escasoni to which I would draw particular attention. It will be remembered that some days ago a question was asked as to whether it was the intention of the Government to use Escasoni as a small-pox hospital instead of that destroyed at Signal Hill and in reply to that question, I find that it is. Now Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the position the Government finds itself in with regard to this hospital, but on the other hand it must not be lost sight of that, to establish it in this place would seriously affect the whole of the Escasoni section of St. John's East. This petition draws attention to the fact that the proposed hospital would be right in the heart of a large and important farming section and that it will mean if the project is carried out that the sale of milk from these farms will be seriously affected and with all deference to the opinion of the Public Health Officer, I am strongly of the opinion that in justice to the surrounding people, it ought not to be done. Medical authorities tell us that milk is one of the greatest purveyors of disease.

If you put that small-pox hospital in there you will injure the people of that district, who are mostly farmers. Even though the proposition may be sound from a health standpoint, and certified by a Medical man their customers will not buy their milk. In view of those facts, I would ask the Government to consider the petition. I do not think it would be right to have an institution of that character put in such a location, where it would injure the people of the neighbourhood. It is not because a certain medical authority says it is alright that it should be foisted upon the people when they object to it. The Government has land more suitable for the erection of

such an institution, down by the Fever Hospital, or in some place other than a farming and residential section. This location as far as I know is a very swampy piece of ground and one which is calculated to breed disease. I think it is the worst possible place for the erection of a small-pox hospital. I would like to say to the Government that I invite their consideration of this petition—because it is signed by over two hundred people, and all of them directly concerned in it. Justice Johnson is one of the men who signed it. I am not ignoring the fact that there is a building there already and it would save money to convert it into a small-pox hospital, but I think it is better to make this sacrifice, than to put it there. I ask that this petition be referred to the Prime Minister's Department, and that it be given the early attention of the Government. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant this petition.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of fees paid the Quarantine Officers for the port from December 31st, 1913, to date; the duties of said officer, the name of the officer performing these duties, and the fee collected from each ship for the duties so performed.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I have drawn the attention of the Deputy Minister to this question and the answer will be tabled tomorrow.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. Minister of Justice if, as indicated by the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General under section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, 1899, the salaries of the Judges and Registrar of the Supreme Court were increased by the sum of a thousand dollars each after the close of the last session of the Legislature; if so to state why this increase was not made while the Leg-

islature was in session; and to lay on the Table of the House a copy of all correspondence in relation to the said increase.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In answer to that question I might say that these salaries were increased after the passing of the Estimates last year. It was the intention of the Government to place the Judges' salaries on a par with those of the judges of the Dominion of Canada, and as these were not ready at the time of the tabling of the Estimates the increases could not be made till after the closing of the House.

MR. BENNETT:—Were the salaries of the Canadian judges also increased last year?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—They were, but we did not put ours up to the same standard. That would have meant an increase of \$2,000 where as the increases made here were of \$1,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to question No. 5, (Sir M. P. Cashin): The honorable member is in error in addressing the first portion of this question to the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The first portion of the question to which I refer is as follows:

"To ask the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. Collishaw was commissioned by the Government recently to proceed to Canada and the United States to raise a loan for the Colony or to initiate preliminary negotiations therefor, and if so, what remuneration is he to receive for his services, and to lay upon the table of the House a copy of all correspondence, if any, in relation to the said arrangement."

This portion of the question relates to the Department of Finance and Customs. So that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition may not have to go to the trouble of directing this question to the proper department, I, on be-

half of the Minister of Finance and Customs, who unfortunately is still too ill to attend the House, beg to say that Mr. Collishaw has not been commissioned by the Government to proceed to Canada and the United States or any other place, either to raise a loan for the Colony or to initiate preliminary negotiations therefor, or to undertake any other work in connection therewith.

As to the second portion of the question, which is correctly addressed to Hon. Mr. Coaker in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, I have in his absence to say that Mr. Collishaw has not been authorised to purchase anything for the Railway Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The reply to question of Mr. Walsh, No. 8, Order Paper April 13th, is as follows:

Statement of amounts expended during last year in connection with fire fighting.

(a) Vicinity of St. John's..	\$ 3,606.20
(b) In Ferryland District..	9,279.55
(c) At Blaketown and vicinity	1,255.00
(d) At Port Blandford and vicinity	287.29
(e) Elsewhere	35,972.56

This does not include the wages of the regularly employed fire wardens.

SIR, M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday afternoon I was dealing with the Labrador Boundary Question. After the sitting opened yesterday an answer was tabled to one of my questions that not alone alarmed me, but also the whole House, and which, when known, will alarm the whole country. It was that no less than eight lawyers are engaged in that work. I cannot use the word work in the proper sense because we, as old politicians, know this Labrador Boundary Question is not work. It is only an excuse for certain lawyers, or as

I named them yesterday whether in Parliamentary language or not, certain vultures to suck more of the life blood out of the country. How, I ask, can the Minister of Justice attempt to justify the payments tabled here yesterday? We look to him for the exercise of reason and prudence in connection with this matter, but colossal extravagance has been practised. I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that all the essential work in connection with that question had been done by the late M. W. Furlong, but now we find that one firm alone has received \$10,000 and that the Minister himself and his colleague, the Premier, have had twenty-five hundred dollars apiece besides, and also I understand another twenty-five hundred dollars each for their expenses while on their trip to England last year; and, of course, this is only the beginning of the matter. Countless thousands more will have to be paid before the question is settled. It looks as if this Labrador Boundary is going to cost Newfoundland a quarter million dollars, and it is this matter that figures prominently in the Speech from the Throne at a time when our people are looking for a livelihood. It is estimated that this question has already cost us nearly another quarter million dollars, so that the territory, if we ever secure it, will want to be really valuable if it is to be worth anything like that we will have paid to lawyers to argue the case for us; and this last expenditure has been made at a time and under conditions when everything pointed to the need for retrenchment and economy. And this is the Government that boasted before the election that it was going to practise economies and reduce the public expenditure! Instead of doing so every excuse has been seized upon to squander and throw away the public revenue, until the expenditures of our day,

which the present Government condemned as disgraceful, are now shown to have been only trifling as compared with the money being paid out at present. We were all criticised and accused of every crime and the record of each family for seven generations was turned up by the Government press to vilify us. Now, however, the House is opened, the Government are on trial before the Legislature and the country, and we want to know what is to be done. Hundreds of people are going about starving and looking for work. What industry amongst us is paying to-day? Where is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? He has charge of the fishery interests of this country, has a big fish business of his own and dominates the Government's policy in regard to fishery questions. Mr. Cheeseman can't sell a quintal of fish without his permission now, nor can Mr. Gosse. I could not sell a cargo of fish last March without his permission. I was in Montreal a year ago and could have sold four thousand and quintals to a firm there at a profit of a dollar or more a quintal. I got in touch with people here and practically closed for the cargo, but then I was ordered to go down and lay my cards on the table for the Fisheries Department, tell Mr. Coaker who the firm was, how much I was getting for the fish, where I was going to ship it, and who was going to handle it after it reached its destination. I decided to do it and the deal fell through. The country lost the sale and our people are that much poorer to-day. I asked the Minister a question yesterday, a very awkward question for him though it looks quite simple to many when it was read out. I asked him to table the correspondence between his Department and one of his agents, Mr. Hue, whom he sent to Montreal last Fall at the expense of the Colony, as a

Trade Commissioner. Mr. Hue went to Montreal and after getting about with the fish people there, wired the Department here saying he could sell 10,000 quintals of Labrador fish at eight cents a pound. He got a reply saying "try for nine cents and if you can get it the F.P.U., will fill the order." Mr. Hue tried in vain. Why, because fish was on the down grade and nothing came of it, but here is the important part. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, representing the whole of Newfoundland, kept that information to himself and no other fish trader in this Colony was informed that Mr. Hue could make this sale at the figure in question. I have asked for all the information regarding that transaction to be tabled here, and I noticed that when I did so it made some people on the other side very uncomfortable.

That is a sample of where we are today. Our whole fish business, as Mr. Cheeseman well knows, is dominated by one man and that is Mr. Coaker; the biggest fish merchant in Newfoundland cannot export a cod's tail today without permission of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, without going down and making a sworn statement to the Department, laying bare all business transactions and revealing his private affairs, and when he does so he runs the risk that somebody else, Mr. Coaker or some member of the Advisory Board, will cut under him and make the sale and take the business away from him. I am making this charge here and now that Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and one of the largest exporters, has held back the fish of other merchants from time to time and said "no, you shall not ship that fish, you must get a better price," and then in the meantime Mr. Coaker has gone to work and loaded vessels at Port Union and elsewhere, and when he was ready, has sent these vessels away to the mark-

ets where these merchants were trading, and has sold his own fish in these markets under the prices he refused to allow the merchants to make sales at. I ask the Minister of Justice if this is a square deal. I ask the Minister to take the case of one man in his own district, Mr. Penney, who last year loaded a cargo of fish in June for Europe. Every fisherman knows what it means to put young fish aboard a vessel in June and keep it there two or three months. That cargo was held back by the order of Mr. Coaker for over three months and then it was allowed to go forward. The fish is in Europe yet unsold and unlikely to sell, because when it reached its destination it was in bad condition and no order could be got for it. Mr. Penney could have sold his fish but was refused a permit because the price was not high enough for Mr. Coaker, but friends of Mr. Coaker on the Advisory Board sold their fish to the same people. In the name of common sense and fair play, are we as legislators going to stand for this sort of thing any longer? Personally I am not, and I serve notice on the Prime Minister now, as the Minister of Fisheries is not here, that these Fishery Regulations must come off. There is no longer any justification for maintaining them. It is publicly known that Mr. Coaker sold six cargoes of fish in Portugal recently while eight or ten vessels belonging to merchants on Water Street and on the West Coast were in the same port waiting for their turn to come. But Mr. Coaker went in and undersold them because he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries and could do as he liked. Will Mr. Gosse stand for a continuance of that? Will Mr. Cheeseman? There is nobody else across the floor I can put the question to as Mr. Archibald is not there. The other members are merely shipped men, not representatives of the people of this country at all. I notice

that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs smiles at me. He is a shipped man himself. He is Secretary of the F. P. U., and it is not decent for him to hold his present portfolio. He is Secretary of that corporation and still has the cheek to come in here and take \$5,000 a year from the taxpayers as a salary. He and his like are case hardened and devoid of common decency. In his position he can know what every business man in this country is doing, can take advantage by reading the telegrams that go through his office of every competitor of his company in the country. Then take Mr. Barnes, a very good man in his way but not the man to represent our fishermen. An educated man, but what is the good of his education to our people? He has never spoken here and has never given evidence that he has any interest whatever in the people or their affairs or any concern except to draw his salary and make the most he can out of the time he is in the House. Then take Mr. Foote, representing one of the largest fishing centres in the country, backed by the most independent class of men we have in Newfoundland today. Mr. Foote is independent as far as money is concerned, but as far as his will and his actions are concerned he is a misfit. Then take Capt. Winsor. He is a paid servant of the F. P. U., runs a Union Store for Mr. Coaker, and then comes into this House, and isn't it natural that he must do as he is told. Then take the others, schoolmasters, tradesmen, or others who were getting two or three hundred dollars a year for their own jobs and have had an increase in the sessional pay to a thousand dollars, with the result that they are better off than ever they were before. Then take Mr. Cheeseman, a young man with a good prospect before him, with an industrious independent father who made his money at the fishery, and I hope his son follows

in his footsteps. Yet he has to go to Mr. Coaker and tell him who he is going to sell his fish to. Mr. Coaker put Mr. Cheeseman on the Advisory Board and Mr. Cheeseman then went back to Burin, remained there all summer, and allowed Mr. Coaker to do as he liked. Mr. Gosse's case, I need hardly recount. He found himself last fall with fish he could not sell, and he went down to Mr. Coaker who arranged to take over his fish at eight dollars a quintal while hundreds of men in his own district could not sell a cod's tail, the men who put him in the House of Assembly.

MR. GOSSE:—I will answer that. I didn't sell that fish to the Government. I sold it to Barr. I knew nothing about the Government purchasing fish at the time. It is not my business to know whose money it is.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Thank you, but I don't think you realize where you are. Forty-eight hours ago in this House information was tabled showing that \$500,000 was taken from the Treasury, part of the Surplus, and given to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to buy Labrador fish with. They arranged for part of that money to be given to Mr. Barr, part to Mr. Sellars, and part to Mr. Job. When Mr. Gosse came over to sell his fish and asked the Minister of Fisheries to whom he would sell it, the Minister sent him to Mr. Barr, who bought his fish, and surely Mr. Gosse is not going to argue here that he did not know what money it was that was taken to buy his fish.

MR. GOSSE:—I am not allowed to know.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Well, Mr. Gosse I am sorry for you. You may think that you can get away with that sort of explanation, but I don't think it will go down with the House or with your constituents. You appear on the record as having

been paid for your fish with this money and it is a poor time to come in now and contend that you did not know whose money it was. The people in Harbor Grace will find that as hard to swallow as the poor relief that is being doled out to them now to keep body and soul together. Here is a statement showing the amount of food allowed by the Government for relief of poor in the District of Harbor Grace:—

For 1 person, 6 lbs. of flour, and quarter-pint molasses.

For 2 persons, 11 lbs. of flour, and half-pint molasses.

For 3 persons, 16 lbs. of flour, three quarts molasses.

For 4 persons, 20 lbs. of flour, one gallon molasses.

For 5 persons, 23 lbs. of flour, one gallon and a quarter of molasses.

For 6 persons (just imagine 6 in family) 26 lbs. of flour, 1½ gallons molasses.

For 7 in family, 29 lbs. of flour, 2 gallons molasses.

For 8 in family, 30 lbs. flour, 2 gallons molasses

For 10 in family, 34 lbs. of flour 2¼ gallons molasses. (They won't make much out of that).

For 11 in family, 36 lbs. of flour, 2½ gallons molasses.

For 12 in family, 38 lbs of flour, 3 gallons molasses.

For 13 in family, (some large families in your District, Sir,) 40 lbs. of flour and 3 gallons molasses.

For 14 in family, 41 lbs. flour and 3 and one-eight gallons molasses.

Now you sold your fish to Barr. Some of these people have fish to sell and can't sell it, and you admit in this House, as a representative for a District like Harbor Grace, a Colleague of Hon. Dr. Barnes, that you didn't know from what source that money came that you got paid for that fish. Now how many people of the same intelligence as yourself

will put it down to that. Who will believe that story of yours? Didn't you know that Labrador fish was falling when you went to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and asked if you could dispose of your fish; and didn't he send you to Mr. Barr and Mr. Barr took your fish and gave you an order on the Marine and Fisheries Department.

CAPT. GOSSE—No sir.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Who did you get your cheque on?

CAPT. GOSSE:—Mr. Barr.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—No, Sir, you would not take Mr. Barr's cheque. There are not a dozen people in Newfoundland today who would take his cheque, but you knew you were getting your pick from that half million dollars handed out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

CAPT. GOSSE:—My cheque was not from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at all. My cheque was got from Mr. Barr.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—But did you notice if that cheque was countersigned by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

CAPT. GOSSE:—No, I did not.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Did you notice if it was on the Bank of Montreal? No, you did not. Well, that gives us an idea of what you know about what is going on at the present time. You can't tell us this evening what is going to happen the fishermen of Conception Bay the coming summer. Is there any alteration today from the scale of poor relief that I have read here? You are just back from the District of Harbor Grace. Is there anything after happening in Hr. Grace? Are the men left Hr. Grace? Have they gone to Bell Island? Don't you know work is stopped on Bell Island? Tell us how many hundreds of people are hungry today in the District of Harbor Grace, hungry, living from hand to mouth, bringing a few

pounds of flour in a pillow slip or a clean bag and a pint or quarter of molasses in a kettle, and then, you as a representative come over here and sit down and prepare to vote for the Fish Regulations that helped to put this country in the condition that it is in today. Do you call yourself a fisherman or a fisherman's son? It is enough to make the old fisherman turn in his grave.

CAPT. GOSSE:—I am not the only one who voted for the Fish Regulations.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—No, you are not, but we want to convert you. All the rest of your colleagues voted for them as well as yourself, and most of them voted for the same reason, because it paid you to do it. Their sessional pay was increased, they got departmental offices or salaries or other pickings, and they would have voted for anything else as well as the Fish Regulations. Now, as a result, you have made the country nearly bankrupt. Here's what you have got to get back to. I take these figures from the Auditor General's Report:

Year	Revenue
1913-14	\$3,600,000
1914-15	3,950,000
1915-16	4,600,000
1916-17	5,200,000
1917-18	6,500,000
1918-19	9,500,000
1919-20	10,600,000

You came in last year and you asked for eleven millions. Now here's the expenditure:

Year	Expenditure
1913-14	\$3,920,000
1914-15	4,890,000
1915-16	4,111,000
1916-17	4,555,000
1917-18	5,370,000
1918-19	6,760,000
1919-20	9,247,000

Last year you asked for eleven millions, you can't get it. You are going to be three million dollars short.

I ask the Minister of Education which year you are going to ask to get back to. You must go back, sure, unless you have some other plan up your sleeves, unless you are going to look for Confederation or look for money from the Old Country. You will have to go back. You can't get up now with all the education you have and prove to me you are going to get it. I pick you as the right man to do it. You are the Minister of Education in Newfoundland today. I have asked the best authorities in Newfoundland today their opinion on this country as it is at the present moment. No person seems to be able to know. Perhaps you can tell us which of those years you are going to take. Are you going back to 1914? Can you go back? If you go back to 1914 you go back to a revenue of \$3,600,000. You can't go back to that. Why? Because your interest account is two millions and a quarter. Are you going back to 1914-15? The revenue was \$3,950,000. Take 1915-16, \$4,600,000. Can you go back to that? You have two and a quarter to pay for interest on your fifty million dollar debt. You can't go back now. What are you going to do? You can't go back to 1917 with the tariff as it is today. What are you going to do? That's what I want to know. It is not in the Speech from the Throne. Nothing in that, not a word about anything only the Labrador Boundary and two or three insignificant things and a prayer at the foot that God may guide us. Well, I hope that God may guide us. That's the Speech from the Throne, as near as I can get to it. Now I would like, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Education in this House. I haven't heard him yet. He is here now two years and we haven't heard him yet. He is one of the best educated men in the country and I am the worst, still you can't get a word out of him. Now I want to get back again, Mr.

Speaker, to the figures I have already quoted. I claim that we are on the down grade, that the total value of our export of codfish as already stated to this House, was about twenty-two millions in 1919-20. Now this year it is about five or six millions. There are still half a million quintals here that you can't sell. After leaving the cod fishery, what is the position as far as the herring fishery is concerned? You know, Mr. Speaker, probably more about fish than anybody in this House or in this country because you have had a lot of experience lately that some of us hadn't. You visited Norway, one of the principal fishing centres in the world, and you must, no doubt, have a lot of information, and I hope you will hand it out to the House some day before the session closes.

The following figures refer to our herring fishery:

Year	No. Brls.	Total Value	Average Per Brl.
1913-14 ...	135,962	\$ 469,546	\$ 3.45
1914-15 ...	147,136	551,000	3.74
1915-16 ...	241,587	1,076,144	4.43
1916-17 ...	189,743	2,087,897	9.50
1918-19 ...	212,360	2,585,534	11.94
1919-20 ...	143,122	1,235,864	8.63

I would like to know how many barrels of herring we had in Green Bay last year. The Hon. Mr. Jennings ought to be able to furnish that information right off. We had no fishery in Green Bay at all last year, had we, Mr. Jennings?

MR. JENNINGS:—No.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Well, two years previous to that you had a fishery there worth nearly a million dollars. What happened it, Mr. Speaker? That's what I want to come to. Our herring fishery last year did not amount to any more than 40,000 barrels of herring and price amounts to only about two or three dollars a barrel. Now the herring fishery, that we hear nothing at all about from the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was one day in this country worth two millions and a half dollars. Why is it we never hear a word from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about herring? Why, because he is not interested, he is not doing any herring business, he is only interested in the cod fishery, that's the reason why. Today the herring fishery is gone. The herring fisheries at Bay of Islands, Bay St George, Bonne Bay, Fortune Bay, Placentia Bay are things of the past. Two years ago it was worth two and a half million dollars. Today we haven't a cent in that direction. Add that to the fifteen or twenty millions you are short on codfish. What does the Minister of Justice know about herring? What about it in his District? There was a herring industry there two years ago, nearly sufficient to support that Bay. Today it is gone. What is there instead? Today in that Bay I believe the people are starving with the herring at their doors.

Now we come to the cod oil. These are only small things. Cod oil today is selling at ninety dollars, cod oil that two years or even twelve months ago sold at \$350 per tun. Today it is down to \$90. It is down to seventy cents a gallon. That is the nominal figure in The Trade Review. Herring, Scotch packed, that was exported from Newfoundland to New York and sold at thirty-two dollars a barrel, cannot be sold today for seven dollars a barrel. Salmon that was selling for thirty-five dollars per tierce in 1919 cannot be sold today for twenty dollars, can't even get an offer. Lobster that sold previous to the war for thirty dollars a case today fetch only four dollars per case. How many men can go into the lobster fishery according to those prices, how many go into the cod oil business, how many men go into the herring fishery, how many men have money

invested and going to invest it in that source? Still up to now eighty per cent. have been in the cod fishery, for farming in Newfoundland does not amount to much, as you know.

Now we come along to the Seal Fishery. Where are we on the seal fishery. Last year we heard a lot of bawling about the seal fishery and how Mr. Coaker kept the price up to eight and ten dollars. To-day the catch will be in the vicinity of 100,000 seals. The position you are in is that the seal oil of last year is still here, the sealskins of last year are still here. The merchants cannot to-day pay any more than four dollars, not even four dollars. There is not a merchant on Water Street to-day who has a vessel bringing in a load that will pay the bread box; that's the position as far as the seal fishery is concerned. We have heard a lot about the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the price for fish and the price for fat and the price for herring was what he made it. Two days ago we had a great cry in his paper that following on his return from abroad the price of fat went up thirty-six cents. It was quoted at \$4.36, and that he would take the fat over to Harbor Grace. Now here's what happened about that. The men weighed their fat and took their share and it was put on board of a Government boat called the "Senef" or the "Daisy," costing this colony two or three hundred dollars a day, and taken to Harbor Grace free, and they call that an increase of thirty-six cents a quintal—a boat that's costing the taxpayers sixty cents to bring it over there. The seals then are increased in price, I thank you! That is the statement. I may be wrong. I hope I am, but that's the statement. The fat cannot be put on board the ship, taken to Harbor Grace and landed and the ship brought back here at the price coal is to-day, for thirty-six cents. A

flare-up in the paper when Mr. Coaker arrived said "thirty-six cents more being paid for fat," thirty-six cents more paid by the taxpayers, by the men who paid \$500,000 for the Labrador fish. The same thing applies, and still we are standing for it. Now I would like to know the reason why the Minister is not here to-day. I have quite a lot to say but I am not going to say it until I get him here in this House. I was accused here the other day of saying things in his absence that I would not say before his face. Well what I want to say to him in reference to one or two matters may sound a little harsh and I want to have that gentleman looking at my face when I do say them.

Now, take the pulp and paper business. The pulp and paper business, Mr. Speaker, is the only redemption that Newfoundland had for the past four or five months. Only we happened to have that industry going in Newfoundland employing 5,000 people last winter, what would be the conditions in this country to-day? Five thousand men must be present at least six or seven or perhaps eight thousand families, and that number of families would have to be fed on the same scale as the people of Harbor Grace are being fed to-day. God was good to us in that direction.

Now about the mining industry. I would like to know from the Prime Minister and from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries where are we as far as mining in this country is concerned to-day. What is the agreement between the Government of to-day and the Dominion Iron and Steel and the Nova Scotia Steel Companies. Have they made any arrangement? It was publicly pronounced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at a convention of his people at Catalina, just after the election was over that the export on ore

in future from Newfoundland would be nothing less than one dollar per ton. Now we had a visit last spring from the President of the D. I. S. Co., and from the President of the N. S. S. and C. Co., and one or two directors of each company. Arrangements, I understand, have been made with the Government, an agreement being entered into the terms of which have not been made known to this House yet. A question has been asked about the same but we haven't received an answer as yet. Well do you put on that dollar? Do you put on half a dollar? We hear nothing about it in the Speech from the Throne. Why was not that important item placed in the Speech from the Throne? You don't want to tell anything about it. Nothing about the Railroad in the Speech from the Throne. Oh, no! that will be fixed up after the House closes. Nothing about the half million dollars taken from the Treasury, in the Speech from the Throne. Nothing about money taken for salt. In the olden days all those things were put in the Speech from the Throne. It was handed down as a programme to the House. To-day we have no information. We are only pulling it out of the Government like you pull a tooth. We asked for a public account to be tabled ten days ago and we haven't got them yet. Why?

MR. FOX:—The Railway 'Scheme'—It is desirable to give a subject a title as nearly accurate as possible; and I do not think that I can denominate more fittingly this unsavoury transaction of an unsavoury government than to call it the Railway 'Scheme.' A scheme it was in all truth, a scheme put through without the knowledge of the people, without their consent, and by a half a dozen men who arrogated to themselves the exercise of rights that vest in the House of Assembly only; and a scheme that has resulted in adding two and a half

million dollars to the Colony's expenses—a loss of two and a half million dollars because we will never get it back.

Here is the story. A few days after the House of Assembly closed last year, that is on August 5th, as the House closed the last week in July the following minute was passed by the Executive Council:—

"Whereas the Reid Newfoundland Company have intimated to the Government that they are unable to continue the operation of the Reid Railway system throughout the country;

"And whereas it is in the public interests that the railway system should be operated and that railroad facilities be improved;

"The Deputy Colonial Secretary is authorized to forward to the Reid Newfoundland Company the following letter which has been drafted by His Majesty's Attorney General, the Hon. W. R. Warren, K.C., and approved by the Executive Council:

August 5th, 1920"

The letter referred to set out certain terms and conditions under which a railway commission was to be appointed consisting of three appointees of the Government and three of the Reid Newfoundland Co. which was to take over and operate the railway for one year ending June 30th, 1921. These conditions were subsequently amended under Minute of Council dated August 13th and thereafter the position was as follows:—

- (1) The commission was to operate the railway and steamship service from July 20th, 1920, to June 30th, 1921.
- (2) The Government was to be responsible for all loss on the operation of the railway exceeding \$100,000 and the Reid Newfoundland Co. responsible for any loss in connection with the steamers.
- (3) Renovation and construction work

was to be done materials for which were to be paid for by the Government, but the cost of doing the work to be borne by the Reid Newfoundland Co.

- (4) The Government was to provide certain rolling stock and build certain terminals at St. John's and Port aux Basques, the cost of this to be charged against the Reid Newfoundland Co. at 6 per cent. plus the cost of raising the money and was to be set off against any claim the company might have against the Government under existing contracts.
- (5) The arrangement was to be without prejudice to the rights of either party under existing contracts.

Many features of this railway scheme call for notice, but in the time at my disposal I may refer only to those that call for special comment; and the first thing that strikes me about the whole transaction is its absolute illegality. It is unconstitutional in most respects, but it is illegal in every respect. Here was a railway contract which had been solemnly entered into on behalf of the people of Newfoundland with the Reid Newfoundland Co. as contractors thereunder, which contract had been ratified by the House of Assembly and an Act to that effect placed on our Statute Book, virtually torn up by a Government acting on executive responsibility only. That contract was to continue for 50 years from 1901 so that last year at the time of its abrogation it had still 31 years to run. It called for the operation of the entire railway system of the country by the contractors—the Reid Newfoundland Co.—who were given certain concessions, had certain duties imposed upon them, and were subjected to severe penalties if they did not carry out their obligations thereunder. The entire cost of opera-

tion was to be borne by the company and the Government had nothing to do except to see that the contractors having their rights under the contract protected, faithfully and properly discharged their obligations to the people of Newfoundland. The question of the railway policy of the Government created a lot of discussion at last year's session of the House of Assembly. The seriousness of the situation was pointed out to the Government; question after question was asked them as to what they intended to do. They refused to say what their intentions in the premises were, but towards the end of the session we had the unedifying spectacle of the Prime Minister of this Colony coming down to the House and launching a most bitter and abusive personal attack on the Reid Newfoundland Co. and in particular its then President, Mr. H. D. Reid; and then having done that, having exposed his own pitiable weakness of public business giving the most positive proof of his weakness in controlling the Government of which he boasted he was leader, by stating in effect that he had been forced by his Cabinet to bring down a bill authorizing the raising of a loan for railway purposes.

That Act authorised the raising of 1,000,000 to be applied to the improvement of the railway system of the Colony. The improvements as contemplated were the building of terminals, purchasing additional rolling stock representing on or about \$650,000, and spending the balance of \$350,000 upon renovating the road bed. It did not refer to or authorize taking over the railway or railway extension of any kind. There was not the slightest reference made to the intention of the Government to assume control of the railway, nor to build branch lines. However, there were grave suspicions abroad that

there was some scheme in contemplation and negotiations in progress which the Government was desirous of keeping from the knowledge of the people until the House of Assembly closed, and these suspicions are now verified, because we find that a few days after the House closed last year this Minute of Council to which I have referred was passed under which the control and management not alone of the entire railway system but of the subsidiary steamer service as well was assumed by the Government, and thereby the taxpayers of this country were saddled with an expenditure that will by the 30th of June next total two and a half million dollars, according to the Government's own estimates. A railway commission was then appointed and as was to be expected Mr. W. F. Coaker immediately assumed charge of it. Without any legal warrant for its existence that commission proceeded at once and took over the running of the entire railway and steamship service of the country, undertook the building of branch lines and the appropriation of private lands for railway purposes and incurred expenditures running into some millions of dollars and chargeable to this Colony—and all without even the shadow of authorisation from the Legislature of the country. How the Government is going to reconcile this infamous act of theirs I fail to see. If the condition of the railway was such that it required immediate attention, the seriousness of the situation could not have become so suddenly apparent that the situation could not have been handled while the House was in session last year, and if was as urgent as the Government would wish to make out, in view of its paramount importance, the involved nature of the interests concerned, the fact that it would probably entail tremendous cost to this

Colony, why did not the Government call a special session of the House to deal with the matter? Why did they deliberately keep the whole thing secret and shroud it in such mystery while the House was in session? Why did they not lay the plans before the public when the public had the opportunity of passing upon them through the voice of their representatives? Why was nothing done until the House was closed and the voice of the people silenced for the time being? Why did the Executive Council take upon themselves the powers that vested only in the Legislature? Does it not all prove that not alone was the Government avoiding taking the people into its confidence; not alone was it desirous of having the whole thing done quietly and secretly and behind the doors of a Council Chamber when the whole business should have been transacted on the floors of the House of Assembly, but that it was fearful that the natural indignation with which such a project would be viewed by the public of this Colony would result in upsetting such nicely laid plans and prevent such nefarious purposes from being carried into effect. From the constitutional viewpoint nothing ever happened in the history of this country more calculated to destroy the very fabric of our constitution. From the public viewpoint no greater act of treachery was ever perpetrated against the interests of the people. From the moral viewpoint no more unconscientious transaction was ever put through; and from the legal viewpoint no more unwarranted and unjustifiable step was ever taken by men who were sworn to protect the laws of the country. All losses over \$100,000 were to be borne by the Government. Did not these executive councillors know what that would entail on the people of Newfoundland; weren't they acquainted with the ex-

perience of other countries where public utilities such as railways have been taken under Government control. Did they not know of the tremendous losses that always resulted under Government management of that kind; and if they did not know why did not they inform themselves on the subject? The result of Government ownership or management of public services of the kind in question is apparent on both sides of the Atlantic and points to this fact that under it not alone is it impossible to operate at a profit, but it is impossible to save loss. Canada and the States lost millions while their government's were in control of their railway systems; and if through stupidity or ignorance the ministers here who put through this railway deal were unacquainted with these facts they had the report of the Reid Newfoundland Co. itself on the previous year's operations which was to the effect that that company dropped \$500,000 in operating the railway. If that private corporation, whose very existence depended upon the profits it derived from its enterprise, lost a half million dollars, it was almost certain that if the Government took charge the amount, it would lose would be fabulous and away in excess of that sum.

It must also be remembered that when that deficit was incurred by the Reid Nfld. Co. freights were at a premium, the railway was incapable of carrying all the traffic that offered, there was not sufficient rolling stock to meet the demands of the trade,—in other words under the best of conditions the Company lost half a million dollars in operation. And then we had a Government taking over that railway at a time when depression was beginning to be felt everywhere, when freights were dropping, when there was hardly enough traffic going over the road to warrant

its being open, and agreeing to be responsible for all expenses over \$100,000—in the face of the Company's own experience and the knowledge that bad times were coming. When even taking it for granted that there would be no greater deficit than the year previous, the Government was bound to lose \$400,000. Did not the magnitude of that sum have any effect upon the minds of the Government? Was not that sufficient to deter them from tampering with the matter at all except upon a mandate from the people? But instead of its costing the country "only" \$400,000, the actual cost at the end of June next will be two and a half million dollars—on the Government's own estimate. And to think that colossal expenditure was undertaken without taking the people into the fullest confidence—without informing them as to the actual situation—without letting them know what was going on—without consulting them in any way with all the facts before them—without giving them a chance through the House of Assembly of voicing an opinion of the matter! The whole thing rushed through on Executive Responsibility behind the backs of the people! And why was the name of the Minister of Justice so carefully inserted in that Minute of Council of August 5th? He was two days out on his way to England when that Minute was passed. Even supposing he did draft the letter referred to in the Minute—and there is no doubt that he did—it was most unusual to have that fact advertised on the face of the Minute unless there was some special reason for it. Is it not evident that some of his tried and trusted colleagues wanted to take care that he had no loop-hole through which to escape the responsibility that was bound to attach everyone who had anything to do with the disgraceful transaction

and were determined to see that he as well as they would bear his share of the onus and opprobrium that would be the portion of all those implicated in the matter?

If there was anything necessary to finish this country altogether, to kill its hopes present and to come, to ruin its credit at home and abroad, and to keep its people from ever rising from the despair and despondency in which they are now plunged, it was this Railway "Scheme" put through by the Squires-Coaker Government. Ulleral is a word hardly strong enough to apply to it! Unconstitutional is altogether too mild! Viciously dishonest and disgraceful may more fittingly describe it. It was a combination of all four, and the most abominably outrageous transaction that a Government here or elsewhere could be guilty of. It is sufficient not alone to forever kill the men who put it through, in the estimation of the people, but enough to warrant the people rising up and hurling from power the men responsible for it and stripping from them all vestiges of the authority they have so abused.

And how has all this come about, and what is the inference to be drawn from it? It is the result of the violation of the fundamental principle of constitutional Government which requires that the body politic to function properly should be free and unfettered; which co-ordinates unity of action with independence of thought; which requires that the representatives of the people should be at liberty to freely express their own decisions—and not decisions ready-made for them; which taboos control and gives the greatest liberty to individual initiative and effort; and finally which imposes on every man who takes a seat in Parliament the solemn obligation to serve the whole people and not one particular class or section. In a word it is the result

of Coaker Control and corruption Control—because Mr. Coaker, President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, head of all its subsidiary Companies, Member of His Majesty's Executive Council, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Chairman of the Advisory Board controlling Newfoundland's staple industry, Chairman of the Commission operating Newfoundland's Railway and Steamship Services, Autocrat-in-Chief of all Newfoundland with ten members of the F. P. U. behind him in the House of Assembly, holds Mr. Squires and his followers in the hollow of his hand and with the power to make or break the Government sways its policy and shapes the destinies of this country to suit the purposes of the vast corporation that sent him and his followers to the House under pledges to do as their Union tells them to do, and to serve not the people of Newfoundland as a whole, but the corporation that owns them, first last and always. And it means corruption, because whenever the will of the many is subjugated to the will of the few, whenever the interests of the whole are sacrificed to the interests of a class or section, whenever general rights are made subservient to sectional rights, and whenever influence is strong enough to place the resources of a country at the mercy of a faction powerful enough to exert it and unscrupulous enough to wield it to the furtherance of its own purposes but to the prejudice of the country as a whole, there we have corruption. And is not that the story of the Coaker domination of this Government from the beginning, and will not that be the story to the end. But what about the members of the F. P. U. as a whole?

Do they not recognize that every advantage they gain at the sacrifice of the interests of the general public

of this Colony is but temporary and must ultimately result in their own disadvantage? Do not they recognise that they cannot benefit at the expense of the people of Newfoundland, without they themselves suffering eventually? Do they not recognise that any Government controlled in their interests is bound to work disastrously for the country of which they are only a part, and that therefore if the country suffers they must suffer likewise? Do they not see that every time their political leaders are faithless in their allegiance to the country they are faithless in their obligations to them as citizens of that country—even though their action was prompted by the dictates of the organisation of which they are members? Are they blind to all this, and if so when will the scales fall from their eyes? In connection with this review of the present political situation I am reminded of the saying of a well-known philosopher—I think it is Humbolt—to the effect “That the greatest happiness on earth is to be born an imbecile, because an imbecile never understands the truth.” I do not wish to impute mental incapacity to the members of the F.P.U. or to any of my honorable friends opposite, nor do I wish to cast any reflections upon them personally or otherwise, but in view of the present condition of political affairs, I would like to transpose that quotation and alter it to read thus: “The greatest political happiness in Newfoundland today is to be born an F. P. U. man, because an F. P. U. man never understands the truth.” I see my honorable friend the Prime Minister evince a sudden interest in the reporters’ box. I shall therefore expect tomorrow to see glaring headlines in his and the Government’s other paper to the effect that I insulted the members of the F. P. U. Well it is not my intention to insult that organisation in-

dividually or collectively, nor have I done so. To avoid all doubt I shall repeat my words so that the Prime Minister may take a verbatim report: “In connection with this review of the present political situation I am reminded of the saying of a well-known philosopher—I think it is Humbolt—to the effect: “That the greatest happiness on earth is to be born an imbecile, because an imbecile never understands the truth.” I do not wish to impute mental incapacity to the members of the F. P. U. or to any of my honorable friends opposite, nor do I wish to cast any reflections upon them personally or otherwise, but in view of the present conditions of political affairs, I would like to transpose that quotation and alter it to read thus: “The greatest political happiness in Newfoundland today is to be born an F. P. U. man, because an F. P. U. man never politically understands the truth.” I trust Mr. Squires has taken that down correctly.

* But is there nothing else to be gleaned from the story I have attempted to tell? Yes, the pitiable weakness and incapacity of the nominal Leader of the Government, Hon. R. A. Squires, who allowed all these acts of public outrage to be committed and such an indelible stain to attach to the record of an administration he boastfully pointed to as his own. If he was not strong enough to control Mr. Coaker, and it is evident that he was not, why did he not seek assistance outside the ranks of his (?) Government? If necessary why did he not appeal to the people when the necessity of keeping his more powerful ally in check arose? He did not do it because he had too many self interests to serve. He had ability but he has sacrificed it. He had talents but he has prostituted them to serve nefarious purposes. He had friends, but he has lost them. He had an

opportunity, a glorious opportunity that any man of youth and vigor would have gladly seized, but he has let it slip by. And to-day he stands before the public with his promises broken, his pledges unkept, his prestige gone, and the interests of the people he was sworn to protect sacrificed to satisfy the insatiable lust for power of the men who gave him the Crown and took away the Sceptre.

Sic gloria transit mundi."

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, the 18th inst., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 2nd, 1921.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of Department of Agriculture & Mines for Year ending December 31st, 1920.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Mr. Sinnott gave notice of question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act, 1920," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move that supply be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Thursday move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The following is a reply to question of Mr. Higgins, No. 11, on Order Paper of May 2nd, 1921.

(1) The Government has not yet received any amount of Prize Money due Newfoundland Reservists.

(2) There is no correspondence concerning the non receipt of Prize Money. The Government will receive such payment in due course, but it is not known how soon the Admiralty will make remittance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The following is a reply to question of Sir J. C. Crosbie, No. 7, on Order Paper May 2nd, 1921:

Statement of payments made by the Treasury Department in respect of s.s. "Watchful"

Cost £15,000 @ \$422.60....	\$63,390.00
Cost of cable transfer.....	2.85

—————
\$63,392.85

No payments were made by the Treasury Department in respect of the steamers "Senet," "Daisy" and "Malakoff".

MR. SULLIVAN:—I wish to call the attention of the Chairman of the Railway Commission to the fact that the answers handed me today in reply to the questions asked by me on April 26th, are most unsatisfactory. It shows the very lax way in which this Railway Commission is carried out. One of them says that we have been unable to get the figures covering the periods referred to in the question asked on April the 26th. Now that is ridiculous. There is no reason whatever for handing in answers such as those. Surely the books are fixed up every month and then the accounts should be complete. In answer to numbers six and seven they say the matter is under considera-

tion. Now this information is not good enough for this House, and I intend to keep after it till I get the proper information.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that one of the answers to my question is all together unsatisfactory. The answer is to my question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of date April the 19th, numbered fifteen. I asked the particulars of the fish cargo of the President Coaker namely, 7,500 quintals. I asked for the charter party, the amount paid per quintal, the freight paid President Coaker for bringing the cargo across. I also asked who was in charge of the loading of the vessel on behalf of the Government, to whom it was consigned, where it is at the present time, whether sold or unsold, the price paid the fishermen for it and the amount paid for it by Joseph Sellars. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not very soon give us this information I shall have to resort to other steps to get the desired information.

This cargo of 7,500 quintals was owned by the taxpayers of this country and they paid nine dollars per quintal for it totalling something like \$67,500. We want to know if five dollars per quintal were paid the owners of the President Coaker for freighting the cargo across which is double the current price to-day. Well now if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not table this information by tomorrow I will take other steps to have it so tabled. It is public property and the people's money from the public treasury paid for it and you know all about the Minute of Council and it was handed you by the Auditor General merely for the purpose of buying the Labrador fish here in St. John's. I asked whether the fish taken by the President Coaker was purchased at Port Union, whether it was re-loaded and

if so whether a different price paid for it, how much paid the fishermen of the country and how much was paid for it when it was sold to Sellars. We have to get this information. To prove that you are trying to wink this out of sight you have tabled the account sales so to speak of the Jane Wakeley. Here you give day and date and from whom it was purchased and you go on to say, (reads). Apparently everything is very satisfactory with regard to the Jane Wakeley but when we turn over to President Coaker there is no date given whatever (reads). Then we are told that it was sold to Sellars at eight and one half dollars and Sellars received this price from the 500,000 and he paid it back to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I take it that it was first sold to the F. P. U. then sold back to J. Sellars at \$8.50 and we want all this information. We want to know the amount of the cheque paid by Sellars to the F.P.U. or some other company. I asked you what steps were taken by you to pay for this fish which is drifting around the Mediterranean, who was in charge of it and you were not prepared to tell us. I hereby serve notice on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if he does not give full particulars of this matter I am going to move this House to appoint a commission to acquire the desired information.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—In reply to the leader of the Opposition I suppose he does not want to be unfair and unreasonable. All the desired information has already been tabled. If you will look up the information you will find that you have already got all the necessary particulars.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I asked for the name of the owners of the President Coaker and to whom the cheque was paid and how much that was.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have given all the information I have in my possession. The cheque is not in the possession of the government. As you know the charter party was attached to the Bill of sale. You have no justification for saying that five dollars therefore were paid for freight. The other evening when we were discussing this matter you said that half of the freight was paid in advance and now you come in and say a different story.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No, I said that half of the freight was paid when the vessel sailed and the other half when the vessel arrived on the other side. When the cargo arrived over there it was not sold but put in cold storage and is unsold at present. No demurrage was paid to the President Coaker. All this information was given you and the dates can be got if you so wish. The fish was not taken out of the store. I bought a cargo and lost twenty five thousand dollars on it and I did not put it into the government so as not to lose on it. That shows now what a government bite I was. The cargo of the President Coaker consisted of choice fish. The fish was first culled and we charged it to our account. The fish was sold to Sellers at \$8.50. This covered the cost of labour. I am not quibbling when I say this. I do not think you consider how you are annoying the House by asking for further information when the questions you have asked have been fully answered in every particular. With regard to Mr. Sullivan's question I have to say that I handed the question to Mr. Hall and that is his reply. I told him the fullest information possible and he told me that it is very difficult to get a railway account finalized. The account is finalized up to January but no further

because the accounts are scattered all over various countries.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—With reference to Mr. Sullivan's question number fourteen on order paper of April 26th, I have to say that the government is ready to proceed at once with the arbitrations but the delay is due to the fact that some of the land or owners have not appointed their arbitrators. I also beg to lay upon the table of the House the answer to question number five of April the 13th.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I will give the Minister of Marine and Fisheries another chance to answer this question relative to the President Coaker. It is not good enough for this country to have him get up here and say I am tormenting and worrying him. You have brought the worry on yourself. It is not my business if you take five hundred thousand dollars and squander it on buying fish mostly from your own supporters. I want a statement with regard to that five hundred thousand dollars and I am going to get it.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You have got it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Only with regard to part of it. Where is the rest?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It has not been spent. It is to the credit of the Department in the bank of Nova Scotia.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—If that is the case why should the Prime Minister be running around trying to raise a loan of nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars from the Royal Bank of Canada and why should we have men all over the Island, all fishermen perishing because they cannot sell their fish? No you want to spend it on the side yourself because you have strings to pull down

North. Do you know there are hundreds of poor men around this city begging for bread? Then you get up and say I ought not to worry you. Well I am going to worry you. I am going to keep after that money. Did you to start with put the whole sum in the bank of Nova Scotia and was it left there at your disposal.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—It might have been transferred.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—If you had a minute of council authorising you to have it in one bank you could not transfer it to another. Cannot you utilise that sum in buying the fish of the poor starving men around here to-day. Do you know that good fish is being sacrificed down in the harbour to day at two dollars per quintal. Here it is the first of May and there is no sign of the fishermen getting supplies for the fishery. Last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said it was not time to open the House of Assembly as a great quantity of fish down in the harbor had to be disposed of immediately. Then he got clear of all his own fish but prevented all others in the fish business from selling theirs. Are you big enough to get up here and explain yourself and I ask the Prime Minister to get up and explain himself. We are here now five weeks firing hot shot at the government and after ordering you all to sit still in your seats the Prime Minister gets up to reply to our argument and he uses the same speech he pulled off at Long Pond during the Harbor Main election and here we are nearing the first of June with our country bankrupt the people starving and no policy coming from the Government. What are you going to do? You have no life buoy on board your ship. The Prime Minister got up here and styled the manager of the Royal Bank here a Shylock. I'm in a position to state that he is no Shylock and whe-

I was looking for a loan the greatest assistance was given me by the Royal Bank of Canada and no men worked harder in connection therewith than Sir Vincent Meredith and Mr. Neil of the Royal Bank of Canada. No wonder why you did not succeed in raising a loan from the Royal Bank. Why the school children are alarmed at your conduct. Just think of it you have gone so far as to get up here and say I should not be tormenting you. That we should not annoy you about the President Coaker. No I am in a position to say that the President Coaker is not owned by you but it is chartered from one Collishaw and the money you have been using in paying for the charter of that vessel and for the fish she carried the money which was only intended to be used for the purpose of buying fish here in St. John's to relieve the situation. I guess the money you used in buying the fish from the F. P. U. men got you out of queer street. You have turned your back on the Western fishermen. No wonder why you sigh. There are hundreds of fishermen offering their fish at two dollars per quintal and then even they cannot get that for it many of them with only one barrel of flour in their homes. The position of the country is the worst in the history of the country. The department of which you are the responsible head you have prostituted for the past eighteen months. You cannot expect the people of the country to have confidence in you after such conduct. You know about the story of Mr. Penny on the West Coast. You ruined him. You sold your own fish, but what happened his. You used your position as head of the largest industrial department in the country to do that dirty trick. You as a minister of the Crown have prostituted that Ministry and then you get up here and express surprise why we should be bothering you. It is enough to

make a man lose his temper. What are you doing about the fish that you purchased and left down in the stores in this city? Of course your friends are making a good thing out of it in storage and you are not troubling yourself any more about it. Is it not my duty to torment you with questions under all these circumstances? Did you not turn the searchlight on every act of the Morris government when I occupied a seat on that side of the House? I have in my desk a speech which you made at a Union conference denouncing Sir Edward Morris and I will read it for you within the next forty-eight hours. Now this is May 2nd and you have been in power eighteen months. You are discredited in the eyes of the people; you have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. You have made no pronouncement as to what your policy is going to be. The Prime Minister has made no pronouncement nor has anybody else on that side of the House. They are all dummies and not by the affliction of God, but by your affliction; they are afraid to open their mouths. There is \$150,000 now down in the bank to the credit of your department, money that belongs to the colony and I have no hesitation in saying that the Prime Minister did not know anything about it because if he did he would not have been running about from one bank to another trying to get a loan for the City last week. If he has this big surplus of \$200,000 which the Auditor General mentions in his report as being still misspent, why didn't he go down to the Bank of Montreal and get the money? He knew very well that he could not do it, Sir, that is the reason. The money was not there and it was because of the bungling of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it was not there. He took over the Railway

and all the responsibilities that went with it in the absence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice and now he wants to run away from the trouble that he has created and leave some one else to take it, but an enraged people have their eyes on you Sir, and you will not get off as easily as you imagine. This country was never in such a condition as it is to-day. We have heard it likened to the Bank Crash, but that was no thing as compared with what we have to face now. The revenue at that time did not exceed \$200,000 and the expenditure was about the same but you have added two and a half million dollars to your estimates in the past year and your supplemental supply will amount to another three quarters of a million, and still you go on calling yourselves a government. The Auditor General is simply holding enough to pay the interest on what the country owes and then, forsooth, we are asked not to torment you with questions. Now, get busy on that \$150,000 and if you can't find men to buy fish from, I'll send you enough before six o'clock to-morrow evening to use up every cent of it. There are men right along Ferryland district who have been unable to sell their fish and the whole shore is destitute as a result. You know how it is to-day from Cape Race to St. John's which includes some six or seven thousand people. The big firm of Goodridge is gone and those who were able to get their supplies there in the spring to carry on the summer's fishery are no longer able to do so and the same conditions exist thruout Placentia and St. Mary's Bays and still on to Fortune Bay, the district of the Minister of Justice. The cry of destitution is heard on every hand and the relieving officer is at large, then I am told I should not torment the Minister of Fisheries with questions. Your tor-

ment has not yet begun. You have been weighed and found wanting and now you must take the consequences. I shall have more to say to you on another occasion.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

First reading of Bill, "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act."

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any reports have been received from the codfish inspectors who for months past have been working under authority of his department in this port and elsewhere around the coast inspecting fish for export, which describe the condition of the fish and the results of the so-called policy of standardization, and if so, to lay on the table of the House, copy of same, and if not whether any instructions were issued to these officials to make such reports, and if not why not, and if such instructions were issued, to lay on the table of the House a copy of the same, and to say why they were not acted upon?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, how many men could have been employed in the Reid machine shops the past winter in the construction of six locomotives imported from Philadelphia if the construction had been undertaken here, and what amount of money would have been paid them; and to lay on the table of the House a statement in detail of the reasons why the policy of building the locomotives here was not undertaken.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to that I might say that I have no information.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—If the Hon. Minister will permit me, I might say that a report covering that

question was tabled in the House some days ago over the signature of the Government Engineer.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, in the event of the passing of the Act now before the House for the Repeal of the Fish Regulations, the agreement between George Hawes and certain fish exporters in this Colony made on the 2nd of October, 1919, will continue to receive endorsement or approval of facilities for the carrying it out from the Government of this Colony, and if exporters, not parties to that agreement can be assured that this will not operate to their prejudice hereafter?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if it is intended to undertake this year a revision of the tariff, if the said revision is to be in the interests of the manufacturers only, and if the Government will undertake to provide that the representations of the working classes generally may be recorded as well as those of the manufacturers.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to that question Mr. Speaker, I might say that it is not the intention of the government to have any general revision of the tariff this year. The manufacturers have asked for protection for home industries by means of a protective tariff and the matter is before the Government now, but no decision has been arrived at.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the table of the House a copy of a report made by Mr. J. A. Powell, General Superintendent, to the Commission at its meeting on September 10th, 1920, dealing with the ballasting of the

track, snow fencing, and general repairs to bridges, trestles, and culverts.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Prime Minister what further steps, if any, the Government proposes to take with a view to assisting the fishermen of the country in obtaining supplies to enable them to prosecute that industry during the coming summer, and if, in the event of any action being taken, it is intended that the fishermen generally shall benefit by any such arrangement that is made, or will such be confined, as in the matter of purchasing Labrador fish last fall, to members of the F. P. U. and members of the House of Assembly like the Hon. member for Harbor Grace, Mr. Gosse.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The matter is under the daily consideration of the Government and I can assure the Hon. Gentleman that there will be no discrimination in anything that might be done. The \$150,000 to which the Hon. member has referred was placed to the credit of the Treasury in December last when the purchase of fish was stopped.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Who am I to believe now? The Minister of Fisheries said that it had been placed to the credit of his department.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The balance is under control of the Auditor General and is in the Bank of Montreal.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is it or is it not under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman of the Railway Commission:—

- (a) When the terminal at Argentina is expected to be ready for operation?
 (b) Is it the intention of the

Commission to take the Portia off the present route and make Argentina the terminal for sail steamer?

- (c) If such is the intention of the Railway Commission, what arrangements are being made for Trepassey, St. Mary's and the Coast into Placentia?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It is under the auspices of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That's splitting hairs.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is English.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries signed a cheque for the amount, would it be honored? Why does not the Prime Minister see to it that it is not possible for him to do that if he thinks fit.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Because as Prime Minister I have confidence in my Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I know that he would not be guilty of a dishonest act.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Other people have different ideas on the matter.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE asked the Hon. Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House the amounts paid from the Treasury for S. S. Watchful, S.S. Senef, S.S. Daisy and S.S. Malakoff and amount of exchange paid on purchase of the said steamers.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table the information.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of the House the day book, journal and ledger of the S.S. Watchful, S.S. Sebastapol, S.S. Daisy, S.S. Senef and S. S. Malakoff and that all entries be made up to the 25th April, and if not entered up to that date, why it has not been done?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—The Auditor General is now working

on that and it shall be tabled as soon as ready.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, what steps are being taken to promote the building of hotels through the country to which end the Commission turned its attention in September last as according to an official report of a meeting of the Commission held on September the 10th, 1920.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the information.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Hon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to inform this House what price the Government intends to charge the fishermen for the government salt now on the way here and the price at which the government salt now in stock in Newfoundland will be sold at?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table that information.

MR. HIGGINS asked Hon. the Prime Minister:

- (1) If the Government has yet received any amount of Prize Money due Newfoundland Reservists?
- (2) If nothing has been received is there any correspondence to be tabled on the subject, or does the Government anticipate receiving any such payment and if so when?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Government has not yet received any money due Newfoundland Reservists. The answer to the second part is that there is no such correspondence. The Government does not anticipate receiving such payment as soon as the Admiralty, which cannot be expedited in its work by the Newfoundland Government, is ready to forward it.

Third reading of Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the encouragement of Sheep Farming."

Third reading of Bill entitled, "An

Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918."

Third reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the law relating to Lotteries."

Third reading of Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom."

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is Sir Edgar Bowring resigning?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have received nothing directly from Sir Edgar but His Excellency the Governor has received a communication from him intimating his intention to resign on June 30th. On receipt of this information I cabled Sir Edgar asking him to reconsider his decision but up to the present I have received no reply.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act for the Protection of Neglected and Delinquent Children."

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice this Bill was referred to a Select Committee.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act for the protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of the Minister of Justice, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Higgins and Mr. MacDonnell.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the War Measures Act, 1914."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of the House I moved the Second Reading of this Bill, but the motion was deferred at the request of the Hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox. The operative powers of the Act of 1916 vested

specific war prerogatives and there are two ways by which it can be repealed; first, either by the changing of the section of the 1916 Act and bringing it back to the 1914 Act, which would terminate the powers of the Governor in Council on the declaration of peace by Proclamation in the Royal Gazette, or secondly, by the expressed repeal of the section. The Bill, as drafted, is in a form which provides for the issue of the Proclamation. In view, however, of the fact that there may be a substantial delay in securing the consent of the Imperial authorities for issuing the Proclamation, as there may arise some possible objections which Newfoundland might be identified with, we might consider the alternative of an express repeal. In view of the fact that the Second Reading is really the policy of the Government rather than the formal adoption of the Bill, I am sure my Hon. friend, Mr. Fox, from a legal standpoint, has a thorough understanding of the position.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principle of the amendment to the War Measures Act, under the Bill, as at present framed, as outlined by the Prime Minister, it brings us back to the 1914 Act absolutely, and it will then require to have the Proclamation of the cessation of war published before the provisions of the 1914 Act are to be rendered effective. I see the point of the Prime Minister, because in Committee that specific section might be repealed. I shall have an opportunity, when the House goes into Committee on this Bill, of taking this matter up further.

MR. HIGGINS.—Might I ask the Minister of Justice if a Proclamation has yet been issued by Great Britain declaring peace with Germany?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I understand she has. In England they did not have a War Measures Act like we did. They had a Defence of the

Realms Act and Regulations were made under it and repealed from time to time, as occasion required. I do not know whether or not that Act has been repealed, but I know that there are no further powers under it. My impression that a Proclamation has been issued in England declaring peace with Germany.

MR. HIGGINS.—It is absurd that, if Proclamations have been issued in England and Canada, we are still at war with Germany.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Great Britain is still at war with Turkey, because peace was signed but it was not ratified. Our big opponents in the late war were Austria and Germany. I know that the War Measures Act in Canada, either by Proclamation or Legislation, is gone.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Chairman of the Railway Commission to the fact that the latter part of my question of April 26th, asking what prices were paid for new locomotives recently imported, has not been answered.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I will have it prepared.

MR. SULLIVAN gave notice of question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave notice of question.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to repeal Cap. 18-8, Geo. V., entitled, "The Food Control Act, 1917," and acts in amendment thereof.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw that Bill, as I find that in a subsequent Act passed in 1920 there was a provision empowering the Governor-in-Council to appoint a date for the expiration of that Act. That has been done by the Governor-in-Council and a Proclamation will be issued to make this special legislation unnecessary.

MR. FOX.—I would like to know

whether or not it is the intention of the Government to issue that Proclamation immediately.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, on Tuesday of next week. All matters other than sugar will be dealt with. I think the 20th of May is the date on which the control of the price of sugar ends. The arrangement was thirty days' notice, as already given in the press.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for an adjournment, I would like, with your permission, Sir, to make a few remarks on a subject of considerable interest to the country generally and in particular to the district that I have the honour to represent. I would like to see what the Government are doing with regard to the development of the West Coast. I think that it is a great pity that before the plans are laid definitely before the Government that a scheme of this kind should be knocked. I think that the critics, whatever their intentions or their motives were, might have, at least, waited until the matter came before the Government. I might say that if the proposition whether reasonable or unreasonable, comes up in this House for discussion, I for one am going to support it to the limit, because I think that the development of the West Coast has been delayed long enough. The opportunity is now afforded the people of the West Coast so that the natural resources of our district may be developed. I think that it is more than a pity, it is a shame, that the petty jealousies of individuals should be brought to bear for the purpose of killing a movement of that kind. I wish for the Government to go ahead with this matter as speedily as possible as soon as they get something definite from the promoters of this Company to lay before this House. I trust that the members of this House will view this matter in a non-partisan light and apart from

politics and I hope that there will be men in this House of broad enough vision to see the advantages which must accrue in the future from a development of this kind. I think that now more than ever is there a need for the opening up of this country. I understand that if arrangements can be finalized the promoters of this project expect to give employment to thousands of men, starting from July of this year.

I hope that there will be no unnecessary delay on the part of the Government in bringing in this matter, and I hope that there will be a cessation of criticism, at least, until we get the measure before this House.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill en-

titled "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Select Committee of the House consisting of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Higgins, Mr. MacDonnell.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. SULLIVAN gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave Notice of Question.

On motion the amendment to the Food Control Act was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 3rd.

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

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from 176 of the residents of Southern Hr. and other places in Placentia Bay, praying for a small railway station at Southern Hr. Crossing. The people there have no steamboat facilities, their only means of communication is with the railway which is three or four miles away. The people get off the train there at all hours of the night, there is no place as a shelter or in which to put freight, passengers have to endure much hardship and it would be a boon to them if the Government would see that a small station is erected there. The petition is largely signed by people from Hr. Buffet, Haystack, Red Island, Bar Haven and other places. Men returning from fishing could leave their boats at Southern Hr. and get home from there but they could not leave them at Arnold's Cove which is not a suitable harbor. The station therefore would prove a great convenience to them as well as others.

MR. WALSH.—I wish to support the petition. Mr. Speaker, Southern Hr. is an important settlement and the people there are put to much inconvenience in not having at least a shelter at the railway. At present the people are compelled to go to La Manche while the distance to the Crossing is only three or four miles. An elaborate station is not needed but

the people ask that they be given at least a shelter for the hours while they are waiting for connection with the train. As there is no telegraph there they never know when the trains are due. I think this is a most opportune time for the erection of the station as it would give work and eliminate the necessity of people looking to the Commissioner of Public Charities for help.

MR. SINNOTT.—I wish to heartily support the petition, as the railway station is badly needed in the section mentioned.

MR. SMALL.—I beg to present a largely signed petition from the residents of Channel and Port aux Basques praying that the export duty on fresh codfish and salmon be removed.

MR. WALSH.—I beg to present a petition from the residents of St. Shotts, Trepassey Bay, for telegraph connection. This matter has already come up here this session and the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs gave assurance that the arrangements made by the late Government would be carried out and the line erected but there seems to have been some misunderstanding and it has not been done to date. It is unnecessary for me to point out why this petition should be granted as the Minister of Posts must have considerable correspondence on the matter in his office and in consideration of his promise to attend to it right away I will merely hand in the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I have great pleasure in supporting this petition. I asked a few days ago why this had not been done. When the late Government went out of power they were ready to do it, the money had been voted for the purpose and the poles cut. But for some reason—the members of the district were not consulted—it was decided to alter the route of the line.

It was decided by Mr. Stott, the then Superintendent, to run it from Peter's River to St. Shott's. The poles are still lying along the line and it would be a waste of money to alter the route. I hope this connection will be installed soon in view of the fact that there is a lighthouse at Cape Pine which is a very dangerous locality. It should be pushed to this light house, as in the case of wrecks it might be the means of saving life. I hope the attention of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will be given this matter and that the line will be completed at an early date.

MR. TARGETT.—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Hant's Hr. for \$250 for a breakwater. This is highly necessary in the interests of the fishermen and I trust the Government will deal promptly in the matter.

MR. MOORE gave Notice of Question.

MR. LEWIS gave Notice of Question.

DR. JONES gave Notice of Question.

MR. VINNICOMBE gave Notice of Question.

MR. BENNETT gave Notice of Question.

MR. SINNOTT gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave Notice of Question.

MR. WALSH gave Notice of Question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 163 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

MR. VINICOMBE.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Minister the very poor condition of the roads in St. John's East and to suggest to him, that when making up his estimates, that he consider a propor-

tionate share for that district. Now we have heard a great deal of talk about Mr. Main and how that district was lost on the government in the recent bye-election. The Minister of Public Works has admitted that virtually all of the operations of the road making machinery has been confined to that district, so that we have at last arrived at a solution of the problem as to how the election was lost there.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—No.

MR. VINICOMBE.—But I want to say Mr. Minister that if you bring that machinery to work in St. John's East that it won't effect us politically. Last year the collecting of taxes was taken away from the City Council and put in the hands of the Road Board. I think that that money should be divided up properly in each district. It is not right for Mr. Hibbs, the member for Fogo, to build a road to his own home in Kelligrews. It is unfair, Mr. Speaker, to have all this machinery on the Topsail Road all the time and I hope that St. John's East will be thought of this summer.

MR. MOORE asked the Prime Minister:

- (a) If the sum of five hundred dollars, paid Dr. H. M. Mosdell in connection with the publication of a pamphlet or book on Newfoundland, was for the book itself or for his services in compiling the same?
- (b) In either case is this amount all he is to receive?
- (c) And if the payment is not for the book what will the book cost the Colony, for how many copies will the Colony become responsible, and when will a copy of the book be laid on the table?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The total charges for the preparation and editing of the book, including work incidental to the preparation of such

able cuts, were \$750.00. Of this the sum of \$500.00 has been paid and \$250.00 is still due.

When the order for this book was given a considerable time ago the intention was to supply a large number of copies to the High Commissioners' Office, the various Trade Commissioners, tourist bureaus and agencies and leading railway centres. There had been large demands made for some booklet dealing with Newfoundland. The book issued by the Hon. Sir Patrick McGrath "Newfoundland in 1911" could not be satisfactorily used because of its date, and the supply was practically exhausted. It was consequently decided to publish a cheap, paper-covered book, such as could be freely circulated. The original decision was to procure 10,000. The program which the government had in that connection could not be carried out with a smaller issue than 10,000, which was the number which would be required for the years during which the book might be circulated without the necessity or revision. In December last the original issue of 10,000 was cut to 5,000 for the purpose of economy, as the government felt that under the circumstances the colony should make a sacrifice in its program for advertising its resources and inducements to tourist traffic. For the same reason the expenses which the Colony had been carrying for many years for advertising in the foreign press was ordered to be materially reduced. The repeal of the Codfish Exportation Act, which Act includes the provisions authorising the appointment of Trade Commissioners, will probably result in a further reduction of the issue. I am very sorry that the government feels it necessary to make this reduction and that our financial circumstances are not such as to justify us in carrying out the original program of having 10,000 copies circulated. The

book issued by Sir Patrick McGrath was a splendid asset for the country. The book previously completed by Judge Prowse was also a splendid advertisement for the Island. I feel myself that even under present conditions the publication of the full issue might be well justified in results, and nothing short of the imperative necessity for rigid economy and the sacrifice of beneficial services which for economy's sake must be curtailed have led the government to the conclusion that this program of advertising should not be further pursued in the immediate present.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Is the book printed yet?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will table a copy at the end of the week.

MR. WALSH asked Hon the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing:

- a) The names and addresses of all men in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's who are receiving the old age pension?
- (b) The names and addresses of all men in the said district whose pension have been cancelled though they are still living?
- (c) The names and addresses of all applicants for the old age pension who have not received the said pension, giving date of all such applications?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It will take a couple of days, at least, to get the information prepared. I will table it as soon as I receive it.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the following:

- (1) Do the Government intend to drop the vote for the Model Farm from
- (2) Do the Government intend to distribute seed potatoes this spring the estimates this year?

to those who cannot afford to buy them?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is that we have no Model Farm; there is a Stock Farm and the estimates for which are being reduced this year. With respect to the distribution of seed potatoes, I would say that this is a matter which has to be handled, under the authority of the Public Charities Department. In cases where people are in destitute circumstances and need seed potatoes to help them out for planting in the spring, that matter will be taken up by the Charities Department and provision made through that channel and by arrangement with the Agriculture and Mines Department.

MR. W ALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has any knowledge of potatoes having been sent out already and if any has been asked for by any particular person of any particular section of the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—An application was made by Mr. Sullivan, member for Placentia and St. Mary's. That matter is under the consideration of the Government and I think the request will be granted; but it has not been finalized up to the present.

MR. WALSH.—I might say before departing from this question that the reply is not satisfactory, at least, to me. I don't think that the Government should further stigmatize the people of any section of this country by placing in the hands of Relieving Officers the distribution of potatoes. There could be some other way in which it could be done. I remember to my certain knowledge twenty-five or thirty years ago, when I lived in the district of Twillingate, assistance was rendered poor people other than through the Department of Public Charities.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

That is the Department through which all such moneys have to be paid; not through the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

MR. WALSH.—I want to avail of this opportunity to protest against any further stigmatizing of the people through this system of pauper dole. People applying to me from my own district do not ask for pauper relief; they only ask for a loan. Now I would suggest that the Department of Agriculture and Mines deal directly with the people through the Agriculture Boards. We have in every settlement in Placentia as well as other districts Agriculture Societies with paid secretaries. Now I would suggest that the Government give those secretaries charge of the distribution of potatoes and not have people go on their hands and knees to a Relieving Officer begging a few pounds of potato seed. Last year when I voted against the Government providing fifty thousand dollars for a Model Farm, I pointed out that I thought it ridiculous to hand over to Doctor Campbell, who had no right to it and who had to give no account of his stewardship to this or any other House, that money for expenditure. I protested then and I protest now. It was in the best kind of a spirit that I put this question on the Order Paper in the first place. It was not to get up and occupy the time of the House unnecessarily, but it was in consideration of the evasive reply given by the Prime Minister and in consideration of what we are to hope when the matter is going to be handed over to the Relieving Officers to deal with the situation. It must be remembered that Placentia and St. Mary's is not the only district that is looking for assistance from the Government, although we have heard that a great deal of destitution exists in that district. I know other districts, East, West, North and South in this Island looking for poor relief for

their people, and what I intend to look for is that there will be no further stigmatism of the people but to get the Government to rise to the occasion and help the people out in their present crisis. They do not ask for charity, as I said before, they only ask for a loan; and for goodness sake make arrangements with the Department of Agriculture and Mines to vote fifty thousand dollars, not for a Model Farm and not to send Dr. Campbell to Toronto to attend a cattle show and to bring down horses here with ribbons tied around them, with which to buy potatoes and all the other seeds necessary so as the people of the country will be able to cultivate their lands, thus enabling people to rear their own vegetables and be better prepared to face the hard times when next fall comes around again, as already I see looming on the horizon a picture of the hard times that are in store for our people six months hence, unless something unusual happens. I hope that this suggestion will be taken note of by the Prime Minister, who represents the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this House, unfortunately. The Department of Agriculture and Mines is one of the most important departments in the public service and it should be properly represented here. I am surprised that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was always an advocate of the principle that each and every department in the Civil Service should be represented by its Head in this House, has not shown his consistency or sincerity in this connection, and, I am surprised that he was prepared last year to allow Dr. Campbell to go back to his native home in Canada with fifty thousand dollars of our money to be handled as the doctor wished, and I am surprised now that he does not rise to the occasion. Then again we have Mr. LeGrow, the member for Bay

de Verde, who is drawing a substantial salary in the Agriculture and Mines Department. Why not give him charge of the distribution of seeds, and, if necessary, have him go out and travel and let him go and visit the different districts where people are looking for this assistance. He is well paid to do the work. It is a terrible state of affairs to see the honest, hard-working people of the country go on their knees and beg to a fellow like Campbell for charity, and I want to again enter my strongest protest against the further stigmatizing of our people through pauper dole. The whole matter is one that we should have no reason for discussing here at all and it is a disgrace to us as individuals. It is now the third of May and we are coming here day after day talking about the sending out of pauper relief to our honest, industrious, hard-working and intelligent people—people who made this country so that we could sit in this House and enjoy a thousand dollars a session, and some members enjoy over ten thousand in salaries. In their homes, these people, who are better men than we are, are without, perhaps, butter to put on their bread. There will be no vote passed in this House while I am here, supposing I have to stand on my feet for a week and if my lungs hold out, that will allow Campbell or any other man like him, the spending of the public money as he wishes. It is a serious matter so far as all the members on both sides of the House are concerned. I think we have had enough of this dilly-dallying and camouflaging on the part of the Government, if the intention is to get this House closed. And I would also like to point out that there was no justification for the answer given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries yesterday evening when Sir Michael Cashin was discussing a public question of great importance. Indeed, the Minister said he doesn't

want to be worried. Of course he doesn't, and I do not suppose that Mr. Squires and the several other gentlemen who are holding positions of large emolument in the Government, want to be worried either; but the poor honest fishermen, belonging to the East, West, North and South of the country is worrying about where he is going to get the wherewithal so as his innocent children can be saved from destruction. There have been cases in this Island where good honest men went down to premature graves, because of the interference of the present Government which deprived these men of the legitimate means that they always had at their disposal to make a decent living. I did not intend this evening, Sir, to speak at any length on this question of the distribution of seeds, although it is of far more importance than a Model Farm. A Model Farm is not a dollar's worth of good, only to, perhaps, a few high class, high grade cattle people of this city. What in the name of God is the good of a Model Farm to the men in St. Barbe or Bay de Verde districts or to the men in Placentia or to the men in any other district? But I will tell you what is good to all of them. It is good for them to know where they can get three or four barrels of seed potatoes to put in the ground so as they are assured that themselves and their families will not have to go to the Prince Edward Island dealer and pay him four, five or ten dollars a barrel for potatoes in November next.

Before taking my seat I want to ask the Leader of the House and his associates to make some arrangement that would meet the situation along the lines I have indicated. I for one am prepared to vote fifty thousand dollars for the purchase of seeds, if I am assured that the money will be spent in the best interests, not only

of Placentia and St. Mary's but of St. John's East and West and all the other districts. I am just as much prepared to give my support to the people represented by Mr. Coaker as I am to my own. Although, perhaps, Mr. Coaker and his associates, representing the northern districts, may not think so and may not admit it, I have the information that conditions are not as rosy north as they would wish people to believe. I hope that my suggestion will be considered and I hope that something will be done along the lines I have mentioned; also I hope that other members will have better suggestions to make, and I have no doubt but that they have, and if made in sincerity and honesty, I do not care who the suggestion comes from, it will have my strongest support.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was absent during the remarks of my colleague. I do not know what the answer to his question is.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This debate is out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I will now call your attention to it. If we are to go ahead with any business, we must confine ourselves to question and answer. I am glad, however, to give my friend the answer. To the first part of the question the answer is that there is no Model Farm. There is a Stock Farm.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There shouldn't be one.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The vote is not being stricken out this year, but is being reduced. My answer to part (2) of the question is that the Government proposes to assist in connection with the distribution of seed potatoes in cases of extreme need. This is the explanation that my Hon. friend, Mr. Walsh, did not see the force of. The distribution of potatoes is to be handled through the Department of Agriculture and Mines, but bills in connection with this matter will be transferred from the

Agriculture and Mines Department and ultimately paid out of the general vote under the head of Public Charities. As seeds will be distributed and will not be paid for, it would be impossible to handle the matter directly through the Agriculture and Mines Department where they have a regular accounting system and where they handle a considerable amount of seed for their own regular customers, which include some prominent farmers in and around St. John's, so that any seed that they would have to give in the way referred to by the Hon. member for Placentia would be paid for by the Department of Public Charities.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I wish to thank the Prime Minister for the explanation. The reason for my asking was that I was informed, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister made some mention of a letter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. In answer to a question of Mr. Walsh, who asked if any arrangements had already been made with the Government by any one for seed, I stated that I had received a communication from you requesting seed for your district and that the matter was under the consideration of the Government.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Fearing that a wrong impression might be created, I wish to say that the letter I wrote to the Prime Minister was written in the third person on behalf of my colleagues and myself. I asked, that, if there was being any potato seed sent to any districts where the people were not able to buy their own, to consider our own district and to have them sent through the Chairman of the Road Board.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In my letter of acknowledgment you will notice that I mentioned it was through

the Agriculture and Mines Department, not the Public Charities.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Your letter is rather confusing, and there appears to be some error about it. I was afraid that there would be an impression that my district wanted poor relief in connection with these potatoes; although I have been informed that 150 barrels of potatoes have been applied for by Mr. Cheeseman for Burin district.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It there are any requests from Burin district or any other district, they will be considered on the same basis as those from Placentia district.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I have heard this discussion, but I am not quite clear on it. I would like to know if there are any seed sent out yet to any district?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am not prepared to say there was none. The Public Charities Department and the Agriculture and Mines Department have their orders and they will attend to any necessary cases as brought before them. As to any particular district having received any up to the present, I cannot tell you, but I will find out and let you know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Will you let me know to-morrow?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know about to-morrow, but within a reasonable time. Any time you ask a verbal question you will get a verbal answer.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I will ask what I like. That is what I am here for, and while I am here I am going to demand that right and also to have my questions answered. It is no use throwing back-answers, because a Prime Minister is supposed to have a certain amount of dignity and you should try and maintain that dignity.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—What about your dignity?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You ought to

know better than to take lessons from me.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am not going to take them either.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—And there are lessons in your book that I would not like to take either.

MR. WALSH.—I am not quite satisfied with the explanation given by the Prime Minister.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—The Hon. gentleman is distinctly out of order. The House is debating on a question on the order paper.

MR. WALSH.—I am not debating it. I want to dispose of the question. I have listened to other members here ask dozens of questions and debate on them, but when I get up I am considered out of order.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—I have extended to the Hon. member the privilege of a reasonable time for debating it.

MR. WALSH.—Just a short reference, if allowed to continue, with regard to a letter written by my colleague, Mr. Sullivan. I had no knowledge of the letter until this afternoon and with it I find no fault, but I am not responsible for a letter written by somebody else of which I knew nothing about. Again I want to remind the Leader of the House, who represents the Minister of Agriculture and Mines here, that we have scattered all over the Island hundreds of Agricultural Societies. Here's a report here of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, signed by the different Secretaries. Why in the name of common sense are you giving the distribution of seeds to the charge of Road Boards and Relieving Officers when you have these paid secretaries who can do the work more satisfactorily for the people? I protest again against the stigmatizing further of the people by having to go to Relieving Officers to look for poor relief, and I would suggest in

all honesty, that the matter be handled by the Agriculture and Mines Department. Let the Department get in touch with the people throughout the different sections and let the Agricultural Societies make their recommendations through the Minister. There is nothing unreasonable or unfair about that. Let the Societies in the outports loan the seeds in the spring to the people who could return the potatoes in the fall when they gather their harvest. By this arrangement there would not be a dollar lost to the taxpayers of this country. That is the point I wanted to make.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—In reply to question No. 5 Order Paper May 3rd, I may say that there is not at present any intention of taking the Portia off her present route, and if it is done it will not be done through the Railway Commission but through the Government. It is expected that the terminal at Argentia will be completed during the spring.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education if any steps have been taken by him to establish continuation schools, night schools, and the other auxiliary education services as outlined in the Premier's Manifesto, and in the Minister's speech to the Legislature last year, and if not, why not; also if he has made any report on the work of his Department since its foundation last year, and if so to lay a copy of the same on the Table of the House.

MR. SINNOTT asked Hon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission:

- (a) The names and addresses of all men in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's who are receiving the Old Age Pension?
- (b) The names and addresses of all men in the said district whose

pension has been cancelled though they are still living?

- (d) The names and addresses of all applicants for the Old Age Pension who have not received the said pension, giving date of all such applications?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—In reply to this question No. 7 Order Paper May 3rd, I beg to table the information asked for.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if on the failure of the Royal Bank to advance a sum of \$150,000 to the City Council by way of a loan, he made any efforts to obtain this amount from any other Bank or Banks in this City, if so, what was the result of his overtures and if he failed to obtain the money what were the reasons given by the Banks for their failure to make such loan?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any representations have been made to the Imperial Authorities with a view to the removal of the warship "Briton" from her present position to any other berth in the harbor of St. John's, and to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence and papers in relation thereto?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of Customs Revenue for St. John's for the ten months ending April 30th, and for the same ten months in the last fiscal year, and for the like period in the previous fiscal year, also similar statements of the total revenue for these ten months in cash of the three fiscal years.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a copy of all communications received by him from the Imperial Authorities with reference to the proposed Conference in London in

June of this year, and of any replies by him in relation thereto?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister:

- (a) If any arrangement has been made between the Commercial Cable Company and the Government with reference to the Company transacting cable and telegraph business in the Colony.
- (b) If he is aware that this Company has, during the past few days been delivering cable messages from abroad to parties in this City?
- (c) If this is being done with the Government's knowledge, and if not, does the Government propose to take any steps to prevent what is apparently a violation of the law by this Company?
- (d) The names and addresses of all applicants for the Old Age Pension who have not received the said pension, giving date of all such applications?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to this question No. 8 Order Paper May 3rd, I may say that I have received no authority from the St. John's Municipal Council to act as their financial agent in such a matter. Mr. Mullaly arranged with the Manager to come here and meet me with regard to the loan. Mr. Dubien took the position that unless the entire amount of past obligations of the city amounting to three hundred and twenty thousand dollars together with this hundred and fifty thousand dollars were paid by the Government to the Royal Bank of Canada before December 31st, that they would not advance this hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the Council. The Bank of Canada carries the account of the Municipal Council. I presume that the Municipal Council considered the question of their own bank refusing to grant them a reasonable loan and got in touch with other banks, but that is a matter for their consideration and

decision. I got in touch with other banks not on behalf of the Council, but to ascertain for myself as to whether other banks would be prepared to give them this advance in event of the Council transferring its account. Various banks have communicated with Head Offices but up to date I have received no reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I take it then that the Prime Minister has not communicated with the Bank of Canada on behalf of the Council.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I had an interview with the Manager of the Bank of Canada at the request of the Council and I have already told this House what transpired at that interview.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I take it that it is not true that the Prime Minister attended a meeting of the Council and told them to go ahead with the work as it would be alright about the money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I told the Council that if they could not get the money from any banker I would bring resolutions into this House for the purpose of providing the necessary amount.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Then the Prime Minister was not in communication with the Manager of the Bank of Canada.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As I have already said I had an interview with the Manager of the Bank of Canada and he told me that unless the Government would pay the past debt of three hundred and twenty thousand dollars and this hundred and fifty thousand dollars on the 31st of December that they would not make the advance to the Council.

PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker.—I am glad that Mr. Bennett has spoken on this matter because it gives me the opportunity for stating that the government has decided upon the

consolidation of the city debt, and legislation to that effect will be brought before the House.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN to ask the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to this question No. 9 Order Paper, May 3rd I have referred that matter to Colonel Rendell.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN to ask the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to this question No. 10 Order Paper, May 3rd, I may say that I have communicated with the Deputy Minister of Finance of Customs and he is having the figures prepared.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN to ask the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to this question No. 11 Order Paper, May 3rd, I may say that there has been no correspondence between myself and the Imperial Authorities with regard to the matter referred to.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN to ask the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to this question No. 12 Order Paper, May 3rd, I may say that no arrangements have been made between the Commercial Cable Co., and the Government. Some time ago I was told that the Cable Co. were delivering messages. The legal question as to their rights and liabilities was referred to the Attorney General who was requested to look into the matter.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Would the Attorney General be able to give us the information asked for.

THE MIN. OF JUSTICE—I am not in a position to express an opinion now.

MR. SULLIVAN to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. COAKER—I will get the information asked for as soon as possible.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN to ask the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply

to this question No. 14 Order Paper, May 3rd, that information will be ready in a day or two.

MR. SULLIVAN—I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an answer to my question No. 9 of yesterday's Order Paper.

THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The cost of the Engine landed is thirty thousand dollars.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I have just received an answer to question No. 10 relating to the Department of Finance and Customs and answer.

Third reading of Bill entitled An Act respecting High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to Para. 3 of the Bill. Why leave it to the Governor-in-Council if there is going to be a High Commissioner with a salary the House is now open and the resignation of Sir Edgar Bowring is in the hands of the Government, and if there is going to be an appointment there is no reason why the House should not be informed of it now.

THE PRIME MINISTER—There is no immediate intention of appointing a High Commissioner. I have cabled Sir Edgar Bowring asking him to reconsider his resignation. I am hoping for a favourable reply.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Are you or are you not going to vote a salary for that position?

THE PRIME MINISTER—The government has the matter under consideration.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—If you cannot get a man to take the position on the same terms as Sir Edgar Bowring will you make a new appointment? or will you abolish it altogether.

THE PRIME MINISTER—It has not been decided to abolish the office.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Now is the time to settle the matter and not after the House closes.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I move that this order be deferred. There is under consideration a proposition to include within the contract a proposition for the erection and operation of a cottage hospital. I would like this matter deferred until that proposition has been more fully developed.

MR. BENNETT—Before this thing is disposed of I would like to draw attention to the fact that the procedure is irregular. It is not customary to bring in a Bill to confirm a contract but to bring in Resolutions.

THE PRIME MINISTER—That would apply if the Government were giving them certain financial concessions but we are not doing so, and therefore it is unnecessary under the rites of the House.

MR. SULLIVAN—You are giving them rebates as you will see in Sec. 4.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No rebates are being given. The arrangement is that certain machinery for the installation of new operations may be imported into the Colony free of duty. I am advised that that does not bring the Bill within the provisions of the rules of the House requiring resolutions. It is, however, a matter of no practical importance as to whether this contract starts in the resolution stage or in the form of a bill as at present, but while this practice is entirely correct in accordance with the rules of the House, I am entirely satisfied with the proposition, if the Opposition desires to make it, that this contract be considered in the first instance in the re-

solution form rather than in the form of a Bill. In any event, the Order will be deferred until I am in a position to fully consider the proposition for the erection and maintenance of a cottage hospital.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker. I don't want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily but it appears to me that we have arrived at a crucial time in the affairs of the Municipal Council. It must be appreciated that the Council have no right to raise money on their own account and therefore they are in a most unenviable position. There is a very pressing need for money at the present time to pay for city works, and to relieve the unemployed of the city, and the time has come when something must be done to adjust this matter. It must be appreciated as the Prime Minister will know that in years past the Council have been receiving loans on Government guarantee both the principal and the interest, but that was merely a matter of form because the Council has always paid the interest in full since the debt was consolidated at one million four hundred thousand dollars and from that time on the interest has been paid semi-annually. To carry on the necessary works they have had to raise loans and the way possible to do that was thru the banks on Government guarantee. Now the Bank naturally want a settlement of that debt of three hundred and twenty thousand dollars and I submit that something should be done to consolidate this debt with the debt of the city. It will require Legislation, and it will be necessary to bring in a bill to enable the Government to issue Debentures to meet this debt of the Council. The city is able to meet its obligations, it is not taxed as much as other cities and no bank would refuse a loan to the city of St. John's if they were only responsible to themselves, but it is unfortunate that

the banks that have done the banking for the city have turned this proposition down. It puts the city in a bad position. I therefore submit that we consider the advisability of consolidation this three hundred and twenty thousand dollars into the debt of the city, and then the Council will be able to go ahead with the work that they are engaged in. I throw out this suggestion to try and help in the present position. The fifty thousand already voted will only last a limited time, and we have to spend more unless we are going to let the people starve and I don't think that will be permitted.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing in what way your counter claim of \$51,887.57 against the Reid Nfld. Company, is arrived at, as stated by you in your reply to my question No. 13 on Order Paper, April 26th, 1921.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to table the account of Contingencies etc.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V, Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.

I do not want to occupy the time of the House with this matter. It has been discussed for days during this session. I want to say that this Bill as it stands would have to be amended to have the effect which it was intended to have. The surprising thing about this Act is that many firms have been able to get clear of their fish contrary to the Regulations and they have suffered no penalty. I have here a letter which will explain some of the difficulties of this matter. A. E. Hickman & Co., writing to a New York firm under date October 30th., 1920, states:—

If you are open for Labrador fish in casks of 560 lbs. please telegraph for our quotations. We will undertake to ship without asking you to give a Bond to the Government. We will not confine our sales to the Government fixed prices.

They intimated that they would sell fish contrary to the Regulations. Last December we found that fish had been cleared from Newfoundland and sent to Italy contrary to the Regulations. When the Advisory Board was asked to clear those cargoes the Board received the assurance of the shippers that the law would be upheld.

Two such cargoes were cleared

by A. E. Hickman & Co., and the guarantee given by Mr. Hickman to the Board reads as follows:—

“Mar. 19th., 1920.

To Minister Marine & Fisheries.

Sir,—

Referring to S. V. Florence Swyers now ready to sail for Malaga, we have instruct Hawes & Co., our Spanish Agents, not to send vessel beyond Spain without consent of the Advisory Board.

Yours truly,

A. E. Hickman & Co. Ltd.,
per A. E. H.

Nov. 18th., 1920.,

Minister Marine & Fisheries.

Dear Sir,—

Referring to S. V. Roy Bruce now ready to sail for Malaga, we have instructed Hawes & Co., our Spanish Agents, not to send vessel beyond Spain without consent of the Advisory Board.

Yours truly,

A. E. Hickman Co., Ltd.,
per A. E. H.

These vessels were sent beyond Spain and went to Italy. The Advisory Board was not consulted. That firm forfeited its honor and respect for its written agreement when it deliberately destroyed the law and sold those cargoes about 25s. below the fixed price. Last fall there was some trouble with the “JUNE”. We called the attention of the shippers to the report current in town, and the own-

ers again intimated that the fish had been sold according to regulation prices and conditions. Here is what Baine Johnston wrote us on October 1st.

Our schooner “JUNE” has been loaded for some time waiting instructions to sail. Will you please send us a permit for her to sail direct to Patras. Her cargo is not sold under the regulation price.

This cargo was stated to have been sold at a price not under that fixed by the regulations. It was not sold. We brought the matter to the attention of the shippers after we heard that the cargo had not been sold and the reply again asserted that a sale had been made.

Oct. 8th., 1920.

Minister Marine & Fisheries.

“The information referred to in yours of to-day’s date re “JUNE” cargo not having been sold prior to clearance is entirely erroneous and the statements made in ours of the 1st instant are absolutely correct.

We have the honour etc,

Baine Johnston & Co.,
per J. C. Hepburn.

The facts received later proved that the “JUNE” was not sold prior to clearance or even many days after arrival and the cargo was consigned. This breach of the rules started the trouble in Greece.

The “RUTH” was cleared for Malaga for instructions. She was ordered to Greece without refer-

ence to the Board and her cargo was consigned although the owners had intimated that the cargo had been sold outright.

There was no power to punish except to cancel the license.

A Member of the House has stated that he shipped fish and got around the regulations but he would not say how.

As it is now, the Act is useless for the regulation of the exportation of codfish. Many amendments would be required to make it workable. Accordingly the Government decided to repeal the Act.

In my opinion, unless some steps are taken within a year in some way that will be effective, we are going to be confronted with conditions of affairs in the foreign markets regarding the sale of fish that will be worse than anything we have ever seen; moreover, exportation will be in the hands of five or six shippers, while three-fourths of the smaller exporters will be driven out of business.

An organization on a large scale is being established in Europe, and in the future, the exportation of fish will be only by a few firms, and, in my opinion, Newfoundland fishermen will never get the benefits that they ought to get from their labors if this menace is not throttled and controlled. When the fishermen wake up to the situation that will face them and the country a year hence they will realize that there

must be some legislation. While in London, I made a suggestion to the Colonial Office to convene a conference in London of all the great codfish exporting countries to prevent cutting competition and to establish regular control. I believe that arrangements could be made with Iceland and Norway. I found that where Newfoundland fish was selling for sixty shillings, Iceland fish was selling at five shillings less, and when the regulations were lifted, and the price of Newfoundland fish went down, the Iceland fish dropped in proportion and kept five shillings under ours. There should be some arrangement entered into regarding the assignment of markets to particular fish exporting countries. As far as the fishermen are concerned, they have not spoken the last word regarding the control of codfish exports. Satisfactory results cannot be obtained from the present Act. It can be done by one Association that will control all exporters, the exporters to pool their interests and divide profits yearly in proportion to exports.

I desire to state that as long as I have breath to speak and as long as I hold a Seat in this House of Assembly, or address a public meeting, I shall advocate legislation that will control exports and will thus benefit the fishermen by getting the largest price possible for their fish. The present Bill is

not satisfactory, but that is no reason why something effective cannot be enacted. The Act has been broken deliberately, causing great injury and upsetting the object sought to be attained, and as the trade consider it defective, I have no other course open but to ask for its repeal. If the power to punish effectively were conceded with some other changes it might be more workable, but I am not prepared to recommend such changes in the face of the treatment accorded the Regulations by the trade after I left for England in the New Year. I considered it essential to the country's best interests that a solution be found either as suggested by pooling the exports, or by nationalizing the purchase and export of codfish. It can be done. It must be done before the business is placed on a safe and sound basis. I have tried sincerely to apply a remedy; that remedy failed because of political intrigue and a divided trade. For these reasons the Act will be repealed, and the responsibility must rest with the exporters and those opposed for political reasons.

I would just say a word with regard to what Sir John Crosbie has said in connection with outright sale of fish. If I felt convinced that he was serious in his remarks on this subject, and that he would seriously consider the proposition he suggests, I would say

to the fishermen with every confidence this year that they would get eight and perhaps nine dollars a quintal for their fish. I can see sunshine ahead if this could be carried out, but at the same time he should not cast on me all the responsibility for such an undertaking. I have, I think done my part in trying to get our staple industry on a firm and safe basis, I did what I thought to be the best in the general interests of the country, and seeing that the country now blames the Regulations for all that has happened, it is, in my opinion, hardly fair to expect me to come in here again with another measure, no matter how desirable it may be, and take the full burden of the responsibility upon my shoulders. I am firmly convinced that unless we can evolve some means of establishing outright sales, Newfoundland is going to be up against serious conditions for the next four or five years. For us to permit the consignment policy to continue unrestricted, cannot but be disastrous and no greater proof of this could be found than is furnished by the instance referred to by Sir John Crosbie where he sold outright and received for his cargo something like 79s. while for a cargo that I sold on consignment at the same time I got 52s. and Mr. Hawes handled both cargoes at the same time of the year. That

meant a tremendous difference, and it goes to show the advantage of outright sales.

Unfortunately, at that time, it was difficult, indeed almost impossible to make outright sales, but the reason why Sir John Crosbie did so well was because he was then a big man on the street: He was Minister of Shipping, and in all probability, Hawes was afraid of him and wished to get in his good graces. There was not another firm in the country who obtained such an offer, and I can say, without fear of contradiction, that the cargo I sold was worth every cent as much as his, and while he received payment immediately, I got payment for mine eight months afterwards. If we cannot get out of shipping on consignment, we are going to be up against trouble. As Sir John Crosbie has said, Hawes is spreading his wings and is now getting a firm hold on Greece where he erecting large cold storage plants, and that means that any business from this country which he can get there, will be consignment business. The thing to do is to break that menace and if something is done towards that end it will mean that fish will be at least \$2.00 a quintal higher the coming season. Why not Sir John Crosbie introduce a resolution to have outright sales made law? If he proposes it, I will second it, and in this way, we

can assure a brighter outlook for 1921.

Sir John Crosbie: The same old story, Mr. Chairman. Give me your brains and I will work out the scheme, but, in this case, I am not going to do it. With regard to what the Hon. Minister said about the myself and Mr. Hawes. He said at that time I made the outright sale, I was Minister of Shipping, but it was only a few days afterwards that he himself was Minister of Marine & Fisheries, and surely must have had as much influence at I had as Minister of Shipping. Moreover, it was he, with Mr. Hawes and Mr. Job who grew up the Regulations when the latter two went down to Port Union.

Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

The first time Mr. Hawes visited Port Union was on the day of the General Election.

Sir John Crosbie: A very good day he picked to go. He couldn't get me and he went after you, and you fell for him. He winged the right bird. Mr. Hawes was trying to combine all the merchants on Water Street.

I sat at six or seven of the meetings and when Mr. Job came in with some of the Regulations already drawn up, I asked him who drew them up, he said that it had been done by Mr. Hawes, Mr. Coaker and himself. That's the time you were in the hands of the

Philistines. I never signed Mr. Hawes's agreement first nor last.
Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

It is claimed you did.

Sir John Crosbie: I signed a letter saying that if the terms of the agreement were satisfactory to me, I would consider it, then you came into town and held 2 or 3 meetings at which I was not asked to be present. I was left out because I was on the Opposition and was considered dangerous. I might tell what was going on. I knew all about those meetings nevertheless, and I can tell you now the very house they were held in. Then after the Regulations were formulated and put into force, Mr. Hawes rang me up, it was on Friday. I remember the day very well. He asked me for an appointment and I told him he could see me at the office. He brought the agreement and sat down opposite me at my desk. "Sir John, he said, everything is done, and I want you to sign this agreement." I said "would you allow me the extreme pleasure of reading it first?" "There is not much in it" he said, "but you may read it if you wish to." When I had looked it over, I said "that's a nice agreement." I have seen only one other like it, and that was one I made with a Spaniard. It was so much to my own advantage that I was ashamed to ask him to sign it, and when I asked the opinion of a legal

gentleman on it afterwards, he said it was just as well for me to have taken the Spaniard. I said "Mr. Hawes if you think you can buy me for 4 years, you'd better change your ideas. You simply can't do it." Hawes doesn't like me any too well since, that, but I think he admires me none the less just the same, and he would say to-day that Crosbie is the brightest man of the bunch. The whole thing was nothing more or less than a deal to get the whole trade into Hawes's grip. And I want to tell you, that you signed that agreement, knowing well that you were doing wrong, and if you had it back after you signed it, you would have acted differently. I want to tell you what Mr. Hawes said: "Coaker wanted to know if Crosbie had signed the agreement." He was going away on Sunday and he rang me up again. I wished him Bon Voyage but told him that the agreement had no interest for me. Now, what I want to know is, if the fact of being Minister of Shipping at the time of which the Hon. Minister speaks, why did not the Minister himself have the same influence when he was Minister of Fisheries, Chairman of the Railway Commission, Chairman of the Advisory Board and all the other things that he was as well as being recognized as one of the biggest factors in the export business, and why again

did he allow himself to be caught in the Hawes net.

Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

You had experience of Hawes before and you knew him for what he was, but, I did not.

Sir John Crosbie: Well now that you do know him, let us hope that you will do something to protect this country against the Hawes menace, and keep him from getting control of every cargo that is sent out of here.

Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

Do you intend to help me prevent his doing it?

Sir John Crosbie: Yes, that is one thing that you and I agree upon. I want to say again that if you develop some concrete plan and bring it to me, I will give it my hearty approval, and do the best I can to see it carried out for the sake of the District I represent, in this House, the people of which, earn their living largely on Labrador.

Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman I just want to explain the difference that would exist between a policy such as Sir John Crosbie suggests, and the Regulations which we are now about to repeal. In the case of the Regulations, it is true that outright sales were insisted on, but the price was also fixed below which no fish could be sold, but his idea

is that outright sales be enforced, which simply means that no fish could go from here unless it was already sold, what the price received might be, would make no difference. Why, if we send our vessels to Barbados for Molasses, we have to ask what the price will be, and then before it is taken out of the vessel, the money must be paid into the bank, but our fish goes there without any price being fixed on it, and we are paid whatever the brokers like to give us, months after it discharged, and for the past few months, we have been receiving as little as \$1.18 for fish going there. It will thus be seen that there is all the difference in the world between outright sales only, and the old Regulations. What caused the big trouble with the latter, was that we fixed the price at which fish should sell in the different markets and there is a vast difference between that, and insisting that the fish must be sold before it is allowed to go forward. We must have something to protect the industry, but of course if a man wants to sell at 40s. or 50s. that is his business. What we tried to prevent by the Regulations, was cutting prices, but it proved impossible to do even that because the Regulations were in many cases ignored altogether because of our inability to punish for breaches of the Rules. Now, sir, if we cannot be assured of getting good money

for our fish, how can we go to the Banks and ask them to make advances. That is what happened Harris and others. They sold on consignment and being unable to realize on the fish, that they had sent out, they were refused further advances by the Banks. It was consignments that killed these people and our exporters of past generations, and it was consignments that built up Hawes' business in Spain and now enables him to extend his activities to Greece where he is now building big cold storage plants. He will say to five of six of his friends here "I will look after your fish and get you the best price obtainable," and they will send cargoes on consignment feeling sure they will be protected at the expense of the smaller shippers, and therefore he will have nothing to do with outright sales, because he is making big money on the consignment system. Greece is the best market we have for Labrador fish; Greece has been the salvation of the shipper of Labrador fish. I made \$30,000 on an outright sale of a cargo of fish sent to Greece, and lost \$25,000 on another in a different market I shipped on consignment. Consignments mean that the trade has no solid foundation, because there is no money guaranteed, and all risks are the shippers. If you know just what you are getting for your fish, there is a certain confidence that is oth-

erwise absent, and if we cannot establish that confidence, we are lost. We must make sure that Hawes does not get his grip on our fish the coming season. He is now worth \$2,000,000, chiefly made from Newfoundland consigned fish. He of course sends a share of the profits back to the men whom he left in on the ground floor; the men who are his particular friends, and whose fish takes precedence over all other.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, before this bill passes through the committee stage I would like to have a few more words to say regarding it. I do not think that anything could have a greater effect than the fall of the Minister himself. His fall this afternoon is absolute and pitiable. The fisherman's road was going to be golden, but unfortunately it is dross. The bill may have some good points about it, but the way it was handled and carried out absolutely ruined the fish business of Newfoundland of 1920. I tried to point out to the Hon. Minister last year that gradually he was drifting into the hands of the philistines. If the fishery regulations had not been enforced and certain exporters had been satisfied with reasonable profits we would not be in the hole that we are in to-day. It was greediness that did it. They were not satisfied with 5 cents a quintal profit. I could handle 15,000 quintals Shore fish and I could handle Labrador fish, and in some cases I got more than the regulation prices for my fish, but the Hon. Minister didn't handle it for me. I knew how to handle my fish, but in the case of the regulations some people took too much on them, and they fell by the way side. The bill, as passed here last year, was not hon-

est. No man should try to fill the dual position that the Hon. Minister tried to fill last year. He could not be an exporter himself and deal honestly with the other exporters who entrusted information to him. It was entirely too much to expect of the Minister. Every man is going to look out for himself first, and I for one did not expect the Hon. Minister to favour me in preference to himself. But I am glad, Sir, that you have come in here and repealed the regulations. You are not like the Prime Minister who had the nerve to come in here and say that he still favored the regulations, but he went down to the Board of Trade and lifted them, when the Hon. Minister was away. You would not do it when he was here. You placed the Hon. Minister in a very hard position, but he did the very best he could do. I told him he was drifting into the hands of the Philistines, and his own brothers in the Executive turned him down when he was not here to protect himself. When the Prime Minister said he was in favour of the Regulations he was appealing to the F. P. U.

The Prime Minister in his speech the other day referred to other articles. There is one thing that you have got to remember about fish. It is a perishable article, and if the catch for one season is not marketed you have the new overlapping the old. You will find that this year is going to be worse than 1920. The Hon. the Prime Minister told us a story the other day about sugar in Canada. He said there was a lot of money lost. But what did the Government lose? The refiners put it up to the Government, and the Government refused to finance the refiners. The refiners lost \$17,000,000.00 and the Government lost nothing. It takes the present Government of Newfoundland to throw away money on sugar when someone has it on his hands and can't get rid of it. We have been told that

the low price of our fish is due to the Exchange condition. That is not true. It is sold for sterling money, and the exchange situation would have absolutely no bearing in the price of our fish, unless, of course, it is sent on consignment.

My private opinion about the fish business is that it is the main factor of Newfoundland's industries, and it has got to be handled with a great deal of care and attention. The fisherman has got to make a good quality in order to get a good price. It is just the same with a barrel of "Five Roses," but it cannot be done by legislation. I will pay more for good fish than I will pay for poor fish. It depends on the fisherman himself, and all the regulations and all the inspectors that you want to put on will not make good fish. And if the fisherman does not make good fish he is the one who is going to suffer. I am personally just as much interested in the fish business as the Minister or any other man. I want to see something done. The Hon. Minister is absolutely right in some things. If you will remember the Hon. Minister had a great opinion of Mr. George Hawes last year, but I don't think he has any opinion now.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have an opinion, a very bad one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You see the Minister is willing to be honest. Mr. Hawes handled fish for me once. At that time I got 20 shillings a quintal more than the Minister got. I do not want to harp on the fact that the Hon. Minister has a poor opinion of Mr. Hawes, but I do not understand the Minister when he wrote that article in the Advocate. He must have had a great change of heart since then. (reads article.)

There you are I told you before you were in the hands of the Philistines.
THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE &

FISHERIES—You have not proven that from what you have just read.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, you have said Hawes was a great man. Well you have said that like most of us he looked out for himself. Yes you are correct in changing your opinions. I am glad you are trying to get rid of him and you are up against a hard proposition in doing so but there is one thing to which I want to take exception to this afternoon and that is during the debate here the Prime Minister said he believed in the regulations and that he would back the regulations and still this is the very man who removed them in your absence. During my short while here this afternoon I have heard a lot of debate but what sincerity is there to it? I want to tell the House and the country at large that I have promised to take delivery of ten thousand drums from the coopers of St. John's to help them out by removing their stock and let them have further employment. All this is due to the regulations as owing to their enforcement the coopers have not been able to get rid of their stock. What has been said about the Susu is correct. I want to tell this House and the whole country at large that I have not once asked the unions to rescue their wages. Nor do I now ask them to rescue them. I did not know a thing about this strike until Monday morning when I went down to my wharf and found that Mr. MacDonald and two other heads whom I have employed all the winter to do nothing had left without a word to me about the matter. There had been no question about wages whatever but I wanted the Susu loaded and she was loaded and she will be loaded again under similar circumstances. There is no reason why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could do the same thing and pay the union wages and if the government were willing to pay the union rates I cannot see

why the Portia did not sail. I want to tell the men of St. John's that I for one always want to see them paid the wages they demand and I will never object to them. But I crave the right to run my own premises. If you were prepared to pay the rates asked there is no reason why they were not allowed to work and thereby have the Portia sail on her way to the West Coast. I would not have referred to this matter at all but for the remark from the gallery that I was a scab. I want that gentleman to understand my position and I was prepared yesterday morning and will be prepared to-morrow morning to employ a lot of men and men aggregating about fifty could go to work to-morrow on my premises if the question of wages was not interfered with. Now I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has had any word from Colonel Bernard about the Consorzio?

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes. The message is to the effect that the Italian government has consented to let our fish enter.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Thank God for that. We are getting nearer to something decent again, and I presume we shall be allowed to sell our cargoes again as of old. I have a message also about the Consorzio, in fact the message is from the Consorzio. I think it is a great pity we ever fell like we did in allowing that man Hawe to cat for us and I think when the Prime Minister got his photo taken between Hawes and Rasnoli the whole thing was finished. Still the Prime Minister believes in the regulations and he would still back them. I understand from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that already all the inspectors have been paid off and I take it there is no intention whatever to have any inspectors this year I want the news of this relief to go

out to the fishermen of this country and I am sure the fishermen will welcome the getting back to the old way. But I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries another question because the fishermen may still find themselves in a box and the question is whether there is any intention of standardizing the fish this year in the merchants' stores?

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That is another relief. So every man will be allowed to take care of his own property. That is very nice. We are getting back to normal. This colony will save a lot of money when there is no need of paying those numerous inspectors, but the fishermen will put up a better article than ever when their products were inspected because I want to tell this House that last season the inspectors did not know their business as they were never outside the heads, and I never wanted an inspector to inspect my fish as I have bought my twenty years experience dearly trying hard to realise what the markets wanted, and I was forced to register the brand of my fish, and if the merchants had been allowed to ship their own choice of fish they would never had been any complaints if the quality had been what they represented it to be. I have been told in this House to day that I am blue ruinist. When I see a stone wall I know it is not made of wood, and for the past twelve months I have been studying the position of Newfoundland and to-day's position is due to the regulations and because I depict her situation exactly as I think it to be I am termed a blue ruinist. And again there is one thing the gentleman on the other side of the House ought to regret and that is that after the Prime Minister has seen it his duty to remove the regulations he still says he would back them to the last. But so far as

being termed a blue ruinist I want to tell this House and I do not care who hears it or where it goes, that you have only seen the shadow of darkness as yet, you have not entered into the real dark situation which is hanging over your heads. So I am a blue ruinist because I tell the truth I always believe in telling the truth because it will appear in the end. I do not believe in telling white lies. I suppose if you Mr. Halfyard were walking straight for a pit and I told you about it you would term me a blue ruinist. I am trying hard to keep you out of it.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF POSTS—Why do you not let us know your ideas if you are so anxious to help us out in the situation?

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE—If I gave you my ideas they would appear in the Star and Advocate to-morrow as yours. I am not going to give them to you. You and I only have different opinions on right and wrong. A year ago you had all those ideas but you and your government have forgotten all about them since. And to-day the country is bankrupt. The other day the Prime Minister got up here and said how he was arranging for a loan of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to be used by the Municipal Council and when the question was asked him he said he had in raising the loan and as a rejoinder he called the Bank of Canada a bunch of Shylocks. What better answer than that do you want in reply to your question whether or not I am a blue ruinist? It is not what we are going to do about it, it is what are you and your government going to do about it? You are the government not we. Some insinuations have been flung across the floor that we wanted the government. Why we would not touch it with a forty foot pole. I do not want to get into it and let those insinuations be flung across

again to me. Since those insinuations have been flung across I have ceased to desire to become a part of the government and I want to be on this side alone, even tho I am the only one over here.

Then you ask why do we not save you from yourselves. It is only about eighteen months ago when R. A. Squires laid before us his manifesto and therein he painted us as the worst crowd of crooks in the history of the country, but to-day he says why do we not save you from yourselves. And you ask for the ideas we have in our heads. Of what is that the proof of? I know that nothing you can do will save us. Why do you not suggest something yourselves and then if we view the suggestion favorably we will assist you. Do what you may I want to tell the men of the country that dark days such as they have never seen and such as their children will never see again are ahead of them. I am responsible for what I am saying and I know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows only too well what I am saying is true. He knows you cannot solve the problems ahead of you. When the Prime Minister was looking for the support of the country he said he would practise economy and if he had done so, Newfoundland would not be so bad off as she is to-day. Let me read to you something touching on this matter. Take the railroad problem on which matter the Prime Minister tried to explain himself and try as he may the best he could say was as follows (reads). Is not that frightful and the best proof of that frightfulness is that the country is loser to the amount of the sum of two and one half millions of dollars, and the worst of it is that we have got to keep the railroad. The rottenness of it has come down on you with a vengeance. When you were taking over the railroad you were going to put the Reids in their

proper place. But the result is that you are handling the Reids in a far worse manner than did Sir Patrick McGrath, Sir Michael Cashin and A. B. Morine, and you have been caught badly, but unfortunate for the country. To-day the railroad is run by the Commission and hundreds of concessions have been given the Reids. The railroad will be even worse in June and still you have dumped out two and one half millions of dollars of the people's money on this rotten railroad. What Sir Wm. Lloyd and Mr. Coaker tried to prevent with regard to the Reids you during the last session made it easy for the Reids to acquire. You gave them liberty to take all the lands they needed and many other concessions as well. That bill introduced by you paved the way. Now we see a big head line in the Advocate about this wonderful proposition about to be inaugurated when five thousand men will be employed here shortly and we understand the Humber mouth lands taken from us under this bill are the nucleus of the enterprise, al because the country was not protected. And I say it without fear or contradiction that the government is not capable of handling the situation. You have fallen down on your duty, and you have wrongfully given the Reids rights which should never have been given. Now it just struck me that I am not the only scab around here as I see the papers are not running because the printers are seeking some trifling concession. I wish also to remark that I have been trying to get some information from the Department of Agriculture and Mines, in otehr word, from Dr. Campbell. It resembles drawing out a tooth without chloroform. I guess when this information is properly tabled there will be another scandal laid at the feet of the government. I have nothing against this Dr. Campbell because he was born in Nova Scotia. I have no

fault to find with him, but I do say this that two years ago Mr. Coaker told the F. P. U., after a convention held in that December, that the head of that department ought to have a seat in this House. If he were in his seat opposite I expect we would get some satisfaction.

The Railway, may I ask the Hon. leader, the Chairman of the Railway Commission, not the Prime Minister has any policy in this connection been discussed as to the future. What are you going to do after the 30th of June. We have been here 5 weeks now, and I would be glad if you would tell me what your ideas are about it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISH-ERIES.—We will have a debate on the railway question later and will deal with it in all its phases.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—We have been here 5 weeks—you and I for three at least, and it is time your policy was handed down as this is too serious a matter to be let drift. It is something like the Fish Regulations and needs to be moved out of existence.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISH-ERIES.—What—the railway.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—No—the Commission. We want that put out of business and everything in connection with the operation of the road got down to normal again. If you can't run it, say so, and let the Reid Nfld. Co. take control of it. If competent men were in charge of affairs that would be done. But instead of doing that we find the country saddled as a result of the government's bungling with a debt of two and a half millions that they are unable to find. I would like to know if the Executive, not the ordinary members, are awake at all. What are they doing every night? Are you going to do anything to try and solve this problem which is of such a serious nature? No attempt is be-

ing made to arrive at a solution—is this state of affairs to continue and we be allowed to drift helplessly over the embankment of ruin. What is your idea in regard to the coastal service, the railway policy and in connection with the future. I do not want to be kept here all the summer.

MR. HIBBS—It is time you realized that yourself and kept to the discussion of the Fish Regulations.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—So you've woke up at last. It was your master who brought up the Fish Regulations.

MR. HIBBS.—You will please address me as the master of the House. I am the chairman and I do not want this House ridiculed.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I am addressing you alright. Do you want me to address the audience.

MR. HIBBS—I will call on the Speaker.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Call him and let him give me the answers to the questions I've been asking.

MR. HIBBS—Keep to the subject of debate. You are dealing with an act to repeal the Fish Regulations.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Has the railway nothing to do with fish? Isn't cask fish brought in over the railroad. Wasn't it brought in here last year. It was—and you know the demurrage on it was something frightful. The amount of money which was taken from the fishermen to pay demurrage on the cars would be a surprise to you. The Fish Regulations have caused all the trouble that we are up against to-day. The situation would be in proper order if there had been no regulations, and if the railway were run properly the fish brought here would be in right condition. As it is to-day we have to get great quantities of coal here from Sydney to haul fish over the railroad. Talk about fish—you Mr. Chairman, ought to be sick of it. I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries

through you, would tell me what next year's prices will be.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I hope about \$10.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You are living in hope and will die in fear of it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—We had it last year.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You did for some but you have a whole lot of trouble coming to you yet over it.

I am sorry to have to talk so much about fish but what can I do. A question has been asked here as to the fish inspectors on the other side being withdrawn.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—The commissioners have been ordered to return at the 30th of June.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I hardly know what to call them, inspectors or commissioners, but I am glad you have done that sir. But still, can't you get them back by the 30th of May and save all their expenses for the month of June. I think they should be notified to return at once. I know you are like me now, anxious to save the money.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—If it was not for the want of money we would not recall them.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I see—but the Prime Minister says everything is alright and Mr. Coaker says we want the money. Where are we and whither tending. One minute we got lots of money and the next minute we have to call me n home because of the want of it. It's simply awful. Now let us have a look at this outlay of \$500,000 in connection with fish. You will admit, Mr. Coaker that the giving out of this was due to the Regulations.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I will not argue the point.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You know, sir, that if our business men had been allowed to sell their fish through New York as they had always done, there would have been no need of this \$500,000.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—We could not sell it twice.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You did not know who was to eat it, whether it was Greeks or Turks, or Egyptians. If the New York buyer was willing to offer \$55 a cask for fish why was he blocked by being asked to put up an exorbitant bond before he could do business. You told us a year ago that your one idea was the protection of the fishermen. What odds was it to you what was paid the shipper here as long as the fisherman got his \$7 or \$8 a qtl. If the shipment of the Labrador fish had been allowed last year there would not be such quantities of it lying in the country to-day belonging to the fishermen and others. Members on the other side of the House have absolutely stated that this money was used to help the Northern men—I will not say Union men alone—and I would like to know why Geo. Harris did not get any of it. Mr. Targett, when I referred to this case before, was coming up to my office to see his letter asking for help, but I regret to say I have no recollection of his coming.

MR. TARGETT.—There is no Geo. Harris in my district.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I am not sure if his name is George or Sam, but do you know the man Harris who was engaged with Mr. Dan O'Neil of Bay de Verde last year.

MR. TARGETT.—I was up to your office twice but could not get to see you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Why didn't you hand in your name, Mr. Targett.

MR. TARGETT.—I am only Targett and not used to such formalities. You were not there.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I am addressing you as Mr. Targett because of the order of the Chairman. Anyhow, I will be only too pleased to meet you to-morrow morning at 10.30 and introduce you to the fish belonging to Harris and others which is still lying in

my store where I allowed them to place it when they could not sell it. If you will give \$2 a qtl. for it, I will add \$4 and then let the government give the men another \$2. The reason I am speaking about Harris' fish is because he is a good F. P. U. man and marked his ballot for you in the election and you should do something to protect him.

MR. TARGETT—I don't care a snap of my finger whether any man voted for me or not. I will do all I can for all alike. The men of Trinity Bay vote according to their conscience and are not to be bribed.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That is beautifully said if I could only take it seriously.

MR. TARGETT—It is the truth.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Is it true that in one section of your district there were two operators and when the election was on one let only your men into the office to hear the news and kept the others out.

MR. TARGETT.—That is not true.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Did you ever take an oath in connection with the Union.

MR. TARGETT—That is my own business. I always do my best to help all or any of my constituents.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Alright then; come up to my premises to-morrow where their fish is stored and help them to get clear of it. I will be surprised if you do.

MR. TARGETT.—I will come up and that won't be the only surprise you will get

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—These men I speak of had their fish at my wharf for a week while they were trying to sell it and after beating the streets always came back and said they could not see the Minister of Fisheries. That fish remains in my store and I advanced them \$4 a quintal on it. I give you the liberty now sir, to come up and pay these men as they are writing to me constantly for assistance. Fish Regu-

lations will go down in history and will be remembered by our children's children as the greatest curse ever perpetrated on the country. Business men who should be giving out supplies to-day are out of business because of the incapacity and evil advice of the Advisory Board. Mr. Coaker knows as well as I do that if he had come behind the door and taken my advice we would never have touched the point of insolvency that we have reached at present. Mr. Coaker does not contradict me as he knows I am right. The regulations brought disaster not only to the West Coast but to the cooper, laborer and truckman of St. John's East and West and even to the men of Paradise who make hoops as they were unable to sell them. We will never get over, never survive it, and whoever is in charge of this colony in the next 12 months will not be able to take her out of the water as it is too deep to raise her. The only way to save her is by the best brains being united and doing their utmost for New foundland. I came here a few evenings ago with the best intentions of doing my best for my country, but I can't get up to ask a question without the man called the Prime Minister flying at me across the House. I do not take much notice of him, but I want to serve notice right here and now that I will do nothing to help him, no; not till he "goes west" and I will never be united with him for the good of the country. He may be too smart a man for men but I reiterate for the information of the country that you have yet only seen the shadow of the darkness. It is only the shadow as yet but even before we are out of this House you may realize that far worse is to come. You can take my name and send it across to England, to Canada or wherever you like for this. That is my opinion backed up by the leading men of Water Street. Even in the terrible depression of the Bank Crash you

could find men to give supplies for the fishery, but the names of those who are doing so to-day can be counted on 3 fingers. Men are saying to-day we will pay anything for a little in advance and only a few days ago one man offered at a Water St. premises \$200 for \$100 credit, but was refused. If Mr. Targett or the others want to hear the worst, I am unable to describe it. I am pleased to hear the Regulations are gone and also the inspectors, and am pleased to hear the Commissioners are to go the 30th of June but yet we have been here five weeks and nobody knows if the Government have any policy to offer for the future or not. The Executive do not know, neither do the others but they sit there and listen to the evasions of their leaders every day. The time will come when your policy will be demanded and if it is not given out to the people the responsibility will rest with you. It was said a few days ago by the Minister of Public Works that the F. P. U. did not control the Executive but I would like to point out that the Executive would not last 10 minutes if the F. P. U. wanted to vote them out. That is the power of the F. P. U. there and in this House, they are a united body bound to support each other. When the support passes away the government walks out of the House. You, Mr. Jennings, are as responsible as the Executive though you may not attend their meetings, because you have backed their policy. Mr. Small, and the others who by their support allowed us to be brought to the hopeless situation in which we are to-day, are equally responsible with the Executive members because you should have stood up and said the people are suffering through you and I will clear out. You saw the difficulties of the people you represent, but yet you entered no protest. Now sir, I have considerable still to say in connection with the Fish Regulations. I have only touched on the fringe of it yet. I

am going over them again from A to Z, and give their real history, pointing out the failures, who were ruined by them and what happened generally to the people and Newfoundland itself. As it is now 6.30 I beg to move the adjournment of the House till to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

The Prime Minister announced that His Excellency the Governor, would receive the Address in Reply at half past eleven to-morrow morning.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 4th.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply presently.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, and being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address of Thanks, and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:

Government House.
St. John's, Newfoundland.

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.

C. ALEXANDER HARRIS,
Governor.

May 4th, 1921.

Mr. Speaker then left the Chair until a quarter past three of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista on the subject of a well. The petition asks that the sum of fifty dollars be granted to have this public well attended to. I may say in connection with this matter that water is very scarce in Bonavista and the people suffer great inconvenience in consequence. I trust that the Government will therefore see its way clear to grant this small sum for such an important matter.

I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, from another section of Bonavista town, asking for the sum of \$150.00 for the purpose of clearing the boulders from a beach known as Ford's Beach and otherwise improving it so as to make it accessible to fishermen who desire to use it for fishery purposes. In presenting these petitions I ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate, and that petitioners' requests be acceded to in both cases.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a very great number of the women of Newfoundland on the subject of the franchise. With your permission, Sir, I will read the petition. (Reads Petition.)

Mr. Speaker, during the short time that I have had the petitions in my possession I had not the time to count the signatures appended to them but the ladies who handed them to me for presentation to the House inform me that the actual number of signatures

is 7,485, most of them are those of women but in many cases they are also endorsed by men. I have no doubt that had there been more time, the number of signatures would have been very much larger, but there are still more to arrive and these are exclusive of those obtained last year.

For the information of the House and hon. gentlemen I will specify the places from which these petitions have come. With the exception of my own district and that of the hon. member for Burgeo and LaPoile, I believe every district in the Island is represented in the number. Those from St. John's, both East and West, are very largely signed, not only in the City itself but in the outlying places as well. The petitions are from the following places:

ST. JOHN'S CITY EAST AND WEST.

ST. GEORGE'S—Sandy Point, Curling, Petries, Corner Brook.

TRINITY—Port Union, W. and M., Foster's Point, Clarenville, Belleview, Green's Hr., Whitbourne, Catalina, Little Catalina.

Petty Hr., Old Perlican (large), Western Bay, Western Bay W. (large), Ochre Pit Cove, Bell Island (large), Carbonear, Noggin Cove (Fogo), Burnt Cove, Herring Neck, Georges' Brook, Milton, Traytown, Bonavista, Grand Falls, Bay Bulls, Trepassey, Ferryland, Little Bay Islands, Lewisporte, Laurencetown, Exploits Three Arms, Nipper's Hr., Placentia, Petit Forte, Scund Island, Burin, Great Burin, Grand Bank, Fortune, Brigus, Holyrood, Burgoyne's Cove, Flat Islands B.B.), Hr. Grace (large), Trout River (large), Bonne Bay, Norris' Point, Griquet, Griquet Bay, Sunnyside, Bay Bulls Arm, Southside (St. J.)

From this it will be seen by hon. members that the women have gained a strong foothold all over the Island.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say in presenting these petitions that while I

present them, I keep an open mind as to the advisability of introducing a Bill this session. I have stated this to the ladies who entrusted me with the presentation and they understand that. As to the right of women to have the franchise, there is no need to enlarge on that phase of the subject because it was gone into fully last year when similar petitions were presented but the signatures here show that the cause is gaining strength daily and it is only a matter of time when there will be sufficient signatures to commend the matter to the consideration of the House. I have only to add in moving these petitions that they be received and referred to the department to which they relate; also, I am requested to ask that the petitions themselves be returned to the ladies who presented them. They have their own reasons for this. After petitions have been received by the House I think the usual custom is for petitions to remain in the custody of the House, but I do not think that any great harm will accrue from acceding to the request of the ladies, and I ask that the petitions be returned after they have served their usefulness here.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petitions presented by the Hon. Minister of Justice. I do so for the reasons that I explained at the last session. Just as I intimated then so do I now say, that, as far as I am personally concerned, the matter is of no importance to me whether the petitions were signed by one or by one hundred thousand persons; because, as the Minister of Justice has aptly put it, it is only a question of time when the matter of votes for women will become a reality. That being so, it is a question of dealing with the principle involved. Now the principle is either right or it is wrong; either it is good or it is bad; either it is an advantage to the community or

it is not. Personally, I can offer no objection to the request for the right for women to exercise their franchise and there is no just or no valid reason why they should be denied that right. According to my viewpoint the situation is this: Woman, apart from her war record altogether (it would be quite unnecessary to mention her splendid work in the great world war, rather, as a matter of fact, would it be detracting from the merits of the petitions) has established her place in the world to entitle her to equal rights of the man of to-day. The State, after all, is simply the home at large. The average person may feel like saying that women should not have a vote for the reason that the place for a woman is in her home. But surely the home is the home at large in the community. Woman has proven herself to be a prominent factor in every social and moral movement and her activities in these circles for the uplifting of the community is well known. Women are equally as good and equally as important as men in the administration of public affairs in the community, and I think it ill becomes us as men to assume that we possess all the administrative ability. Take this House of Assembly, for instance. Has any man got the effrontery to say that, if 30 women had been elected to the House of Assembly two years ago, they would not have done just as well as the present Government has done for the past couple of years. However, I say, so that my remarks may not be taken as levelling a charge at the Government, that I am quite satisfied that, if I abandoned my place in this House to-morrow, it could be filled equally as well and equally as good by a woman; consequently, I subscribe to the principle, after giving it a deal of thought, deliberation and consideration, that equal rights should be granted. It is just as well for us

to recognize this demand,—this demand of right. What woman asks for is not a privilege; nor is it something that we men might be inclined to think that we have in our own keeping and which we will or will not give; but it is a right. I do not see to-day what process of reasoning would prompt me to undertake any other course than to stand by woman franchise, irrespective of what might happen when next I go before the electorate. I am satisfied that this is a matter of absolute right and I can give no intelligent answer to any woman or to any man to-day as to why a woman should not have a vote. The day is gone when women are to be looked upon as possessed of less intelligence than men. Sixty years ago this agitation for women suffrage first started in the Old Country. The pioneer worker in this movement was John Stuart Mill. He started the agitation particularly among the English speaking people. It took a long time to have the right for women recognized, but eventually, through the untiring efforts of this champion, it becomes an established fact. It has been acknowledged as right now practically all over the world. At the outset this idea of the franchise for women was looked upon as a kind of radical and novel thought, and in fact right down to the present day conditions have not changed in some sections. Time there was when we were prone to look upon women as an object, purely something to be used by man for his comfort, to be kept, more or less, as a servile subject. We find that in all the walks of life women have acquitted themselves not inferior to men. In matters of administration of commercial, business or professional calling; in matters of thought or of action, women have at all times throughout the whole universe proven themselves as capable as men. In our own country they have

shown themselves—and if we are candid to ourselves we will admit it—as being in very many respects our superiors. We as men have to admit that the greatest counsellor that man can have is an intelligent wife, and, after all, she is the one in which he puts his trust; she is the one whose advice is listened to more attentively and more eagerly than that of the average man. Conditions have advanced in the country to-day and it is just as well for us to make up our minds to meet the situation. We in Newfoundland to-day should be trying to keep pace with other places in all the forms of legislation. We are to-day practically the only English speaking people where women are still kept without the franchise. Personally, as I said before, I have given a good deal of thought to the matter and to-morrow I would vote for a Bill giving equal rights to women in all respects. We have outgrown the day when man was lord and master. The home is of a co-equal status and by the man and woman working together in our own families; similarly is the family at large in the community of a co-equal status, and men and women in the daily affairs of life are going hand in hand in movements for the public good.

I support the petitions for the reasons I have indicated, not that they happen to contain the names of any ladies in the district that I represent; rather would I support them if they came from all other districts except my own on equally strong grounds and with equally strong convictions. The position before us has reached the stage when we have to recognize that this Woman Suffrage movement is no longer a matter of begging a favour; it is no longer a matter for women to be asking something that men think they have the right to dispose of, as by an array or circumstances we men seem to arrogate to

ourselves all the power of depriving women of their right, but it is a matter that women should be given their just rights. I do trust that the Minister of Justice, who introduced these petitions, will be able to see that, despite the difficult times ahead of us, an opportunity will be found to bring in a Bill dealing with this important matter. I will go further and say that a solution of those difficulties in the matter of economy particularly, and in other matters in which to-day the State is more directly interested in this country than ever before, will be arrived. I think that the day is far gone for some of us men to be thinking that we have got all the business brains of the world, and I think we should be only too glad to enlist the support of all people of thought and ability to help us to grapple with the economic and other difficulties that are confronting us. Women have their proportionate share of intelligence and of executive ability. It is not all confined to men. I am compelled to recognize that. Experience has shown that women maintained those high ideals in the days of the American War. Consequently, when woman was able to take her place in the savage aspect of life with man and later when it developed that she was found to be equal to man in all the walks of life, and in some respects his superior, and because she has shown herself to be, at least, on the same footing with man physically, intellectually, morally and socially, I subscribe to the prayer of the petitions and I hope the day is not far distant when, by virtue of the age of this Colony and by reason of the fact that this Colony is no longer going to retain the old fossilized notion of long ago, woman will be given her right and what no man has a right to keep from her.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks, not so much to express an opinion on

the relative merits or demerits of the question, but to comment somewhat upon how the matter was brought about. To my mind this is going to mean a drastic change in the constitution of the country. It is a matter that, if ever there was a necessity for a referendum, I think this is one of the cases where a referendum is absolutely necessary. This bill will affect the voting power of the country and consequently affects the constitution. I might say that I was surprised when the Minister of Justice enumerated my own district among the others where petitions came from, because those responsible did not do me the courtesy of mentioning the matter to me. So far as I am personally aware of, there is only one petition from the district of St. George's and which petition I will present to the House, and in my attitude here I will be guided by the views and the sentiments of the people of St. George's on the question. For the present I prefer to follow the lines laid down by the Minister of Justice, namely, of keeping an open mind on the question. I do not intend to commit myself like my colleague, Mr. Higgins, or, in some respects, to talk about things in advance as he spoke about them, because if, for no other reason, he is better qualified to talk about the idea of the home and the authority of the home, than I am. Mr. Higgins told us in advance that if we had a woman Government on that side of the House for the past two years that things might have been better. That may be so, my opinion is that it would be desirable to have an Opposition composed of women from the point of view of obstruction, such an opposition would be sure to have the last word. I should like to know if it is the intention to bring in a Bill this year. If it is, I can get the Minister of Justice to let me have the number of localities in my district

that petitions came from, so that I can find out if there is sufficient interest in the movement and so that I can get some idea of the sentiment of the people.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the subject matter now before the Chair. When petitions were brought in here last year, and a Bill introduced by Mr. Fox, member for St. John's East, in relation to this very important matter, I gave both petitions and Bill my utmost concurrence. At that time some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House thought fit to move that the measure be given the six months hoist, and, unfortunately, his motion was carried. Now I see no reason whatever why I should alter my opinion to-day. The ladies of Newfoundland do not ask for any special favour or any special privilege; but equal rights with men. Consequently, I am prepared to stand by the women in their fight for their just rights and I have but to say "God bless them in their work and I hope they will succeed." They have my heartiest support.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have to add a few words in regard to these petitions, and I want to say to the House and to the country at large that I am fully in accord with the petitions, as I would like to see the ladies given a right to vote. I understand from the remarks of the Attorney General that he is in sympathy with this movement. That being so I would suggest to him that a Bill be brought in and have an expression of opinion on it and decide whether women shall or shall not have the right to vote, then, if hon. members feel that they cannot pass that Bill, adopt the suggestion given by Mr. MacDonnell,—have a referendum. I do not think it is fair to have these ladies coming in here year after year with petitions and immediately

after have them thrown aside for another six months or so. I take it that they demand better treatment than that, and I repeat the suggestion that a Bill be brought in giving the matter a fair test. I do not intend to enlarge upon what my hon. friend, Mr. Higgins, has said, suffice it to say that the granting of women the right to vote is absolutely what other countries are doing, and I want to say again to the ladies, to this House and to the country generally that I am perfectly in accord with the movement and that I am prepared to support Women's Suffrage.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, before the motion for the petition is put, I might say that I did not have the advantage of listening to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Justice. Might I ask the Minister whether or not it is the intention of the Government or of any member of his party to bring in a Bill this year?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not know what the opinion of the Government is as a Government.

MR. FOX.—Is it your own personal intention to bring in a Bill?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No.

MR. FOX.—I regret that very much and I do not think that there was any necessity for presenting this petition. On merit there should not have been any necessity. It is merely prolonging the agony for these people who are demanding something that is not a favour, but merely a right entitling them to vote. For the present I will refer to what happened last year. There was no justification whatever for the position taken by the Government then, and the matter was not forced as it might have been for one reason and one reason only, namely, that it was promised privately, and, more or less, publicly—and I have an idea that the Minister of Justice is not without implication in the matter—that a Bill would be presented this

year. I think that the ladies who are behind this movement recognized that, if the Bill failed last year that it was certainly going to be presented and passed this year by this House. If that was the decision then why go back upon it? The arguments in favour of the measure need no comment from me. My hon. friend, Mr. Mac-Donnell, stated that he was not prepared to discuss the merits and demerits of the measure. Well in my opinion there is no need to discuss them. There is no reason why the women of Newfoundland should be kept from voting any more than the women all over the rest of the British Empire should be kept from voting. To-day all over the Empire, with a few exceptions I think, women are allowed to exercise the franchise and we are refusing them the right to do so. We are occupying that exceptional position of refusing this right. Australia, New Zealand, Canada and England, all have conceded that right. Last year the Government said that they would be in a position to deal with it this year. In other words, the Government was going to give it in one breath and in another they fall down under it. The matter is too serious to be trifled with, because trifled with is what is being done. I do not think that it requires any great courage on the part of the Government to decide whether they shall or shall not pass this measure this year. The measure was voted down by the Government, as a whole, last year; the only party that supported it was the Opposition, and I am sure that the Opposition, as a whole, would support a Bill if it was brought in this year. I understood and my impression was that the Government was sincere in their promise last year—because they certainly gave out the promise—that a Bill would be brought down this session. If the Bill had been passed last year there would be no necessity

for bringing in this petition this year. I do not think that that speaks well for the sincerity of the Government. It is a Government matter because it was turned down by a Government vote. I understood from the Minister of Justice last year that it was the intention to bring in a Bill this year. If I remember rightly, in conversation with the Minister of Justice, he put me under the impression that if the Bill did not get Government assent last year that he would support it this year, and I am sorry that he has seen well to change his mind. After looking around among the Government ranks, personally I thought that the Minister was sincere in this matter. In recognition of the war services performed by the women and looking at the matter from a more broader viewpoint, I do not think that we should withhold from them for one single day this concession that they ask for. From every viewpoint I think it will be found that they are entitled to vote; and if you look around in every section of the electorate at present, I do not think from the standpoint of experience or executive ability that women are in any apologetic position whatever. I think they can justly claim as much privileges as men in this dominion, because they have shown themselves equal to any situation that might arise in the national affairs of the country. I ask that the Government forget any party feeling in this matter and I ask that they justify the position that they took last year; because I see no earthly reason for a referendum. The attention of the electorate will never be concentrated on it; it will always assume a political guise. From the passage of the Reform Bill in England, I think it will be conceded on all sides that the Women's Suffrage Bill began a political reform in the world. We cannot blink it out of sight. It is coming and why not this

Government pass it and have done with it. It would have come last year with better grace, but it would be still better that a Bill be passed this year than to have it forced upon the Government later. I think it a shame that women should be treated with in this fashion and I regret that the matter should be discussed from a party viewpoint. Last year this matter was not alone treated disrespectfully in this House, but was treated contemptuously by certain parties would I could enumerate, but I would be delaying the House by doing so. I want to point out that, in looking at this matter from a broad and national viewpoint, instead of getting the women to give reasons why they should be given the right to vote, I think the Government should be put upon their defence and to show the reasons why they should not give it to them. That is the position. These people should not have to come here on bended knee as if begging a favour, they are not begging, it is their right they ask for, and you should have to show to these people an adequate reason why they should not get this right. I appeal to Mr. Warren, the Minister of Justice, and to the Government as a whole, to carry out the promises that they made to the women last year, and I ask each member of the Government to seriously reconsider the situation and try to bring a measure before this House to fulfil the promises that they made last year to the women of the country, to perform their duty as I regard it and give to the women the right they are demanding, it is not a favour they are asking but a right and the Government have no right to withhold it from them.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker. I trust Sir, that the statement made by Mr. Warren when he presented this petition this evening, to the effect that these petitions would be handed back to the ladies at their request, will be

the termination of this movement. The fact of having before us to-day a petition signed by seven thousand women of the country warrants this Legislature's taking careful and serious consideration of this very important question, and I rise for the purpose of endorsing the remarks made by my colleagues on this side of the House, and I think some steps should be taken towards bringing about a realisation of this petition. The women of Newfoundland stand second to none in the British Empire. In every other part of the Empire to-day Woman Suffrage is on the Statute Book. It has been in Canada for some years, since the early part of the War. As to experience in the working out of that enactment I have little knowledge, but I sympathise with the contentions put forward by Mr. Higgins of woman's power in the Home, and as he says the Home Land is the home of the common people and women should be given a chance to influence its government. This question is one that calls for great consideration, and of course while it would be impossible for any member to commit himself to support a measure that might have undesirable features it is the duty of the government to take some steps to perfect a measure that will meet the requirements of the petitioners. This country is peculiarly situated with a far flung coast line of hundreds of miles with many sparsely populated localities, because of its geographical make up and this measure would greatly effect its voting power, but surely this Legislature composed as it is of representatives for all parts of the country have enough intelligence to sit here and frame a measure that will be acceptable to the country and the women. I therefore wish to say that on general principles I give the petition my support, and trust that the time is not far distant when a Bill will be introduced to bring about the

desire of the ladies of Newfoundland and to put them on an equal footing with the men, their more favoured brethren, I regret that I have not with me a petition sent to me by some of the Electors of St. John's West. I didn't know these petitions were being presented this afternoon. This is the only one I have received or my colleagues either, and it was signed by twelve or fourteen people, but I understand that among the papers in the hands of the Minister of Justice are petitions from my constituents in St. John's West, and I will be glad to digest them, and see the movement as it affects my own constituents.

I regret that any political shadow has been introduced into this matter. The Minister of Justice introduced and presented this petition not as a representative of the Government, but as a representative of his own constituency and because he was asked to do so. Any member opposite would have done the same thing or any member on this side though we might not be able to do it with the same grace as he did, and when opportunity offers I shall present to the House the petition sent to me a few days ago, to which I have already referred. This is not a party measure and there is no party line or division. As to whether the government does or does not support the petition is a matter upon which I cannot express an opinion. With the general principle of it we all agree, and with Mr. Bennett I feel that the practical application of it may be satisfactorily worked.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr Speaker. I desire to confirm the observations which I made on this matter last year. The first point was brought out just now by Mr. Higgins. The principle of this may be right or wrong, and with him I agree that the principle is right. The second point is the application of a measure of that sort to Newfoundland, and with Mr. Bennett I agree it is a matter for careful

consideration in view of local conditions, and while I do not go as far as Mr. MacDonnell in his statement that a Referendum is necessary, nevertheless he is correct when he suggests the possibility of this Bill making a great change in the administration, re-distribution of seats, etc.

When I was in London last year I took up the matter with some ladies, Suffrage for women and its resulting conditions in England, and I consulted a London Barrister and got him to draft for me of the existing Legislation in that connection in England, also in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. It appeals to me as a proposition quite feasible, not only just and fair but quite feasible having regard to local conditions, that men and women in the matter of voting should be on an equal basis. Women have to bear their share of public taxation in an indirect sense, she has to bear her share of responsibility of the community not perhaps in the same way as a man but indirectly to an equal extent. She has to bear a greater share of Home responsibility than man and upon the home to a greater extent than even depends the life, morality, industry and success of the community. I feel therefore, that a measure giving women an opportunity to take her part in public affairs may be of major benefit to the community as a home. The principle I feel everyone concedes, and the working out I think can be made quite successful.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

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

amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series—entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if it is the intention of the government to purchase any more live stock, and if so, what appropriations will be set aside for this purpose.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of firms supplying oil to Lighthouses in this Dominion—also stating price paid for same.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if Mr. E. Collishaw has been commissioned or is to be commissioned by the government to visit Canada and the United States with a view to the disposal of stock of pit props cut during the past winter by various parties under the government's agreement or guarantee to pay for the same at the rate of six dollars per cord, and if so to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence between the government and Mr. Collishaw in relation to this matter.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if any amounts have been paid to any members of the staff of the Postal and Telegraphs in this city since the first of July last, and if so to state for what purposes, and to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the names of the officials who have received such extra compensation, and the amounts paid to them for the ten months from July the 1st, up to April 30th.

MR. VINICOMBE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving an estimate as exact as possible of the losses caused to the coopers and other workmen of this city

the past eighteen months through the crippling of the staple industry of this Country by the Fish Regulations which are now being repealed.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the quantity of codfish in the colony at the present time, according to the statistics kept by his department, specifying as closely as possible the quantities of the different grades for the different markets—(a) Greece, (b) Italy, (c) Spain, (d) Portugal, (e) Brazil, (f) West Indies, setting out specially the quantity of Labrador fish particularising the quantity remaining of the stock purchased on account of the government last fall, and if he can give any idea where and when and at what figure this Labrador fish is likely to be disposed of, or whether he is making any arrangements with the farmers in this country for the purchase of the same for fertilizer?

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what is the position of Mr. Samuel Bradbury in his department, when he was appointed, what salary he draws, and what qualifications he possesses for the work he is engaged to perform?

MR. SINNOTT asked the Minister of Public Works if Mr. Samuel Churchill, Deputy Superintendent of Public Works, is now absent from this Colony on any mission for the government if so, what is the nature of the same, and what allowance, if any, has been made him in connection with the same?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was the Minister of the Crown, who instructed the Deputy Minister of Finance to draw a cheque to obtain from the funds of the Colony the money to pay for the cargo of salt brought by the S.S. "Tuckahoe" to Port Union last year and why no Order-in-Council was obtained to author-

ise this payment being made. Also to state what protection if any, exists if this practice is to be permitted, to prevent a dishonest Minister from securing possession of the entire credit balance of the Colony and misapplying it for his own purposes, and if the government proposes to take any steps to amend the Audit Act, so as to prevent a repetition of this irregularity and possibly disastrous consequences to the country in the future?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs

- (a) What is the total amount of the temporary loan obtained by the government after the close of the last Session, from the Bank of Montreal?
- (b) How much if any, of this sum remains at the present time?
- (c) To table a statement showing all payments made out of this amount to date, to whom such payments were made and the purpose of such payment.
- (d) Will a further loan be required in the near future?
- (e) If so, when and to what amount?
- (f) Is it proposed to obtain such a loan from the Bank of Montreal in the form of a temporary advance, or is it intended to introduce a Loan Bill?
- (g) In the latter case why—has no attempt been made to put on the market the Loan authorized last session?
- (h) If conditions have been unfavorable for floating that Loan, what is the prospect of floating an additional loan now?
- (i) Is it the intention of the Government to attempt to obtain a Loan from the Imperial Authorities, and is it proposed to agree to a suspension of the Constitution of this Colony, in order to obtain the same, and if not, what steps does the government propose to

take to prevent the bankruptcy in the near future?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that there is a flagrant violation of the Prohibition Act at the present time, both in the city and in many outports, if it is a matter of common report that the principal parties associated with this movement are strong supporters of the present government, and claim to have assurances that no prosecutions will be initiated against them; if there is any warrant for this report, and if not, what steps does the Government propose to take to enforce the law? If the Prime Minister is aware that smuggling on a widespread scale is being practised on different parts of the coast, and if it is the intention to employ any of the government steamers now lying idle in this port at a heavy expense, in enforcing the Revenue and Liquor Laws?

MR. WALSH asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a detailed statement showing how many extra hands were employed by the Marine and Fisheries department, since November the 15th 1919, to date, giving names of each person employed, the amount of salary paid each, and the nature of their work.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an itemized account showing the cost for all repairs made to his Department since November the 15th, 1919, to date. Also the amount of furniture installed and cost of same.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a detailed statement showing all monies paid by his department to E. G. Stone, from July 15th, 1919 to date.

DR. JONES—Might I be permitted to say a word or so in connection with this matter of the epidemic in Placentia Bay. I had a conversation with Dr. Chishold and he told me that the people there are suffering from malnutrition and if they are not properly treat-

ed and promptly they will be put out of business for some months at least. This matter is of great urgency. Dr. Chisholm told me that he was going to approach the government on the matter. I ask that Dr. Chisholm's report be acted upon immediately because if it is not the people around that section may be put out of business permanently. It is essential to have them recover to have the proper foods immediately shipped to those points in question. No better man than Dr. Chisholm could handle the job.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—May I ask the Minister of Shipping where the Daisy is?

THE HON. MIN. OF SHIPPING.—She will be at Placentia to-morrow morning.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—The government appreciates very much the attitude taken by the Opposition in connection with this matter. Under the circumstances perhaps the House will permit me to relate the facts. I have to say that the department of public charities has for some time past been receiving reports from the various Relieving Officers and they have been instructed to investigate and handle the situation and it has been done with satisfaction. With respect to Placentia Bay the Relieving Officer is Mr. Leonard and he has got in touch with the department of Public Charities and both himself and the Commissioner of Charities and Magistrate Sullivan have been in communication and it was decided to send sufficient supplies of flour, tea, sugar and molasses to relieve the distress in that neighbourhood. A little while ago a report came in from various sections and Dr. Chisholm was ordered to attend to matter but up to three o'clock this afternoon the report had not been received from him. I have had the privilege of an interview with two prominent residents of that district in conjunction with Mr. Leonard who has come into town to get direct information from the De-

partment of Public Charities. He stated that a supply of potatoes is required and with a slight addition of other necessities they were quite sufficient. It was also decided that instead of the Poor Relief Officers handling the stuff it was thought advisable to have them dispensed through Mr. Leonard thru the Road Boards so that those receiving supplies would have a chance of working it out in the ordinary course. This has been tried in other constituencies and it worked satisfactorily so that those getting relief were not under compliment to the government. The suggestion as to getting reports from the various sections is an admirable one and very much appreciated. The reports we have been receiving have been very efficient and complete as the Relieving Officers in question are very experienced. Mr. Leonard has been doing the work for a very long time and gives the utmost satisfaction. I think the sum of seven thousand dollars has been sent the various sections covering quantities of flour, sugar, tea and molasses. I could not get the exact figures from the Relieving Officer but will have them by to-morrow at noon. Dr. Chisholm has not yet handed in his report, but he is to be sent back to look after the necessary cases. The suggestion that the patients be brought on to the hospital is not now necessary to be followed as the doctor will be able to look after them in their homes.

MR. FOX—Does not the honorable leader of the government think out it advisable that immediate relief be forwarded without waiting upon other developments in this matter?

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Relieving Officer has been in town and I had a conference with him in conjunction with Father Fyme and Magistrate Sullivan and it was decided that the Relieving Officer look into the matter.

MR. FOX—If the reports of the members for this district are as serious as

they purport to be the matter should be given attention right away, and I think the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition and Sir John Crosbie that the ship should be sent to-morrow morning should be acted upon. I understand from Dr. Jones that it is not so much the necessity for medical attendance as it is for food. If they are well fed there will be no need for medical attendance.

MR. SULLIVAN—I might say that with regard to the reports that they can not be overestimated.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I think it is a pity to overlook the opportunity of recalling the steamer. In fact food could be sent by train. There is more than one place to be reached and if you recall the steamer and place Mr. Dee in charge you cannot make any mistake.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—With reference to question one I have to say that it is not the intention of the government to purchase any more live stock and that there will be no appropriation for that purpose. I beg to lay upon the table of the House the reply to question two. As to question three I must say that Collishaw has not been commissioned nor has the matter been considered by the government at all. As to question four the answer is in state of preparation. As to question seven I will take a memo in accordance with Mr. Bennett's request to-morrow.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply to number five. As to question six the department is trying to secure the information and will furnish it as soon as possible. As to the ninth question the matter has been called to the attention of the Auditor General and he has been asked for a report. As for question ten, the total amount of the temporary loan obtained from the Bank of Montreal was one million and one half under last year's loan bill at five per annum. As to A. & B. one million and one quarter

went to the railway commission and one quarter of a million to the Surplus Trust account. As to D.E.F.G.H.I. it is the intention of the government to submit a loan bill during the present session. As to E. it is impossible for me at this moment to state the amount. Some time ago as to the floating of loan in London it was very satisfactory as to the price of the bonds but owing to the state of the Exchange it was not so satisfactory. The government has no intention to obtain loan from the Imperial Authorities, and I regret that a question of this sort should have been asked in this form as it will go abroad to our detriment. With reference to question eleven, I am not aware of any flagrant violations of the Prohibition Act either in the city or the outports, but as there may seem to be some semblance of truth in this matter I have asked the Inspector General to furnish me with a report. I have heard no report whatever that those connected with any violations if any are strong supporters of the government. I am not aware that smuggling is being practised, but as it suggests some truth I have asked the assistant collector of Customs to let me have a report on that matter.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—That part of the question dealing with smuggling you cannot answer. I guess you do not know that West of Cape Race there is no protection for the revenue service. You cannot make a statement with regard to what smuggling is going on. Perhaps you do not know that many vessels have a few months ago gone into St. Pierre and got all their supplies and there was no one from the Customs to look after our interests. Therefore you cannot answer that part of the question.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It will take some time to prepare the answers to questions 13 and 14. I have received a reply to question ten, on order paper of April 28th, I table the

original document and I will be glad that it is safeguarded.

I intended to go ahead with the third and fourth items on the Order Paper but as my honourable friend Sir John Crosbie has requested that they be deferred in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I consent but I would like permission tho' to say a few words with regard to fishery regulations. I feel sure that Sir John did not intend to leave the House under any misunderstanding with regard to the matter dealing with the removal of the fishery regulations to which he referred to yesterday and in that connection I think that in justice to him and in justice to myself I should inform the House of the actual facts. Sir John used words to the effect that in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the executive council has discredited the fishery programme and caused the removal of the fishery regulations. That is the statement that came from Sir John but I feel sure that he did not intend to leave any such impression on the House or elsewhere because the truth of the matter is entirely different. Shortly before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries left town the Codfish Exportation Board held under view certain changes with regard to the European markets. It is not true that the Governor in Council annulled any rules, promulgated any regulations modified or cancelled any scheme coming from the Board. Anything done by the Executive Government was done on the instruction of the Board. The day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries left town he sent a set of resolutions to the government showing how the board were contemplating certain changes. These changes were forwarded by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the Committee in Council that day and they were considered the same evening. But in view of the fact that those changes sent up by the Minister of Marine and Fisher-

ies were not signed by the secretary of the Board they could not be accepted and dealt with by the Executive Council. In other words until the decision of the Board was properly communicated to the Committee in Council it could not be considered. Because the Minister was leaving town by steamer that day he did not sign them and they were sent back to have the office formalities complied with. The members of the board then held a meeting and endorsed the change. It was not unanimously signed as the whole number of the members were not capable of being present owing to the fact that some of them were out of town. But when the record was properly completed and the decision properly brought before the Committee in Council then only did the matter come up for the consideration of the Committee. But I wish it to be understood that the decision was the decision of the exporters of fish. A meeting then was called for to take place in the Board of Trade Council Chamber under the presidency of the Governor and every one interested in the subject was invited to attend and voice his opinions. The records of the Board was communicated to that body of representative persons and Sir John Crosbie was not there as he was sitting outside the large Council with Mr. Collishaw and he said he did not intend to go in and at that meeting the communication of the Board was approved so that out the statement that the regulations were removed without the knowledge of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is entirely incorrect. I feel that this explanation will relieve any misapprehension which may have been the result of Sir John's statement which perhaps was made on the account of a lack of knowledge of the facts. Owing to the printers' strike it has been impossible to get that bill printed and the same thing applies to the other agenda. I hope to have the bill to-mor-

row so I move that the balance of the order paper be deferred to to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Sir J. C. Crosbie 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 5th.

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

MR. SAMSON.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Friday's Bay, asking for a sum of three hundred and fifty dollars for the purpose of repairing a wharf there; also I have a petition to present from the inhabitants of Little Bay, asking that the sum of two hundred dollars be allocated to repair the roads leading from Patrick's Cove to the Church of England Cemetery.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from St. Anthony East on the subject of a breakwater. I would ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it is related.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House replies to questions Nos. 6 and 7, of April 27th, asked by Sir Michael Cashin; and to question No. 11 of April 28th, asked by Sir John Crosbie.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of the Prime Minister, I wish to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bauline, requesting a special grant for the purpose of making a road suitable for motor trucks to go into Bauline. In supporting this petition, I would like to point out to the Minister of Public Works, into whose department this

petition will be committed, that it would be a most beneficial act if some arrangement was made to divert some of the road grant to that purpose.

Bauline is peculiarly situated. The telephone connection which was put there some time ago has proved of great service. Lying as it does down along the coast of the seashore it is impossible for anything like a motor truck to get within three-quarters of a mile of the stages. In Bauline we have some of the best fish killers on the shore. It is a settlement which through the industry of the fishermen is perhaps per capita one of the best in the district of St. John's East. Previously there the people had been bringing their fish to town by boat and they can only bring it in small loads, and the motor truck will prove there to be of as much benefit as it is to Pouch Cove, which settlement was in the same position a few years ago. It established a communication with town and is a great aid in getting supplies to the people there. I can vouch from personal knowledge of the place that the allocation of this small amount towards this road will have beneficial results. The Minister of Public Works will find out from Road Inspector Parsons if he wished that it will not take much for blasting operations. I support the petition and ask that it be given the consideration of the Government.

MR. VINICOMBE—I wish to support the petition presented by Mr. Higgins. I assure you that it is a petition which should receive due consideration. The difficulty of the fishermen there has been that because they could not get a motor truck there they have had to load their fish in quarter loads and bring it up here, thereby entailing a lot of extra labour and loss of time. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant this amount asked for in the petition.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Min-

ister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House all cablegrams, letters and other correspondence from the Trade Commissioner, Col. Bernard, in Italy, since taking up his position there, in order that the House and the Country may have an opportunity of learning the quarters from which this Country suffered competition in respect to its fisheries, the nature and extent of this competition and the ruinous consequences of the fishery policy altogether.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his attention has been called to a tabular statement published in the Daily News of March 21st, past, showing a comparative statement of the shipments of dry codfish to Brazil for the first three months in each of the past eleven years, and to ask him if he has any explanation to offer for the very marked reduction in the shipments from Newfoundland to that country for the first three months of the present year.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education (1) Why it is that the good things to come in Education, as promised last year are now, as they were then, merely under consideration by the Government; (2) Does he honestly believe that it is more desirable to continue the top-heavy educational administration, in these times of stress, than to use the money devoted to those salaries, for the purpose of carrying out some part of the promised educational programme of last year?

MR. MOORE asked the Minister of Public Works how much money has so far been spent on the laying of the new water service from Petty Harbor ponds to the Sanatorium and Lunatic Asylum, (a) for labour, (b) for pipes and how much more will be required to complete the undertaking, (c) for labor and (d) for pipes?

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Minis-

ter of Marine and Fisheries, in view of his statement yesterday, that all the Trade Commissioners now on service abroad are to be required to return here by June 30th, to lay on the Table a statement of all amounts paid in connection with this service from the appointment of the first of these Commissioners up to the 30th of April, and an estimate of the amount required to pay salaries, travelling and other expenses back to this Colony, and any other amounts required in connection therewith up to the 30th of June next, and also to say if it is intended to abandon all votes and terminate all expenditures in connection with this service after that date?

MR. SINNOTT asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if his attention has been called to an article reprinted by the Advocate last week from the "Boston Transcript" purporting to be an interview with Messrs. J. M. Devine and E. Collishaw while at Washington, in regard to our fisheries, and if the declarations attributed to them represent the views of the Government, especially in regard to the matter of Prohibition, inasmuch as they are quoted as authority for the view that the present Prohibition Act is to be repealed or modified in such a way that Newfoundland will become a resort where foreign tourists can obtain liquor in unlimited quantities and does the Prime Minister consider that to picture Newfoundland in this guise is calculated to redound to the credit of the country?

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement, showing to what extent the Colony is obligated by Statute to pay interest on the Capital Stock of Shipbuilding Companies in this country, the time when such obligation began in each case and the time when it will end, the amounts if any, paid towards such

guarantee of interest for the financial years, 1918, 1920 and what shipbuilding construction is in progress at the present time in the different concerns for which the Colony has assumed this obligation.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if any parties acting as agents of Insurance Companies in this Colony and required by law to deposit securities with his Department for the protection of those insured have been granted permission by himself or by the Government to withdraw any of these securities from the custody of his Department and if so why, and if in that event it is intended to require them to deposit any other securities for the protection of the insured, and if so to what extent.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, what is the cost to the Colony of the publication of the Annual Report of the Department, how many copies of the Report have been published, and what has been the cost of same, and to lay on the Table of the House the bill for the same, and to say, whether in view of the severe financial depression, at the present time, the publication of this Report could not have been abandoned without any serious drawbacks resulting.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what progress has been made by himself and the Municipal Council in the matter of obtaining a loan of \$150,000.00, which loan was refused by the Royal Bank, and if it is the intention of the Government to take any other steps to secure this money for the City.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what legal advisers were obtained by the Government to ask for it in the drafting of the contract with the Dominion and Nova

Scotia Steel Companies now before this House, and what payment was made to them, or is to be made to them for their services in that capacity.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what amounts were paid as mail subsidies during the Calendar Year 1920 to the following steamers: (a) "Portia," (b) "Prospero," (c) "Kyle," (d) "Meigle," (e) All other steamers engaged in the carriage of mails during that period, and to say the routes or services for which the sums, if any, were paid them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, whether any decision has yet been reached in the matter of operating a daily cross-country train service during this summer and autumn, and if so what is the decision, also if it is intended to operate such a service, when will it begin, what steamers will be employed on the Cabot Strait route and will the inauguration of such a service curtail the number of locomotives and rolling stock available for other purposes, and generally to set out the reasons influencing the Commission in this matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission if his attention has been drawn to a letter in the Evening Telegram of Monday last, signed W. L. Butler, and making very serious charges against the management of the railway system, whether he is aware that Mr. Butler is a certificated locomotive-engineer, of many years experience, whether he considers Mr. Butler's charges sufficiently well founded to order an enquiry into them,

and if not, why not and whether he will lay on the Table of the House a report from the Government Engineer, dealing with these accusations of Mr. Butler.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House, the cost of repairs to S.S. "Watchful," S.S. "Seneif," S.S. "Sebastopol," and the S.S. "Malakoff" in detail since their arrival in this country, and who did repairs, and if any contracts were made for said work and the cost of each ship in detail.

MR. MOORE gave Notice of Question.

MR. VINICOMBE gave Notice of Question.

MR. MACDONNELL gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave Notice of Question.

MR. BENNETT gave Notice of Question.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if anything has been done about the matter under discussion yesterday in connection with Placentia Bay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On yesterday Mr. Leonard the Relieving Officer, and the Rev. Fr. Fyde had an interview with me and arrangements were made under which Mr. Jerry Dee now at Placentia was telegraphed to look after the situation in co-operation with the Relieving Officer. Early this morning arrangements were made to send out five barrels of pork and one hundred and fifty on this morning's train. This morning I saw Dr. Campbell and asked him to get in touch with Lady Harris in connection with her nursing scheme and ask her if it were possible to get two nurses to go there to-morrow and look into the medical end of it. Just before lunch I received a letter from Mr. R. H. Devine forwarding some correspondence and intimating the supplies required, and I left instructions for

Mr. Mews to look after the matter during my absence. I feel that the situation is being dealt with in the best possible way.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—With reference to a question asked by Sir John Crosbie regarding the pedigree of cattle, I have just received a communication from the Secretary of the Agricultural Board, and I beg to table it. With respect to question of Sir Michael Cashin No. 8, Order Paper, April 27th, I beg to table information. With regard to question No. 3, Order Paper April 20th, Mr. MacDonnell, I might say, no authority was given Mr. Collishaw and he received no commission in that connection.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are fifty questions unanswered on Order Papers since the opening of the House as follows:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Owing to a delay in preparation of the figures in the Estimates, I will not be able to table them before Monday next.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I will get a reply to question No. 1 as soon as possible.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table reply to question No. 2.

DR. BARNES.—I would like to say that the matters referred in Mr. MacDonnell's question to have gone beyond the stage of being under the consideration of the Government, they are now under the consideration of the Department, and are receiving the best possible attention. With regard to the 2nd part of the question I may say that I think it is in the best interest of Education for those officials to take up their work and I hope they will do so.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—The information asked for in question 4, has been given Mr. Fox.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the information asked for in question 5.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have not seen the article referred to in question 6 but Mr. Devine and Mr. Collishaw have no authority to express the opinion of the Government on Prohibition or Tourist License.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table reply to question No. 7.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to question 8 I may say that Life Insurance Companies have to furnish securities, but the securities may be withdrawn if they can furnish other securities of a satisfactory nature to take their place.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have asked the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines to furnish me with the figures asked for in question 9.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Question 10 was answered a couple of days ago in reply to some observations of Mr. Bennett. The Royal Bank of Canada would not give the loan unless the Government could deal with the matter this year, and I pointed out that a loan bill for this three hundred and twenty thousand dollars and the hundred and fifty thousand will be brought in.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to say in reply to question 11 that no legal advisers were retained by the Government but the work was done by the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Summers, and Sjr William Lloyd. No amount has been paid to these gentlemen, and no bill has been received from them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Question 12 is one that will require some preparation and it will be available on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table reply to question 13 and 14.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—In reply to question 15 I may say that the information will be available on to-morrow.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I will furnish the information asked for by Mr. Moore. I was searching around this morning for a copy of the information I gave Mr. Fox but I couldn't find it.

MR. MOORE.—What I want to know is this. There was fifty-five thousand dollars voted and there is thirty-nine thousand spent. I do not know how far you have gone with this matter and I would like to know what it will cost to complete the job.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I will get the information.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V., Cap. 25, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. SAMSON took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask Mr. Coaker if it is his intention to abandon the export tax.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is the intention to reduce the amount.

MR. LEWIS.—I crave the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks on this Bill. We are very pleased to have this Bill come before the House, in as much as the abandonment of the Fish Regulations is a blessing in disguise to Newfoundland. A great deal has been said about these Regulations during the past year and more will have to be said in the years to come, and to my mind the years 1920 and 1921 will go down in the history of Newfoundland to be spoken of by the children in years to come. It was very interest-

ing to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago when addressing the House, make the statement that he still believed in the Regulations, and giving us his assurance that when the proper time arrives it will be his most earnest wish that the Fish Regulations would again come into force in Newfoundland but in a more restricted form, that is to say that notwithstanding that last year Mr. Coaker was monarch of all he surveyed in this country he is not satisfied, not satisfied with putting a large number of business to the mat, he won't be satisfied till he puts every one there and will not allow any man to dispose of his produce as he desires to. He took for his point the fact certain gentlemen in this town broke through the Regulations and went in quickly and sold their fish, against the best wishes of the Advisory Board, he was dissatisfied because he could not imprison these gentlemen or take from them all that they owned in this country, but if we have in this House in 1922 a Bill passed giving the Minister more power than he had last year, then I think it will be time to abolish this House altogether, because from what we can see to-day and what this country has experienced in having large number of vessels tied up in St. John's and a resulting loss of a considerable amount to the owners, the longshoremen, truckmen, etc., he did as much harm last year as it will take a considerable time to rectify. When we take the short shipments to Brazil, Mr. Coaker may tell us it is due to other reasons, but if it is why did it not happen before and why is it that the men from Halifax and Lunenburg are able to market their fish when we have ours tied up here waiting for something to turn up. Look at the loss to the coopers, longshoremen, truckmen and all the other men of the country. Then again go to Europe and the great drop

in prices. Of course a great deal has been said about the Consorzio in Italy, but why Italy kept up this combine and would not allow our fish to go there was because of the Fish Regulations and the Agent we sent there, Mr. Hawes. He was not allowed to sell fish under a certain price to the Italians. Spain was waiting for fish and when the Spaniard's saw that we could not get our fish into Italy they said to themselves we can get Newfoundland fish for a song. Our fish was dumped into Spain and sold there at ruinous prices to the merchants of this country, and what do we find to-day. Only three days ago Newfoundland was informed that the Consorzio has been abandoned, we have orders from Italy for fish at 65 shillings a quintal. Now if it pays to-day to sell fish at 65 shillings a quintal, it should have paid last fall to sell at seventy shillings, and I can say here with authority that one hundred and fifty thousand quintals would have been disposed of since last November at seventy shillings a quintal with a very decent profit to the shippers and our Labrador fish could have been disposed of but that did not suit Mr. Coaker. Now at some future date he wants to bring in a more stringent bill and have it passed and I have no doubt he will not have much trouble in passing it because the Government will support it. The Prime Minister in his remarks a few days ago approved of the Fish Regulations.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I approved of the policy of the Fish Regulations.

MR. LEWIS—The policy of the Regulations and the Regulations themselves when boiled down into the one pot are the same thing, and when we come back to the West Coast and see the mark the Regulations have left there we will have enough of them for all time to come. We can go to Con-

ception Bay and there find hundreds of quintals of fish in the stores unsaleable. In Spaniard's Bay there is one gentleman with two hundred quintals of Shore Fish prepared with the greatest care last year, No. 1 Fish worth one dollar more than the ordinary cure and what happened is that he has two hundred quintals of fish on his hands unsaleable, and you know Mr. Gosse that some of your own dealers still hold part of their fish in their stores in Spaniard's Bay.

MR. GOSSE—You are absolutely wrong there is no man in Spaniard's Bay with his fish on his hands.

MR. LEWIS—We shall see if I am wrong. Anyhow you cannot deny that there is ten thousand quintals of fish unsold in Conception Bay. This is unprecedented. If I remember rightly Mr. Coaker's Organ the Advocate advised the people last year not to be in a hurry to sell their fish, that this Spring shore fish would be at its highest and would demand ten or twelve dollars a quintal. If I am wrong about Spaniard's Bay I am sure I am not wrong about that. Mr. Coaker thought at the time I don't know whether he still thinks it, but I say here that it is a good thing to have the Fish Regulations done away with. I might tell Mr. Coaker that the Mercantile people of the country are watching this Bill, and that they will govern themselves accordingly, and if this Bill had not come in that we would have little or no supplies for the Fishery this year, but when it is passed they will come forward and supply for the Fishery which as you know is absolutely necessary for Newfoundland as she is to-day more or less pauperised.

We have here the members for Placentia and St. Mary's asking for Poor Relief for that district which is unprecedented since 1869, and then we have the assurance of Mr. Coaker that when the proper time comes he will introduce another Bill to enforce Fish Reg-

ulations. If he wants to bring about a worse state of conditions in this country than we have already let him do so. But I think that Mr. Coaker will be honest enough once this Bill passes into oblivion to let it stay there, he will not again bring in a Bill to enforce Fish Regulations in this country. Take Penny of Rameo, as an example of the Fish Regulations and that should be sufficient for us as a lesson against interfering with business men in this way. The Regulations have ruined him absolutely. Take Geo. Harris or the Marystown Trading Co., who have lost one half million dollars. The sent one cargo to Oporto which sold there at one dollar a quintal which cost them fifteen dollars a quintal. Other vessels could enter Oporto and have little delay in disposing of their fish, but Harris and Co. had to wait outside and finally had to leave their fish at New Harbor and let it go to Dun. It is not so much the loss to Harris and Co. that matters, because they can come out of it. These gentlemen even if they do go insolvent never go to the poor house, but it is the loss to the Fishermen of Placentia Bay that matters. That company has four hundred boats depending upon them for supplies this summer. Another branch of this firm in Change Islands is in the same position, and it is due to the Regulations, and I say that I am one on this side who is going to give this Bill before the House now my hearty support, and not take the attitude that the gentlemen opposite took to the Amendment brought in by the Opposition. They did not see their way clear to vote for that Amendment, but I am going to support this Bill to the limit, and I hope it is the last we shall see of a Fish Regulations Bill before this House unless times change very much and we might have our fish business nationalized.

I saw in this morning's News that Iceland steam trawlers were coming

ing to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago when addressing the House, make the statement that he still believed in the Regulations, and giving us his assurance that when the proper time arrives it will be his most earnest wish that the Fish Regulations would again come into force in Newfoundland but in a more restricted form, that is to say that notwithstanding that last year Mr. Coaker was monarch of all he surveyed in this country he is not satisfied, not satisfied with putting a large number of business to the mat, he won't be satisfied till he puts every one there and will not allow any man to dispose of his produce as he desires to. He took for his point the fact certain gentlemen in this town broke through the Regulations and went in quickly and sold their fish, against the best wishes of the Advisory Board, he was dissatisfied because he could not imprison these gentlemen or take from them all that they owned in this country, but if we have in this House in 1922 a Bill passed giving the Minister more power than he had last year, then I think it will be time to abolish this House altogether, because from what we can see to-day and what this country has experienced in having large number of vessels tied up in St. John's and a resulting loss of a considerable amount to the owners, the longshoremen, truckmen, etc., he did as much harm last year as it will take a considerable time to rectify. When we take the short shipments to Brazil, Mr. Coaker may tell us it is due to other reasons, but if it is why did it not happen before and why is it that the men from Halifax and Lunenburg are able to market their fish when we have ours tied up here waiting for something to turn up. Look at the loss to the coopers, longshoremen, truckmen and all the other men of the country. Then again go to Europe and the great drop

in prices. Of course a great deal has been said about the Consorzio in Italy, but why Italy kept up this combine and would not allow our fish to go there was because of the Fish Regulations and the Agent we sent there, Mr. Hawes. He was not allowed to sell fish under a certain price to the Italians. Spain was waiting for fish and when the Spaniard's saw that we could not get our fish into Italy they said to themselves we can get Newfoundland fish for a song. Our fish was dumped into Spain and sold there at ruinous prices to the merchants of this country, and what do we find to-day. Only three days ago Newfoundland was informed that the Consorzio has been abandoned, we have orders from Italy for fish at 65 shillings a quintal. Now if it pays to-day to sell fish at 65 shillings a quintal, it should have paid last fall to sell at seventy shillings, and I can say here with authority that one hundred and fifty thousand quintals would have been disposed of since last November at seventy shillings a quintal with a very decent profit to the shippers and our Labrador fish could have been disposed of but that did not suit Mr. Coaker. Now at some future date he wants to bring in a more stringent bill and have it passed and I have no doubt he will not have much trouble in passing it because the Government will support it. The Prime Minister in his remarks a few days ago approved of the Fish Regulations.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I approved of the policy of the Fish Regulations.

MR. LEWIS—The policy of the Regulations and the Regulations themselves when boiled down into the one pot are the same thing, and when we come back to the West Coast and see the mark the Regulations have left there we will have enough of them for all time to come. We can go to Con-

to Newfoundland using our banks. We have already fifty French Trawlers and now we will have fifty Iceland steam trawlers, and the people here who cannot afford steam trawlers will have to go out of business unless this government or the Canadian Government can come to some arrangement with the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. not to supply those trawlers with coal I would suggest to the Minister of Justice to consider this matter and if Sydney is left open to those people, and they are able to catch fish at our doors it is an opportune time for us to protect ourselves and see that there be some restriction put upon these trawlers in going to Sydney and getting coal. That is necessary if we are to be a fishing country and I don't see how we can be anything else. If we don't Newfoundland is going to fail and it looks to me as if she will fail in 1921.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker. After my speech of a few days ago I had not anticipated that I would have much further to say, but I find that I am forced again to more or less review the whole situation with regard to Fish Regulations and their effect on the country to-day. Last evening I asked the adjournment of the debate on this Bill feeling that I was not justified in going ahead with my speech when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not here. When I moved that this Bill should stand over I made the statement that I thought the Regulations were taken off shortly after Mr. Coaker left the country, and expressly against the wish of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I reiterate that statement in the presence of Mr. Coaker, and I would like to ask him if it is correct.

THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—You are right in a way.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Coaker says I am right and I agree with him that at that time if the Regulations had been kept on some good may have

been derived from them. Now I am going to call your attention to another matter that is on my mind. I did not intend to until I heard those voices in the gallery. The man who interrupted me here yesterday is one Robert Avery who with his son is employed by the Minister of Public Works. Now if this thing is going to continue, if it is the desire of the Prime Minister to have this, I hope he will let me know and we will accommodate him. If you Sir do not assert your position in this House and if the speakers on this side are going to be interrupted this House will have to adjourn for the afternoon I now serve notice on these chaps employed by the government to interrupt the speakers on this side. I state my case and I ask you Sir if there is any more of it to remove these gentlemen paid by the government to sit in the gallery. Now I ask the gentlemen who are supporters of the Opposition to give every man a fair chance. You have more right here than Robert Avery or his son who are paid officials of the government, and if I am forced to I will have this adjourned and this matter will be settled for once and all. I will not put up with any more interruptions. I think notice has been served fully and if it should occur again I have something interesting to read of a meeting which took place in the Star office. Amongst the twelve Apostles there was a Judas, and there was probably a Judas at that meeting also. Now Sir, I want to deal with the Fish Regulations and the Bill before this House. I have no soft soap for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have no soft soap for the Prime Minister nor for any man on the other side of the House. What I want to prove to the country is that the statement I made here twelve months ago is correct, and the Fish Regulations as the Bill was passed here last Session have brought this country to a state of absolute collapse. I do not care to go all over the West Coast again, and

it has been said in this House that the Opposition had no right to bring a man's private business into the House. I will now tell George Penny's story under his own signature, the story of the Edith Cavelle. I shall read a letter appearing in this evening's Telegram and it is the worst frightfulness I have yet heard of. It is the worst castigation your Ministry has got since you have got in power. If what Mr. Penny states is correct he stands to lose seventy thousand dollars owing to the regulations and not a blush appears on the face of any one, (reads letter). I have heard a great deal about the Edith Cavell's cargo before. I hear that Mr. Penny had been treated pretty bad but I never dreamt that it was really as I heard it. It is preposterous. I do not believe that Trotsky in Russia could attempt anything like this. This statement coming under the signature of Mr. Penny is the worst charge yet heard in this country. No wonder the residents of Rammea cannot get supplies and with their finger in their mouth are looking for some one to help them. All of this is entirely due to the regulations. Many firms have been put out of existence by what is known as government control and yet we are told that the regulations are correct. Because of the regulations many were forced into a hole and not allowed to sell their cargoes of fish with a good profit. Now I would like to come round to that famous place called Marystown. I heard one of the serious discussions yesterday on the conditions existing in Placentia Bay. I stated to the government that it was not possible to realize the condition of affairs existing there. Yesterday I said I was not going to lay the blame for everything on the government and the regulations, but I am of the opinion to-day that if the regulations had not been passed last year not one ounce of able bodied relief would be required to-day, and I will prove that in a few words. Take

the case of the West Coast schooners being loaded by Harris of the Marystown Trading Company and then sailing to Oporto but they were only allowed to enter the harbor of Leixoes and were kept there until the fish became dung and was then given to the Portuguese farmers to be used as fertilizer and then the Prime Minister tells us the regulations were good, but I do not think he was serious.

This Marystown Trading Company took hundreds of quintals of fish from the fishermen of Placentia Bay and promised to pay for it in January, February and March and the result is that the fishermen of that district are today owed for sixty thousand quintals of fish and instead of living on their own money they are receiving able bodied relief from the government. All due to the regulations. The government did not take our advice and numerous merchants have been driven to the wall as the result of their enforcement and of course the fishermen suffer even worse. They were so headstrong and determined to place the yoke of depression on the country that they ignored our advice. Let me now come round to Hermitage Bay, and the same conditions exist there and also in Fortune Bay. The people not paid for their fish. Let me cite one case of a man who sold his fish to the Marystown Trading Company, putting him in credit to the amount of thirteen hundred dollars and a few days ago he went to that Company, and asked for a barrel of flour and he was told he had to pay cash for it. And notwithstanding this big credit this man today is in the state of poverty all due to the fishery regulations. I understand that one man never received one dollar for thirty five hundred quintals of fish he sold. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that every statement I have made is correct. But this cargo of the General Bobs is only one of many and do you think we can sit still here in golden silence without expres-

sing our opinions on the matter. What effect had the regulations on St. John's? Why, go to the Municipal Council office and you will find coopers, mechanics and others looking for work. The coopers could not sell a drum in this city last year, and I have my store filled with them, because I had to help them out. Yet we are told the regulations are good. To-day the coopers will sell their drums for anything. Still we are told that it was a good thing that such a Bill as those authorising the regulations to enforce upon a free and independent people was the right thing to have done. Then I come to the district of Port de Grave which I have the honour to represent and the fishermen there have had to hold their fish and to-day they are receiving able bodied relief owing to the cursed regulations. I know of what I am talking. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will come to that district I will introduce him to the conditions existing there. Then when you find the result there owing to the fact that they could not sell their fish you will feel as I feel that the regulations were a serious mistake. I now want to take you on to Spaniard's Bay in the district of Harbour Grace. I have some information here in my possession which may be interesting to Mr. Gosse. This man asks me to store on my premises for the coming summer his fish which he has been unable to sell. And his name was one time mentioned as being a member of this House. He could get no one to buy his fish and he had a considerable quantity of it. Did you Mr. Gosse ask Moses Young to sell his fish to you? Go down to that place called Lower Island Cove and you will find the same thing. The people there are receiving able bodied relief. The relieving officer will easily prove it to you if you question my word. All again due to the fact that the people's fish could not be sold. If you Mr. Gosse tried to buy it, I say go over again and see if they will not sell

If they do not grant them pauper's relief. You ought not then be part and parcel to doing out the people's money in pauper's relief if they will not sell their fish. Conception Bay stands in the same position as Placentia Bay and down in Spaniard's Bay there are not twenty families not receiving able bodied relief. They did not have the pull with Mr. Coaker that is the trouble. I am speaking in a fair minded manner and I can truthfully say I never supported the regulations. I saw the trouble coming in the distance and I knew that it was utterly impossible to escape it. I told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries he was on the wrong road and he was in the hands of Philistines and he knows I was correct. White naped fish. The Minister knows that no one would take that kind of fish. The white naped Labrador was a farce. When the blackness of the fish was washed away and it had lost its originality not one could be persuaded it came from Newfoundland. I remember I was in Liverpool on the 18th of August last year I was brought down to a gentleman's fish store there and he said there were one hundred of fish brought over from Newfoundland, and I asked him where did the fish come from. And he said he did not like it as he could not sell it. The reason was the blackness had been washed off and the fish lost their originality. I shipped some of this fish across last year, and it was the only fish that did not come to the quality required and I was asked not to send any more of it. I do not know much about the shore white naped fish. I only saw out of thirty thousand quintals about thirty quintals of white naped shore fish. Nobody paid any attention to it. These are some of the things the fishermen of the North are complaining of. The fishermen sent down this kind of fish having been told they would get one dollar more for it than for any other kind but when they come to get paid for it they

found it was thrown in with the rest and they had all their trouble for nothing. The white napes are like the regulations a nuisance. Let me travel into Trinity Bay. But I must first refer to Bay de Verde. I am sorry the Minister of Shipping is not here now. In that district numerous men are receiving able bodied relief all because of the regulations. Those men down there who three years ago were well to do now have to hang their heads in shame. In Bay de Verde proper where the men are industrious and enterprising they cannot get supplies not even a barrel of flour. They cannot do anything as they have lost their all. The merchants down there cannot supply until some merchant here help them out. They cannot help themselves. Now we come to Bay de Verde. First there is Grate's Cove, which never received one dollar of poor relief until to-day when they are seeking all the relief they can get. Why? Because of the regulations. Then you come to Old Perlican where not one is ready for the fishery and they have no intention of prosecuting the voyage at all. Then we come to Caplin Cove where they are not going to supply at all. Only one man has been shipped down there. All the men of Lower Island Cove have gone to Port au Port to get work as there will be no fishery there as no supplies can be gotten. A few months back down on the North Shore all the fish was going to be bought because the votes were wanted but the promises were quickly forgotten. To-day although they have lots of fish to sell they are receiving able bodied relief. The men of that place were usually well to do as they came here and got plenty of work but now there is not enough for men of the city. All the same conditions prevail in Trinity Bay. All the men there with schooners and motor boats cannot get any supplies. There was not a country in

the world two years ago with the same population as Newfoundland that was in the same position. We stood unique and could face years of bad business. But one year of Fish Regulations took all we had, and more, and to-day the mercantile men are like the small outport business men—they are unable to do supplying and collapse is at our door. Let me take you now to Bonavista Bay which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows so well. He knows the state of chaos that exists and that the men of the North side of the Bay cannot come here to St. John's and obtain supplies. Relief is being given out at Wesleyville to an extent unknown for 20 years. At other points where the men have their boats, nets and everything else ready they cannot prosecute the fishery because they cannot get supplies. Why? Simply because the men who formerly conducted their own business and shipped their fish across, have met their Waterloo and have no money to carry on supplying as in the past. It is all due to the notorious regulations. I do not know much of Green Bay but I do know this, as I am absolutely cognizant of the fact, that the small merchant has met his Waterloo and can no more do supplying than the man in Bonavista Bay. He met it through the regulations, and the herring business no doubt helped somewhat, but the regulations were the greatest factor in taking his business out of his hands and putting it into those of men who know nothing about it. There is one thing I do not fear to express and it is this: I honestly believe that Mr. Coaker did it all, with the best of intentions. In my own mind I am sure he thought he could carry out the proposition. But when he saw that he was wrong he had a right to call the regulations off. If he was a big man he would have taken them off the first day of last

October and not be doing it to-day as it was written on the wall, it was a sign all over Water St. that if they were continued after Oct. 1st. there could be nothing but disaster. We have been told they would have worked if there had not been some people to oppose them. That is as untrue as it can be. The regulations were already doomed, they were dying from the day they were passed in this House as it was utterly impossible to beat one of the greatest things in the world—the law of supply and demand, which big men if they were such, should have seen. The Hon. Minister of Marine, Mr. Coaker, sees the weak spot in the regulations, he sees that it is impossible to carry them out, and he comes in here with the Bill to remove them from the Statutes. He has played the part of a man and I give him credit for doing that when he realized it was impossible to carry on. He had not the heart to say he believed in them as the Prime Minister said he did.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I believe in the regulations but the way they were operated was horrible.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—As chairman of the Advisory Board, Mr. Coaker, you should be ashamed to have operated them that way. I am glad Mr. Squires has been converted to my ideas.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not believe in the way the regulations were worked last year.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Alright—and if we have not agreed on anything in the session already, we do so now and can make our bows to each other.

But, Mr. Coaker, you have taken them off too late. You have removed the standardization, the inspectors and the commissioners and I trust you will now try to make up what we have lost. I appreciate your act in coming in here and admitting the flat failure by the Advisory Board during the last

12 months. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister a few questions, as this is one thing on which we agree as shown by his recent remarks. I never believed in Mr. Hawes and it was an unfortunate day when the Minister fell by the roadside with him. It was not unfortunate for me but it was for the country and him, as Mr. Hawes took the pound of flesh off him as he did off the others. If I had been on the Advisory Board I would not have allowed him to do it. Now, Sir, I say I cannot go gack on the broad principles that were bred in me and I want to state, in the House or out of it, that outright sales are the best and in my experience I have made it a rule that when I put up my goods I was paid for it.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You are a Coaker man now.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—No. I know I taught you that principle but you have not learned the lessons. You put the taxes on Portugal, Italy, Greece and New York but left Spain open for him to get the drop on you. If you had taken my lessons to heart you would never have allowed Mr. Hawes to do that but would have put Spain on the same list and made them pay the same as the others. I will tell you of one man from Trinity Bay whom I helped out of trouble with a cargo. He was in great difficulty but I went to the Court House with him and rather than see him go astray paid him \$58,000 and took the fish. We sent it across but the sale was cancelled. You, Sir, had also loaded a vessel in Trinity Bay.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It was loaded at Fogo.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Alright, Fogo will do. During the time it was on the way across, Hawes and I negotiated for the cargo. My vessel arrived one day before yours. Now this will show the result of greed. Hawes said

to me, "give me the cargo and I will get you a good price for it." I said that's very nice of you. He said, "I will give you \$2/6 for it outright but if you will let me sell it on consignment I will get you 95/--." I told him to take it outright and get the others on consignment. The result was that I got my hard money. No doubt Hawes himself told you the story. He probably put the same proposition to you and you fell for it as you were anxious to get a few dollars more. Of course I would not be so ambitious, simply because I was afraid I would not get it. The two cargoes went in and were sold. I sold outright and I tell you now that I got \$2/6 and you got 52/-- on your consignment.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You might have got it but he put it over on the others.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You were looking for the last stick in the ditch. I am heart and soul with you to-day in favoring outright sales as it is the only way in which we can handle our business.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I agree with you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—We want the brightest minds we have to fill the bill and the only way we can deal with the situation is by the brightest brains taking hold of the situation and showing no favors to any concerned. If none had been shown under the regulations the results would have been different. The trouble was with the Advisory Board, and if they had been as fair to the public as to themselves, and not so selfish, the disaster would not be so great. This statement can go out to them now. You, Mr. Minister of Marine, and I have got down to the same line of thought in some respects but how you were influenced to let Spain be an open market has been a mystery to me. You handled Oporto, Italy, Greece and Brazil under control and

the only reason I can see as to Spain is that Hawes demanded of the Advisory Board that it should be free and it was done.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The reason was that it was looked upon as a dumping ground for fish not saleable in the other markets as they had cold storage there.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—That is what it was alright. But even if they had cold storage there were we justified in leaving Spain out of control of the regulations.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I agree that it should have been under control.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—The men on the Board then were Mr. Hawes' best friends and he had everything his own way. The only thing I fear is that the same will be done in Greece where outright sales were made and that Hawes will upset the appercart there for every firm doing business with Labrador fish. And you, Mr. Minister, will be as much upset with your Trading Co., etc., as the others, by Hawes getting a hold on Greece.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I quite agree with you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—He has got a hold on Italy, a hold that none can understand, and he has an army of men employed to take charge of this country's fish, as you and I know. I always sold in Oporto cash against documents in London but to-day this cannot be done. This is due to the way in which the Advisory Board handled them so as to bring disaster on the country. Now you and I, Mr. Minister, agree that something should be done to help the country over this trying situation, to aid the fishermen, coopers, laborers and others who are out of employment and to keep the streets free of those who are walking around. This is a most delicate question. Am I right.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You are.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Now I want you, Mr. Minister, with the aid of the Government to devise some scheme to beat that crowd and when you are ready I am prepared to come in and cut the corners of it and string it out. I do not intend to prolong the discussion further this afternoon but I hope I have left some ideas in the mind of the Minister. He knows of the collapse which threaten us and as I told you just now he should try to devise some scheme to get us out of our troubles. If he will do something to tide us over our difficulties, to help his fellow countrymen in distress, I will do all I can to help him. I say that something must be done to save the fisheries of Newfoundland. I blame the Fish Regulations for the state of the country to-day and I know that I am right. I am trying to get something into your mind, Mr. Minister, as there is no one else in the Government who has the energy or understands the position enough to do anything, and I hope you will go to the Executive with something that they can take hold of. I am trying to give you something to lay before the Executive that will be beneficial to the country. I will not tell to the House how the situation can be remedied, as my brains would be stolen and the Advocate and Star would be out to-morrow saying this is what the Government is doing. Now, Mr. Minister, how do you propose to handle Hawes?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You have already told us; by outright sales.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But do you know how to do it without getting every business man in the country upset.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No, I do not.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But I do;

still I can't tell you here as the Star and Advocate would give the Government the credit.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It can't be published as they cannot get the papers out at present.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—No, they are up against a demand for a 44 hour week or they would be out. But I had no more to do with this situation, or the strike of 'Longshoremen than the Minister of Shipping who paid the men the Union rate of wages on the Portia.

The only reason the Minister agreed to pay what the 'Longshoremen wanted was because they were a larger body than the poor unfortunate printers. I have got away from the Fish Regulations, Mr. Chairman and I apologize. I still say that something has got to be done to save the Colony from absolute bankruptcy and what is more it has to be done through the medium of our main industry, the codfishery. It will take the brightest mind we have to-day to devise some scheme whereby we can do this and after that scheme has been thought out perhaps we can get the lawyers to draft something that will meet the situation. Prices for our fish must be in some way stabilized and supplies for the coming season must be got out and I would advise the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if there is a man in his Government or if there is a man in the country equal to the occasion, to get him. You must get together and discuss this thing in all its phases and then formulate some concrete plan which, however, must have as its basis the principle of outright sales for fish. That is the goal which you must keep before you; outright sales must be the crux of the entire situation, and as I opposed the Fish Regulations when they came before this House last year, just so strongly will I support anything that will have for its object the establish-

ing of outright sales now. How it is going to be done I do not know but done it must be if the Colony is to be saved. I want to say to the Hon. the Prime Minister that as he himself said, he took full responsibility for these Regulations which was perfectly right, but the time is now come when he and his brother executives must take matters more seriously and not alone be prepared to take their share of responsibility after the thing has been done but they must interest themselves in evolving something concrete to meet the demands of the time and I ask him this evening to get his Government together without loss of time and see that this is done.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I thought a few days ago when the Amendment was brought in by the Leader of the Opposition that it was a pity those who believed in the repeal of the Regulations did not vote for it, but I am not convinced that it was a good thing they did not do so because the consideration of the Bill since its introduction has brought forth many things of interest in connection with the question which we did not know before. I don't know if it has been the same with other members, but what has struck me most forcibly was the contradictory nature of the opinions expressed by members on both sides of the House irrespective of whether they were Government or Opposition. I said in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I thought when he took full responsibility for the Regulations as he did, and charged himself with seeing them worked out that he was very venturesome, and I think it will be admitted that when he stood up here in his place and admitted his failure to realize the aim he had in view, it was one of the finest things ever seen in this House. I understand that on that occasion that from the first the Regulations were looked

upon as but an artificial prop by means of which the markets could be sustained temporarily, and when he said that I thought that he was expressing the opinion of all the members on the other side, but when the Prime Minister said that in his opinion the Regulations were right—

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I said I believed the policy was right.

MR. MACDONNELL.—When the Prime Minister said that the policy, which the Minister of Fisheries described as an artificial prop, was a sound one, where are we? If I believed that the Regulations were right, then I should certainly not vote for their discontinuance because an accident prevented their proper and successful working out and when the Prime Minister takes such an attitude it is difficult to see the logic of his position; indeed most of us are left completely at sea. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to have the spectacle in this House of persons believing in one thing and voting for another.

It seems to be the concensus of opinion amongst those best qualified to judge that the best way to market our fish is according to the natural direction of supply and demand. If the Regulations were an artificial prop, as the Minister of Fisheries said they were, then how is it that Sir John Crosbie now suggests still other regulations to control the export of our fish and the Minister agrees with him? Are we to have more artificial props; are we to have further interference with the Colony's trade? I for one will want to be shown good reason for such legislation before I will support. I think, Sir, that we have had enough of artificial props in the past to do us for some time. I think, too, that the opinion of all right thinking men is that the Government, having got the fishermen in the hole and having ruined many business

houses, should now seriously set themselves to consider some means of getting them out of the difficulty but let them take care that in formulating regulations now to remedy the evils brought about by those of the past, they do not make matters still worse.

I did not intend, Mr. Chairman, to have anything to say on this matter until I heard still further regulations spoken of. It is the consensus of opinion amongst business men that it is not desirable there should be any further interference with trade in any way and that is why they are slow in supplying for the fishery this spring. They are waiting to see what this House is going to do and I do not think that anything of the kind should be considered for a moment. There was more than a hint in this House this afternoon that further regulations were likely to be considered but it should not be forgotten that the fight that was waged against those that we are now about to repeal was based on the contention that they were against free trade and that argument is just as strong to-day as it ever was. I voted for them last year after the Minister of Fisheries had agreed to put in a protective clause safeguarding the interests of my district, and Mr. Chairman, in this connection I want to say that I always found him willing to do anything in his power to enable the people of that District to carry on their trade with Canada and the United States without interference. I am glad to be in a position to be able to do that but on the other hand I am sorry to be in the position to have to ask as a favor that which is mine by right. I am clear and straight on this matter. I think there should be no more regulations of any sort and I will oppose any measure that may be brought in which will mean interference with free trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know nothing whatever of the marketing of fish but there are cer-

tain economic theories in which I believe and it is from these that I speak. There are men in this House to whom we can safely entrust the practical side of the question but as to the economical aspect of it I think it is only fair for any man to state his position and I am still of the opinion that any buyer who pays the price that is asked of him has a perfect right to sell where and how he can get the best returns for what he has to place on the market. If he is prevented from doing this, is it not reasonable for him to refuse to buy at all. Another point is that which has to do with the Italian market. Is it not correct that because of the Regulations and the friction which resulted therefrom between this country and the Consorzio, the best marketing time in that country was lost to us and that consequently 100,000 quintals of Labrador fish which would otherwise have gone into consumption was not disposed of? Was it not, therefore, the logical consequence that subsequent fish shipments that would ordinarily be destined for the Italian market began to become congested and the sale of practically 200,000 quintals lost? I hope the honorable minister will clear up that point. My sole idea in making these few remarks is to ask him to keep awake to the fact that Regulations again after our bitter experience of the past would be absolutely inexcusable. It was all very well for the Minister of Fisheries to come in here last year with Regulations and tell the House that he had given them close study and that he had estimated and felt convinced of the good results that would accrue from their enforcement. I have no doubt that he was serious in what he professed to believe, but what I cannot hold with him in is that he did not have them cancelled immediately it was seen that the result must be disastrous instead of beneficial. He

saw this not later than September and he should have abolished them then. This year, however, the position is an entirely different one and there is no explanation that any hon. member could give for again voting for Regulations, not the old Regulations but new ones under the same guise. While I support the Bill now before the House, I trust that the hon. minister will be content to allow trade to continue without further interference.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I just want to explain the difference that would exist between a policy such as Sir John Crosbie suggests and the Regulations which we are now about to repeal. In the case of the Regulations it is true that outright sales were insisted on but the price was also fixed below which no fish could be sold, but his idea is that outright sales be enforced, which simply means that no fish could go from here unless it was already sold, what the price received might be would make no difference. Why, if we send our vessels to Barbados for molasses we have to ask what the price will be and then before it is taken out of the vessel the money must be paid into the bank, but our fish goes there without any price being fixed on it and we are paid whatever the brokers like to give us, months after it is discharged, and for the past few months we have been receiving only \$1.18 for fish going there. It will thus be seen that there is all the difference in the world between outright sales only and the old Regulations. What caused the big trouble with the latter was that we fixed the price at which fish should sell in the different markets and there is a vast difference between that and insisting that the fish must be sold before it is allowed to go forward. We must have something to protect the industry, but of course if a man wants to sell at forty shillings or fifty shil-

lings, that is his business. What we tried to prevent by the Regulations was cutting prices but it proved impossible to do even that because the Regulations were in many cases ignored altogether. Now Sir, if we cannot be assured of getting good money for our fish, how can we go to the banks and ask them to make advances. That is what happened Harris and others who failed. They sold on consignment and being unable to realize on the fish that they had sent out, they were refused money by the banks. It was consignments that killed these people and it was consignments that built up Hawse's business in Spain and now enables him to extend his activities to Greece where he is now building big cold storage plants. He will say to five or six of his friends here "I will look after your fish and get you the best price obtainable" and they will send cargoes on consignment and therefore he will have nothing to do with outright sales. Greece is the best market we have for Labrador fish; Greece has been the salvation of the shipper of Labrador fish. I made \$30,000 on a cargo of fish sent to Greece, but of course I lost \$25,000 on another in a different market. Consignments mean that the trade has no foundation because there is no money guaranteed. If you know just what you are getting for your fish, there is a certain confidence that is otherwise absent, and if we cannot establish that confidence, we are lost. We must make sure that Hawse does not get his grip on our fish the coming season. He is now worth \$2,000,000, made off Newfoundland cargoes for the most part and that is not all, he sends a share of the profits back here to the men whom he let in on the ground floor, the men who are his particular friends and whose fish takes precedence over all the others. If I send a cargo of fish to be sold thru him,

mine is put in the store while other cargoes are immediately put into consumption and Mr. Hawes says you can take 90s. while others get 110s. the latter being for those particular friends. We know just what is going on and when you hear Sir John Crosbie and myself discussing these matters, you have men who know what they are talking about. I realize that if we were to introduce such a measure as that suggested, we would have the biggest men on Water Street getting together to oppose it just as they set out last year to smash the Regulations, but nevertheless, if we could enforce it we would be protecting at least three fourths of the business people of the country.

MR. MACDONNELL—Mr. Chairman, I thank the honorable minister for his explanation. That explanation has been fruitful in many ways, not the least notable of which is that it confirms, even though after such a long time, the suspicion that there was in reality such a thing as a ground floor in connection with the Regulations. Another thing to be considered is that if the salvation of the country lies in outright sales, and if conditions in Spain and Greece are as has been stated, how does this knowledge improve our situation; how are those large exporters going to avoid selling as Mr. Hawes says they must?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Hawes does not control the whole of these markets.

MR. MACDONNELL—But have you not a two-years contract with him?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Yes but I have given him notice of my intention to cancel it.

MR. MACDONNELL—Then a law permitting the cancellation of that agreement is to be brought in. Mr. Chairman, I think that bears out the stand we on this side of the House took last year, and the confirmation

comes from no less a person than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, that it is a dangerous precedent to place so much power in the hands of one man, whether he be Mr. Hawes or anyone else. I am glad the honourable Minister has seen the error of his ways and I trust that he will be as energetic now in opposing the schemes of Mr. Hawes as he was last year in lauding him for his virtues. We all know that Mr. Coaker was the main spring of the mechanism that worked our down-fall last year and as without that mainspring the mechanism is useless, let us hope that things will be different in the future and that immediate steps will be taken to ensure the interests of at least three fourths of the people of the country will be looked after.

MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he is strongly convinced of the efficiency of outright sales, but he should not forget that Mr. Hawes is a very powerful man in Spain. He controls all the cold storage plants there and if he gets up against us in that market we are likely to be confronted with difficulties not unlike those which we had to face in Italy the past year. From what I know, he controls practically all the purchases in Spain and now he is extending his activities and his influence to Greece and if he takes a firm stand against our fish he can make it very awkward for us in both these markets. Outright sales are all right but on the other hand if we antagonise the markets we are placing ourselves in a delicate position. It is true that Sir John Crosbie might have made outright sales, but all exporters cannot do the same. A grave mistake was made last year and if we again attempt to interfere with the export trade by legislation this year, another mistake might be made and one that may have equally as disastrous results. I thoroughly

agree with Mr. MacDonnell in the contention that we should have free trade. If a man is free to ask as he thinks fit and fails, then he has only himself to blame but if restrictions are placed upon him he cannot be blamed if he refuses to take the risk of what these restrictions may mean to his business. I trust that the hon. minister will consider well these circumstances before committing this House to any legislation enforcing a policy of outright sales and that he will bear in mind the fact that Mr. Hawes is a powerful factor in Spain, Italy and Portugal as he will likewise be in a very short time in Greece.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—

Just a word Mr. Chairman, with regard to Spain. About 300,000 quintals of fish goes there and of this amount Hawes handles some 200,000 quintals. The other larger importers are Lazo and Campos. The latter formerly took about 100,000 quintals of our fish, but when Hawes went there he took much of that business from Campos. During the last eighteen months, however, a great deal of it has come back. Before Mr. Hawes did much business in Spain, there were thirty or so importers there and most of these bought outright, paying thru London but now you can't get an offer on these terms. Norway which was in the past a strong competitor of ours in that market is now practically out of running. From information to hand it seems that the row between that country and Spain has ended in Norway's defeat and the Spaniard's have placed an additional 12 pesetas import tax on Norwegian fish which will mean their almost entire exclusion from the Spanish market. This means to us that we will now be able to sell our fish in Bilbao and Barcelona which formerly bought largely of the Norwegian product, and we should in future find it possible to

market an extra 200,000 quintals of fish in Spain.

Another thing I want to point out is that Spain is not the same as Italy. Hawes might be powerful there but so long as there are other importers he cannot control the whole market. Italy on the other hand could only be reached thru one man. I agree with Capt. Lewis that anything we may propose to do must be given serious consideration but in the meantime it must be borne in mind that the failure of the Regulations was attributable to one or two causes and that had we worked together for the common interest the outcome would have been very different.

The Opposition press did all in its power to defeat the object we had in view by encouraging those outside not to buy our fish and the foreign markets had their eyes open and acted accordingly. Regulations such as we had last year are not desirable again, but we can have regulations enforcing outright sales. I saw an account sales to-day of fish that went to Spain last year and for which the shipper received only three dollars a quintal. A good price was paid for it in the first instance, something like \$0 or 90 pesetas, but the expenses were so enormous that three dollars was all the man that owned it could get for it. It simply meant that the fellow to whom it was consigned actually took the fish. Now this kind of thing must not be allowed to continue and I see no other hope for it than to enforce outright sales unless we nationalise our fishery and cut politics out of the question altogether. In that way every man would get a good price for his fish and I believe that if the government controlled all exports, we would always come out with a very fair average. In my experience on exporting I have found that you will make a profit on fish shipped up to

December and meet a loss on that shipped after January. If we sent just sufficient quantities and no more that could be remedied.

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 amend the Pro-fiteering Act, 1920" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the income tax was being collected from clergymen and the Prime Minister promised to bring the matter before the Assessor and have the practice discontinued, but I find that forms and requests for payment are still being sent out to them.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am obliged to Sir Michael for making me aware of that fact and I shall have it attended to at once. It was the intention to bring in a Bill in the Budget stage to amend the Act in this respect.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE tabled correspondence between the government and the Commercial Cable Co.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I was quite serious when I told the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that he could collect fifty or sixty thousand dollars from this company, and I think that by this time it is nearer \$200,000. The Anglo American Company owes his department to-day at least \$160,000 or \$150,000. The proposition was twenty and two for all business in

and out of the colony. Surely if the Commercial Company can take care of two hemispheres they can take care of us. If you are going to allow them to come in here and pay only for landing the cable then you are not doing your duty. That is all they are paying for; they do not pay for the business they do. They lost their case last year and had to pay you \$180,000 and now they come in here and do business and you are not able to collect the tax from them.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—The leader of the Opposition has taken it upon himself to make certain hints with regard to this cable tax. My knowledge of the matter is this: One of the first things undertaken by the National Government on taking charge was to try and collect the Cable taxes. Sir M. P. Cashin thought that pressure should be brought to bear and thereupon it was determined that six months' notice be given them to pay up but there was not a written agreement by which we could force them to pay this amount of which Sir Michael speaks. He tried to do it himself and failed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—There was a letter. ..

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—If there is we cannot find it. If we could find that agreement we would have no trouble in collecting it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I bet I could collect it in forty-eight hours. It was brought to your notice last year that this money could be collected and you laughed at it and now you are trying to put the blame on me.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—You didn't know how to collect it yourself. You didn't know it was worth anything to us; you just continued on with the Anglo.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Did you know why we got no revenue. No, but we got it till the cable across the Gulf was dropped. Go on and give us the

information if you can. You can't, and you got none at all from the Anglo yet.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—(Reads article).

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Who wrote that?

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—It is the opinion of a man who knew what he was talking about. I do not know who it was.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—The man who wrote that was crazy, and I would not use it if I were you. Here you are, getting up and reading a thing like that and yet you don't even tell us who the author of it is.

MR. HIGGINS—I will tell you about the Anglo.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—Please allow me to proceed. The writer of that article was an operator. He says in one part of it here that his chief stood behind him.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Is it the Liquor Controller?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—He must have had a script.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—This is no laughing matter. It was the most colossal blunder to cut the connections with the Commercial Company.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You know nothing at all about it.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPH—You could not collect the tax—the 20 and 2 you have been talking about. You got notice verbally that the agreement would terminate in 1917, but you could not collect it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I couldn't, because it was not collectable.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—You made the greatest blunder in the history of any administration.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Sit down—you are foolish to read and depend on an article written by an irresponsible individual.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-

GRAPHS—You can get knowledge by talking to some understrapper of the Anglo who will tell you that you can do this and that. I am trying to show you where you made the big mistake and you are not big enough to admit it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You brought all this criticism on yourself. I will have you removed from this House if you do not get that \$80,000. A few days ago it was said that there were imbeciles in the House and now you are proving it by your conduct. You should have been arrested and kept out of the House if only for your own benefit. You know they refused to pay the tax. If they had not been compelled to pay, the Anglo would have refused and could have gone back over their accounts for years and demanded the return of what they had already paid. But we took the case to the Supreme Court and won. Then it was brought to the Privy Council where it was delayed a year and a half. You got back the tax and then the Anglo had to pay up. If the Commercial Co. had won that case you would have been deprived of all the taxes. We had to give 6 months' notice to the Commercial Co. to clear out. They did so and we grounded the cable at Port aux Basques and there it is to this day. The Anglo made us an offer of 20 and 2.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELE-GRAPHS—Have you anything in writing to show to that effect?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—No, but I got it down in my memory which is better and you can get the money if you will be humble enough to let me tell you how. Of if you like, Mr. Geo. W. Le-Mesurier can tell you. By your blundering you are depriving the colony of \$200,000 a year. You don't know what you are able to get or how to go about it and yet you get up here and read such an article as you did a few moments ago. I drew the attention of Mr. Coaker to this matter last year,

not in debate but in a social way after closing, and said some \$60,000 was still outstanding. He promised to look into it but evidently forgot it. You can make that contract yet if you know how.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I dare say that it could be done conditionally and I have no doubt but the Commercial Co. would agree if it would be beneficial to them. You, Sir M. P. Cashin failed to collect it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—It was not due till the end of the fiscal year.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—It was due 18 months, six months longer than the fiscal year. You say you couldn't collect the taxes; then why did you discontinue their business. You had to pounce on them and that is where the mistake was made. Mr. Saunders or whoever the local superintendent is may think you can make arrangements whereby you will get the 20 and 2 with the Anglo. If you can't do it with the Commercial but can with the Anglo I think it should be done.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I think I know something about this cable business and I regret that Hon. Mr. Halfyard should be the one to foul his own nest. As I take it Sir M. P. Cashin is only giving him advice in a friendly way, and I lied the way in which the Attorney General suggested that the matter not be discussed, he feeling it a nice thing to be told how to get \$80,000. There is no question as to the need of it to-day. The whole thing was done under the National Government who decided on their course and that was an arrangement with the Anglo. I know the amount is due us and can be collected. I myself, saw Sir Thos. Shaughnessy in Canada and Mr. Robinson was also sent and we all thought the only thing to do was to force the Commercial Co. But Mr. Stott, the superintendent, was afraid of theirs and did not favor it. I can tell the whole story from A to Z and I don't

think Mr. Halfyard, that you know anything at all about it.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPH—That is the trouble; the Postmaster General was not consulted.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You were in the government, you were a responsible minister, but you gave them a law unto themselves in providing a committee to deal with the matter. Why don't you go down and ask Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Lloyd about it; he will be able to tell you alright.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPH—He knows nothing of it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I'm sorry if he has lost his memory. I am also sorry for Mr. Halfyard. Sir M. P. Cashin only addressed him in a friendly way and he should take the advice as the Attorney-General suggested at the close of Sir Michael's remarks.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I wish to move the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker. The discussion for the last three quarters of an hour has been out of order.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 6th.

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

MR. LEGROW.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the Naval Reserve men with regard to Prize Money, and I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs and be given due consideration.

MR. WINSOR.—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants

of Squid Tickle asking for two hundred dollars to build a bridge, and two hundred and fifty dollars to repair a road. I also wish to present a petition from Happy Adventure asking for three hundred and fifty dollars for a road. I ask that these petitions be referred to the department to which they belong and that they receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. ABBOTT.—I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Winsor.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fleur de Lys asking for postal communication and a telegraph office. I support the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it belongs and that it receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. ABBOTT.—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's asking for the sum of five hundred dollars to build a road from Shalloway Cove to the Catholic Church, and another petition from Shalloway Cove asking for five hundred dollars to repair a road there. This petition is largely signed and I ask that it be given the consideration of the Government.

MR. WINSOR.—I wish to support the petition presented by Mr. Abbott.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN gave notice of question.

MR. HIGGINS gave notice of question.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I will get a reply to question No. 1 on the Order Paper to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The reply to question 2 will be prepared as quickly as possible.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have not seen the article in the Western Star and referred to in question 3 and the matter has not come before Minute of Council so far. I asked Dr.

Campbell about the matter and he has not seen the article in question.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I may say that no instructions have been issued with regard to Standardization, but it is understood that it is not enforced and shippers are now shipping fish in their own way.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—With regard to question 5 the reply has already been given in answer to another question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—There has been no answer to question about salt landed at Port Union, and we asked about the President Coaker's cargo and received no answer. I will allow this matter to stand over until Monday and then if they are not answered I will take other means to have them answered. We won't put up with evasive answers.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if in conformity with his pledge at the last session of the House that Captain Fenn, Captain English and Mr. Collins (Marconi Superintendent) would be appointed a commission in connection with aids to navigation, especially along the Southern Shore and vicinity of Cape Race, if these gentlemen were so appointed; if so, did they proceed with their investigation and make a report thereon, and if they did to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the said report, together with a statement of what action, if any, the Government proposes to take to give effect to their recommendation?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I would like to say that no report has been sent in. They had to investigate the conditions on the Southern Shore. Captain English was in charge of the Commission. The Commission was appointed last summer.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Have you any idea, Sir, when the Commission will send in a report. You will remember we talked this matter over when we were coming down on the Kyle, and saw the great necessity of something being done.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I don't know when they will send in a report.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a copy of all reports received from relieving officers in the various districts throughout the country from the first day of January to date; a report, if any, from the Commissioner of Public Charities on the same subject, and to say what, if any action the Government is taking or proposes to take for the relief of the people to prevent some of them from dying of starvation which seems now almost inevitable.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have had that question referred to the Commissioner of Public Charities, and will have an answer in a day or two.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House copy of the report made by Dr. Chisholm on his recent visit to Placentia Bay to investigate reports as to destitution in that area, and to state what action the Government has taken or proposes to take in regard thereto?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the report of Dr. Chisholm has not yet come to my desk. I have asked the Commissioner of Public Charities to see if a report has been made and to have it forwarded to me. With regard to the second part of the question, I might say that the "Daisy" has been held up at Placentia so as to take supplies which have been sent out by train.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister with reference to his statement yesterday in reply to a pre-

vious question that all the loan of one million and a half dollars obtained from the Bank of Montreal has been expended, how much money is owed at present on account of the railway undertakings to which this sum was applied, and if in addition to this amount now due the Government plans undertaking any commitments which will further increase this liability?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The amount of the loan was one million and a half. Of that amount one million and a quarter were placed to the credit of the Railroad Commission account, and the remaining quarter of a million was repaid to the Surplus Trust account. I have asked Mr. Hall, the Secretary of the Commission to let me have a statement of the expenditure. It will have to be a rough estimate, and it probably can be had by Monday.

MR. BENNETT—To ask Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if it is correct that the Commission owes the Reid Newfoundland Company at the present time the sum of one million dollars or thereabouts, and if not how much, and to give a statement of the main items making up the total whatever it is; also if the Commission owes business people in the city and elsewhere for supplies and otherwise, a sum of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or thereabouts, and if not how much, and to give a list of the principal sums making up this amount and what they represent; also to state what steps the Commission or the Government is taking to liquidate these obligations?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply, Mr. Speaker, I beg to state that the only amount the Commission owes the Reid Newfoundland Co. was paid here the other day. I know of no other amounts. Instructions have been given to hold over that amount of \$51,000.00.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—To ask the Hon. Min. of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) If A. H. Salter of the Royal Stores, is employed by the Department
- (2) What salary is he paid.
- (3) What are his duties.
- (4) What are his hours of employment?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has given me the answer to that question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V., Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Targett took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, before this bill passes through the committee stage I crave your indulgence, Sir, to make a few observations on the only important piece of legislation that the government has introduced so far. When one recalls the amount of attention given to this question by the whole business and fishing population of the country, and that the bill which was passed last year has created a revolution in the commercial and industrial life of Newfoundland it should receive the full consideration of this House, when the matter was put through this House, in spite of words of caution from this side of the House to go slowly on a measure of this kind the words fell on unheeding ears. If the harsard were referred to it would be found that I had the necessity of warning the Hon. Minister to go slowly on a measure that was revolutionary in character. There was not a member of this House at the time who realized the result of the passing of that bill. The government was full of rejoicing. There was a great blow-

ing of trumpets. It was a great jubilee, and as aftermath of that great measure we have to-day a bill with a single paragraph of one line and a half as a pin that will prick that bubble. This relates to the bill that was brought in here last year with great pomp. I do not charge the Hon. Minister with insincerity. I believe he was sincere. I believe he thought the bill would be for the best interests of the Colony. He was optimistic to a fault, but it was the greatest curse that has ever come upon this country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a dreamer. He dreamed a dream; but unlike the dreamer we read of in the Bible or hear of in our churches, his dream did not materialize. Joseph of old, dreamt that all his brethren made obeisance and bowed down in submission to him, and often they had sold him. He became a great power in the land of Egypt, and we read, that when famine overtook the land of his fathers, his brethren went down to the land of Egypt to procure food and provendor to keep them alive, and after much fear and misgivings owing to the peculiar treatment they received at the hands of the great Governor or Ruler (who was none other than their brother Joseph) they returned home with well filled sacks and each man's money was found in the mouth of his sack. How different is our experience with William our modern dresser. He dreamt alright that his brethren made obeisance to him; but when famine and want came over the land, he was found unprovided for and his people had to return to the land of their fathers with empty bags and bands. So much for the collapse of the Fish Regulation dream of the Hon. W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I will be pardoned if I make reference to a few remarks made by the Prime Minister the other day in his speech on the Address in Reply. He made a statement which if put under

the magnifying glass would be found to be absolutely empty, and hold out absolutely no encouragement to the people of the country. He did not rise to the importance of the position which he occupies. He would be expected to hold out something more tangible to a hungry people. If I am right he said he assumed all responsibility for the Fish Regulations. He assumed the same responsibility as the Minister who introduced the Bill last session. One cannot think of his doing otherwise, but there can be no doubt that the Prime Minister was grinding his own axe when he made that statement. He is very anxious to get in strong with the Union, knowing that that is his only chance when the time comes for him to again to appeal to the country.

It is a common report that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is very much exercised over the attitude of his colleagues in this instance and the Prime Minister has an axe to grind though on that occasion and it represents his feeling towards Mr. Coaker and his colleagues. His object was the consolidation of the factions on the other side and I understand he was very successful because the next day I heard that the honourable members pledged their allegiance to the Prime Minister. I remember Sir Robert Bond and Lord Morris had a difference in this house and Morris crossed over to this side and I remember Lord Morris bringing in on that occasions resolutions dealing with two or three crews of ships which met disaster at the sealing voyage. The crews were here walking around and they had no money or bread except what they received through the charity of the people of St. John's. Some of the members present will remember these crews sleeping at the Railway station, Mechanics Hall and other places. Morris came in as a member of the Opposition and moved a resolution that the government take immediate

steps to care for the men. But they were voted down. I got up in my place here altho I was on the government side of the House as the senior government representative of St. John's West and readily appreciated the stand taken by Sir Edward Morris and gave the Resolutions my hearty support. The government was fairly and honestly asked to do something for the men some of whom are to-day supporters of the Coaker representatives here, but they gave the resolutions a deaf ear, but thank God I was decent and independent enough to vote for them and while I am here I will never turn a deaf ear to an appeal made on behalf of the fishermen or sealers or any men of this country when they are in distress. I was then told to get out of the party and so I did, but I was back on that side of the House before the others knew where they were to. On the following election those men were turned out. I was told by Bond on that occasion that my attitude was unexpected and I said in reply that the members of his party had very poor faith in themselves when they had to make an open confession that they were loyal, and that when I was loyal I did not have to confess it. I voted according to my conscience. But to return to the Prime Minister. Having espoused the mantel thrown off by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and seeing that the government factions were crumbling he tried to cement them together, and has evidently succeeded. I very much appreciate the way in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries confessed before the House that the Act covering the exportation of codfish was a failure and that he was going to introduce an act to repeal it. It takes a strong man to make such an admission he has made a life study of this work and he has failed and he is big enough to confess he has made a big mistake. I regret

to learn that the honorable Minister is not in good health and it is possible had no such an event happened his activities may have circumscribed more than they did. He was unable to grapple with his many duties owing to his falling health. The Prime Minister has very cleverly accomplished his object. He said he was in favour of the regulations and said they were the only redemption for the country, and yet a bill is brought in to wipe them off the Statute Book for ever. Inconsistency personified. He did not take that position for any other reason than for political expediency. His conscience played no part whatever. On that day he was a little astray in his figures and he was prompted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He was talking about the five hundred thousand dollars appropriation for the buying of fish and he being prompted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said the Norwegian government appropriated thirty millions for the same purpose. I am prepared to accept that statement because the loan was based on a well defined policy and the whole of Norway benefited. The matter was given serious consideration and there was an ample justification. That was a matter subscribed to by the whole people because it was a national matter benefitting every one and no one in particular. With regard to our appropriation of five hundred thousand only certain sections of the country got the benefit on account of the discriminate conduct of those in charge. Any one with any spar of honour and honesty with him must necessarily proclaim against such conduct. If the proper measure had been introduced a measure that would not help one man while another would be starving it would have received the support I am sure of every man on this side, if the contingency warranted it. But when a measure such as this one helping one section of the country while the other section

was let starve, I say how can you justify yourselves in so doing. What was done in Norway was done in a proper manner, while it was done in an improper manner here in Newfoundland. The case is altogether different. The Prime Minister also talked about his visit to Italy. I feel he ought to have had on his return material for an excellent address to this House on the subject of our fish markets. But I am sorry we were very much disappointed. I remember when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries returned here after one of his visits abroad he gave us an enlightening speech on the handling of our fish products on the other side, and I learned more about the subject then than I have on all other occasions put together. The Prime Minister has had the same opportunity, but he did not avail of it. He did not tell us about the Consorzio and what we should do in the matter. His speech was mere bunkum and nothing else. He had an opportunity to make himself acquainted with the problems which unfortunately had a very far reaching and detrimental effect on the people of Newfoundland, but the people have got little information from the Prime Minister about the matter. In his speech he talked about the exchange being a big factor in the matter but he merely blinded the issue. Exchange had nothing to do with it. Our fish was sold on sterling exchange. His speech resembled a drowning man grasping at a straw. Merchants here could have sold their fish to people in the United States and made two dollars in addition to the other profit on account of the exchange and surely that was in our favour. When you got an offer from Montreal to buy ten thousand quintals of fish the exchange had nothing to do with that and not owing in the least to the exchange there is now a tremendous quantity of fish here in St. John's which should have been eat-

en long ago. The Prime Minister also referred in his speech to bust shops. I can tell him there are no bust shops over here. As far as I know the members of this side have not in either thought, word or deed endeavoured to break the government. The time is not ripe for such an event. You shall have to sizzle a little longer. And when the remedy comes it will come from the people of this country. You have returned from the electorate after making your promises and regretfully you have notoriously failed in your attempt to fulfill them, and you are not attractive company for anybody of men. I do not think the gentlemen on this side would be well advised if they wished to be in the position of the gentlemen of the other side. What Newfoundland is going to do will shortly come from the people and I say that she cannot go on like this for much longer. Never in the history of the country has the present condition been paralleled. We have one man representing four ministries. The Prime Minister is head of the departments of the Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary, of the Agriculture and Mines and of the Finance and Customs. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries represents his department, he is Chairman of the Railway Commission, he is President of the F. P. U. and many other companies. It is not possible for a human to fulfill all those jobs at the same time. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has broken down and I warn the Prime Minister to safeguard his health above all things. In the Speech from the Throne we were told that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will be going to London in June, the latter to attend to the Labrador Boundary case, and the Premier the Imperial Conference. Who is then going to look after the country in their absence as Mr. Coaker is ill. Now that is the situation the country has to face for the coming year. Mr. Higgins said the other day

the women would run the government better than you are running it and he was right. Then the other day you were going to have a secret session. For what? There has been enough of secrecy. What ever the Opposition does it is done in the light of day and we are prepared to assist the government if their programme is beneficial to the country. But it is essential to have a strong man in charge of the country's affairs, a man of experience and in whom the people will have confidence. Not alone is bread lacking at present, but confidence is lacking. It is imperative to maintain our country along proper lines and then our homes are all right. The banks have no confidence in the merchant and vice versa and the same applies between the fishermen and the merchants. A man is as much responsible to his country as he is to his children, because his country is his home. I believe our country can be brought back as a Newfoundlander I want my country to remain with and then pass to my children. What Newfoundlander does not? When one is away he wants to return to see the old rocks out of sentiment for our homeland. Do you not remember when Sir Chas. Fox Bennett and his followers defeated the Confederates. But I hope things will not go as far as that. But if we do find ourselves beyond recall let us put our house in order, wash our faces clean and act as an independent and upright people and not a bankrupt race. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that still there is one quarter of a million quintals of fish unmarketed. What a great benefit it would be that amount of value in money was in circulation here now. It would help our merchants along, and tide them over the present difficulties. The merchants find it difficult to get advances from the Banks, but some are prepared to advance supplies to a limited extent. We all belong to a common bro-

therhood and we must sink our differences and pull together for the common good. I now understand that some nineteen thousand quintals of fish have to be placed in cold storage as no sale can be found. Seven thousand and five hundred quintals are to be stored on the other side. But I would like you have some expert examine this fish before it is stored. The storage is going to cost two dollars per quintal at least, and when you sell it I do hope you will receive twelve dollars per quintal for it. But you ought to make sure first that it is prime number one fish because it is better to use it as fertiliser than have it completely lost in the end when it will have cost two dollars per quintal for storage. But I think the Minister of Marine will do the right thing because I know him probably longer than any other man on the other side. We were religiously brought up together under Archdeacon Botwood and he made a fine job of him if not of me. I sat with him in the executive council of the national government, and I want to say I found him a reasonable man. Of course he was then sitting with such men as Cashin and Crosbie and others. He was well looked after, and if he had the same associates to-day this blunder would never have occurred. On your shoulders nowever, the responsibility lies and on those of the Prime Minister as he has assumed the mantle which the Minister has thrown off. I know it is desirable to have some regulations as to the quantities of fish to go to the markets so that too much will not go to any one market at one time, and thereby avoid any glutting such as happened in the past. But no man should be interfered with in the carrying of his legitimate trade. When you say to a man how he has to sell and when, and that he must not sell, to so and so, you are doing a very wrong thing. The death knell has been sounded when you interfered

with the law of supply and demand. Of course at times there are trusts to be defeated, trusts who hoard stocks and then try and exact from the public unwarrantable prices. As you know there has been disastrous results in the United States from the operations of big monopolies. Professor Robinson who is an expert on cold storage and agriculture said that he was sorry he introduced cold storage because it was a curse in as much as it interfered with legitimate trade. So through the medium trust it has been found hundreds of thousands of carcasses of beef, mutton, pork and meats of all kinds and eggs with various other foods kept in cold storage till the prices were forced high and then the public were fleeced, showing cold storage as not an unmixed blessing. I have much pleasure therefore in voting for this Bill because it closes a chapter which has caused this country more financial losses more lack of employment, and more hungry men and women than this country has ever before known. All due to the unlawful interference with trade. Many are the men who at all times earned sufficient to keep their families in comfort who are to-day walking the street with nothing to do, and on the verge of poverty and want. They have not got the wherewithal to get the necessaries of life and with the limiting of the regulations I hope work will come and the depression existing will be considerably lessened. We must save our country. We have to realise that we represent a common country whether you sit on this side of the House or on that side and Newfoundland's future interests should receive our first and undivided consideration.

MR. WALSH—After listening this afternoon and yesterday to the two magnificent addresses of my two honourable friends, Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett, I presume it will be easily appreciated by you how difficult it is for me to discuss this subject after

these two gentlemen have so exhaustively dealt with it. However, I would like to add my little wreath to the coffin enclosing those regulations which are gone for ever more. Usually there is a tinge of sadness in attending a funeral, but in this case we feel glad to be able to do so, and I am sure every member of this House is glad that this ceremony is now almost completed in that the last part of the regulations are confined to Mother Earth. And I might say here that I am glad that my suspicions of yesterday were unfounded when I thought I smelt a rat when a suggestion was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to introduce another act to unlawfully interfere with legitimate trade. I did not hear or catch owing to my defective hearing the reply of the Minister to the main question asked by Sir John Crosbie, but upon enquiry I was told by one of my colleagues that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not desire to introduce any such legislation, and I am sorry, very sorry that the Minister did not earlier discover the disaster that was sure to come in the wake of those cursed regulations. I have been before accused of making a dead set on certain individuals in this House when debating, but I want to say here that I am addressing the Minister in his official capacity as Minister of Marine and Fisheries as I have always addressed him, and I cannot lose this opportunity of again reminding the Minister that he is responsible for those regulations, and if they had been removed months ago when he was advised accordingly this awful calamity would have been diverted, and the country saved from ruin which those regulations have brought upon it unnecessarily. And the most regrettable feature of those regulations is that various parts of the country suffered more than they should because they were not carried out indiscriminately as is evidenced by the letter read yes-

terday by Sir John Crosbie which was written in the Evening Telegram by Mr. Penny of Ramea. The people on the South West and West coasts were robbed right and left by the government, and I think if Mr. Penny had published that letter last autumn I believe sufficient hostility would have shown against the Regulations, that the people would combine in a big crowd and march down to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and make it impossible for him to carry on those regulations, another hour when such good and enterprising business men such as George Penny who is one of the biggest exporters of fish on the South West Coast, were practically ruined for life after years of industry. Mr. Penny sold a cargo of fish in July last which should have netted sixty thousand dollars under ordinary conditions or rather he tried to sell this cargo but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied to his application saying that he could not sell and later one of the Advisory Board, Mr. Barr, asked Penny to sell the fish to him for fifty four thousand, and he did and to-day that gentleman cannot pay fifty-four cents, let alone say fifty four thousand and the result is that Mr. Penny is ruined for the remainder of his days. Now that is what happened the good old firm of Penny. but the same happened to Moulton, Buffett, Harris and Inkpen and others all belonging to the South West Coast, but in other parts of the Island the same treatment was not meted out, and the reason is already known. But there are other parts of the Island besides the South West coast which also suffered to the same deplorable degree. Now it is not my intention to labour this question very far. I have already had a word or two with regard to this matter, but as this subject is of such vast importance I think I cannot let this opportunity pass without availing myself of it to say a word or two further. Now it is common know-

ledge that on account of the peculiar conditions existing on the South Coast that the people there have been dependent on the American markets and it is common knowledge that American firms sent down three or four hundred thousand dollars to purchase fish from us, and it is also common knowledge that the people of Placentia and St. Mary's Bay are dependent upon American markets yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his associates saw fit to issue an ultimatum to those American Fish Firms, so that they were not allowed to ship their fish with the result that the large sum of three or four hundred thousand dollars was sent back to America to the American banks and it is doubtful if it will ever return here and this is another instance of the scandalous way in which those regulations were carried out. They were so carried out that those in charge tried and accomplished the construction of monopolies and you all know without competition the people cannot get good prices for their products. There is one part of the remarks of Mr. Bennett's that I have to disagree with and that is his reference to cold storage in that it was a curse. I would agree with him if he had said that cold storage was a curse to any other country but our own as we are so peculiarly situated, especially on the South West Coast where it is impossible to get the required weather to make the class of fish put up down there for the different markets and just west of us we have one hundred and twenty million people starving for fresh fish. No cold storage is good for all of us any way. I would like to see some capitalists but not the government who have hundreds of millions of dollars ready to invest to get busy, and invest them in the erection of cold storage plants and supply those people.

May I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whom I know do know quite

a bit about the fishing industry of the country and whom I know, having discovered that he made a fatal blunder in connection with the fishery regulations, will display his activities in some other directions to try and make good—that before he vacates the department that he now occupies that he would get busy and try and interest some outside capitalists to come in and view for themselves the conditions and possibilities here with regard to the erection of cold storage plants. I want once more, and I hope for the last time, to enter my strongest protest against the manipulation of that half million dollars. That is, in my opinion, one of the most serious blunders and one of the most criminal actions that was ever committed by any administration, and why I protest against it so vigorously is because of the fact that on the South West Coast and in Placentia and St. Mary's Bays there are at this very moment thousands of quintals of fish lying in the stores and stages of the people and those very same people have to be stigmatized because of the unfortunate position that they find themselves in to-day in not being able to buy food. This is the reason that I want to again protest against this action of Mr. Coaker and his associates. During the past week in this House members got up debating the wretched conditions that existed in Placentia and St. Mary's Bays and other places. These conditions would not have existed if the legitimate trade of the people had not been interfered with by the present Government who brought these conditions about, and if those people had got what was their rights such conditions would not exist to-day. Equal rights to all is what the members for Bonavista and other northern districts proclaim and represent, but if that principle had been carried out the men of Placentia and St. Mary's

Bays would have had a chance to dispose of some of their fish, and, if they got that chance, perhaps, members would not have to get up in this House and appeal to the Leader of the Government and his associates to send out to Placentia or any other Bay, poor relief and whilst referring to that matter I want to avail of this opportunity to extend my thanks to the Leader of the Government for his courtesy to my colleagues and myself and also to thank him on behalf of those unfortunate suffering people for the way in which he treated the recommendations that were given him with regard to this matter. And may I suggest, with your permission, Sir, from my place in this House, that Mr. Dee, who I understand is the gentleman who is gone on that steamer with relief and medical assistance to the people of the Western Shore, be instructed to call at the other sections of Placentia Bay where the conditions of the people are very gloomy. The people around Sound Island and vicinity and up around Baine Harbour the circumstances of the people are poor indeed. On behalf of my colleagues, I ask the Prime Minister to consider this request and I hope that he will give serious thought to the matter. Perhaps the most important matter affecting the fishery at the present time is lack of supplies. There are people in Placentia Bay, especially on the West Coast, who are solely depending on the Marystown Trading Company for supplies, which is now practically gone out of business. The Marystown Trading Company grew up with those people. A great number of those people formerly came to St. John's and got their supplies from the city and went to the Marystown Trading Company at Marystown and it was because of the good treatment that they received from Mr. Harris and his associates, they finally withdrew from St. John's and dealt solely

at Marystown. Now those fishermen are in the unfortunate position that as the Marystown Trading Company have closed their doors, they are not able to get the necessary articles they require to prosecute the fishery. The same happens in another part of Placentia Bay where the firm of Thomas Wakely & Sons did a large business at Hr. Buffett and Haystack. Owing to the unfortunate loss they sustained last year, they find that they are not able to supply this year. Kemp at Placentia is in a similar position. At the present moment there is, at least, from my district in this city 100 men seeking supplies and cannot get one dollar's worth. Since this House opened this afternoon my colleagues and myself have been called out on two or three occasions to interview men who came here from various parts of my district. They told us that they had travelled from one end of Water Street to the other and could not get any supplies. Now this is a serious condition of affairs. While ready and willing to thank the Government and the Prime Minister for the way in which they treated our constituents in the matter of relief, I would like to point out that this kind of thing cannot go on. It is a drag on the revenue and the people who receive it do not want it if they can get work and the work they want is what they are best used to—at the fishery. Grand Falls is overcrowded with men and Limeville on the West Coast and all other individual centres is overcrowded and, as long as Newfoundland is Newfoundland, it is just as well for us to make up our minds once and for always that the codfishery of the Colony is going to remain the staple industry. Therefore, it behooves the Government and it is the bounden duty of the Opposition to try and devise some scheme whereby those people will be able to go to work. If those men are deprived from

prosecuting the fishery this year, where is the money going to come from to pay my sessional pay for next session, Mr. Speaker, and your sessional pay and the Ministerial salaries and all the other salaries of the Civil Service. The only possible hope that I see, and I think it will be agreed to by individual members generally in this House, to bring about a solution of the serious problem facing us in regard to supplies for the fishery, is by having a secret session, although my Hon. friend, Mr. Bennett, did not take kindly to that idea. When I suggested a meeting of that nature a few days ago in this House I did not mean a secret session in this House of Assembly. What I meant was for both sides to meet anywhere outside this House—Kelligrews, Topsail or anywhere you might name—and discuss the matter in a friendly way. It would be almost impossible for both sides to meet here where the chairs and desks are charged and surcharged, because a man may get up and make a friendly remark and something may prick him and the whole thing may end in a fight before very long. But I say that conditions are getting so serious in all the districts that something ought to be done quickly. It is now nearly the middle of May; formerly boats operating on the Cape St. Mary's grounds would have two or three trips made by the middle of May. As I said at the beginning, I had no intention of making any lengthy remarks, as I thought the ground was so well covered by previous speakers and as I understand that the Leader of the Opposition and other members on this side of the House are going to have a word or two to say; but before taking my seat I want to make one more appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as he is the most conversant with the matter of fishery supplies and I would ask him to try and get the Government and Opposition

together on this matter, if he feels it is wise to do so, but I wish to assure him personally that any suggestion that he has to make or any suggestion that the Government has to make in the direction mentioned will have my strongest support. I might say that I have discussed the matter at a meeting of the Opposition and I found that it is the desire of every one of them to come to the rescue to try and devise some means so as our fishermen can prosecute the fishery the coming season. Do not leave it for another week or even another day, but act this afternoon. I believe that, if the government and the Opposition went into this thing wholeheartedly and honestly, each bearing its proportion part of the responsibility and without any desire of blaming in particular, that some good would be done for those much deserving people whom I have so often referred to.

MR. VINNICOMBE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Bill before the House, but I must say that my support is not whole-hearted. If the members on the government side had to be manly enough to vote for the amendment that was brought in a few days ago when the fish regulations were under discussion, there would be no necessity for this bill. The government side did not have backbone enough to vote for the Amendment because it came from the Opposition; nor did they look to the welfare of the country in casting their vote. We have been accused of hang 'er down tactics and all sorts of things on this side of the House, but when the public were clamouring for a repeal of the fish regulations, we were responsible for having them repealed, while the government side thought fit to vote against it. Still we are asked by one government member and another to unite for the good of the country, well when we started to unite you threw us down. Now I agree to support this

Bill because of what that bill means for the country and its people; but any other bill coming from the government side—well, I think, I will give it considerable thought before voting for it. As a matter of fact the men on the government side are so incompetent that any bill they do bring in here should necessitate the donning of our thinking caps on this side to see whether we are doing right or wrong in voting for it. Mr. Coaker is not a fisherman, never was, but is proclaimed the fishermen's friend and he turned out to be their friend too, especially since he got in the Executive. Dr. Barnes is Minister of Education. His knowledge of fish is confined to the caplin's school. Men like Mr. Foote, Mr. Brownrigg and Mr. Warren know nothing about the subject and whatever Mr. Coaker says about fish, whether right or wrong, the Prime Minister says alright to, even though he knows it to be wrong, fearing that Mr. Coaker might take his crown away from him, so that Mr. Squires has to cater to Mr. Coaker. As Mr. Bennett said, when Mr. Coaker was in the Executive with him and with a good man over him he was as nice as pie. You could handle him any way; but, Sir, the present government and the Prime Minister had all they could do to handle him when he cut loose.

When Sir John Crosbie was talking the other day on this Codfish Bill, the Chairman brought him to order because he spoke on railway matters, well I contend that any man in this House can talk on all matters all over this Island, even on education, and he won't get away from the subject because the whole country is a 'cod' and made so by the present government. I want to say, Sir, that some of us are not alone here to day to fight for the repealing of the fish regulations, but we are here to have something more tangible done for the district of St. John's East. We hear no talk here about poverty in that district. The

people are bearing their burdens, with out murmurs. They are not letting their poverty be known. To-day in that district are some farmers and fishermen who have not a potato to put in the ground. Men who used always have provisions made for their seed potatoes have them all eaten up, owing to the hard times within the past six or nine months. I think that some employment should be given those people this summer and I think that the government should raise a loan, if they have not got the money in the Treasury already, to provide work for those people. I am told that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has \$140,000 left. Well I think we might ask him for part of that. I do not think it would be wise to keep it where it is, because, if you do, it may get like the fish and you will probably have to put it in cold storage. The Prime Minister said in his Manifesto to the people that he would do everything in his power to keep the wolf from the door and that he would devise some sort of scheme whereby the poor man and the poor woman, who, through the hand of fate, were deprived of incomes, except what could scarcely keep body and soul together, would be able to live properly. No doubt the Prime Minister got up a scheme alright. There were a few poor people in the country before he got in power, but within the past 18 months there are thousands more, and those who were poor before have been made poorer still. I do not know what the hand of fate had to do with it, but I know what the hand of incompetent men had to do with it. There was a time when Mr. Jennings was in Opposition and when he always advocated that there should be pensions for old and aged women as well as for men; also that he was going to have the pension of the latter increased when he got in the government. He used to tell about the poor women whom he met in the streets. But he has not

fulfilled his promise yet, after being eighteen months in the government, and I am afraid he never will. I think that the poor worn out women will have to wait until the women get a vote, and I don't think that Mr. Jennings will ever give them that right if he can help it. But he took good care to help himself from the Treasury since he became a member of the government. I was going to say that I have a certain amount of regard for Mr. Coaker, but, perhaps, I am treading on dangerous ground by saying so, because it will likely make the Prime Minister feel uncomfortable. I believe that if Mr. Coaker was with the right kind of men and kept in his place that he would make an ideal public man, because I believe that he is more or less sincere in everything he undertakes. It was pitiable to look at him, but he was man enough to throw up his hands, after the failure of the fish regulations, and say "blame me for it; I did it all." I must say it was a corporal work of mercy. The Prime Minister never assisted him in his troubles, but to serve his own political ends he got up here and praised Mr. Coaker. The F. P. U. and F. P. U. members and forgot the constituents that he represents in the West End of St. John's. But at that time there was talk of a "bust". I don't know where it was going to be, but this I do know that the "bust" was not going to take place on this side because we are contented over here and I hope that you are as happy over there, though, I doubt it. Dr. Barnes is smiling. Well I know he is happy—and why wouldn't he—drawing his enormous salary. If I were on that side I would be like King Henry, I would never smile again, after helping to put the country in the state it is in after eighteen months of office.

I got up here this afternoon to say that I support the Bill before the House and it is only that I am a true Newfoundlander that I do so, but I

wonder if the same could be said of members of the Government. I think that the condition of this country today was brought on solely by the fish regulations; but I don't think that four million dollars left by Sir Michael Cashin when he left office was all thrown away on the fish regulations. The Prime Minister does not seem to come in for any blame whatever. I asked Mr. Samson the question the other day as to who was his boss and he replied that Mr. Squires was. Only then I found out correctly as I always thought up to that time that Mr. Coaker was his boss. That being so, Mr. Squires really had charge of the spending and squandering of that four million dollars and other public moneys as well. When Sir M. P. Cashin was thrown out—one cannot call it anything else but thrown out—of the Government by deception, lies and slander has not the Prime Minister allowed public moneys to be thrown out here, there and everywhere ever since. Enough proof of that statement is the sugar question and the "Food Control Board" not the Food Control Board which was brought about by the Prime Minister. Even the Speaker is talking about the free trip abroad that he had to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister is telling the Speaker, I suppose, of his visit to European countries where he saw the people lying about the streets in their tattered clothes and in a state of poverty and starvation.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES

MR. VINICOMBE.—Well that shows the incompetent men that you were when you charged those poor people such a high price for our fish. I understand that there is also to be Standardization of fish Bill to be brought in this session, well I am not going to vote for it, even if I think it is good, because of your incompetence.

Before taking my seat I would like to say that it is time that we were up and doing in this House with a view to enabling the fishermen of the country to get supplies to carry on the fishery this year. It is time for the Government to see what can be done for the poor fishermen and the poor laborer of the country as well. There are coopers in St. John's to-day in distress caused by the fish regulations preventing them from selling their products within the past year. These people were always independent before the regulations were enforced, and, who, if they could sell their stocks to-day, would be independent again.

Every available inch of space in the cooperage is taken up with stock for which the coopers are unable to find a market. Now Mr. Chairman, I do not like to see the Minister of Fisheries talking while we are asking him if he is going to do something to help the people; I would ask him if he is going to raise a loan for this purpose.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Will you support me in that if I do?

MR. VINICOMBE—Yes, I would support anything that I thought was for the benefit of the people of my district. I know of clergymen in St. John's East who are daily receiving appeals for help and why not open up a road to Flatrock or Pouch Cove that would give these people some way to earn a few dollars. A petition was sent in a few days ago from Pouch Cove and Flatrock asking for the money to open up work on this road; it would at least help them to buy a barrel of flour which they are now unable to get. A man came to me not long ago for a barrel of flour and he told me that altho he was ashamed to say it he had been forced to eat his seed potatoes. This has been so in more than one case, and another man asked me if I could guarantee him a couple of barrel of potatoes to put in the ground. I told him I would see

that he got them. The firm of Bowring Bros. who always did an extensive business in Flatrock are no longer supplying and these people are at a loss to know where they are going to get supplies for the summer. While we have been sitting here for two months doing nothing some plan should have been devised to give out work to relieve the distress which is now so general. The Prime Minister in his Manifesto talks about the hand of Fate, but God knows it is not the hand of Fate that has been responsible for the times that are now upon us; it is the hand of incompetent men. I bet Mr. Penney has seen the result of these times in his district of Carbonear.

HON. THE SPEAKER—Not at all.

MR. VINICOMBE—How much poor relief has had to be given to your district, Mr. Archibald?

MR. ARCHIBALD—There has been no special relief for Hr. Grace.

MR. VINICOMBE—But there has been relief nevertheless?

MR. ARCHIBALD—A little.

MR. VINICOMBE—I thought so. Now I ask is it not time for us to do something to relieve the sufferings that people are undergoing because of lack of employment. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to talk about the hand of fate, but the hand of incompetence is responsible for a whole lot more. The members of the government who at one time professed such concern for the poor fisherman have fallen from grace but I never thought Mr. Jennings would fall and I am surprised that he does not try to do something.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—If you would stop talking for a while we would be able to do something.

MR. VINICOMBE—It is all very well for you to tell me to stop talking, but that is only camouflage. You've had time enough if you wanted to do anything. You can go right to work now and we will give you till Sunday for

that matter. It is the corporal works of mercy any way and the better the day the better the deed. You might think I am joking, but I was never more in earnest in my life because when we see people with distress in their faces looking for something to do to keep themselves and their families alive. It is no joking matter. We are told that Mr. Coaker is going to resign and I would be long sorry to see that. Besides I do not see how that could help matters. It is better for him to hold on for another two or three years and do the best in that time because he will not have the opportunity of doing it after that and there could be no better proof of this fact than the Prime Minister's speech a few days ago. Well, Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is that I rise to support the Bill before the Chair. I am sorry the hon. gentlemen on the other side did not join with us when we brought in the amendment. I can see what a dread the Prime Minister has over him. He doesn't know where he is. He said that the Fish Regulations was a good measure, but if he believes this why take them off. I want to make an appeal to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and Mr. Coaker to do something before the House meets again to deal with the situation that confronts us with regard to the distress existing in and around the city and throughout the country. As I stated before, Bowring Bros. are doing nothing for the men who always depended on them for their supplies and here are we wasting time in here taking a section off this Act and putting a section on that. When Mr. Coaker was man enough to come in and acknowledge his faults it is a pity he does not now try to do something to atone for them. I believe that if he had good men to advise him he would be different. He was all right when he was in the National Government with men who knew their business, but now he has nobody to whom

he can look for assistance or advice. Now Mr. Chairman, I am not going to further delay the House. Mr. Jennings said that if we on this side of the House would stop talking something would be done. If he will undertake to do something to help the fishermen, the whole Opposition will stop talking.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Will the hon. member guarantee that?

MR. VINICOMBE—Yes.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Then if the hon. member carries out his part of the contract, we will carry out ours.

MR. VINICOMBE—We can't trust you on that side of the House.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

The Prime Minister has given his word
HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I will promise that something is going to be done.

MR. VINICOMBE—I knew the Min. of Fisheries was your real leader, Mr. Jennings. Would it be too much to ask the Hon. Minister what time something will be done. Will it be soon Sir?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Yes.

MR. VINICOMBE—Before taking my seat, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that no Bill be brought in this session to further interfere with our fisheries or with the trade of the Country.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the interjection thrown across the House by the Minister of Public Works to the effect that we on this side are talking too much and thus taking up the time of the House, I rise to make a few remarks on the Bill before the Chair. I cannot think that the suggestion made by the hon. minister was made in all seriousness as I have always taken him to be a man of his word. He said if we on this side stopped talking that the Government would go ahead and do something, but all I ask hon. gentlemen to do is to look at the Order Paper to-day and see if there is any-

thing on it in the way of legislation the passage of which is being delayed. There is nothing on the Order Paper from day to day; we have not had more than one or two night sessions since the House met and the House has been adjourned from Thursday till Monday. Does that look as if the people on this side of the House want to hang her down? If on the other hand the Minister is sincere in his remarks, I apologize but I fear he is not and therefore, I shall proceed with my remarks.

One difference which is very noticeable this year is that in the deportment of the members on the left of the Speaker as compared with the previous session. Last year they were at the zenith of their power; they came in here with a large majority; a large surplus left by their predecessors in office was at their disposal and for them the land was flowing with milk and honey. To-day gloom and despair are depicted on their faces and after all, is it any wonder that they should look like they do. Everything they have touched has gone against them; they see the handwriting on the wall and they realize that their doom is sealed. I would ask the hon. gentlemen to whom I refer, I would ask them individually not to be offended at anything I might say. With regard to the Fish Regulations, there was never in the history of the Colony a measure placed on the Statute Book that has become more familiar to the public and it is doubtful if there was ever one that has gained such unpopularity. That Bill was brought in here with all the pomp and power and glory of the Government and now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to come in and admit its failure. He says that he does not agree with the way in which the Bill was carried out but if it was not who was to blame? I supported it because he assured us

that it would not be put in force unless the necessity for it arose and when he went over to the other side and came back and put the measure in force, it was thought that his experience in the markets had taught him that the necessity had arrived. In my remarks on the Bill when it was introduced last year I said that in enforcing these Regulations there should be a certain amount of give and take, but the result has proved that it was all give and no take. I heard the statement made here this afternoon that there are 250,000 qtls. of fish remaining in Newfoundland unsold and in all probability, if it was all estimated we would find that there are more like 350,000 qtls. here, and I contend that if it were not for the Regulations we would not have a single quintal out of this on our hands to-day. I am not saying this without knowing what I am talking about. The South West Coast was held up and men like Penney and others who have been ruined, were not allowed to export their fish when they wanted to; if they had been permitted to do their business in the way they thought best, at least 100,000 quintals of fish from that section would have been put into consumption that never was marketed. Take again the case of the Iceland fish that was sold in Italy. If it had not been for the Regulations 260,000 quintals of our fish would have gone into that market. I see the Minister of Fisheries taking notes and he will probably tell us that there is not 100,000 qtls. of fish left on the West Coast but that is not what I mean. Perhaps he will also tell us that we did not lose a market for 200,000 quintals in Italy. I was told by an exporter of Conception Bay that if they got the prices for their fish set by the Regulations it would nett them five dollars a quintal profit but if they had been allowed to have their own way they would have

been satisfied to take four dollars; three dollars; two dollars or even fifty cents to be able to dispose of their fish. If we had free trade last year, the Italians would have paid a better price for our fish than they paid the Icelanders and we would have sold that much fish which now remains in the country. Now, Sir, look at conditions all over the country to-day. Appeals for food are coming in from all quarters and the people find themselves unable to purchase the bare necessities of life. The reason of this is not because they are not independent; it is true that they are not able to buy their supplies now because for example, the Marystown Trading Co. has been placed in the position that they have twenty-five hundred quintals of fish taken from the dealers out around Placentia and St. Mary's Bays for which they have not been able to pay them. What happened was this: The dealers turned in their fish and up to the present the money has not been paid for it. It was stated by Sir John Crocshie yesterday that men who had \$1,200 on the Company's books were unable to get supplies. The same thing applies to the larger number of small merchants and all this misery is not the result of any action of the people themselves but the direct result of the Regulations. A great mistake was made when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not take the advice of people whose experience warranted their opinions being taken seriously. The country is now in a desperate plight and the loss of revenue will be so great that it will be years before the country can again be put on a paying basis. At least two and a half million dollars will have been lost to the Colony in revenue while between sugar purchases and fish purchases and other bungling, the expenditure will show an increase of another two and a half millions over

last year. You will have to go in for a very severe retrenchment policy. We hear on the street that it is the intention to cut the salaries of the civil servants but that, Mr. Chairman, should be the last resort. Cut the salaries of the members of the House of Assembly or if any reduction in salaries is to take place, I hope you will have a sliding scale and I hope too that you won't cut the salaries of men who are getting less than a thousand dollars a year.

I have received a message from the people of Bar Haven, in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's since coming into the House, asking why the telegraph office has been taken away from them. Perhaps this is the first step in the retrenchment policy that the Government has to enter upon, but I want to serve notice that in matters of this kind no partiality must be shown. If you are going to cut out telegraph offices in Placentia Bay, you must cut them out in every other place of equal population. The message reads as follows. (Reads Message.)

Those men are very much in earnest over this matter. If this administration has to go on I trust that the Government will see that fair play is shown and that every district of a similar population to Placentia and St. Mary's will be treated on the same lines. With reference to the remark made by the member for St. John's East, Mr. Vinnicombe, in connection with the resignation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would say that we would be very sorry to see him resign, as we would miss him very much indeed in this House. I trust that, if he has any intention of resigning from his ministerial position, he is not going to give up his seat in this Assembly. Mr. Coaker has made the amende honorable here. He has come in and pleaded guilty. When the

regulations did not turn out as he wished, he had the courage of his convictions and was honest enough to admit their failure. I am sorry that they did not turn out as he anticipated; and I am sorry for the Government which is now in an awkward position financially. But there is a ray of hope, and might I suggest to the Government and to the individual members of the Government to follow the example of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to get up and state here that you are sorry that your legislation did not turn out as you expected, that results have not been what you expected, that you are sorry for your mistakes and that you are prepared to get out now and give more competent men charge of the administration of the public affairs of the country. I do not anticipate that you will do that, but I will make this statement now, that, if you men in the Government are prepared to resign and let the burden come on other shoulders, I will promise you that within twenty-four hours \$150,000 would be at the disposal of the Municipal Council for the purpose of giving the men in St. John's work and that \$5,000,000 would be raised in England at 5 per cent. because the financial people on the other side of the water have the utmost confidence in the men, who, up to eighteen months ago, conducted the public affairs of Newfoundland.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "Of the Auditing of Public Accounts."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has asked for this Bill so that rules and regulations may be made by him from time to time and to place in his hands a little more definite authority and power in the matter of accounts and the execution of cheques payable out of surplus trust accounts.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It is about time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Hon Leader of the Opposition says it is about time. Well I might say for his information that this does not affect any act of the present administration for the past year or so. However, it is desirable that further authority should be vested in the Auditor General so that he can make rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council, in order that his department can carry on its work in a more efficient and business-like manner. The only change in the Act, as it is already, is a verbal change because of the retirement of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is included within the scope of the ordinary minister. The accounts of the Shipping Department will not come under the Audit Act but will be included in the Customs Act, as the Shipping Department will be going out of existence. In 1905 these Acts were consolidated and this Bill repeals section 28 of Chapter 23, as follows:

'The Minister of Finance and Customs, the Assistant Collector and all Ministers, deputies of Ministers, officers, clerks or persons charged with the receipt of moneys, except the Minister of Shipping, shall cause the gross revenues of their several de-

"partments or offices to be paid at "such times and under such Regulations as the Minister of Finance and "Customs prescribes from time to "time to an account to be called 'The "Newfoundland Exchequer Account,' "at such bank or banks as are deter- "mined by the Minister of Finance and "Customs, and daily accounts of such "moneys so deposited shall be rend- "ered to the Comptroller and Auditor "General in such form as the Treasury "Board provides: Provided that such "sums as may be required to pay com- "mission on the sale of revenue and "postage stamps, and other reimburse- "ments of a like kind for which no "vote of the Legislature is taken, may "under an Order-in-Council be deduct- "ed from such gross revenues and "shall be allowed by the Comptroller "and Auditor General, on production "to him of a proper certificate or "voucher satisfactory to the Comptrol- "ler and Auditor General."

I propose to get for Committee stage, so that the matter may be fully discussed, a report on the main points from the Auditor General and which report, I understand, the Auditor General has already prepared.

MR. BENNETT.—It strikes me at a cursory glance that, under the first section, the Auditor General cannot put in force these rules and regulations until he has first received the approval of the Governor in Council.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is the same as prescribed under the original Act for the carrying on of the Audit Act.

MR. BENNETT.—And should not these rules and regulations be approved of first by the House of Assembly?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is the present law of the Colony.

MR. BENNETT.—My conception of the position of the Auditor General is that this official stand in a unique position and he should be untrammel-

led by any influence, either Governor in Council or any other authority.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—So he is.

MR. HIGGINS.—The only apparent noticeable alteration made to section (1) is that the "Governor in Council" substitutes the words "Treasury Board."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Treasury Board practically consists of the Governor in Council: namely, the Colonial Secretary, the Attorney General, the Minister of Finance and Customs and I think one other.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, this Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts'," was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. MOORE gave Notice of Question.

DR. JONES gave Notice of Question.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE gave Notice of Question.

MR. LEWIS Gave Notice of Question.

MR. SULLIVAN gave Notice of Question.

MR. WALSH gave Notice of Question.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House on its rising do adjourn until Monday next at three o'clock, I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement made in the editorial columns of this afternoon's issue of the Evening

Telegram newspaper. The editorial refers to Beaumont Hamel, which it rightly describes as a sacred field made holy by the blood of Newfoundland's sons shed there on that fatal day of July 1st, 1916. The subject under discussion in the editorial is the purchase of Beaumont Hamel battlefield by the Newfoundland Government. The editorial reads as follows:

"It would have been much better if the Government had bought the ground for Newfoundland out of general revenue, leaving it to popular subscription to erect a fitting monument, and to look after the upkeep and beautifying of the cemetery."

That is exactly what the Newfoundland Government did. In March, 1921, the Newfoundland Government, through the Department of Militia, transferred to the credit of Lieut.-Col., then Major, Nangle, at the Bank of Montreal, Paris, the sum of \$15,000, for the purchase of the Beaumont Hamel area, the cost of which was estimated at approximately \$10,000, and the purchase of certain other sites for the erection of other Newfoundland war memorials. The Newfoundland Government has also arranged for the War Memorial itself, and that amount is also being paid for out of public funds through the Department of Militia. Up to the present the Government has arranged only for the purchase of the area and the erection of the War Memorial, which, as is well known, is intended to be the caribou monument designed by Mr. Basil Gotto. A portion of the funds for the monument has also been already forwarded.

No arrangements have yet been completed by the Government for the laying out of the Beaumont Hamel battlefield. I would like to see a fund of \$25,000 raised by public subscription for that purpose. I understand that a sum of money has already been raised

by direct subscription by some ladies who are interested, and I am sure there will be a ready response throughout the whole Island of Newfoundland to any general movement which may be undertaken to secure funds for the beautifying of this historic battlefield; this piece of Newfoundland in France, this burial ground of so many of our heroic dead.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 9th, 1921.

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

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Haricott asking for the sum of \$300 for the purpose of making a breakwater so that the road to Salmonier can be maintained. It is very important that this matter be attended to. This is the only means of communication between Haricott and Salmonier, and the road cannot be kept there without a breakwater.

MR. WALSH—I beg to support that petition.

MR. SINNOTT—I give the petition my hearty support.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Upshell, asking for the sum of \$1000 to complete a railway connecting road. This road was begun a few years ago, and the sum of \$500 was spent, but that amount was not sufficient. This petition is very largely signed by all the prominent men of the community. I have another petition from Little Harbour on the same subject. This petition is also largely signed.

I have also a petition from Famish Cove on the subject of a bridge. This bridge forms a connection between two banks of a river. It is now in a falling down condition as it has not been attended to for a number of

years. The petition ask for the sum of only \$200 for this very necessary work. I have a petition from Sound Island asking that some change be made in the Relieving Officer'ship. At present the Relieving Officer resides at Harbor Buñett. Although he is a very capable man it is impossible for him to keep in touch with all the places in his jurisdiction. The petition asks that Mr. William Mitchell be appointed Relieving Officer for the outlying islands. The salary would be very small, and the service very great. I have a petition from the people of Branch asking for a sum of money for the completion of a breakwater. My colleague asked for \$2000 last year for this purpose, but it was found that the amount was not sufficient. Branch is a very important settlement and the people are depending entirely on fishing for their livelihood. If a couple of hundred dollars could be found for this purpose it could not possibly be spent to greater advantage, and where the people would appreciate it more. There is another petition from Patrick's Cove asking for the sum of \$150 to complete a road to a fishing settlement. The very least this House could do would be to grant this modest request. The road is absolutely essential to the fishermen of that community.

I have just one more petition. This is from Pack's Harbor, asking for telegraph communication. I think the communication could be made with less than a mile of telegraph wires, and the benefit to the people would be very great.

I have pleasure in asking that these petitions be referred to the department to which they relate and that they be given the consideration which they merit.

MR. SULLIVAN—I support the prayer of this petition and as we go through the estimates I will have more to say about this petition and

with regard to the Postal Telegraph extension.

MR. SINNOTT—I give the petition presented by my colleague my hearty support.

MR. MACDONNELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition handed me through the courtesy of the Minister of Shipping re the Humbermouth-Battle Harbor Steamship service. The petition is largely signed including signatures from a large section of Bay of Islands. In connection with this service I have to say that it has not been very satisfactory. The request is that the government take up this year the proposition of putting a larger steamer as regards passengers and freight on this service. It is the intention of the government to give us the Glencoe for a few trips, but it is the petitioners' wish that the Sebastapool not be employed permanently as she is too small, and I am sure the petition will recommend itself to the Minister of Shipping, the executive and the government in general, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition as it is one which certainly deserves the careful consideration of the government.

MR. SCAMMELL—I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member for St. George's and I would like to say that I have been interesting myself in the subject matter of this petition, and I understand it is the intention of the government to give the area in question better consideration, and better accommodation than it has had for the past year. I hope during the Session to have something more to say about this service and therefore I defer my remarks for the present.

Sir John Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question
Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I can believe the anxiety of the honourable member by answering that question right away by saying that Mr Collishaw did not receive any authority whatever either recently or earlier and there is no intention on the part of the government to appoint him as an agent with reference to matter referred to.

MR. WALSH—Gave notice of question.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—If the honourable member will be good enough to give us time to prepare this answer and have it removed from the order paper he will receive a more detailed statement.

MR. WALSH—Yes, certainly.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Board of Works to my questions, re A. H. Salter.

THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have that answer; it is the answer to one on Order Paper, May 6.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to question 9, May 4th. This is a simple question.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I have asked the Auditor General for this information and hope to table it very shortly.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to question four April 12th., relative to the Economy Commission.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have called the attention of the

Deputy Minister of Finance, and it will be soon tabled.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If I am not out of order Sir, I would like to say a few words re A. H. Salter. I am so astounded that I am really shocked to know that an accountant down at the Royal Stores should receive from the Board of Works the sum of \$1080 per annum. The gentleman in question is a servant of the Royal Stores and has to go and come when he is called. I want more information on this matter. Mr. Minister. When if so, was this salary voted or where did it come from? Do you know that there are many soldiers' families starving to-day for want of work. So this is the price of his support. I have more to say later on, and I feel sure that the members of your party are just as much surprised as I am when they are told that Salter receives \$1080 per annum for work which you and Mr. Harris should do.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—A more detailed statement of the duties and services Mr. Salter has performed and which could not be performed by either myself or Mr. Harris will show an improvement on that statement.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Surely there must be some one around town who can do this work. I have never heard of such a thing. He is paid \$1080 to go and come when he likes and gives what orders he likes.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question. Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move for the appointment of a Select Committee of this House (with five Members) to enquire and report upon the appropriation and expenditure of Public Money in 1920—for the purchase of Fish and Salt, and into all matters concerning the charter of vessels, the hiring

of stores, the purchase and sale of Fish and Salt, and the whereabouts of the said Fish and Salt, and the control and management thereof; with power to employ Counsel to take evidence on oath, and send for all persons, papers and things necessary to the said Enquiry with an instruction to the said Committee to hold an enquiry in public and to have the evidence taken stenographically, and to publish the same from day to-day in the newspapers of the city.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table the reply to that question

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that in the issue of his organ, "The Daily Advocate" of April 24th, 1920, he published a statement or address to the electors of Bonavista district with reference to Saw Mills in that district and the demand for licenses and the introduction of motor saving outfits, and to ask what action if any, he has taken to prevent the "wholesale destruction that would clean out the timber resources from the water front in four or five years," to which he referred in that communication.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if the government intends to contribute any amount next year towards repeating the experiment of using airplanes in connection with the seal fishery?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines to lay on the Table of the House (a) A statement showing the number of Saw Mills operating in this country during the fiscal year 1920, or the Calendar Year 1920, if statistics are available for the latter period; (b) distinguishing between the mills which pay stumpage or other tax and those which do not; (c) stating how many mills have not paid these or other taxes or fees which they are required by law to pay, the reasons why they have not

paid, and the amount unpaid; (d) and to indicate what action, if any, the Government proposes to take in collecting unpaid fees of this kind, in view of the colony's great need of funds at the present time?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he can make any estimate of the quantity of salt required for fishery needs of this colony, during the present year; if he is aware of what quantity of salt has been ordered by the merchants to help meet these needs, what quantity has been ordered by the government, and what action is it intended to take to obtain the balance.

MR. HIGGINS—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of the amount of printed matter imported into this colony during the years 1919, 1920, and to the end of April 1921, and the duty paid thereon; also the names of the business concerns who have imported the same.

MR. HIGGINS—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House, a detailed statement of printed matter imported into this Colony for use in that department, also if any officer of that department has received a Commission or rebate on same; also if enquiry has ever been made why same could not be done in this country; if not, why?

MR. HIGGINS—Asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the value of the printed matter imported for use in his department, during the years 1919, 1920, and to April 30th, 1921; also if any officer in his department is receiving a Commission or rebate on same; if any enquiries have been made whether this work cannot be done by the Printers of the city, if not, why?

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—On behalf of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have to say in reply to question two, that last summer a contract was entered into the sealing owners and one Major Clayton Kennedy for the rendering to two year's service re the sealing fishery project. The Government were to pay half of the cost, but in no case exceeding fifteen thousand dollars. Kennedy fell down on his contract and it was cancelled and during the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries another arrangement was made with Major Cotton under which the sealing fishery was to be patrolled for this year only the cost to the colony to be less than fifteen thousand. The money paid under the first contract amounted to twelve thousand dollars, but it was paid back and then it was placed to the credit of the surplus trust account and the total cost of the latter contract will not exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—As to question three I have asked for the preparation of this information. The same applies to question five. The answers to questions six and seven will be soon tabled.

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply to question four.

MR. MOORE—To ask hon. the Prime Minister if Mr. Blackstead, here recently in connection with the proposed contract for an enterprise on the West Coast, is any connection of Mr. Christopher Hannevig, who established a shipbuilding plant at Harbor Grace, or has been associated with Mr. Hannevig in any of his enterprises; if the said Christopher Hannevig is now bankrupt and if Mr. Blackstead was concerned in such bankruptcy?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I regret exceedingly that any person should use his position as a member of this House in the way Mr. Moore has done, namely, to place on the Or-

der Paper a question so worded as to suggest a deliberate intent on the part of Mr. Moore to injure the financial standing and general reputation of any gentleman who should visit this country for the purpose of interesting himself in commercial enterprises here. Such a question, so worded, is a discredit to the honourable member, is a discredit to the seat which he occupies in this House, and a serious reflection upon the courtesy and dignity of this Legislature. This House will appreciate the fact that if a visit to Newfoundland in connection with business matters of a man of high financial standing and repute is to open up an attack of this nature, then no financial man of any standing or repute would have anything whatever to do with Newfoundland. By this question the member for Ferryland is attempting in an underhand manner to strike a blow at negotiations which may be of untold advantage to the island of Newfoundland in general and the W. Coast of the island in particular, and to say that the action of the honourable member in placing a question so worded upon the order paper is discourteous and contemptible and that it reflects upon his personal character, his position as a legislator, and upon this Legislature itself, is putting my views upon this matter very mildly. With respect to Mr. Christopher Hannevig, I would say that I have no knowledge whatever as to whether Mr. Blackstead was or was not in any way identified with the operations of Mr. Hannevig at Harbor Grace. I do know that Mr. Hannevig expended large sums of money in Harbor Grace and in St. John's, that these expenditures represented a substantial revenue to the country and hundreds of thousands of dollars in the pockets of the workmen of the colony. I am also aware that Mr. Hannevig's venture at Harbor Grace has been wound up, but I understand that that was due to the fact that Mr. Hannevig was not suc-

cessful in large ventures which he had undertaken in other parts of the world, and that while the Harbor Grace proposition was one which, standing on its own, may have been splendidly successful, yet the collapse of Mr. Hannevig's mercantile enterprises in other countries necessarily brought this Newfoundland enterprise down with them. The people of Newfoundland appreciate the fact that Mr. Hannevig came to this country and expended large amounts of money here through which the revenues of the colony and the people of the colony largely benefited, and we all regret that his business ventures elsewhere did not work out satisfactorily, with the result that his Newfoundland enterprise became hopelessly involved and ultimately failed.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—In the absence of Mr. Moore on his behalf I have to say that I do not agree with the Prime Minister in so eulogizing the firm of Hannevig. Do you not remember when the war was on that we spent thousands of dollars watching this Hannevig, and for a long time it was thought that Hannevig was under the direction of the German government, and it is too bad to injure a gentleman of this calibre.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is without foundation, in fact.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—It is six of one and a half dozen of the other. I was in the government of the day and I do not hesitate to say that this gentleman was an improvement to this country, but when we trace them we find out that Mr. Moore was in keeping with the rules of this House when he asked this question in the manner set out. This gentleman is one of those parties who are ever afflicting this country. He is one of the pests that come here, look around and run away again. I have been thirty years in this House and the same class of man arrive here in the spring and go away again in the fall, and nothing

is to be seen of them. I fully agree with Mr. Moore. What about one Wilson who hung up this House for weeks. He had a map showing a hundred vessels in use because of his wonderful enterprise. We were in the House here six weeks. Mr. Morine was on this side of the House and the present Lord Morris and others were on the other, endeavouring to bring in an industry. But what happened? The Prime Minister didn't refer to it this afternoon. We had a Mr. Blackman here a few years ago and the name Blackman is getting pretty close to Blackstead. In the absence of Mr. Moore who asked the question, I am not prepared to accept the Prime Minister's statement.

MR. MACDONNELL—I was not here when the matter came up or I would have objected. If Mr. Moore has any knowledge in relation to this question a duty devolves on him to make expression of it to the public. The suggestion of Hannevig's insolvency makes this all the more important as he is associated with Mr. Blackstedt. As the representative of St. George's, the district directly concerned, I wish to disassociate myself from anything in connection with knocking the project till it is discussed on its merits. At present the members have no knowledge of the scheme.

MR. MOORE—To ask the Minister of Public Works if it is correct that Mr. W. H. Rennie, recently appointed Secretary to the Board of Governors of the General Hospital, has made a requisition for furniture for his office amounting to nearly fifteen hundred dollars, and if it is the intention of the Department to authorize the procuring of this material, or if a sufficient quantity for his use cannot be obtained from any of the departments created during the war and now in process of being extinguished?

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the reply.

MR. JONES—To ask Hon. the Prime

Minister of W. H. Greenwood, described as a London financier and who arrived here recently in connection with a proposed enterprise on the West Coast, is the same Greenwood who has been connected for the past year or two with the Reid Newfoundland Co. and certain enterprises associated therewith; if he is at present a director of the stock broking firm in London in which members of the Reid Newfoundland Company are principal shareholders; if he is the same W. H. Greenwood who wrote an article on Hon. W. F. Coaker in the Canadian Courier which was reprinted in the "Advocate" of this city of April 9, 1920, the heading of which is "A Country Where Fishermen Run The Show" if Mr. Greenwood is correct in stating that Mr. Coaker can count eighteen members in a House of thirty-six and Mr. Squires six more; if there is any combination or agreement between Mr. Coaker and Mr. Greenwood in regard to this West Coast enterprise by which the F. P. U. is to derive financial advantages from the venture going thru, and what is the financial standing of Mr. Greenwood to justify his being described as a London capitalist.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This question is allied to No. 8 of Mr. Moore and my criticism of that I ask to be repeated. Mr. Greenwood was I believe, identified with the formation of a banking trust company in London with which the Reids are connected. I do not know if he is a member of any stock firm. I do not know if he wrote the article referred to; I did not see it. He is here as secretary to Mr. Blackstedt. I feel that this and question 8 are both aimed at discrediting this project which has not yet been definitely laid before the House.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House what amount of orders has been sent to the Royal

Stores and Martin Hardware Royal Stores, from Nov. 15th, 1919 up to April 30th, 1921, from his Department.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the reply.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. Collishaw during his recent visit to Canada and the United States sold \$25,000 worth of bonds of the F. P. U. to the companies mining iron on Bell Island; also if he sold \$20,000 worth of lumber belonging to himself (Mr. Collishaw) to the same Companies for use in Bell Island; if he secured these sales by undertaking that the proposed contract for an ore tax now before the House would be put through the Legislature unchanged; if Mr. Collishaw was authorized to give any such pledge or undertaking, and if not does the Government propose to take any action in the matter.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to inform this House whose authority the telegraph office at Bar Haven is to be closed up and telephone installed instead (2) If such is done on account of retrenchment and if so will all districts be treated alike with regards to Telegraph and Telephone offices changes, (3) Why were the members of the district not notified of proposed change at Bar Haven?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In the absence of the Minister of Posts I wish to say the information will be prepared for to-morrow.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will reconsider his decision of a few days ago, and make provision in his estimates for the erection of a Fog Alarm at Pt. Le Haye, thereby keeping his promise of last year?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND

FISHERIES.—I am sorry I cannot put it in this session but if any amount is voted for fog alarms later on I will put it in the estimates.

MR. WALSH.—May I ask that the next fog alarm built be at Pt. La Haye.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes.

House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled, "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V., Cap. 25, entitled "An Act to regulate the Exportation of Codfish."

MR. FOX.—I think, Mr. Speaker, that in passing a few remarks in connection with this Bill, I will take the opportunity to refer to the interesting comment of the Prime Minister as to the form of certain questions put to the Government by the Opposition. As to the merits or demerits of the matters themselves I will not enter but will deal with the form only. He thinks that as framed these questions suggest financial incompetency. His strictures in this regard may be correct. But I deeply regret his shortness of memory in forgetting the time when in his position as Prime Minister he levelled a similar, or even more serious charge, against one of the most prominent men in the community, Mr. H. D. Reid. As to comparison between Mr. Reid and the others referred to I will not enter. Mr. Reid has done as much in connection with the Reid Nfld. Co. as any other. He has built up a huge organization, employing large numbers; he has done something tangible for Newfoundland but the Prime Minister apparently forgets that last year he rose in this House and stated Mr. Reid was as the others are now. Not only did he accuse him of financial incompetency, but of actual unfitness and allowed the statement to go broadcast to the world. He said he was absolutely incapable of conducting his own busi-

ness. His hypocrisy is disgusting. And yet he holds up his hands in holy horror when others use their position to insinuate anything against men in business life outside the Colony. I am prepared to concede anything in reason or to censure any allegations that may be indecent or improper, but I decidedly am not prepared to support a man who will do one thing to-day and something entirely different to-morrow; a man who uses his position to scandalize one who has carried on huge operations here, has reared his family and has been under the eyes of all in all his transactions since ever his father came here. He gets up here and asks Newfoundland and all the world in general to accept the reference to the Opposition as a despicable crowd. If I had not been in this House last year and did not know of his charges I might take his statement at face value. But having this knowledge I have heard his remarks with disgust and chagrin and I for one am not prepared to receive them. In dealing with this Bill I will not have much to say though a whole lot, nevertheless, may be. I am prepared to speed on its way an unwelcome visitor that for some time has occupied a few pages of the Statute books, a law that has turned out to be a danger and a mepace to the whole community. The Act itself was alright in some respects. It had the approbation of the two main factors interested in its operation—the fishermen, it may be said, represented by the F. P. U. under the leadership of Mr. Coaker, on the one hand and the Board of Trade, representing the merchants or exporting trade on the other. While this Act permitted some restraint of trade, it also made provision for fair play and did not exercise control to the prejudice of the business of the country. But it was thrown to the winds after it had passed the House. No explan-

ation whatever was given. Why was this legislation which was brought in to being to regulate the trade, thrown overboard and the iniquitous War Measures Act used in its seat. The months of July, August and September, the most important in connection with the marketing of our codfish, were allowed to pass but export was not controlled by the Act as passed but by the War Measures Act of 1914 that ought to have been dead two years ago; that ought to have been abolished and which was only intended from the first to be used for a special purpose. We have not yet got any explanation of the glaring indecency in this regard. The War Measures Act had no application except to when the country was in a state of war, and gave unlimited power to the Government and the placing of that power which might be exercised by unscrupulous men to the furthering only of their own ends. It was used instead of that which, through their representatives, had been passed by the voice of the people. Still there was no explanation when the Board of Trade rose up and loudly complained of the serious state of affairs arising from the use of this measure by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and those associated with him. They asked, and the country at large asked, why this was done but it was all in vain and no criticism can be too severe or talk too long to use in dealing with this question. If we want a scandal to condemn the regime of the present Government we have it here. When people talk of the criticism of the Opposition, let them remember that these scandals would have never been disclosed but for the questioning of the Opposition. We would be derelict in our duty if we did not spend our time, ourselves and our energies in probing the iniquitous doings of the Government during the last year

and a half. There is every justification for everything we have done and for even going further as we intend to. It makes one tired to hear all the talk of obstruction. We are only doing what the people are not in the position to do for themselves. I have spoken plainly and criticised the Government severely but the time has come to call a spade a spade and it positively infuriates me when I consider the record of the past eighteen months, a record of maladministration that has brought us to the very verge of ruin. I demand an explanation of why they have been derelict in their duty to Newfoundland; why they have disgraced themselves by the most reprehensible conduct and even stooped to the pilfering of the public funds to suit their own purposes. Let us enumerate the scandals connected with the Fish Regulations Act, which we are now bidding farewell to; the scandal in connection with the purchase of the salt cargo now at Port Union, the scandal of sugar control and the scandal in the conduct of the administration generally. Run through the whole list and see what position we find ourselves in. Their whole history of power is nothing but scandal after scandal. It makes one mad to look at the state of affairs at the present day; mad to think of the kind of constitution that allows such glaring misconduct to go on. Someone certainly is to blame but if we had a proper Government these scandals would not have occurred. They came to power through misrepresentation and deception; they came with a programme of reducing taxation and purifying public life but their tenure of office will be written down in the history of this country and of all the globe as one which violated all the decent principles of Government. When I spoke previously of the apathy of the representatives of the West

Coast I meant every word of what I said. When I am on the floors of this House I no longer represent one section of the country. I would do nothing for St. John's East that would be detrimental to the rest of Newfoundland but I would be derelict to those who sent me here if I were to stand on this floor and see injustice done my district. Their turn was served when they were elected and they are prepared to see the West Coast crucified by the illegal carrying out of regulations that was strangling the business on which that section and all of Newfoundland depends. There is no red blood in the veins of these representatives. Where is their independence? Were they tied to the chariot wheels of their party. Were they so dependent on their positions that they could see their districts pilloried and undermined and the land, once so smiling and prosperous, turned into a desert waste. From Cape Ray all along the shore to Placentia, a section whose people are among the most industrious in the Island, destitution and hunger now stalk through the land. They were elected to office with the greatest majorities on record and they would have been only showing ordinary justice to the people who returned them if they had said, "No, we will not stand for this nefarious legislation; we will not see you suffer." The regulations would never have been carried out if these men had been of the same breed as we are in St. John's East. You can take that, gentlemen, it is the truth. If the same had happened here the representatives of St. John's East and West would want to know what was going on. You should be heartily ashamed of yourselves and should feel compassion commensurate with the sufferings of the people who sent you here. The member for Burin was asked why he allowed the injustice to go on and he

replied that if the people's shipments were delayed they had been instructed to telegraph him. When he further saw other sections than that which he represented being strangled in business, why did he not say "I am going to protest." But no—there was not a word; they took it all lying down. I would not mind so much, as they are bound to suffer later, but it is their total indifference to the interests of their constituents that merits censure.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman. In reply to the honorable member for St. John's east Mr. Fox, I would say that he made some very serious insinuations in his address this afternoon. He occupied the time and attention of this House for over an hour and made a wonderful impression, as he thought, dealing with a baseless charge; what kind of a splurge would he have made, if he had a definite charge to lay against me. If he was manly, he would have asked to have that charge investigated but he prefers to come in and insinuate wrong doing in a way that is unworthy of him.

MR. FOX—I can—

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I am speaking now. He said that this \$500,000 was all spent by me for the benefit of Port Union, and that I was always doing something to try and bolster up the F. F. U., the people of Port Union and the people of the North generally. I say in reply that that statement is absolutely incorrect and that there is no foundation whatever for it. The honourable member for St. John's East knows that the statement is incorrect and he knew it when he made it. He knows very well that the government allocation for fish was something like \$350,000, which was spent to purchase thirty five thousand quintals, and he knows that out of that large quantity only seven thousand five hundred quintals were

taken at Port Union, the rest being taken at St. John's. He knows all that by the records of the House already. I will go further and tell him that, since we took office in this government, not a penny of any public monies whatever, in any way or in any shape or form, has gone into the pockets of the F. P. U. or into the pockets of any Companies associated with the F. P. U. at Port Union. We have been listening for the last six weeks to baseless insinuations and lying charges coming from the opposite side of the House concerning the F. P. U. and the transactions of the government for the past eighteen months. I must say that in all my experience in this Assembly for the past ten years I have not, at any time, ever heard such grossly unfounded charges as have been thrown across the floors of this House by members of the present Opposition. I sat on that side of the House for six years and I got Sir Edward Morris, the then Leader of the government, to do many a good thing for us, but I throw out the challenge this evening that I never once made an insinuation or a charge in any way, if I did not have some foundation in fact behind it. Several gentlemen, who were colleagues of Sir Edward Morris at that time, are at present members of the Opposition here and they are at liberty to contradict my statement if they think it is untrue. What have the F. P. U. done since it was created twelve years ago? It has done everything in its power to help Newfoundland; it has helped fishermen all over the country to dispose of their products at higher prices than they were getting before, thereby helping out the country generally. Ever since I became a member of the Opposition—when the Morris government was in power—the F.P.U. kept the price of fish up all round. They even kept it up for men in St. John's as well as for fishermen outside of St. John's. Let me go further and tell Mr. Fox this. No mat-

ter what number of insinuations are cast across the floors of this Chamber they are all directed against me. They are not intended for any one else in this House. The idea is to try and take away the power that I hold in the North, but the more you oppose me and the greater your number of insinuations are the greater and the stronger you make me throughout the entire North. I have not had an easy time of it since the F. P. U. came into existence and particularly since I came into public life. Others have assailed me just as savagely and just as unwarrantedly as you have, but failed in their objective. When the F. P. U. first began to spread itself and look for representation for the fishermen in the House of Assembly, persons, who were reckoned to be the smartest and cleverest in the country were opposed to this Union; the government in power at that time was opposed to it and Water Street as a whole was opposed to it, with the result that I stand here to-day, as you see, the strongest factor in the country. If any of you gentlemen opposite want to know how unshakeable my position is in the North all you got to do is to come there—now if you like—and oppose me. Now the effect of your slanders and insinuations and the campaign of vilification and abuse in your newspapers carried on against me will be to go to the West Coast and establish there what I did North, and I intend to do that next month. I intend to go on the West Coast this year and buy as much fish as I can, and I expect to achieve as much success with my mission on the West Coast as I did North. With regard to the insinuation made by Mr. Fox as to the taking of the public moneys to buy salt. That salt was purchased by the Government across the water because there were no supplies to come in. The trade was not in a position to buy it and there was no salt in sight for July

or August of last year. The Government situation and if the hon. member for St. John's East does not contend that I am an imbecile I know something of the salt question. No salt could be got anywhere at the time, it seemed, and after searching practically the world for a supply we at last found some at Hamburg. The salt was paid for by the Minister of Finance and Customs before it left on the other side. This salt was intended for the trade but when it arrived the trade did not want it. The people North did not want it, as they had sufficient to carry them through the entire season because the catch of fish North, as is well known, was something like four hundred thousand quintals short. When the merchants here refused to take delivery of the salt when it arrived it had to go somewhere to be stored or either had to remain in the holds of the steamer. I then offered to store the salt at Port Union and keep it as long as it was necessary, without any charge whatever. If I had stored the salt in St. John's, it would have cost 10 cents per hoghead per month and I would have been pronounced the greatest fool and imbecile that ever had charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We took the salt and stored it at Port Union as the Government ordered. If the fishery had to be anything near normal last year there would not have been a pound of salt left and salt would have been sold at the current price here, but because I dared to store it—and it had to be stored—all kinds of charges are hurled at me. Do you mean to say that we did not want cheap salt and did you mean to put another burden on the people by not having any cheap salt here this year. Then my hon. friends on the other side see fit to hand out attacks without any justification for them. I know your policy. It is not to destroy the Squires Government, but it

is to destroy Coaker and the F. P. U. That is your aim and your ambition. I am prepared to fight the North now against the Opposition, and the West Coast in twelve months time.

Take the fish that was bought by the Government last year. If that fish had not been sold at that time, what would have been the result in St. John's? Instead of \$8 and \$10 per quintal being paid for it, it would not have fetched more than \$3 or \$4 like the rest of the fish was bought for in St. John's. There is one thing about the whole situation and that is that most of the men who talked against the fish regulations talked about something they knew nothing at all about. The only man in the Opposition ranks who knew anything worth while about them was Sir John Crosbie, because it takes an exporter of fish of considerable experience to know properly about the regulations. I don't propose to contend that the Regulations were perfect in every detail because there can be nothing done faultlessly, but the regulations were based solely upon recommendations of the Exporters, who met in solemn conclave and resolutions and recommendations were made and sent to the Advisory Board. There was not one section of the Regulations that was not asked for by the Exporters along Water Street. The prices they fixed in the foreign markets are the prices they fixed; not what I fixed. Then those prices were afterwards fixed by the Board which consisted of all Exporters. When these men approved of the regulations they were passed over by me to the Governor in Council for approval. These men who comprised the Advisory Board were men who knew their business. They were not lawyers or dry goods men; but fish exporters. If a man came to me to discuss legal business would not I refer him to a lawyer. Well then what in the name of Heavens does a lawyer know about

exporting fish. Let the country realize this fact that had not that thirty-five thousand quintals of fish been purchased when it had last year that the people who sold it would have lost all the Labrador fish that was in four dollars a quintal on it, because Europe and on the way to Europe, amounting to about two hundred and fifty thousand quintals, which had been purchased at \$8—then there was high prices for insurance and high freight rates—fell in price about \$4 in the foreign markets. Thus will be seen the wisdom of the Government in buying that 35,000 and saving that money for the fishermen. In addition to that we had six hundred thousand quintals of shore fish and if the price of Labrador came down in the foreign markets it brought down the price of the other. As to the suggestion of bringing the House together last fall when this happened, my own opinion is that the whole thing would have amounted to this. It would be sent broadcast to the world that Newfoundland had to buy 35,000 quintals of fish conditions were so congested here, with the result that people in the foreign markets would not buy at all. We saved the situation. We helped nearly every man who had a quintal of fish to sell as well as as those who bought. And then you criticize the effect of the regulations on the price of fish. Do you know, and you ought to know already from the observations made in this House, that there would not have been last year about six dollars for shore and five dollars for Labrador, if there were no regulations. The fact is that the price for shore fish was increased from six to ten dollars per quintal and the price for Labrador was increased from five to eight dollars per quintal, through the regulations, which is proof that the country got four or five million dollars which it would not have got had not the re-

gulations been in force. And then the Opposition will come in and say that we made the merchants pay for the fish and that they have not got back their money yet and cannot get it back. If that is so, the fault is their own for taking off the regulations.

When I was in Portugal I got an offer to buy all the fish that was then in Portugal afloat on the water—fish that no one would buy I was told. It was an outright sale, cash down, that I arranged for. I communicated the matter here and I was informed in writing that the Water Street exporters had held meetings on the matter but that they did not believe that such a thing was possible in the face of the circumstances that they knew to prevail in Portugal. What happened? The fish intended for Portugal since that day has not realized twenty shillings a quintal whereas it could have been sold by me for fifty shillings cash down. In other words, every quintal of fish intended for Portugal this year might have been sold and would have enabled every fisherman to get seven dollars a quintal for shore fish this year. An arrangement was made to sell all the fish for Portugal for 1921 at a price that we fixed, not the price that Portugal was pleased to put upon it but at our price. Do you know that Water Street could not be got to back up that suggestion, despite the good terms of cash down before the delivery of the fish. The reason is that they feared they would likely offend some of their customers to whom they were used to consigning fish. I know that there are some men in this House who cannot believe that the business men along Water Street were so dense and so lacked of ability as not to be able to view intelligently the proposition I had offered them. I had everything in black and white for them, everything was covered in Portugal and still they went back on it.

But that was not the worst feature of it. All that fish that was in Portugal and which I had arranged to sell at fifty shillings—and forty the lowest—was afterwards sold for twenty-two.

When the regulations came off in January last exporters of fish here were selling in Liverpool at sixty shillings: that is, for Labrador fish. It was not very long, however, when the same quality of fish sold for forty shillings and went as low as thirty. When I went over to Liverpool last winter I was told there that Iceland was selling fish, Labrador make, for fifty shillings, which was five shillings less than us at that time. The reason Iceland did this was because we did not keep on the regulations. However, in spite of their underselling us in price we sold a great quantity of our fish, it being required by the markets. When we came down to thirty Iceland lowered to twenty-five. As the fish fell in price they always went five shillings less than us.

What happened in Spain on the first of January last? We were getting sixty shillings on the average for Labrador and eighty for shore fish. Shortly after when the regulations came off Labrador fish was sold as low as thirty shillings and a lot of men did not get that for it and all high graded Spanish shore fish came down proportionately. In Greece we were selling fish at the beginning of this year at seventy-five shillings and just as the regulations came off the price fell to fifty. To-day that same fish is being sold in Greece for forty-five. In Brazil the price of fish in the early part of January last was ninety shillings per drum. To-day it is fifty and forty. If the regulations had been kept on they would be paying us ninety shillings a quintal, cash down; whereas with the regulations removed they are paying fifty and forty, and wait for probably six months for payment and no end to all the claims on

the exporters. I believe that the taking off of the regulations spells ruin for the country. If they were in force to-day Portugal would not be paying thirty shillings for our fish, but sixty or sixty-five, as the consumption there is about the same as it was before.

All this fuss about the failure of the regulations can be summed up in one word almost, namely, the want of co-operation in the Trade and the want of unity between the Government and the Opposition. Had the Opposition and their newspapers ceased their destructive criticisms and had three or four men of Water Street allowed the regulations to continue Italy would have bought last October her usual supply of Newfoundland fish. But your newspapers teemed with abuse of the regulations and of me and the result was that Italy waited her time and until Ragnoli would get the fish at the price he wished. But for this Italy would have bought one hundred and fifty thousand quintals last fall and that would have saved the whole situation in every foreign market. Your bogey cry then was that the regulations killed every one and that is your same cry now. If the regulations had been kept on as regards Italy last fall it would have meant incalculable benefits for Newfoundland this year. If no good was meant by putting on the regulations in the first place, blame the exporters themselves. They were drafted by the men in my department. My department was not the Advisory Board. It was men along Water St. that comprised the Advisory Board and some of the political friends of the Opposition. Any mistakes you can bring home to me or my department no one will admit them more readily than I.

Before closing I would like to point out that no attempt made by any man or men in this House and no opposi-

tion that I get in this House will tend to remove me from the place I hold in the districts of the North. I am prepared to go to the country now and fight you in the North, and if you will give one year more I will fight you in the West. What better proof does this House want of the sincerity of the men on the Opposition side than the number of questions asked by them in this House this afternoon. Is there any justification for such a thing and are they asked in the sole interests of the country? I say that they are not.

Take that Humber River proposition against which asperations and insinuations have been cast by men of the Opposition as well as by their newspapers. If we get four hundred tons of paper daily, which is anticipated by the promoters, as a output from this paper mill, it will be the means of giving employment to four or five hundred men. This mill would be about one-third larger than the Grand Falls mill and would be one of the greatest things that any body of men or any Assembly could legislate upon and pass on behalf of Newfoundland. But you struck at those men who promoted that scheme in the same way with your poisoned arrow as you did at us. Those promoters are stirring business men. They come here to start an industry that will be of benefit to the country generally and for so doing are insinuated against and slandered by men, who use their positions and privileges here, to ask questions imputing that those men are not as good as they ought to be. Is that fair? Is it right? Is there anything we can do to induce capitalists to come here and start an industry equal to the one at Grand Falls? That should be the question uppermost in our minds. Up there in that Grand Lake area there is three hundred horse power. It is running away and apparently of no use. Why

should that be allowed to run away without any benefit coming to this country when it could be turned into the largest coal mine that exists in British North America, or it might be used to give power to Bell Island or to give power to Green Bay for the purpose of smelting copper ore or it might be used for turning timber into paper. I know that while I sat in Opposition that I continually advocated openly and fearlessly for things that could be done by the then Government for the benefit of the country. And I will say this that while the Morris Government was in power that I received more concessions for the F. P. U. than I have received since I became a member of the present Government eighteen months ago. Many of the Bills that were put on the Statute Book by the Morris Government were brought about through the exertions of the F. P. U. members. The Morris Government listened to our appeals because they knew they were not made in the interest of party politics. Sir Edward (now Lord) Morris often told me that he was always delighted to hear any suggestions that came from us. We always made suggestions to keep the price of fish up, but I do not hear of any such suggestions now from the present Opposition. All one can hear now is this despicable Government led by Squires and Coaker and the wonderful crimes they have committed by taking over the railway, for instance. Do you know that had we not taken over the railway that it would not have been operating for some time past?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Why did you not do it when the House was open?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Because if we had done so the House would have remained open for three or four months longer. Further, the condition of the Reids was not known then.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Sure it would.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—But when the House was closed we had not decided to take over the railway.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—The Prime Minister showed it in his speech last session.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No agreement was ever finalized.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Do you want to hear it, the story?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I heard it the other day. The Reid Newfoundland Company's steamers were held here in June last and the Company refused to let them go on their regular routes because they were unable to do it. We took over the railway which was practically of no use then, with the result that to-day the road-bed is in as good a condition as it has been for the past ten years. We spent \$250,000 on it. This expenditure had to be made to ensure the safety of those who travelled by it. We also built a terminus for handling freight at Port aux Basques. This terminus had been asked for many years before but no one seemed to have sufficient courage to go ahead with it. Then again we all know that Placentia was asking for a safe harbour. The pier belonging to the Reid Company was carried away by storms and the only alternative we had was to give a safe harbour at Argentia, which is alongside, that may be of some benefit to the people of the West Coast.

We did it, we had to do it or there would be no way only to waste more money in Placentia. Look at the Opposition we met with in the opening of our coal mines. Every Newfoundlander wanted to see our coal mines worked. We were all told that coal abounded in the country, we have been trying to find out. We tried to

see if there could be anything to be done in that connection. We have a twelve foot seam one hundred and twenty feet deep, and having that are we justified in paying fifteen dollars a ton for coal at Sydney when we can produce it ourselves at five or six dollars a ton and at the same time give employment to the people of the country. Is there anything unreasonable in having the courage to open a coal mine, which no other Government attempted to do. I have spoken before about the position of the country. Is it possible that there are men on the other side of the House who cannot put country first at a time like this. I do not mind your criticisms about the policy of the Government, that is your duty, but you are up against conditions in this country which never had to be faced before. You had no such conditions in 1917 when you had the Government. Is it possible that if we could forget our political differences in 1917 and I risked my political future when I did it, that you cannot do so now. I held out the hand of welcome to the Government and we put our heads together and got the country through. Many a time during the period of 1917 and 1918 we did not know what would happen on the morrow, but we forgot everything but country and we pulled her through and pulled her through well. Now we are facing the reconstruction period. We must recognise that if the world wasted billions of dollars as it did during the war that the bill must be paid. We paid it in our blood during the war, but now that the war is over we must pay it in dollars and cents. The whole world is crippled because of the effects of the war. In England they say we cannot exist as a Government unless we are a Coalition Party, and in Canada the same. If there was ever a time since we got responsible Government ninety years ago that we must remember

nothing but country it is now. If you will do your best and if you don't want to associate with the Government, if you will put up no undue opposition to our proposals, we can present proposals that will help the situation considerably. You have Sir John Crosbie making that statement that one of the solutions is to insist on outright sales for our fish in the fall. He knows what he is talking about. I know the value of his words. They are written on my heart. I know that if we can get a dollar and a half more a quintal for fish that it will mean three and a half million dollars more to the trade of the country. He knows and I do that there is a chance of the Newfoundland business of exporting fish falling into a great monopoly, if we compel everybody to sell fish in St. John's. He knows as I do that you are going straight up against a wall in the exportation of your fish by the men who have not put up three or four hundred thousand dollars to buy fish and then send it to the markets are the ones who do not know it. Take Capt. Abraham Kean last fall he went into this business but he lost his money and it was his own fault.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—What did Mr. Grieve tell you? I suppose he knew what he was talking about.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He didn't know any more than other men. I tell you that if Sir John Crosbie and I were in the one Government that we would have Fish Regulations. The only thing we can do is to nationalize our fish. That is a good thing but look at the fight that will be necessary to get it. If I were as strong as I was five years ago I would tackle the question, and I would convert the country to the nationalization of our fish. Let the men on the other side believe that.

Where are the firms of Tessier, John Duder, Stewarts? Go down the town and take all the firms except

Bowrings and Harveys that have been handling fish for fifty years and they are all killed by exporting their fish, when there were no Regulations and having to take what the men on the other side chose to pay them for it, and as long as we have fish shipped by consignment we will have these conditions in the country every seven or eight years. Do you think that the young men of the outports will remain fishermen if they have those conditions facing them. They are educated men now and they will not put up with what their fathers put up with, and if they cannot get a decent living as fishermen in this country they will leave the country and our future as a fishing country is gone. Three years ago fish was fifteen dollars a quintal, last year it was ten, this year it will be six dollars for Shore Fish and four and a half or five dollars for Labrador Fish. Under these conditions the old men of course will have to remain but the young men from eighteen to twenty-five will not. On some cargoes of fish money is made and on others lost. There is money made on the first cargoes of fish and lost in the latter part of the season. The best way is for the Exporters to sell the fish in one body at a price not lower than a certain amount, let it go to the market through a Commission appointed for that purpose. Then you will get the same price first and last and let the profits of that fish be divided between the men who exported it. Who will achieve this in the face of the treatment which I have received? I have always done my best for the fishermen of the country. What sane man in the future will undertake such a problem as Nationalization. No other man would have tried to do what I did last year. Having the fishermen behind me I succeeded in getting the measure through which I thought and they thought would be beneficial, and

which would have been if it had been given a fair trial. In the face of the treatment I have received will I tackle this problem? My life is too short. I am worn out as it is. I would tackle it if I had the strength I had five years ago. In a year or two I will probably disappear from public life, but when I go they will be glad to have anotehr Coaker to take my place. Now I am sorry that I have taken up so much time and if I have said anything offensive to Mr. Fox I want to ask him to overlook it.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, I agree with what Mr. Coaker says about saying a thing in the heat of the moment. There is nothing personal in the matter and I would like to disabuse his mind of a wrong impression. He says that the fight of the Opposition is not against Squires but against Coaker and the F. P. U. He is wrong. I do not know whether it is the drop of Irish blood in me but I am again the Government. If the F. P. U. was the Government I would be against it. I do not single out any portion of the Government. As a Government you have a record you ought to be ashamed of and on that record you will be judged and punished. Towards the F. P. U. as a Commercial enterprise I have no animosity, but as a political factor which controls the Government I fight it. The Minister said that our attacks only serve to strengthen his position in the North. Well, if that is so he ought to be delighted. I have no doubt that he is very strong in the North and why shouldn't he be, and if he continues to do as he has done during the past eighteen months, I feel sure that he will be impregnable there. Why shouldn't he when he is feeding those people at the expense of the rest of the country.

Now Mr. Coaker says that that salt to the amount of seventy-five thousand dollars was not an outright sale. Then either he is wrong or the Attor-

ney General is wrong. The Auditor General's report says it was. The men who purchased that salt had not enough business ability to sell at a profit or save a loss and they sold to the F. P. U. for sixty-one thousand dollars and lost fourteen thousand dollars. This is what the Auditor General's report says. Which is wrong? Suppose it was as Mr. Coaker said it was he had no right to touch one cent of the public money. If you want to know the crime in that salt deal it lies in the fact that you used money you had no right to touch. If you were in England you would be dismissed from office for that action. No money should be expended unless it is voted in this House. Now here is the Auditor General's reply to Sir Michael Cashin's question. Either he is right and Mr. Coaker wrong or vice versa. Is the sum of seventy-five thousand dollars of so little importance to a destitute country that you can attempt to explain away the situation by saying the whole thing is wrong and should not inquire into it. Is that the way to justify the public confidence? You had not even the justification you had for taking the half million dollars to buy fish. We don't know upon what authority the Deputy Minister of Finance and Customs he had no right to do so. You are only the trustees of the public money and you have to handle it as such. If you were ordinary trustees you would be put in jail for this action. That is where the crime is in the refutation of that contract of sale and in throwing back upon the hands of the government, and the government will be lucky if they do not lose sixty-one thousand dollars on it. The Minister was wrong when he said that I stated that the half million dollars taken to buy fish was expended in Port Union. I did not say that, what I said was that it was expended to buy the Fish of the mem-

bers of the F. P. U. whether they all reside at Port Union or not I don't know or care. That does not interfere with the principle of the thing. That money was taken without justification or right and used to buy fish from the F. P. U. or their supporters, and if it was done for any organisation of a similar nature in my own district it would be just as wrong. The F. P. U. is only an illustration. If any section of the country is benefitted at the expense of other sections then that is wrong no matter what section it is, and let me tell Mr. Coaker that although the F. P. U. benefitted it was only temporarily because no one section of the country can receive any lasting benefit to the detriment of the country in general. The idea that I have any personal opposition to the F. P. U. is a ridiculous one. It is only because it controls the government that I oppose it. Mr. Coaker talks of my insinuations. I asked him a question some time ago now will he answer it? Is it not true that he undersold two cargoes of fish last year in Oporto that when the price was seventy shillings he sold at fifty-five.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—No it is not true.

MR. FOX—The Board of Trade says that you undersold your Regulations and if it is not true why don't you take some action about it?

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker. If you know anything about fish you will know that in Oporto they have been buying fish all faults. Two men came to me last year and said to me we are shipping two cargoes of fish No. 1, but we would like to have it put on our Bill of label All Faults, and we gave them that privilege and shipped their fish for them. Sir John Crosbie can tell you that your fish may be all No. 1, and it may sell All Faults. This expression means that they will take the cargo as it stands. There was an

insinuation that I sold fish at Oporto last year while other men could not do so. The Regulations called for outright sales. Every broker was trying to sell fish for Newfoundland. No man had to sell fish through the Department as long as it was sold outright. I had a right to sell my fish as well as other firms and I sold outright sales. The reason I sold so easily is that the Fish coming from the North has a splendid reputation there. When it comes from the West Coast they think it is different fish, bank fish in particular, but the Northern fish is easy to sell. If I had two cargoes since I came here I could have sold it, but I could not sell West Coast fish. They say do not give us that fish if you have any better. I tell you Hodges and Joe Lond or I should say Mr. Lond could sell their fish easily because of its reputation. Port Union has a good reputation. If I have a cargo to sell they get in touch with me and come to terms because they think it is good fish, but I sold no fish through the department. Some men could not get outright sales and these men came to me and asked if we would sell it for them They were granted that privilege. I sold my fish because I know those people over there. I was there two years in succession and they have confidence in me.

MR. FOX—I think the Hon. gentleman has touched the crux of the whole matter. You remember the old saying "You cannot serve God and mammon." But here we have a gentleman engaged in a private business and controlling the entire business of the country of the same nature. How can he serve both. He can't do it, and he is doing his reputation a lasting injury by attempting to hold down two jobs. You know there are very few of us who are willing to give the other fellow the benefit of the doubt. When a Cashin supporter's fish was held up on the West

Coast, and he is caused to lose heavily as a result people are inclined to think that there has been some unfair dealing. There is a nigger in the wood-pile somewhere. If the rumours are incorrect why does not the Hon. gentleman go down to the Board of Trade and deny them. It is no use in your going to the Exportation Board. That board represents only about one-third of the exporters of the country.

The hon. gentleman is attempting to serve two masters. He is attempting to serve the country, and he is attempting to serve his own private company in competition with the business of the country. I want him to regard that fact seriously. I want him to come out and disabuse the public mind of the rumors that are going around. I admire the Hon. gentleman's energy; I admire his indomitability, but the more energetic, the more influential, the more indomitable the greater is the danger to public interest. The bigger the man, the greater for good or for evil. I wish I had half his ability and half his energy. While in his present position the hon. gentleman has got to remember that there is such a thing as an F. P. U. while he is Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has got to remember that if he does not work in the interest of his private corporation his political position and influence are most unsafe. The record of the government during the past eighteen months indicates that the party that has come off second best has been Newfoundland.

The hon. Minister states that the reason the Regulations failed was the opposition from the merchants. So there is evidently opposition to the Regulations besides that of the lawyers. The Hon. Minister bows to the opinion of Sir John Crosbie, but there was no greater opponent of the Regulation than Sir John Crosbie. The Hon. Minister says that when he make

a mistake he is willing to acknowledge it. That is a good point in his favour, but when he makes a mistake that means the downfall of the country we cannot say to him "go and sin no more." The mistake is too serious and we have to be sure that he is not in a position to make the mistake and admit the Minister's courage in coming in here and admitting his mistake, but the people who are responsible for such a mistake cannot continue to conduct the affairs of the country. You have proved yourselves incompetent and inexperienced. Why there are shops on Middle Street selling essence of vanilla that were here a long time ago with you in charge. You have fired away hundreds of thousands of dollars without any consideration whatever. No mistake that you have made has cost less than half million. How can you expect men to cooperate with you? The country has absolutely no confidence in you. You have failed in your administration. Why not call a dissolution and go to the country. Never mind talking about a national government. That is merely dust thrown in the eyes of the people. The time for soft speaking has gone; the time for co-operation has gone. The next thing we should have is a re-shuffle of seats. I am prepared to stay in the Opposition, and you should be prepared to stay in your seats. The Hon. Minister talks about going West. If this government goes on for another year there will be no West to go to. I can imagine the torch-light procession when the Hon. members go back to the West Coast. If you had a sense of decency you would give up your seats and go to the country. Go back to the people you have wronged. Must the condition that at present exists continue? If it does God help Newfoundland. The country seems to be under a blight. The land that was to flow with milk and honey according to the prophecies

of a year ago has become a land of destitution. I wish the hon. Minister could forget there was such a thing as politics, and go back to Port Union and enshrine himself in the hearts of the people. Long ago he was regarded as the uncrowned king of the North I do not want to think of him as a political opponent, not as a political autocrat, but as the uncrowned king of the North. Rid yourself, Sir, of politics and political ambitions. Free Newfoundland of the stranglers hold, and I will do my best to co-operate in the administration of the affairs of the country. But if you stay in politics and continue to maintain your stranglehold, you will have no more bitter opponent than I will be.

It was moved and seconded that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on 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 they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of Enquiry'" without amendment.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 10th, 1921.

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

MR. TARGETT—I beg leave Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hant's Harbor asking that the sum of five hundred dollars be granted for the repair of the main line which is very badly in need of repair. The petition is signed by one hundred and sixty persons and I give the prayer of the petition my hearty support and that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WINSOR—I ask leave Mr. Speaker to present a petition from the residents of Newtown in the district of Bonavista requesting that the motor boat service between Newtown and Gambo be made permanent and that a better boat be put on the service. By this means the people are able to connect with the trains at Gambo. I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT—I give this petition my hearty support.

MR. ABBOTT—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Bonavista asking that the sum of five hundreds dollars be allocated to cut away an embankment at ———Cove. Something like forty boats fish out of this Cove and under present circumstances it is impossible for them to prosecute the fishery from this Cove. They therefore ask for the above amount and I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be handed to the department to which it relates.

MR. WINSOR—I support the petition.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir John Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to answer the question asked by

Mr. Higgins on yesterday's order paper. And in reply I would say that no printed matter was imported for use in the department of Finance and no officer or official received any commission or rebate on same. As to question five which asks for particulars extending over a period of three years and which will require some time to prepare I hope to be soon in a position to table.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that question 9 of May 4th., is still unanswered.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have asked the Auditor General to give me an answer but no reply has yet come to my desk. I may receive it during the afternoon.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted Sir M. P. Cashin moved "for the appointment of a Select Committee of 'this House (with five members) to enquire into and report upon the appropriation and expenditures of public money in 1920, for the purchase of Fish and Salt and into all matters concerning the charter of vessels, the hiring of stores, the purchase and sale of fish and salt, and the whereabouts of said fish and salt, and the control and management thereof; with power to employ counsel, take evidence on oath and send for all persons, papers and things necessary to the said enquiry, with an instruction to the said Committee to hold an enquiry in Public and to have the evidence taken stenographically and to publish the same from day to day in the newspapers of this City."

This motion was seconded by Mr. Bennett.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I beg to move that this Select Committee be appointed. The reasons for this appointment are not necessary to be told to the House as the matter has been thrashed out since the House opened. As we all know enormous amount of money has been taken from the Treas-

ury and the information asked for with reference to this sum has not been forthcoming and I am therefore compelled to take this step to have the necessary information given to this House and to the public. We have asked for the particulars of the taking of this sum of five hundred thousand dollars from the Treasury but we have not yet got them in the whole only in part. We have been told different answers to this question and we do not know whom to believe. We are in duty bound to insist on the acquisition of this information. But I wish to bring it to the notice of the gentlemen on the other side that they have brought this on themselves and if they have clean hands there is no reason why they should be afraid to court an enquiry into this matter. The same applies to the salt question. The member for the department tells us one story and the Auditor General another and we do not know whom to believe. We discovered in the report of the Auditor General that the cargo of salt was sold to a firm and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that it was stored and not sold to a firm and I think it is only fair to the department in charge if there is an enquiry re this salt. It is only fair to those responsible and for this reason and for no other motive do I ask that this Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the matter.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The motion before the Chair reads as follows:

I cannot accept the motion as it is not at all necessary under the circumstances

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Legislation is being brought in during the Session, legislation will be introduced in a day or two having the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply, then there will be Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, and the Surplus Trust Account will be before the House, then we all shall

have opportunities to discuss every detail of the motion involved. If my honourable friend desires a very careful scrutiny on behalf of the public then the public shall have it through the reporter's box of this House. There will be several opportunities to discuss matters of supply, matters of finance and the surplus trust account especially on the occasions associated with the committee stage of the House. The Government welcomes every just criticism in this connection, it welcomes every question in this connection, it welcomes all the publicity which is obtainable when the House is in Committee of the Whole with regard to the policy of the government in the detailed management of all these matters. The government welcomes the opportunities the country shall have through the medium of the reporter's box and the official reports of learning of every detail, of learning of the policy and the business transactions of the government. There is no one who more welcomes a just clear concise discussion during the Committee stage of the House than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, and there will be a multitude of opportunities between now and the time the House closes to have this matter fully discussed. With respect to the general matter of the question asked I have to say that practically every question from the other side of the House has been answered very fully and promptly, having regard to the nature of the question asked. The number of questions remaining unanswered to-day amount to only a few considering the hundreds of questions asked during the last few weeks. The leader of the Opposition will fully realise that of the numerous questions asked that very few remain unanswered according to parliamentary practice. Having regard to previous occasions in this House, I am of the opinion that the multitude of questions asked have been answered very fully and promptly

having regard to the nature of the question. I am sure that the numerous questions put by the members on the other side have been answered more carefully and more promptly answered than they have been during the last ten years. Not long ago Sir, when my honourable friend was a member of the government one hundred and sixty questions remained outstanding and unanswered at the end of the session. I consequently cannot concur with the motion before the Chair, which has been so courteously worded and put by the leader of the Opposition which is intended to suggest a vote of a want of confidence in the government or in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If he desired to have an enquiry into this matter then during the Committee stage of this House there will be the fullest opportunity and facility according to parliamentary practice and procedure. So far as I can see the motion of the honourable outlines no specific charge and as there will at a later date be an opportunity for the honourable member to secure any information he may desire I consequently cannot support the motion.

MR. HIGGINS—I did not anticipate taking part in the discussion relative to the motion before the House. I heard a motion, and when I say I heard of it, I mean I heard like the other members on this side of the House in a private capacity for the first time yesterday afternoon. I am surprised at the announcement of the Prime Minister, and, to put my opinions mildly, to come in here and hear such a reply is certainly a matter of absolute astonishment to me. I did not think it possible that such an answer would be uttered by the leader of the House. A member of this House makes a motion that a select committee be appointed to enquire into a matter of public importance. The matter in question has not alone been the subject of comment in this House but

it has been a subject of comment in the public press of the country, and it is a matter that touches upon the taking out of the Treasury of a large amount of money in an unusual way, in an improper and illegal way and contrary to all precedents, and then the leader of this House gets up and says that this motion will not be acceded to because it is a vote of want of confidence in the government. Surely the Prime Minister could not have seriously thought of the implication arising from the answer, of the conclusions that would have been drawn from it, namely that there may be a direct charge against some Minister of the Crown. There is no charge against any one, and I say if there is any charge against any minister of the Crown, then it becomes our bounden duty no matter on what side we sit, in the interests of the member, in the interests of the government and in the interests of this House to have that matter fully and properly disposed of. If it be true, and I do not for one moment suggest that it is true, that everything is clean and nothing is wrong then why not appoint this commission. Why are you afraid? Has it got down to this, that each member of the House is tabbed and you are told because you sit on this or that side of the House the vote whether an enquiry will be held or not is given according to the seat you occupy? You have heard a lot of talk about a suggestion that some one is guilty, but I do not know the member he refers to. Yet during the past twenty-four hours it has been said that there is a great necessity to get a proper union of minds. How is it possible to get together and expect co-operation when immediately when a thing of this sort is asked by a member of this House in the words of the Prime Minister in an inoffensive way and with words not even suggesting any charge whatever the Prime Minister makes an announcement such as

he did? The honourable leader of the Opposition merely moved that five members be appointed to go and get the facts and the papers and documents and the necessary witnesses and give the story to the country. You are making a mistake when you turn and say that this motion must be voted down because it emanates from the Opposition. I am sorry that you yourselves admit that there is something too rotten to be touched. You are afraid to have it exposed. I have neither heard it said, or suggested from this side that something unprecedented, irregular or improper has been transacted by the government. It is no matter whether the Committee comes from this side of the House or is wholly composed of your own members so long as this matter is disposed, but for the Prime Minister to make the utterance he did is unworthy of him as leader of this House, unworthy of him as a lawyer, and I am sorry to have to say it because he knows better than to say in reply that this can be exhaustively dealt with during debate here in this chamber. He says the matter can be thrashed out in debate, but the chances are one hundred to one that the true inwardness of the story will never be brought to light. It is the privilege of the country to know the story. Is it fair to come in here and is it decent for you because you have a majority, because you are the government, to sit down in your seats with closed mouths and let us talk. I cannot believe that the members of the other side, and especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have come to this stage and are going to support the suggestion of the Prime Minister. No I believe it is the spontaneous thought of the Prime Minister when he draws a red herring across the matter. The passage of this motion will help this House to transact its business more expeditiously and close the House earlier. There is no logic whatever in the state

ment of the Prime Minister, and we on this side of the House will only find ourselves in the humorous position that it is our bounded duty to enter into a lot of argument and discussion which we never contemplated, all because you refuse to accede to the simple motion before the Chair. This will surely convey to the country at large the impression that something is being kept clear of being stirred up, and it is the natural duty to fall upon us to take the line which we never thought of taking, a stand wherein we are forced to believe that there is something peculiar, that some one is afraid of the lime light. The leader of the House himself has suggested that the motion imputes wrong doing to some member of the Crown. Presumably he refers to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Not a man in this House since the opening of the debates has suggested wrongdoing of a personal nature, wrongdoing for personal gain. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has often courted enquiries into his conduct. His language has always suggested that course. He has more than once wished the searchlight to be turned on him because he is not afraid of the enquiry.

And yet we now hear "Cut off the glare; stand aside and let us get back in the dark." Is that to be the policy now that this committee is asked for? Do honourable gentlemen think that they are to come in here and act according to the dictates of the Leader of this House without consulting at all their own feelings in the matter? If the conduct of the government was all that it should be why do you funk this committee; why fear that the facts be laid bare? I never thought that the day would come when honourable gentlemen in this House would funk an investigation into matters involving such a huge expenditure as that which we now seek to have examined into. This House is the seat

of all law; it is above all courts; it is the one institution in the land that must stand for the rights of the people, then surely honorable members opposite, surely the Leader of the government himself is not serious, surely he is not going to refuse an investigation when wrong doing is imputed to a minister of the Crown and when so much is at stake. Someone said a day or two ago that if a petty larceny is committed there is no hesitation in finding the perpetrator and giving him six months in jail; if a man's house is burnt, an enquiry is immediately held, but now we are told that altho a minister goes down and takes three quarters of a million dollars irregularly and improperly, the transaction ought not be enquired into. Does the Prime Minister think that the people are fools all the time? Does he think that if the people are suffering because of the depression that exists they do not remember who caused it? We hear a lot of talk about the times in other countries, but I want to tell you that in no other country under the British flag would there be the slightest hesitation in holding an enquiry such as is asked for here. How can the government expect the people to have the slightest faith in them if they go on the policy that there should be no enquiry into this matter because wrong doing is imputed. That is the greatest reason why an enquiry should be held and if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the man I think he is he will be the first to support the motion. No man whose record is clean would shirk any enquiry into his actions and it is because I have faith in the hon. Minister, and because I believe that he is able to satisfactorily explain his personal position in this matter, that I expect from him a different answer from that given by the leader of the government, namely that to appoint this select committee would be paramount to a vote of want of confidence. Want of

confidence in what? The committee could consist of a majority of government members, or for that matter it could be composed of all government members so far as we on this side are concerned, and such a committee can do no more than get the facts and, moreover, by virtue of its very composition it would be a government committee. I repeat that this committee can only get the facts and report on them. And we to take it then that the facts are such as if taken under these circumstances the people concerned would be placed in a really serious position; is it suggested that if that method were employed, the story would after all be different from what I had thought it would be? Is there really something in these transactions that if they were to be enquired into the results would be unpleasant for the minds behind them? How can any hon. gentleman allow himself to be placed in the humiliating position of having to go back to the people who sent him here and say to them "I could not vote for the appointment of a committee to enquire into these matters because it would set in motion machinery which would bring to light facts which are better kept out of sight. If we can keep our mouths closed everything is alright, but if they get to work things may be discovered that would make it awkward for those whom we are pledged to obey without question." Is that the position hon. gentlemen opposite are going to take? Is it the position that this House cannot investigate matters of such momentousness as this because it would make it unpleasant for some of its members? Honourable gentlemen opposite, don't for the sake of the children who are to come after you turn down this committee; compose it how you like, but don't turn it down, for to do so would be an open request for us on this side to look upon you as wrong doers whose actions cannot bear the light of day.

Don't let us approach this serious business by telling us straight that you've done something that you don't mind us talking about in the House, but which you dare not have enquired into outside. Don't, for the sake of those who are to come after you, have yourselves looked upon as men who are licked into shape for party exigencies. Don't, for the sake of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, refuse to support this motion. The Prime Minister would not, on more mature consideration, I feel sure, give such an answer as he has given, that for a committee, composed entirely of members of the government and not influenced by any force outside the House, to be appointed to enquire into matters of such far reaching importance, would amount to a vote of want of confidence. If you vote against it you are writing yourselves down as men who voted in this way because the dictate came from the leader of the party. I suggested a moment ago that no man who is innocent cares what methods are employed to enquire into his conduct. I go further than that now, and I say that the man who supports a motion that would tend to create the impression that he had done something wrong a man who supports a motion not to enquire into his actions when such an enquiry is asked for or even suggested, leaves the impression in the minds of every thousand that there is something which he is ashamed of. If the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take it from me in all honesty, as from one who has at all times tried to play the game in that way with him he ought to welcome this committee; he ought to seek the enquiry; he ought to demand it. If I were in his place I would resent the suggestion that there was anything I was ashamed of. I would not care if it was a commission such as has been spoken of here, it would make no difference

where they came from, I would say go ahead and appoint your commission and get all the facts you can, and I would put it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not to allow himself to become an object of suspicion, not to deliberately give people the impression that there is that in his actions of which he has to be ashamed. The very worst that could be said would be to condemn the method of handling this matter. If the hon. Minister does not support the motion we can only assume that he has indeed been guilty of some personal wrongdoing, and from any evidence in my possession shouldn't suggest or even think him so guilty. Therefore, I appeal to him for his own sake and to every hon. minister who has his interest at heart not to let this opportunity pass. I would say again finally that this is a matter in which the Committee could do no more than get the facts, it cannot affect the Minister in any way and if this is so, why hesitate. If you do not have this motion carried, believe me, you will find that the people will come to the decision that "there is something rotten in the state of Denmark."

MR. MACDONNELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word to say before the motion is put. I also am disappointed that the government should have treated this matter the way they have. It will be remembered that yesterday afternoon the hon. minister, himself expressed the desire to have the fullest investigation. He said in reply to the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, why not have an investigation into the fact instead of making insinuations. Now Sir, could that have been merely bluff? It could not have been because notice had already been given of the motion now before the Chair when he made that statement. Are we then to have the spectacle in this House of a barefaced and abject back down for that is what his declining to-day to have

an investigation amounts to. As far as I can see, there is only one construction that I can place on his action. Sir John Crosbie has said that people may draw the conclusion that there has been some wrong doing, but I go further than that and say that no right thinking person can draw any other conclusion. The hon. minister has said that fish and salt are things that should be kept clear of politics and yet the Prime Minister now wants to make party politics out of these same matters. What is the explanation? I say that someone either inside or outside of this House is afraid of the truth. It has happened in this country before that gentlemen standing high in the councils of the government were forced to vacate their positions because of conduct that was not as serious as that suggested here, and it may happen again now if the whole truth is brought to light. You may knife this motion today; you may kill it now but remember that killing the motion does not kill the cause for the motion and there are many ways in which pressure can be brought to bear to have an investigation held. You have now been given the chance to court an enquiry, you may decline to take advantage of it, but do not be lured into the false security of thinking that it will end there. I do not know what is the practice in this House that corresponds to an impeachment in the House of Commons, but whatever it is we would have something very near an impeachment in this case if that practice were carried out. I cannot see any sense in the position and the only conclusion that can be arrived at is that there are facts in connection with the transaction which, were they to become known, would place the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the position where the Governor could tell them to get out and if this is so are they such fools as to imagine that by warding

off the evil day he will obliterate the matter altogether. The motion has been introduced properly and put forward in a manly and straightforward way and it will never be dropped until the whole matter has been sifted to the bottom and the entire fact made known and then those whose actions have not been what they should have been must take the consequences.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker. Before you put the motion I would like to ask the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the interest of the country at large if they have not one word of explanation to make before this vote is cast, or will they sit down and let it be cast. If that is what you intend to do then God help you and God help the country.

MR. VINICOMBE—I rise to support the motion before the Chair and in doing so, I would like to say that I think it is a motion which should have been put here two or three weeks ago, to stop the public from talking about the affairs of the government. I was surprised when Sir John Crosbie sat down, that the Minister of Marine & Fisheries did not rise and say that he feared no inquiry that could take place. We have to take it that the Prime Minister spoke for him when he said that there would be no Select Committee appointed for this purpose. I think it is time for the country to know of these matters. We have heard all about what the Prime Minister said in his Manifesto regarding the different departments of the government. He said that Mr. Coaker's position should be held by a man who had no interest in the exportation of fish from the country, and then he places one of the largest exporters of the country in that position. If he was above suspicion why did he get up and refuse to have a Select Committee appointed? I am surprised that Mr. Coaker did not get up and say I will

court inquiry, because I have the opinion of Mr. Coaker that even if he did do wrong that he would wriggle through, like the Prime Minister got out of the Woodford Affidavit. That is why I say that you were backward in not getting up, because if there are any tricks to be done the government will do them, but they can't do the business of the country. Now I am sorry that this thing did not go thru. We have been told that we have been hanging up this House for six weeks, and I say in all sincerity, as one who loves his country, that we should hang it up until October or November, because we have a crowd of incompetent men in the Executive government, and that would keep them from doing any material harm like they did last year. It is the duty of the House for this reason to hold up the House until October, but fortunately perhaps there is no more money fo. blunders to be made with. Now I hope that Mr. Coaker will get up and support this motion of a Select Committee as I do with my whole heart, and soul.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the motion:—Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis (13); and against it—Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Minister of Public Works, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Sasmon—(17).

so it passed in the negative, and was ordered accordingly.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, certain learned gentlemen of the Government have decided to vote down the motion for a select committee to be

appointed for the purpose of enquiring into the matters of the purchase of fish and salt out of the public funds. Unlike previous speakers, I am not at all surprised that they should have so decided, rather does this but confirm my previous opinion, it only buttresses my idea of what the Governments' action in this instance would be as indicated by their record for the past year and a half. We all know the history of their broken promises and pledges unredemmed; the whole country has been nauseated by the statements of the Leader of the Government of all that was going to be done to purify politics; they thought that there was no party possessed of honor or morals but themselves and all were tired hearing of the rejuvenation that was to be wrought in public life. They slandered their predecessors to gain favor with the electorate even though the previous administration had included in its ranks many who now sit on the other side. The Prime Minister himself was a part of the administration that was so slandered by his own party in 1919 and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a part of the National Government. Do what they will these gentlemen cannot disassociate themselves from that administration but instead of having taken their share of the credit or the blame for all that had been done, there was nothing too bad for them to say about those who now sit on this side and nothing too good for them to say about themselves. The whole thing was pure sham and rank hypocrisy and now you have taken power unto yourselves and used it to further your own private ends. You had laws placed on the Statute book which you immediately disregarded and when charges of wrong-doing are brought against you, you exclaim with one breath "we are innocent" and with the next you deny this House the right

to enquire into your actions in connection with a matter that concerns the whole country.

You have done as you had no right to do. Mr. Coaker to-day as the man in charge of the Fish Regulations in the country for the past year stand in the position that he is surrounded with suspicion, and whether or not the charges which have been made are true there have been charges made in connection with that half million dollars which you had no right to touch, there are rumours rife that all is not as it should be, that cheques have been drawn and paid to the account of the man in charge of these Regulations. Water Street is flooded with suspicions of that character, and Mr. Coaker owes it to himself to refute them. If he has done nothing wrong he need have no fear of an enquiry, but if he has he has every reason to refuse to vote for this motion, and the only conclusion I can reach is that you do not want an investigation into your record in this connection as subject to this motion. The men on the Government side hold up their hands in holy horror at the wicked Opposition for suggesting that they are not paragons of virtue and ask vengeance upon a crowd of men so lost to self-respect as to suggest such a thing. Well now from what has been disclosed during the past six weeks there is every justification for the Oppositions' asking for this inquiry. There have been nothing but scandals since you came into office. You have been proved incompetent but I say that you are worse than that, that you have been dishonest in the discharge of your public duties. Are we going to have an investigation of that sort stifled? Now where are the men who boasted of their independence a few days ago? If your party is right you need have no fear, but if you think your leader have done wrong then as independent

conscientious men it's your duty to see that we have an investigation and say if we find our leaders have done wrong we will disassociate ourselves from them forever. Now prove the independence and honesty of purpose that you want attributed to you and which is believed in by very few. There is one statement made from this side of the House which I object to on principle and that is regarding the personnel of the Committee, namely that you can choose five men from the Government ranks. I am not very strong on Biblical history, but I believe that there was a city of Sodom and Gomorra and Lot was told to go and find ten good men there and if he could the city would be saved, but he could not and the city was destroyed. This Liberal Reform Government is Sodom and Gomorra of Newfoundland, and any man who engages to find five good men among you is undertaking some task, and as a consequence of this the country will be destroyed and you with it. If any hon. gentleman would get up and say yes we will support this motion I would alter my opinion, but you sit there and no man has courage to do this to prove his sincerity or assert his independence. Then certain gentlemen are surprised that the motion is about to be turned down. I can only come to one conclusion and that is that if the Minister allows this to be turned down he has something to hide. Ever since you have assumed office you are not fit to associate with, because no man can touch tar and remain unsoiled and the same applies to you. It is impossible to associate with men who have outraged every principle of decent government for the past year and a half who have seen fit to go down and take half a million dollars of the public money and use it for one section of the country, who have used their public offices for their private interests, who now refuse the

public something that is their's by right, an inquiry into what they have done with public moneys they had no right to touch. The public are your masters and to them you will have to account. Through the voices of the Opposition and the public press they demand an investigation of certain matters, and that right you are denying them, the people who sent you here, and why? Because you know you have done wrong and you cannot face the clear light of an impartial investigation, but remember you are only postponing the evil day, but be it long or short, the time will come when upon your heads will be visited the sins of your administration. Why this motion means merely that an impartial Committee be appointed to investigate certain matters that the public want to know about. Grave suspicions are afloat in connection with those matters and the public want that inquiry to find out whether you have done right or wrong, how that money was spent, and you refuse to grant that right, and yet you boast of your independence and protest before high Heaven that you are the personification of everything good and pure in public life. Hypocrisy never went further, it could not go further. A lot of indignation has been expressed in the Government ranks during the past few weeks, because insinuations have been made that they are not independent, that they must jump when their leaders say so, and get down when their leaders tell them to. Your action with regard to this motion puts you in the position not only of men accused of certain charges but found guilty of them. Farewell now to your boast of independence and purity of motive. I personally have no doubt that the suspicions abroad are correct, that if an investigation be held by an impartial Committee that you will be found guilty of the charges laid against you, and I am not at

all surprised that you have shirked the issue. The Prime Minister said that this motion is equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in the government. You are the only people who have any confidence in yourselves. The public has none, because you have violated the pledges you made them. You stand in the position to-day of a discredited Government, a body of men who have proven themselves incompetent and incapable, and if rumour is correct, dishonest in the administration of public affairs.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House what Orders have been sent to the Royal Stores Furniture and Clothing Departments from Nov. 15th, 1919, to April 30th, 1921, from his department?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table that information.

MR. BENNETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement giving the amount of money spent on that section of the South Side Road from the Gorton-Pew Company's premises to Fort Amherst from March 1st, 1920, to present date, giving details of work performed, the names of all persons employed with particulars of amounts paid to each, and if a proper division of the work is allotted to residents without regard to political affiliation, also to state if work at present performed is essential, having regard to financial conditions at the present time.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The answer to that question is being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if people who undertook the cutting of pit props as relief work the past winter were given in any case such articles as tinned meats, canned fruits, dried fruits and accordeons as part of the payment for cutting pit props near Newman's

Sound during the past few months, and if these articles were given with the approval of the Government, and if not does the Government propose to take any steps to prevent this practise being continued; also if it is the case that the Government has been charged with the distribution of 370 barrels of flour, 70 barrels of meat and other fruits in proportion as well as a number of accordeons which were distributed in a section where there were only three families reported to be in need, and if so who is the mill owner who distributed this material and what quantity of pit props was furnished as the equivalent for this distribution?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Leader of the Opposition is aware that no pit props are being cut by the Government. We have not issued supplies for this purpose to anyone. This information has already been tabled but I will again table the whole lot.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Before we get away from this matter do I not understand that pit props were given for the benefit of the people in the Northern and Western Bays last year. Certain people were given contracts provided they would employ poor people.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Certain people who wanted to cut pit props said we are not prepared to cut unless the Government will give certain guarantees. The Government guaranteed that provided they were notified of liability before the thirtieth of June they would purchase such as were pronounced suitable by Government surveyors for Tidal Waves. These people got their own supplies. The Government guaranteed no credit, but merely entered into that contract.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—The Government promised those people if

they did not make a success financially that they would take the pit props off their hands. Was there no representation made by members of this House to the Government for the cutting of pit props in the Northern and Western Bays? Did not members intercede with the Government to allow pit props to be cut and exported from the Colony, with the understanding that the men who contracted with the Government would give employment to the poor and not the rich people.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is quite correct.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—The Government knew that there was destitution in the Northern and Western Bays and that the poor could be relieved by the cutting of pit props, and they gave the contract provided the poor were employed. That is what I am after.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is not what was asked.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Well I put the question now. Pit props were given last year to certain individuals instead of poor relief, and as gentlemen on the other side can bear me out we made representation to the Government to this effect and the Government gave contracts to planters to cut pit props but they had to give employment to the poor, and the Government guaranteed a price. Is not that what I was after?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No. If you want to ask me a reasonable question like that, that is a different matter. My answer to your question is that the Government had nothing to do with these accordeons, etc.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What I want to say is that the planters in the North did not employ the poor man because there is no poor man. I knew what you would say but what I want to point out is that the men in the North

were handed out thousands of dollars.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Good for them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The reason you say good for them is because it means your existence. If they did not you were gone. You got up here and made an exhibition of yourself in this connection the other day. Here is how the relief was made in the North. Salvage, do you know where that is? This gentleman is taking notice, he says as follows: (Reads letter.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—What is his name?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I am not going to tell you his name. That is for you to find out. You should have an Inspector down there to look after matters.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he did not at the F. P. U. Convention at Port Union, in November 1919, declare his intention of imposing a tax on the Steel Companies operating at Bell Island of a dollar a ton or of an amount which would realize for the Colony the sum of a million dollars a year, and if so how it is that the proposed contract with these Companies does not embody any such provision and if this failure to do so was a result of any special arrangement with the Companies in the interests of the F. P. U.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if a person named Dugald White, holds an appointment as Customs House Officer at Port Union, or acts in that capacity, and if so what salary he is paid for such services; also if it is the case that the same Dugald White is a regular employee of the F. P. U., at Port Union and spends virtually all his time in the service of that concern, if in his capacity as Custom House Officer he is

supposed to protect the interests of the Customs' Department in Port Union, and if the Government is satisfied that he can serve two masters—the F. P. U. and the Colony; also a statement of the amounts collected by the said Dugald White in his capacity as Customs House Officer from the 15th of November 1919, up to date.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House the original log of the dredge "Priestman" of her work during the year 1920, together with a statement of the amount which her operations cost this Colony, and also of what amount, if any, was paid in return for such work by any private concern or concerns whose property was improved by her work during the year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he has read the letter in the "Telegram" of last Thursday signed by Mr. Penny of Ramea, in which the writer claims that his firm has lost the value of a cargo of fish through the refusal of the Minister of Marine and his Department to grant him facilities for the sale of the same last year and if it is the intention of the Government to compensate Mr. Penny for his loss and if not why not, and again, if not wherein does this matter differ from the case of the constituents of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whose catch was bought with public money last November.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Hon. Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House if this \$1,060 to A. H. Salter is over and above the amount of \$250 voted him last session?

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if the Old Age Pensions for the quar-

ter ending the 31st of March last, have yet been paid and if not why not?

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V, Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. SULLIVAN gave Notice of Question.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE 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 11th, 1921.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that an Address of this House be presented to His Excellency, the Governor-in-Council praying that he will be pleased to appoint the three Judges of the Supreme Court, a Commission under the provisions of Chapter 21, Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled "Of Enquiries Concerning Public Matters" to enquire and report concern-

ing the appropriation and expenditure of public money in 1920, for Fish and Salt, and particularly into the purchase, shipment and disposition of the cargo of the "President Coaker" and all matters relating thereto, and into the purchase sale, custody, and control of the salt cargo stored at Port Union: and praying that until the said Commission shall report the Hon. W. F. Coaker, who holds the dual and irreconcilable positions of representative of both buyer and seller in these transactions, shall be suspended from his office as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in which he controls the evidence and sources of information essential to the protection of the interests of the colony.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked the Hon the Prime Minister if Mr. H. R. Brooks a Director of Job Bros., in this city, has been acting as adviser to the government in connection with labor troubles here, with proposals for reduction in the salaries of the Civil Servants, and with regard to measures for breaking strikes or in any other way, and if so to state in what matters he has been in consultation with the government, what advices he has given the government, and if he is receiving any remuneration for his services and if so how much.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I can answer that question right away, in the negative.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. I beg to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the Revenue of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year 1920; also a statement of the Expenditure and a Balance Sheet for the year 1920; also statements showing the estimated revenue and estimated expenditure for 1921.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if a person describing himself as Colonel J. H. Riley, has made any overtures to the government with regard to the operating of mining areas at York Harbor, Bay of Islands, and if the government has given him any concessions in regard thereto, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing who Colonel Riley is, what is his standing, and what is the nature of the concessions, if any given by the government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply I wish to state that Colonel Riley has not made any overtures to the government with regard to the operating of mining areas at York Hr. Bay of Islands; also that the government has not given him any concessions in regard thereto.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his department has any information as to how much of last year's catch of fish is at present in cold storage or otherwise stored in ports in Europe; and if so, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the quantity in each port at date of last advices, and if he has no such information can he obtain it; and if not, what is the value of the Statistical Department which he claims organized some time ago in connection with his department?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked hon. the Prime Minister if, in addition to the correspondence in relation to the Commercial Cable Company doing business in this colony, tabled last week by the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, any other correspondence or negotiations took place with him (the Premier) or any member of the government, either orally or in writing in relation to this matter, and if so to lay on the Table copies of all such correspondence and a statement of the nature of any oral negotia-

tions; also if the government permits the Commercial Cable Company to operate in this colony, will not the other Cable Companies and the Reid Newfoundland Company, which operate a telegraph system, have the same right, and if they do operate and some future government should decide to enforce the law which prevents them operating, will they have an action for damages against the colony, and, in view of these contingencies, does not the government think the wisest policy to adopt a definite course of action in regard to this matter in accordance with the law already on the Statute Book?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There has been no correspondence or negotiations with myself or the government or with any member of the government individually, either orally or in writing in relation to the matter referred to in the question other than the correspondence already tabled.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—But they are doing business in the meantime and are you going to allow them to continue to do business before the matter is definitely settled.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They are going ahead, without prejudice, during the time as is necessary for the Attorney General to look into the legal position.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—But don't you think that there should be no delay. The matter is of vast importance and I think that we cannot move fast enough in having it immediately investigated.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—During the next few days the time of the Attorney General will be profitably employed ascertaining the legal aspect of the case.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that the coopers of this city have been among the most serious sufferers by the fishery policy enforced by the

government the past eighteen months: if he (the Prime Minister) did not promise the coopers and laborers and other workers, especially of the district of St. John's West, that under his administration they would have plenty of work and good wages, if he can say that they are in the enjoyment of plenty of work or good wages at the present time, and what steps he proposes to take to see that these promises are made good?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am not aware that the coopers of this city have suffered seriously by the fishery policy of the government during the past eighteen months.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You are the only one in the city who have not heard it.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the reply of the Prime Minister. Surely he could not be sincere when he made that reply. He must be aware of the fact that thousands of dollars worth of coopers stocks would have been used, if no fish regulations were in force.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is a matter of argument.

MR. BENNETT.—No, but it is a matter of absolute fact. As I stated in this House in the early days of this session, I was in Halifax some time in February last when two large ships loaded for Brazil somewhere between twelve and fifteen thousand drums of fish. That fish was Nova Scotia fish, packed in drums made by Nova Scotia coopers and which would have been made by the coopers in the West End of St. John's, but for the Regulations which have been so often spoken about and criticised. Hence I think that the reply of the Prime Minister to that question is not decent, because as a member representing that district he must have known that the hardships thrust upon those people through lack of employment

were caused by the fishery policy of the government in St. John's West as well as in other parts of the country. It is no use for the Prime Minister to burke the question. He should have admitted that the inauguration of the fish regulations was responsible and entirely responsible for the putting off of the coopers of St. John's West and the labourers as well, and, in fact, every workman employed in connection with the exporting of fish. I think it is a deplorable situation, Mr. Speaker, and the government are entirely responsible for it. They have taken the work out of the country and especially out of the district of St. John's West.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. I feel that I am out of order as much as my honourable friend was and that on a later occasion I will have an opportunity of discussing this matter at greater length. I have the idea that the operation of the Newfoundland Fish Regulations has not been responsible for the lack of employment to any large extent, particularly in view of the fact that 75,000 quintals of the Lunenburg catch of fish is not yet marketed, and that while we had 500,000 quintals of codfish this time last year unmarketed we now have 250,000 quintals, but these are all matters we will have an opportunity of dealing with later in the ordinary course.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. F. Collishaw is employed by his Department in any capacity, or has been commissioned by his department to undertake any sale of fish outside this colony, and if so to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence in relation to the same.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House what orders has been sent from his depart-

ment to the Woolen Mills, owned by the Royal Stores, from Nov. 15th, 1919 to April 30th 1921.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the reply.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House what orders has been sent from his department to Royal Stores Grocery Department from Nov. 15th, 1919, to April 30th, 1921.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—None whatever.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Asked the Min of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House all orders sent from his department to Jethro Penny, employed by the Royal Stores or the Woolen Mills owned by the Royal Stores from Nov. 15th, 1919, to April 30th, 1921.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—None whatever.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the member for Carbonear made a visit to Prime Minister to say if the Hon. Norway last year and if so for what purpose; to state the time the trip occupied and the amount paid the hon. member (a) as compensation and (b) for travelling expenses; and to lay on the table of the House a copy of the hon. member's report on his mission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. member for Carbonear paid a visit to Norway last year for the purpose of studying their various fishery methods; the trip occupied between three and four months and he had been paid nothing as compensation; the amount of his travelling expenses was approximately \$2,500, which information was tabled some time ago; I understand that the hon. member has a report finished in connection with his mission and will table it in due course.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention

of the Government to introduce legislation at this session to carry into effect recommendations of the Commission appointed some months ago to inquire into the working of the Prohibition Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No report has as yet been received from the Commission and until that report is in the hands of the Government it is impossible for the Government to make any definite pronouncement with the respect to the matter referred to in the question.

MR. BENNETT.—May I ask if that Commission is still sitting or how does the matter stand?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Some weeks ago I wrote Sir William Lloyd, chairman of the Commission, as I informed the House at that time, asking him when the report would be ready. He replied that he would let me know the following day or the day after. I saw him and understood from him that the Commission had completed its work of taking evidence and was settling down in an efficient and business like fashion to make carefully prepared report and that it would be tabled very soon after.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the table of this House a detailed statement of the expenditure of \$250,000 on the road bed of the railway as stated by him in his speech in this House yesterday:

- (a) Amount of ballast distributed and cost of same.
- (b) The mileage over which ballast was distributed.
- (c) The number of new ties laid down and cost of same.
- (d) The mileage over which new ties were placed.
- (e) The amount spent on drainage.
- (f) The amount spent on new rails and fish plates.

(g) The amount spent in snow fencing, if any?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The answer is being prepared.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Minister of Public Works to inform this House by what authority Mr. A. H. Salter was paid \$1,080, if by Minute of Council, then to lay on the table of the House a copy of such minute.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—There is a Minute of Council and I hope to table a copy before the session closes this afternoon.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table a further memo. in reply to question 4 of Order Paper, 12th of May; also the following reply to question 5 of Order Paper of May 10th. In the year 1908 Mr. Dugald White was appointed as Tidewaiter at Catalina. He is not a Sub-Collector and therefore does not account for revenue receipts. His salary is \$489.50. The Government have not been informed as to whether he is an employee of the F. P. U. at Port Union or any other Company and whether he is or is not I do not know.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Does Mr. Coaker know?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I did not ask him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to call attention to question 9 of Order Paper of the 4th. I am waiting for an answer to that question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Minister who gave those orders was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, acting under orders from the Government. The salt was purchased by the Newfoundland Government and was agreed to be held in trust by the Union Trading Company at Port Union. When the Government permitted the salt to be held in trust, they took a receipt signed by W. F. Coaker. (Reads Receipt). That was sent in the form of a letter addressed

to the Minister of Finance and Customs. The cheque for the salt was signed by the Deputy Minister of Finance, and under the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was acting with the concurrence and authority of the Executive Council. It went through the Bank of Montreal in the regular way.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Was the order given in writing or verbally?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I cannot tell you that, but the transaction was perfectly regular and straight from a business standpoint.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V, Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to add a word or two about the Bill before the Chair. I have not taken any large part in the debate the past week, but simply listened to what was being said, but now I desire to offer some observations. There are so many important matters before the House that one scarcely knows where to begin because each has its special appeal of interest to the country at the present time. Before touching on the Fishery Regulations or the Bill before the House I would like to say something of the charges made this evening by Sir John Crosbie. We all know and the country knows likewise that many extraordinary things have happened during the past twelve months. Among the most amazing of these was the taking of a sum of \$500,000 by the Minister of Fisheries to purchase Labrador fish from people of the Northern Districts, mostly from his own constituents. Last November a rum-

or gained currency about town that something of this kind was to be done and many schooners were in port from the North with Labrador fish aboard and found the merchants would not buy it at what was known as the current price. Then these schooner owners held a public meeting in one of our city halls and demanded that the Minister of Fisheries take measures to make good the declaration previously made by the Minister of Fisheries that Labrador fish was worth eight dollars a quintal and that he was prepared to pay that. After the meeting, at which the subject was fully ventilated, the owners of that fish besought the merchants again to purchase it from them, but without avail, and meanwhile the Minister of Fisheries held another meeting in the same hall when he tried to set his side of the matter before these people and others interested. The owners of the fish insisted that he do something on their behalf and then came the report that he proposed to buy the fish with public money taken from the Colony's surplus in the Bank of Montreal. Most people scoffed at the idea it was so opposed to all practical business principles, and the commercial community in the main refused to credit it. Something, however, had apparently occurred, because the fish was bought, the men went home, and quiet reigned again. All attempts by the Board of Trade in correspondence subsequently published by individual merchants at meetings of the fish owners, and in other ways, to obtain any reliable information as to what had taken place, proved fruitless, because the Government and the merchants involved in this discreditable transaction refused to give any information whatever. Not till after the House opened and we put questions on the Order Paper did the country realize that all these rumors were based on realities and that three

or four merchants in alliance with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, himself one of the largest exporters of fish in Newfoundland, had got this money, the money of the taxpayers, that bought this fish at prices which no merchant would pay himself and that the country would likely be saddled with a tremendous loss on the transaction. An attempt has been made to justify this proceeding on the ground that a national emergency existed, and it was on this plea that the money was taken from the Public Treasury and we heard the Minister this afternoon rebuke us for raising this question here and argue that such would not be done in England. But I take leave to tell him that it is beyond belief that any member of the British Government could be guilty of the transaction of which he stands accused here this afternoon or would be allowed to retain his position for twenty-four hours after such a charge was formulated against him. Does anyone familiar with conditions in British public life imagine for a moment that a man could be as the Minister is at one and the same time, head of so important a Department as the Fisheries Department, and also head of one of the largest fish trading concerns in the country, and occupy the wholly impossible position of selling his own fish on the one hand, to himself as Minister on the other hand, and then use according to the charge now made, an outside party as a make-believe to camouflage this transaction. Could any man believe a member of the British Cabinet would do such a thing or that the Bank of England would give him money under such conditions? I maintain that the thing is unbelievable with regard to the Old Country and that the Minister credits us with very little knowledge when he expresses surprise that Sir John Crosbie should

assert here that his action as a Minister was in any way irregular.

Yesterday we had a motion for a Select Committee on this matter, and, to the surprise of those of us who sit on this side of the House and even more to the surprise of the country, the Prime Minister resisted that motion, called upon his party to vote against it, and declared that its passage would be a vote of want of confidence in the Government. This was, in my mind, an extraordinary position to take. It had no precedent in this country except the precedent of the charges against himself a year ago, and I need not say it had no precedent in any other country, because everywhere else in the British Dominions, when charges like this are made, an inquiry is immediately granted. When the Premier yesterday refused to accept our motion and to agree to a Select Committee, he passed a verdict of guilty on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the opinion of every right thinking man in this country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as we know to our cost, was practically alone in the control of the government the past summer. The Prime Minister was away for nearly five months, God only knows for what, neither we nor his followers, nor the country, have ever been able to learn or ever will learn. The Minister of Justice was abroad for a similar period, and Mr. Coaker took charge here at home. We forced an admission of this from the Premier this afternoon. The Minister was not alone in charge of his own department, but also of the Customs House, and issued orders for cheques to be made out for drawing public monies from the bank without any order-in-council or other warrant for doing so. Then he was also Acting Premier and ran the Colonial Secretary's department in the same way. In addition to all this he was Pres-

dent of the F. P. U., one of the largest fish exporting firms in the country, and when this "national emergency" as he terms it arose last Fall, when all other resources were gone, he went, without making any representation to his colleagues, I mean his colleagues in the Assembly, took charge of everything, induced the Governor to sign a warrant to enable him, as Acting Premier, to take half a million dollars out of the Bank and then gave this money to two or three people on Water Street to buy fish, including his own fish, and now he asks the House to accept his statement that there was nothing improper in this. Why did he not, if it was a national emergency, called the House together. What is the House here for? Why does the country elect thirty-six men every four years? Instead of that gentleman, filling all these positions and with a lot of fish on his hands of his own and a lot of people clamoring to him to buy fish from them or to sell their fish for them, induced his few colleagues in the Executive to concur with him in doing what was never done before and ought never be done again, that is, take half a million dollars of our money to buy fish from private people without any idea of when or how or where or at what price this fish could be sold again. Who of the Executive were here at the time I do not know. As far as I can figure out they were Mr. Halfyard, the Vice-President of the F. P. U., and as much interested in this transaction as Mr. Coaker himself; Mr. Samuel Foote, and Mr. George Shea who is not responsible to this House, and these three, with maybe one or two others, got together, discussed the public meetings that were being held and the agitation that was in progress, and said "well, we must do something about it, the price of fish is down, the merchants won't buy, the people are clamoring for us to make good

our promises that we would see they got the best price, and the only way that appears to exist of our giving them this price is to take half a million dollars from the Treasury, and start in to buy their fish." That is the position as I see it. By what process the Governor was induced to agree to this proposition I do not know. No report has been tabled here, nor I suppose will there. Yet there never was greater reason for such than there is in this case. The country looks upon the Governor as the safety valve and the reasons which induced the Governor to move in this matter ought to be put on the records of this House, together with a statement of the results to serve as an example for all future Governors of a pitfall that they should avoid. You may ask why and I will tell you. It is because this fish as an article of commerce is worth to-day not four dollars a quintal, and the only justification the Minister could advance to this House a few days ago to justify this transaction, was that certain cargoes were now on the way across the Atlantic, that others arrived in Europe, and that messages were sent across the cables that fish had gone down in Newfoundland and that these cargoes would then have to be sacrificed. Now, even if that is true, which I doubt, why should the owners of this fish not have taken their medicine as well as the rest of the people in the country who own the money that was taken to buy this fish. No fair treatment was given the country as a whole. Discrimination was practised and that money was handed out to a chosen few and not to the general public. Still a bluff is put up in this House when a charge is made about wrong doing. We were told recently, when the first statement about this fish was brought down, that the cargo of the "President Coaker" was taken out of schooners then in Port

Union. Now it appears that some of it was taken from the F. P. U. where it had been for some weeks, no months. Then we were told that the fish had been bought by Mr. Joseph Sellars, but Mr. Sellars is going about town to-day saying that he had nothing to do with it and that he can tell an entirely different story of the whole transaction. I am not developing this matter because of any hostility towards the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have nothing against him politically, but it is our duty as representatives in this House to probe this matter to the bottom, and if the Minister's hands are clean it is his place to court an inquiry instead of using his influence with the men who sit beside him on the other side to help whitewash him, because that is what it seems to mean. The whole thing is a transaction that reflects no credit on the Minister or on his pretensions in this House. He took this money and paid for his own fish with it. He took it for fish that was here in St. John's and applied it to his own private business. He chartered the President Coaker, supposedly to Joseph Sellars and at a price far above that ruling for the freighting of fish at the time. He was asked to table in this House the charter party made out between the F. P. U and Mr. Sellars. This charter party would show the amount he was getting, or the owner of the "President Coaker" was getting for the freight for taking that fish across. The Minister came into this House and told us he had no charter party and there was none to be found though he did admit he thought there was one aboard the vessel. Such an excuse is not good enough for this House. No business man would enter into a transaction on that basis and we are prepared to believe that the Minister did so. Then, again, we ask who represented the Government in loading the "President

Coaker" with the 7,500 quintals she is said to have taken on board. We could get no answer. We asked who can swear that there was 7,500 quintals put on board and we can get no answer. We asked what was the quality of the fish and there was similar silence. Now, Sir, all these things need probing, and the Minister has put himself in a wrong position by voting against the motion for an inquiry. If he was innocent he should have welcomed an inquiry and when he resists it there is only one conclusion possible, and that is that there is something to hide. The Premier told us yesterday that we could debate this matter when the Estimates were on and that all these questions would be answered but that is no way to deal with a matter of this kind. We don't want to debate the question here, we want it investigated on oath and all the facts brought out. We offered to taken a committee of five chosen from the other side of the House, provided the inquiry would be made on oath. That offer was refused and we were asked to accept instead a proposition to discuss this in the House where we would have no means of getting at the bottom of whatever there is irregular in the transaction. I say the searchlight should be turned on you and everybody else connected with it as it has been turned on others. I am glad it was turned on me for one. The Government tried to get evidences of wrong doing on the part of myself and my associates in the last Ministry, and auditors were brought here from New York to investigate our work. For that you paid \$10,500 of the public money, and the only result is that the document stands as a certificate of character for myself and my hon. friend, Sir John Crosbie. Now you resist an attempt to have an inquiry into the conduct of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on charges that he used his position for his own ad-

vancement, that he improperly applied public moneys for the benefit of the organization of which he is President, and the Government majority would like to vote down this proposition if it could.

And now to go back to the Fish Regulations. When the House opened and the Speech from the Throne was read, the Minister of Fisheries was not here. We waited for him to come back and when he did arrive an amendment was brought in by the Opposition calling for the removal of all the Fish Regulations. The Government came in and told us it had decided to remove the Regulations and refused to accept our amendment on that ground. The Government was not big enough to accept the amendment and vote for it, but now it is taking weeks to try and get through a Bill of two lines to remove this famous enactment which a year ago we were told was going to transform the industries of the country. We are thus a unit in this House for the removal of the Regulations, but the Opposition cannot permit them to come off without telling the country the damage that has been done by ever allowing them to be put on. These fishery regulations have ruined the country and the people know it. And then, after all the debating and criticism of the Regulations, the Amendment, and the Speech from the Throne, the Prime Minister renders the situation more absurd than ever by a declaration that he is in favor of the Fish Regulations that are going to be taken off and that the Minister of Fisheries is also a believer in them, and that they and their colleagues consider that they are a measure in the right direction. Yet they are going to remove them after one year's trial because they have played such havoc with the trade of the country that nobody will stand for their being continued on the Statute Book

any longer. I ask both these hon. gentlemen why in the name of common sense do they take these off now if they believe they are of value, and I ask the Premier why he took off the Regulations from certain markets in January immediately after the Minister of Fisheries left here if he believes in the Regulations. We all know the reason for this statement of the Premiers' now. We all know that he is without any following in this House and is kept in office merely by the support he gets from the Minister of Fisheries and the F. P. U. members, from the man who boasted the other day that he had this following in the House and intended to retain hold of it. The Premier is playing for that support and for that alone. No man of principle or spirit or pluck would assume the ignominious position assumed by the Prime Minister in this matter.

Then the Prime Minister told us he was convinced the Regulations could be worked effectively, but this is absurd. The law of Supply and Demand as we now see cannot be disregarded and we are powerless against the whole world. To-day this country is trying to get the price of flour down although the farmers of the West are trying to keep it up. In the same way the consumers in Europe are trying to force down the price of our fish which they need in the same way as we need flour. It is impossible for us to get cheap flour only because there is competition in this commodity from other parts of the world against the stocks held by the Western farmers, and in the same way our fish has to come down in price because the French and the Norwegians and all our other competitors are selling it for a lower figure than we are. Our experience of the past eighteen months has proved conclusively, if our previous experience hadn't already done so, that we

cannot fix a price for fish here in Newfoundland and dictate it to the whole world. The Minister of Fisheries tried to justify his position yesterday by claiming that certain firms trading in fish here had gone out of business, but as against that there is the fact that the Bowrings, the Bairds, the Baine Johnstones, the Ryans, and other firms have been continuously in this business for 60 or 70 years at least and others of them for more than a century and have weathered all the storms of that period and are as prosperous to-day as ever. The Minister of Fisheries also claimed that no harm had resulted from his Regulations, but if he will read the letter from Penney & Co., of Ramea, about the cargo they loaded last June and for which they had a firm offer at a paying price when they loaded it, he will find a different condition from what he asserts. That fish was held back at the Minister's orders. It didn't reach market for some months, and when it did it had to be sold at a very reduced price, and even at that the owner of the fish has not yet been paid. It is also suggested that somebody whispered something to the President of the F. P. U. about prices that could be got and that he used this information improperly and sold his own fish below Penney's price and left Penney with fish on his hands that had been loaded for market months before the Coaker fish. Still the Premier gets up and tells us that he believes in the fish regulations because the Minister of Fisheries believes in them; whereas the truth is that the Premier really means to say, "I believe in what Mr. Coaker believes, if I don't I will have to get off this side of the House." To consolidate himself in that position he then went on to plead for the support of what he called the Baymen. He said he was a Bayman. Well, I am a Bayman but I am not prepared to play

for the support of this House in that fashion. I hope that while I will have a seat I will use what little intelligence God gave me in the direction that will best serve the country's interests, and not sit down and follow men who are acting like the present leaders on the other side of the House, simply to hold office and position. The Premiers' contemptible plight at present is no worse than that of the gentlemen who sit opposite and represent the Western Districts, men who were supported at the last general election by business people of the type of Penneys of Ramea and now have seen their constituents sacrificed without lifting a finger or raising a voice to prevent them. Is that the way to look after the interests of the export merchants and planters who have been trying to build up this country? Is that the treatment to give the Harris's of Burin, the Buffetts of Grand Bank, the Penneys of Ramea, and all the other men of that stamp along our Southwest coast? I cannot see how a sane man such as I take the Premier to be, could make the statement in this House that he believes in the Fish Regulations, after the proofs he and everybody else has had of what ruin these Regulations have brought about, and equally I cannot see how men representing Districts that have been brought to beggary by these Regulations can support the Government and the policy that caused this disaster to the country in general and their constituents in particular. What are the Premier, these members, and the other members across the floor, preparing to do for our fishermen who need supplies this year? There are over 20,000 fishermen in this country without the wherewithal to go fishing this summer. No more than two or three merchants on Water Street will issue supplies against twenty or thirty last year, and now it is nearly the

first of June and no steps are being taken to relieve the situation. We rise this House every afternoon at 6.30 after putting in two or three hours of debate, but no legislation has been submitted to us yet, though six or seven weeks in session, to conserve the interests of the people or make their economic future sure. Petitions are being introduced here every day for poor relief. Steps are being taken to give able bodied pauper relief on a wholesale scale, but measures of that kind cannot accomplish anything and some large programme has to be taken in hand and dealt with. You may quiet the situation in St. John's for a time by giving out work on the city roads and otherwise, but the conditions in the outports are very much more serious, and some practical measures of a permanent character will have to be devised. The financial prosperity of the country has been destroyed. Nothing has come into this country for the past six months in the way of receipts of permanent character. I heard a gentleman on Water Street a few days ago state that the only money coming in here now is what is paid in life insurance on the deaths of those who pass away, fire insurance on property that is destroyed, and marine insurance on vessels that have been lost at sea, but that not a dollar is coming in for the produce sent out from this country, as nothing that we handle—fish, oil, skins, herring, salmon, lobsters—is being marketed at a profit to-day.

That is the situation as I see it, sir. This country, one of the most prosperous in the world when we laid down the reins of office eighteen months ago, has been reduced in that short period to a condition of collapse only equalled by some of the hopelessly bankrupt countries of Central Europe. Everything that the hands of the men now in power has

touched in the past year and a half has been blighted and ruined. Our fisheries, the mainstay of our people, have been wrecked in such a fashion that it will take years to restore them. Our manufacturing industries have been crippled as a consequence of the impoverishment of our people through the destruction of our fisheries. Every other industry in the country is suffering in the same way. The splendid Surplus in cash which we had piled up and put away safely has been dissipated and squandered without anything whatever to show for it, and to-day the country is virtually bankrupt, drifting on the rocks rudderless and dismasted without a single man on the Government benches showing an atom of capacity to try and bring her safely to shore, and this, sir, is the result of eighteen months of Liberal-Reform Government. Surely there never was a greater farce in the history of any country than for the men now in power to describe themselves as Liberals and reformers and patriots and statesmen, a crew whose political bankruptcy is now admitted by even their best supporters.

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.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920" and "An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act 1918" without amendment.

MR. SULLIVAN gave Notice of Question.

MR. WALSH gave Notice of Question.

MR. MOORE gave Notice of Question.

MR. SINNOTT 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.

THURSDAY, May 12, 1921.

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

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move the following Resolution.

RESOLVED—That a Select Committee of this House to consist of three Members be appointed to take the evidence of Medical Practitioners of the City of St. John's, and others, on the question of the suitability of the Escasoni Site on Portugal Cove Road for a Small-pox hospital.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker. Before any petitions are presented and with your permission, Sir, I would ask for the attention of the House for a few moments while I refer to a matter, which has already been brought up in this House, but has now reached a very serious and acute stage. Between 10.30 and 11.30 a.m. to-day 20 men, belonging to St. Mary's Bay and who had just returned from Grand Falls, called on me at my office. I

questioned those men and after finding out certain things I promised to lay their case before the House this afternoon. The name of the man who acted as spokesman for the rest and presented their case was Gus White, whom I asked the following question: (Q) What is your name? (A) Gus White; (Q) Where from? (A) Pt. LeHaye, St. Mary's; (Q) How many men are with you? (A) Twenty; (Q) Where did you come from now? (A) Grand Falls; (Q) How long did you work there? (A) Personally I worked there for about 3 years; (Q) At what? (A) As a grinder; (Q) Are all these men with you family men? (A) All are married with large families except three; (Q) How long did they work at Grand Falls? (A) Some of them 3 years and some of them not a year at all; (Q) How did you get to St. John's? (A) We came over the railroad, eighteen of the men were given free passes by Magistrate Fitzgerald, I being one of the two who did not get a free pass; (Q) Do L understand that you are all here stranded, but have tickets for home? (A) Yes, but we do not want to go home, because most of the men have to walk a distance of 45 miles from the train to their homes, also because there is nothing at home for us to do and we want to try and get supplies in St. John's for the fishery or to get employment here and we ask you to bring this matter before the House of Assembly. Mr. Sullivan and Walsh were present to-day when those unfortunate men presented their case, which was really pitiable. Those seventeen family men had an average of five children to look after. They are prepared to go home if there is work for them to do, but as they are unable to get supplies for the fishery they are prepared to go to work here. They say they cannot go home for the sake of their children, as they have nothing whatever to give their children. They suggested that if some way was

devised whereby they could get supplies they would go home and go fishing. On account of the position of the Marystown Trading Co., and other merchants they are not able to get supplies where they used to get them before and they want to know what we can do for them. I promised them that I would acquaint the government of their circumstances and I ask now on their behalf what can be done or what are we going to do about it? Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is only a small proportion of what we are going to meet within the next ten days or so. I think that something should be done and done quickly, because if nothing is done, well, from the story I heard from these men to-day in my office, personally I fear the result of what is going to happen. I am informed that at present there are two thousand men in Grand Falls, Millertown, Badger and other places around there out of employment. The government are sending some of the men home on passes, but it is no use in sending home the 20 men that I have just mentioned, if they claim that they cannot go home and see their children starving. I want to know if the government or his party or the Executive Council have any scheme in sight to try and cope with this condition of affairs. If there is, I would like for you to tell us so that we may have an opportunity of dealing with these men with a view to helping them out the coming season. We must do this Sir. The responsibility is not mine. The responsibility rests upon the government of the day; but in all honesty I am prepared to do anything whatever to assist or relieve the condition which is about to take place here within the next few days. We have had the labor troubles in St. John's and the Prime Minister and the government have endeavoured to find labour for the people in the West End and I have no doubt that they have done their best in providing help in

that connection; but we have the other side of the situation now, we have the people of Conception Bay, Placentia Bay and of all the other bays, whom we represent in this House crying for some assistance in the way of labor or supplies for the fishery. The Prime Minister very courteously told me yesterday that the government were endeavouring to find some plan which possibly might relieve the situation. I take it from his remarks that certain monies were to be given out in connection with road grants, but the expenditure of a half a million dollars all over this country will not carry us through the serious crisis that is facing us. Now the 20 men whose case I presented this afternoon have asked for some concrete answer from the government as to what they intend to do to assist them. I would like to pass over to the Prime Minister a list of those men so that he can read them for himself.

This is only a small instalment of what is going to come. Let me say in all fairness to the government that I have a certain amount of sympathy for them in the position they stand in to-day, but they should try and evolve some scheme which will suffice to carry us over this critical period. If the government is not able to do anything they should say so, but I do hope and trust that, on behalf of those men of Placentia Bay, Conception Bay, St. Mary's Bay, Southern Shore, Burin, Fortune, Burgeo and La Poile, something will be done, and that before this House goes into session again that the Prime Minister will make a statement as to what the intention of the government is and what they intend doing within the next few days in endeavouring to give all for the assistance possible. I am not criticizing at all now. I am appealing for something concrete to give those people in order to get employment for them, or to enable them to carry on the fishery as heretofore. You, Sir,

as well as I know that if there is no fish caught and no employment to give to the laboring classes that Newfoundland cannot proceed very far. A loan to us from any country would be utterly useless, if we cannot find labor or cannot give supplies to start the fishery. What is wanted and what the people generally are craving for and what we must try and find is labor at once. If you, Sir, had been with me at 9 o'clock this morning on my premises you would have seen 120 laborers looking for work. I put on 25 of the men whom I knew were needy and whose children were in want. That condition not alone exists on my room, but exists on every other mercantile room in St. John's. In fact in St. John's this day, May 12th, a few years ago you would hear nothing but the clang of the hammer; but to-day there is absolute silence. I want the government to lay before this House within the next four or five days some plan which will either tend to start employment or start the fishery and get the wheels of progress once more going. I have endeavoured to lay this case as clearly as I can before the House and I have endeavoured to plead for those people and plead for my country. I am honest enough now Sir, to say to the Prime Minister that I know the difficulties confronting the government, and I know the troubles they have to face; but we got to realise that something must be done and the quicker the better both for the government and for the people of this country.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker. On behalf of these gentlemen who interviewed Sir John Crosbie this morning, I want to thank him most sincerely for the service he has rendered them here, and not alone on their behalf do I thank him but on behalf of the thousands of others belonging to other constituencies who are similarly situated. This is not the first time that this matter has been brought before this

House. It is not only to-day that Sir John Crosbie and others, myself, included, could see those conditions. A month ago we saw them and we pointed out that they would be multiplied as time went on. Unfortunately, with centres like Grand Falls closed down the situation has become more acute. I advocated some three weeks ago for a meeting of both sides of the House whereby the matter could be discussed and some concrete proposal entered into. Now I would ask the Prime Minister and his associates in all seriousness if there is any intention whatever of expecting the operation of, or to take seriously the proposition, which has been discussed through the public press, on the West Coast, or if Blackstead and Company have any intention of opening up an industry that would give employment to five thousand men. If such is the case, I think that the government should immediately place their cards on the table of this House; but, perhaps, it is a 'cod' like all the other 'cods' that we have been treated to by this and other governments. The Bell Island proposition has been on the Order Paper of this House for the past few weeks and deferred from day to-day. Over at Bell Island the men are being laid off the same as they are at Grand Falls. Is it the intention of the government to alleviate the sufferings of those people who have been laid off at Bell Island by discussing that agreement? Surely the Bell Island proposition is of such importance as to take first place on the Order Paper and the very day that the matter was first introduced in this House it should have been discussed and disposed of so that our working people could be employed again on the Island. I want to say that the people of Placentia and St. Mary's are in a very unfortunate position, but, though that district has been so well advertised in this House, I would stake my

sent here that there has been less pauper relief sent to that district during the past six or eight months than to any other district of its size in the country. The people there are not the kind of people who look for pauper relief; all they ask for is work, and no better proof of that is the fact that these men, referred to by Sir John Crosbie, left their homes at their own expense to go to Grand Falls where they were not sure of employment, and some of them had to borrow the wherewithal to pay their passages to Grand Falls. The unfortunate result was that a strike took place at Grand Falls, the plant closed down and these men had to go and seek free passes, because all the money they had was spent in board etc., to bring them to St. John's where they now are, looking for work, because the getting of supplies for the fishery is an impossibility. This morning I met one of my constituents who had \$250 in his pocket with which to pay on \$600 worth of supplies. He had two traps, a trap boat and all the necessary utensils for the operation of his two traps. He went to different firms on Water Street this morning and offered to pay the \$250 for an additional worth \$350 worth of supplies, but nobody would give them to him.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES
—Send him to me and I will give it.

MR. WALSH—Thanks very much, I will be delighted to bring the man to the Minister to-morrow morning. I trust that this discussion this evening will not end here. Something concrete must be done, or else we will go on further dragging down the people by additional pauper relief. Those people are not consumers; they are producers. The people are losing confidence and in some sections of the Island to-night there are people who have reached a stage that they do not care what happens. It appears that Water Street have no confidence in the producers of the country. Surely

when a business man, an importer and an exporter of this country's products, refuses to grant supplies there must be something rotten in the "State of Denmark." I hope that the appeal of Sir John Crosbie will get the serious consideration of the Executive Government and I hope that these unfortunate men who are now walking the streets of St. John's will be enabled to earn an honest living, as in the past, and be able to pay dollar for dollar. They do not want anything for nothing. They are prepared to pay 100 cents to the dollar as they always did. Several weeks ago Sir John Crosbie, on behalf of the Opposition, would assist the government in any way possible in this present emergency. Surely that offer should be welcomed by the government. We can come here and vote on matters of policy; but surely there are some common ground and some common policy by which all can bury their differences for the time being and assist the serious situation that is facing the country at this very moment.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Sir John Crosbie for bringing this very serious matter before the House and I would like to say that I fully endorse all that has been said by Sir John as well as by my colleague, Mr. Walsh; and now I have a few words to say on my own behalf. I was surprised this morning when I went up to see Sir John Crosbie and found so many of my constituents on his wharf. There were 32 there and they had an appointment with Sir John. I went to hear their story, and if you could hear it, Sir, you would be moved to pity. Some of them got good voyages of fish, and ought to have had enough to carry them through the winter and fit them out for fishing again; but it was late when they got their fish down here last fall and some of it was sacrificed at \$4 a quintal. I am not going

to discuss this whole fish matter again, but there is a reason for all this poverty amongst those people. Many of them have large families, and they are too proud to beg. Now the situation is become more serious. You have heard that Mr. Gus. White told Sir John Crosbie that the whole of Grand Falls had closed down. The strike has now spread to Millertown and Botwood, and it will add at least 10,000 people to the army of unemployed of Newfoundland. It is going to be a serious menace to the country. From information which I have I know that there will be at least 500 men in here looking for supplies during the next three weeks. The people are not looking for charity. They want work, and it is up to us to get together and do something for them. It is a very bad policy to be giving out able-bodied relief, and it is not only the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, but it is the whole country. Only since I came in here this afternoon I have received a letter from Mr. J. R. Rodway of Baine Harbor. Here is the letter: (Reads letter).

There are people here now with lobsters caught, but they can't get anything to put them in. Something must be done, and done quickly, to relieve the people who are starving all over the country.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to say a word regarding this matter. When the labour situation of St. John's was before the House my colleagues on this side of the House expressed the entire sympathy with the situation and did all in their power to help out the situation. I therefore take this opportunity of reciprocating. Many people have come to the verge of starvation thru no fault of their own. I have heard the Prime Minister say that he has conferences with the merchants and with the Bank Managers, and for all we know they have been

absolutely futile. Now, Sir, I think it is time the Prime Minister had a conference with this House. The members of this House represent the people of the entire country, and it is absolutely essential that the government should make some pronouncement otherwise conditions will arise that will be beyond their control and beyond the control of the constituted authority of Newfoundland. Let us wake up to the seriousness of the situation. To-day you have Water street the mainspring of Newfoundland, practically broken. It is quite true that the banks have been absolutely unsympathetic, and unfortunately we have no control over the banks. I appreciate the fact that something has been done here in the city to relieve the distress, and that a large sum of money for that purpose was acquired the other day, but even that will be inadequate if something more is not done. The Bank has advanced \$150,000 on the guarantee of the government, but the city of St. John's is as good a security for that amount as there is on this side of the Atlantic. The total city debt at the present time is only \$2,000,000, while the debt of the city of Halifax is \$30,000,000. Without the government guarantee it would be a gilt-edged security. The reason the government guarantee is necessary is because there is nothing in the city charter to give the city the authority to raise money on its own account. It is gilt-edge security because the city of St. John's is capable of paying a much larger revenue than she is paying to-day. I therefore sympathize with the members of the other districts that have no such means of helping themselves. The situation is very serious, and we members of the Opposition are willing to sit down and do our best to help the government. I sincerely trust that something will be done by the government regarding this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr Speaker. I desire to make an effort to approach this matter in the same business-like and concise manner in which Sir John Crosbie referred to it a while ago. I am pleased to be able to-day to submit another programme, in addition to that which has already been submitted for relieving the distress in the city. The government has secured the sum of \$500,000 which will be handled through the department of Public Works. The idea is to enable the fishermen to earn sufficient money to assist them in fitting out for the fishery. What the people want is an opportunity to earn between \$25 and \$50 which will help them over the present time and enable them to get some supplies. With that in view the sum of \$500,000 has been immediately secured and will be available by Saturday. This, it is hoped, will carry them along for the present time. The arrangement that has been made in securing this amount is much more satisfactory than the arrangement the city had to make with the Royal Bank. The Grand Falls strike has greatly aggravated the situation, and how far there will be need for something else I do not now know. I think that the programme that has been arranged for immediate assistance is one that will meet with the good feeling of the whole House.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, Sir, I want to thank the Leader of the government that consideration has been given to this matter, and that something has been done. You will realize that I sounded this warning four weeks ago. I said that in a short while the men would be looking for supplies, and I say now that very shortly the merchants or someone else will be called on to provide supplies to the extent of \$2,000,000. I assure the leader of the government that everything will be done by this side of the House to distribute that, though a

small amount, as well as possible. I saw this situation a year ago. The district that I have the honour to represent has been completely forsaken. The men saw no hope of getting supplies and they have given up the idea of going fishing. The great firm of Goodridge and Sons, which was in every settlement on the Southern Shore for the last 75 years, is in liquidation. But the half million dollars that the Prime Minister has spoken of will not relieve the situation. The amount of flour needed in the small district of Ferryland to relieve the situation is about 6,000 barrels, and that will only carry them for about six weeks. But I endorse all that has been said, and appreciate what has been done. We have got to make up our minds that the fishery is abandoned. Take the situation in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. In many places where as high as 25 boats operated there are this year two and three boats operating. That is the general situation. The St. Mary's Bay fishermen are looked upon by the American bankers as the best fishermen in Newfoundland. The schooner of Grand Bank and Fortune are no more. Now there is no place for the men to look for employment. Grand Falls is closed down, the fishery is given up. Quite a number of men have gone to Lunenburg, but there is practically nothing doing there this year. The situation is mighty serious. I appreciate the position that the Prime Minister finds himself in, and I for one will not cause trouble if the government is serious. It cannot be solved in a day or two, but we cannot act too quickly. I brought this matter to the attention of the House when it opened, but I am glad that at last the government has realized what it is up against.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Sir John Crosbie for the interest he has taken in the district of

Placentia. The people are in a bad situation, but through no fault of theirs. I presume the reason why the situation is worse there than in most other places is because they do not go to the ice. I am very pleased to hear from the Prime Minister that something is being done.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Prime Minister for his explanation, and I want to assure him I am in full sympathy with the programme. Even if my political opinion has wharped my mind the stories of those Placentia Bay men this morning got me, and especially the stories of their children. The very best advantage must be got out of this amount. For every dollar we ought to have a dollars worth of work I quite appreciate the fact that the Minister of Public Works will be honest with the money, but may I ask that it be dealt with in an absolutely non-partisan way. It is advisable that the matter be put in the hands of the clergy of every district who would co-operate with the chairmen of the various road boards. I throw out this suggestion in all seriousness, I thank you, Sir, for your explanation.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, seeing that the Public Works Department will be responsible for a certain amount of this money I want to see that the greatest possible good is obtained. I have in mind the following line of co-operation. First, that a circular letter be sent out stating that consideration must first be given to the needy cases. Second, I want to get all the information possible from the members of the various districts, and third, I want to get the clergy to co-operate with the road boards.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I might say I will be glad to receive recommendations for marine works from the various districts that ought to be attended to.

I would like for each member to make out a memorandum and hand it to me.

CAPT. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to all that has been said regarding the great need of the fishermen. Not alone is the need great in Placentia and St. Mary's district, but all over the country, and it is our business to see that the fishery is carried on or we will have no revenue. I consider the half million dollars that the Prime Minister has referred to as being a very small part of what is necessary for getting the fishermen ready for the fishery this year. It is going out more in the way of relief than for the purpose of getting supplies. I say that this policy is abominable. The bottom is out of the country. There is a much better way than that to get at it. The idea of putting fishermen to work on roads when they should be getting ready for the fishery is foolish. It would take the manhood that has been born in them out of them. Mr. Speaker, it is the first time in the history of Newfoundland that we are supposed to have a fishermen's government. Why do you not stand up for the fishermen. We have a Minister of Marine and Fisheries who endorses a policy of building roads and marine works when the people ought to be going fishing. Take or borrow a million dollars and get supplies to let the people go and catch fish. We are told to-day that Grand Falls has closed down. Now what are we going to eat if we don't catch codfish. Rise to the occasion Mr. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Get a million or two million dollars if necessary upon the security of the country and get supplies for the fishermen. We have already had enough waste during the past few months. Don't waste another half million. Let the fishermen go fishing. That is what they want to do this time of the year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker I

désire now in accordance with the notice I gave yesterday, to move an address to His Excellency the Governor in regard to the matter of the cargo of fish shipped by the "President Coaker," and into the matter of the cargo of salt brought to this country some months ago by the S.S. "Tuckahoe" and landed at Port Union. As you are aware, sir, I moved a day or two ago for a Select Committee of five members to inquire into this whole matter. That motion was as follows:

"That a Select Committee of this House be appointed with five members of engine into and report upon the appropriation and expenditure of public money in 1920, for the purchase of fish and salt and into all matters concerning the charter of vessels, the hiring of stores, the purchase and sale of fish and salt, and the whereabouts of said fish and salt, and the control and management thereof; with power to employ counsel, take evidence on oath and send for all persons, papers and things necessary to the said enquiry, with an instruction to the said Committee to hold an enquiry in public and to have the evidence taken stenographically and to publish the same from day to day in the newspapers of this city."

That motion was rejected by a party vote, the Prime Minister having taken the position that to grant such a Committee would be equivalent to a Want of Confidence Vote in the Minister and in the Government and that the matters could be discussed in Committee on the Estimates, an contention which I maintain had no validity. However, our motion was rejected and I then intimated to the Government that they had not heard the last of the matter but that we would take other steps to secure this information.

It is not necessary for me to go into lengthy detail in regard to these sub-

jects as they have already been discussed somewhat exhaustively, but I feel it is only right that I should go over the principal features of the two transactions. Everybody knows that last November there was considerable discontent throughout the country over the prices of fish and especially by Northern people with regard to the low price offering for Labrador fish and indeed the difficulty of making any sale whatever for this quality. As a result of that condition a public meeting was called by a number of schooner owners from the Northern Bays who invited their fellow fishermen from all parts of the country then in St. John's to join with them in formulating certain demands upon the Government which were briefly, that the Government would make good pledges given at the General Election and afterwards by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he would keep the price of fish up to as high figures as prevailed the previous year. At that public meeting, which was largely attended, resolutions were passed along these lines and a committee was appointed to wait on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to demand from him that he make good these promises. The Committee did this, and according to the newspaper reports he assured them that if they could not sell their fish about town he would arrange to buy their fish. At the same time he called a counter public meeting at which I think you, sir, were one of the speakers, when he endeavored to put his side of the case before the fishermen and others who attended, but I do not think with much success, as he was subjected to frequent interruptions, and when the regular speakers, who included yourself, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and others, have finished, the dissatisfied ones took the platform and attempted to hold a counter

meeting, and the hall had to be cleared by the police. Evidently as a result of the strong feeling exhibited by the fishermen, the Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues in the Executive decided that they would take from the Public Treasury half a million dollars to buy the stocks of Labrador fish then unsold, and they undertook to justify this proceeding on the ground that the situation created by the non-receipt of this fish was a national emergency. I maintain, sir, that if such was the case, it was the duty of the Government to call this House together. That is what we are elected for, and that is what we are here to-day for,—to appropriate moneys and look after the public interests of this Colony. We were not called together, no publicity was given to this proceeding, but without any warrant, except the fact that they controlled the machinery of the Government, four or five people did an unheard of thing—an unheard of thing in the records of the British Colonies. They took half a million dollars of public money to buy fish from a few friends of their own, and they concealed this fact from the Legislature, from the business community, and from the country at large, until after the opening of this House they were forced to admit that this step had been taken. You will recall, sir, and every member of the House also, that attempts were made at meetings of the fish exporters and in every other way, to get at the truth of this transaction, and that not alone the Government but that two or three business men who were parties in what I call this crime, joined in the conspiracy of silence and took every possible step to prevent the facts getting to the public. The rest of the fish exporters and others were naturally indignant that the Government had done this thing, and moreover that two or three people who had

been fetching and carrying for the Minister of Fisheries on his Advisory Board, had been given all this money instead of an opportunity being afforded for every exporter to get a share of the money. This money was taken from the Surplus Trust Fund in the Bank of Montreal and placed to the credit of the Fisheries Department with instructions, we are told by the Minute of Council, that the same was to be checked out under the signature of the Minister or his Deputy or in the absence of either, that of the Deputy Colonial Secretary. Many dealers in codfish asked members of the Government and their supporters in this House, if it was true that this thing had been done, but they all denied it. A more dishonest and discreditable proceeding was never attempted by any administration in any country. I doubt if in any other country under the British flag would such a proceeding have been attempted and got away with. Not till this House met, as I said, did we obtain a revelation of this fact. Even then we were not told the whole story and we have been trying ever since to get it, but when we got on ground that was dangerous for the Minister no further information was given, and we are now forced to the step which we are proposing to-day, a step which we feel that as members of this House and representatives of the people we must take. We are not pursuing the Minister of Fisheries personally or any other member of this House, but we are asking for full information about the purchase of this fish, the prices paid for it, the charter parties in connection with the sending of vessels with that fish across the Atlantic, and all the surrounding circumstances in connection with the matter. Our Resolution for a Select Committee was in quite accord with the practise of Parliament. Already the Prime Minis-

ter has accepted a resolution for a Select Committee to investigate the workings of the Food Control Board, especially in regard to the purchase and sale of sugar. Why, then, should he refuse a Select Committee to investigate this transaction in codfish. I fail to see how one could be a reflection on the Government, or a vote of Want of Confidence in the Government and the other not be the same, or why he could concede one Committee and refuse the other. The only conclusion one can come to under these circumstances is that there is something discreditable about this transaction in fish, something that the Government does not want exposed, something which, if it is brought to light, is going to shatter public confidence in certain members of the Government, and perhaps terminate very speedily their presence as Ministers in the present Administration. We want to know what truth there is in the rumors that a Minister of the Crown used his position for the benefit of the Company of which he is President, and the more the Government resist these motions, the stronger will be the suspicion in the minds of the country that this is what is really at the bottom of the case, and that is what the Government is trying to prevent being exposed. We want to know, in the first place, who sold the cargo of fish loaded in the "President Coaker." Was it the Minister, acting in his capacity of President of the F. P. U., or was it somebody else. Then we want to know to whom was that fish sold. Was it to Mr. Sellars, who according to rumor denies that it was sold to him and asserts that he merely allowed his name to be used, or was it sold to the Minister in his capacity as President of the F. P. U. We also want to find out who was the charterer of the vessel and what freight was paid on the fish. Was it the ordinary freight or a special

rate? We likewise want to know whether the price paid for the fish was eight dollars, which is the same price as was paid for the fish taken in by Mr. Job and Mr. Barr, or was it \$8.50, or was it \$9.00, and if the latter who shared the fifty cents or the dollar a quintal paid for this fish over and above the fish taken by Job and Barr and who got the money.

Then we come to the salt transaction. The Auditor General stated in his Report that \$77,000 was taken from the Surplus Trust Fund to pay for a cargo of salt which cargo he said had been purchased by a firm in the country, but that this firm still owed \$61,000 on account of this cargo, though he had been assured, he explained, that it would be paid in due course. Now we want to know what firm bought that cargo, if any firm did, and why it wasn't paid for, and what foundation is there for the counter-statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this House last week that this salt was not purchased by his Company but was merely stored on behalf of the Government, and that presumably it was being sold on the Government's account and the money turned into the Treasury. Then we want to know how much of the salt was actually sold, when it was sold, and what was received for it, and why a sum of \$4,400 on account of that salt was only handed in to the Government a few days ago, more than two weeks after we first asked questions about this transaction. We want to know all these things because they relate to a situation that is either right or wrong. If they are right and if the Minister's hands are clean, then the whole country will know it, but if his hands are not clean then it is time that the facts should be made known and he be subjected to the proper punishment. I hope he will show to the

country that his hands are clean as far as both these undertakings are concerned, and I trust that after the time for reflection he has had in the past two days he will realize that if he refuses—for when I say he refuses I mean the Government, as everybody knows that he is the Government—then only one construction can be placed by the country on that fact and it is that the Minister is afraid to have this matter investigated. As for me, sir, the only course left for me as leader of His Majesty's Opposition in this House, and for my colleagues who sit around me, is to take the course we take this afternoon, to move for an address to His Excellency the Governor asking that this whole matter be investigated, and in moving that address I would point out that I am divorcing the subject from party politics or any partisanship whatever when I ask for the judges of the Supreme Court to be appointed to hold this inquiry. I do this because the Court is above suspicion, and if the Ministers' hands are clean, the Courts' declaration to that effect will command the confidence of the entire community.

I will not deal further with this subject just now, Mr. Speaker, because it may be necessary for me to speak further upon it at a later date, but I wish it clearly understood again that I am not pursuing the Minister personally or anybody else in the House. I am only trying to do what is right by the country and that is why I ask for this investigation. I think the Minister would be wise in his own interests if he stated now, or had the Premier state on his behalf, that he would favor this inquiry without our having to force this matter to the Governor. If this proposal is rejected this afternoon then it will be for the public at large to take further measures to satisfy themselves whether the affairs of this country are

being conducted honestly and honorably, or whether people in high places are making use of their positions dishonorably and dishonestly and prostituting their positions for private gain. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the dual position to Mr. Penney, of Ramea, and then after weeks or months to make him two offers, one from a fellow member of the Minister's on the Advisory Board and one from the Minister himself offering this man ten shillings less than he had first been paid for his fish, but which the Minister refused permission to sell for. This man did not accept the offer. Finally he got a permit to ship his fish. He sent it across to Europe. he is not yet paid for it, and he now asks if the government is going to pay him \$60,000 for the cargo of fish which the Minister would not allow him to sell last year. That is an other matter which a commission of Inquiry will ventilate and satisfy the country as to the truth or falsity of these statements and the extent to which the Advisory Board in connection with last year's fishery problem was utilized by private individuals for their own advantage. Another circumstance of the same kind is the charge freely made and not disputed as far as I am aware, that when cargoes of fish exported by people not on the Advisory Board or in the ring that controls this matter, reached their destination in foreign markets, they were held back by the trade agents of this colony from being sold, and cargoes shipped and owned by members of the Advisory Board allowed to get into the market ahead of them and be sold first though not arriving until after these.

One could speak for hours on this very important subject, but I feel that I have said enough. In moving this address and supporting it as earnestly as I know how, I shall have done my duty as a representative. If those on the other side of the House are for

justice and the truth then they should support this Resolution. If they feel there is something to hide, their refusal to support this motion will confirm that suspicion. Every honorable gentleman opposite, from the Minister of Justice, whose special function it is to see the laws carried out, down to the youngest member amongst you, have a duty to perform, and I now leave it to them to do so, hoping they will not be like dumb driven cattle sitting silently there refusing to say a word in support of what they know is right and just. I therefore move the following address to His Excellency the Governor:

St. John's, May 12th, 1921.

To His Excellency, Sir C. A. Harris,
K.C.M.G., Governor.

May It Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly, in Legislative Session convened, humbly presents the following facts:—

(1) That in the Autumn of 1920,

Your Excellency-in-Council, by Minute of Council, appropriated the sum of five hundred thousand dollars, for the purchase of certain Labrador Fish then in the disposition and control of fishermen, at certain fixed prices, and the said appropriation was placed under the control of the Hon. W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine & Fisheries;

(2) That a portion of the said money was used in the purchase and shipment of the cargo of the vessel named the "President Coaker," and in paying freight, and that the said fish was shipped to market, on account of the colony and is yet unsold;

(3) That this House has been informed that the said cargo was not purchased directly from fishermen, but from the Union Trading Co., Ltd., or Union Export Co., Ltd., at a price above the authorized rate;

(4) That the Hon. W. F. Coaker is

President of both the said Companies; that the vessel, the "President Coaker", belongs to one of the Companies controlled by him; and that the purchase and sale of the said cargo, and the charter of the said vessel, was wholly made and arranged by him in his dual capacities, as Minister and as President and controller of said Companies;

(5) That the transactions in relation to the said purchase, charter and shipment, including the payment for the said fish and freight, was made by the said W. F. Coaker, as Minister to himself as President, and colorably only in the name of another person, and that the full particulars requested in this House in relation thereto have not been produced or satisfactorily accounted;

(6) That a large sum of money was taken from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1920, without so far as the House is aware, the authority of a Minute of Council, and by whose pretended authority the House is at present unaware, and a cargo of salt purchased by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries;

(7) That the said salt cargo was stored by order of the said Minister in the premises of the Union Companies at Port Union, from which quantities of salt have been taken from time to time by or for the said Companies, and that the said salt has been at no time and is now under the immediate control of any reliable agent of the government;

(8) That the Auditor-General has reported to this House in reliance upon the statements made to him by treasury officials, that the said salt cargo was sold to the Union Trading Co. Ltd., but that the Hon. W. F. Coaker has denied the fact of the said sale, and as-

serted that the salt at Port Union belongs to the Colony;

- (9) That since this matter of the salt cargo has been mooted in this House, a sum of money has been paid by the Union Trading Co. Ltd for salt, admittedly taken from the said cargo by the said Company, the acceptance of which money may be asserted to be a waiver of the legal rights of the Colony in establishing that a sale of the said cargo as a whole was made to the said Union Trading Co., Ltd.;
- (10) That the occupancy by a Member of the Executive Council of the dual positions of Minister of the Department having to do with the said purchase of fish and salt—and of President of Companies selling to and buying from the said Companies, and disputing liability to the Colony for large sums of money, is inconsistent with public interests.

Wherefore this House respectfully requests:

- (a) That Your Excellency, shall be pleased to cause a Commission to issue to the three Judges of the Supreme Court, under the provisions of the said Chapter Relating to Enquiries Concerning Public Matters, directing them to enquire and report concerning all the transactions connected with the said purchase, sale, disposition, custody and whereabouts of the said salt and
- (b) That until the said report shall be received, the Hon. W. F. Coaker, shall be suspended from his Office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in which he has the custody and control of the said fish and salt, and of essential evidence concerning the said matters,

And this House, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, since I arrived at this House this afternoon

I got an opportunity for the first time of seeing the memorial submitted to the House by the leader of the Opposition Sir Michael Cashin. I think Sir, it was a pity that notice of motion given by Sir Michael Cashin, when he subsequently moved that a select committee be appointed to enquire into the alleged appropriation of certain of the public funds of the Colony thru the medium of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was turned down. The leader of the Opposition in making his address on that occasion I think it will be conceded by every one, stated the case in a moderate, impartial, honest and straightforward manner. He stated as we have again heard him say this afternoon, that it was not personal animus against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or his desire to injure or affect the Minister in any way, but rather to bring him to task for certain actions of his which were irregular and improper. And it is in such a spirit I desire to approach the subject. The other day I seconded the motion but I did not make any comments on the matter, and I hope the honourable members opposite will accept my statement, that I am not making any charge of a personal character against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but I do say that his public conduct has placed him in the position in which he has been very much adversely criticized by the right thinking people of this country. His actions in relation to the taking of the five hundred thousand dollars of the public funds of Newfoundland and devoting that to the purchase of fish from certain people in this colony who come from certain specific sections of the Country cannot in the least be justified on the ground that precedent allows it. I have on a previous occasion endeavoured to prove that no precedent in the history of this country or any other which is possible of citation, can be brought forward to justify

what happened last year. It was contended that the Norwegian Parliament voted thirty million dollars for the purchase of fish. Well I accept that statement, but not because it was justifiable for that country to do that that it was equally justifiable for Newfoundland. That deduction does logically follow. Circumstances arose in Norway which made it necessary for the Parliament there to protect the main industry and they justified what otherwise would have been wrong doing but I submit that we are not doing it in a legal and proper manner. What the Norwegian parliament did was legal and it was indiscriminatory because the whole people of Norway got the benefit of that appropriation, but that is not our case where certain sections only derived the benefit accruing from the appropriation of the five hundred thousand dollars.

Certain sections of the country were absolutely ignored. Different members have admitted that they were totally unaware of the transaction till they sat here in the House. Some of them thought the whole thing was a bubble and the criticism of the Opposition only tactics adopted to embarrass the government. I simply can not understand how they, with their constituents ruined, could condone such conduct as that perpetrated. It is absolutely non-understandable. They are men of independent means and should have stood up in their places and faced the situation on the floors of the House instead of running into holes and corners and saying: "I did not know it was like this, I think I will cross the floor." No man representing a West Coast district should have sat here and condoned such an infamous transaction. It was discriminatory in the highest degree. One section of the country was bolstered up, but the other ruined and then we are told "we had to save the fishermen." By all means save the

fishermen. Take the money if you like for supplies, take 2 or 3 millions, but do not supply only one section. If you supply one, supply them all. Treat all fairly. The men of the West Coast have to pay their proportion of that \$350,000 that was unjustly taken and spent and what have they got for it. Nothing—but empty boxes and barrels. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries occupies a position in this House and in the country to-day that is an impossible one. It is wholly indecent that he, the head of a department which has such power and influence where the opportunities to control our principal products are concerned, should occupy such a position while at the same time he is a large exporter himself. It is absolute tyranny because of the power in his hands and he has been an absolute monarch for the last 18 months in his department. To err is human, and to say the least he has erred in his whole fishery policy and the proof is here, for he has admitted in the floors of this House that he has failed. He found his regulations unworkable. The Opposition have been endeavoring since the opening of the House to put the probe in the wound and to heal the sore. We have asked time and again for information from different departments to throw light on certain transactions and in some cases we have been given the information. But in connection with this matter we have not been given all and half the truth is worse than a lie. If we are to get only half it were better we got none at all. I am sorry that the Prime Minister immediately after the introduction of this motion got up to oppose it. He couldn't have given the matter serious consideration or he would never have taken the stand he did. There was no charge against Hon. Mr. Coaker personally. It is against his department and ministerial position. Charges were made against his Advisory Board and

here was the opportunity for him to defend his actions. All know what a Select Committee means; the placing in the hands of the Hon. Speaker the selection of 5 or 7 members to enquire into the subject. My friend Mr Higgins, even suggested the appointment of 5 men from the government side of the House. That was a challenge that none could refuse. We were prepared to have these 5 and abide by their finding. We are not prejudiced in the matter, nor do we wish to place the Minister of Marine in an improper position. But unfortunately for the government, they refused this offer, and where there was suspicion and doubt before and where there were some people with an open mind, there is only one conclusion to arrive at now, and that is there is something to conceal. If there is something to conceal, due only to errors, I promise he won't be sent to the place where he and his associates threatened to send us in the early days of their power. I believe he will not reach that place, but that he will have extenuating circumstances to offer in explanation of his conduct. The opportunity is here now an opportunity he will never have again, to bring on the investigation, to get the sworn evidence and to show up every phase of the whole transaction so fully that it will be done and over with once and for all. This subject has been a fetich with both sides since the House opened. Day after day we have heard nothing but fish. Mr. Coaker, salt and the "President Coaker's" cargo and now I am sick of it. Let us have an end to it; send it out to a tribunal that full confidence is reposed in by all the people in the country. I trust the Prime Minister will see his way clear to do this and not look upon it as a vote of want of confidence in the government. It is no such thing. I remember some years ago certain parties were involved in enquiries, when men on that side of the House charged those on this with

serious offences. Hon. Mr. Coaker was then on the aggressive and Sir Michael Cashin on the defensive. The latter courted the fullest enquiry and publicity and came through unscathed. What is sauce for Cashin is sauce for Coaker. The Hon. Minister of Marine finds himself in the position to-day of having a large section of the country suspicious of him that something has occurred that should not have. Besides the suspicion of his having taken money for the benefit of only one section of the country, charges are heard as to certain companies with which he is identified. It is a vicious principle when Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine, is allowed to deal in the fish business with Mr. Coaker, fish exporter. He hired the "President Coaker" arranged about her cargo and sailing and it was Coaker all through the transaction. This is an intolerable situation and one that can not longer be submitted to. Talk off receiving emolument from the government. Everyone knows that any person taking an office of emolument has to go back to the country for re-election, every member taking a position as a commissioner etc., has to resign his seat. The Constitution is so jealous of the reputation and character of those occupying ministerial seats that everything is done to safeguard them. But how do we know that the Minister of Marine is not bringing grist to his own mill. He is in an impossible position to-day. As to the charges preferred against him, I will not say whether I believe them or not. Time will tell and his innocence or guilt will be proven. I hope to see him out of the situation with clean hands. Personally I would be sorry to see him condemned. If he has committed an error of judgment, he should let the country know. If he has done wrong through not giving sufficient thought to the matters with which he was connected he should let us know; let the searchlight of enquiry be turn-

ed on his actions and all the incidents referred to, and he himself, will be the better satisfied when the verdict is brought in. As to the cargo of salt that has been so much discussed. I said before that the statement of the Auditor-General in connection with the same was a surprise to the whole country. He imported salt to the value of \$77,000; it arrived here in due time and by the report of the Auditor General it was sold to a certain firm for \$61,000. Right in the first place this meant a loss to Newfoundland of \$1600. When enquiries were made as to where it had gone and who was the firm that had purchased it, it was discovered to have gone to Port Union. Hon. Mr. Coaker after being charged with taking and storing it, admitted that he had used some of it though it was not his, but the government's. That only came to light when the matter was ventilated in the House. He says too that there is some at Port Union yet. I do not know how much. It is not under the care of the Fisheries Dept., but of Mr. Coaker. Nobody knows who tallies out, say 100 tons to some fisherman; we have to take his statement at face value. He hands it out to himself and says he paid \$4,400 for it. But how do we know whether he did or not. I do know however, that no sane business man would leave it there to be taken out at the purchasers' own price and according to their own measure. These matters are of the gravest importance and require that they be given the utmost research and have the searchlight thrown fully on them. It is regrettable that the first effort of the Opposition in this direction was not met in the spirit suggested. The Commission could now be half thru their work; the whole matter could be settled by Saturday night, and then the House could go on with its work. This holding back of information is useless and the lame attempt of the Prime Minister to make out these mat-

ters can be attended to when the Estimates come up for discussion, is merely camouflage. By what manner of means can we get the necessary out side evidence then. Are we going to summon private citizens to the Bar of this House when their evidence could be got better by Commission? The evidence of those interested here in the House will be accepted with doubt and with very little weight. The Estimates will offer no opportunity for the investigation. One thing must be done, and done before these matters are lost sight of; a commission must be appointed to deal with them and let us have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution, moved by the leader of the Opposition.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion put by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by my friend, Mr. Bennett, and in doing so I am sorry indeed that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as I told him a few days ago, should have decided to vote down the motion then before the House and be here to-day faced with a higher tribunal than I then suggested. While I say higher, it will be looked on as the highest in the country that any man can get before, this tribunal which is suggested in the motion before the chair. I regret that he did not take my advice when I said to have a Select Committee. I hope he understands that I have no personal feeling against him in this matter and am acting in no way beyond my duty to the people of Newfoundland whom I represent, and endeavouring to lay before the country the history of what happened during the last 18 months. That is my position; I am not dealing personally with the Hon. Minister of Marine but on behalf of my constituents and the people of all other parts of Newfoundland. Take the position

of the Leader of the Opposition. He sent request after request, day after day, but the information for which he asked was not produced. There must be some reason for hiding it. If there is no reason, why is it not given as asked for by the Leader of the Opposition. Why is it not tabled in this House? Why is it locked away in some cupboard or drawer? If there is no skeleton in the cupboard, lay the whole thing on the table and let us all take a look at it. Yesterday when I was dealing with this matter I charged that Mr. Jos. Sellars—I had been told by Capt. Kean that Sellars had told him, and I know myself that he told others—had nothing to do with the "President Coaker's cargo in any shape or form. The Hon. Minister of Marine has stated here that Mr. Sellars had received cheques for his part in the transaction. I am stating what I know to be correct, what Sellars told Kean and others, that he received none and was not interested in the matter. If it is correct that the Minister of Marine had in his Department cheques returned from Mr. Sellars and others made out for him, I cannot see the justification for keeping them concealed. If he has any that were issued to him or if he received any back, I say the Hon. Minister of Marine should lay them on the table of the House right now. Let us clean up this thing; let us have these cheques and remove all doubts in the matter. If we cannot have the cheques, let us have the enquiry. We cannot have it too quickly. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine, as he has stated here that he had the cheques to lay them on the table now.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, if I am interrupting. I have those cheques in my possession and can lay them on the table in a few moments.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I think when

he lays them on the table, the cat will be out of the bag. We've been at this now a week and we've got it at last and will now prove conclusively that there was something wrong in the transaction.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is nothing that we desire to cover up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There is nothing you may desire to hide. Will it be long before you table the cheques, sir. I expect that when we get these cheques we will have still more conclusive proof that there is something wrong about the whole transaction.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The cheques are as follows: One dated Nov. 27th, 1920, payable to Joseph Sellars, Esq., or order for the sum of \$67,500.00 and signed by Arthur Mews, Deputy Colonial Secretary and H. V. Hutchings, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is endorsed by Mr. Sellars in his own handwriting and was paid at the Bank of Nova Scotia the same day. The next one is dated Nov. 26th, 1920 and is drawn in favor of Joseph Sellars, Esq., or order for the sum of \$82,675.00 and is also signed by Arthur Mews, Deputy Colonial Secretary and H. V. Hutchings, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, endorsed by Mr. Sellars. The third cheque is dated Dec. 10th, 1920 and drawn in favor of Joseph Sellars per A. H. Murray, for the sum of \$3,781.11 and signed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hutchings, the Deputy Minister and is endorsed in the handwriting of Mr. Murray.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—May I ask if there are any other papers in connection with the President Coaker's cargo.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—These are the cheques for which you asked.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Yes, but I want to know if there are any bills

of lading or other documents of that kind.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Not up to the present time.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Well I expected that the cat or rather the mouse would fall right into the trap and so he did. For a whole week I have been trying to get at the bottom of this thing and now I am firmly convinced that there is something crooked about it. I am going to make a statement now about the President Coaker transaction and I fear no contradiction from anyone of what I am about to say. Here is the story. This morning I had occasion to call at Mr. Joseph Sellars's office and while there I took the opportunity of enquiring from him what his connection with the President Coaker's cargo had been. He told me in the presence of a witness that he had no interest whatever in the cargo but that on Nov. 26th last a cheque for the sum of \$82,675.00 had been sent him from the Marine and Fisheries Dept. with a request to deposit it to his account and to give the Minister of Marine and Fisheries his cheque drawn in favor of the Union Trading Co. for \$82,675.00. Now, Sir, do you wonder why the Leader of the Opposition wanted an enquiry into the transaction? Now do you see why there was such a reluctance to have a committee appointed?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You are welcome to see the facts.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But we had a mighty hard job to get them and now that we have got them, something more than a Select Committee is going to be appointed to enquire into them. Just imagine, Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries occupying the position he does in this House, getting up here and telling us that Mr. Sellars bought the President Coaker's cargo. I say that Mr. Sellars did not buy it but the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries sent Mr. Sellars his cheque and received Mr. Sellars's cheque in return for the identical amount so as to cover up his own tracks and hide behind somebody else. Can you beat that? No Sir, that has never been beaten in the history of this country. Then you wonder why we are asking for a committee to investigate this matter. I advised you, to save you from your friends, to make a clear statement of your part in the transaction. I appealed to you, and I had the proof in my possession when I did so, to stand up in your place like a man and tell the whole story and so avoid all this debate and discussion. If you were not trying to hide behind Mr. Sellars, why did you send him a cheque with a request for him to send you his for the same amount in return? If there was not some ulterior motive actuating you why did you do it? Would it not have been better for you to have written out the cheque in the first place in favor of the Union Trading Co., while it would undoubtedly have been irregular and improper, I cannot see that it would have been any great crime. But the half of it has not yet been related. What arrangements have been made for getting that money back; does the Prime Minister know if any arrangements have been made for receiving these funds, that is if you ever seen a cent of it again?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I know quite a lot.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But you don't know it all.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Which balance you probably know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I know more than you think I do. The President Coaker's cargo is now landing in Italy and you will never see a cent for it. I say that this investigation should take place and it will be a standing disgrace to the country if you go out of this House without seeing that it

does take place. It is not what the people deserve. They are clamoring for it and although you may vote the motion down, let me tell you that you will not attend the June conference till this matter has been cleared up, and if all on this side of the House are as determined as I am, it will be fully investigated. I suppose when the Prime Minister produced these cheques he thought that the whole thing would be over but I want to tell him that the trouble is only just beginning. I remember when I myself was arraigned before this House, when I was petitioned and protested against, but my position then was as that of a prince as compared with the Minister's position now. I do not mean to say that Mr. Coaker deliberately stole this money but I am going to say that if Mr. Coaker's department is to be judged by this cheque, then goodness knows how much money is gone. According to this official statement furnished by the Minister of Fisheries the amounts which were to be paid are as follows: half the freight \$9,760.00, export tax \$2,250.00, insurance \$6,325.00 and the cost of the fish at 8.50 per quintal, \$63,750.00. Now add that up and you will find that it amounts to \$82,585.00, and yet you send a cheque for \$82,625.00. If that's the kind of addition that is done in your department then the Lord knows how much money is gone. Now I suppose we ought to have a committee to check this up. If this is a sample of what the auditing in the department is, we ought to send for these New York chaps again.

"I did not have anything to do with the President Coaker's cargo, I sold it to Mr. Sellars," says the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Yes, and you gave him your cheque and he gave you his for the same amount in return. If that is not the latest way to buy fish! You can swap cheques and then go home and have your supper

for nothing. Oh no, Sir, you don't want to have a committee appointed to enquire into the President Coaker's cargo and I am sorry to see you misled; I am sorry to see you gone that way. You could have done the thing openly and above board; you could have signed the cheque in favor of the F. P. U. and as I have already said, there would have been no great crime in it, but when you try to hide behind another man's back, you have gone astray. Where is the Bill of lading of the "President Coaker?"

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is attached to the other documents in Genoa.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Is there not a copy of the Bill of Lading?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I only saw one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But if you gave the Bank of Nova Scotia the original Bill of Lading in the first place, they would have a copy of it. Sir Michael Cashin has been asking for this for the past ten days and cannot get it. There must have been 3 copies of the Bill of Lading and surely they did not all go forward to Genoa. I suppose they were like the cheques they were lost for the time being. I wonder who has them at Genoa, Ragnoli? I say, Sir, that a copy of the Bill of Lading should have been laid upon the table of this House days ago; but like the cheques there seems to be no record of anything kept. As it is now after half past six, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is the intention of his Department to employ the services of Mr. George Hawes to advise the Department during this year as to conditions in European markets, and if not who does he propose to employ for that purpose?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND

FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if a printed circular originating in Oporto and addressed to him with the prefix 'Your Excellency' pretending to be a statement of Oporto fish exporters with reference to the Newfoundland trade, but which was repudiated by the recognized codfish exporters there in a statement published in the newspapers of this city on April 15, and certified by Mr. Hanover Grant, British vice-consul at Oporto to be fabricated in the office of the Newfoundland Trade Commissioner at Oporto. Mr. S. K. Smith, or with his connivance; also if the Minister during his visit to Oporto was a party to this transaction or knows anything about it; if it was fabricated in the office of the Newfoundland Trade Commissioner was any public money paid for its composition and printing and if so how much; and in that case does the Minister consider that this was a creditable transaction for an official of the Colony to be engaged in, and if the Minister does not believe that it was fabricated in the office of the Trade Commissioner or with his connivance, can he suggest any reason why any parties should undertake to fabricate such a communication and represent it as coming from a body of commercial men who had nothing whatever to do with it?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that members of the Codfish Exportation Board, commonly known as the Advisory Board, manipulated sales of fish in the foreign markets from time to time in their own interests, so that they were able to get rid of cargoes to the disadvantage of ordinary exporters, and whether

these members of the Advisory Board utilized the private information coming to that Board to assist them in accomplishing these objects; and if so, will he lay on the Table of the House a statement of the cases in which this occurred and the names of the members of the Advisory Board who thus misused their positions?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. H. V. Simms, who left here some weeks ago to visit Canada, United States and Europe, has been despatched by his Department on any official business or has been commissioned to undertake any business for the Department during the course of his trip and if so to state the nature of the undertaking committed to him and to give an approximate estimate of the cost which such work will be to this colony.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The answers to question 4 are being prepared and will probably be tabled to-morrow.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of this House a statement of all orders, and amount of same, sent from his Department to the firm of Hon. John Anderson, and if no orders have been sent, why discriminate against such a well-known supporter of the Government?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the information.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, is it correct that one Jas. J. McGrath of St. John's, formerly a Fish Inspector, has been lately employed by the Custom Department and is now attached to the South Coast revenue service?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, Mr. James J. McGrath has re-

cently been appointed in the Customs.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Why was James McGrath shifted from Fish Inspector to the Custom House where people are already falling over each other. This is not economy.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The appointment was necessary on the S.S. Daisy.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—If it was necessary, why not give it to some returned soldier?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The position is not new. It was a vacant position.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Who was the man who was there last year?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I don't know.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Well I do.

MR. WALSH asked the Minister of Public Works if the 1921 grants for Roads and Bridges have been sent out to the different Road Boards and Commissioners as promised in this House some ten days ago?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the information.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs:

- (a) For a detailed statement showing the name and address of all applicants for the Old Age Pension, whose applications are on file in Mr. Woods' office and who have not yet received said pensions.
- (b) Is it the intention of the Government to vote a sufficient amount, the present session, to give all applicants who are qualified, this pension?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As soon as I get that information I will table it.

MR. SINNOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of this House a statement showing all orders sent from his Department to

Steer Bros., and amount of same. If no orders have been sent, why not?

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the information.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 13th, 1921.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled 'An Act to amend the Election Act, 1913.'

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister it was resolved that a Select Committee of this House, to consist of five members, be appointed to take the evidence of the Medical Practitioners of the city of St. John's and others on the question of the suitability of the Escasoni site on Portugal Cove Road for a Smallpox Hospital.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Committee—Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. the Minister of Education, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Some days ago a petition was presented with regard to the Hospital that the government decided to erect at Escasoni, on the advice of the practitioners of the city. They claimed it was an admirable site for such a

building. Mr. Higgins put the position to the House that this petition against this project is largely signed by Justice Johnson and others, and it has been decided to select a Committee of three to take the evidence of the practitioners, and general opinion in that connection. We have been advised that it is an admirable site, and that it can in no way have detrimental effects on the neighbourhood. On the other hand Mr. Higgins voices a contrary opinion, and I would like to have the matter investigated before a decision is arrived at. I would suggest that the Committee be appointed by the Hon. Speaker before the close of the House this afternoon or on tomorrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, (a) how many barrels of seed potatoes have been imported by the Department since the first of January last and how many have been purchased in the colony (b) what has been the average price paid for imported potatoes and what for local potatoes, (c) what distribution has been made of imported potatoes and of local potatoes showing the localities to which each has been sent and the quantity of each; (d) and what quantities are yet to be imported and what quantity it is proposed to buy locally and where and in what quantities will the same be distributed?

THE PRIME MINISTER—There have been no potatoes imported since 1st of January last year, but seventeen hundred barrels have been purchased in the Colony. I cannot give the price at the moment but it was the market price at the day of purchase. There has been no distribution of imported potatoes, and the local have been sent to the various localities by the government through the department of Agriculture and Mines. As to the quantities to be imported there are some farmers who desire special

seeds. These will not be imported at the expense of the government, but will be purchased by the Department of Agriculture and Mines and delivered to these people at cost. It is impossible to estimate the quantity to be distributed but there have been requisitions from various districts, and the department of Agriculture and Mines will supply them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House, a statement giving the details of the sum of \$1,170.93, received by the Fisheries Department, on account of dredging work performed for private concerns as shown in his reply on May 10th, to my question respecting the operations of the dredge; also to say if there are any amounts outstanding and yet to be collected for such private work, and if so to state the amount and the parties from whom such is due.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That statement is being prepared and it will be ready.

MR. MACDONNELL—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to furnish a list of the lighthouses erected this year, as provided for in the estimates of last year.

HON. MR. COAKER—The answer to this question is being prepared.

MR. WALSH—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if Mr. Edward Whelan who was last year employed as Customs Officer on the South Coast Revenue Service is still in the Customs Service, if not why not?

THE PRIME MINISTER—I have asked the Assistant Collector to let me have the information in this connection. I have no personal knowledge of it.

MR. BENNETT—Asked Hon. the Minister of Justice, the names of the lawyers who drafted the agreement

between the government and the Bell Island Companies, which is now the subject of a Bill before this House stating who represented the colony and the companies respectively?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—In reply to that question I would say that the lawyers engaged in this matter were Mr. Summers and Sir William Lloyd for the government, and Mr. E. M. MacDonald for the Companies.

MR. BENNETT—Have they been paid any fees?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No.

MR. SULLIVAN—Asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of this House a statement showing (a) The number of bedsteads purchased within the last twelve months for the Poor House (b) from whom purchased, (c) price paid for same, (d) If mattresses are included in price mentioned, (e) if not to give price of bedsteads and mattresses separately.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—In reply to that I may say that the information is being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what steps his department is taking to assist the people of the Southern districts who have stocks of fish on their hands at present, or who are unable to obtain supplies for the fishery this year, owing to financial embarrassment of the firm which ordinarily supply them, but which through the operation of the Fishery Regulations are now unable to do so, also if the members for Burin, Fortune Bay, and Burgeo districts have made any representations to his department with a view to securing assistance for those people, and if not will the Minister now take the matter into consideration, and say what action if any, the government proposes to take, and if the government proposes to take no action, why not?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—

In reply I beg to say that no action has been taken.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—There are a lot of men with fish on their hands who cannot sell it. Could not some arrangement be made with the people who own stores on the Water Front, to have that fish stored there? There are lots of twenty-five and forty quintals.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Does the leader of the Opposition suggest that we secure a store for that purpose.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Yes that is my suggestion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I might say for the information of the Hon. Min. that we are storing some of this fish, but there are a lot of people that way and there may be some way of fixing it up, if the matter is thought over seriously and quickly.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Could you give me any idea of the quantity. Would there be a thousand and quintals?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—There may be more than that. I think there will be a lot of Labrador fish.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if it is the intention of the Government, at the present session to introduce any enactment with regard to common carriers which would give greater protection to business people, as recommended by the Board of Trade on several occasions, and if not, why not?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In reply I beg to say that no recommendations from the Board of Trade or any other source have reached me. This is the first I heard of it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his Department has yet compiled a complete statement showing the total catch of fish during the calendar year 1920, and if so to lay on the table of the House a statement show-

ing the Department's figures respecting:

- (a) Bank Fishery.
- (b) Shore Fishery.
- (c) Labrador Fishery.
- (d) With the catch of each quality for the different Districts as far as possible and also to indicate wherein the Minister's estimate made last September and submitted to a meeting of Fish Exporters, differs from the actual figures now supplied by his Department.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I do not know whether the first information is yet prepared, but the second part I know is being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is the intention of his Department to continue during the present year the army of so-called Fishery Inspectors, sent out last year, and if so what services they are to perform in view of the Minister's declaration last week that while the standardization law will be retained on the Statute Book it will not be enforced, and also if the Minister has received any representation from the Board of Trade with a view to recognizing certificates of inspection issued by the Board with regard to fish cargoes being exported from this Colony, and if so what is his attitude with regard to such a proposal?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—There will be no Fish Inspectors this year.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Minister of Education, if Mr. P. G. Butler, principal of Springdale Street School, St. John's under Church of England Board of Education, is one of the persons sent abroad by his Department for the purpose of perfecting their educational training in order to make them eligible for position under the new system about to be in-

augurated by the Hon. Minister for the promotion of higher education in Newfoundland, and if so, to state whether Mr. Butler is, during his absence, drawing his customary salary from the Church of England Educational Grant for St. John's in addition to whatever other emolument he may be receiving from the Department of Education?

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—I beg to say that Mr. Butler did not attend an institution abroad in the interest of the Board of Education but upon his own initiative. I have ascertained from the Secretary of the Board of Education that Mr. Butler is not receiving any salary.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Annual Report of his Department for year 1920.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Auditor General has objected to sending out the moneys for the Road Grants unless the vote is before the House, and it is only this vote that I want discussed this afternoon. The balance of the Estimates will not be discussed until next week so that the Opposition will have the week end to peruse them. Owing to the Printers' strike there has been a delay in the Estimates and we are not tabling them in the artistic form we would like. It will be noticed that there is no mention of reduction of salaries of Civil Servants in these Estimates. It is the intention to bring in a specific Bill for this purpose.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It will be noticed that the total for roads is \$125,000.00 less than last year. The courtesy of passing that road grant this afternoon will enable

the Auditor General to open up a new account, and will furnish the proper authority for sending this money throughout the country.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker. I have no desire to hamper the passing of this vote, but it opens up our new estimates and the expenditure for the entire year. A great deal of concern is abroad as to how the country's expenses are going to be met this year. It was thought that the budget and the estimates should be tabled together. We are in a situation now where we have to cut our garment according to our cloth. The Prime Minister has stated here this afternoon that he intends making a reduction in the salaries of Civil Servants, but the question arises also whether we should not make a reduction in our road expenditures. The people of the entire country will have to curtail in the whole of their living until we get back to normal conditions. The Department of Public Works is a department that spends a large sum of money. I don't suppose there is a department where there is more money wasted, and it has always been that way. Our method of spending road money is absolutely wasteful. We don't get adequate returns for the money we spend. The Governments have always depended for a great deal of support through the handling of the road grants. I know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was very strong on this point. He inaugurated a system of local road boards so as to have the money spent in an economical way. I believe his intentions were serious, but I doubt if there has been any improvement. It is very difficult to get the people to realize that this is just as important as keeping their homes and farms in good condition at the least possible expense. They have to pay this money that is wasted.

I do not wish to hamper the Gov-

ernment because I know the necessity of something being done quickly so as to get some money in circulation amongst the people. This is confirmed by the action of the Government this afternoon in asking for this authority for the distribution of this money. If we can afford it let us do it, but if we cannot afford it we should not pay it. That is my reason for stating that I would like to see a copy of the Budget, in other words the Ways and Means tabled. I would like to see where the money is coming from. It is not good enough for the Government to come in here and make comparisons and show the votes of other years. Last year was abnormal. No man in business is thinking or planning as he did last year. Economy must be practised in every possible direction, and above all we cannot afford to be wasteful in our expenditure of road moneys. I say that by all means we should give the road boards all the money we can afford to give them to relieve the distress, but we should not run into it blindly. There is only one way that we can meet the present emergency and that is by the strictest economy. The earning power of the people is going to be cut into, and that means a corresponding reduction in revenue. We are not going to have any business profits tax this year. In every direction the revenue of this country is going to be so curtailed that it will only be by the most far-reaching economy that we will be able at all to maintain our financial independence.

I would suggest that the matter be left over until Monday. When we once open the door we might go on from one vote to another until we find that we have bitten more than we can chew. The condition is not so pressing that time cannot be given the members to think this matter over

and look over the estimates so as to be able to discuss them intelligently. We all know that the most important legislation brought into the House is the Ways and Means bill. Members of the Government I am sure will understand my position, and will consent to have this vote stand over until Monday at any rate.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I do not think it would be decent to take the vote in globo. It is time the Auditor General woke up and his report for the past twelve months does not require any consideration from us. He has asked you to get an authority to send out the road vote and he intimates that by voting on it immediately matters would be facilitated. I may say that the Minister of Public Works may for the next four days or so go on with the preliminary work and make arrangements for when the vote would be passed and it will be put through in the course of a few days. By voting on it this evening his step would not be quickened. When you take thirty or forty cents per capita all over the Island then it is not an important matter so far as the Road Grant is concerned. The whole thing does not involve more than two hundred thousand dollars and that amount per capita will not relieve the distress prevailing. The summer season is now well with us and the time for the repairing of the roads is now past. So I think it is better for the Prime Minister to rise the Committee and give the Opposition time to consider the matter.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I would like to say a few words with reference to remarks of Sir Michael Cashin. Now for the past week the Department has been doing every possible thing as to the preliminary steps and in fact for the past two weeks we have been doing everything possible to get the grants ready and we have been anxiously waiting the time when

this matter will be placed at the disposal of the Department. With the exception of the twenty per cent. increase in the main grant, the vote is the same that has been passed for the past thirty years.

The total amount would I believe considerably relieve the distress in some sections of the country. I think it is only right and proper that those grants be put through in a hurry. I expect that it would take three weeks after the vote is passed to have them sent out. For the past three weeks the department has been receiving from the Road Boards various reports as to damage to bridges, etc., and it is yet impossible to do anything and I thought I might say these few words before the Committee rises.

I do not think it would take long once do not think it would take long once it is passed to get the money to the Road Boards. In fact a telegram could be sent saying that the money was going. That would be sufficient for all intents and purposes. I think a few days delay would be all right as the Opposition would, like that amount of time to consider the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I quite agree with Mr. Bennett that usually the notice of the Estimates is given on say a Friday and they are not gone through until the following Monday. But this matter was brought so suddenly before the House because of the pressure brought to bear on the Department of Public Works with regard to the desirability of sending out the Road Grants, but if it is the desire of the Opposition to have the matter deferred I am quite satisfied.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to say that I entirely agree with Mr. Bennett that it would be all right from all points of view to let this matter stand over for a little while. Like my friend Sir Michael

Cashin. I think the delay would be serious. The only trouble once the vote is passed is the sending out of a cheque in an envelope. It only means thirty cents per capita. May I ask the Prime Minister if he is going to get the whole five thousand dollars?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That amount has been arranged for and may be got from the Bank of Montreal to-morrow. I intend to give notice this afternoon of the introduction of a Bill on to-morrow and Ways and Means on Thursday.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I do not agree with the Minister of Public Works because I do not think the delay with reference to this vote will be any way serious and it would facilitate the Opposition considerably if it was let stand over for a little while.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—May I ask the Prime Minister, if this five hundred thousand is a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal and is it going to be distributed among the different Road Boards and what programme is going to be arranged?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It will be divided among the different districts per capita and the Departments of the Marine and Fisheries and Public Works will confer the respective representatives of each as to the handling of the money.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I hope it will not be sent out in the same manner as it was last year. It was sent out to the heelers of our opponents and the principal instructions were given by the Prime Minister. Now if that is the policy of the distributon it is just as well to cancel it right away.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That custom Sir Michael is evenly balanced.

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.

On motion the debate on the Address to His Excellency the Governor, was postponed until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Renew 10-11 Geo. V. Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Last evening you will remember, I was on this matter re the President Coaker. Now I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how this discrepancy between the amounts as the individual cheques indicate and the amounts of them according to the official report. The cheque given to Sellars is for \$82,675 and according to the official report it should be \$82,575.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—There is a mistake of one hundred dollars.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The insurance was not made up accurately and the one hundred dollars arose with reference to that calculation.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Now is that the way the matter is being run. May I ask again the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if his accounts have been audited by the Auditor General.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I understand he has gone through the accounts and he found the mistake. And the \$100 has been returned to the Department. It

was deducted from the next payment for freight.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—May I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will table the cheque of the last one paid for freight and also a statement showing the deduction of the one hundred dollars.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I will bring it up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There is \$6,225 charged in the official statement for insurance. Who did that insurance?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Some by Dale and some by Barr so far as I know. The Union Trading Company did the insurance.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Now that is worse. Could not the stub of the certificates issued by Dale be produced in the House?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I expect I could get them.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I would like them to be placed on the table of the House. You will remember you tabled a statement showing that the cargo of the President Coaker was sold to J. Sellars. We asked for information claiming that it was not Sellar's cargo and he had nothing to do with it but we received none. Yesterday you tabled two cheques which are signed by your department in favor of J. Sellars but Sellars denies having seen them and it appears that there was only a mere exchange of cheques and the Prime Minister with a flourish of trumpets produced these two cheques and if the Prime Minister has known me as well as he does to-day he would not have tried this trick on me. He does not know why I know so much about the case and if he did he would certainly think it would be dangerous for him to interfere. Now there is no more conclusive proof that the President Coaker's cargo is not own-

ed by Sellars than these facts exhibited this evening. Sellars had nothing to with the insurance. Yes it is beginning do you not think, that he had nothing to do with it whatever. Now that is the reason that the other day when the previous motion was before the Chair that I appealed to you through our friendship that you have an enquiry and bring the matter to the public eye. Now I am satisfied that something more serious is going to become of this matter and I say this because I know what I am saying is correct. It is more correct to-day than ever. I believe that you in your soul will admit that Sellars had no more to do with the cargo of the President Coaker than the mere exchange of cheques. I think if these cheques had been produced here before the whole matter would have been cleared up much quicker. And you say the Bill of Lading was in the name of the Government. I would like to ask you again if there is any possibility of tracing that Bill of Lading? The other day when I asked you for it you said the cargo had been bought by Sellars. Now if these cheques had been produced and the matter had been cleared up so that you would be placed in a position of righteousness it would have been gratifying to all concerned but to-day I think I am right and you are wrong. I asserted yesterday when the Prime Minister produced these two cheques to the House with his chest stuck out and a smile on his face that I was not satisfied with the information and there was a cheque held by someone else and now I am determined that this matter will be ventilated and brought to the public mind. The Little Princess was loaded alongside the Jean Wakely but there is nothing showing the discrepancy arising with reference to this cargo. There is some reason as to this. The same fish from

the same fishermen was put into both of these vessels. Why was the President Coaker allowed to take fish from the stores of the F. P. U.? I think everyone should have been treated along the same lines. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has now tried to place the blame on Sellars and this motion before the Chair is one which gives us the opportunity to have this matter cleared up and if it is their intention to vote it down I say I cannot understand it and I cannot understand why you are not satisfied to have the atmosphere cleared. I do not understand about the prices paid for the Jean Wakely's cargo. Some of it fetched nine dollars per quintal and some eight dollars. The same applies to fish of the President Coaker. The Minister has to explain this. I asked you yesterday for a copy of the people who sold the fish and the amount which had been taken from the Union Stores. I endeavoured to trace this information to-day but failed so will you kindly let me have it. In this cheque business and this insurance business there is something which you do not want the public to see. So that is the reason why the Government is going to vote it down. I am rather astounded that the Prime Minister should be away at the present moment, but I can understand it if 600 hungry men are outside the building. I hope it will not be the same during the discussion of the matter of the "President Coaker." The two leaders of the House are lost. The real leader of the House is lost.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—Perhaps you would like to take his place.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Would you like to have me in his place; I know you lay your confidence in me more than in any other man in the country. I would wish to have a word to say now of these cheques in connection with the "President Coaker." We have three now, dated Nov. 10th, Nov.

27th and Dec. 6th, and we intend to produce the fourth. These will tell the tale. This is a serious matter but as I thought the enquiries would be over before this and they did not take place, I will tell you of it now. You Mr. Speaker, should get the members to take notice. On Nov. 26th, under the Marine and Fisheries account, the Bank of Nova Scotia paid Mr. Jos. Sellars \$82,675. That was passed by an employee of the Marine and Fisheries Department to Mr. Joseph Sellars on the afternoon of Nov. 26th, or the morning of the 27th, and when that cheque was passed to him, this other dated Nov. 27th for \$82,675 and signed by Mr. Sellars was paid back to the Union Trading Co. The two cheques were exactly alike. One was given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the others was handed back by Mr. Sellars and yet I am told there is nothing wrong. You can't get away from it. I offer to bet that if the Prime Minister held this cheque yesterday the same as I do, he would never have read it out. This is a sorrowful moment for him. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has backed up the case. As I said before, this is conclusive evidence. Mr. Sellars only swapped his cheque with you, sir. I do not like the idea, sir, of standing here and bringing attention to such questions as you brought up a year ago when you tried to take every spark of character from me. You realize now, sir, that you are up against an even more serious charge than you preferred against me. I tell you here and now, sir, that if this enquiry does not take place, if the skeleton is not taken out of the cupboard and the cards laid on the table, something is certainly going to happen. This matter will be taken, if necessary outside the House, and it will be taken up whether the Government wants it or not. You never

dreamt when in the early stages of your career you wrote to the Governor about me that you would become an even greater sinner. But history repeats itself—especially when the Bank of Montreal or the Bank of Nova Scotia keeps the records. The facts are here, sir, right in these cheques. May I ask the Hon. Minister of Marine if it is the intention of the Government to vote on this motion. I am prepared to stop now and give you a chance, because there is a great deal more to come out of this case than any of you may imagine. Here is a cargo of fish insured by the Government with freight and all totaling \$95,000 and when Fonseca in Italy gets his touch cut out of it, not even this cheque here will be left for us. When I asked the Hon. Minister of Marine yesterday where the money had gone he could not tell us. Why does he not tell us where it has gone? Has it gone to Fonseca.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is in the hands of the Trade Commissioner.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—After Mr. Bernard leaves who is going to look after it. Here is \$95,000 dangling about, being tossed about like dice, and nobody to look after it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It's no use to tell you differently.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You won't tell us anyhow but I am rather inclined to think you will be left there. I tell you now your cargo of fish will not be sold for the next 12 months.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Some of it is sold now.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—At what price, may I ask sir.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—We are getting a very good price for it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Now isn't that something terrible, gentlemen.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND

FISHERIES.—I said to sell it at 45/--.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—What do you anticipate the loss is going to be to the Colony. You think there is only 10/-- a qtl. lost on it. That will show a loss of 3,500 pounds but I say there will be a loss of 7,000 pounds or more on the "President Coaker's" cargo, because of the bungling in handling it. That is what it has cost the Colony. I will go further and say that the "Jean Wakely" and the "Little Princess" cargoes turned out differently, as they were handled by men of business ability, but this one, the "President Coaker" was not. I charged before that \$19,000 freight was paid. The Hon. Minister of Marine tells us that the other half was paid and I ask him now, when was the balance paid.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Some time in March.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Would that cheque be available, sir.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It might be at Port Union.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You mean to say it might be issued at Port Union and held there.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It may be in the Fisheries Department.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—The cheques themselves are not half as important as the date you paid them. Now I ask you fairly why you will not have the investigation.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I would like to have it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Good for you. You are the man behind the gun and if you tell the Prime Minister that you court it you will have it. If the Prime Minister refuses, I believe the little Attorney General will agree but I do not want to put him in the awkward position of asking him. If you

do not want to put it now as a vote of want of confidence in the Government we are perfectly agreeable. Come over on this side of the House and vote and then you will see the Hon. Mr. Warren coming with you and the Hon. Dr. Barnes coming next. We can fix it now if you want it. This must be cleared up. I understand we are not going to stop at this as if the motion is not carried through and we get something to tell the people who are clamoring for the truth, some who are not members at all will tell us to go to the country and have it investigated fully. I am tired of pleading with you, sir, to have this enquiry in justice to yourself; a clergyman could not have been treated more gently, sir, than you have been. Have this Commission appointed and the enquiry held before this House for your own sake and the sake of those who are supporting you here. Get up and say we will have no more of this "President Coaker" affair, and as you say it, whisper to Hon. Mr. Halfyard to vote with you when the motion comes up and I will draw off. We will then have the atmosphere clear in a few days. These cheques, however, will be needed and I will take care of them for a few days. When Mr. Sellars makes such a statement as he has, something must happen as the public will take it up clear of this House. I have nothing further now to say on this matter except that when the vote comes on, you be on this side of the House. You can't do anything else, sir, in justice to yourself and the country than come over on this side and vote with me.

MR. MACDONNELL—I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two on this matter. The situation which confronts the House at the present time justifies the position which we took last year when we questioned the propriety of Hon. Mr. Coaker, holding two positions at the same time; the

danger of a Minister of the Crown acting in a dual capacity. We were assured, however, that our fears on this score were groundless; that he was too big not to faithfully discharge his public duties and that there was no collusion between him and the Prime Minister. Some were slow to believe the charges against him. I was of the same impression till yesterday; I was a disbeliever too, and was not slow to express my views in that regard and the hope that he could give an explanation that would clear the whole matter up. But now I am no longer in doubt—we have ample proof that when the Hon. Minister carried out this transaction he knew that he was doing wrong. There is no need of bringing in a third party in order to camouflage it—he knew clearly that when President Coaker of the Union Trading Co. approached the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries he was looking to someone that would help him without demur. I make the definite charge here that he did wrong and that he knew it when he made that sale of fish. That is admitted and every member has now to judge how that transaction has affected the Minister personally and the House collectively. I have no doubt but the members of the Executive were accessories to the fact and that it was done with their connivance though the others might not know, and I am convinced that those on this side of the House were not aware of the details till yesterday. But there is where the similarity in the position of members ends. It is still possible, however, by any man voting down this motion to identify himself with this infamous transaction and by so doing he takes as much of the blame as the Minister or Marine who was responsible for the first action. That is the first view to be taken of this question. I am prepared to hear anything in the way of explanation and to see the reflections

cast on those involved cleared up; but this is not a question of bringing up whether Mr. Sellars is right or wrong, but of what we are going to do now, that we know that this wrong has been committed. Is the name of the Minister of Marine sufficiently strong in the government to buy him a clear title. I have no desire to say harsh things of a man who is down. I have great respect for the old motto "Ne mortuis nil nisi bonum" but I often substitute the word "bunkum" for bonum. I can see now that Hon. Mr. Coaker is politically dead. If you believe in his innocence then stand by him all the time. But are we to believe that you knew of this infamous transaction before we did. If so, you are party to the absolute deception of those who are trying to explain the question away. This was the shadiest transaction ever carried out by a member of this House and anyone that votes down this motion becomes identified with it. Everyone doing so writes himself down as party to the deception and does so with his eyes open. You gentlemen on the other side must remember that there are traditions attached to this House and that during the last few years such amendments have been made to the Placeman's Act that those traditions have gradually ceased to stand out with the same clearness and distinction as heretofore.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled

"An Act to amend the Profiteering Act 1920."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker: I should like to make a few observations before this Act passes. I think that some commentary should be made with respect to the administration of affairs in relation to the Food Control Board, that have been in existence during the past twelve or fifteen months. It is not my purpose to refer to that section of their duties which relates to the handling of sugar, because that matter is now before a Select Committee of this House and is being dealt with in such a manner, and I hope that the finding of that Committee will be such, that the utmost information will be given to the House and to the country at large as to the operations of that Board during its tenure of office. It is quite proper that there should be a Board, as contemplated under this Act. It is desirable in every possible way that we should have a Board, properly constituted by proper individuals. The desirability of having a Board was very evident during the past two years to prevent the extraordinary amount of profiteering that has taken place in the country, and it looks to me like locking the stable door when the horse is gone by coming in to-day to introduce a bill to amend the Act in relation to profiteering. Unfortunately, in this country when a Bill of this kind is put into operation there is very little attention paid to the fitness or ability of those who are to constitute the Board and who are to carry out the special duties that they are called upon to perform, and it would be absolutely futile for us to pass this Bill if the government do not intend to put into operation machinery to prevent a repetition of extortion, which has brought about the hardships that the working classes of this country

have been called upon to bear, and to prevent the further excess profits on the part of those dealing in commercial commodities. To-day the prices of foodstuffs are on the down grade, for which we are all thankful. We hear of big reductions in prices that existed in the foreign markets. We hear of butter having been reduced from 15c. to 20c. a pound in the Canadian markets and in conformity with that we find in our own city a reduction in butter of two or three cents a pound. I consider that when the price of goods, especially of foodstuffs, is reduced in the foreign markets, they should be reduced pro ratio in this market. I contend that it is a one-sided bargain that business men have with the consumers, because if the price of flour advances in the foreign market to-day one or two dollars a barrel immediately the price goes up in the local market accordingly; but if the price in the foreign market drops one or two dollars we get a reduction of twenty-five or perhaps fifty cents. Now I say what applies in the one case should apply in the other. We are paying higher prices to-day for foodstuffs than the people are paying in any other country in the whole British Empire. Canada, the great producing country of North America, is re-establishing herself in the commerce of the world and is getting back to pre-war conditions and is coming down in the prices of her products. I will ask any sane man to-night to compare the prices of foodstuffs, with the exception of one or two articles, and he will see that we are paying from fifty to one hundred per cent. more for them here than what is paid for them in Canada, exclusive of freight charges, etc. The answer we get from business men in this country is that indeed they must first get clear of the foodstuffs that they bought at the high prices before we get the advantage of the reductions; but when the boot was on the

other foot and they had stocks here that they bought at the cheap prices they held them until they sold them at greatly increased prices and made handsome profits. Consequently these people should be forced by some machinery of the government to give advantages to the consumers when prices are reduced. There is a necessity for some intelligent and efficient operative to regulate the prices of foodstuffs in this country, but if the government is not sincere in this matter and unless it does not intend to grapple with the problem in an intelligent and business-like way, it is just as well to throw the Bill to the wind. At present the Act respecting profiteering is not as effective as the Lotteries Bill, which we amended in this House the other day. We heard nothing at all about the activities of the Control Board, except as regards sugar and the history of that will be tabled in this House when the Committee appointed to investigate their transactions finalize their work. But there are other commodities that we have heard nothing about. I know that in Halifax to-day fresh beef is sold for 13 and 14 cents a pound while in St. John's we are paying 45 and 50 cents for it. Now there is something radically wrong about such a condition as this, because the difference between here and Halifax is only one or two cents a pound duty, and we are paying 300 per cent. more than we should be paying for this very necessary article of food. Therefore, I desire to impress upon the government that a Board should be appointed to make rules and regulations to go into effective operation to enable persons appointed on the Board to go to business houses and compare the prices of goods and compel the proprietors to sell at a reasonable profit so that those people who to-day are devoid of money and looking for work can make what they do earn go to the utmost extent. This is a very important matter and de-

serves the attention of all thinking men. Men should be appointed on that Board to go around like Police Inspectors. They should be on the job every day to protect the people until such time as we get back to a reasonable position and normal prices once more.

I, therefore, make those observations with the very best intentions, because I think that it is our first duty to protect the people and see that they get a square deal.

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.

A committee representing the unemployed appeared at the Bar of the House and presented a petition on the subject of unemployment:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr Chairman: I am glad my friends brought this matter up, although out of order, so that I can read to the House the correspondence which has taken place this afternoon. After coming into the House this afternoon I was handed this letter by an official of the City Council: (Reads letter)

My reply to that letter is as follows: (Reads letter.)

In other words here is a road in St. John's that needs repairs and the Municipal Council are asking the electoral district of St. John's West to repair it, a road for which everybody who lives in St. John's, is paying taxes. This road was built by the Municipality twenty years ago at great expense and has been maintained ever since. With respect to the overture asking to provide \$15,000 out of the road grant of the electoral district of St. John's West for the purpose of repairing their own roads, I think that

this is a piece of impudence on the part of the Council; for it would be just as reasonable to repair Carter's Hill out of the district road money of St. John's West or to ask Mr. Higgins to repair the roads in his district out of the government road grant. The arrangements in relation to the loan of \$150,000 are completed. Mr. Mul-laly, Deputy Mayor, and I came here a few evenings ago and while one newspaper said I was afraid to stand fire. I drafted for him the necessary resolution for the Council to pass. They passed it and the matter came before the Executive Council. The resolution was confirmed and the necessary warrant was issued arranging for the St. John's Municipal Council to have to their credit in the Bank \$150,000 which loan I am introducing a Bill to cover. The Council have all the funds they need to go ahead with. There is no question as to whether they got the \$150,000. They got it on the understanding that they would take up immediately the matter of placing the men at present out of work. What has happened is that the City Commissioners have fallen down on their jobs. If they have no work to go ahead with they do not need the \$150,000. So far as this other offer was concerned, if the Council were prepared to appropriate out of their loan of \$150,000 five or ten thousand dollars for repairs and re-construction which means the putting up of a fine concrete embankment, I was prepared as senior representative of St. John's West to arrange with the surveyors of the Department of Agriculture and Mines and to get the government engineer, if the City Engineer was too busy, to have this work immediately undertaken under efficient management, but that the work would be carried on entirely at the expense of the Municipal Council.

The actual position is that the St. John's Municipal Council is not going to get a five dollar bill out of gov

ernment road money. I am speaking as the senior representative for the electoral district of St. John's West. If the Council will give us fifteen or twenty-five thousand dollars out of the money that we are providing for them we are prepared to put through the work on their behalf, but the money has got to come out of the \$150,000. Apparently, what the Council wants is to get the \$150,000 and throw over the work on the government and at government expense besides.

MR. VINNICOMBE—Mr. Chairman. As one of the City Commissioners, I think this is out of order. I heard the Prime Minister say that they fell down on their job. Well my opinion is that he fell down on his job, because last winter the Municipal Council saw depression ahead and they asked the government to give them a loan of eighty or one hundred thousand dollars for the purpose of laying pipes through the city of St. John's. When we asked the Bank for a loan they refused. That was in February. In March we asked you if some arrangements could be made whereby the Bank could be paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The negotiations were with your Mayor, Mr. Gosling. Go ask him about it.

MR. VINNICOMBE—We got no reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Your Mayor got a reply.

MR. VINNICOMBE—You said the Council fell down on their job.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes and I repeat it.

MR. VINNICOMBE—When the people in St. John's West were hungry you did not see far enough ahead; but we did, and the work that you threw over on the Municipal Council to do you should be doing to-day. Have not the Municipal Council dealt fairly with you? Did you not come to us and ask us to give out employment by opening up a field on the back of the city? We did so. Instead of going ahead and building the Long Bridge you said

that you wanted to spread out the money and the work. You knew the work on that Bridge was to be done, and if you had gone on with it then there would be no men idle to-day. The people of St. John's to-day are not getting the benefit of the labour, and there are men employed who are not able to give a day's returns in work, through starvation and through no fault of their own. Does the Prime Minister think that we were going to be dictated to by him as to how we should spend our money or does he mean to suggest that we should spend it in keeping up Mr. Charlie Ayre's wall around his home. We wanted to see value for the money. We are doing as much as we can out of the \$50,000 that we got. We have to go thru property where we have to give 30 days notice. I was abused by those men at the Bar of the House at a special meeting of the Council this evening. They said they had a letter from you and that everything was arranged. The Secretary of the Council said we have not got the \$150,000 yet. He said it may be in the Bank, but we have no notification of it. I said wire to the Bank, as those men are blaming us.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If you are not prepared to go and spend the \$150,000 we are not prepared to give it to you.

MR. VINNICOMBE—You do not imagine we are going to throw out the money for charity. We would be poor representatives if we did that. I was going to say that I asked the Deputy Mayor to telephone the Bank and he refused. The workmen's committee then went to find out for themselves and the message they got was that the Bank was still waiting for the Minute of Council from you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Have you not got \$30,000 left out of the \$50,000 to go ahead with.

MR. VINNICOMBE—\$150,000 was the amount you stated. I always proved a friend to the working man and I am

not going to try and fool him now. With regard to what you wanted done with the \$30,000, I will resign from the Council before I will squander money like that. You are not going to dictate to me to build a road where no one lives. The Municipal Council have not fallen down on their job, but you have.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: We have been told by the member for St. John's East, Mr. Vinicombe, that to expend money for the repairs of the South Side Road would be squandering money and that he for one would resign before doing so. I also understand from him that the loan the Council asked for last winter was eighty thousand and not \$150,000. My honourable friend was present when the proposition was made, and that instead of \$80,000 it should be made \$150,000 to provide for extras and to enable the Council to give a large amount of labour at the present time. The mathematics of my Hon. friend are a bit slack. \$150,000 plus \$50,000 makes \$200,000 and when you pay back \$50,000 you still have \$150,000 left. If you do not want that \$150,000 and if \$100,000 is all you want, nothing will give me greater pleasure than to reduce your loan, and I will deal with the other \$50,000.

MR. VINICOMBE—What about the fifty in which we took you out of a hole to spread the work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The whole trouble is that the City Council have not alone fallen down on their jobs, but are incompetent and incapable as well. I am able to evolve a scheme in twenty-four hours to help out the unemployed better than the City Commissioners could get in two years. If the Council do not want the \$150,000 I propose to get a better organized equipment to do the same work for \$50,000, that the Council tried to do for \$150,000. The unfortunate part of it is that I thought that my friend opposite and his associated

were competent, otherwise I would not have had to face a bunch of men who took a fortnight to get 500 men to work. This whole discussion is entirely out of order. The fact is that the Municipal Council wants to get the government to spend the road money for the electoral district of St. John's West. I will be glad to confer with my colleagues in connection with this matter, but personally I am opposed to an appropriation of this kind, because the matter is one for the Council to assume entire responsibility for.

MR. BENNETT—I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I draw the Prime Minister's attention to certain facts in relation to statements that he has made this afternoon. I happened to know something about that South Side Road, although being the junior member for St. John's West. I know more about the South Side Road and about the district of St. John's West than the Prime Minister and his crowd will ever know. The history of that road is that when the railway was brought into St. John's West the South Side road was diverted and brought on the back of the house occupied by Mr. Nicholas Cousens through a marsh. That was the original South Side Road West. The Government improperly built the road, because to secure it they only put a load of starigans on it. I was not in the Government or did not represent the district of St. John's West at that time, but those conditions have been an eyesore to me ever since I have been in the district. The road is unsuitable, especially for vehicular traffic, and is used entirely as a road of pleasure. But the position is this that the Municipal Council do not get a dollar of taxation from that section of the town. They never had sufficient money to meet an emergency in a matter of that kind. The Prime Minister is not sincere in the statement that he (the Prime Min-

ister) was not going to be a party to the appropriation of any Government funds for the benefit of the City Council. I am in this fortunate position that I asked the Minister of Public Works the following question a couple of days ago: (Reads question). I am also in the happy position to produce the evidence showing what each man got. Here are the pay sheets I got from the Minister of Public Works in relation to that very small section of the South Side East extending from the Gorton Pew Co.'s premises to Fort Amherst. There is not a poor man in that section of the town. (Reads from returns what each man got.) The total amount is \$350.00 that was spent a week ago and spent by the Department of Public Works and charged up to the electoral district of St. John's West. Where is the consistency on the part of the Prime Minister to get up and make a statement that he was not going to be a party to spending Government money on the South Side Road West and he was a party to spending it on the South Side Road East. And everyone of the men who was employed was a staunch supporter of the Prime Minister. When I represented that district in the Government I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that I never made any such distinction, nor did I ever influence the Road Inspector in regard to any man's political affiliations. It made no difference to me what a man's opinion was in politics. He was entitled to it and entitled to his share of the public moneys that were spent in his locality. Whenever any work was done down there before in my time in the Government men were employed whether they supported Bennett or not. But it seems that times have changed, things have altered and ways are different, and that any man who supported Bennett at the last election, between Gunner's Cove and Fort Am-

herst, cannot get work, even if starving. It appears that if you did not vote for Squires you cannot get any work from the Department of Public Works.

The only thing I think I can do in this emergency is to advocate what was so aptly put by Mrs. Julia Salter Earle. This is no time for red tape. Put the men to work no matter who spends the money, whether the Municipal Council or the Government. Appoint a Committee of this House, if you will, to arrange for the employment of these people and satisfy them. Do not let us have a repetition of the story told by Mrs. Earle this afternoon. You may talk about the sincerity of the Government and talk about the sincerity of the Municipal Council. I do not care and it is a matter of indifference to me whether the Council or the Government exists. If we are men at all let us do something to relieve the situation. I am tired of pleading for it. I tried to make the Government realise the seriousness of the situation; and then we find the spectacle about the sending up of \$50,000. Nero fiddled while Rome burned; and Squires is fiddling while the people in St. John's West are starving.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, I want to add a word or two to this debate. As has been properly said by Mr. Bennett, the Government is fiddling while the people in St. John's West are starving. It is a pitiable sight to see the Prime Minister trying to explain with a multitude of figures what happened between the Municipal Council and the Government of the day. I now state here to this House of Assembly that not alone are the people of St. John's starving, but that the people all over the country are on the verge of starvation. We are now here over six weeks and almost every day listening to appeals coming in from various parts of the country for

relief. Up to now the Government have not started. Now if we do not move in the name of our common interests and our common country, why not appeal to outsiders to come in and feed the hungry. There are 1,000 men outside the Bar of the House and 5,000 children home starving and the Prime Minister is here trying to explain a difference of \$15,000 existing between the Government and the Council. Even if there is no work for the men to do give them the money anyhow. I promise you men to-night that if you are not satisfactorily relieved by Tuesday next come to this House and by the good God that made me I will see that you will be relieved. Take that message home with you to-night. I am not here for anything else but to see fair play and right. If you are the men that we think you are and which I know you are, and if you are in need, as represented here this evening, then do not go one day further than Tuesday next. I do not care whether the next house that I live in is Government House or the penitentiary. Take this as my message; if you are still starving by Tuesday next, without the Government moving, come here. It is up to the Government to get busy. Their stomachs are full; but the people who are waiting for relief have empty stomachs. The day of retribution has arrived and now the Government has either got to get down to work or get out.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the Prime Minister that the Government discuss this matter fully to-morrow morning, and I want to assure him, on behalf of my two colleagues, Mr. Vinnicombe and Mr. Fox, that any form of action that the Government adopts we will support, we care not what it is so long as it will enable those people outside to go to work and relieve their families.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I promised to meet the Committee at the Municipal Council to-morrow at 11 a.m.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Why not include the representatives of St. John's East and West?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will confer with the Deputy Mayor and the members for St. John's East and West to-morrow morning. I hope my hon. friend is aware that the Surveyors of the Crown Lands Office and the West End Road Inspector were inspecting that road at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, this thing has reached a more acute stage than I imagined a little while ago, and if the story told by Mrs. Earle is true matters are very serious indeed. May I suggest to the Leader of the Government to meet the Opposition to-morrow morning and try and devise some plan to save the situation. I have no party politics in this matter and I am sorry that the Prime Minister said that party politics were being used.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—May I ask Sir John Crosbie to consider the suggestion I made a few moments ago, namely, that the representatives of St. John's East and West meet the Deputy Mayor.

MR. FOX.—To-morrow is Saturday and the Banks will close at noon, your meeting will be at eleven o'clock, so that I do not think you will have time. Why not meet at eight o'clock to-night. Do not waste a single moment longer than is necessary. To-morrow may not suit, as described here this afternoon. Every moment is valuable and why waste any more time discussing the matter. I make the suggestion now that the Committee that the Prime Minister has in mind meet here at 8 o'clock to-night so that some scheme can be formulated by to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Committee can meet after the House rises.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There seems to be a diversity of opinion regarding this \$150,000. I take it that although your Minute of Council is gone to the Bank the money is not there for the Council.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This is not a question of money. Out of the \$50,000 that I left them the Council have a credit balance of \$30,000. They intended to send \$15,000 of that to the Board of Works department, but no amount has reached there yet from the Council.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—What I am anxious to know about is this. Supposing that the Council do not want to spend that money, I don't think you can force them to do it. I presume we can allocate certain moneys for relief work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We have \$500,000, as arranged yesterday.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—If the Minute of Council will give you that at the Bank of Montreal, I think we should make up our minds within the next twenty-four hours so that the unemployed can go to work Monday morning.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think that the suggestion of Mr. Fox to meet after the House rises is the most commendable one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I do not want to see a repetition of this thing in this House so I would ask you men to retire to your homes. I am anxious to see you to work, but I want to see it done in a right and proper way. If satisfactory arrangements are made by to-morrow, you will be able to go to work on Monday morning. You have the word of Sir Michael Cashin, who told you that if everything is not satisfactory for you by Tuesday next that he will stand by you. Well I

take the same position as he does, though I hope it will not be necessary to have you gentlemen before the Bar of the House again. I trust that a way out of the difficulty will be seen to-night, so I would ask you gentlemen, who comprise the deputation of workmen, to advise your brothers outside to go to their homes and not cause any trouble.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Loan for Requirements of the Colony and certain obligations of the St. John's Municipal Council.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on Thursday next the 19th inst., move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 16th, 1921.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: I desire to say a few words as to the present condition of affairs in this country. We are in a position to-day that we were never in before in the history of Newfoundland. There is nobody supplying on Water Street while the fishermen from the North did not get a chance to come here yet, and from reports to hand they are in as bad a predicament North as the people are in the South and West. Well if that is so, and it is so, there is but one thing left for us to do and that is to face it. But how are we go-

ing to do it? I would suggest that we meet the Board of Trade, which is comprised principally of the merchants of Water Street and the biggest planters around the Island, and see if they can see their way clear to bring about a solution of the difficulty. We got to get down to business. It is no use of winking at it. We have been winking at it long enough. We are now nearing the first of June and fishermen of the Westward should be fishing. Fish have struck in to the Westward and some boats have arrived home from the grounds with good catches. There are thousands of people in this Island to-night actually starving and what are we going to do about it. I have letters from people who have gone to bed without their supper and each of those people with seven and eight children. These people were good independent fishermen, in the past and always had full and plenty, but they are not now among the few who are in want, but they are among the hundreds and the thousands. Take Ferryland district where the fishermen were supplied last year by Goodridge and Sons, the French firm at Cape Broyle and by Bowring Brothers. The whole thing is closed down now to the people there and there has been nothing moving for the past six months. We all know what happened to the firm of Goodridge's, whose going out of business has been a big loss to the fishermen of the Southern Shore. Similar happenings have taken place in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. Take the Marys-town Trading Company. They are so embarrassed financially that they can not give any supplies either. On behalf of the Opposition, who are prepared to do all that is possible for them to do, I suggest that a move be made by the government to ask the Board of Trade to meet them and hear the views of the planters and merchants on the matter; and even while that is going on people are starving

to death. The government have a steamer or two available at present. There is no reason why a steamer could not take a thousand barrels of flour along with other provisions and make a tour of the South and West Coasts, find out where destitution prevails and give relief as the steamer goes by. As far as potatoes is concerned the majority of the people have no seeds in the ground yet. People have lived on potatoes and fish and potatoes and herring in the past, but if the potato crop is neglected and there is a bad fishery this year and if prices are anything like what they are at present, where are we in the Fall of the year. It is just as well for us to look at this thing square in the face. Other districts are in the same position as Ferryland district and I think we should move and do something and move very quickly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. I am sure the government appreciates the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the distress that exists in various sections of the country. If the leader of the Opposition will now name two or three other Opposition members, representing Opposition constituencies, to act in conjunction with himself, I shall be glad to arrange a meeting of a Committee of Council to discuss the matter. The two or three Opposition members are to be nominated by Sir Michael Cashin himself to take the matter up with the Executive administration so that an opportunity will be afforded of thrashing it out fully with a view to formulating some satisfactory scheme for the relieving of this distress. In so far as reports have come to the government from various sections of the country they have been met—I think the leader of the Opposition will agree—liberally, and with reasonable despatch and efficiency. Respecting the district of Placentia, as soon as the matter was brought before the government by the members for the

district, the response was one of liberality and promptitude, and Mr. Dee was instructed, as suggested by Sir Michael Cashin, not merely to take with him supplies for any particular place but he was instructed by telegraph by myself to call at the various places and report by telegraph from time to time as to the needs of any particular locality specifically, as, I am informed, the situation in the outports is growing more aggravating every day.

I am sure the government will be very happy indeed to confer on this matter with the Hon. leader of the Opposition and the other gentlemen opposite whom he may select.

SIR JOHN CROSSBIE—Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur in the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, and I want to personally thank the Prime Minister for his attention to it. I feel that there will be some solution to this problem, if we pass the hand across and get down to business. To-day I received several messages from a district that I am not interested in. Mr. Abbott, member for Bonavista, has told me that his colleague, Mr. Winsor attended to this matter to-day and arranged to get the stuff sent out. That is quite satisfactory to me and I shall telegraph those people accordingly.

I might say that I am quite in accord with the appointment of a Select Committee of the House to deal with this distress that is existing all over the Island. Regarding the position of the mercantile community. I do not think the merchants seem to know what to do and apparently somebody else besides the merchants has got to start this going. If the Opposition met the Executive Council I think possibly something might be done. I had an opportunity since Friday last of visiting Port de Grave, my own constituency, and I might say that there is a great deal of unrest there, unrest that is due in a large measure as to what is going to happen within the

next few days—where to find labour. Every man one would meet was asking “where are we going to get labour”? Bell Island and every other such avenue of employment is gone. I know the difficulties confronting the government. The task is not an easy one. Through the courtesy of the Minister of Public Works whom I asked about certain things I arranged over there certain matters. I do not think there will be any trouble around Brigus or Cupids in the matter of able-bodied relief, if we can get any work started to give the men employment. The same applies to North River and Clarke's Beach. I am, informed, although, I did not have an opportunity of visiting these sections. I understand that the Minister of Public Works is arranging to send out the monies there in connection with the repairs to roads. That is satisfactory to me. There is one thing in the district that seems to be troublesome and that is supplies for the Labrador. I can hardly say how we can get over it. The Labrador boat will be leaving about the first of June, and I think that, if we exercise a little discretion, and arrange for salt that we can get quite a crowd out of Conception Bay to go on that steamer. If the Hr. Grace representatives take the matter seriously I feel sure that something can be done in that connection. Around Brigus and from Conception Hr. to Hr. Grace, most of the fishermen go to the Labrador. I hope that a scheme will be devised that will work out alright. I might say in all honesty that the government tried to help out a great deal of distress in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's but I learn from the members. Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sullivan, that the position has become more acute there now. They have shown me a message which demands immediate attention. I do not propose to read the telegram because the gentlemen representing the district know more about

the circumstances than I do. Take Goodridge's house, as pointed out by Sir Michael Cashin. We all know what happened. The Marystown Trading Company are almost similarly situated. There are quite a few men from Placentia district in St. John's at the present moment and I think we should try and relieve these men and get them away from here and go fishing. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the quicker we get at it the better. I am anxious to see this thing being done. Something must be done and I would suggest that the quicker this Select Committee gets at it the better.

MR. WALSH—I would like to have the privilege of saying one or two words. I am glad to see this important matter discussed in a friendly and co-operative spirit by both sides of the House; also I want, as one of the representatives of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, to say that I fully appreciate all that has been done by the Prime Minister; but the matter is so serious that something has got to be done in order to get the men fishing. I want to thank the Hon leader of the Opposition, the hon. leader of the government and Sir John Crosbie for the pleas they have put in, and I want to respectfully thank the Prime Minister for the co-operation of the government in those pleas. There are thousands of men involved in that district and I shall be glad to communicate this information as quickly as possible, thereby relieving the tension that exists and assuring the people that the serious crisis will not occur. The people are anxious to go to work. They do not want pauper relief doled out to them, if they can possibly avoid it. All they want is the means to earn an honest living as they always did. The loss of the firm of Goodridge's in St. Mary's Bay, as already referred to, is keenly felt. They supplied practically the whole of that Bay and there are now noth-

ing less than 500 men who are unable to purchase their own supplies and cannot get anybody to supply them. The men are not able to get employment at Grand Falls, Limeville or Bell Island and consequently have to return to their homes where there is nothing for them to do. I do not want to occupy the attention of this House unless the discussion is going to terminate in something substantial being done. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion that a Select Committee consisting of members from both sides of the House be appointed to deal with this matter within the next few days so that the people can go fishing.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker. The gravity of the situation must be our apology for detaining this House discussing this matter. I feel quite sure that the members on both sides of the House have the fullest sympathy in having this matter aired and ventilated. In making statements here of the conditions that exist in our district for the last couple of weeks, we members did not think that conditions were so bad as they really are. I have received some very touching messages from people in our district, appealing for immediate assistance, proving conclusively that something has to be done and done at once. It is no use dilly dallying about the matter and promising to do it within the next two or three days. It is imperative that food must go to the people in St. Mary's Bay immediately. One of the gentlemen from whom I received a message is Rev. Fr. O'Driscoll, who absolutely refuses on all occasions to take poor relief, if it can be avoided. He never appealed before to us as members. He has always done his best to keep people from getting poor relief. But he has spoken at last, intimating that the people cannot hold out any longer. He says if the people are to be kept from starving, it is absolutely necessary for them to go fish-

ing at once. There is one thing that can be done and that is to fill up a steamer or vessel with provisions so that the people can be supplied for the fishery. If we allow our codfishery to go down where are we? We thank the government heartily for the offer of \$500,000 to be spent on public works, but that is not sufficient to meet all the urgent demands of this large and important district. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is needed for supplies for the fishery and how the government is going to go about this I do not know, but I think there must be some way out of it. I hope that something good will come out of the conference of the Select Committee. I would suggest that this Committee meet the merchants and meet the Bankers and see if some way cannot be found to supply the fishermen this year. I am quite convinced that many of the merchants are not able to supply; but if the government would give one million towards the financing of supplies, I think it would be very easy to get some of the merchants to give some too. Some merchants take the stand that if the government supplies that they will not supply. The men at St. Vincent's, the Gaskers and Cape St. Mary's have been looking for supplies for weeks and cannot get any. These men have got to get supplies in order to go fishing immediately. The government should step in and give these men a chance in that section because, I understand, fish is plentiful already there. The embarrassment to the men of our district is caused by the failure of Goodridges and practically the curtailment of every merchant in the district. It has been told already that Goodridge's firm is gone. That affects Ferryland district as well as ours. The Marystown Trading Company are short of funds and not in a position to supply. The same applied to Kemp at Placentia and Wakely at Hr. Buffett. Consequently what are the fish-

ermen going to do for supplies. They naturally look to the government, I have been told that the Limeville quarries at Port au Port are closed down. There must be some reason for that surely. Also Bell Island has curtailed considerably and that Grand Falls is closed down. I think that the government should communicate with those Companies and see what the possibilities are for having those much needed centres of employment opened up again.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the stand of the preceding speakers. As the conditions existing in Placentia and St. Mary's are beyond all imagination and previous occasions I think something ought to be done promptly by the government. The same applies to the district of Ferryland. The government has no doubt done a lot to relieve the distress among the fishermen, but I think that this Select Committee referred to before ought to take the matter up with reference to the coming fishery and do something as promptly as possible.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the leader of the Opposition at his leisure will give a list of those gentlemen he intend to recommend I will immediately make arrangements on behalf of the government.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1913." was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave grant-

ed and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a loan for requirements of the Colony and certain obligations of the Municipal Council.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Samson took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker. Through the courtesy of the Opposition I will submit these Resolutions in their present form as it has been impossible to get them printed. They will be considered and discussed contemporaneously with Supply and when Ways and Means come down before the House. Four and one half millions will be raised on the credit of the Colony at the rate of six and one half per cent. payable in London, New York, Montreal and Newfoundland. The objects for which this loan is being raised are as follows: (1) To pick up the loan of one million and one half raised temporarily last January at the rate of five and one half per cent from the Bank of Montreal; (2) To provide for the five hundred thousand to which reference has already been made; (3) To provide for the five hundred thousand raised and given to the Municipal Council three hundred and twenty thousand of which has already been floated and an extra one hundred and fifty thousand is now to be raised of which latter amount eighty to one hundred thousand dollars are to be expended on pipes and labour and fifty to sixty thousand to be reserved for emergency work. This one hundred and fifty has been carried with the Bank of Canada, the Council paying six per cent. (4) the further sum of one million to replace the amount taken from the Surplus Trust Account which should have been capital account. These bonds are in the form of fifteen year bonds at rate of interest six and one half per cent. Arrange-

ments have been completed for the floating of this loan through Dill, Reid and Company of New York, Lea, Higginson of Boston, and the Dominion Securities of Toronto. At the present rate of exchange the Colony would not get for these bonds here in St. John's ninety nine and one eight. The rate of the floatation is ninety nine and three quarters which includes eleven per cent. exchange. In view of the fact that money transmissions from New York to Newfoundland costs according to the fluctuation of the rate of exchange we desired to get this Bill through with reasonable despatch, and have as much progress made as possible so that the government may be in a position to take advantage of the rate of exchange. If it had been passed some time ago it would have been possible to have these bonds here in St. John's at ninety nine and one eight. The transaction is this:—If the Minister of Finance handed that bond over to the representative of the Company the representative for that bond would place to our credit at the Bank of Montreal here ninety nine dollars and twenty five cents. I am sure Sir John understands the position. You would get eighty nine for them in New York; as for Toronto you would get for them there the sum of ninety nine and three quarters less the difference of exchange between Canada and Newfoundland. In other words if eighty nine in New York that would net us here ninety nine and one quarter at to-day's rate of exchange. The arrangement is that so long as we get ninety nine and one quarter for them at to-day's rate of exchange, they may be sold anywhere. If the bonds were sold in London and we got ninety nine and one eight for them then they would have to be sold beyond par. To get ninety nine for them in St. John's we would have to get over one hundred in London because of the rate of exchange. The interest is payable in

the same way as it was with reference to the six and one half on the loan raised in New York some time ago. The details with respect to the working out of the loan are in accordance with previous acts that is left to the Governor-in-Council. At the present rate it will cost us some thing like one for six million did. My reason in handing these copies of the Resolutions to the members opposite was that progress may be made when we come to discuss them contemporaneously with Ways and Means.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I take it that the one million and one half is already spent; the five hundred thousand to the Council is also spent with the exception of the one hundred and fifty thousand; the million taken from the Surplus Trust account is gone; the million on the railway is also spent and the only amount left is the five hundred thousand for relief work and that will soon be gone.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That one million covers the four hundred thousand taken from the Surplus Trust Account so it is merely capitalization.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Cannot some amicable settlement be arrived at with the printers?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know the details but I understand that the printers desire an increase of ten or eleven per cent. and the various publishing plants find it impossible to compete under such a condition of affairs and would have to either close up or run with a loss ensuing. I think the type to the extent of about four-fifths had been set up to print the estimates but it had to be reset to suit other machines to be used because of the present conditions. I have just got one copy here. The pages are numbered.

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.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that large numbers of people are returning from Grand Falls as a result of being unable to secure work there owing to the existence of a strike, and if so what steps the Government proposes to take to find employment for these people or to assist them in getting supplies to prosecute the fishery, and if he does not consider the time has come when the Government should formulate some broad and comprehensive policy with reference to the widespread industrial depression now existing in this country?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I received a telegram from the Magistrate at Grand Falls a short time ago stating that the strike was still on and that the strikers had held another meeting but the result of it was not yet known. The Government felt, up to the time this strike burst on them like a thunder clap, that the 1¼ millions cut out would meet the emergencies of the case.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if it is correct that the imports from abroad since the beginning of this year have been smaller in volume than any year the past decade; if this result is not attributable entirely to the disaster brought upon the business people by the policy of Fishery Regulations enforced last year, and what steps the Government proposes to take in the effort to stimulate trade between this Colony and the outside world in accordance with the promises made by him in his Manifesto before the last election?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In

respect to the first part of the question I have asked that the information be prepared. As to the second part I felt sure that the hon. member does not think I would get any such thing done.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It is a fact that you made them though.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The price of codoll and seal-oil has been kept up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Coaker, of course, always kept up the price of fishery products.

Questions 3, 5, 7 and 9 were deferred.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if Mr. Albert Salter is receiving from the Martin-Royal Stores Hardware Co., Ltd., or any other business concerns in this city, a commission on orders received by them from the Public Works Department; if so what is the amount of said commission, and if it is the intention of his Department to prosecute the said Albert Salter and the said firms for this offence against the law prohibiting the payment or receipt of commissions in respect of goods purchased or supplies for public purposes?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am unaware that Mr. Salter is receiving any commission from any business concern on orders received by them from the Public Works Department. If any charge is made that a breach of the law is being or has been committed the Department of Justice will take the necessary steps.

MR. WALSH asked the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines what steps have been taken by the Government with a view to the sale of all the pit props cut as relief work during the past winter, and to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the progress made up to date in the

matter of the disposal of this material?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Department of Agriculture and Mines is busy with the possibility that a lot of these pit props may be thrown over on the Government.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in view of his statement a few days ago to the committee of the unemployed of St. John's, that the plans for the construction of a new "Long Bridge" have not yet been prepared, how it is that no action in this important matter has been taken before this date, seeing that the "Advocate" of December 1st, announces that the Railroad Commission sat for four hours the previous day and decided upon the building of a new Long Bridge and also on dredging the water above the bridge, and why no steps to carry these important decisions into effect have been taken for a period of five months?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The committee of the unemployed must have misunderstood me that the plans had not been prepared. What I said was, that since the allocation of the fund, no steps had been taken as till the vote is returned there is nothing with which to carry out the operations. The sum of \$50,000 will represent but a small part of the expenditure necessary. The situation is this. There is a very strong feeling in certain circles of those interested in the matter that a permanent bridge, with dredging inside it so as to make a harbour, is not possible. Others, however, are in favor of it being undertaken. It has not been before the administrative Government at all but is a matter for engineering experts to deal with and Mr. Hall, the Government engineer, is making a report on the question. As to the construction of the Long Bridge I fear that I am somewhat responsible for it not going ahead last year. We had only the

\$50,000 and in view of the high cost of materials, iron, etc., it was considered that adequate value for the outlay could not be got. I think that Mr. Bennett will agree with me that if this account had been spent last year the work could not have been done to practical advantage. It was held over and but for the present depression might have been held over till next year so as to get the proper value for it. By going on, the benefit would not be equal to what half the amount would bring if expended according to the programme followed in St. John's East and West on road work where the labor represents about 90 per cent. of the expenditure. In this proposition now brought up the material for the work would take up the bulk of the money.

MR. BENNETT.—I agree with the Prime Minister that it was not an opportune time last year to get the necessary materials but I understand that part of the programme at present is the paving of the bridge from Water St. to the Southside which would give a very large amount of work. First, the cutting of the blocks at the quarries on the Southside Hill and then the laying of them would give a whole lot of labour. I sympathise with the Prime Minister in the Long Bridge situation. It is hard to tell what form of bridge to get there. The upper part of the river has been filled in by the continuous dumping by the people of refuse there and now the other side is being filled up also. If we had a breastwork from the bridge to the Gas House it would leave a narrow channel which the water would flow at increased rate and serve to keep it clear. A narrow drawbridge would allow schooners which are kept here for the winter to lay up above the bridge and relieve the trouble in the harbour. At present ships going to the upper part of the harbor or the dock find it difficult to navigate their

way and this would be a great relief in that direction. It is a difficult question to settle as to the waters above the bridge. As to a harbor in the upper portion, that is out of the question as the place has been filled in. There should be a concrete wall just above the bridge and the channel dredged which would make a deep water terminus to the railway. If steamers were able to get up there it would be a great asset to the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The cost would be something enormous.

MR. BENNETT.—Of course it can hardly be grappled with now. But I refer to it as it has been mentioned by people who are competent to give an opinion on the matter. I think if the Government would consider the paving proposition it would be a good time now to spend some of the money.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act, 1920."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I support this Bill because although the Act has been on the Statute Book for a year and not the slightest attempt made to enforce, it can now do no harm and it is to be hoped that some use will now be made of the powers in the Act. While the need for such a measure has to a great extent dis-

appeared there are still many ways in which it can be employed to good effect. I have in mind a case in point wherein through more or less of a monopoly of the limited cold storage facilities of the City, two or three persons have got together and have the price of fresh beef practically in their own hands. With these men it is, of course a matter of business but because of this monopoly we in St. John's are paying more than a reasonable price for this article. Now that a Board is to be appointed under the Act let us hope that it will be something more than a name. The position in the past has been that we had elaborate machinery to check this sort of thing but no attempt has ever been made to use it. It is I think pretty generally realized that a lot of the profiteering talk that has been heard was groundless but nevertheless comments on certain aspects of the matter has been absolutely justified and there is no doubt that at present cold storage in the City, the limited, is monopolized and as a result of this the prices that we have been forced to pay for beef have been unreasonable. The importation of this article is in the hands of a limited circle and the local or small butchers have at certain seasons of the year to buy from them and through their enterprise they have become the dictators of the prices to be charged. Now this is one of the things to which the Board to be appointed should give immediate attention.

As to the question asked with regard to the payment of the Board, that will no doubt be a matter to be regulated according to the result of their efforts. I support the Bill, Mr. Chairman, and the reason for my remarks is to draw attention to the necessity for having such cases as that which I have cited in connection with the cold storage looked into.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman,

when this matter came up on Friday I said that I thought the creation of a Board now for the purpose of dealing with profiteering was a case of locking the stable door after the horse was stolen. There will no longer be the same opportunities for profiteering as existed during the war when fluctuating prices afforded such chances to business people to charge exorbitant prices. Personally I know nothing of the company interested in the cold storage to which reference has been made this afternoon but I made the statement that fresh beef was selling in Halifax for twelve cents per pound while we have to pay forty and fifty cents for it. Now to-day I notice there is a sale of a large quantity of live cattle that have just come in and perhaps the competition that will result from this will tend to lower prices somewhat. If we are going to do something under this Profiteering Act let us do it with earnestness. It is just as essential as it is to have a health inspector to have an official whose duty it would be to go around from one business place to another, see their invoices and in this way see that the people were given a square deal. Such a policy as this would greatly strengthen the Government. Nobody expects a man to do business unless he can get a legitimate profit but at the same time extortion should not be permitted. The people were extorted during the war and in my opinion this was the cause of the unrest that has been and still is so evident on every hand. Prices were permitted to soar at such a rate that wages were found to be inadequate to enable the laboring classes to live. Now, Sir, if a man were appointed who would carry out his duties in this respect fearlessly and without favor he would be an asset to the country.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—Mr. Chairman, there is an aspect of this, if it

can be called an aspect of the Bill which seriously affects outport fishermen and which seems to have been overlooked. Does not this Bill take out of the hands of outport magistrates the power of deciding what shall be a fair and just price to be charged on the accounts of fishermen? Heretofore, if a shareman for example thought that he was being charged too much on his account, he could go to a magistrate who was empowered to decide what was or was not a fair price and have the matter adjusted. Now does not this Bill take that power away from the magistrate?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, the Bill does not affect that. I might say Mr. Chairman with regard to the working out of the Profiteering Act this act was placed on the Statute Book for the purpose of regulating prices generally. It seems to have been the idea that it was the duty of the Minister of Justice to institute all proceedings under the Act but this was not the case. The Act itself is almost a fac simile of the English Act and any person who thought that he was being charged exorbitant prices for goods he purchased could immediately proceed against the seller. As Mr. Bennett has said, the appointment of a competent inspector would go a long way towards remedying the evils that exist in this way. Last year when this Act was passed there were people very anxious to have some means of dealing with those who charged unreasonable and exorbitant prices, and a number of them like Mr. Thos. Peel and Mr. Doyle and others banded themselves together in what was known as the Consumers' League. They came up here and induced the Government to put this Act on the Statute Book and I thought when that power was placed in their hands that something effective would be done but nothing

has been heard of them since. As to the question of meat prices, I do not know anything about cold storage monopolies but from personal experience I can say that although I purchase a portion of my meat from a local butcher as those who come from Kelligrews and other places of that kind are known, I do not get it any cheaper than I could get it in the City. It may be of course that these people are taking advantage of the cold storage monopoly. However, as I said, under the Act any individual who thinks he is unjustly charged can go to the Board and lay his complaint.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I wish to refer hon. members to page 18, Department of Public Works, on roads. The total for local roads is \$75,000; for Main Lines \$65,906 and for Railway Connecting Roads \$3,060. All these amounts are the same as last year but the Special Grant is reduced to \$20,000. We got the Special Grant as we had it for years. It is for the whole Island and is divided among the districts on the per capita basis.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I move that this \$20,000 be not held for convenience but be spent right out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Grant is simply there as a provision in the case of bridges, etc. being swept away by rains and floods.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I think that it will be allocated in a month or so and is always distributed quickly.

MR. HIGGINS.—It is what is commonly called the Local Special grant.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—It is alright as long as Hon. Mr. Jennings understands it.

MR. WALSH.—I take it, sir, that it will be at the disposal of the sitting members.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I think it would be best to have it distributed irrespective of politics.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, that's right. I may say that the total grant for roads is \$165,968.00.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—When can you get the amount allocated.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Immediately the account opens 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 Bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for special purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Samson took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this bill (An Act respecting the cutting of pulp wood) was distributed some time ago. It was explained in the second reading. We were in Committee and the Committee rose until the contracts could be distributed. The effect of this bill is to legalize the arrangements made some time ago regarding the matter of cutting pulp wood for certain purposes. The matter to which Mr. Bennett referred could not be contained within the scope of this bill, and another bill will be brought in with respect to that.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, before this bill goes through I would

like the privilege of saying a word. It seems to me, Sir, as one who has a little knowledge of the timber areas of the country that some arrangements ought to be made whereby it would be possible to give licenses for the cutting of timber on granted land on which an exportation tax of say one dollar a cord could be charged. I am informed that if a time limit of from three to five years could be granted that a good business could be done in this direction. In White Bay and other places there are limits held by people who are unable to carry on an industry. Gradually these valuable areas are being destroyed by fire, and neither the country nor any individual is getting any benefit from them. People who can turn these areas into revenue for the country should be permitted to do so rather than have them go up in smoke. A time limit of from three to five years would have to be allowed because certain machinery would have to be imported and put in operation. The work that needs to be done to comply with the requirements for exportation cannot be done by hand.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I recognize the strength of the arguments produced by hon. friend Mr. Sullivan. The point, however, is contrary to the policy of the Government during the last 15 years at least. The policy has been the preservation of timber areas. The observations have some considerable weight in that through forest fires we are allowing to go up in smoke what should be exported. I shall be glad to submit the proposal to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the Prime Minister that this is contrary to the policy of our Governments during recent years, but that is really no argument. As it is these areas are held

for many years without bringing any benefit to the country or to any individuals. There should be some provision whereby areas would revert after a certain number of years.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to allow the members to allocate this amount of \$500,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, strictly speaking the members have nothing to do with the allocating. The various members see the Minister and arrange for the allocations, but the Minister is responsible for the final decision.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, one reason why I would like to have the co-operation of the members is because they are familiar with the needs of their districts. We get scores of requests from every district, and without the advice of the representatives the money might be sent where it is least needed. I am prepared to accept suggestions from any members whether on the other side of the House or on this side.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners," without amendment.

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

Act Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber.

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 17th., 1921.

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

MR. GOSSE—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Spaniard's Bay for \$600 for repairs to the road between Spaniard's Bay and Hr. Grace and known as Hr. Grace Ridge. Quite a number of families live on this road which is in a neglected condition and almost impassable.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to confirm an agreement between the government and the D'Arcy Exploration Syndicate Limited.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked hon. the Prime Minister if he has taken up, either directly, or through the High Commissioner in London (whose knowledge of conditions here would be invaluable in setting out the actual conditions), any representations to the President and Directors of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. with reference to the existing strike at Grand Falls and the desirability of the Company conceding everything possible to its employees in order to maintain this industry in active oper-

ation during the present summer, in view of the great scarcity of employment elsewhere, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copy of all correspondence bearing on this subject.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On May 14th., I sent the following cable to the High Commissioner in London: "Rurality, London.

"Understand that Grand Falls has "closed down. Reported due either "to strike or disagreement between "company and workmen over reduc- "tion in wages. Am not informed as "to actual facts. Would you kindly "get in touch with Lord Rothermere "and advise me as to what is real "position and whether it is possible "for anything to be done to adjust "situation so that operations may "be continued as formerly.

"SQUIRES."

To-day I received the accompanying reply from Hon. Sir Edgar Bowring:

"Rothermere out of England. Directors Anglo Company considering "matter. They will reply early as "possible."

Up to the present moment nothing further has been forthcoming.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a list of the foreign-going vessels which ordinarily take away cargoes of codfish, now lying in this port, how many of the vessels are unemployed and the reason they are so unemployed; also an estimate of the number of seamen out of work as a result of this unemployment, and what steps, if any, he proposes to take to afford relief to the men so unemployed?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have no particulars in my office as to the matters referred to.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that it is commonly reported in this city that there is very little, if any, of the salt landed by the S.S. "Tuckahoe" at Port Union some months ago now in the

stores there; that the explanation given for the salt not being the government; and if he will appoint one or two constables to proceed to Port Union and other points, report how much of the salt is held in stock there, and trace what has become of the remainder, in the same way as he sent constables into Ferryland district after the election in the Fall of 1919, to force people in that district to return public monies that had been granted to them; and if not does he hold to the principle that there is one law for the F. P. U. and another law for the rest of the people of the country?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am making enquiries and will table the information as soon as it is ready.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked the Prime Minister if he has made any representations to the Imperial Government with regard to the conditions in this country, to the difficulty of obtaining funds for carrying on the pub- loan for such purposes; and if he has requested any such loan; and if so, what answer he has received; and to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence in relation to this matter; also if it is his intention, during the coming Imperial Conference, to make such representations to the Imperial Authorities, and if so what is the amount of the Loan which he will ask from them?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No representations whatever have been made to the Imperial Government as to the condition of the country or the obtaining of funds. The reason none were made is that I felt there was no necessity for so doing as we already had the 4 1-2 millions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—When I put the question on the Order Paper I did not know you had that loan.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table

of the House a statement showing the number of railway sleepers cut in the different electoral districts of this country from the first of July last up to date, and the amounts paid in each district for the same; also if any more sleepers require to be cut, and if he proposes in the distribution of the orders for the same to consider the claims of all the districts in the country?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE—I will table the information in a day or two.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, if Mr. George Morley, Superintendent of the coal boring operations at South Branch, has reported to the Commission or to the government that it is waste of money to continue operations at this deposit; if he has so reported does the government intend to pursue this work and waste further public money; if he has not so reported, what report has been made and to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the same.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—As far as I know the gentleman has made no report such as pointed out here, but if he has made any I will get them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—The reason I ask is because it is public property, and very important if the rumour is correct, as the work there will be ceasing then.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—As far as I am concerned I do not know of any reports.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is there any report from him, good or bad.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I think reports have come from him, but I have not seen any.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is it your intention to make any enquiry into the matter.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I will enquire about it.

MR. SULLIVAN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the Customs Revenue for St. John's week by week, from March 31st to date, for the financial years 1918-19, 1919-20, 1920-21, and an estimate by the Auditor-General of the expected receipts in St. John's for the balance of this fiscal year together with the actual receipts for the same period in the past two fiscal years.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will have the information shortly; it will take a little time to prepare.

MR. BENNETT—Asked the Prime Minister, seeing that only six weeks now intervene to the end of the fiscal year when, according to the correspondence between the government and the Reid Newfoundland Co. last August, the scheme for government co-operation in the working of the Railroad by a Commission will terminate:

- (a) If the Government has notified the Reid Newfoundland Company of its intention to terminate this agreement at the end of June next and if so to lay on the Table of the House, a copy of the letter giving such notification, a copy of the Reid Newfoundland Company's reply, if any, and if no such notification has been given, the reason why it has not been given, the reason why it has not been;
- (b) If the Government, in view of the fact that Mr. H. D. Reid, President of the Reid Newfoundland Co. has been back in this Colony for a month, has undertaken any negotiations with him or the Company in regard to the operation of the Railroad after June 30th next, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company in regard to this matter, and if the negotiations, if any, have been conducted orally, to Table a

statement describing what has been done, and if no negotiations have been commenced, a statement of the reason why;

(c) If the Government is not negotiating with the Reid Newfoundland Company, to lay on the Table a statement setting out the Government's position with regard to the operation of the railway system after the 30th of June next;

(d) If it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation at this session with reference to the matter of the further operation of the railroad system after June 30th, and if so will he undertake that such legislation will be Tabled in sufficient time to enable the House and proper opportunity be given to enable the country, to thoroughly understand the nature and effects of such a measure instead of rushing it through in the last hours of the session as was done last year;

(e) Will he give this House and the country proper undertakings that any such legislation, if introduced and enacted, will be carried out in accordance with the letter and spirit of the same instead of, as last year, being disregarded and an entirely new policy adopted by the Executive Government after the closing of the House, with the result that this Colony has been saddled with an expenditure of a million and a half dollars which it need not have paid if the legislation enacted last session had been enforced in accord with the terms of that enactment; and

(f) Is it the intention of the Government, after the 30th of June next, to identify itself with the operating of some of the Reid Newfoundland Company's steamers or to be come responsible for any of the obligations incurred in their operation, and if so to state to the

House the reasons for such a determination?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I hope to have the information by tomorrow. I did not see the question till I picked up the Order Paper here in the House.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice (a) If Inspector General Hutchings is out of the Colony at the present time, (b) if he is away on public business, (c) if so what is the nature of his business and (d) what allowance has been made to him for his expenses?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I beg to state in reply, that

(a) Inspector General Hutchings is out of the Colony at the present time, but will be back on May 28th.

(b) He is away on public and private business.

(c) To procure some machinery and appliances in connection with the Fire Department, and fire-fighting apparatus for the Tuberculosis Sanitorium.

(d) \$200.00.

MR. HIGGINS, in the absence of Mr. MacDonnell, asked the Minister of Education for (1) An explanation as to why the vote for the C. H. E. for 1920-21 is shown in this year's estimates as \$13,903.00 instead of \$14,425, being the total of the vote last year, including amount in supplementary supply? (2) Why this amount has been reduced this year to \$11,429.80?

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION, —I gave an explanation to Mr. MacDonnell before but will now give it to the House. In the 1920-21 estimates the \$13,903.00 did not include the amount of \$52 as it had not been granted in supplementary supply when the paper was made up, so that that sum must be added. To that add \$4.80 and with no reduction the total vote would be \$14,429.80. This year \$3,000 is being dropped.

MR. HIGGINS.—I know that Mr. MacDonnell is at a meeting this afternoon dealing with this and other educational matters. As to the second part of the question, is this is a matter of policy.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—We felt it best to put the knife into the vote.

MR. HIGGINS.—I think the meeting is on that this afternoon. I agree with the attitude taken by the Hon. Minister in the matter of retrenchment and I also think that while he is working along these lines he would be doing a laudable act in lopping off a lot of the fancy inspectors.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act, 1920" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, permit me to read to the House the following communication to me from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

14 May, 1921.

Dear Mr. Squires,

In view of the allegations made by Sir John Crosbie in the House of Assembly to the effect that I secured for

myself, or the companies with which I am connected, special advantages in connection with Fish and Salt, purchased by the Government, I request the appointment of a Commission, under the Public Enquiries Act, to enquire into the subject matter of the said allegations of Sir John Crosbie.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) W. F. COAKER.

Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.,
Prime Minister.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following Report of Hon. W. F. Penney re his visit to Norway:

HON. W. F. COAKER,

Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir,—In pursuance of your instructions contained in your letter of July 30th, I embarked upon the S.S. "Digby", to Liverpool, England, thence by rail to London, enroute to Norway, where I was to collect all information possible regarding the Norwegian Fisheries and report upon same on my arrival at St. Johns'.

I therefore beg to submit the following report of my investigations during my circuit of the coast of Norway, and my stay at the principal fishing and exporting centres.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to say that at our London Office of the High Commissioner for Newfoundland, I received every courtesy and in the absence of the High Commissioner, Captain Gordon obtained all the information he possibly could for me, regarding a visit to Norway—had my passport vized and assisted me with letters of introduction on the British Legation and Consul at Kristiannia and Bergen, which proved very useful indeed.

From London, I proceeded by rail to Newcastle, where I took passage by a Norwegian Line Steamer to Bergen, and arriving at this port I at once proceeded to Kristiannia, the Capital of Norway, in order to confer with the Legation Authorities. The Commer-

cial Agent and his Assistant were most courteous and considerate. They very kindly mapped out a route of my travels, gave me letters of introduction to the Consuls and Vice-Consuls at the different points, which I found most useful. The Officials in every case where I used such letters, being very kind and manifesting a desire to assist me in every way they possibly could, and much useful information was imparted to me by those obliging officials.

Having obtained letters of introduction, I took the boat at Kristianna and proceeded around the South and West Coasts to Bergen, calling at all the principal ports and seeing what fishing was then in operation at the various points, but this was the slack season and there was not much fishing, but yet enough to show one the methods employed in the catching and cure of the fish caught.

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 this great country form just one of the industries of a nation of about two and three quarter million inhabitants, with a very old European civilization, and this industry contributes about 45 per cent. of its annual exports, while in the case of Newfoundland, the fisheries are the principal industry 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 to my mind, from the standpoint of prestige and connection Norway possesses overwhelming advantages over Newfoundland in this respect.

I may here state, that general conditions in connection with the prosecution of the fisheries and trading in fishery products were conducted up-

on the same lines in Norway (as in Newfoundland some twenty years ago.

The large exporting merchant outfitted the Norwegian fisherman, and sent him to the fishing centres, and received the proceeds of his catch and once a year there was a settlement of accounts when the fishermen say they were rarely able to square up, and the exporters say the fishermen only thought how much supplies they could obtain, without paying for them.

To-day conditions are about the same in both countries, except to my mind, the Norwegian fisherman has the advantage, that he generally disposes of his catch as it is taken from the water, while the trading is upon a cash basis from the start.

The large fishing centres for cod, are Lafoten Islands and along the coast of Finmarken farther North, but at the same time, quite a lot of codfish is caught along the West and South Coasts of Norway, and in fact it is here that the best klip or split fish is produced, while the production of stock fish in this section is not possible owing to climatic conditions and the season when the fish is caught.

The seasons here for Lafoten during the months of January, February and March when codfish of large size averaging 5½ lbs. come around and inside those Islands in great schools to spawn, while in Finmarken, the season usually opens in April and continues until the beginning of July; but in fact a good deal of cod of smaller size than Lafoten fish can be caught along the Finmarken Coast during the whole summer, and I cannot refrain from remarking here that I gained the impression, while visiting this section, that if Newfoundland fishermen were prosecuting this fishery with their methods and gear the returns would be astonishing. I make this statement in the best of

faith, casting no reflection upon the hardy and industrious Norwegian fishermen.

The Lafoten Islands are situated within the Arctic circle, many miles north of Newfoundland and of Northern Labrador, roughly between the degrees of 68" and 69" North Latitude.

The sun is not seen by the fishermen during the early part of the fishery when there is about three hours of daylight only, and this is the very heart of winter, and yet, strange as it may appear to many Newfoundlanders, there is never a cake of ice to be seen, owing to the action of the Gulf Stream, but the season is Winter and there are snow storms and frost, although 10" below is extreme cold, and under such conditions, much of the catch of Norway's codfish is taken.

The Aurora Borealis affords sufficient light for the work, and the temperature contributes to keeping the bait fresh and fish from getting soft. One must not have the impression that the Norwegian fisherman pursues his calling in these northern latitudes under conditions of isolation such as prevails for instance upon our Northern Labrador, nor yet as those upon our North East Coast, commonly termed the French Shore, because there are very many splendid towns around the Lafoten Islands. Those towns are provided with the most-up-to-date conveniences and facilities, such as water services, sewerage, electric light, paved streets, daily newspapers, hospitals, splendid public schools, telegraph and telephone service and in fact with every equipment which goes to make a modern civilization.

They are provided with a splendid postal service which consists of ships of 350 tons for the Fjords, and ships of about 1,000 tons which are termed "Express Boats" and which run between Bergen and the northernmost town of Finmarken, calling at all the

principal places between. This service is continued the year round, and all sorts of luxuries in confections and fruit can be obtained, at all seasons, as well as every necessary article of commerce.

Magnificent stores, warehouses, stone piers abound, and the roads are exceptionally good when one considers the amount of labour and the money expended in the majority of cases to blast through walls of solid granite.

Automobiles are to be seen in goodly numbers the past year or so.

The town of Svolvaer, a new town of about 2,500 inhabitants, which is now being built up as the distributing centre for Lafoten Islands, is a striking example of Norwegian push and enterprise, as well as of engineering skill.

This town is built on three islands, practically on bare soil, and has a water service from a natural reservoir away up on one of the high mountains, and the service and sewerage systems have to be laid through solid granite mostly. It possesses a splendid harbour, well protected as all Norwegian harbours are, but its approaches are anything but desirable. The first day I landed here 8 different coastal and express steamers called,

A post office is being erected to cost \$250,000.00, and the warehouses are most modern, and chiefly built of stone and reinforced concrete. I mention this place because it was right here in the neighbouring waters that the biggest fishing was done last season, and during the season perhaps 20,000 fishermen were in this neighbourhood for the months of last January and February and March, and as a consequence, the trade done was very great.

In addition to the settled population of the Lafoten Islands, fishermen from all parts of Norway congregate here for the fishing season, and at many

points upon the Western or inside of the Islands, there are many erections where the fishermen reside during the season, paying hire for them to the owners. These houses are for the most part, covered with sods; but the sleeping and eating quarters are quite comfortable, and while from the outside, the houses make one think of Labrador some years since, still when one enters, he finds very comfortable and clean living quarters.

During seasons when the war was on, it was estimated that as many as 30,000 fishermen and attendants congregated at the Lafotens to participate in this fishery.

It would be a difficulty for me to attempt a description of the boats used in connection with this fishing, because of the many different types and builds—from the small cross-handed canoe type, to the 5, 10 & 20 ton decked motor craft, and the calculation is that 10,000 motor powered boats are operating. There are exceptionally few boats propelled with oars and sails nowadays, and everything from the canoe to the large freighter in Norwegian waters, is equipped with motor engines of one type or another, and one is led to ask this question: Where are the supplies of oil obtained and how are they kept up? I find most of the oil and petrol comes from America in tank ships, which supplies are taken in large quantities at the different towns and centres. There is every variety of engine used in the small boats, but with scarcely an exception all the decked boats, lighters and freighters are equipped with the hot-headed kerosene semi-deisel engine and every one seems to be loud in praise of this type.

The smaller decked boats carry one or two of the small boats for hand-line, fishing or trawling; but it is not unusual for the trawls to be hauled on board this larger boat.

Every engined and decked boat is fitted with a sort of capstan winch, operated by the motor, and the engine is so controlled by one man that the propellor can be very slowly turned over or not at all, while the man looks after the steering and the winch, and no strain is laid upon the trawl in hauling.

The larger motor craft and small steamers, of which there is a goodly number engaged in trawling, carry from 4 to 12 dories, which are locally built, after the style of American dories, but are claimed to be better conditioned. At any rate I should judge it to be a very serviceable boat. Before the advent of the motor, fishermen in those waters suffered untold hardships, and many harrowing tales are told of experiences in open boats, when they were driven off towards the mainland and then back again, until in many cases the occupants succumbed from cold and exposure. One noticeable feature of the build of the Norwegian boat is that they are all "Pink" sterned, while the same applies to the schooners and larger freighters, and our type of open square sterned trap-boat is nowhere to be seen, this is easily explained by the difference in the methods of fishing and of the gear used to take the fish.

Not all the fishermen build their boats by any means, and I priced some of the smaller types in a yard where they were on sale, to find that the small canoe cross-handed boat costs 280 kroners or say \$58.00, and the price then climbs as the boat becomes larger, so that a decent sized boat for any use to a Newfoundland fisherman would cost more in Norway than in Newfoundland.

Motor decked craft built of soft wood are very expensive as well, and taking things all round, general fishing supplies in gear, boats and motors, about the same conditions as to

price exist in Norway as in Newfoundland.

As to the gear used in the catching of cod, there is not a great variety, and no new or very improved methods are employed. The hand line fishermen use the same hook and lines as do our men, except perhaps the lead has an iron rod through it with an eye at either end to which the line and the leads are fastened. The jigger is the same practically and the trawl, while the Norwegian fisherman uses generally a wooden tray for his trawl, instead of a tub, he also uses a stick to hook on his hooks and hangs up his trawl in this way when not in use. The gill net seems to be the most popular method of taking cod when the school is on, and this net is very similar to the one in use by our fishermen, except perhaps that in Norway glass gloves covered with stout netting are used as floats, while the nets themselves are deep or shallow, long or short as the operator wishes. I noticed some gill nets were made of linen twine, others were of cotton and some of hank. During the fishing season at Lafoten, the cod appears to be very near the surface and the nets are operated almost afloat. The water is very deep around those Islands, and although there is a patch of ground where 60 to 80 fathoms is found for the most part the depth runs from one to two hundred fathoms and much deeper, and generally this is around the Norwegian Coast, and even in the Fjords. There are no codtraps or codseines used in Norway to take codfish, and, owing to the great depth of water, I can very well imagine that the use of such gear would be impracticable; but the Norwegian fisherman himself is prejudiced against the use of any methods whereby larger quantities of fish would be taken, and he reasons that if larger quantities were caught, then

the price would decline and the business unremunerative.

The whole of the Norwegian Coast is not only exceptionally well lighted and buoyed, offering the best aids to navigation possible, which allows the coastal boats to run at full speed by night as well as by day, but every place is connected by telegraph, telephone or wireless stations. Consequently the fishermen are advised by properly constituted officials of the fish, and armies of these congregate at different points, which means great congestion. To facilitate those crowds in the operation of their gear, a fishery officer or extraordinary policeman is with them, and he directs the setting of the different gear, in allotted sections, while nobody starts out in the morning before six o'clock, when this same official by the hoisting of a flag, or the firing of a gun, notifies the fleet to begin the hauling of their gear, and in this way or otherwise very disorderly conditions are arrested if not entirely eliminated.

In order that the fishing may be prosecuted around the Lafotens, it is essential that a supply of bait must be found for those operating, and the fishermen themselves depend upon others for their supply. The bait used is chiefly herring, Loda (like our caplin) squid, mussels, and what our fishermen locally call "Cocks and Hens," and clams. The supplying of bait has been a most profitable business for those engaged in it. Small smart steamers and motor craft are employed to bring supplies from Finmarken and the Fjords. Squid is found to be a good bait, but only the "pip" of squid is used generally, and there is great difficulty in finding any supply of this article. Mussels are also prized as bait, and I was told that as much as \$25.00 has been paid the fishermen for half a barrel of shelled mussels. Herring is the chief

source of supply, and there is generally sufficient of this to be obtained. Loda is another small fish which frequents the coast of Finmarken, as our caplin come to our shores and generally contributes a large part of the supply. This Loda they say is, our caplin, the same species and the same fish, while I am convinced that it is a different fish altogether. I could not find anything but a decayed specimen in Finmarken during my visit there, except those preserved in liquid in the museums. The male fish is very similar to our caplin but the female fish to my mind is not.

From the descriptions I had given me, of this fish, its rank odour and its utter tastelessness, I decline to believe it is the same as our caplin.

From what I saw of the coming industry in Norway and the methods employed, to preserve, to me, unappetising fish, I feel convinced that the Loda of Norway is not the caplin of Newfoundland, but it is very similar to what our fishermen term white fish.

Bait is not put up on ice, for the simple reason that during winter it is not necessary to do so, and it is at this season the fishing is on.

The Finmarken fishery opens as a rule just as the Lafoten season becomes slack, and a great many of the fishermen who participated in the operations of this most southern fishery, move North to Finmarken to reap another harvest in this section.

The Finmarken fishery takes on more of the feature of our operations upon Northern Labrador. The fish being smaller than the Lafoten fish, and the coast line of such great extent, the congestion is not so great. But the facilities for gaining information are the same, and the dissemination looked after officially, so that the fishermen are not handicapped in searching out favourable localities as are the Labrador fishermen. In this way, a great deal of the uncertainty

in connection with Newfoundland fishing is eliminated from that of Norway.

In this section it seems to me that people of all nationalities are scattered along the coast line and Fjords and the town of Hammerfest for instance presents a most interesting study to the stranger. The habits of the majority of the people appear very different to those even of the Lafotens, and here even a more diversified class of boat is seen, some of them most peculiarly built, which I confess my inability to intelligently describe.

It is in this district the Lapps are found, and I thought the habits of those people were not unlike the habits of our Labrador Esquimaux. Their camps along the coasts and Fjords reminded one very much of similar scenes met with upon Labrador, except that Reindeer would take the place of dogs, and yet the dogs were in evidence, but not in great numbers. The dress of these people comprised of skins and furs, intermixed with coloured fabrics, very diversified, presented a most unusual and peculiar sight.

A most unusual condition prevailed in Finmarken before the War, and the Norwegian Government was most considerate in its dealings with this Nordland people, taking into consideration their very northern situation and that their living depended upon the fisheries the success of which was not always a certainty. This country borders upon Russia at its North Eastern part, and a great deal of its trade was with Russia before the War. The Government did not enforce the revenue laws, but allowed a system of free trade so that the bulk of the produce of the fisheries found its way into Northern Russia. Russian trading craft had a free hand and traversed the coast of Finmarken with cargoes of lumber, flour and general

merchandise, exchanging them for cargoes of fishing products, furs, etc.

During the War, those conditions were revoked and have not since been revived, so that the Finmarkens appear to be hard hit in this respect and they entertain a feeling of ill-treatment in this way, and there is considerable unrest in this quarter fostered by Bolsheviks, who manage to visit here and propagate their pernicious doctrines. I really think the fishermen of this district enjoy the special consideration of the Government.

Fishing along this great stretch of coast is prosecuted under very different conditions, in April, May and June and even July, to those at the Lafotens, because the season is not so rigid and the days grow longer quickly, until in July the sun is shining at midnight as at noonday. Bait is plentiful. Loda for the early part of the season run to the shores in immense shoals, as do caplin and herring in Newfoundland and is very plentiful.

It is in this section that the bulk of the klipfish or split codfish is cured, and hence this is the product that comes into competition with that of Newfoundland. The process of splitting and salting is very similar in Norway to that in Newfoundland, but it is the exception rather than the rule for the Norwegian fisherman to cure his own fish. There are quite a number of men owning their own vessels and outfits, who catch and salt their voyages, and then take the cargoes to places where the fish is dried as is done in Newfoundland, but as a rule, it is in the production of the cured article that the business differs. The fisherman of Norway, brings his day's catch to the producer who is generally the exporter or his agent, and makes his bargain, either so much per kilo, or so much per 100 fish, with or without the livers, as the case may be, and having made the sale, he de-

livers his catch and is through with it. Sometimes the fishermen agrees to take out the livers and guts, particularly when a big school is on, and the dressing crew of the purchaser is rushed, but the head and sound bone is always left to the buyer, who dries them to dispose of to the fertilizing plant, where they are converted into fish meal, fertilizer and glue. When I told those people that in Newfoundland and Labrador our fishermen allowed those to drop into the sea as waste products, they were shocked, and could not at all understand such waste of valuable products.

The throating and heading is generally done as our fishermen perform the operation on the banks, in a tub, and the fish is then placed upon a table for the splitter, but the salter, in curing for klip-fish, is considered the principal man.

The gills are very often taken from the fish as they are caught, and this is the bleeding process we have heard of.

The splitter open his fish to the very tip of the tail always, and as a rule, he cuts through two or more joints of the sound bone in the operation of removing it, which, to my mind, does not add anything to its appearance.

The fish is not always washed from the knife, but when this is done it is properly drained before salting and I find the usual quantity of salt used is 6 barrels to 40 barrels of fish.

In curing for stock fish, which is the usual cure for the bulk of the Lafoten fish, all the fish are not opened from the throat, but the knife is entered just below the fins and then down in the usual way. Seeing a good deal of fish cured in this way, I asked the reason, and was told that some of the markots preferred the fish cured in this manner.

The curing of stock-fish is very simple and crude indeed, the fish being

simply throated and headed, removing the guts, then thoroughly washed in Fresh water, tied two together at the tails and thrown across a very smoothly planed quite heavy longer, which rests upon stout beams. Those fish are not removed until thoroughly cured. It is considered useless to hang fish for stock cure later than early April and the process occupies three or four months according to weather conditions.

One of the largest producers of stock-fish at the Lafotens explained this process to me, and took me through his stores, which were then packed to their capacity, and I could not refrain from remarking that there was no smell of stale or slimy fish, and he laughed when told, and said: "Nay, nay, beautiful and fresh." He then brought two samples and tapped them with a stick when I noticed the sound from one was as if a hollow stick were tapped, and he explained that was the test; the hollow sounding one was spoiled in the cure and was hung too late in the season.

This gives me the impression that on account of climatic conditions, and the season when our fish is caught, Newfoundland cannot produce stock-fish, but I would strongly advise that an attempt be made while fishing is being done early in the year at our Western ports.

Could we produce good stock-fish in Newfoundland, a good deal of our troubles with split fish would be overcome, and our markets for that article, would be relieved to the extent of stock-fish production, and from what I have learned, I have the opinion that the market for stock fish is very large, indeed particularly in Italy and South America.

In Norway, particularly at the Lafotens, stock-fish is considered spoiled, if left upon the sticks later than 10th to 12th June, and when cured

the cuticle is a veritable club, being so hard and dry and tough.

Of the 30 odd millions of fish caught at the Lafotens this season, only five millions were cured as klip-fish. One thing is very remarkable in connection with the size of the fish and that is its uniformity for one sees no small fish and there is no observable difference as to the length or weight. This fish also struck me as being thin fish and not well fleshed, and this is accounted for in this way; that the fish come around these Islands to spawn, and are not therefore in the best condition, while at the same time, there are no schools of bait fishes with them.

It will be observed that in the production of split fish in Norway, the producer has a very decided advantage over the Newfoundland producer, because of the waste products in heads and sound bones being converted into a marketable article, which yielded the producer this season a fraction over 5c. per pound, while the value of those products when converted into articles of commerce, such as cattle feed, meal, guano, glue, etc., contributes quite a sum to the annual value of Norway's exports.

To view the immense piles of dried cods heads and sound bones at the Converting Plants, simply astonishes one.

There are large quantities of fish similar to cod which are taken and cured both for export and local consumption, such as Sei (which I termed black cod) quite large in size and which is cured as stock-fish. Then there are haddocks in goodly numbers and of all sizes which are mostly consumed locally, but a large quantity is exported, while large quantities are smoked as well.

Oure (called red cod) is another very well flavoured eating fish, which is split open and pickled in barrels. This is a red fish with large protrud-

ing eyes, and quite short and thick and is much prized by Norwegians. While another fish similar to Cusk or Hake is caught in quite good numbers, and is cured as stock-fish, being split through the back to within three inches of the tail, and with the sound bone removed before it is hung for cure.

From an exporter in one of the towns of Finmarken I find that new split fish is rarely if ever ready for export earlier than the middle of June, under most favourable circumstances and generally the end of July is looked upon as the opening of the exportation season. Some of the earlier caught fish at Lafoten may be ready by June 1st but a very small quantity and any shipments made earlier is usually stock held over from the previous season.

Another product of the Lafoten fishery is the Cod Roe, which is canned in considerable quantities and salted as well.

I find that in all the handling of fish of every kind in Norway, extreme care is taken to handle it as an article of food should be handled, and in the preparation of dried cod fish, particularly in the washing, every particle of blood is removed, while the blood is washed and brushed off every nape, and the backs of the fish appear to receive even more care than the faces.

The beaches and rocks where the fish are spread, receive every attention with brooms as well, while the fish are always piled upon movable plank stands, and care is taken to always lay the fish perfectly flat in bulk and pile.

Many steamers and motor vessels with dressing crews are sent by the klip fish exporters and curers to the different places where the fish is caught, those vessels have the dressing crews and salt for curing the cargoes. When the cargoes are obtain-

ed, they are taken to the Fjords where the Islands are bare of turf to be cured, or to some southern port, such as Alaasuna or Christiansuna, where the owners have beaches and drying houses, and the fish is treated in the very same manner as in Newfoundland.

I have not seen a flake in Norway, and only at Alasuna did I see anything approaching a hand flake, covered with wire netting, and here too for the first time I saw what I concluded was being made for soft cure fish, to imitate our Labrador.

This fish has evidently been soaked in pickle, very white and of large size, but was very rough and to my mind was a very poor imitation of the real Labrador article.

I noticed as well that they have quite a bit of sunburnt fish here, while I am told that "mites" or dun is quite a common trouble, and the only remedy they use for the latter is to brush the stuff off.

I may now state authoritatively that no chemicals whatever are used in the cure of stock or clip fish in Norway. The Pure Food Law forbids its use, while the curers have evidently never used any in any way, and the same conditions apply to the production of Medicinal Oil.

In the production of Medicinal and Cod Liver Oil, every producer of cured codfish generally participates, and has his plant in connection with his warehouses, but there are some quite large factories in this business, such as we do not see in Newfoundland, and it appeared to me that the bulk of the livers were treated for Medicinal Oil.

The boilers used and the means employed to produce this oil are very similar to those employed in Newfoundland, except perhaps more labour saving devices are employed in Norway. Presses are for instance, constructed in a different way, and the

bags are filled by machinery and not by hand.

Several firms possessing factories, all claim to turn out the best products, and also to possess a secret for the non-freezing process.

While at Sralveer, I noticed a very large building of stone and concrete upon the point near the pier, and upon enquiry I was told that this was a Medicinal Oil Factory.

There was no gaining admission to this place, and I was told it was the only one of its kind in Norway. The method or treatment is a German production, and a German Chemist was in charge and although the factory had entered upon its second year of production, none of its products had so far, been placed upon the market. The claim of this factory is that it produces an article perfectly "Neutral" to the taste without the least flavour, while at the same time, it possesses all the properties which makes its use so beneficial. While on this subject I may here state that some of the parties interested told me that some large French buyers of the Norwegian product prefer the first rendevingo or skimmings of Cod Liver Oil to the auto-freezing article.

We seem to have gained the impression in Newfoundland that the cod fisheries of Norway are the most productive of the national wealth, but from what I have seen in making the circuit of its long coast line, I am of opinion that the cod fishery forms only one of its many valuable fisheries. One can perhaps explain this mis-conception in this way—that the products of the cod fishery are those which compete with ours in the same markets.

The herring and mackerel fisheries are of such volume as to astonish one, particularly the former, and if I were asked which was the most valuable fishery of Norway, I would be led to answer the herring fishery, for such

vast quantities are taken and such a large sum is invested in steamers, motor vessels and gear as to impress one that way.

At every point along the South and West Coasts, particularly, fleets of small steamers, from 80 to 200 tons were moored in rows, while there were very many motor crafts as well tied up in the same manner, and when one asked for what purpose they were used, the answer came: They were all employed in the Herring Fishery, but now that there was no market for herring, the whole outfit was tied up. Then the coast is dotted from one end to another with immense factories of most solid construction (generally stone and concrete) and those were pointed out as Herring Factories.

The Fisheries Department says an average take of Herring is one and one half million barrels per annum, and that perhaps the larger part of this quantity was converted into guano, feed meal and oil, which means a very large contribution to the values of this great country's productions.

I was much interested in watching this fishery because of the experience I had with herrings in the Straits of Belle Isle quite a few years ago, when we enclosed thousands of barrels at a time with seines. I remember as well the actions of our Fishery Board in forbidding the use of the seine, and the close seasons and other regulations enacted and enforced to protect our Herring Fishery, and still the herring practically forsook their old haunts along Labrador, and the Straits of Belle Isle, and other centres along our coast line.

I described the conditions as well as I could to the scientists of the Fishery Department and asked them for a reason as to this desertion of the herring, but they could offer no opinion upon my statements of bare facts. I expressed my consternation at the

practices in vogue in Norway, and I asked if similar conditions to ours were not anticipated, those men smiled at the suggestion, saying those conditions were continuing from year to year, and yet there were no diminution of the schools. Thousands of barrels of immature herring were being taken and brought to those factories, where they were first boiled and the oil extracted, then pressed for the residue of oil, and then ground into meal and guano. Herrings of all quantities and sizes are accepted at all seasons, and at all points along the long coast line and factories are still in course of erection. I was informed those herrings produce from 10 to 15 per cent. of their bulk in oil, and the fatter the herring the most acceptable are they.

At first I was filled with a feeling of consternation, and was regularly shocked to find that this valuable food fish was caught in this way for reduction at those factories and I expressed myself along those lines, but I was told that I had the wrong idea altogether, that this idea was antiquated and not in keeping with the times. The argument was: Why should fish, capable of producing so many necessary articles to our civilization and so much wealth, be allowed to come to our doors and no effort be made to utilize them, and I confess that I am now a convert to that idea.

I believe I see here quite a source of wealth to the fishermen of Newfoundland, as well as good investment for capital.

The fertilizer is quite valuable in itself, while the feed meal, known in Norway as Herring Flour, has been proven a splendid article of food for cattle and hogs, while the oil itself it quite an odour about those fact-herring at the factories were about \$1.60 per barrel and while there was was quite an odour about those factories and in the neighbourhood, still very little of the materials and pro-

ducts were handled by workmen. Herring Oil was about \$235.00 per tun.

The purse-seine is a favourite means to take Herring in Norway, and those seines are huge. Motor schooners and steamers are equipped with those seines, often two for a ship, with very large seine boats fitted with rollers, over which the seine is run out, and with winches for hauling up the bottom and arm lines. There is often as well a smaller motor boat which carries a smaller seine or spiller, and often these seines overtake a school of fish where they can moor to the land and so "har" large quantities. The whole outfit is ponderous and quite expensive.

Steamers and motors are again supplied with long fleets of drift nets and those operate in the offing while the stationary fisherman has his nets where our people have and moor them small herring are taken with seines. in favourable places.

In this connection I may say, that I made enquiries as to the cure of Norwegian canned and pickled herring, and I was told that only herring taken with a seine and "barred" could produce the good No. 1 article.

The herring should be confined in the seine for at least three days before being hauled out for cure. The reasons given for this were: that the "stomach of the herring must be emptied" in order that the fish will keep and be of good flavour, and while enclosed for this length of time in the seine, the fish feed upon themselves empty their stomachs—then the "gills and heart" alone are easily extracted, and as much of the blood as possible goes into the brine to keep the flavor of the fish, soaking into it. I secured a sample of the pincers used in Norway for the operation of removing the gills and heart.

A great deal of mackerel could have been taken this season, but the price was low and the fishermen did not catch any quantities to cure. The fish

were very good for size but were not fat.

In teh salting of the herring, I find the usual calculation is one barrel of salt to four barrels of herring.

During the war, an agreement was entered into between the British and Norwegian governments, so that the produce of the Norwegian fisheries as well as all other products of the country would be controlled by the state and not allowed to go to the Central Powers.

By this agreement the Norwegian government bought all the fishery products, principally stock and split fish, herring and oil, under British inspection and with British gold, and at very high prices. I believe the standard was set according to offers from Germany.

When the war ended enormous stocks of fish, particularly klip fish and herring had accumulated through out Norway, and the warehouses were practically filled, while immense bulks of barrelled were in evidence everywhere

Once peace terms were arranged, the idea prevailed that an enormous demand would be made for this fish at once, and an open market created in Germany, Austria, Finland and Russia, and the British government stopped buying, reselling its stocks in Norway to the government, at a loss of millions.

Then another fishing season was about to open, and the government of Norway, in order to sustain prices, and to alleviate the clamour of those interested, was compelled to purchase the catch of 1919, and that season's production was not delivered until July 1920.

I saw and handled this split fish as it was being delivered to the warehouses by the curers, and it was poor stuff to say the least of it.

In September there was about 10,000 tons of this article still with the government, and every effort was be-

ing made to dispose of it, special agents being sent out to Spain, Portugal, Italy, and I believe South America. Quite a quantity I learn, was disposed of or arrangements were made for its acceptance on consignment. To my mind, fully 40 per cent. of this article, if not more, will eventually find its way to fertilizing plants and a great many of the exporters endorse that opinion.

There are at the same time, fully one and a half million (1,500,000) barrels of herring in the hands of the state, as well, and although arrangements were being made with Germany for the export of quantities of this stock, yet a large amount of this stock must as well be converted into fertilizer.

There appeared to be demoralization in the export fish trade of Norway during August, but during September things appeared to brighten considerably.

From one dealer I had the cost of klip-fish to the government, which I figured would be about \$9.50 per qtl. delivered to warehouses, and the freight to Portugal he said, would be nearly \$1.60 per quintal, and to Italy nearly \$3.00 per quintal. In preparing or shipping dry codfish for market, there is no compulsory government inspection and the exporter selects the different parcels for the different markets from his stocks through his own culler or inspector, but if he wishes to verify his inspection, he can call a government official to do so.

The No. 1 quality of klip-fish, or what he considers first quality, he calculates for the Havanna market, the next for Spain, Portugal, Italy and Brazil, while the next he considers he can market in Argentine, Chilli and Brazil.

I was told that a London firm had offered 60 pounds stg. per ton for a lot of 100 tons, delivered in London for export to Chilli, but that this firm in Norway wanted 80 pds. stg. which I

thought was an excellent price indeed, but the deal was not made upon those terms.

Heretofore the shipments to Argentina and Chili were made in the lined cases, but now such packages are found to be too costly, and only the wood cases are used, while the quantity per case is regulated by the purchaser's demand. The same applies to Brazil, and I did not see our packages in evidence anywhere. In fact, all packed fish appeared to be cased, and I was told that in some cases a special paper lining is used.

Stock-fish is usually baled; the fish being packed heads to tails, and pressed tight, then bound with three or four wire binders, similar to those we find around baled hay. The quantities are 50 kilos or are about one qtl. to the bundle, but weights are regulated according to the requirements of the different markets. The napes are covered at both ends with brin sowed to the first wire, and the branding is done upon the brin before it is put in place. This process applies to all the stock-fish markets. Some of the Italian dealers have of late demanded that the tails be cut off and the tips of the napes, and this is done after bailing the fish with a broad axe, all the cuttings being saved for the fertilizing plants.

It is my firm conviction that the Norwegian producer and exporter produces a very much cheaper article in stock or split fish than is produced in Newfoundland.

He also handles the product more expeditiously and cheaply as well. In the first place the warehouses both for receiving the round fish from the fishermen and also for receiving the finished dry product and again for shipping out for export, are built upon stone or concrete foundations close to the water front, where vessels or steamers may discharge or load cargoes at the warehouse doors.

Along the South and West Coasts

there is very little rise and fall in the tides so that the ground floors of the warehouses are very little above the water. I noticed there was always some dunnage underneath the bulks of cured fish, while the fish was laid perfectly flat in the bulk.

I noticed that dried codfish while being discharged from schooners was scarcely handled in yaffles at all as in Newfoundland but boxes with rope stops at either end were fitted in the holds of the schooners and then hoisted to the warehouse where it was thrown upon the culling table, and in the majority of cases, women were doing the culling. Then the fish was placed upon a barrow for weighing, then placed upon a scale by two boys or women. The system of weighing being different to ours, usually 40 to 50 kilos, 88 and 110 1-4 pounds, the barrowing is not such heavy work, and women do a great deal of this work from start to finish, but of course, quite a number of men are employed as well.

There is very little drying or second handling of dried fish except by lighter and the passing by hand eliminated by the hoist. I imagine those hoists are operated by electricity, as power can be obtained now almost everywhere throughout the country and is very cheap.

The one great advantage the exporters of Norway possess over those of Newfoundland is the means of transportation, and her proximity to European markets. A list of steamship lines operating in Norway was given me by Mr. Brodewick, the obliging and courteous manager of the C.P.R. at Kristiania, which is appended to this report. This list will show that when at any time practically any exporter of Norway wishes to send forward a parcel of fish, either to a European market, to the West Indies or Brazil, Argentina, Chile or Peru, he can do so, and he can also calculate the time of arrival at its destination.

He also has this advantage, that the parcel may be large or small, and in this way he is able to cater to the needs of the smaller dealer. Many of those exporters were complaining bitterly of the outward freight rates, but those rates were becoming easier. The exporter is only four days journey from Portugal or Spain.

Many of the large exporting firms of Norway have as well, branch business in many of the large shipping ports of those countries, to which they send fish and the consignments are therefore looked after by those branches, while trade is drummed up as well. Some of the firms have branches in Rio de Janeiro or Pernambuco, Buenos Aires, and one of the Lafoten firms had a representative in Genoa, while one of the partners of an Oporto firm was doing business in Christiania. A large dealer in Svalren told me his son was then travelling in South America.

Norway as a nation consumes a good deal of the produce of those countries to which she sends her fishing products. She imports quite a lot of coffee from Brazil, hides from Argentina, and a good deal of olive oil and tomato which she uses in her canneries from Italy. A lot of Port Wine was also imported from Portugal and Spain, before she enacted her Prohibition Law, and while I was in Norway, both of those countries gave notice of a 25 per cent. duty on her dried fish in retaliation of her exclusion of their wines. A commission was at once dispatched to meet representatives of those countries for a conference, the result of which I have yet to learn.

Since writing the above, I find the Norwegian Commissioners have returned to Norway, and they were unsuccessful in obtaining any commercial treaty.

In making any attempt to describe the Fisheries Department of Norway, it might be said that this department

had the distinction of being the second of its kind in the world, first place being accorded the Fisheries Department of Scotland and Edinburgh. The Department is constructed upon non-political lines, the Minister of Marine & Fisheries being in Kristianna while the Fisheries Department is at Bergen, presided over by a Director who controls the Department and advises the government of its working and needs.

I was fairly over-whelmed with manuscript and reports covering the fisheries of Norway, which reports are tendered with this report, but as such documents are all printed in language of the country, they would need to be translated in order to be intelligently understood. A copy of the Fisheries Budget is appended herewith, which was given in English, and will give an idea of the construction of this Department and of the amount of its disbursements for the year 1920 and 1921.

I may here remark that this is the only document which was obtainable for current year. None of the other reports on statistics have not yet been printed.

The Director talked over many matters in connection with the fisheries of both our countries, and he appeared very well informed as to our doings. He was very interested in our Fishery Inspection Laws and Export Regulations, copy of which he had in his possession, which he was having printed and distributed, and he was calling a meeting of the Fisheries Council to discuss them, with a view to suggesting Regulations for Norway, along the same lines, as he appeared to favour such himself.

Beside the general business department, with a large staff of clerks and stenographers, (about 12 to 15 I should say) there is a Department of Scientific Research, and a Technological Laboratory as well as a Department of Development, each being staffed with scientists in their special

branches, and with assistance and stenographers.

A large building is now in course of erection to be the home of this Department, plans of which were given me, and which I tender herewith.

I was much interested in the method employed to find the age of the fish and it was demonstrated to me by Mr. Swed. The scales were taken from line fish, and sent to the Department, accompanying them being a description of the fish—its length in millimeters, weight, sex, and conditions whether active or normal. Those scales with particulars are carefully placed in small luvos upon which particulars are noted also when taken and where.

The scale is covered with a solution of glycerine and put upon a glass slide. This slide placed under a microscope operated with electricity shows a perfect picture upon a white screen, revealing certain very distinct lines or circles, each of which means one year's life, and in counting those lines or circles, the number gives the age of the fish.

I saw both cod and herring scales, placed underneath this machine, and it was quite simple to find the age of the fish they were taken from.

The work of taking those scales for the Department devolves upon the Inspectors, of which there are five (5), for the country. These Inspectors are not employed for the purpose their names would imply to us, for they do not pass upon the qualities of fish caught, but their duties are to assist fishermen by disseminating information regarding the movements of fish and to explain to them the Laws enacted for their guidance and protection.

I asked the opinion of the Scientists with regard to the increase and assistance of propagation of codfish by artificial means, such as hatcheries, and he replied that the Department was not decided as to whether the fish

eries could be augmented by artificial hatching. In substantiation of this statement, he said that the Department was only operating one small hatchery which was still considered in an experimental stage, the construction and operation of which was explained to me.

This hatchery takes the form of a salt water pond, where by a pumping arrangement, the water is kept fresh and in motion so as to keep the ova or ova afloat or near the surface, in which position it is always found in the open sea to develop naturally. Once this fry is developed and given its freedom, it has to run the chance of fry naturally developed under circumstances which render it healthier and stronger. There has been no appreciable increase of cod in the neighbourhood to justify the development of this hatchery, or establishment of others.

This hatchery is situated on the South Coast, and after seeing photographs of the place and hearing the officials report regarding it, I did not visit the place. A report is attached. The Department of Research has the steamer "Michael Soos" under its charge, which vessel is equipped with fishing gear and apparatus for all kinds of scientific investigation. This ship is getting old and expensive to maintain, and is being replaced with a motor ship, plans of which were kindly given me, and are with this report.

While listening to these men talk of the ocean currents, depths, and temperatures, etc., I asked them if they could forecast where the school of fish would strike, knowing as they would where conditions were right and ideal. The answer was "No we cannot, but we can tell if the coming season would be a good or a poor one." The gentleman said, they had intelligently calculated the volume of the schools from year to year, from the ages of the cod frequenting the localities, and

other statistics in their possession, and volunteered the statement that the next season's fishing would be better than this, or that the school would be larger.

In connection with this Department two Mercantile Agencies are established. One in Hamburg, and the other in Hull. Those agencies keep the Department informed as to the fishing operations being carried on in the countries where they are situated, the conditions of the markets in those countries, as well as all other matters pertaining to the marketing of the fishery products of Norway and every other matter of interest which would be helpful to producers and exporters alike.

I may say that I met the representative at Hull, Mr. Johnston, who impressed me as a gentleman, well informed in the business methods of his country, as well as their possession,

These gentlemen, along with special commercial agents, who collect information in the different centres of Norway, form an organization, whose advice and suggestions are most valuable and afford the Norwegian exporter an admirable means of information.

It must not be forgotten that the local markets of Norway for all kinds of fish and qualities of cure are considerable, for the Norwegians are a fish eating people.

Fish of all kinds and cures are offered, and disposed of in those markets, line-fish, dead fish, smoked, salted and dried, and it surprises one to see the quantities of small cod and haddock, crabs and prawns which are so carefully handled and sold daily.

The canning industry of Norway is as well an extensive business, and while Stavenger is considered headquarters for this industry, yet canneries are in operation all along the coast line.

The canning of Norwegian sardines, which are nothing more than imma-

ture herring, is quite an industry of itself, and while the producer is now forbidden by law to label his product, sardines, yet the business suffers no decline.

Larger Herring, Brisling, Crabs, Lobster, Fish Balls, Fish Soup, Cod Roes, Salmon etc., are all canned, and the industry is quite extensive, while it enhances the value of the fish and contributes quite an item to the statistics of the country's exports.

The fish exporters of Norway meet regularly at central points, and discuss matters very thoroughly in connection with their business and shipments, and they keep the commercial agents very busy answering inquiries and giving them advice with regard to markets and conditions in fish producing countries.

From all that I could gather, I find that there is no acute competition among exporters that would lead to the congestion of over supply of our markets, and indiscriminate shipping to one port does not occur; but shipments are regulated by the inquiries received, and there seems to be a feeling of mutual confidence among the exporters themselves which regulates shipments.

The meeting at Froudiheu early in August, was I believe, very interesting, because of a discussion on the "Regulations of Newfoundland" and the manifestation of a desire to set the consignments of shipments upon a cash against document basis.

The exporters of dry salted codfish in Norway have, and are yet having trouble, with dun and red fish, and I made special inquiries as to the methods used to eradicate them. I find that chemists and scientists have been making investigations, and a gentleman from London was brought over to investigate and with regard to "dun" the conclusion reached was that the infection was had from the rocks and places where the fish was dried, and

a thorough disinfectant was advised, but the trouble has not been eradicated.

As to pink or red fish, it was thought that perhaps the infection might have come from the salt, and the holds of salt carriers as well as the salt stores, were disinfected, but this trouble has not been eliminated either.

The Seal Fishery too is quite an important industry in Norway and a large sum is invested in ships and gear for its prosecution. When one, however, is conversant with the outlay in Newfoundland, and the type of ship and gear employed, he is rather surprised when he is shown the class of steamer and motor vessel employed by the Norwegian.

When first I detected this ship in going along the West Coast, and then only by the "Crows Nest" at the mast head, and was told it was a sealing ship, I was not a little surprised at the size.

The steamers may be about 150 to 200 tons, perhaps smaller, while the motor vessels are as a rule, smaller.—numbers of them I should judge being 70 to 80 tons.

There must be a fleet all round of fully one hundred or more, motor vessels, principally, engaged in this fishery, all of which are sheathed and I suppose, specially strengthened in a way, but the method of catching seals is very different to ours and the ships are not "powered" to force the floes. The seals are usually shot upon the ice, by men put out in boats, and the pelts are taken on board in boats, while the ship lays by the floe. Not more than 15 to 25 men form a crew, and the pelts are skinned on board, the skin being salted, while the fat is cut up and put in barrels or tanks.

The proceeds of last season was over one hundred thousand skins, with a corresponding amount of blubber. One vessel brought home over 600 barrels of fat, and 3000 skins, after a four weeks trip, which was a record.

The owner outfits the vessel, and makes advances as needed to the crew, and of late years, the owner gets 67 per cent. of the value of the voyage, and the crew the 33 per cent. while gunners are paid two to three hundred kilo extra. The captains get 6 per cent and 1 and half share. A good many walrus and norwhales are picked up by those vessels, and it was said that last season's voyage, altho successful was unprofitable. I was told that one firm in Tromso, the headquarters for the fishery, had in store the skins of two seasons' catch.

From all that I could learn, the seals taken by those ships are of a different species altogether from ours; they are generally of the hood species. The blubber is subjected to a heating process in order to extract the oil, but it is not treated to any refining process.

They have what they term a Fisheries Council in Norway, which is met by the Director of Fisheries once a year. This Council consists of 20 members or representatives. Those 20 men are selected by representatives of Heralds or small Councils, and those smaller Councils are composed of men elected by small districts, with which the 20 electoral districts are subdivided, besides the towns of Bergen or Tromsdiem, which both have a representative upon the Council.

Those small Councils elect men to a fish Council or District Council (I term it) and again, this Fish Council select a Fisheries Council.

The subordinate Councils meet regularly and discuss all matters connected with the fisheries, which specially concern and apply to their localities, and they impart their views to the District Councils, through the representatives they send to those Councils, when again those Councils further discuss the matters and make investigations and report to the Fish Council, who finally pass their reports to the general Fisheries Council.

This Fisheries Council is summoned to meet once a year in Bergen by the Directors of the Fisheries who accept their views and every matter in connection with the fishing business is here thoroughly weighed and meditated upon, and the decisions of the Fisheries Council are then passed to the Storting or Parliamentary Committee, on National Industries, which sends them to Parliament. Those recommendations scarcely ever fail to become the law of the nation.

It must be remembered here, that every matter, before being submitted to the Norwegian Parliament, must be considered by the proper Committee whose function it is to bring the matter before Parliament for its discussion and decision. The fishermen through those Councils command the ear of Parliament, and as all the District Constituencies except two or three are specially interested in the fisheries. Parliament is particularly generous in dealing with all matters pertaining to this great natural industry and fosters it in every conceivable way.

There is no State Insurance, nor any Old Age Pension Scheme, but there is a Fishermen's Insurance under the direction of the Fisheries Department.

Fishermen participating in this scheme, pay a yearly tax on fee of 2 1-2 kroner and in case of death, his dependents get 2,000 kroner.

The Employees' Liability Law takes in the Fisheries as well as the Trades, and claims for disablement at the Fisheries are adjusted under it. The poor are taken care of in excellent houses provided in different towns and districts.

There is also a system of—Loans, for assisting fishermen to procure motor boats. The fisherman 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 towards 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 fisherman 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 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.

There were no Licenses extracted from the fishermen using gear of any kind, and no special taxes imposed upon them.

Hospital ships and nurses are supplied by the Fisheries Department for Lafoten and Finmarken, when the seas on is on, and a tax amounting to about 10 cents per cwt. of fish is collected from the producers or exporters to defray the cost of this service.

In the matter of education, Norway to my mind excels. The system of Public Schools provided all over the country is admirable, and the per cent age of illiteracy must be exceedingly small, for if you can write a phrase in the Norwegian language, any child man or woman you meet can read it. The school buildings are models of their kind, and are mostly constructed of brick, stone or concrete with recreation grounds and beautiful patches of flowers surrounding them.

All masters or skippers of craft are supposed to have certificates for their different services and areas—coasting, foreign going pilots, engineers, etc.

In order to facilitate the obtaining of these certificates, navigation schools are provided in every seaport where certificates can be obtained and where the tuition is free. It is only

when a sailor sits for an examination to obtain a Master Mariner's Certificate for foreign trading, that he is asked to pay a nominal fee of 10 kr., while special courses for mariners, and other Engineers and Mechanics are provided in Technical Schools at Trondjem and Bergen, Curriculum of which is tendered herewith. This school at Trondjem may be said to be part of the University and is splendidly equipped.

There is no special instruction with regard to the Fisheries in any of the schools, except in the Public Schools under the subject of Natural History, a little extra time is given to Biology, but nothing to warrant the name of special Fishery Instruction.

The Public Schools open at 8 a.m. and for seniors or advanced classes are open until 6 p.m., but tots are through at 1 p.m., and juniors at 2, while there is an interval of 10 minutes every hour and an hour for mid day meal. Attendance is of course compulsory and no child over seven years but must attend school.

There is a Society in Norway of a National Historical character whose chief business is the founding of museums and every little town of any importance has its museum.

This Society collects funds for this purpose and when the fund reaches a certain percentage of the amount required to establish a museum, the State contributes the balance. In those museums specimens of relics of all things are exhibited to best advantage, specimens of invention and production and particularly specimens of all kinds of fish with their different finished products, also of animals, birds, etc., and everywhere the maps of Norway with the products of different districts noted upon them are in evidence, and every stranger who visits those museums is impressed at once with the variety of this country's produce.

The Museums of Kristiannia and

Bergen of course take on the role of National Museums and the variety of specimens, ancient as many of them are, is very striking and the collections are most valuable. Those gathered by the Great Norse Explorer, Ronald Amundsen, are of themselves priceless treasures.

The Fisheries Museum at Bergen is most interesting to a fisherman, for here are practically specimens of every fish, found in the waters of Norway.

Specimens, too, of all Fishery Products are here in great profusion, while the different methods of capture fish, devices used in other parts of the world to capture fish, form a most interesting collection. I was particularly struck with the fishing appliances and apparatus of the Japanese to capture all kinds of fish, and as well the many traps made of twine used by these ingenious people. These people are sending their fish oil to Norway to-day, and they have sent shipments of stock-fish to Italy, which however were not acceptable, but it would be no surprise to find their salt codfish competing with ours in the near future in the different markets.

In the course of a conversation with Mr. Johnston, the Commercial Agent of Norway and Hull, England, I learnt of a firm in London which was doing an extensive business upon the Pacific Coast of South America, and from a remark made by this gentleman, I got the impression that this firm handled large quantities of salt fish.

Upon my return to London, I decided to make an attempt to locate this firm, and with the assistance of Captain Gordon of our London Office, we succeeded in arranging for an interview. I met the principal of Messrs. A. G. Scott and Co., East Cheap Street.

I found that this firm was one of very long standing having extensive branch business in South America, particularly upon the Pacific Coast in Bolivian and Chill.

This firm handles large quantities of salt cod fish and herrings and although they have been in business for many years, they have never handled any Newfoundland products. During pre-war days, Norway and Leith furnished this firm its supplies but in recent years Japan has secured the business and still retain it.

The following is an extract from a letter written to me by this firm while in London:—

"As promised in our pleasant interview with you this morning, the most suitable packing of Cod Fish for Chili and Bolivia is in tins of 5 or 5 1-2 kilos gross weight, in cases containing 8 tins. The boneless quality is most in demand but 'with bones' is also shipped to both these markets. Supplies in pre-war days went from Norway and Leith, but in recent years Japan has secured the business and still retains it. Her C.I.F. price to-day is roughly 6 pounds stg. for Boneless Cod in cases 8x5 kilo tins. Should the business interest you at those figures, small parcel sent on consignment should speak for itself.

"Herring in Brine"—There is a certain trade for small quarter barrels of salted herrings each containing about 110 fish. If, however, a large number of rather smaller fish of a reliable quality can be packed, it would be an advantage as they are sold at so much per fish. For your guidance, the dimensions of the barrels are 18 in. x 13 in. To give you a more definite idea of what exactly is required, we enclose a notice from a large Scotch supplier which gives full details regarding treatment of the Herrings on arrival at destination."

In concluding this report, I would say that the Director of Norwegian Fisheries complained that although the catch of Cod Fish in Norway was accurately furnished the British Consul for our information and guidance, still he could never obtain such information regarding the Newfoundland

catch. He also informed me that he was recommending his government to appoint a Commercial Agent for Newfoundland.

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 18th.

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

And it being after a quarter past three of the clock and there being no members present, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until to-morrow afternoon, at three of the clock.

THURSDAY, May 19th.

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

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Scammell took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not propose to deliver the annual Budget Speech to-day but will do so to-morrow. I am moving the House into Committee of the Whole as the restrictions on sugar cease tomorrow and the Government having decided to impose an import tax of 2½ cents per lb. on this commodity, the matter can be dealt with and the increase come

in opportunely. At present there is a deficit of about \$184,000 to the debit account of the Food Control Board but that will be reduced when all the accounts are finalized. I understand the investigating committee is about to get a final statement from the Chairman of the Board and I am not yet ready to furnish that statement.

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.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education when the Annual Report of his Department will be laid on the Table of the House and if it cannot be laid in the form of a typescript as was the report of the Fisheries Department last week, instead of waiting for it to be printed, as its completion in this form will probably be delayed owing to the Printers' Strike.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that the Royal Stores, Limited has a monopoly of the grocery and provision trade of the town of Grand Falls where the employees of the paper mills are now on strike; if, as a result of this monopoly the cost of all the necessaries of life to the employees of the mills is greatly in excess of what it is in other parts of the Colony; if the Government will make representations to the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company with the object of having this monopoly terminated, and if not will the Government introduce at this session legislation to terminate this monopoly, and if not why not?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the

Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines, if, in spite of the fact that all Crown Lands in the Colony were reserved for mineral grants since last December, Mr. E. Collishaw was granted rights over certain areas on the West Coast supposed to contain petroleum or was given an understanding by the Department that his applications would receive first considerations on the re-opening of Crown Lands for mineral leases, and if this is the case to say why an exception was made in the case of Mr. E. Collishaw and what is the extent of the areas in respect of which this action has been taken?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance & Customs, to lay on the Table of the House the originals of all correspondence in relation to the raising of a loan for four and one-half million dollars, resolutions respecting which were tabled yesterday.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, if a lot of ballasting and other work is being done along the railway line, and if so is it being paid for out of the funds of the Colony or of the Reid Newfoundland Company or both, and if in the latter case what proportion of the cost is being paid by the Reid Newfoundland Company and what portion from the public funds and what is the extent of the programme of work in this and similar directions for which the Commission is responsible, and how much will the same cost the Colony?

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, if Albert Salter has been acting in any capacity for the Commission in the way of making purchases or otherwise, and if so for how long he has been acting in such capacity, and what payment has been

made him for his services up to date?

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, the 25th inst. at three of the clock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER tabled the following correspondence:

Copy of wire sent by Fraser-Dominion Securities Corporation, Toronto, to R. W. Steele, Manager Dominion Securities, Montreal, to St. John's, on May 18th, 1921.

"A highly injurious article telegraphed by McGrath appeared this morning's New York Tribune—two columns with large headlines telling collapse fishing industry in Newfoundland and of serious unemployment situation and of difficulty of the Government in raising money by way of loan; coming at present time seems to us inspired for some unaccountable reason. Have Premier telegraph us to-day for insertion Morning New York papers a reassuring statement."

The Dominion Securities Corporation, Ltd., Toronto, Lee Higginson & Co., Boston, Dillon Read & Co., New York.

New York.

Hon. R. A. Squires, Prime Minister, St. John's, Newfoundland:

"New York Tribune to-days' date publishes in most glaring characters special cable from Sir Patrick McGrath, emphasizing unemployment, hunger, misery desolation, collapse fishing industry, contemplated looting provision-stores, general disorganization, entire financial fabric in Newfoundland. McGrath also inserts Government's difficulties increased by problem obtaining loans under present conditions. Object message evidently synchronize crucial period closing arrangements here prevent bonds being taken up. Dastardly attempt injure Domin-

ion's credit in America, embarrass Government. Please hear loan success this market."

J. M. DEVINE.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 25th, 1921.

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

Petitions were presented by Hon. Mr. Foote from S. Harris and Company Re guarantee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that petition for a moment. I may Sir, that it's one of the saddest moments of my lifetime to stand on the floors of this House and hear a petition read such as this one in connection with the firm of S. Harris Ltd. It's the saddest moment of my experience in more ways than one and in coming into the House with that petition I felt in duty bound to hand it to the senior member of the district which it affects and a member of the Executive who have assisted in bringing about the conditions which have made it necessary for the petitioners to approach the Legislature in the manner they do. Fearing the House may not have obtained from Mr. Foote's reading of the petition a true sense of its importance, I shall read it again. Mr. Foote's voice was very low and as he said he had not seen the petition before. This petition Mr. Speaker, is one of the best evidences we could have of what the real conditions in this country are to-day and it bears out everything that I said in this House just one year ago when I opposed the Regulations. I regret that Mr. Foote did not see just twelve calendar months ago that this very thing which we are now seeing occur was bound to result, for, if he had he would not now be seeing one of his best friends and one of the strongest supporters of his party brought to the pass where he has to

appeal to this House to assist him in the keeping afloat of his business. He would not have seen him thrown down in the manner in which he has by the very men whom he helped to attain office. I should like to read the petition once more to the House. The matter is too serious to pass by without letting the country understand it. I feel that the Hon. member, Mr. Foote, feels, if he has any heart in him at all, for his old friend. One of the greatest supplying merchants the country has ever known is Samuel Harris of Grand Bank. I have known him from my boyhood. Ever since I was eight or nine years of age I have seen him and his business grow, and to think that all the work he has done has been undone by incapable men and to think that he has to come and appeal to this House to save himself from liquidation, is, I think, one of the worst crimes ever committed in the history of the country. So that the House and the country at large can appreciate properly how serious this position is, I will read the petition again: (Reads Petition). Mr. Speaker, what a mess has been brought about during eighteen months by the incapables in charge of the government of the colony. Poor old Newfoundland. What she has suffered by having such an incapable and incompetent gang in charge. Little did I dream in my darkest thoughts and in my darkest hours of blue ruin of what was going to happen. When I fought those Regulations on the floors of the House last session little did I dream that the great house of Samuel Harris Ltd. would, after twelve calendar months, have to come in and appeal to the government to save him and save his firms from liquidation. What if the Carters, the Thorburns, the Whiteways the Bonds and the Morrises could today look upon the present Prime Minister and the crowd associated with him in the Executive and see the turmoil brought about by the inability of

the present administration? They would hang their heads in shame. How I feel for my old friend Mr. Harris whose business is to-day brought before the public of Newfoundland and whose business was in a position that no other house ever found itself in before. Imagine then the proposition of having to come in here and ask for a guarantee for a half million dollars to save one of the greatest supply houses Newfoundland has ever known. Oh Mr. Cheeseman when I appealed to you twelve months ago to save your district and when you were called upon to play the part of a man you allowed the opportunity to pass,—the greatest opportunity of your life as a young man—and yourself and Mr. Foote will go down in history as the greatest cowards ever known in Newfoundland. You allowed Mr. Harris, who began in his dory and who built up such a gigantic business and who attained such a prominent place in the commercial world by his industry and perseverance, to be crucified by the crowd of incapable that are governing this country.

HON. MR. FOOTE—I rise to a point of order.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You may rise to any point you like. I have the floors and I am going to give this matter the attention its seriousness merits. You sit down. You are the guilty culprit who caused this situation to-day.

HON. MR. FOOTE—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The language of Sir John Crosbie in referring to Mr. Cheeseman and myself as cowards is unbecoming and unparliamentary. A man who has been in the House as long as he has should have better sense. Half the stuff he is getting off is absolute piffie. I ask the honourable member to conduct himself as a parliamentarian should. I am no more coward than he is. As a matter of fact he has illustrated himself all through this session of the House to be the coward himself.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You proved yourself a coward twelve months ago. You're only a joke as well; you are a joke to be representing the district you do represent.

HON. MR. FOOTE—A schoolboy can make those kind of remarks.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If you had thought that twelve months ago you would be a scholar to-day.

HON. MR. FOOTE—Produce the argument?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I will give you the argument before I am done. The best argument which condemns you from A. to Z. is this petition and you know it.

HON. MR. FOOTE—In your opinion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Not in my opinion, but in the opinion of your fellow-countrymen. If you had taken the position you should have taken twelve months ago you would not now be asking for a half million dollars on branch stores to-day. That is my opinion and the opinion of the country and when you talk of piffle I must ask you for a lesson on piffle because you are all piffle from the heel of your boot to the top of your head. You are the most incapable individual that ever represented the district of Burin. I was here on these floors when you would not be allowed in here and I want you to take a note of that now.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I wish to draw the Hon. member's attention to the fact that he is out of order and to inform him that the rule of this House is that he can speak only five minutes on a petition.

MR. HIGGINS—That rule was never enforced.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That rule was never kept in this House.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Speaker? I rise to a point of order. Five minutes will not give any member a

this House a chance to discuss intelligently such an important matter as the petition now before the House.

HON. THE SPEAKER—Rule 47 reads as follows: (Reads Rule). But in view of the importance of the petition I shall allow you to proceed.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You are quite right, Sir, this matter is very important and very serious and I am glad that His Honor the Speaker, if no other member in the House does, appreciates that fact. The fact is that houses like Mr. Harris's have been ruined within the past twelve months as a result of the fish regulations. Mr. Foote cannot stand to listen to this. This petition tells the whole story. No man like to hear the story, which when true, told on himself. I have been here for two sessions with Mr. Foote and I never saw him jump before or rise in his chair like he has this afternoon. The reason is because he has been pricked and his conscience is troubling him. He knows and his conscience tells him that he betrayed the trust of his constituents when he voted for the fish regulations. He knows as well as I do that nothing touches a man so severe when he is guilty as to mention something that he does not like to hear. An innocent man never troubles a continental about it. Fifty years ago Mr. Harris started out with his hand lines in a dory. He rose from that position and became one of a crew of a banking schooner. From that he became Mate, from that to Captain and then went in charge of a business, which when conducted by himself was absolutely sound and solvent commercially and one which nobody would refuse to give credit to. That was when he was not interfered with, but a crowd who do not know the first rudiments of commercial business dictates to him and tells him how he must handle and market his codfish. What a sorry plight Mr. Harris must find himself in to-day to have to send this

petition to ask this government to guarantee \$500,000 for supplies to outfit 4,000 fishermen who reside in Change Islands. The concern that is operating there is run by Elliott and Company and owned and controlled by Mr. George Harris, son of Mr. Samuel Harris. The enforcement of these fish regulations was the worst piece of legislation ever perpetrated on a free and intelligent people. To-day at Change Islands there are six or eight schooners tied up. They usually take sixty or seventy men to the Labrador, but not one penny's worth of supplies have been given them yet. Most of the people are in the city to-day and not one dollar's worth of credit can they get with which to purchase supplies to enable them to prosecute the fishery. The answer to all this is contained in the petition—the fish regulations. Look at the loss sustained on the cargoes of the "Little Stephano" and "Jean McKay"—\$122,000, which practically puts the firm of Harris Ltd out of existence in Change Islands and makes practically eighty people with families dependent on the hand of sweet charity for supplies, if the government does not supply them. That is the position. Only a few days ago the Prime Minister said that he backed the regulations, but I think that he realises to-day, if he never realized before, the unfortunate position this country is in by putting on these accursed fish regulations which has caused us all this trouble. Now let us come to Placentia Bay. Marystown is where the great house of Samuel Harris started a branch some years ago. As this petition states, up to the years 1919 and 1920 when the owners were allowed to conduct their own business everything went well, but thru the interference of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who thought that he was Lord Almighty over all and who thought that he should control the whole of Newfoundland, would not allow him to handle his progressive

business as he desired, with the result that to-day Marystown looks like a pauperized village. If you shake the hand of a man there to-day there is not enough life left in him to say how do you do. The Marystown Trading Company that used to employ 1400 men of Placentia Bay is not able to employ a boy to-day. Harris' house there to-day is ruined, due entirely to the fish regulations. What a shame, what a criminal offence against freedom. Why Lenine and Trotsky were Kings to you. And then I am called to order because I called Mr. Foote a coward. Yes, I called him a coward and I repeat it. It was his duty to have saved that firm from the position they are in by voting against the fish regulations in this House. Why if they were only the two of us in this House who voted against these regulations it would have saved financial ruin to that firm. Then why should I not call him a coward. He lost the opportunity to prove himself a man. Look at the fishermen of Placentia Bay, who used to be supplied by the Marystown Trading Company. They are going around St. John's with their hats off begging the merchants for supplies and even if there was a half guarantee from the government the merchants refuse to give supplies. That is the answer regarding a country that was once prosperous and that has been prostituted by the present gang of incapables. If I were in Mr. Foote's shoes I would be glad if coward was all that I was to be called, because I am afraid that some day he will have to go hide himself away from his fellow man. If you multiply that 1400 men by five it means that 7000 children as well as men and women are to-day demanding supplies from this colony to enable them to prosecute the fishery and thus carry on the business of the country. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of Responsible Government that a petition of this kind has been

presented here, and you will live to be years older, unless the whole colony come in short and demands supplies, before such a thing happens again. Another thing I would like to point out to this House and to Mr. Foote in particular that the fishermen of Placentia Bay are not alone seeking supplies to-day, but they are crying out to be paid for the fish that was taken from them last Fall. Not a man in Placentia Bay can get a barrel of flour on credit there to-day and all this was brought about by the regulations which were put in existence by Mr. Coaker, who knew as much about carrying them out successfully as an eight year old boy.

I am sick and tired of this thing and I don't intend to stand it any longer. It is time we cried quit to this nonsense, and if I don't stop it the public will and I may tell the Prime Minister that a warship will not save him for a moment, because when public opinion becomes so intense they will demand their rights and will have them though the Heavens fall. Have you any idea what it is to sit in a merchant's chair to-day, and see a man come in with his hat in his hand with a government order for half of the supply and to have to refuse this order because of the position of the colony. Did it ever happen before. No it could not happen now if men of business ability were in charge. Step along with me now to the good old district of Burin, and Grand Bank a beehive of industry formerly, and now look at it, and Mr. Speaker take your own district of Carbonear. If you could have seen three years ago what was going to happen, if you could have seen that this government was going to pauperise the greatest people the country has ever known, and force these people to come here and ask for a half million dollars to save a situation which is the worst I have ever known, and force these people to come here and ask for a half million

dollars to save a situation which is the worst I have ever known, you would have said save me from this crowd I am associated with. What will happen if Harris and Co., fall down what will happen to the four thousand people that Company supplies and takes care of, multiply that by five and it means twenty thousand men, women and children must be fed by the government or by the sweet hand of charity. These are not my words, but the words of that petition. Mr. Chesebrough that is what this petition tells you. How proud you must feel of your position. Now I want to jump across to a place called Fortune Bay. What has happened there? It is gone and Hermitage is gone also out and as Mr. Harris states through the Fish Regulations. On the cargo of the Jean McKay combined with the cargo of the Little Stephano one hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars was lost by the Elliott Trading Co., which is controlled by Harris & Co., forty thousand dollars was lost by the Hermitage Co., on a cargo of the General Maud that sailed from here in 1920 to Oporto, and anchored there in the harbour and was forced to stay there by the Fish Regulations until March, and the cargo of fish was finally used in Portugal for fertilization purposes. Do you think that would have happened if Mr. Harris had been allowed to conduct his own business? How can you expect a cargo of fish loaded in August on the West Coast and sent across to Oporto arriving there in September, and held there until March to be fit for food? Not only is this petition a serious one but every business man in the country is in a serious position. I have been told that I am a black ruin man, but if you had listened to me twelve months ago you would have a little money left which you have not now. Go down to Water Street to-day and what do you find, the most capable of business men are afraid to move because

they do not know what the incapables are going to do next. Now let me read another little message from the West Coast that will interest Mr. Small concerning the story of the Edith Cavell as follows: (Reads message).

Did you send these messages Mr. Coaker? I hope Mr. Coaker in his position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not so far forget himself as to send this saucy message.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is no worse than you did here this afternoon.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—That has nothing to do with you. You should not model yourself on me. If I as a member of this House forget myself you should know how to conduct yourself or you should leave your position and according to Mr. Penney you had not the decency to send a courteous reply, only a bluff that you were the boss of the job. Mr. Speaker the Minister of Marine and Fisheries nor any other man has no right to throw a retort across the House to me, and if he does I will answer it the best way I can. When this House wants to deal with me they know what to do. What a nice thing for a Minister of the Crown to say to a man with a cargo of fish loaded and ready, "Do not send me any more of these messages I am running this job." He did run it and a nice mess he made of it, he ran her on the rocks. Listen to this further on. I did not intend to read this but the Minister reminded me I ought to. (Reads.)

It does look like a conspiracy to me of the worst kind and I think the President Coakers' cargo ought to be forgotten when we receive messages of this nature signed by reputable men like Mr. Penney and Mr. Samuel Harris. Just imagine the Government agent gives up documents of a cargo of fish worth sixty thousand dollars to Mr. Hawes when he was told to for-

ward them to the Bank of Montreal in London. Do you not feel that a climax has been reached with the case of Mr. Penney and Samuel Harris & Co., Ltd. What is going to be done in this matter. Is not the whole country in a similar condition to the West Coast. Is not the North nearly as bad? The constituency I have the honour to represent is nearly as bad. I will state a case in this House this afternoon that will make the Government sit up. Listen to it Mr. Speaker and the Prime Minister and see what it means. Here is a man in my own district, one of the most upright men I have ever had anything to do with, receiving pauper relief, and a fish merchant owes him three hundred dollars of which he cannot get a cent. Isn't that a lovely position for Newfoundland to be in? This man is owed three hundred dollars for Labrador fish and he and his family are receiving the paltry dole of pauper relief, and yet that merchant has the audacity to write to a man in my district and say he will give him supplies for the fishery. How proud the Prime Minister must be of his position today in a country that has been prostituted by a crowd of incapables. Only the other afternoon when the House adjourned the Prime Minister stood on his feet and read a letter or telegram printed and sent to the Tribune in New York by Sir P. T. McGrath in which he stated certain things, and the indecency of you Sir, to forget your position and send that message to the Star, and write a castigation about me as being part and parcel with Sir P. T. McGrath in this matter, when you knew Sir, that I agreed with you that the message should not have been sent, but you wanted to get me blamed for that although I was innocent as Anderson Squires himself, you wanted to make me out a scoundrel before my fellow man, but

may I say to you Sir, that you are not able to slander me. The people know me better than they know you. The day you told the story in Port de Grave that I had made my money out of the Government you lied, you knew better than that, because you sent to New York to bring down men to audit the books to try to find out what Crosbie had taken from his department, and you found nothing and you had to pay ten thousand five hundred dollars for that enquiry. Why should you stoop so low? I am not Sir Patrick McGrath's keeper and I don't want to be yours, and for what he does he is responsible to himself and not to me. You knew Sir, it was indecent to do this, but you are capable of any action that suits your own purpose, and that is the reason that the Fish Regulations were imposed upon the Colony, because you were trying to make a soft bed for yourself, and you had not the manhood to buck against Mr. Coaker. Why should you hit below the belt and bring me before the eyes of the public with regard to a message I had nothing to do with simply because you can never play the part of a man. I am proud Sir, to be classed in the Star with the Rev. Dr. Forbes of Gower St. Church, and I intend to treat you in the future with silent contempt, and let you go on with your dastardly acts, but you will be crowned before you finish in a way that you don't expect. Don't blame Dr. Mosdell, admit your guilt. Then you ask for co-operation from this side of the House to deal with a case such as Mr. Harris of Harris & Co., I would rather flee to the wilderness than have anything to do with a party such as yours. You think this state of affairs will continue but it will not. There is an outraged people looking to you to-day, and you and your associates shall not be saved from the downfall which you brought upon

Newfoundland. This last week or so I was tempered with mercy for you and your Government, but when your filthy Star ceases its dirty abuse it will be time enough to let you alone and not before. Your paper is not fit for children to read, and I would suggest that the Minister of Education take you in hand and give you a little education in true etiquette. That is as far as I am connected with Sir P. T. McGrath and that is what I have to say to you now. You are not dealing with Sir Michael Cashin now, you are dealing with a bit of orange, and you can tell it to this country when you like, and unless you conduct yourself I will have no pity on you or any part of you. What are you and your Government going to do about the Harris Trading Co. What is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries going to do? Do you intend to let this non. House fall down and put twenty thousand people out of business, do you intend to let this Harris Trading Co. go into liquidation or what do you intend to do? The job is not mine it is yours and your Government's. You have to answer the question in the next few days and you have to reach a decision quickly. Are you aware that to-day or to-morrow a couple of hundred men will be paid off at Port au Port. What are you going to do about it? What do Mr. Foote, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Small and all the other members intend to do about it? You have no idea. I don't blame any individual member on the other side of the House, they have nothing to do more than to vote to keep the Prime Minister in his position. Mr. Foote gently reads this petition and then sits down without saying a word, and says it is the first he knew of it. That may be so but if I were the member for Burin I would have known of it long ago. What will you do? You have supplied certain people in Placentia Bay, Now Mr. Harris asks for a considera-

tion to supply four hundred more. A public message was issued the other day to the effect that the Government was giving out supplies, some of my constituents were told this and they want to know what about it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I would also crave your indulgence for a moment. I agree with the remarks made by Sir John Crosbie this afternoon. Perhaps I may not go as far as Sir John, but this much I will say with reference to the petition presented to this House from Harris & Co., that if the Government feel they are responsible for the downfall of the Harris firm through the Fish Regulations, then it is the duty of the Government to do something. That is the universal opinion throughout this Island to-day, and that is the opinion expressed in the petition presented to this House from the Harris Co. Well, if the Government of to-day made laws and rules and regulations, and on account of these laws, rules and regulations being put into force within the past eighteen months, the house of Harris & Co. and other business houses around this Island have gone into bankruptcy, certainly it is the duty of the Government to compensate them. It would only be common sense to do so, pure and simple. What this will mean to the country is another thing. The taxpayers of this Colony will have to pay the bill. I agree with Sir John, as I say, to a certain extent, but if the Harris Co. are to be compensated, I take it every other firm doing business in this country will have to be compensated, because there is no reason why you should compensate one firm and not compensate other firms that have suffered just as much. Have we not received petitions from other firms? As I pointed out a few days ago, where is the Penney firm of the West. Where are the other firms of the North? Where are the Templetons, the Ry-

ans, the O'Rourke's, the Munns, and all the other firms that shipped fish from this Colony last year? Not through any fault of their own but by the Government taking over their fish business, they are placed in such a financial position to-day that they cannot carry on the fish business the coming year, and on account of that thousands of people are now without supplies to go to the fishery. Placentia Bay, I have no doubt, is more in the limelight than any other part of the Island to-day, through this great firm of Harris & Co. going to the wall. It is not one firm that has gone down there, it is half a dozen firms which seem to be controlled by Messrs. Harris of Grand Bank, The firm at Marystown supplies largely in Placentia Bay and St. Mary's Bay way down to Trepassey Bay. It has been pointed out that 4,000 accounts are on the books from that part of the country, which means that 20,000 people to-day are looking for supplies in that direction. The Harris Co. and all the other Companies have my sincere sympathy, but it is not our duty to do anything, you are the makers of the position they are in to-day and on you rests the responsibility, not on the Opposition. We are not responsible and it is your duty to get up and do something, not to let things drift as you are allowing them to drift. I am very grateful to a certain extent for the promises made for help in Ferryland District, but I would like to remind the Prime Minister this afternoon that he told me on yesterday and I know it is right, that Ferryland District would be treated the same as Placentia, because in Ferryland the great firm of Goodridge & Sons has gone to the wall and a number of fishermen in that District are left practically destitute to-day. But here's the difficulty in this matter. The Chairman of the Board of Works, I understand, has given a cheque for

\$50,000 for Placentia District, that cheque is held at the Bank.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Cheque to the order of Mr. O'Reilly who is the Commissioner placed in charge.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Yes, but Mr. O'Reilly refuses to give any cheques against the \$50,000, I understand, till the fishery season is over.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Well, I don't know all the details of the arrangement.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Well, it was from you he got the assurance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The point was this: The arrangements which were made by committee consisting of the representatives for Placentia District, under the Chairmanship of the Attorney General, was that the Government would give a guarantee of \$75,000 as against a guarantee of \$75,000, the District was putting up \$25,000 of its own funds, that was the position. The Bank desired something more than a guarantee, by word of mouth or by letter or by Minute of Council, and desired a guarantee in cash, they having been advised by their solicitors that they would have to protect themselves by having the deposit while they weren't protected sufficiently by having Minute of Council guarantee, and consequently arrangement was carried out by actual deposit of money in Bank. So, if under the circumstances the Committee feel any other arrangement should be made, that is a matter for the Committee to consider and discuss, but the arrangement as finalized was that Government giving guarantee and not putting up cash, by giving guarantee to amount of \$75,000 as against which \$25,000 would remain in the Department of Public Works or be deposited with the Finance Minister, question of paying in cash not having been considered at all.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Well

that's the point I want to discuss this afternoon. I interviewed several merchants on Water Street this morning reference this matter and their answer was that they wanted cash. Perhaps the right way to do it would be to put the matter in the hands of Inspector O'Reilly or some other competent man you have ample confidence in, and if on inquiry he finds that it is necessary to issue \$100, or \$200, or \$300, whatever the case may be, to any one man. The merchant on Water Street that I spoke to this morning required that 50 per cent. paid down now, not to wait till next fall for the amount, because the position is this, they have to spend the money to buy that supply and pay one hundred cents in the dollar, whereas if the government will pay the amount that they intended now to guarantee 50 per cent. the supplier is in this position that he uses that money and he can turn that cash over three or four times between now and the end of the year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—But the proposition as it came to the Government from that joint committee under the Chairmanship of the Attorney-General was the idea of a guarantee.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Yes, but if the guarantee is good enough at the Bank it's good enough for cash if actual money was put up in the Bank as guarantee. I take it that the government have no objection to issue cheque instructing Inspector O'Reilly after inquiry of each applicant who comes along, after going fully into the list or the amount required by him, that he will pay to any one merchant on Water Street who wishes to supply 50 per cent. of that amount immediately.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, well that's a matter I will take up at once.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Well, I find that I cannot do any business on

Water Street under the other arrangements proposed by the Committee.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the petition that has been presented by the hon. member, Mr. Foote, for the guarantee of the cost of supplies to the fishermen of the West Coast. It is regrettable that the Hon. member had not one word to say, pro or con, regarding this petition. We do not know whether he is in favor of it or not. It is pitiable to see one of the advisers of the Prime Minister, a member of the Executive government, without having an opinion of any kind on a question of such magnitude as this one, and one that primarily affects his own district. How will he ever be able to face these hungry men who are now looking for supplies? How will he ever be able to go into that district and face the many children to whom he turned a deafened ear when they were hungry and their fathers wanted to get supplies so as to be able to earn something for them to eat? I do not believe that they are any better off in Mr. Foote's district than they are in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. The firms that are asking for this assistance have done a very large business in this country. They have a large amount of capital invested in the fishing business of the country in many districts. Now Sir, what are you prepared to do about it? It is a very serious matter. The man that has presented that petition can very well go into liquidation, but what is going to happen to the 4,000 dealers and the 20,000 people that they represent.

Then there is the other question, what are you going to do with respect to our district? We got a promise of \$50,000 on the understanding that the merchants would give another \$50,000 supplies. We guaranteed \$25,000 from our road grants. Since we got the promise we have heard

nothing further about it. First, it was to be \$50,000 in cash, then a \$50,000 bond placed with the Bank of Nova Scotia. On enquiry up to the present no bond or guarantee has been put up. A few have been taken on and the others have been told to wait. I rang up the Prime Minister this morning, and he told me he had nothing to do with it, and that it was in the hands of the Poor Commissioner, Mr. O'Reilly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It was the fact.

MR. SULLIVAN.—But you might have been more courteous, Sir. You know that my office is filled every day with men looking for supplies. Owing to the dilly-dally policy of the Government we have the best fishermen of the country walking around the streets of St. John's when they should be engaged in the fishery. When one of the biggest firms of the country asks for a guarantee for the supplying of the fishermen a member of your executive who represents Burin District hasn't got a word to say. What is \$500,00 anyhow? Isn't it better to give that guarantee than spend many times that amount for poor relief? Harris is not asking the Government to put up one cent of cash. If you fail to give this assistance in getting supplies then you will be up against a condition of affairs that you have no idea of at the present time. There has been a great uproar about this \$50,000 that you promised the district of Placentia & St. Mary's, but we are giving the district grants to the extent of \$25,000 to assist in getting supplies. If there is a loss, it is the district that loses.

Now with reference to the Marys-town Trading Co., they have dealers in the district of Placentia & St. Mary's. Some of them have been provided for, but there are others for whom no provision has been made. We know that the \$50,000 promised

will not be sufficient. It will require at least \$200,000. If we could get the guarantee of that \$50,000 put up it would take care of many people, but the district looks mainly to the Marystown Trading Co. This Company has been placed in the position they are in not through any fault of their own, but through the mad policy of the Government. I feel sure that when the Government takes all the facts into consideration they will do something to relieve the situation.

It would be better for Harris if he went into liquidation to-morrow, but if he could get this guarantee he would go on. I hope the Hon. Mr. Foote will do his utmost to see that the prayer of this petition is granted. I confidently expect to see Mr. Cheeseman take an interest in this matter, and Mr. Warren and Mr. Small. If they do not I would not like to be in their shoes and go back to these Districts; to face an outraged electorate, are you aware that large numbers of men have walked here a distance of sixty or seventy miles to try and get supplies, they walked because they had not sufficient to pay their passage. And now they are beating the streets begging the merchants for supplies, without result because the guarantee has not been put up. Fish has now struck in on the Eastern Shore of Placentia Bay and men from Placentia Bay, good fishermen too, are walking the streets looking for supplies when if things were as they should be those men would be at home catching the fish which is practically at their doors. Is not this a dreadful state of affairs? If the Government intends doing anything it must be done at once, otherwise it will be too late as the caplin will be in on the South and West Coast in a few days, and if the Fishermen cannot prosecute the fishery it will mean a great loss to the people so hampered and to the Country generally.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my heartiest support to the petition that is now before the House. But at the outset I want it to be distinctly understood that I am doing it not for any political propaganda. I think the firm of Harris is worthy of the most serious consideration of the Government. We had not the slightest hesitation in coming in here and voting ourself a 300 per cent. increase, and to vote tens of thousands of dollars to send men out of the country to come back and teach people how to die in poverty, but when an honest firm comes in here and asks for a guarantee the men who bring it in are looked upon as lunatics.

Probably the best way out of it for the Harris family would be to go into liquidation, but that is not their way. They grew up side by side with these 4,000 dealers. Old Mr. Harris went out himself in a dory or small skiff, he then went master of a banker, then as owner of the banker, and later as owner of a banking fleet. I do not intend discussing the cause of what brought this ruin about. It behooves us now, as representatives of the people, to get together and render assistance to the people who are looking to us. Men came in here a few months ago in the picture of health, now they are starving to death. No heed was paid to my suggestion of a few weeks ago for a secret session when the whole condition of the country would become known.

I promise the Government that I am prepared to give them my support to any extent and if my associates on this side of the House do not see their way clear I am prepared to shift my bench down to the end of the House. I trust the matter has been settled this afternoon and I hope the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice will be in a position to be able to tell the House or the representatives of

Placentia and St. Mary's that the matter has been settled one way or the other and then we will be able to tell our men what to do. If the Government does not intend to render any assistance let it say so or if it intends to do so then assure us of the same and then we shall thank them. With regard to the Marystown Trading Company it was pointed out that certain sections of the country were looking for the same treatment that was being given to Placentia and St. Mary's but I promise my unqualified support to any other section of the country because I have always preached from my seat here in this House that I admired the motto of the Advocate "To every man his own." If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wants similar treatment for the District of Bonavista I will give it to it provided there is reciprocation. A half million dollars is not a large amount of money. It is easy to clip off a half million dollars off the present expenditure of the Government and if I ask him to hand over a cheque to-morrow drawn on the Bank of Nova Scotia signed by the Minister of Finance for one half million dollars I would not be asking too much not alone to ask for the guarantee for the same. And even if one cent of it never came back from the people to the Treasury even then I say they would have made a good investment. There are four thousand men dependent upon the Marystown Trading Company which cannot go on and as you know they cannot go to Limeville or to Grand Falls as both have closed down. And I see no hope when they are going to re-open. Mr. Sullivan has told the House that the fish is plentiful and it is a down right shame and an unprecedented crime on the part of the Government to sit down here day after day and then adjourn a week at a time to suit some individual so that he may go

home to his family or may be attend to his private business. And about ninety-five per cent. of those attending this House day after day are fishermen who wish to get away to their work. This is the position I take and I do not want to go into details which can be discussed to better advantage later on. But the matter I am interested in is the remedy and I take it that every patriotic person is also interested therein and now is the occasion for the Ministerial heads to rise to their feet as they must hear the rumbling of the thunder in the distance and I say this not because of the applaud coming from the gallery, but because I am in contact with all people of Placentia and St. Mary's and for the past fifteen years I have travelled all over this Island and I now have on my desk some twenty-five letters not one of which is from my district, asking that assistance be rendered them. I promise the Government that if they make any attempt to overcome those difficulties which are quite evident during these days of depression, to make an honest attempt notwithstanding all the serious mistakes both of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Prime Minister, to relieve matters I will in turn do my best to help the Government out in any matters in which I can be of any assistance. I think the Minister of Marine ought to show some sympathy to those who put him where he is to-day. There are hundreds of people who are looking for work and it is better to have them working and earning their own living than to be a charge on the Treasury of this country. Let them become producers and not paupers. Whether he comes from Bonavista Bay, the Straits of Belle Isle or anywhere else, our Newfoundlander is independent and wants to be so all his life. He does not want to go to the Relieving Officer, the Parson or the

Priest to get pauper relief. I also appeal especially to the Minister of Justice because he is the chairman of all the Committees dealing with the matter to give us an answer, an intelligent answer before bedtime to-night so that my colleague and myself may be able to tell the thousands of men awaiting on us what they can depend upon. You are responsible for their walking around. It is you who have fooled the people and as early as possible I beg you to let us know your answer so that we may know where we stand. I have much pleasure in giving my unqualified support to this petition with reference to the firm of Harris and Company and the other firms included.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, it is now half past six, but with your permission, Sir, and by the courtesy of the House, it is my intention, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side have finished speaking on this petition, to deliver the Budget Speech at this sitting. I had arranged to do so this afternoon and move the adjournment of the House as I had a party meeting on for this evening. The time of the House, however, has been occupied by a matter that is altogether extraneous.....

MR. BENNETT—The matter is not extraneous, it is very pertinent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The subject matter of the petition with which the afternoon has been taken up is extraneous.

MR. BENNETT—The subject matter of this petition is the crux of the whole situation in this country to-day.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is one point I would like to call attention to; it is not fair for the gentlemen on the other side to criticize the government for adjourning the House from Thursday until to-day

SIR M. P. CASHIN—It is as fair as it was for you to write that article for the Star.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In the first place I did not write it and

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It was you who gave the messages to Mosdell tho.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Certainly I did. I gave them to Dr. Mosdell and to Mr. Mews as well—As to the insolence of Sir John Crosbie, I shall deal with that on another occasion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You can go ahead and do that now if you like.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I happen to know enough of parliamentary procedure to realize that this is not the time for the introduction of personalities.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You don't know very much about parliamentary procedure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—According to your ideas, Sir John, I do not.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Perhaps I can teach you a few things.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There are some teachers one would not care to have. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I move that you leave the chair till 8 o'clock.

The Speaker left the chair till 8 o'clock.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker—When the House rose at 6.30 before recess I intimated my desire to address a few remarks in relation to the petition presented this afternoon by the Hon. Mr. Foote, and in common with other speakers this evening I want to express my sympathy with the petitioners upon the position they find themselves in through circumstances that have arisen in this country during the past eighteen months. I take it Sir, that this document that we are considering this evening is one of the most important documents that ever came before this Legislature, because it is the crux of the whole situation in this country. We have the extraordinary situation of one of the most

reputable, one of the most reliable and one of the strongest financial concerns in this country a short year ago finding themselves in the position of absolute bankruptcy and unable to carry on their business. Hence I say that this petition is the crux of the situation advisedly because it brings this House immediately in contact with a situation that not alone appertains to the district of Burin, but to the entire country at large. A great deal has been said since this House opened. As a matter of fact during the last six weeks we have been considering, debating and dilating upon the conduct of the government in relation to the fishery policy of this country, and from the opening days it has been our effort on this side of the House to endeavour to drag from the Government some declaration of their policy with regard to the situation that we find ourselves in to-day. The very speech from the Throne foreshadowed a line of policy that has been followed out in every possible way since this House has been in session. In speaking to the Speech from the Throne I endeavoured to point out that on former occasions the Speech forecasted the legislation to be introduced during the ensuing session. The Speech from the Throne this year did not forecast anything. It was a document that was absolutely void of any information, void of any declaration of policy and void in any possible measure to inspire hope for the country, and in our criticisms of that document we took the same constitutional stand—and the only logical stand—that this country required from those in authority at the earliest possible moment a full declaration of what their policy was going to be, an entire explanation and the laying of the entire cards upon the table, so that this legislature would be prepared for eventualities which necessarily had to ensue, and in having that opportunity at an early date in the session we would not find our-

selves in the position that we do this evening without one tittle of evidence or knowledge as to what the policy of the Government intended to be or how to cope with the situation. A most lamentable illustration of the government in this connection was given by the introducer of this petition—the Hon. Mr. Foote—this afternoon. He received this petition from Sir John Crosbie, who courteously asked him as one of the sitting members for Burin district, to present it, telling from whence the petition emanated. The Hon. Mr. Foote presented it in low tone of voice and refrained from making any comment upon it by in any way committing himself as to what should be done with the petition. He said that it was the first time that he had seen it, and, therefore, was not in a position to speak to it. Does the hon. member want this house to swallow such a statement that he was unaware of what that petition meant; that he was unaware of the conditions that led up to that petition and that he was unaware of the situation in his district and unaware of the conditions of the house of Samuel Harris Ltd. and subsidiary companies? I have too much regard for his intelligence to accuse him of absolute ignorance of a situation that was so well known to this House, and not alone to every member of this House, but to every thinking man in the country, and the petition is merely an outline, which is put in phrases and sentences, of the general knowledge that exists throughout the country.

The attitude taken by Mr. Foote a member of the Executive in getting up here is a demonstration of the indifference of the Government to the welfare of the country. If the Government has been considering what we are up against, Mr. Foote has not done them justice this afternoon by his silence on this matter. We have tried to awaken the government to a realization of their duties ever since this

session opened. The government seems to be satisfied to lie back in their chairs with the assurance that this is only Opposition talk, done for purposes of obstruction to prevent any legislation being put through. Well, even if that were true which I absolutely deny what is the answer to the charges set forth in that petition, by one of the most influential men in Newfoundland, the guide, philosopher and friend of Mr. Foote and Mr. Cheesman in the last election. It is questionable whether either of these men would be here to-day if Harris Trading Co., had not given them their support, and then when they are in trouble you turn your back on them, men who have grown up in the trade of this country, who have devoted their lives to increasing that trade and who by the sweat of their brow, have attained the position of honour, emolument, and of commercial prestige, now through the policy of the present administration they are driven to the wall, and they are short of everything necessary to carry on their business, and the good work they have been doing for the general trade of Newfoundland. I say and that is my reason for craving your indulgence and the indulgence of the House that this is a very important matter, more important than any other business in the House to-day, because the whole economic position of Newfoundland is contained in that petition, and it does not stop with that Company but every merchant in the country is in a similar position, with rare exceptions, and that is the reason that we on this side of the House want to emphasize the seriousness and the importance of this situation, so that the government may even at this late hour wake up to a realisation of their duty. It has been contended that all this talk of the Fish Regulations was a political dodge all the Opposition have been doing is to try to embarrass the government, to try to turn out the present govern-

ment and get in themselves. That of course is accepted by a certain section of the country, but that section is getting smaller every day, and when they read this petition it will be smaller still. You can't accuse George or Samuel Harris of politics talk. I say this matter cannot be considered too seriously and when the Estimates were tabled the other day I endeavored to bring home to the Prime Minister, the necessity that all documents relating to our finances should be tabled before we were asked to discuss the Estimates. He agreed with me and he gave notice of Ways and Means. We have the Estimates and we have Ways and Means, and we have Loan Bills, and we still lack that necessary information, and if we are to discuss these matters intelligently we must have that information. I said before we must cut our garment according to the cloth, and if the situation is going to arise as outlined in this petition it is well worthy of the consideration of the government. I cannot suggest at the present time any way out of the difficulty, but I say this. We must have the fullest information of our financial transactions, before we pass another vote in the Estimates, or the Loan Bill, or any other Legislation. Sir Michael Cashin has already asked for correspondence relating to this loan raised in New York. I presume that will be forthcoming, and it will enable us to diagnose the terms and merits of that Loan. The Prime Minister has also given notice that he would introduce the Budget, before this sitting closes, and I trust that we will get all the necessary information from that Budget. Let us face the issue like men, and take the country into our confidence. It is absurd to ask intelligent men to come here and discuss matters of importance practically in the dark. How can we consider what we will spend before we know what we can earn. We can't spend it unless we earn it

and like any other business firm, the business of the country should be run on sound commercial principles. The country to-day is in a state of collapse. The Hon. W. Baine Grieve said a short time before he died. "Newfoundland before May will be suffering from financial paralysis." Those words were prophetic. He is dead and his words have come true, and that is the reason that we are as anxious and desirous that the best means be taken to meet the situation as it comes. This petition Sir, as I said before is one of the most important documents ever laid upon the table of this chamber, coming as it does from four firms namely Samuel Harris Co., Marystown Trading Co., Hermitage Trading Co., Elliott Trading Co., four large firms that have grown up with the trade of the country during the last twenty-five years, firms that have built up the West Coast of Newfoundland, firms that made a barren waste into smiling towns and villages, firms that put the West Coast of Newfoundland on the map as a big commercial centre, firms which up to the end of 1919 were in a position of affluence, with large credit balances, large property, not in the least appreciated, doing their business soundly, and with every possible advantage to those whose moneys were invested, firms of the highest character. I have never heard any man say a word against the treatment he received from these firms, and to-day what do we find. I have a great sympathy for Mr. Geo. Harris who has to come here to this House, praying us to come to his assistance or he will have to close his doors, and four thousand fishermen will be laid on the broad of their backs, without bag, or barrel for themselves and their families. It is tragic, and what puzzles me more than anything is that the men who come here as representatives of that district and other districts adjoining can condone that situation. I would like to ask the mem-

bers for Burin if they have made any representation to the government during the past year to stay them in their mad policy of ruin forced upon their districts and other districts of the West Coast. I am sure Mr. Cheesman is sympathetic with the people with whom he lived. His relations, his friends in life, his business associates to-day are practically without hope as to what the future holds for them, and I do not say this on my own authority but on the authority of the four thousand men represented by Harris and Co., and for which the Fish Regulations is responsible. I said just now when we made these statements on this side of the House it was called politics. The government said the Fish Regulations saved the situation, they said we are no worse off than any other country. Well the only answer I can give to that to-night and it will be effective enough to refute even the statement of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries because it comes from men identified with the Fishery before he was thought of, a source beyond question of dispute. Take paragraph six of this petition. Is that an answer? Is that the Opposition speaking? Is that coming from a supporter of the present Opposition? It comes from the God-father of the government on the West Coast, a man whose opinion is second to none on this subject, and how men can sit on that side of the House in the face of this is beyond my comprehension, because I would rather dig stones for the rest of my life than go back on the people who honoured me, or dishonour them. I was going on Mr. Speaker when this unseemly interruption occurred by a man who has visited this House ever since its opening and has made himself a nuisance. His name is Cullen. He should not be allowed here any more. He is obnoxious and has no decency, because my remarks were not offensive, or at least I hope they were not, and interrup-

tions like that should not be tolerated I know his history and character and its beneath my notice to refer to him. This House is engaged in very serious business, that not alone requires the close attention but the uninterrupted attention of every member of it, and I want to speak fairly as every Newfoundlander should speak on an important matter like this, its beyond a political issue, for our country's life is at stake. If nothing is done in this matter four thousand fishermen will be starving before the winter is over. I take it we are all serious in this matter and we want to have the fullest debate possible on this situation. Talk about Newfoundland to-day she is rotten with politics. You are fooling the people, it was said this afternoon codding them, we will use that word as it has been going on, men coming here to know what is going to be done by the government, what is going to be done by the Opposition, how they will get bread for their families, and surely God if anything is serious that is, and let us face it in a serious way, as statesmen and not politicians. I have said before this country needs the best men in it, no particular body of men or no particular creed, but the best men to pilot her through the shoals and difficulties she has entered upon and we can't do that blindfolded, we cannot camouflage the issue, nor burke the responsibilities upon us—and we must have a statement of the facts of the government transactions of the past couple of years, and what they hope for in the future. How will we meet our obligations, collect our revenues, pay our officials, meet our liabilities on this side, and the other side of the Atlantic, keep up our various departments. Those are the serious problems we are faced with, and on top of that we have a breakdown in our commercial industries, the banks have abandoned the trade of Newfoundland, the merchants on Water Street are unable to carry on their

business owing to the lack of financial support. Our industries are closing down. Grand Falls where thousands of men are employed is practically closed down. Bell Island ordinarily a beehive of industry is practically abandoned, and we might as well all go when our fisheries is about to be abandoned. A serious situation, it is appalling, and we had a demonstration of a member of the Executive coming in here, and not saying a word in this connection when he presented this petition. If that is an index of what will happen this session it is a poor look-out. What we want next to bread in this country is confidence, confidence in our banks, in our merchants, and above all in our government, and there is no such thing in this country to-day. That petition is only one case, it is merely a forerunner of what will come from every part of the country, North, South, East and West.

I am not a blue ruinist. I have taken the position ever since this House opened that I believe in Newfoundland, and I still believe in Newfoundland. She can weather the storm if properly handled, although in so dangerous a condition at the present time. We are hearing a great deal about the recent loan, but we are not in possession of all the information. As large as it is it is not large enough to meet the situation. The fishery must be carried on. If it is not every one of us will meet with disaster and starvation. The main industry of the country is shaken to its very foundation, and the government is doing nothing to overcome the situation. This has been brought about according to Mr. Harris, and now I do not quote Sir Michael Cashin or Sir John Crosbie, but one of the largest business firms in the country that makes it undisputable that the Fish Regulations have been the downfall of the West Coast. After Mr. Harris makes that

statement he gives the evidence. (Reads from petition).

That is an indictment that might shake the foundation of any government. It is more forceable than anything that could be said on this side of the House. It is an indictment from a man who fought hard for the present government. It is pitiable to see men like Mr. Cheesman and Mr. Foote sit down under such an administration as this. I do not want them to sit with the Opposition; not at all; but there is a place in this House for Independent men. I left the government ranks of this House before on a much smaller pretext. I left on a vote of sympathy and I have held my self-respect ever since. You will go down in history as men who are not afraid to show their independence.

This petition section 7 says:

Isn't that a serious statement? When you come to consider that there are 4,000 families depending on the firm of Harris, what is to be the answer. God knows there is enough of good blood emigrating already, and who will earn the revenue to keep the country going? That is a document, Mr. Speaker, I submit that will go down in history as the most important document ever introduced into this House. It is probable that the whole country will follow suit. We do not know how the finances of the country stands. We on this side can merely express an opinion. Any man could see that when the war was over reaction would set in, but unfortunately for Newfoundland she swapped horses while crossing the stream. We have now a government without brains. The country has been run on the rocks and the government merely watches the wreck breaking to pieces.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two on this resolution. I shall endeavour to compress what I have to say into as narrow a compass as possible. I concur with you, Sir, in relaxing the rules of

the House on this matter, and I would say to the honourable members opposite that the example set by the Speaker might well be followed by them.

An extraordinary situation developed just about half past six, when the Speaker left the Chair until eight o'clock. I refer to the attitude of the Hon. the Prime Minister. It is said that this is the most important petition that has ever been presented. It is surely the most important petition that has been presented since I have been in the House. It is a petition that affects the whole country, both politically and economically. Any man who does not bring his best thoughts to bear on this petition is not worthy of a seat in this House. It is not a question of politics. It is not a question as to who controls the government. It is a question that may decide whether or not our families are going to be brought up in Newfoundland. This petition summarizes two things: First, the temper of the people, the labour troubles that we are having in this House every day; and in the second place there is the larger question, the political and economic question if you wish what the country is able to do about it; and it is to the last phase that I want to address myself. I regret that the principle of the Government of the colony embarking on the matter of guaranteeing supplies for the fishery is a dangerous and probably a vicious one. But circumstances are now so unusual that extraordinary steps may be justified. If it is admitted that the principle in the present instance is sound then it must be true for the whole country, and the sum of ten million dollars will have to be placed as a charge against the country. What sort of an answer do we get to that? What is the answer to the other taxpayers? Is there the slightest attempt made to say that we will adjourn and consider this matter. No, Sir, the Hon. the leader of the government at

half past six mere'y rose and said that the Budget must be brought in tonight. The Budget is the pronouncement as to what the estimated expenses of the coming year will be, and the method of meeting those expenses. I admit that the circumstances are hard, but because the case is a difficult one and the circumstances hard, we cannot give an off-hand decision and should rise to consider the matter. On the other hand the Prime Minister says the Budget is to be introduced. Much good indeed will that do. Much joy to you all if that is the kind of responsibilities that the administration attaches to it. Joy, I say, to you, Budget, but I pray that it may not be such a disappointment to those outside the House as it is to me. I say it deliberately, and I wish to make it clear, that you cannot bring in the matter of expenditure for the year without considering the fishermen. How dare you—how dare you, I say, come in here to this House with the Budget and cast aside flippantly this petition with no attempt to consider if anything can be done. We are here in this House merely by accident; we are only as chips and porridge; others have been here before us and others will come after. Let us not forget then that this is not the way this petition should be treated. Let the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who sat by all the afternoon and did not utter a sound, say whether this should be entertained or not. The honorable gentleman who introduced the petition boldly and calmly announces that he knows nothing about it; he cannot say a word for or against it. His colleague sits with his mouth shut as tight as a clam and the other honorable members sit idle with their own people are affected. Mr. Speaker, I speak to this petition because in the district which I have the honor to represent, and Mr. Fox and Mr. Vinnicombe will endorse what I say, the people are, but thank God to a much

lesser degree, similarly affected. Would I deserve to be permitted to go down the Shore and sit in this House if I did not say a word about this. I put it to the members opposite, straight and squarely as Newfoundlanders, forgetting the accident which puts us on opposite sides of the House and the small talk that goes on outside, that here is one case where we can sink all differences. We have already stated that we will go outside the House and stay out till you do something. The leader of the Opposition made that statement here this afternoon and pointed out that it was made off his own bat without consultation with the others on this side, and I say now that in making that he speaks for me and the others as well. We all say, we shall go out—we will have nothing further to do with debating and let you take up this question. Whatever you may do, you have a hard proposition ahead of you. I know it is hard and recognize that it will mean a big demand on the Colony to settle this matter, and I also recognize that I will make the same demand for my district and the others on this side will do the same for theirs. In spite of all this you got to take the same position as a few days ago in regard to the nationalizing of the fishery. We heard the Hon. Minister of Marine talk glibly of the nationalizing of the marketing of our fish. And you must remember that this may be the first time in which you may have to nationalize the supplying for the fishery. It is no trouble for you to say that this matter is too big to touch, too great to handle. But you must remember on the other hand what is going to happen if you do not touch it, what is going to happen to the country. This is not a question of shrugging your shoulders and saying we would have to do the same all over the country. I say that unfortunately the position of the government is this, as the other members on his side of

the House have already said, that we have arrived a stage where time can no longer be lost, the country will have to be supported. With regard to the suggestion made here that we, the Opposition, have brought extraneous matter into this discussion, I beg to remind you that we may possibly never meet again as this House is constituted now. If it be true that the fishermen cannot get supplies, as others who have proceeded have pointed out, and that conditions are the same in other places as in those referred to in the petition, we may not have to worry who will pay the bills. If it is true that thousands cannot get supplies and therefore cannot catch fish, it means that instead of the Colony shouldering a responsibility for carrying on the fishery it will have to carry an equal burden for relief later on. You have made a very poor job of it up to now, because as the petition claims the existing conditions are due to the enforcement of the Fish Regulations, and if you have done that there is all the more moral reason why you are strongly bound to apply the remedy. It is not enough for the Minister of Marine to feel that Port Union is alright. There are people outside that place who are now crying out for aid and he cannot divest himself of the responsibility; no member on his side can shake it off. The people put you there and you have to accept it or do the more manly thing, clear out and give the position to those who will try at least to do something. As long as the Minister of Marine keeps silent he is alright; that is his proper position. But I say this is no time to merely say we cannot entertain this proposition, or that because he provided for the North that there is no need to worry about the West. If the rumour be true that he is going out of political life, let him do so properly; now when he finds the wheel turned and retribution following close at hand, now is the

time for him to make amends to the people. If you, Mr. Minister of Marine can compliment yourself on looking out for the North at the expense of the West, remember the people of the latter are still Newfoundlanders, and give them some share of the energy and attention that in the past you have bestowed upon the others. I recognize fully that compliance with the petition is not easy, compliance must mean a big drain upon our resources, but it is unfortunate for yourself and the government that the situation was brought about by your own conduct. During the past year you have given consideration to certain districts—you have allocated to another district on the West Coast a sum of money—and as I said before I now repeat, you cannot discriminate between the two. As it was not proper to discriminate last year in connection with the purchase of fish, it is not proper to discriminate now with regard to supplies. Surely the government recognizes as their duty that this petition is not to be lightly dismissed. Let the Prime Minister deeply consider the manner of answering this petition—let him consider that it is not to be treated as a request for a road to a cabbage garden and be thrown lightly on the table. Remember the people are not asking for an ordinary little vote, but have come in here to this House with a deliberate statement that they have been wronged morally and if there is to be redress for that let something be done now. Let the honorable members opposite take notice now that if the government imagine they can satisfy public opinion by discriminating this petition, without consideration, they are only laying up trouble for themselves. In view of what has happened in this House for one district, how can they neglect this. You have reached the point where you have got to face the situation of arranging for supplies or saddle the responsibility of supporting the people. Does any

man mean to tell me that we can afford to see thousands of the people starving, and with the Sydney and Bell Island mines closed and other sources of employment cut down, that we can tide over the summer. The situation cannot be cured by indifference or shrugging of the shoulders. Give some thought to this petition and if you can devise some scheme as the result of your deliberations for the giving of supplies; if you can bring down a vote to give them out equally and indiscriminately; if you can do anything at all that is reasonable and business-like, I am prepared to support it. I do not ask you to jump up and say, yes; I do not ask you to say off-hand we are going to accede to the petition. The government should not take the position that this is a matter not deserving of consideration, because too many are affected and the position means so much—this carrying on of the fishery means the maintenance of the colony—and as the government is claimed to be a fisherman's government this question should be considered at once and an answer be given. May I not ask the representatives of that organization which controls the government—the Fishermen's Union—to see that this petition is fully considered before they rush in blindly and say here is our expenditure for the year. You cannot bring in the Budget without considering the petition unless you say you are going to do nothing about it. If you once venture on the methods of raising the expenditure, the only thing we can say is that you have turned a deaf ear to the appeal of these people. Can the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries who knows so much of the needs of the fishermen, who spoke so much of those needs in the days gone by, who talked and wrote so much of the "under dogs" can he when they come to him holding the position which he told them would give him the chance to redress all their wrongs, can he when

they now make their first call upon him see that they do not get the deaf ear. Can he not see to it in view of the blame which is attached to the Fish Regulations, that this petition be considered. I ask for the sake of the country in which we have been born and in which we hope to die, for the sake of the children which we are bringing up here and in view of how much some assistance means to the fishery in this critical time, consider this matter. If after deliberation you come to the decision that you can do nothing, I will bow to it. But don't I pray you dismiss it lightly. I sympathise fully with the petition and again ask the government to deal with it. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy shown me in allowing me to trespass beyond the usual time discussing this most important question.

MR. MOORE—Would you permit me Mr. Speaker, about three minutes to explain my position on this question. I will not occupy longer than five minutes. I rise out of sympathy for the men who are responsible for sending that petition here. I do not know Mr. Harris personally, but I have heard a great deal of him as a business man. From what Sir M. P. Cashin and Sir John Crosbie has said. I think he is a gentleman, and am glad that every member of the Opposition is to be allowed to speak 5 minutes on the question. His position is the same as that of one whom I have in my mind's eye and who carried on business in the district of Ferryland. It is Mr. Goodridge I refer to. He has been forced out of business through the Fish Regulations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If he had been allowed to carry on his business in his own way as in the past, he would not have failed and the men of the Southern Shore who dealt with him would not be walking the streets to-day looking for supplies. Sir M. P. Cashin was up in Ferryland on Saturday and he found

nothing more doing in the way of preparing for the fishery than if it were January. I hope the government will do something in this matter so that we will not have the men following us about day after day. I thank you Mr. Speaker for your courtesy and will not take up further time. I give my heartiest support to the petition and hope the government will do something for Mr. Harris and those depending on him.

MR. LEWIS—I crave, Mr. Speaker, the five minutes in which to refer to this question.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—The five minutes is allowed only to the one presenting the petition.

MR. LEWIS—I crave the 5 minutes on a point of privilege.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—I rule now that the question be put to the vote.

MR. HIGGINS—I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. In respect to your ruling, I wish to say that every member has a right to speak 5 minutes.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—It is allowed only to the one presenting the petition (reads the rule).

MR. HIGGINS—The ruling you have adopted is one which we decided on a few years ago. Every member is allowed to speak 5 minutes.

MR. LEWIS—I sympathize with Messrs. Harris and Elliott who are now compelled after their many years of successful business to petition this House for assistance. I have known Mr. Harris 40 years, ever since he was a bait carrier for the French. By industry and ability he rose to the important position of perhaps the largest supplier in the country but through no fault is now compelled to send in here a petition for consideration as to financial aid. It was my privilege 2 weeks ago to suggest to the government to consider well the taking of \$500,000 and the manner in which it was to be spent. I then said it was not sufficient to meet the requirements of the fishermen and I also pointed out

that it was high time for them to be up and doing to reap the harvest of the deep if they and the country are to keep going. Nothing has been done up to the present. One school of fish has already passed our headlands, and I say without fear of contradiction that if the Hon. Min. of Marine would speak openly he would say there has been a very great shortage on the herring catch. The caplin is now near our shores, but there is nothing doing. Thousands of men do not know what they are going to do to prepare for the fishery which will be here in a few weeks. The government sits callously by and says all the delay is due to the Opposition. It is up to us to plead the cause of those who are not here to plead for themselves; the first of the kind since we were granted responsible government. A leader of it is the head of the organization known as the Fishermen's Union, but still there is no effort made to help those who are the mainstay of the country. We know he did make an effort last Fall, he took \$500,000 for 320 men; there were 40 vessels in the harbor with fish that carried 8 men each. To-day we have here a petition from 20,000 people asking for a half million to assist Mr. Harris to carry on and supply his 4,000 planters. I say that it is the bounden duty of the government not only to assist him but to take up the matter all over the country and supply the people or else feed them. Some form of employment will have to be given the next few months I can speak, like my colleague, Dr. Jones for my district, Hr. Main, which is a most important one in connection with the fishery and I say that the fishermen there who are as industrious as any in the country cannot go on without assistance. I have now spoken my 5 minutes and in closing I trust that the Hon. Minister of Marine in his generosity will do something so that those mentioned in the petition and the others too may be able to go

and catch the codfish on which the country depends.

MR. MACDONNELL—I would like to say a word or two Mr. Speaker before the final disposal of the petition I have been of opinion from the first that the matter of supplying is a dangerous one. I have knowledge from experience, but do not want to lay down the law. It is known all over the country what has been done as to the purchasing of fish, and I believe that it has gone out through the public news to the North, South, East and West that the government proposes to give out supplies. I have received an intimation from the people of St. George's that they have the idea this is going to be done. I want to say right here that if a guarantee has been given to supply any section or district you cannot draw the line between one and another. I say further that if you embark on this policy I will consistently agitate in this House for an equal sum for my district for the fishery or some other purpose. In many instances, even in the case of brothers, one is a farmer and the other a fisherman. Most of the people in my district are farmers and I think that if the fishermen is supplied so should the farmer be. If you subsidize one, do the same to all districts. Here is a message which I received through the courtesy of the Prime Minister.

(Reads message.)

These three gentlemen who signed this message are beyond reproach and are thoroughly conversant with the conditions existing in Bay of Islands. From that I think that the idea of the government supplying is abroad. Since I got this another came asking how many men have been supplied. If such is done we of St. George's will look out for our proportionate share. The Hon. Min. of Marine has spoken before of a plan for nationalizing the fisheries and no time could be better for it than now. If you embark on the expenditure of 8 or 10 millions it is

time for a plan to get it back to the Treasury. I feel sure that before this petition is disposed of we will hear from the Hon. Minister of Marine, from the representatives of the West Coast and from every member in the House as to what they can offer or suggest towards meeting this matter which is the most serious that was ever brought in here. I think it should be considered before any other business is transacted as it is of the most important nature and the opinion of those on the other side should be taken before going on.

MR. CHEESEMAN—I presume Mr. Speaker that if the Opposition members have 5 minutes to speak on this matter, we on this side have the same. In reference to the petition I realize that it is too important to deal with in a few minutes, and I will not say whether I agree with it or not. I am closely identified with the fishery and can fully sympathize with the petition to-day. With the firm of Harris or any other which is in financial difficulties, I sympathize. I am a merchant myself, but not many of those who have spoken here have any dealings with the fishermen. As to my firm, my father was not given money to throw away. He was a fisherman and sailed out of St. John's as master for \$25 a month till he rose up and has given his last dollar and security, even as far as the bottom of Paradise to help the fishermen. I am prepared to do my best. I have been accused here to-day by Sir John Crosbie of being a coward. He can say what he likes, I don't care. I supported the Fish Regulations because I thought they were in the best interests of the fishermen and the country and I am not afraid to say it. I am not afraid of blame in that direction. If it means my political or commercial death, I am prepared for it. I acted in good faith and I am prepared to go back to the people who sent me here and if turned down I am satisfied. It is a fact

that Newfoundland is faced with a serious situation and we must grapple with it, but we can't take up a matter of millions and deal with it in a few minutes. What we want is less politics and more business and we would be better off. Before an election every one poses as the friend of the fisherman, but they forget it once they are returned. This has always been and most likely will continue to be the history of this country for a long time to come. I may have more to say later on this matter, but I want to state now that I am not afraid to state my position last Fall and I am prepared to stand or fall by it.

MR. VINICOMBE—I would like to say a few words Mr. Speaker as to the petition presented here by Hon. Mr. Foote and I may state that I would not like to be in his shoes. If I went to a district with a manifesto promising everything like he did and the people can now find nothing but depression I would not like to be in his place. Mr. Cheesman says he is not ready to state whether he will vote on this matter or not, and then refers to his father. But I would like to say that Mr. Harris is also a fisherman and he rose to the top too, but is again at the bottom and through what nothing but the Fish Regulations. The Government has squandered over 4 millions and we can get no statement as to where it went. The fishermen have to come in here and ask for help and if I were in the place of the members opposite I say now that I would sit as an independent rather than have my district abused as theirs has been. I want to say right here that when fishermen such as Harris have to ask for supplies we should certainly consider their petition and do something and Messrs. Foote and Cheesman should find out why aid was given the Northern men before. I think they were entitled to it but why do not the representatives for Burin get up and demand it for the Western men. What

is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Mr. Cheesman gets up and says he does not know what his position is in the matter, in spite of all that has gone on. Sir M. P. Cashin said that the Prime Minister coddled Newfoundland and the Prime Minister laughed at it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I always smile when attacked by Sir M. P. Cashin.

MR. VINICOMBE—You smiled at the crowd out there because you coddled them too. I wish I had charge of your four millions to spend.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I dare say you do.

MR. VINICOMBE—I would like to hear the Hon. Min. of Justice express himself on this matter. Why do you not accept our proposition; we will go out and give you every opportunity to do something. Now what you done since closing the House last week; it's the little things that count up and you have many that could have been attended to. You have the matter of flour for instance. It was \$17.50 during the winter and is now about \$14, but is there any change in the price of hard bread to-day. This is an article that is largely used by the fishermen and why is there no change in the price. Hon. Mr. Coaker professes to be their friend and why does he not get hold of this matter. Why has it not gone down, I ask the Minister of Marine.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It will have to go down.

MR. VINICOMBE—I knew I would get you to do something. If I had another 5 minutes to talk I'd get you to give the half million to the fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go over the 5 minutes allowance but I hope and trust that when you will get together, as we will allow you to do without obstruction, you will do something for the West as you did for the North and if you decide on anything

reasonable and business-like I will have no fault to find with you.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the petition brought before the House by the Hon. Mr. Foote is one of major importance and the Opposition should not lessen weight and importance of that as of others by introducing into the discussion of it personal offensives. I have asked the Supervisor of debates for the report of Sir John Crosbie's remarks and will deal with them later. May I suggest, Sir, that the criticism of Hon. Mr. Foote in his presentation of the petition is not at all fair. I was in my seat when Sir John Crosbie who had received it, crossed the floor and asked Mr. Foote to present it. He arose and presented it and stated he was not in a position to deal with it then, as was only natural. His position was in full accordance with procedure under the circumstances. I will not now deal with the large losses of the petitioners as that is purely a business matter. I regret that Mr. Harris's name should be so dealt with as it has and I regret that a man of his standing should be dragged in here and his losses laid bare as well as the other things which contributed to these losses, together with the million which he attributes this year to the Fish Regulations. This is without our purview as it is purely a business matter and when Hon. Mr. Foote said he was not ready to deal with the petition I think he took a sane stand. I had proposed as I said at 6.30 to present the Budget but the talk of the others has delayed it till this hour. I think it most unfair to criticize us for the closing of the House the last few days as the proposition to do so really came from the Opposition and I concurred in it. It is unfair to criticize us for it. I agreed as I knew some of my own party would be glad of the opportunity to visit their own homes. With respect to the criticism that the Budget be delayed till this position be dealt

with; it is essential that the House have before it the fullest financial statement. The presentation of the Budget should take precedence of any other financial matter. It is impossible to deal with a matter involving a capital of 10 millions or more before the finances and expenditure of the country are considered.

MR. HIGGINS—That is why it is delayed.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—My statement will cover all the financial position up to the 30th of June. Any proposition such as that of the petition must come up in the form of a resolution, as if moved by a member.

MR. HIGGINS—In Canada and England all large matters such as this petition are dealt with in the Budget.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It should be brought in the form of a resolution The Budget should be dealt with first.

MR. FGX—Mr. Speaker, the one remark of the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Cheesman, and of the hon. the Prime Minister that struck me very forcibly was that this petition was one of more than ordinary importance and, therefore, I wondered why an attempt was being made in face of this to curtail a free expression of opinion by the members on this side of the House. I have in mind, Sir, petitions of minor importance which occupied much more of the time of this House and which were the subject of five or six times the discussion which has resulted in the case of that which we are now discussing, a petition dealing with matters touching the country's most vital interests and the expenditure of public monies, and one that should by no means be treated in the cursory manner in which it is apparently the government's intention and desire to deal with it. I say that I have asked myself why the government attempts to do this and there is but one answer that I can find. The Government realizing that upon their shoulders rests the full responsibility

for the conditions of affairs in this country that makes an appeal such as is embodied in this petition imperative are very, very reluctant to admit their fault and to let it be the subject of full and frank discussion in this House, and now I ask the government what they are going to do about it. I think that it is very necessary we should have a full discussion of this matter, not necessarily a discussion that would be destructive but one that will help in dealing with the question confronting us.

The importance of this petition cannot be lost sight of. I speak of it with mixed feelings, feelings of sympathy for the firm of Harris Ltd., who have been compelled to thus appeal for assistance in the continuation of their business because they are facing ruin to-day as a result of the pernicious Fish Regulations, feelings of sorrow that I cannot support the prayer of the petition and of regret that the hon. members for Burin should stand idly by and allow the scandalous acts of a scandalous government to bring to the verge of insolvency and ruin the very men who gave them the support that placed them in their seats in this House.

It is the irony of fate that the duty of presenting such a petition as this should devolve upon the Hon. Mr. Foote and it would be ironical if it were not so sympathetic that it should be one of the strongest supporters of the government from whom the petition comes. There has been an attempt made also to hide from the public the real seriousness of the present situation. It has been said that the Opposition has time and again exaggerated the dreadful conditions existing to-day, but if anything is to be done we must know just where we stand. You cannot apply the remedy until you have first ascertained the cause. Can there be any doubt about the seriousness of present conditions? Is not this petition the strongest proof

we could have that the Opposition has not exaggerated and when I heard it read I wondered that the man upon whom rests the responsibility for these conditions could take to his bosom, as he has done the one whose nefarious schemes had brought them about. Mr. Bennett has spoken of an observation made in this House to the effect that Newfoundland has a magnificent future, but permit me to say, Sir, that in my opinion Newfoundland has a magnificent future behind her, and this is not so because of exchange or because of any of the other influences that have been put forward as an excuse to palliate the offence of those responsible; it is due wholly and solely by the Fish Regulations. The hon. Prime Minister, although he does not say so directly, insinuates that the facts as set out by Mr. Harris are not alone far fetched, but that they are wrong, but Mr. Harris has been in the public eye for some time; he has had the white light thrown upon him perhaps more than any other man in the country in this connection and when the voice of Mr. Harris was awaited as to his opinion of the Regulations it was an accepted fact that if he said they were good and should be continued his pronouncement would immediately be accepted by the government and sent broadcast in the press; yes, it would have been shouted from the very house tops and now when this same Mr. Harris makes the statements he does here, they must be accepted as true. I should like to tell the Hon. Prime Minister that it seems to me most unfair, when Mr. Harris has been courageous enough to lay bare the facts of his business and invites enquiry into these facts, that it should be even hinted he is not stating what is true. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I had a feeling of regret that I could not support the prayer of the petition. I cannot support it because to do so would be to subscribe to a principle that is vicious. If we vote

away the funds of the colony to buttress any man's business we must do the same thing for all who might make a similar appeal. If we accede to the request in this petition what reply can we make to the multitude of other business men who find themselves in the same position if they come in and ask for the same treatment, and moreover, this does not apply particularly to the fishery business but to the dry goods and every other class of trade, and it applies equally to all firms who find themselves in need of funds to carry on their business. It would apply to the F. P. U. organizations as well as it would Harris Ltd., not that I would say for a moment that the leader of the F. P. U. would dream of allowing the public funds to be used in forwarding the interests of the concerns with which he is connected. It is a position we cannot tolerate; it is a principle we can establish with regard to the expenditure of public monies.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the fact that the five minutes has been exceeded by the hon. gentleman.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the hon. minister should draw your attention to the clock. I am not surprised that he should want to curtail this discussion so that his own part in the transaction which have brought the present conditions about may not be made public. I know things about the conduct of Mr. Jennings that were I to tell them he would appear in a very different light from that in which he is seen to-day.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I challenge you to tell anything that could in any way reflect upon me either in my public or private life.

HON. THE SPEAKER—As the hon. gentleman has exceeded the five minutes allowed for the discussion of the matter before the House, I would ask him to take his seat.

MR. FOX—The hon. Min. of Public

Works has asked me to substantiate my statement and I am prepared to do so.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I must ask you to take your seat.

MR. FOX—If His Honor the Speaker will not give me the privilege of substantiating my statement, then I would appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works, as a gentleman very close to the Speaker, to crave for me the indulgence of the House while I proceed to comply with the hon. Minister's request.

HON. THE SPEAKER—The five minutes allowed you are gone.

MR. FOX—Then His Hon. the Speaker refuses to allow me to proceed?

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—Yes.

MR. FOX—In that case I move the adjournment of the House, and in moving the adjournment of the House I want to express my regret that the Speaker should attempt to curtail the debate in this manner. I think it is very regrettable indeed Sir, that you should see fit to curtail an expression of opinion on any matter coming before this Chamber, but particularly is it regrettable when the matter under discussion is of such vast importance as this which relates to the condition of a section of the country as large and important as the West Coast. I think it is a pretty pass we have come to that we are not alone bound hand and foot at the feet of inconsiderate and incompetent men, but that we, the Opposition, the trustees of the people in this House are not permitted to give free expression of their opinions. It is, however, in keeping with the conduct of the present administration for the past eighteen months. The War Measures Act, than which there could be no more dangerous instrument in the hands of incompetent and unscrupulous persons and especially so in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was used by them without consideration of the possible consequences. Why Mr.

Speaker, if the War Measures Act were used to strip every man in the country of every right that has been his from the time of the Magna Charta, he would be powerless to resist and that is what was used by the government when they could gain their ends by no other means and now they try to close the mouths of those who would protest against such treatment. It matters not to me whether I speak for five minutes or five hours, but the principle must not be forgotten and every Hon. member of this House should, on behalf of the electorate who sent him here, protest against any violation of it. We have witnessed the most tyrannical acts on the part of the Government and if we have public uprisings they are but the result of attempts to crush the people. We had an example of this a few days ago when the public coming into this House, and expressing approval or disapproval of the governments actions, asked that fair play be accorded them, were called by the government press hooligans and we have not been allowed to forget that occasion because the gentlemen who should have kept those who caused them under control found himself unable to do so. Therefore, I protest to-night against any attempt being made to shut the mouth of any member of this House, and I am surprised Sir, that you should be the first to attempt to take such a regrettable step. If it were an ordinary matter I would not mind; but here's a petition that asks for the appropriation of a half million dollars, and if this House accedes to the prayer of the petitioners is it not only natural for every other constituency in the country, that is situated as Grand Bank is, to ask you the same privilege and as the Prime Minister himself has said it may involve the expenditure of ten million dollars. Still we are asked to consider the matter in the space of five minutes, and, as the Speaker of the House puts it, the petition has

been received and referred to the department to which it relates and will be sunk into the oblivion of forgotten things and never to be resurrected. It is only natural that the government should want to hide their transactions for the past eighteen months; it is only natural that they want to throw dust in the eyes of the people and prevent them from peering into the dirty dark places the government have made within the past eighteen months and it is quite natural that they should attempt to prevent the people from instituting public enquiries. It is only during the past week or ten days that we have had the indecent spectacle of a Minister of the Crown, accused of a public offence, attempting to prevent the public from getting the appointment of a commission to enquire into the conduct of an office where he was put and asked to solemnly pledge himself and conduct properly. That minister came down on the floors of this Chamber and said that he courted a public enquiry into all his actions since he assumed office and he accused me of insinuating things and said that I should have preferred definite charges instead. But when definite charges were preferred and a Motion made to appoint a Select Committee to tell the people of Newfoundland the story he refuses to allow such an appointment. Then another Commission is asked for and the Government lurks that enquiry also; and is it not only natural Sir, that the attempt on your part to limit debate is only consistent with your attitude throughout. Surely then it is only natural that you are afraid to have your actions investigated and scrutinized as to how you comported yourselves while in office. But when you attempt to curtail the freedom of the individual members of this Chamber then you are up against a hopeless proposition. And then the Hon. Minister of Public Works, who is at an age when he should have learned more discretion,

even if he has not a proper knowledge of the conduct of the procedure of this august assembly, has the impertinence and audacity to get up and interrupt a member of the Opposition because he exercises his freedom of speech in this Chamber. We are come to a pretty pass, a delightful situation has arisen, when we are to sit down and jump up at the command of any man—even a gentleman as important and as influential as the Hon. Min. of Public Works. We are come to a pretty pass when we must subject ourselves to the dictation of a man who should know better than to conduct himself in the way he was during the past six weeks. Does he imagine for one moment that any member of this Opposition is going to allow hi to exercise his sovereign rights over his conduct in this Assembly. I am surprised at the conduct of the Hon. Minister of Public Works. I always thought that he was a man of mystery and that he was one of these delightful individuals, a fine, courteous gentlemanly member, who was above all things that seek to hurt the feelings of any other person. We have been told how sincere the gentlean is, what a model of propriety he is, what an exponent of the great virtues he is and a man, who, like Caesar's wife, is above suspicion.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—My character was made before you were out of your swaddling clothes.

MR. FOX.—I am not talking of your character before you entered the party you are associated with; but the character you made since. For example when the last administration went out of office your government was pleased to parade the names of the several Ministers of that party before the world as crooks of the worst characters, blacklegs, scoundrels, men who should be inside the walls of the Penitentiary rather than inside the walls of public offices, and your leader, carried away by the sense of responsibility upon his shoulders

brought Auditors from American to properly investigate the scandals of that administration. Of course the gentlemen that Newfoundland is paying for doing her audit work were not good enough; the government had to import Auditors. Those visitors reported that in every respect they found those departments conducted as they should be and that there was not a single stain on the characters of the gentlemen that you Sir, and your party immortalized in black headlines in your paper. Its a axiom of British law that a man is innocent until proven guilty; but you and your associates found guilty every man who was opposed to you. You hanged him first and tried him afterwards. And then we have the Hon. member for Twillingate saying "I am going to take charge of the Department of Public Works, a department that has been prostituted." The late head of that department was held up to public scorn and ridicule by one who was not fit to tie his shoe-strings, because what else Mr. Woodford might have done he did not do anything for his own selfish ends or personal aggrandisement. Mr. Jennings was going to bring order out of chaos in that department. He was the lovable and proper man; but the public accounts which have come down here show that he has saved for the government the fabulous sum of \$239 on the purchase of splits. And then the Hon. member goes around swelling with pride over his wonderful achievement. The Harbor Main election next comes around and thereby hangs a tale. I wish I were capable tonight of bringing in somebody who could play a nice sorrowful piece of music while I am telling that story music that would instinctively be a sort of dreamy, mystic, mournfull, sorrowful medley when you hear it. The government provided thousands of dollars belonging to the people of Newfoundland and they threw it around Hr. Main district and bought

votes with it and then they ran it in the pay sheets of the department of Public Works under the guise that \$7,000 was expended in that district for the necessary purpose of snow shovelling. Where do we find this great exponent of public virtue, Mr. Jennings? Do we find him coming out and taking a firm stand against things of that sort as he said he would? And do we hear him reproaching the government for putting through such a transaction? The unlawful expenditure of \$7,000 out of the public monies was ostensibly for snow shovelling, but in reality to buy votes. And then we wonder if any man has any doubt of Mr. Jennings' protestations of public virtue. There is another chapter in this story that I might enlarge upon to-night, but will refrain from doing so. For the future I would advise the Minister of Public Works to be careful at what he says to me.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—It's a terrible affair to interrupt you.

MR. FOX—I don't care what you say to anybody else; that won't affect me. And perhaps I might tell you something else. A few short weeks ago you attempted in the same manner to impertinently interrupt me when I was talking about the manner in which the public services of Newfoundland were being carried on North of Baccalieu and when I was pointing out that a half million dollars of the public monies was taken and given to the fishermen North of Baccalieu. He rose in his chair and said that I could not point to one single dollar that went to the district of Twillingate of that money. I was not talking of his district at all at the time, but I have a fairly strong suspicion that when the good things of the government were being given out that the last man to get something was not a Twillingate man. Do you remember the year of grace 1917 and the following year 1918 and the previous year 1916 when a pe-

tion came from your district to the Legislature to cut pit props. Permission was given to cut on the three mile limit in order to keep the people from starving.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—No such thing; that's not correct.

MR. FOX—It is correct. Look up the records of the House. They speak with far more force than you speak. The contractors went down there and fitted out crews who went in and cut the pit props and were paid for cutting them and were given grub during the process. They were told to bring the pit props and store them on the banks. Unfortunately, the pit props were held up on account of shipping not being available. These contractors had spent tens of thousands of dollars on the manufacture of these pit props and were prevented from taking delivery of them owing to not being able to get ships to take them to England where they were to be sold. The people around Twillingate took advantage of the delay and they helped themselves to the pit props that did not belong to them and when they were asked about the matter they said that they took them on your word. The owners of the pit props were compelled to institute criminal proceedings against the people who were responsible and I was retained by some of those contractors to go and prosecute those people. I went down and carried out my duty and since I have been immortalized in the pages of the "Advocate" because I did something that the administration of justice in Newfoundland is sworn to do. I was merely performing a duty to a client who retained me, and when I went to enquire into the circumstances I found that justice should be tempered with mercy. In a great many cases these poor unsophisticated men were responsible because in many cases they had followed out the guidance of people to whom they look for protection and assistance. Eight or nine men were

tried before a certain Stipendiary magistrate and were convicted and fined. The learned magistrate when trying these men expressed his regret that he had to inflict a penalty on them because he did not blame them so much as the gentleman who sit in this House and told them to do what they did; and it came out in sworn evidence, in my presence, that the gentleman, who told them to help themselves to the property that did not belong to them and whose advice eventually landed them in the position that they had to dip down in their pockets, was one by the name of Mr. W. B. Jennings.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—As the hon. member for St. John's East has finished his side of the story, I would ask him to take his seat while I give my side of it. I was wondering what the hon. member was trying to get at when he started back in the years 1916-17-18 to tell the history of the cutting of pit props in this country. During the war representations were made in Newfoundland from the Old Country that they were badly in need of timber of that kind and it was thought they would be procurable in Newfoundland more so than in any other part of the British Empire. Formerly it was got in Norway. The result was that certain legislation was introduced here making the exportation of it possible. Nobody at that time ever dreamt that the cutting of that timber was going to reach the proportions it did. Operations were carried on in Twillingate district and the second year of the cutting of timber showed some of us that the forest on the South Side of the Bay would be denuded if operations were continued much longer. Consequently, representations were made to the government of the day that it was unwise to cut timber on the three mile limit any longer and our request was acceded to. Personally, not being a Lawyer, I thought it was necessary to safeguard

the interests of the people in the district. What happened was that certain contractors, who expected to make a fortune from having this timber cut, put up a proposition to the Morris government that the people in Twillingate district were starving so that they could get permission to cut, and I say now as I said at that time that the district was never in a more prosperous condition than it was at that time. These contractors got an Act passed allowing them to operate on the three mile limit. They had young men at work there who were incapable for the work. Lots came from the Southern districts and not half of the men belonged to Twillingate proper. However, the feeling among the people of Twillingate regarding the cutting of that timber was that it ought not be cut and that it was bad for the country. I remember when that matter was discussed in this House. The present Judge Morris, who was then a sitting member for the district of Placentia, contended that he did not consider that the people had broken the law by appropriating that timber, but that the government broke the law by allowing those contractors to cut it. In 1915 I was the means of getting a certain Act passed preventing timber from being cut and left in different parts of our Bays where they were no inhabitants in some places after eighteen months would not longer be the property of the person who cut it. This Act while not intended to apply to Saw Mills was later attached to the Saw Mills Act. However, the point I want to make clear to this House is that the people who appropriated that timber that Mr. Fox alluded to never approached me about the matter. I never knew anything about any man going to take that timber until I heard that a number of men were being brought before court and they wrote to me about it. I replied by sending them a copy of the Act passed in 1915, but declined

any responsibility whatever for their conduct and I intimated in my reply that as far as I was personally concerned that I would have nothing whatever to do with it. The people took the timber on their own responsibility before I knew a word about it. Personally I believe that various opinions can be put on the clause relating to pit props in that Act; but I want to say plainly and fairly and particularly to my friend Mr. Fox, who made the charge against me to-night, that I never encouraged by word or deed or in any shape or form, any man in the taking of this timber. I hope that I shall have no worse charge levelled at me than that as long as I live, and that I shall feel my conscience as clear about everything else as I do about that timber episode. If I don't I shall not have to trouble much about the hereafter.

MR. FOX—The hon. member has evidently gone into the realms of metaphysics. If as the Hon. gentleman says he did not tell those men to take those pit props then he is in the same position as most of us on this side of the House; he has been badly belled. Not alone has the hon. member's character been taken away by ordinary word of mouth, but his character was taken away by sworn testimony by the very people who took this property. I am prepared to take his word, but I am pointing out to him this fact that in the district he represents, in my own presence and before a British Tribunal of justice men got in the witness box and they swore that they were told to take pit props by Mr. Jennings. It makes no matter to me whether you told one man to take them or whether you told one hundred men to take them. The evidence calls for depletion of these contracts in your district. A report was circulated that you told your people to help themselves to wood which they had been paid to cut, property as sacred to the men who employed them as the furni-

ture in their houses. Contractors you say made fortunes

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I did not, I said that the contractors expected to make fortunes.

MR. FOX—They met with heavy losses instead, losses that they would not have met with had the people represented by you been guided properly. I do not blame these people, but I blame their representative, who failed to regard the sacred rights of property. Now if Mr. Jennings had only remained silent this passage at arms would not have taken place. I did not come here with a chip on my shoulder looking for you, but I can't take my place here but Mr. Jennings is looking around for something to say to me. Never trouble trouble till trouble troubles you, and then don't trouble. I didn't think of you at all, I had no idea where you were to-night. The first I knew of you was when your voice rang out, "Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the fact that the hon. members for St. John's East exceeded the five minutes. I don't want to cross swords with the honorable member any more than is necessary. If I have to administer punishment to the Hon. Minister or any other member of this House, it is not with relish I do it, but of necessity. In future might I ask him to keep silent, to refrain from interrupting, and observe the rudimentary principles of debate in this House. Now instead of the original five minutes I have taken nearly an hour, I have had to depart from the subject, wearying myself, and perhaps the government, and now I have to come back to it again. I move the adjournment of this House and in doing so I want to say I view the petition presented by Mr. Harris with the utmost seriousness and sympathy, sympathy for that gentleman who has had to expose his business to his fellow countrymen, and admit he has met with severe losses which have crippled his business of twenty-five years success-

ful standing with feelings of indignation that the government of which he was a loyal supporter should have been responsible for this, feelings of surprise that members like Mr. Warren, Mr. Foote, Mr. Cheesman, and Mr. Small should have remained silent and inactive while their districts were being bled white, feelings of regret that I cannot support the prayer of the petition because of the principle it involves, feelings of hope that the government will arise like Phoenix out of the depths of their incompetency, and if they themselves have not the ability that they will seek assistance outside their own ranks. The position in Newfoundland is far more critical than the government thinks, or admits, our whole staple industry is at stake and this government is inactive, they adjourn from day to-day with nothing done for weeks at a time, last week they adjourned it from Thursday to to-day. They seem paralysed, and they have not the common decency to give up a charge which they cannot control, which they cannot protect. I ask them to attend to this matter with a full realisation of the seriousness of the situation, to give it their best attention, and to do so in the knowledge that this Opposition will be too ready to co-operate in a concerted attempt to save the land of which we are all so proud.

I regret Mr. Speaker, that I cannot like the others who have preceded me, thank you for the courtesy of the indulgence extended to them.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Venereal Diseases."

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Returns of Reid-Newfoundland Company, under schedule "E" for period July 1st, 1919 to June 30th 1920.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Dr. Jones gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Vinicombe gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question

MR. BENNETT—Asked Hon. the Min. of Posts and Telegraphs if it is correct that Mr. Geo. F. Moores, Post master at Heart's Content is pensioned, and if Mr. Walter Young is appointed in his place, if such is the case to state how long Mr. Moores has been in the public service, what is his age, and why he has been pensioned, also to state if any returned soldiers were applicants for the position, and if so why one of them was not appointed?

MR. HALFYARD—In reply to that question I might say that I did not see the Order Paper till I came here this afternoon. There is a mistake in the name. The gentleman in question is not pensioned. I asked over the 'phone how long he has been in the service, and I find it is six or seven years. I don't know his age. The reason he has retired because he is suffering and has been for the past six months from a peculiar illness. Two or three months ago a returned sailor made application for this position, but at the time we were hoping he would be able to return to his position. I understand that the gentleman who applied has since found employment of perhaps a more remunerative nature. I do not know of any other application.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to point out to the Minister that I don't think it is good enough for a Minister to come here and say he did not see the Order Paper. The custom is to have an Order Paper sent to the different departments before the session, and I would ask him to let me have that answer in writing on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance and Customs, if it is correct that the sugar remaining

in the hands of the Food Control Board has all been disposed of to one purchaser, if the said purchaser is J. J. Rossiter, if Hon. M. P. Gibbs is a silent partner in the firm of J. J. Rossiter; if J. J. Rossiter received any advance information as to the rate of duty to be imposed on sugar in the Budget; and if the government proposes to take any action to cancel the contract that appears to be of a suspicious character?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—All the sugar was not disposed of to one purchaser. Mr. Rossiter is one I think of nine purchasers. I do not know whether Mr. Gibbs is a silent partner in the firm of J. J. Rossiter. Mr. Rossiter had no advance information.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—To ask the Min. of Shipping what was the cost of the salt now in this city and imported by the government; what was the cost of freight; what do the other expenses amount to; what will the salt be sold at and what will be the loss, if any, to the government; also if the F. P. U. is interested to any extent in the importation of this cargo; and if so what steps are being taken to see that this organization bears its share of cost?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House the annual statement of the Reid Newfoundland Company for the year ending June 30th, 1920, and also a statement of the operations of the Railroad under the Commission for the ten months ending on the 30th of April of this year.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Tabled a reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance and Customs, if imports, of cube sugar have been

permitted into the Colony during the last few days, and if such sugar is now being sold at from eighteen to twenty cents a pound, whereas granulated sugar costs a higher figure, and if so is not this import contrary to law and how does it happen that it has been permitted?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Tabled the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance and Customs seeing that the Hon. Min. of Marine & Fisheries claims it is not in his department, to lay on the Table of the House a list of the foreign going vessels which ordinarily take away cargoes of codfish, now lying in this port; how many of the vessels are unemployed and the reason they are so unemployed; also an estimate of the number of seamen out of work as a result of unemployment, and what steps, if any, the government proposes to take to afford relief to the men so unemployed?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will ask the Assistant Collector to prepare the information. It will probably be ready in a day or two.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the account of the General Contingencies from July 1st last to date.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Tabled a reply.

And it being past midnight.

THURSDAY, May 26th.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

BUDGET SPEECH.

(Owing to the illness of the Hon. H. J. Brownrigg, Minister Finance and Customs, the Budget Speech was delivered by Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C., Prime Minister.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

May 25th, 1921.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the custom of the House I take the opportunity on this motion that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to present the annual Budget.

It is a matter of great personal regret to every member of this Legislature that the Hon. H. J. Brownrigg, the Minister of Finance and Customs, has for many months past been suffering from an illness which has made his attendance to the business of his Department utterly impossible, and consequently the responsibility has devolved upon me of addressing you on this occasion.

During the period of War the contesting nations paid for the War in blood; now that the War is over, we in common with others have to make our payments in money. Newfoundland was glad as a patriotic Colony of our great Empire to bear its responsibility to the Empire and to civilization through its fighting forces on both sea and land and through its sacrifices at home, and now we have to face the post-war problems of re-organization, reconstruction and deflation, and at the same time carry the large liabilities which the War has entailed. Deflation, reconstruction and re-organization after the world turmoil of four years' War are naturally difficult and trying problems, and we have to approach them in a spirit of seriousness and self-sacrifice. The trade depression throughout the world has seriously affected Newfoundland, and while we are fortunate in not having in our Colony a depression so serious and a trade disorganization so extreme as in many other countries, yet we have to realize that Newfoundland is now passing through a period of trade depression, deflation and liquidation which demands the serious consideration of every patriotic Newfoundlander.

Our chief source is revenue of Customs returns, practically the whole of which is an ad valorem duty on imported goods. In November last the high prices which had prevailed dropped almost suddenly, with the consequent result of a great depreciation in Customs returns.

During the previous year the leading importing merchants had brought into this country goods estimated at a value of seven million dollars over and above the natural requirements for that year. Their decision to make these large importations was undoubtedly due to the fact that the termination of War did not, as was expected, cause an early depression in values, but instead prices continued to advance, and in view of the situation the importers felt that for their own protection large importations should be made. As a consequence last year's revenue was augmented by an estimated amount of two million dollars over and above the duties which would be collected on normal supplies for that year, with the result that the quantities of imports during the present fiscal year were proportionately reduced because of the large stocks on hand. This has necessarily meant a corresponding reduction in revenue. In other words, the increases of \$3,299,243.88 in the Customs returns for 1919-20 over the year 1917-18 represented to a substantial extent duties collected on surplus stocks which are going into consumption during

the current fiscal year, and a consequent reduction of revenue on this year's returns. In addition, there is a shortage in revenue due to general trade depression throughout the world and the shrinkage in taxable value of imported goods subject to taxation on an ad valorem basis.

I estimate that the total revenue from all sources to the 30th day of June next will be \$8,244,104.18, made up as follows:

Customs	\$6,060,709.15
Postal	234,674.80
Telegraph	150,436.02
Inland Revenue Stamps	55,224.80
Crown Lands	84,307.80
Taxes and Assessments	244,125.04
Fees Institutions	5,118.91
Excess Profits and Income Tax	600,494.92
Liquor Sales	345,877.90
Broom Department	8,701.14
Fines and Forfeitures	7,000.00
Interest Guaranteed Loans	56,485.24
Miscellaneous Revenue	160,948.46
Probate Duties	50,000.00
Amount of Arrears collectable from A.A.Tel.Co.	180,000.00

\$8,244,104.18

This, together with estimated balance to the credit of Surplus Trust Account as at June 30th, 1921, amounting to \$3,001,186.21, makes a total credit of \$11,245,290.39 on Current Revenue and Surplus Trust Accounts.

The expenditure during the current fiscal year, estimated up to the 30th day of June next, amounts to a total of approximately \$11,171,821.07, made up as follows:

Amount voted as per Estimates of last year	\$9,766,859.24
Amount expended for which Supplementary Supply will be sought (estimated)	1,151,961.83
Expenditures under Audit Act	380,000.00
	<u>\$11,298,821.07</u>
Less dropped balances surrendered to the Treasury, (estimated)	127,000.00

\$11,171,821.07

This leaves a credit balance as at the 30th day of June next of \$73,469.32. That is to say, the Colony liquidates its liabilities as on the 30th day of June next and starts the next fiscal year with a credit balance of \$73,469.32 in the Surplus Trust Account.

An examination of the details of Supplementary Supply will show that large amounts were paid during the past year in connection with the necessary completion and equipment of undertaking inaugurated by the late Administration, such as the Sanatorium and Insane Asylum Extensions, the consequent additional cost and maintenance of these institutions, the consolidation of the Statutes of Newfoundland undertaken many years ago but only partly paid for by the late Administration, and various other projects the responsibilities for which fell upon this Administration to liquidate.

The serious problem to which I now direct your attention is the matter of

finance for the coming fiscal year ending June 30th, 1922. In view of the present world turmoil in financial and industrial matters, and the trying circumstances incidental to deflation, the problem of estimating with any degree of accuracy is exceedingly difficult and consequently the figures which I shall submit are based upon a most conservative calculation, as it is imperative that this Legislature and the Colony should face the situation squarely from a purely business standpoint and be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to ensure safe and sound financing.

Last year's Estimates amounted to a total of \$9,766,859.24. The Estimates already tabled show a total of \$8,143,796.30. This represents a preliminary reduction of \$1,623,062.94 in the public services of the Colony. I say "Preliminary" because the Estimates as tabled show only such reductions as had been determined upon when the printers were instructed to submit the proof for further revision. The printers' strike has made it necessary for me to table the Estimates in that form, and I am submitting the further reductions separately, as under existing strike conditions great delay would result if any other course were followed. The exact figure of the estimated expenditure for the year 1921-22 is \$7,885,295.15, together with the sum of \$422,500.00, being interest for a period of thirteen months from the first day of June, 1921 to the 30th day of June, 1922, on the new loan of six million dollars, making a total estimated expenditure of \$8,307,795.15. This shows a reduction of \$1,881,564.09 in the estimated expenditure for the public services of the Colony, less new interest charge of \$422,500.00, being a net reduction of \$1,459,064.09.

It will be noticed that in the Estimates as tabled there has been no reduction in the salaries of civil servants. It is proposed that the salaries of civil servants as voted remain in the Estimates as at last year, and that a special bill be introduced making a percentage reduction in all civil servants' salaries, including the salary of His Excellency the Governor, the judges of the Supreme Court, Ministers of the Crown, and the sessional indemnity of members of the House of Assembly and Legislative Council. It is also proposed that a Civil Service Commission of three be appointed to examine into the various public services of the Colony and report to His Excellency the Governor in Council as to what steps may be taken to maintain the efficiency of the service at a substantially reduced cost. This Commission would also deal with any special cases of hardship which resulted from the application of the Salary Reduction Act, as it is quite possible that in the operations of a general law some salaries may be reduced below the pre-war standard, and in the event of a necessary office occupied by an efficient civil servant whose pre-war salary did not exceed the pre-war standard of salaries for civil servants, a serious injustice might result. I estimate that the proposed measure will represent a reduction in civil service salaries of \$230,000.00. For the purpose of dealing with the Estimates, however, this does not appear as a reduction in the Estimates, but will appear as an addition to income, the intention being that the percentage reduction will be deducted as the salary cheques are issued by the responsible Departments.

The revenue for the coming fiscal year I have estimated as follows:

Customs	\$4,470,000.00
Customs Surtax Increase	1,117,500.00
Customs Surtax on Liquor	30,000.00
Postal and Telegraphs	360,000.00

Crown Lands	80,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	5,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	50,000.00
Guaranteed Interest	56,000.00
Broom Department Penitentiary	11,000.00
Fees Institutions, including General Hospital	35,000.00

Taxes:—

Banks, cable etc.	\$60,000.00
A. A. Tel. Co.	60,000.00
Estate Duties	60,000.00
Liquor Sales	480,000.00
Income Tax	150,000.00
Arrears collectable under Business Excess	
Profits and Income Tax	100,000.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	150,000.00
Proposed Sales Tax	900,000.00
Proposed Civil Service reduction	230,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,404,500.00

Expenditure is estimated as follows:

Total estimated expenditure as per Estimates	
1921-22	\$7,885,295.15
13 months' interest on new loan at 6½ per cent.	
on \$6,000,000.00	422,500.00

\$8,307,795.15

showing an estimated surplus on June 30th, 1922 of \$96,704.85. Based upon present tariff, the revenue for the coming year would probably not exceed \$6,127,000.00. The total expenditure estimated for the coming fiscal year is \$8,307,795.15. Thus without additional sources of revenue there would on the 30th day of June, 1922, appear an estimated deficit of \$2,180,795.15. The additional taxation proposed to meet this prospective liability is as follows:

Special War Tax of 25 p.c.	\$1,147,500.00
Civil Service Salaries Reduction Act	230,000.00
Sales Tax	900,000.00
	<hr/>
Total Additional Taxation	2,277,500.00
Amount required as above	2,180,795.15

Estimated Surplus as shown above \$96,704.85

I do not propose to weary you with a discussion of past revenues and expenditures, because the conditions which we are now facing are not such as can be materially helped by a consideration of past returns. The situation is brought about by the unparalleled world conditions of war and the aftermath of war. We have to bear the interest burdens on a war expenditure of approximately \$16,000,000.00. We have to face an estimated annual expenditure of \$1,750,000.00 due immediately and directly to the participation of Newfoundland in the War. This sum includes interest on War expenditure, pensions for soldiers and sailors, increased hospital, sanitarium and other services to suitably provide for those who suffered during the War. In other words, our increased annual burden immediately and directly attributable to

Newfoundland's participation in the War is estimated at \$1,750,000.00, and the indirect burden several million dollars additional for all of which revenue in addition to pre-war revenue must be secured.

It was the intention of the Minister of Finance and Customs to have submitted a revised tariff at this session of the Legislature, and considerable preliminary work was done with that in view. The illness of the Minister of Finance and Customs for such a long period of time and the fact that it may be impossible for him to attend the House during the present session has made the carrying out of that program impracticable. A commission will consequently be appointed for the purpose of a revision of the tariff, so that at the next session of the Legislature such may be considered and taxation placed upon a more equitable basis than it is at present.

The Sales Tax to which reference has been made takes the place of the Business Profits Tax, which tax is not now in existence.

It is proposed to introduce legislation during the present session to provide for the leasing of some of the many salmon fishing pools in the country, and while I have not estimated any revenue from that source for the coming fiscal year, yet it is a program which may reasonably be anticipated to bring in some returns during the coming year and be a most productive source of revenue in years to come.

The following are the trade returns for the past five years:—

Year	Imports	Exports
1915-16	\$16,427,336	\$18,969,493
1916-17	21,318,310	22,381,762
1917-18	26,892,946	30,153,517
1918-19	33,297,184	36,784,616
1919-20	40,533,388	34,865,438

From the above figures it will be noted that the Imports of 1916-17 exceeded those of 1915-16 by \$4,390,974; those of 1917-18 exceeded those of 1916-17 by \$5,574,636, and those of 1918-19 exceeded those of 1917-18 by \$6,404,238. The value of the imports between 1915-16 and 1918-19 doubled; there is no doubt that during those years there was a large importation, but the increase in the amount of value was due largely to the increase in the cost of goods. I would particularly call attention to the difference in the amount of imports between 1918-19 and 1919-20 which amounts to \$7,236,204. This excess is not in any way due to increased prices, as the average of prices for 1919-20 was, if anything, slightly less than for 1918-19, hence it is clear that the large increase of importation, amounting of 22½ per cent. above that of 1918-19 is due mainly, if not solely, to over importation. This would not only account for the large revenue of the year 1919-20 but would also largely account for the shortness in revenue at present, as there is a large amount of capital locked up in stocks that are remaining in the hands of Importers. In looking through the importations I find the following in excess of the previous year:

Dry Goods	\$379,935
Confectionery	122,279
Groceries	223,921
Fancy wares	12,000
Jams and Jellies	44,128
Jewellery	22,804
Leatherware	62,854

Automobiles	45,301
Meats, canned	108,020
Preserved Meats	18,315
Fresh Meats	207,152
Poultry and Game	32,746
Bacon, Hams and Tongues	30,467
Barrelled Beef	274,575
Oiled Clothes	55,023
Paper Hangings	58,310
Musical Instruments	17,650
Perfumery	11,818
Readymades	361,875
Feathers, Ribbons, Velvet, etc.	150,370
Soap	61,185
Sugar	1,142,543 lbs.
Tea	\$91,882
Tobacco, Cigars, etc.	34,007
Tweeds and Cloths	204,250
Women's Dress Goods	67,687

These are a few of the principal excess importations for the year 1919-20.

The year 1919-20 is the first year since 1912-13 that the Imports have exceeded the Exports; then the amount of difference was \$1,339,476, last year the excess of Imports amounted to \$5,667,950.

Our total funded debt as a Colony will on the 30th day of June, 1921, be approximately \$49,000,000.00. Of this amount approximately \$2,000,000.00 represents the Municipal debt of the city of St. John's. This Colony consequently compares in an exceptionally favorable manner with other colonies and countries in that (the total funded indebtedness of the entire Colony, including all Municipal indebtedness, will on the 30th day of June, 1921, be less than \$50,000,000.00.

The loan of \$6,000,000 which has recently been floated is being applied approximately as follows:

- (a) \$2,500,000.00 approximately for railway purposes. This includes the \$1,500,000 Loan Act of last year, which money was raised as a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal, and the cost of purchase of certain new and improved equipment, certain railway improvements, and that portion of the deficit for which the Colony is responsible on current year's operations.
- (b) \$90,000 approximately for the St. John's Municipal Council, which \$500,000 is the capital indebtedness of the Municipal Council for public works during recent years and upon which the Council will pay the annual interest charge.
- (c) \$500,000 for Public Works.
- (d) \$1,000,000 as a refund to the Surplus Trust Account of moneys paid out of the Surplus Trust Account for War purposes which sum should have been borne on capital account.
- (e) \$1,500,000 as a reserve for the general purposes of the Colony.

This means that the Colony will have approximately \$2,500,000.00 out of the total loan of \$6,000,000.00 as a reserve.

The Newfoundland Railway problem has not worked out very satisfactorily during the past year under the joint management created by the appoint-

ment of the Railway Commission whose term of office expires on the 30th day of June next. The operations of the railway will not be continued under the control of the Railway Commission after that date. If the Reid Newfoundland Company is not in a position to further finance their undertakings and carry out their contractual obligations to the Government, the Reid Newfoundland Company may find it necessary to wind up its operations in Newfoundland, when the many important legal and financial matters outstanding between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company will have to be determined by legal or other proceedings, and the railway and steamship systems operated by a receiver, so that the public transportation services of the Colony may not be interfered with, in which event entirely new arrangements must necessarily be made for the management and operation of the railway and coastal systems. In any event, a program for railway and coastal reorganization will be submitted to the Legislature at its next session.

I feel that I should not let this occasion pass without expressing my deep regret that there are some unpatriotic Newfoundlanders amongst us who by their voice in this House of Assembly, by their private conversations both at home and abroad, and by their writings in the local and foreign press, have for their own personal and supposed political advantage been prepared to attempt to sacrifice the financial reputation of the land of their birth on the altar of their own personal selfishness and ambition. For more than a year and a half there has been a concerted attempt of political opposition origin to injure the foreign trade and foreign credit of our Colony for the deliberate purpose of embarrassing the Government in this hour of world turmoil and deflation. I desire merely to say to my fellow countrymen who are loyal Newfoundlanders that such men are few, and as the years go by will count for less and less in Newfoundland life and as an influence abroad; and to the world at large I would say that Newfoundland already crossed the trough of the wave of depression and is steadily rising to a greater and more permanent prosperity than ever before.

The resolutions which I propose to submit to the Committee may be summarized as follows—

- duties; in the case of spirits 50 p.c.
2. A reduction and adjustment of the export tax on fish. The reduction is estimated at approximately 20 p.c. of present export tax. The adjustment in favour of Newfoundland registered vessels is an encouragement and protection for locally owned and operated shipping.
 3. An adjustment on imported sole leather, so that manufacturers who import sale leather in strips be not discriminated against, and the further manufacture of boots and shoes encouraged.
 4. The preference recently given to Kerosene Oil when imported in wood packages is to be repealed.
 5. The exemption clause in the Income War Tax Act, 1918 is made clearer in certain particulars and clergymen are made exempt from income taxation.
 6. The irregular practice of a sturdy ten years' growth by which free entries have been permitted and drawbacks and refunds given without special statutory authority is declared illegal.
 7. Home Industries are protected by the proposal enactment of special "Dumping" legislation.

8. The bank tax formerly collected under the Business Profits Act is continued.

I append hereto for the information of the Committee the following comparative statements in tabular form:

(a) Statement showing original estimates of expenditures, Supplemental Supply and expenditures under Audit Act, for a period of ten years; a statement of revenue and expenditure, showing Surplus or Deficit, covering a period of ten years; a statement of the public debt, showing interest charges thereon for a period of ten years.

(b) Statement of revenue, showing the various heads under which the revenue is scored, covering a ten-year period.

(c) Statement of estimates of salaries of civil servants from the year 1914-15 to the year 1919-20.

(d) Details of percentage increases to salaries, illustrating the effects on salaries of increases from 1916-17 to date.

(e) Statement of Surplus Trust Fund estimated as at the 30th day of June, 1921.

ORIGINAL

Together with Supplementary Supply and Expenditure

	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13	1913-14
Original Estimate	\$ 3,055,055.22	\$ 3,331,814.20	\$ 3,603,639.05	\$ 3,735,074.41
Supplemental Supply	307,774.15	248,643.54	227,815.37	244,719.17
Audit Act, Section. 33	43,448.85	7,711.84	54,175.25	17,181.69
Total.	\$ 3,406,278.22	\$ 3,588,169.58	\$ 3,885,629.67	\$ 3,996,975.27
Revenue	\$ 3,527,126.43	\$ 3,736,455.87	\$ 3,919,040.43	\$ 3,618,329.13
Expenditure	3,354,746.52	3,524,652.51	3,803,561.42	3,920,178.21
Surplus	\$ 172,379.91	\$ 211,803.36	\$ 115,479.01
Deficit	\$ 301,849.08
Public Debt	\$27,176,280.18	\$27,489,956.92	\$29,670,060.54	\$30,450,765.27
Interest on Public Debt	1,025,302.88	1,036,399.94	1,105,996.36	1,115,384.32

ESTIMATES,
under Audit Act, from 1910-11 to 1919-20, inclusive.

1914-15	1915-16	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20
\$ 3,936,622.85	\$ 4,051,690.37	\$ 4,081,457.63 417,450.91	\$ 4,571,167.49 234,165.00	\$ 5,371,020.00 26,500.00	\$ 7,079,717
168,120.97	124,415.94	83,515.00	700,338.00	1,373,413.57	2,412,219
42,893.88	30,745.07	38,280.31	51,523.76	36,595
\$ 4,147,837.70	\$ 4,206,851.38	\$ 4,620,703.85	\$ 5,505,670.79	\$ 6,822,457.33	\$ 9,528,532
\$ 3,950,790.25	\$ 4,600,271.66	\$ 5,206,647.53	\$ 6,540,082.69	\$ 9,535,725.16	\$10,597,561
4,008,622.76	4,110,885.39	4,554,890.58	5,369,454.75	6,766,430.51	9,247,006
.....	\$ 431,553.76	\$ 651,756.95	\$ 1,170,627.94	\$ 2,769,294.65	\$ 1,350,554
\$ 57,832.51
\$31,454,678.45	\$34,489,665.60	\$34,489,765.60	\$34,489,955.60	\$42,032,785.60	\$43,033,035
1,173,385.88	1,258,912.19	1,338,916.80	1,490,127.48	1,951,508.65	2,148,795

REVENUE FOR TEN YEARS—

	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13	1913-14
Customs.	\$ 2,898,615.25	\$ 3,142,491.29	\$ 3,283,304.89	\$ 3,083,313.46
Postal and Telegraphs.	197,216.65	200,071.78	203,986.78	215,124.95
Crown Lands.	192,334.45	119,708.87	105,008.99	146,021.39
Fines and Forfeitures.	5,854.45	6,940.03	5,695.99	5,221.18
Liquor Licenses.	5,829.00	5,746.50	5,366.50	5,096.45
Inland Revenue Stamps.	14,479.33	14,479.33	16,645.63	18,151.88
Interest Guaranteed Loans	55,104.86	57,041.10	58,396.44	56,313.64
Brooms—Penitentiary	12,733.51	12,405.62	11,616.86	9,239.57
Fees—Institutions.	3,047.16	3,473.88	3,965.03	4,459.29
Profit on Coin.		29,249.99	84,560.00	
Taxes and Assessments.	51,806.13	51,586.29	55,728.62	38,651.32
Estate Duties.				
Liquor Sales.				
Excess Profit's Tax.				
Income Tax.				
Miscellaneous—General	90,105.64	91,691.13	84,674.70	36,735.72.
Miscellaneous—In aid of Revenue.				
	\$ 3,527,126.43	\$ 3,736,455.87	\$ 3,919,040.43	\$ 3,618,328.85

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

1914-15	1915-16	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20
\$ 2,744,567.85	\$ 3,950,688.42	\$ 4,470,537.56	\$ 4,923,396.31	\$ 7,191,260.71	\$ 8,658,255.00
228,504.20	262,798.89	282,220.29	330,906.76	410,891.02	417,962.00
94,165.02	88,554.59	83,493.57	77,030.43	92,336.22	90,805.00
3,915.39	3,667.01	2,660.33	3,455.31	7,471.08	7,077.00
4,938.50	4,728.50	4,536.37
18,891.55	22,154.08	28,846.05	44,225.83	55,367.69	63,611.00
56,485.24	56,485.24	56,485.24	56,485.24	56,485.24	56,485.00
8,169.29	10,419.69	13,444.89	25,594.07	32,388.50	22,540.00
3,563.45	5,771.67	3,936.53	5,683.45	4,921.45	4,974.00
.....	784.12	95,472.58	104,561.29	35,563.00
38,468.85	40,237.55	45,677.16	130,865.70	55,556.92	56,854.00
9,843.16	106,864.42	17,349.78	88,255.04	55,501.82	103,896.00
.....	6,462.02	138,779.77	193,091.00
.....	640,450.93	976,366.48	621,766.00
.....	49,881.60	64,536.73	98,698.00
41,126.83	47,117.48	106,987.14	52,828.69	393,851.53	165,979.00
* 698,150.92
\$ 3,950,790.25	\$ 4,600,271.66	\$ 5,206,547.53	\$ 6,540,082.67	\$ 9,535,725.16	\$10,597,561.00

* In 1914-15 \$500,000 was taken from Loan and \$198,150 from Reserve Fund, in aid of Revenue.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY PROCEEDINGS
ESTIMATE OF SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

In 1914-15 as compared with 1919-20.

Total Salaries paid in 1919-20	\$1,482,648.99
Less new appointments since 1914	25,963.00
	\$1,456,685.99
Total salaries paid in 1914-15	705,632.15

Increase on salaries paid for offices in existence in 1914 .. \$751,053.84

Due mainly to the following, viz.:

Postmasters, Labrador, increased approximately an average of	200%
Travelling Post Offices " " "	180%
Outport Telegraph Operators " " "	150%
Outport Postmasters " " "	140%
Outport Couriers " " "	100%
St. John's Telegraphers " " "	150%
Telegraph Repairers " " "	150%
Customs Salaries, St. John's " " "	95%
Outport Customs Salaries " " "	100%
Salaries Civil Government " " "	94½%

**DETAILS OF PERCENTAGE INCREASES TO SALARIES ILLUSTRATING
THE EFFECT ON SALARIES OF \$100.00, \$500.00, \$1,000.00
\$1,500.00 and \$2,000 respectively.**

1916-17	Inc.	1917-18	Inc.	1918-19	Inc.	1919-20	Total
\$100.00	50%	\$150.00	25%	\$187.50	30%	\$243.75	105%
500.00	23%	615.00	25%	668.75	30%	869.37	78%
1,000.00	5%	1,050.00	20%	1,260.00	20%	1,512.00	45%
1,500.00	Nil	1,500.00	20%	1,800.00	20%	2,160.00	40%
2,000.00	Nil	2,000.00	20%	2,400.00	15%	2,760.00	35%

N.B.—It will be noted that \$1,500.00 and \$2,000 salaries did not participate in the initial rise 1917-18, but in many instances they were subsequently advanced in accordance with the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

The salaries of ferry-men, mail couriers, outport relieving officers and local constables were in many instances not increased in above average proportions.

**ESTIMATE OF THE SURPLUS TRUST FUND AS IT WILL STAND AT THE
END OF THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30TH, 1921.**

Balance at the close of 1919-20, including surpluses

Repayments as follows, viz.:

for 1918-19, 1917-18 and balances		\$5,290,477.50	
St. John's Gas Company	\$49,402.80		
Salt	27,400.00		
Railway Maintenance	250,000.00		
Sugar	184,250.00		
			<hr/>
Refund from War Loan	205,000.00		
Unexpended balance of old railway loan transferred to Surplus Trust Account	59,000.00		775,052.80

CR.

1918-19.—Expended as per details furnished\$1,125,304.13

1919-20.—Expended as per details furnished 1,022,807.00

1920-21.—

Teachers' Convention Fund	\$3,000.00		
For steamers	339,066.10		
For Salt	77,767.02		
For Sugar	194,250.00		
For Coal	49,232.02		
Railway Maintenance	250,000.00		
For Aeroplanes	12,917.82		
			<hr/>
			\$3,064,344.09

Balance to meet liabilities consequent upon shrinkage of Customs Revenue for 1920-21	\$3,001,186.21
--	----------------

RESOLUTIONS.

Submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on Way and Means

Resolved—

(a) In addition to the duties, including excise duties, imposed by the Revenue Act, 1905, and by the Act in amendment thereof, and by the Resolutions tabled on Thursday the 19th day of May instant, and by these Resolutions, and in addition to the Surtax imposed by the Revenue Amendment Act, 1914 (4 Geo. V. Cap. XXV), there shall be paid a special War Surtax of twenty-five per cent (25%) upon the total amount payable in respect of all such duties, except only in the case of duties imposed upon coal and upon spirits the subject-matter of Item 133 of Schedule A to the Revenue Act, 1905, and of the excise duties imposed upon Butterine manufactured in the Colony, upon which last mentioned duties the said special War Surtax of twenty-five per cent. shall not be levied or collected.

(b) In addition to the duties, including excise duties, imposed by the Revenue Act, 1905, and Acts in amendment thereof, upon Spirits the subject matter of Item 133 of Schedule A to the Revenue Act, 1905, and Acts in amendment thereof, there shall be paid a special War Surtax of fifty per cent. (50%) upon the total amount payable in respect of all such duties.

(c) Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor-in-Council that the operation of the said surtax is producing a revenue in excess of the requirements of the public service, it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Council, by Proclamation in the "Royal Gazette," to reduce the rate of the said surtax to such an extent as will in the opinion of the Governor-in-Council suffice to provide for the said requirements, and from the date fixed by such Proclamation the said reduced rate, and no other, shall apply.

RESOLUTION II.

Resolved,—

That Schedule E. of the Revenue Act, 1905. be amended by substituting for the item

"Fish, viz.: Cod, Haddock, Hake, Ling, Pollack, and Halibut, dried or otherwise preserved, per quintal, 20 cents."

"Fish, viz.: Cod, Haddock, Hake, Ling, Halibut and Turbot, fresh or exported from salt bulk, without spreading or airing, N.E.S. per cwt., 10 cents."

the items following—

"Fish, viz.: Cod, Haddock, Hake, Ling, Pollack and Halibut, dried or otherwise preserved, N.E.S. when exported in ships or vessels not registered in Newfoundland, per qtl., 10 cents."

"When exported in ships or vessels registered in Newfoundland, per qtl., 20 cents."

"Fish, viz.: Cod, Haddock, Hake, Ling, Pollack, Halibut and Turbot, fresh or exported from 'Salt Bulk' without spreading or airing, N.E.S. per cwt., 15 cents."

RESOLUTION III.

Resolved,—

That Item 90 of Schedule A of the Revenue Act, 1905, as amended by subsequent Acts, be further amended by striking out the words in Item 90, viz.:—

"Leather, known as 'Sole Leather' ad. val. 30 p.c."

and substituting therefor

"Leather known as 'Sole Leather' when imported by the side—lad. cal., "20%.

"Sole Leather, in strips or pieces and shaped, when imported by Manufacturers of boots and shoes for use in their factories to be used in the manufacture of Ladies' fine Boots and Shoes, ad, val. 20 p.c."

RESOLUTION IV.

Resolved,—

That sub-section (d) of Section 1 of Chapter 56 of the Acts 11 Geo. V. entitled "An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905" be repealed.

RESOLUTION V.

Resolved,—

That sub-section (a) of Section 5 of the Income War Tax Act of 1918 be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

(a) The income of the Governor, the judges of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the Judge of the Central District Court, and clergymen of all "religious denominations."

RESOLUTION VI.

Resolved,—

That no free entry, drawback, refund or reduction of revenue shall be deemed legal, unless expressly authorized by Statute. Provided, however, that His Excellency the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, permit drawbacks or refunds with respect to stores required by the Admiralty, for the use of H.M.S. "Briton," upon which stores duty has been paid by the importer.

RESOLUTION VII.

Resolved.—

(a) That in the case of articles exported to Newfoundland of a class or kind made in Newfoundland, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Newfoundland be less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Newfoundland at the time of its exportation to Newfoundland, there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected and paid on such article on its importation into Newfoundland, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption.

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed twenty-five per cent. ad valorem in any case;

Provided further that the excise duties shall be disregarded in estimating the market value of goods for the purpose of special duty.

(b) That the expression 'export price' or 'selling price' in this section shall be held to mean and include the exporters' price for the goods, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment from the place whence exported directly to Newfoundland.

(c) That if at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor-in-Council, on a report from the Minister of Finance and Customs that the payment of the special duty by this section provided for is being evaded by the shipment of goods on consignment without sale prior to such shipment, the Governor-in-Council may in any case or class of cases authorize such action as it deems necessary to collect on such goods or any of them the same

special duty as if the goods had been sold to an importer in Newfoundland prior to their shipment to Newfoundland.

(d) If the full amount of any special duty of Customs is not paid on goods imported, the Customs entry thereof shall be amended and the deficiency paid upon the demand of the Collector of Customs.

(e) The Minister of Finance and Customs may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section and for the enforcement thereof.

(f) Such regulations may provide for the temporary exemption from special duty on any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance and Customs that such articles are not made or sold in Newfoundland in substantial quantities, and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

(g) Such regulations may also provide for the exemption from special duty of any article when the difference between the fair market value and the selling price thereof to the importer as aforesaid amounts only to a small percentage of its fair market value.

RESOLUTION VIII.

Resolved,—

That there be paid to His Majesty by every bank and banking corporation doing business in Newfoundland, except the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank, an annual tax of one half of one per cent., to be computed on all moneys on deposit on December 31st of each year.

RESOLUTION IX.

Resolved,—

That these Resolutions come into effect at 9 a.m. on Thursday, the 26th day of May instant, except in so far as the special War Surtax affects sugar, which said surtax on sugar shall come into effect at 9 a.m. on Friday, the 27th day of May instant.

RESOLUTION X.

Resolved,—

That a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF SAVINGS
Showing amount of Deposits as at the 31st.

_____	1916	1917
Bank of Montreal.	\$ 4,050,410.39	\$ 4,111,938.29
Canadian Bank of Commerce.	284,268.39	339,607.14
Royal Bank of Canada.	1,612,019.71	2,262,047.11
Bank of Nova Scotia.	3,931,978.85	5,673,995.00
Government Savings' Bank.	2,410,929.93	2,494,049.57
Totals.	\$12,289,607.27	\$14,881,637.11
Total Deposits as at March 31st, 1920.		\$20,543,937.99
Average for the five years.		17,093,922.65
Savings' Deposits as at the 31st, 1920, exceeds average for five years by.		\$ 3,450,015.34

DEPOSITS IN NEWFOUNDLAND.
day of December for each of past five years.

1918	1919	1920
\$ 4,480,181.17	\$ 5,820,723.00	\$ 6,013,891.00
349,385.87	542,289.04	715,083.93
2,883,334.02	3,580,813.61	3,673,856.84
6,806,390.00	8,567,566.00	7,751,179.00
2,215,764.16	2,507,984.02	2,389,927.22
\$16,735,055.22	\$21,019,375.67	\$20,543,937.99

Population of Newfoundland at last Census, 238,670.

Savings' Deposits for the Island of Newfoundland on a per capita Basis, \$86.08.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

RESOLUTIONS

Submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on Ways and Means.

Resolved,—That item 138 of Schedule "A" of the Revenue Act, 1905, as amended by subsequent Acts, be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor:

"Sugars, Loaf, Cut Loaf, Cube, Castor and Icing or Fine Ground, per lb. 5½ cents.

All other kinds of sugar, granulated or otherwise, white, brown or yellow, per lb. 4 cents.

Resolved,—

(a) The specific additional duty of two and a half cents per pound imposed on sugar as provided for in these resolutions and surtax thereon shall be placed to a separate account in the Bank of Montreal, to be held there for the purpose of liquidating the debit balance of the Food Control Board.

(b) Upon the certificate of the Auditor General that the amount of the deposits to the credit of the said account of the Food Control Board has entirely liquidated the debit balance of the said Board, the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance and Customs, by proclamation published in the "Royal Gazette" reduce the duty

on sugar, the said item 138 to then read as follows:

"Sugars, Loaf, Cut Loaf, Cube Castor and Icing or Fine Ground, per lb., 3 cents

"All other kinds of sugar, granulated or otherwise, White, Brown or Yellow, per lb., 1½ cents."

Resolved,—That a Bill be introduced to give effect to these resolutions.

Resolved,—These resolutions shall be held to be in force and to take effect as from the 20th day of May, at 9.30 o'clock in the morning.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 26th.

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

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present two petitions, the first from residents of that section which may be regarded as No Mans' Land just outside the boundary of the City Council around Belvidere. In the past few years a number of houses have sprung up there and there are about fifty or sixty families living there. I believe that under the new Charter it is the intention to include this section in the activities of the Council, but up to the present it has been dependent upon the Board of Public Works. The petition is to ask for assistance with regard to roads out of the Government grant. I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition, and I would like to point out to the Minister of Public Works that it is a case where the money will be well spent for two reasons, first because of the amount of property there, and secondly because the roads around there are used considerably, and the people who would be employed in the work on those roads are the very people who are in need of work now.

The petition from Torbay has regard to a road on the South Side, and it will be found by the Minister of Public Works if he consults Mr. Parsons the Inspector of Roads, that it is a fact where it won't cost much, and it can easily be arranged out of the grants for that section of the district. I trust that these petitions will receive due consideration from the Department to which they appertain.

MR. FOX.—I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Higgins. The amount is not large and the object is a very deserving one. I trust that these petitions will receive due consideration from the Department to which they belong, and that the Government will see their way clear to grant the prayer of these petitions.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by Mr. Higgins. Those people around Belvidere are badly in need of the road asked for, and I feel sure that when this petition comes before the Minister of Public Works that he will do his utmost to see that the prayer of the petitioners is granted, as I am sure any member of the Government would do if he would go up there and see the condition of these people. With regard to the petition from Torbay, with Mr. Higgins I say that it will not cost much and it is a very necessary work, and I am sure that the Government will give this matter due consideration and grant the prayer of the petitioners.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Venereal Diseases" was introduced and read a first time and it

was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, may I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House while I ask the Prime Minister what programme or arrangements have been made as far as the fishery supply is concerned. I understand Placentia Bay made application for a certain sum of money to supply the need in that district. I am sorry to say Ferryland is proportionately in the same position, and I would like to know from the Prime Minister this afternoon, if on representation from us Ferryland will be extended the same privilege as Placentia Bay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Ferryland will receive the same per capita. Ferryland and Placentia are in a particularly bad position because of the failure of the two big firms in those places, Goodridges' in Ferryland and Harris & Co., in Placentia Bay, and consequently those sections of the country are so situated that unless merchants are encouraged to handle the situation, it will be impossible for the men to prosecute the fishery. No other sections are being considered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he has yet received any report from Messrs. Collishaw and Devine in reference to their recent visit to Washington, and if so to lay a copy of the same on the Table of the House, together with a statement showing the expenses incurred in connection with such visit, and if no report has been received, when does he expect to receive it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No report has yet been received, and no bill has been received from any person. I expect a report from Mr. Devine.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government in recalling the

Trade Commissioners from the various centres in European countries where they have been acting lately, to appoint Mr. George Hawes to represent the Colony instead, and if so what compensation Mr. Hawes is to receive for his services and what guarantee will the country have that Mr. Hawes will not utilize his position for his own advantage rather than the country's advantage, as suggested by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the notes on his European trip which he published in the Advocate after his return here, wherein he expressed opinions very hostile to Mr. Hawes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It is not the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. George Hawes to represent the Colony on the lapse of the appointment of the present Trade Commissioners.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if the duties on the six motor cars given entries some months ago without payment of duty, has since been paid, and if not what steps is the Government going to take to secure payment of the same, and if the Government proposes to take no steps, what is the reason for such failure to act?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will ask the Assitant Collector to favour me with that information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention had been called to an advertisement in the "Evening Telegram" of Monday last offering for sale eight new houses on Merrymeeting Road near St. Georges Field, described as up-to-date in every particular and ready for occupancy, and if so (a) to say if these houses are part of the twenty houses constructed during the past year by the Company of which the Hon. John Anderson is the moving spirit; (b) if

these houses were constructed by Mr. Andersons Company for the firm of Bowring Bros., Ltd., who intended to rent them to reliable workmen in their employ or to sell them to them on easy payment terms; (c) if Bowring Bros. have found that these houses have cost roughly twice the estimated amount and will therefore require a rental to be paid double that expected; (d) if as a consequence the houses are beyond the reach of the type of workman for whom they were designed and if Messrs. Bowring are selling them in consequence; and (e) if, in view of this proof that these houses are not suited for the working classes, what steps does the Government propose to take to redeem the Prime Minister's promise to the people of St. John's in his manifesto prior to the last general election, that one of the first steps the Government would take would be to solve the housing problem of the city?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will ask my Deputy, Mr. Mews, to try to get that information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraph to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence between himself and the Commercial Cable Co., or any other Company in relation to telegraphy in the Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I beg to table a reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the financial statement of this Colony on which the recent loan was raised in New York.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No financial statement was furnished.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs (a) who is going to sign the

Bonds representing the new Loan; (b) if Mr. J. S. Keating, Deputy Minister of Finance, is to proceed to New York shortly in order to undertake certain duties in connection with the floatation of this Loan; (c) if so why has it become necessary to take this step seeing that in all former cases when Loans have been raised outside the Colony it has not been necessary to send any official for such purpose; (d) in view of the illness of the Minister of Finance and the proposed absence of the Deputy Minister, who is to take charge of the affairs of the Finance Department?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The interim bonds will have the name of the Minister lithographed. They will be signed by the Deputy. Mr. Keating proceeded to New York on Wednesday for the purpose of signing the interim bonds. A Minute of Council as authority to sign the interim bonds has been given Mr. Keating.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the following questions: (1) Have any of the Coastwise Fishery Wardens been dismissed this year. (2) Have any of the Inland Game Fishery Wardens been dismissed this year. (3) If so to Table a list of all officials so dismissed, giving reasons.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table a reply.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what would have been paid for the private car occupied by him on his weekly trips to Port Union and return at the same rates charged ordinary travelers, and also what an ordinary passenger would pay for his first class ticket from St. Johns to Port Union and return for as many trips as made

by the Minister since the first of July last.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have referred that question to Mr. Hall.

MR. LEWIS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if a lot of material has been imported for the railroad system the past two years for which there is no immediate need, and if this material was ordered by an official of the Railway Company who comes from the organization which manufactures this material, and if so does this mean that this individual is working in the interests of his former employers and receiving a Commission from them for the ordering and bringing in here of a lot of material that is not being used; Also if the Government asked for bids or tenders for the new locomotives imported the past winter, or whether the order was placed with the Baldwin Locomotive people without tender; and if no tenders were sought why not; and if there is any report from any competent impartial authority certifying to the suitability of these locomotives for the work in this country for which they are to be used; and if there is any connection between the individual responsible for the ordering of these locomotives and other material and Mr. E. Collishaw?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table a reply.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the value of food sent for relief purposes to the Districts of Burgeo, Fortune Bay, Burin and Placentia, from January the 1st to date, and the per capita value of the same among the people of each of these Districts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have called the attention of the Poor

Commissioner to that question, and hope to have a reply to-morrow.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the Table of the House the names of the Fire Wardens appointed in the District of Hr. Main for the season 1921, giving rate of pay and length of engagement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I'll table the answer to that question to-morrow.

MR. VINNICOMBE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if Mr. Albert Salter has been appointed by the Government to arrange for the supplying of relief goods to sufferers by forest fires during the year 1920 and if so to lay on the Table of the House a statement of all amounts paid him for his services in this connection and of all amounts paid for such relief goods and to whom?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No such arrangement has been made.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Prime Minister (a) if the Government authorized the publication of a handbook of Newfoundland recently issued by the High Commissioner's Office in London and copies of which have been forwarded to members of this House and others; (b) who compiled the hand book and what amount, if any, was paid him for such work; (c) what sum was paid the publishers, Messrs. Whitehead and Morris Company of London for its issue and how many copies were included therein; (d) if the handbook for which Dr. Mosdell was recently paid \$750, for the compilation and of which The Daily Star is to furnish 3,000 copies at 80 cents is the same handbook that has been published in London or a different one; (e) if these are two different books, what is the explanation of the publication of two at the same time and would not one or the other have done; (f) are any other hand-

books or publications being prepared by authority of the Government or any Department thereof and if so who is preparing the same, what sum is being paid for the compilation thereof and what sum for the publication?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Government did not authorize the publication to which reference has been made. No sum was paid to Messrs. Whitehead & Morris Co. London. The hand-book which Dr. Mosdell is preparing has no connection whatever with that published by Messrs. Whitehead & Morris & Co. There is no other publication being prepared on the authority of the government, unless there is any literature being sent out by the Agriculture & Mines Department.

MR. BENNETT—Asked the Prime Minister if it is correct that a British Warship is shortly to arrive here and if so to state the object of her visit, also to state if it is true that she is to take the Prime Minister of this Dominion over to England to attend the Imperial Conference to be held in London next month?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The ship to which reference is made is merely making the usual annual visit. The visits were interrupted during the war period. As to the last part of the question I might reply in the words of a well-known predecessor, the words are familiar to my hon. friend, "This is the first I have heard of it."

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker. The labor situation as it developed a few weeks ago resulted in a conference between the members of St. John's East and West and the Municipal Council, a matter in which the whole government was interested—but a matter in which the Municipality was primarily interested because of the large number of unemployed who came from the constituencies of St. John's East and West. The representatives of St. John's West

met the Council and the matter was satisfactorily disposed of when a large additional number of men were employed on the roads to be opened up in the Western section of the city, and the Eastern Division as well. I put at the Council's service the surveyors of the Crown Land's department and the work was expedited thereby. On the Saturday in question the surveyors were on the spot and on the following Monday morning the men went to work. The arrangement as to wages was that the rate of wages was to be paid by the Municipality as for similar work outside the city limits namely two dollars per day that is as paid by the Public Works department, but it was municipal work in part, and as it was being done in the interests of the Electoral District of St. John's West that District agreed to pay half so that if the work was an external one undertaken in the ordinary course of business the rate would have been two dollars per day. This situation this afternoon is entirely new to me. As to whether my colleagues from St. John's East and West are aware of this I do not know and so far as I know there has not been any conference. I would suggest to the delegation the appointment of three or five members to compose a committee to discuss the premises in the situation and have it satisfactorily disposed of. The decision arrived at a few weeks ago after acting upon the suggestion of a conference between the members of the two districts worked out satisfactorily with the result that the work was undertaken and I take that the same organization will be only too glad to see what steps can be taken to have matters adjusted to the satisfaction of all. So far as to discussing the question here in this House it is utterly impossible. The work is being undertaken by the Municipal Council, but the money is being provided by the Government in the nature of a loan for which the Council is respon-

sible, and for which they will have to pay interest. The only thing the government has to do was to secure the loan and the only thing I had personally to do with it was just that the Council should make it one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, so that it may have additional funds to deal with the necessities of the case. I suggest the appointment of three or five and have a conference called as soon as possible.

MR. BENNETT—I want to put myself clear as to my position in the matter. I must say that I know nothing whatever as to this demonstration. The Prime Minister has suggested that we on this side of the House knew something about it.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If so I apologise.

MR. BENNETT—We had no knowledge whatever about this, but I must say that the prayer of the Committee before the House has my sympathy in view of the conditions existing in this town to-day. It is grave hardship to have one's wages cut these days, and as to my connection with this matter I want to inform the House and the gentlemen at the Bar that it ceased on the night I conferred with the Prime Minister and Council, and the representatives from St. John's East. I was asked to attend the conference and thereby devise means whereby these men may be employed. I have not been honoured since by being asked my opinions or being consulted as to the carrying out of its work.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I was not consulted either.

MR. BENNETT—The Prime Minister will pardon me if I will tell him that he is not absolutely correct. The road he has taken power to construct has my entire approval, but the work has been undertaken, the men employed, the position of foreman has been filled, the time keepers have been given their jobs and the general work commenced without my knowledge, so

therefore I think it is absolutely futile for me to attend any conference, because well I do not intend to be treated with indifference and contempt any more. This matter was taken up clear of politics altogether, but it has not been carried out, though in its entirety as to the people who have been employed to my mind are political partizans, but I will assist the Prime Minister in anyway with regard to the district grants and the way so far they have been allocated, has my entire approval, and he has done what he pleased with the district grants since he has assumed office. The actions that are attributable to the Prime Minister are his own business and he may continue on. I may follow him.

MR. HIGGINS—Just a word from the representatives of St. John's East. So far as we are concerned we stand in an unusually fortunate position. We have a party of our own, and we do not stand in the same position as the honorable members for St. John's West. Further we are in the proud position to be able to tell the Prime Minister that not alone has there not been any conflict between ourselves but perhaps there has not been any conflict with the authorities at all. We attended the meeting and we understand the work is going on satisfactorily, and it is also gratifying to state to these men at the Bar that we from St. John's East are able to testify that we did not even visit the road so as to insult the cause for which this work is being given. The work being done out there is the best that can be desired, and I am given to understand that the workmen are certainly worthy of the consideration at the hands of the members of this House when the vote comes down later, worthy of the ready sympathy and endorsement of, this vote in spite of the comment upon the inefficient work which is supposed to have been carried out there, but I can assure you that out there have been

and are time keepers who have actually dismissed men because of their improper conduct and regularly docked the time missed, and I know that in one instance where a man tried to bluff and say he worked full time when he did not, he had to forfeit his day's pay as a penalty. These facts show the spirit in which the matter is being lived up to, and there is an entire absence of anything that is bordering on disorder or impropriety, and I think there is great cause to compliment ourselves on the way in which the whole scheme is being worked out. Now if that spirit is wished to be availed and wanted to continue, I say with all sincerity that we ought to appreciate and court it, and give a sympathetic and ready ear to their request. There is no reason why we cannot deal satisfactorily with this message, delivered by the Council to the delegation. The Council certainly has today more than enough to cover the whole work. I am informed that it is said that there have to be arbitrations on land, and that these have to be taken into consideration, and that the sum is not sufficient, but here is the unfortunate position the Prime Minister has to face. The impressions created in the minds of these men was that one hundred and fifty thousand dollars was to be allocated to the Council for purely relief work, and in addition to this sum there was to be taken from each of the district grants the further sum of ten thousand dollars so that there would be the sum of one hundred and seventy thousand dollars at their disposal apart from the proposition with regard to water and sewer pipes. I trust my friends who are listening will not have a demonstration as this matter is too serious. I merely want to put the Prime Minister straight on behalf of the constituencies involved and on behalf of the Government itself. They say their impression is that the \$80,000 is a district loan. Whether that impression is

formed improperly or inspired improperly or is a conclusion jumped to as the result of impressions gained without full thought, the Hon. Prime Minister can take it from me that that is the whole crux of the situation. There are two troubles—first they are lead to believe that the loan for water works would be distinct from the \$150,000, and second, they get a proposition put up to them reducing their pay to \$2.50 per day. As far as the reduction is concerned that is a matter for the Council. If the money has been given to them the matter is in their hands, but the influence of the government ought to be strong enough to point out the anomaly of reducing these men who are Council employees while the others who are doing exactly the same class of work are paid \$3.30 as they were in good times. I say it is unfair, for the reason that while recognizing that in time there must be a reduction of wages, there should be a standard rate for the one kind of work, and as the delegation put it, the cutting began at the wrong end. They have reason enough to say they expect a reduction sometime, but now they are asked to do for \$2.50 what another man who is not on relief work gets \$3.30 for. The honourable members can take it from me that to those men to whom every dollar means so much, this 80 cents a day, or \$5 a week, is a very serious matter particularly as they have been so long unemployed, and their prospects for the future are so insecure. My suggestion to the Prime Minister is this; might not the government arrange to have the first impression of these men carried out, make this amount for water works a straight and separate loan. Say you have eaten up a lot of money in this relief work, but you most remember that all the amounts spent in this way comes back to the Colony, and really is no charge on the colony's funds. Cannot the Prime Minister arrange for an extra loan; it means no

charge as it is a loan to the city. Instead of asking for \$150,000, ask for more. It has been the practice for years to have the city loans guaranteed by the government. Any steps in that direction on behalf of the people will suit me and you will have my and their thanks.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Higgins has covered the situation so well that there is scarcely any need of my speaking. I fail to see why the original plans were not carried out. I took part with the Hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett and my colleagues in the meeting with the Council; I attended in a consultative position. It was there suggested that work for 1100 men be found in the building of a new road in St. John's West, on Pearce Avenue and in the opening of other roads. Each district was to give \$12,000 of its grant, the labour was to be given out on a non-partizan basis, the pay was to be \$2.50 per day employment was to be given immediately and materials, such as picks, shovels etc., were to be obtained if necessary from the Reid & Co railway. We all left the chamber after that meeting with the impression that these plans were to be carried out, and I am at a loss to know why such was not done. I am in entire sympathy with the gentlemen at the Bar of the House and deeply regret that they have to come here again. I do not think it would be difficult to carry out the original plans and we, I think, should set ourselves to the task of finding out why they did not go on smoothly. I believe the situation is made more serious to-day by the reduction of the wages. That step is entirely opposed to the original plan, when it was distinctly understood that the pay be \$3.30. That is one reason why the work was put under the direction of the Council. I would like to point out to the government that this is a matter for the authorities. If there is to be any solution it got to be reached by

the government, as it is part of their duty to look after the people, and to consider what preparations can be made to overcome such difficulties as presented themselves. To-day we have only a Municipal Commission which is under direct control of the Government and which must do as they are told. I would again point out that the fact of it being a Commission eases the position for the government. But so far as the Commission can be helped I agree to help them to the full, but this is their business first, and foremost, and they cannot shift it to other shoulders. If aid is needed I will give it as far as I can, but I appeal to them, the government, to find out why the plans of 10 days were not carried out. If, as has been pointed out, destitution is abroad, this is no time for words but for action. I suggest to the government that they betake themselves to the task of finding out the reason why the plans did not work smoothly and ask themselves what is the matter. If they do not know themselves let them enquire and find out. I ask the spokesman of the delegation at the Bar to ask his followers to restrain themselves and remember the government may be in a serious position. All must see that the demonstration is kept within the bounds of propriety and that nothing is being done, that may cause regret, nothing that may seem to flout authority, but let all come together and try to find the best solution. In all sincerity I congratulate the leaders of the unemployed on the manner in which they have all through handled the demonstration and the good order prevailing in their ranks. They have indeed been tested to the limit, and are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have held themselves in leash. I ask them to continue in that spirit, and I ask the government to see that the situation is taken up and an offer of help made. I ask them to respond in the spirit in which we of

the Opposition have offered to assist.

MR. BENNETT—Just a word, Mr. Speaker in corroboration of the statements of the members of St. John's that of the loan originally granted a portion was intended for the purchase of water pipes—some \$30,000. That, I think, the Council negotiated months ago, before this situation arose. The pipes would not be here for some time and as the money had been ear-marked for this purpose, they refused to spend it on other work. As has been pointed out they are not a Council, but a Commission and should do as they are told or resign. I hope and feel that the situation will be overcome and that such a step as their resignation will not be necessary. One feature about this employment in which I fear sufficient enquiry has not been made, is as to who is really in need of employment. I have here a letter, which if correct, as I have no doubt it is, will show the indescribable state of things in St. John's West. Before the last election we started to build a road to circle Mundy's Pond, but it was stopped 10 days before nomination. Then the Winter came on, and it was not completed that Fall. Now they are working on it. While I had the honor of representing St. John's West, a period of 17 years, there was never any discrimination as to work shown there. If a man asked for work, he was treated as his neighbor. I am sorry to say this is not the case now. A few days ago the Minister of Public Works tabled a statement which showed that at Gunner's Cove \$2,000 was expended on work, and not one of my supporters got a day's employment. I will not mention names, but I will read this letter which is from a hard working man with a large family. He states that work was given to four men of one family though they had no children to support or school or clothing to provide for, while he, the writer, who has a large family was not taken on and had be-

come tired of asking the Inspector for a job. He is asking for aid for a dozen other families as well as his own. If this case be true there is discrimination of the worst kind, as the four men mentioned are single, Are the children to starve while others not needing it are given employment. I ask the Prime Minister to look into this and if these are deserving cases to give them help. Those not in need should not be employed. The money was given to aid those in distress and why are they kept out. We are not here to-day to help the well-off, but the poor and destitute. I hope that from this afternoon care will be taken to see that the deserving get the work and if they are too weak to stand up, give them a chance to get some food into their bodies. A few days ago a man working near Bennett's Dam actually fell down from hunger. It was not proper to discharge that man; he should be given a chance to get some nourishment. Though I said a few moments ago, I would have nothing to do with it. I am prepared to support any steps you, Mr. Prime Minister, may take to get over this situation. If you can meet it you will have my endorsement and admiration. Again I wish to express my sympathy with the gentlemen at the Bar.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation of the assurances of co-operation by Mr. Bennett and his colleagues in this matter. In reference to what Mr. Bennett has stated, I say there is no need of any family being destitute. At no moment since the opening of the road in the West End has the full number of men been employed on it; there is always been room for from 50 to 80 more. No man has been refused employment because he was not poor. The work is under direction of the West End Inspector who is a thoroughly capable man. If any man in that section where the work is going on is out of employment, all

he has to do is apply for it. Mr. Fox has put it as to the Council very clearly; the plans laid at that meeting were definite. As he will remember, I even offered the assistance of the surveyors from the Crown Lands Office in arranging for the work. They made their survey and to make sure that everything was alright, I was at the spot at 7 o'clock in the morning to see that all were on the job, and that the work was taken up. I have been assured the work has gone on well though the full number of men has not been employed. It may be as Mr. Higgins says, that the loan of \$150,000 is the crux of the whole situation. It never occurred to me that such an impression as he refers to could get abroad; that \$35,000 was for material and \$115,000 for labor. Eighty thousand was for water works which means there would be \$35,000 short.

MR. HIGGINS—The Council has ear-marked \$80,000 and would not start other work with it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the Council wants that we will facilitate them in the matter.

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 27th.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. Prime Minister, in order to facilitate the discussion of the Budget, to lay on the Table of the House the following statements:

(a) Details of the item, "Amount of

- arrears collectable from the A.A. Telegraph Company—\$180,000.00 appearing on page two of the typescript of his Budget Speech.
- (b) Details of the estimated balance to the credit of Surplus Trust Account as at June 30th, 1921, amounting to \$3,001,186," as shown on page three.
- (c) Details of the "amount expended for which Supplemental Supply will be sought, estimated at \$1,151,961," as shown on page three.
- (d) Details of expenditure under Audit Act \$380,000, as shown on page three.
- (e) Why, in his estimate of Interest payments of \$42,500 on the new Loan for the thirteen months from June first next to June 30th, 1922, he makes no provision for exchange which at present is about twelve per cent. and which at that rate would represent an additional charge of about \$50,000.
- (f) If in his plans for meeting our obligations he is making any provision for liquidating our loan to the British Government, roundly two million dollars, and if not why not, as he claims that the Colony will have two and one-half million dollars out of the total Loan of six million dollars as a reserve.
- (g) An outline of the proposed scheme of reducing salaries of public officials.
- (h) Details of the \$2,500,000 described as approximately for Railway purposes, on page 9.
- (i) Details of the one million dollars described as "a refund to the Surplus Trust Account of moneys paid out for war purposes, which sum should have been borne on capital account" as told on the same page.
- (j) What liabilities, if any, will exist as against the sum approximately \$2,500,000 which he claims the Colony will have out of the six million dollar loan as a reserve as shown on page 9, also
- (k) From what source he proposes to pay (1) any losses sustained on the Government's purchase of fish, salt, and sugar; (2) guarantees on pit props, fishery supplies and other things, if any; (3) payments on account of Poor Relief and any extraordinary undertakings during the present calendar year; and (4) expenditure on the railway after the first of June next:
- (l) What steps does the Government propose to take in the event of the Reid Newfoundland Company failing to operate the railroad system after July 1st, and how are the financial obligations which would then ensue to the Colony be met;
- (m) A statement giving the names, positions and salaries of all new appointments to the public service, including Trade Commissioners, Educational Inspectors and others, made since the 15th of November, 1919.
- (n) The amount of money on deposits in the Newfoundland Savings Bank, and in the Savings' Bank Department of the other Banks doing business in this Colony on the 31st of Dec., 1920, 1919, 1918, 1917, 1916, as shown by the annual reports of these banks to the Department of Finance and Customs, also the amount of deposits bearing interest in the various Banks doing business in the Colony at the end of each of the above years, as shown by the same statement.
- (o) A statement of the Customs Revenue for the financial year of 1920 giving (1) the amounts received at the various rates of duty as far as possible, (2) the amount of the present surtax of ten per cent. on duties and (3)

what increase in the existing rates of duties, roundly will the special War Tax of twenty-five per cent. represent.

- (p) A statement of the dutiable imports and free imports for each of the past five financial years, the amount of duty paid in each of these years, distinguishing between the regular duty and the surtax in each year.
- (q) Details of his proposed scheme for a sales tax and how he proposes to raise by this means a sum of \$900,000 as indicated on page 6, of his typescript.
- (r) To Table a copy of the Customs Blue Book for the financial year 1919-20 if printed and if not to table a manuscript copy of the same;
- (s) To Table a copy of the detailed statement of the expenditure of the Colony for the financial year 1919-20.
- (t) To Table copies of all correspondence and reports of the Auditor General in connection with the proposed reductions in the salaries of Civil Servants, the proposed special War Tax and the proposed Sales Tax, and any other correspondence with reference to matters covered in the Budget.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that it would require some time to prepare an answer to this question as asked by him on to-day's Order Paper but I will ask the reporter to take it down and furnish it to the Leader of the Opposition as soon as possible.

With respect to

(a) That amount of one hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$180,000) is an amount which the Anglo American Company will owe the Government up to July next, I have not the exact dates. As to this sum of one

hundred and eighty thousand due by the Company as to whether there is a difference of one or two months does not materially affect the discussion of the Budget.

(b) These will be tabled shortly.

(c) I hope to have these this evening and if I do not have them before the House closes I will send them to the Leader of the Opposition to-night or to-morrow morning.

(d) This sum was spent out of the sum of Five hundred thousand dollars on the purchase of fish. This sum is the estimated expenditure. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not know there was a letter of credit and the amounts as drawn were only member knows well the procedure. then placed to credit. I think the hon. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had authority to draw to the extent of five hundred thousand but the five hundred thousand was not at any time placed to his credit. A Minute of Council authorized the drawing out of a sum up to Five hundred thousand dollars and no more.

(e) The exchange was not included for this reason. The Government for the past few years has had a large credit balance on exchange account. The credit balance on exchange account is in the vicinity of forty-four or forty-five thousand dollars. It was estimated that the situation next year would be somewhat similar to the last year, the English exchange would go up and there would be a depreciation of the American exchange so there would be a few thousand dollars one way or the other. I estimated sterling on the basis of four dollars and eighty-six and two-thirds cents and I put the American dollar at one hundred cents just the same as the Minister of Finance three years ago estimated his basis. If you put the American dollar above par then you would have to put the Sterling under.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You are out many thousands of dollars. Answer my question. Don't be afraid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You have asked the question and I have answered it.

(f) No. The loan due the British Government will be brought forward in the Estimates.

(g) That will be introduced in the form of a special Bill or Resolution. It is to the following effect. Ten per cent. reduction on salaries up to five hundred dollars; from five hundred to one thousand dollars, fifteen per cent.; over one thousand dollars, twenty per cent.; that does not mean that the man with a salary over one thousand will have to pay twenty per cent.; first ten per cent. on the first five hundred; fifteen per cent on the second five hundred and twenty per cent. on the amount over one thousand. The estimated gross reduction will amount to slightly over two hundred and thirty-one thousand dollars taking the exact figures of the department.

(h) That sum includes first a temporary loan raised from the Bank of Montreal. The further sum of one million is the sum necessary according to the Auditor General's report to close the railway transaction from June 1921. This includes the purchase of engines, the cost of the Argentinia terminal, the cost of coal operations, railway ballasting and ties. This is giving you a general idea. I desire to give the information as fully as possible. The details of the question will be laid on the table later to-day.

(i & j) I will send these to the home of Sir Michael Cashin as soon as I receive them. They are in accordance with my observations with respect to the supplemental supply.

(k) With regard to the purchase of fish with the sum of three hundred and eighty thousand dollars that whole sum is a debit. The credit does not show any amount at all. The

amount paid out was three hundred and eighty thousand dollars in accordance with the papers already tabled.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—There are other expenses besides. I would like to get in detail a statement of that fish transaction covering amount paid for storage and labour up to present time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will get that for the hon. member.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I was told outside this House that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not going to answer my questions but was going to evade them. I was told by a gentleman who is a friend of his. The proof of the truth of that statement is that you have left unanswered about forty questions on the order paper. The Prime Minister has done his best to answer them for you but there have been no answers from your department. You will have to answer them.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—There are no more than five outstanding unanswered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—you are not as you ought to be. You are under a cloud and you know it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This is more of your dirt and if you want to be dirty I can defend myself.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—This Colony has paid ten thousand five hundred dollars for your dirt and I have a copy here. You brought down a number of auditors here to incriminate Sir John Crosbie and myself. This is where you have exhibited your foul dirt. And then you have impudence to get up here and talk to me like that. You are a beaten dirty cur and you know it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES. — The Government brought them down to see how the accounts and the various matters stood in the different departments.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—No, you brought them down to enquire into the doings of the late Government. I will furnish copy of it. You tried to furnish the country with proof that I was a scoundrel and a robber; and that cost the Colony ten thousand five hundred dollars. You have no right to dictate to me like that. You have a wrong conception of your duty to your country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Before I resume my observations I wish Mr. Speaker, to have it noted that the Leader of the Opposition described the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a beaten dirty cur. I merely want that noted.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If you do not believe it I will write it over to you.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—With regard to question (k) re salt, on the debit side of the account there is the sum of seventy six thousand dollars and the entire credit is twenty seven thousand, four hundred dollars and the difference between the two is the total cost. The surplus trust account shows a deficit of the differences between the debit and credit which is the loss.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I think the Prime Minister is mistaken, (reads portion of the Budget Speech). That cargo went to Port Union. The last page of the Budget Speech estimates the surplus trust fund as it will stand on the end of June 31st., 1921. At the bottom of page there is a credit of \$77,767.02, because the surplus trust paid it out as a banker would do so, it appears as a credit when it really is a debit. That is the total paid by the Colony. The credit is \$27,400. With regard to the loss on Sugar, the total expenditure on sugar it appears as a credit in the surplus trust accounts, is \$184,000. That sum has been transferred to a special account at the Bank of Montreal in the name of the Food Control Board. To this there has

to be credited between forty and fifty thousand dollars, and the two and one half cents duty until the account is liquidated. The sugar situation has been anything but a sweet thing for me. With respect to the guarantees on pit props, fishery supplies, and other things, as to the pit props the owner has to give notice to the government by the first day of June as to the number of pit props he has taken up and the number he has sold. As to Poor relief, the amount of liability incurred up to the present is included in the Supplemental Supply. As to the expenditure on the railway after the first of June next, the government anticipates that the control of the railway Commission will cease on the 31st of June next and then the Company will or will not continue in the performance of its contractual obligations to the colony, and if it throws them down then it will go into liquidation. All the assets of the Company and its stock will go for the security to the government

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—If the leader of the Opposition will pardon me I will now answer his question re the Municipal Loan. The debt due by the Council to this date not including the present Royal Bank guarantee is one million four hundred and twenty nine thousand dollars, (\$1,429,000). To this there has to be added approximately three hundred and twenty thousand (\$320,000) the amount of the already liability of the Council to the Bank plus the new loan of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000).

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the answer handed me yesterday, to a question of mine asked the other day, and in reading the reply it would appear that there was other correspondence not furnished. How did Lea, Higginson and Company find out

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I took up the matter first when I was in Montreal in December, re the Bell Island matter. I had an interview with the people and asked them to send the Manager of the Dominion Securities to Newfoundland. All the negotiations were personal up to a few weeks ago. There was never any financial statement. I told the manager to see the Auditor General and the Minister of Finance and get all the facts he wanted. I do not know of any memo in writing.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Is it not possible to find out whether there was any other correspondence or not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will find out. There was no writing to my knowledge. When he visited the Auditor General the representative talked over the financial affairs of the country. I am not aware that he got a statement from the Finance Minister.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Will you undertake to ask those people if they had a financial statement of the country from here?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will undertake to hand over any memo passing from the Auditor General or the Finance Minister.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Do you think these people were going to give a loan to the country without being furnished with a financial statement of the country? I will now tell you exactly the statement you gave him. You gave him the statement we handed down in 1919-20, and I go further and say that it may be claimed you obtained money under false pretences.

MR. HIGGINS—Arising out of the correspondence re the loan to the colony there is a letter dated May the 10th, 1921. I understand from the Prime Minister then there was no correspondence previous to May the 10th. Is it to be understood that this correspondence really occurred after this gentleman had reported to his principals?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I cannot tell you what report he made to his principals.

MR. HIGGINS—You can surely speak for yourself while in Montreal. Do you mean to tell us that they confined themselves to enquiries concerning the conditions of the country twelve months ago?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We did not discuss the financial position of Newfoundland. We came to the conclusion when they agreed to consider a loan to this colony.

MR. HIGGINS—This correspondence is very meagre and surely you ought to be able to find out what was done in the matter with regard to writing.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Finance gave this gentleman all the information he required. I told the representative to get the information from what sources he liked and then come and see me.

MR. HIGGINS—You say there was nothing in writing so far as you know but you must recognize that they were not going to give a loan without having some thing in writing with regard to enquire as to the standing of the country. I endorse the position of the leader of the Opposition that at the next session we have some information from the Auditor General as to what happened.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I am sorry the Prime Minister did not tell us before that this gentleman was in town.

MR. BENNETT—I notice there is an absence of a Minute of Council which to my mind is essential to confirm such an arrangement as this. Was there one?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes. I was not asked to furnish it.

MR. SINNOTT—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of Capt. Walter Ken-

ney's expenses as Ships' Agent or Trade Commissioner for the calendar year 1920-21.

MR. MOORE—Asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House, a statement showing the total amount paid Messrs. Stafford—Druggists of this city, for drugs and other requisitions for the different public institutions from November 15, 1919 up to March 31st 1921, and to lay on the Table of the House, for inspection by Hon. members, the original bills furnished by Messrs. Stafford in regard thereto.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 30th, 1921.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled report of Commission on Prohibition.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, before going on with the business of the House I would like to ask the Prime Minister if any decision has been reached with respect to supplying

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Yes, the intention of the government is to let the various districts have an advance per capita on the basis of a \$500,000 dollar fish guarantee out of a new loan account. This will be available when the new loan bill is past. The question as to each district will be left in the hands of the representatives of the district. It will be on a per capita basis. A half million was all the government thought it could spend.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—If that is so \$12,000 is all we will get for Ferryland District; you can take that and add it to some other district. You have spent practically all the revenue of the Colony in other districts. You have recently added \$80,000 to the Marine grant in Bonavista district. You have given half a million dollars for fish in a few districts that the rest of the country could not avail of. That was done in your absence. Now the rest of the districts must put up with their per capita share.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—How is this going to be distributed?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a copy of the report of the Royal Commission on the matter of intoxicating liquors.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Justice, do I understand that the City Council at yesterday's sitting decided that inasmuch as the Commercial Cable Co., are now and have for sometime been doing business in this City if it is in order for the Council to collect the Telegraph Tax of four hundred dollars from that Company, and it was ordered that this be done forthwith?

Do I understand that the Act empowering the Council to impose this tax also empowers the Council to permit the Company paying the tax to carry on business in the city, and I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice how this will effect the exclusive rights of telegraphy as vested in the Nfld. Postal Telegraphs by special

Act of Legislature enacted, 1904 and what he proposes to do to preserve the integrity of these rights or are they being allowed to be by default.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have no knowledge of what was decided by the City Council at the sitting referred to. Any question of law regarding the City Council is one for the decision of the City Council's solicitor.

I cannot find anything in the Act referred to empowering the City Council to permit any telegraph company to carry on business in the colony. I have advised the government as to its rights, and I understand the matter is in the hands of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

MR. MOORE—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity as Chairman of the Railway Commission:

- (a) if the new "folder" for the railroad recently issued was with his authority, and if not why;
- (b) how many copies were ordered and what was the cost of same.
- (c) was any person paid any sum of money for the preparation of the reading matter in the book, and if so, whom and what sum,
- (d) what was the cost of the ordinary time-table folder previously used and what amount would have been saved by continuing the old folder, and what is the object of issuing an expensive folder like the present and inducing tourists and other travellers to come here at a time when we have no hotels or other facilities for their convenience, and when, according to leading members of the government, the Railroad is in such a hopelessly broken down condition that it is unsafe to human life to travel over?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if, in view of the Prime

Minister's statement that the government intends to cancel the present arrangement for the operation of the railway at the end of June he has made any commitments involving the government in any financial liabilities with respect to the ballasting or improving of the Railroad across the country or other services which would involve the Colony in any payments after June 30th, and if so, to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the said commitments and an estimate of the amount the same will cost the colony.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement certified by the Auditor-General showing:

- (a) the disposition of the Temporary Loan of \$1,500,000 raised by the Bank of Montreal on account of the Loan Act of last year, and giving the amounts paid for the purchase, freight, and setting up of the six locomotives recently brought in here;
- (b) the purchase, freight and cost of setting up of the fifty freight cars under erection;
- (c) the cost and freight on the fish plates for the Railroad if ordered and the cost of putting in position such of these as have been applied to the Railway irons on the main line or elsewhere;
- (d) how the remainder of the sum of one million dollars provided in the Loan Act for Railway purposes has been spent;
- (e) the amount spent on coal boring and other work and expenses in connection therewith at South Branch and what has become of the balance of the \$500,000 appropriated by the Loan Act for coal boring purposes?

Also a statement showing:

- (a) the amount applied from Current Revenue or Surplus Trust Fund month by month since the first of July last towards the cost of op-

erating the Reid Newfoundland Railroad system and steamboat services, and

- (b) the amount required to be applied to such purposes for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Also to show the actual loss, on the operation

- (a) of the Reid Newfoundland Company's Railroad system and
 (b) steamboat services during the current year and the amount provided
 (a) towards the Railroad and
 (b) towards the steamboat services, and a statement showing the loss on operation of the Reid Railroad System for the five previous years as shown by the statements already furnished by the Reid Co. to the government in regard there to.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the hand-book of Newfoundland, under preparation by Dr. Mosdell has yet been completed, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the same.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I ask to have all the questions directed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries particularly number seven of Mr. Moore deferred. The information in answer to question number two was sent to the home of the Leader of the Opposition on Saturday night at about nine o'clock. I beg to lay on the table of the House a copy of the Book referred to in question three of Sir Michael Cashin.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Education if his annual report is yet ready and if not when it is likely to be; if it is his intention to introduce any legislation this year to give effect to the promises of the government with regard to education progress and reform and if not will he say what services are being performed by him and his staff which justify the maintenance of his Department

and the expenditure of public money on the officials?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF EDUCATION—In reply to the honorable gentleman I have to say that the annual report is not yet ready on account of the printer's strike, but the party who has the handling of the work tells me I may be able to have a copy of it in ten days time, and as to the second part of the question I have to say that it is not the intention of the government to introduce any educational legislation during the present session and the services performed by the Minister and the Department are those imposed by means of legislation passed during the last session of this House.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—What about the Address to His Excellency?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Min. of Marine and Fisheries is out of town.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—It is not necessary to have him here. I understand he is not coming to town until next week. He was here last week, and it looks as if you are purposely putting it off. We ought to deal with it right away.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Three or four days ago, it was decided to go into Committee of the Whole on these Loan Resolutions, and it behoves us I think to make immediate progress from the country's standpoint.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I beg to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that we asked for a copy of the statement furnished the Financial Agents by the Auditor General when the representative was here previous to the raising of this loan and we cannot go on till we get the particulars of that statement. On Friday last you told us he got from the Auditor General the necessary information as to the financial standing of the country. Until we get a copy of that statement, whether it was fur-

nished by the Auditor General, the Finance Minister, or the Prime Minister, signed by the Auditor General, we cannot proceed with this loan Bill wherein is involved the raising of six million dollars. There is no reason why the particulars in this connection cannot be tabled and thereby give satisfaction to the country and to the House. I think the Prime Minister will see likewise. We must have this financial statement before we can proceed.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I telegraphed the Auditor General this morning who is away because his wife is ill, making enquiry as to whether such a statement was ever given or not. There is no record in the department and under my opinion no such statement was ever given by him. The leader of the Opposition was Finance Minister one time himself and for a long time and I think he will agree with me that in the interests of the colony that it is imperative that we make expeditious progress, yet if he desires to have this matter adjourned until later to-day or until to-morrow. I shall be only too happy to extend him the courtesy, provided there is a bona fide feeling on the other side to expedite this loan bill according to parliamentary debate and to have this very necessary transaction closed as quickly as possible. Time is vitally important in so far as the exchange is concerned on the one hand and the saving of our interest on the other, and if the leader of the Opposition will facilitate this matter so far as the ordinary procedure of the House will permit I shall be only too happy to have the matter stand over until we get a reply from the Auditor General. I have no desire to press this matter but from the stand point of the country it is very important that as much despatch as is reasonably possible ought to be made.

SIR M. P. CASHIN,—I thank the Prime Minister for the courtesy ex-

tended to me, but I think the Prime Minister will agree with me that no important financial house is going to loan a large sum of money to any country whether the firm is an English, American, or Canadian one, without first having a statement showing the financial standing of the borrowing country, and it is certain somebody must have furnished a financial statement in Great Britain, United States, and Canada before they entered into negotiations re this loan, and it is necessary to have this financial statement before this House. Yes it is true I had previous experience and I had advertisements issued and they were soon grabbed up and looked over by a half dozen specialists and I take it the same thing should have been done in this matter. It is only folly to tell us that a financial statement was not given. On what basis did the people loan the money if they had no statement? Did they not ask for a statement showing the trade of the Colony and its resources? I feel sure all this information was furnished before these firms undertook to talk loan matters and I notice there was not any notice given to the outside world. There was no advertisement given to Canada or the United States and this loan was negotiated by the Prime Minister when in Montreal last December. There are many other firms in Canada and the United States that had no intimation of this loan and I do not agree with the Prime Minister that that is the right way to raise a loan. I think some one must have given a financial statement. The Prime Minister also lost a quarter of a million dollars to the Colony by reason of the way he went about raising this sum of money. If the proper advertisement had been inserted in Canada and the United States you would have had applications from many firms, including Wood Gundy & Company. I learned from Wood Gun-

dy & Company they had no notice of this loan. It was simply and purely a private negotiation. It should have been handled as you would sell any article of commerce and thereby receive tenders and then have the tenders opened in the presence of the various agents of the firms who made application, in the Finance Minister's office and the lowest tender, if according to Hoyle, accepted. When I was Finance Minister we advertised the loan abroad and received five or six tenders and they were opened in the Finance Minister's office in the presence of the various representatives of the firms interested who had come to St. John's from the United States and Canada. The Finance Minister and his Solicitor were also present. The tenders were opened, the lowest tender from Wood Gundy & Company was accepted. But the Prime Minister opened up this loan and I ask him to have furnished to this House the Statement given by the Auditor General, as we cannot go on without it. By reason of the Prime Minister's method of raising the same we lost, or rather the United States beat us, seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars. According to what the Prime Minister told us we only received eighty-eight for the loan. I happen to have an advertisement here which I will read. (Reads.)

MR. BENNETT.—I think the House will feel very grateful to the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, for throwing so much light on the subject because the more we consider this loan the more astounded we are at the price this country is called upon to pay for this accommodation. It looks very heroic for the Government to raise this loan but the limits have been reached when this country only is getting eighty-eight dollars out of every one hundred dollars in New York funds and when we have to pay six and one half per cent. in New

York funds as well. The astounding part of it all is the fact that the loan is floated in New York at ninety-three and five-eighths, an increase over the price by five-eighths per cent. for every dollar we give. That is to be the price we shall have to pay for this accommodation. The person on the street there is asked to pay ninety-three and five-eighths but the underwriters price was eighty-eight and we now come to the position that vital information is asked for and it must be forthcoming before we are prepared to give our endorsement to this loan. The leader of the Opposition had to drag for this information. The question has not been answered and I agree with him and endorse his intention, that no financial firm in the United States, Canada or Great Britain will advance one dollar to this country without being first furnished with a statement as to the financial standing of the country. It is absolutely absurd to think that any intelligent person will accept the statement that there was no such statement. We want the document or some concrete information and we must have it before we can proceed. In the interest of the country we must get this information first. It is only right and proper that we should.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Fitzgerald, to whom reference has been made, was sacrificed last year because he did not see eye to eye with the Minister of Education. He has been in the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the last ten or twelve years, and he was one of the best officials of the Civil Service, but there was some misunderstanding and with the assistance of the great poo bah, his excellency I think he is called by some, who has ruined the codfishery and is now starting to ruin the salmon fishery, Mr. Fitzgerald was thrown out on the street. The Prime Minister is here this afternoon straining himself trying

to tell us what is happening down in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I think you had better leave this matter until we can get the gentleman who organized the department here.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government with respect to the Inland Fisheries is absolutely contemptible and unworthy. The salmon fishery of this country can be made second to the codfishery, but instead we are pursuing a policy of waste with agriculture. Last year we voted \$50,000 for this department, and now again we are asked to vote another \$50,000. It is nothing short of outrageous, and the country should not stand for it. We have not had one dollar's return from the Agriculture & Mines Department, but we are seriously asked to vote that department \$50,000 and we cannot do a thing for the fishermen of the country who are looking for supplies. Men who pose as representatives of the fishermen come in here and ask us to vote this money.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the policy of the present Government with respect to the Agriculture & Mines Department is merely a continuance of the policy of previous Governments. I can appreciate the enthusiasm of the hon. member for St. John's West regarding the Inland Fisheries, he being a member of that Board, but I do not think that the dropping of that vote is going to be such a serious matter as the hon. member seems to think.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the general purposes of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR M P. CASHIN.—If you are going to hand the cable back to the Commercial Cable Company, you have got to go back for years and hand it back to the Anglo Telegraph Company. I do not propose to go into the matter at any length to-night, but I will certainly take the very earliest opportunity to discuss it. Why not give us the whole correspondence? Why give it to us piecemeal, if we are to deal with it intelligently in this House I am sure that this House and this country will be surprised when the whole correspondence is read; and I am sure that the correspondence never took place within the knowledge of the Attorney General. The ordinary school boy would not write the letters that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs wrote to the President of the Commercial Cable Company. The revenue annually from the Anglo is something in the vicinity of a hundred thousand dollars, as against thirty or thirty-five thousand from the Commercial Cable Co. Moreover the Commercial Cable Company have nothing to offer the Government. They have nothing but two cables; but the Anglo Company have eighteen cables in and out of this country to-day. Had I known that this was going to happen, I would have brought this correspondence down, but I asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to table the correspondence in full, not a little bit to-day and another bit to-morrow. It is just as much my business and every other man's in the country, as it is the Minister's. Why should he take the matter in his own hands and make an offer to the Commercial Cable Co., when the matter should be dealt with by this House, and in this House, not after the House closes. If you do this after the House closes you will be in the same position as Sir

Robert Bond. In his case when the contract came up it was thrown out and justly so. This matter requires to be gone into by someone who understands it. From the correspondence which I have received I believe that Mr. Halfyard knows nothing about it, and it is a matter which means thousands of dollars to the country. The offer made to us by the Anglo American Telegraph Co., in 1918, if carried out, means a quarter of a million dollars to this Colony. They made an offer to carry our correspondence in and out of this country free, and to give us twenty cents and two cents for every extra word on every other message in or out of this country. We had a cable from Port aux Basques to Canso and from that we never collected more than forty thousand dollars and we had to bear the expenses of that cable, the offices, salaries, and the keeping up of the line at the other end. The Anglo people say we will give you all correspondence free, we will give you twenty cents and two cents on every message transmitted, and in addition to that we will give you the telephone system in St. John's, which is equivalent to fifty thousand dollars. In return for this we want that cable from Port aux Basques to Sydney. That cable across the Gulf cost one hundred and five thousand dollars before the war. For this they would give us their own lines in Newfoundland. As you know here in this country you can go to a small outport and you will find two offices side by side, an Anglo office and Government office, where there is not enough revenue for one. If the Government accepted this offer they could use whichever of the offices suited best and close up the other one. In addition to this we would get the telephone system, or as they have sold out to another company, the amount they received from that Company instead. They want

this cable across the Gulf in return. That cost one hundred and five thousand dollars thirteen or fourteen years ago. The life of cables is I believe twenty-five years. The depreciation on that cable to-day would not warrant more than half that amount from the Anglo people, and if you accept that offer and the country receives an increased revenue of eighty or seventy or sixty thousand a year because of it, in times like these, are we not in a better position than when we were running the cables in 1914, when the most we ever got was from thirty to forty thousand dollars. Then here we find that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs says to the President of the Commercial Cable Co., I am heartily sorry for the manner in which the late Government handled the affairs in Newfoundland. It would make the saddest man in Newfoundland laugh to read that correspondence and see it as I see it and what it means to the country. I would suggest to the Attorney General and to the Prime Minister that at the earliest opportunity they bring this matter before the House, and let the House dispose of it in the proper way, as it means a quarter of a million dollars to the country. Instead of this you are taking that quarter of a million off Civil Servants and you know that you can have it for the asking. Mr. Halfyard was the most surprised man in the House when I told him that if he had accepted that offer he would be owed that money by those people. You get in touch with the Commercial Cable Co., who have no line across the Gulf, and here is the Anglo American Telegraph Co., with eighteen lines, all over two hemispheres. This is purely a business transaction and a very good one. The Commercial Cable Co. are doing business here now without leave. They started about three or four weeks ago. Surely that is not

permissible. If they can do so there is no reason why the Reid Newfoundland Co., or any other private concern who can put a cable here should not do so. The trouble is that this offer is too good to be true. That is what Mr. Halfyard thought and what his officials thought. Some people thought that this twenty and a two applied only to messages over Government lines but that is not so. When the Commercial Cable Co. came here it was not for the benefit of Newfoundland. They put a cable across the ocean first and they found they could not do sufficient business, and they put a repeating station at St. John's, which meant that they could do one-third more business. That is the reason they are here, and that is why we did not ratify their contract in 1909 after Sir Robert Bond was defeated and we came into power. I would suggest that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice go into this matter and I am sure that after reading this correspondence which I have received, no member will sanction an agreement such as is hinted at by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks in reply to Sir Michael Cashin. It seems that the Opposition side of the House is the only place where you can learn anything. I suppose the explanation is that they have no business of Government to take their attention. The business with the Commercial Cable Co. terminated in 1918. In August or September of 1919 the Government of that day of which Sir Michael Cashin was the leader, sent the Postmaster General of that day, Dr. Robinson, to Canada to try to make arrangements with the C.P.R. people to take over the Newfoundland cable business, and it was only recently upon receiving a message from Mr. McMillan of that Company, referring to a contract be-

tween the Newfoundland Government and the C.P.R., drafted in August, 1919, that I knew such a contract existed, and my deputy knew nothing of it whatever, and the Deputy Colonial Secretary was some time looking it up. It was found that a contract between the Government and the C.P.R. had been drafted on similar lines to the one with the Commercial Cable Co., with certain disadvantages when compared with the Commercial Cable Co. agreement. Sir Michael Cashin was Premier at the time and that was twelve or thirteen months after we had broken off business with the Commercial Cable Co., and the Anglo American Telegraph Co., was doing our business and that proposed contract was read and re-read by Sir Michael Cashin, as it had been presented to him in Oct. 1918.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I never saw the correspondence you refer to.

MR. HALFYARD.—Sir Michael Cashin says he knew nothing of that proposition and he was acting Premier and Chairman of a committee of the Executive Council in conjunction with Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Clift with regard to negotiations on behalf of the Government with the Anglo American Co. Now if you want the correspondence since 1918 to date I will bring it down and find out all the notes passed and repassed by you as Acting Premier and Chairman of that Committee. Sir Michael talks in a grieved fashion because we did not enter into a contract with the Anglo Co., which proposition was made to him in 1918, thirteen months before the Squires administration assumed office. Now can I be blamed for trying to induce the Commercial Cable Co. to do our business on similar lines as they did up to August 1918, which item estimated would have given us a revenue of one hundred thousand dollars where we were not getting a cent.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That is not correct. You are forgetting that the agreement was until 1918, and no year from 1914 did we earn more than forty thousand dollars.

MR. HALFYARD.—I will give you figures. The fact of the matter is that Sir Michael Cashin knows more of this matter to-day than ever he did, and if he is honest he will admit it. He knew nothing of it when we broke off business with the Commercial Cable Co. One of the chief reasons why the Government of the day turned down the Anglo proposition was that they considered there should be competition, but as far as I am concerned there is no sentiment in connection with it. We want a revenue and what I did I am not a bit ashamed of, nor of the correspondence which I, as an act of courtesy, gave Sir Michael Cashin the correspondence and trusted to his honour. I told Mr. Bennett that negotiations were going on between the different companies and it would not be advisable to have it tabled, and he let it go at that. Sir Michael Cashin said it would be alright to show him the correspondence. If he thinks it should be tabled personally I don't care but it is nevertheless a breach of honour. It is time for someone to do something. We are trying to do it. You tried to do it while you were Premier. You sent Dr. Robinson up to Canada to interview the C.P.R. people. You were making arrangements to get a steamer to repair the Canso Cable. If I were to table that correspondence it would look much more ridiculous than you claim mine does. However I am glad Sir Michael is so interested in this matter, it is an important matter. I will be only too pleased to have his support, as apparently he has as good a knowledge of conditions that obtain, much better than he had in 1918 and 1919. He has admitted to me that we did not know

what we were doing at that time. I hope that this matter will be finalized soon and that some arrangement will be made to give the Postal Telegraphs a revenue. Even with this new proposition we don't know that the trade will be satisfied because of cable rates. Mr. Chairman, I hope Sir Michael Cashin will reconsider the matter of tabling this correspondence, I don't care but we are all working for the common interest of the country and I don't think it will help to table this correspondence.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You have only tabled one-half of the correspondence between Dr. Robinson and the people he went to see.

MR. HALFYARD.—In answering questions we have been accused of going out of our way to answer things we have not been asked, and I was under the impression that Sir Michael Cashin was familiar with any correspondence that transpired during his term of office.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—May I ask Mr. Halfyard as he has such a good knowledge of this matter whether he considers the Anglo proposition or the Commercial Cable Co.'s proposition the best. He has given both these offers consideration and which does he consider best for the country.

MR. HALFYARD.—I would like for some arrangement to be made with some company.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The Commercial Cable Co. have only one cable where the Anglo American Telegraph Co. control two hemispheres, and as far as the Trade is concerned, the trade here is nothing like so important as the trade in Canada or the United States, and they are operating there.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Speaker, now I would like to remind Mr. Halfyard that I remember sitting with him when this matter was brought up for discussion, and he was just as ambi-

tious for us to turn down the Commercial Cable Co., as anyone else, and it was on the advice of Sir William Lloyd also that it was done. He also knows what happened when Dr. Robinson went to the C.P.R. people to try to make arrangements. The Commercial Cable Co. jumped in and said we will not allow you to do this, we will not allow you to do business with the Nfld. Government. You did not know what the C.P.R. could do but let me tell you that the C.P.R. does as much business as the Commercial Cable Co., but they had a deal with the Commercial Cable Co. and the Commercial Cable Co. would not allow them to come down here. Lord Shaunessey who was the man in charge of this agreed to do what we wanted, and when Dr. Robinson went up he found that the Commercial Cable Co. had blocked the matter. If it were not for the Anglo American Co. we would get nothing from this Company at all. You know that. What I can't understand is that you have been flirting with that crowd, and the man making you do so is one David Stott, who is always meddling with such contracts and you can tell him to-morrow I said so. If you did not want the Commercial Cable Co. in 1918 and 19 why do you want them now? What I want to say here and now is that the quicker we get this thing fixed the better, and I want to see the correspondence referred to myself, I was on that Committee you referred to, and I would like to see all the correspondence and refresh my memory on the matter.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker. I would like to say that it is quite time now to suggest to the government and to Mr. Jennings in particular, now that the government is in the Liquor business that they adopt the suggestion of the Committee appointed to go into this matter. They recommend that the Controller's Department be abol-

ished in the sense of Controller, and in its place we have a Clergyman, Medical man and a business man in charge on the Board, and make a State business of it, and to offset the making of moonshine that Liquor be sold to householders, and the matter be left to the government as to quantity. Might I suggest to the government that now that they are Liquor Vendors that they compete with Cuba and British Columbia. It is no news that you cannot get a passage to the former place because of the influx of American tourists. May I suggest to the Prime Minister, as he said that the Railway is going into the hands of a receiver and as there has been a loss on it of two and a half million dollars, that you avail of Cuba's example and send men out along the road, and extend your State Control. The position is that the government wants money and the government is taking a very rational means of getting it. We all know that the lid is off. If you extend the control out along the country, the amount of travellers on the railway would go a long way to make up the loss. My friend Mr. MacDonnell here who travels across country suggests a Bar in the Dining Car would be acceptable. It is about time now to quit this hypocrisy about Prohibition. When we talked about the injustice of it, hon. members from other sections of the country, cast up their eyes to Heaven in holy horror, and said that they didn't want to have anything to do with liquor, and now we are told that we are setting out to make a half million dollars on liquor. It is just as well to cut out all this. It only gets back to the position that we have been saying all along. Honourable members opposite want to get money to increase their own salaries, and allow the sale of liquors to a certain extent for that purpose. The whole thing is a joke, and a farce of the worst kind. I say

seriously that it would be far better to have no prohibition at all. As I said last year I repeat now—the carrying out of the Prohibition Act is an absolute scandal. Apart altogether from the talk we hear about the prevention of smuggling, the manner in which liquor is got to-day is a huge joke. Why not wipe out the script system entirely? Leave the Controller there and take chances on his judgment. It is only gross hypocrisy to be coming in here and casting sanctimonious faces across the floors of this House. A continuance of the present frightful conditions in this country is going to destroy the morale and the finer things in the character of our people. The attitude of the average man to-day is that it would be better to have no Prohibition Act at all rather than have this script system continued. At present a man is supposed to get liquor only for medicinal use. Every man knows in his heart this is a joke. Imagine the great number of men who are suddenly going to take sick in this community and who are going to get liquor prescribed for them to remedy their sickness in order to provide a half million dollars revenue for the government within the next year. I say seriously Sir that the time will come when the men who will be the greatest advocates for the abolition of this present condition will be Hon. members who took a different stand up to now. When they open their eyes to see the conditions around them the more they will satisfy themselves that this system should be done away with. What is happening in town to-day is that not alone is it a case that certain medical men have grossly and scandalously abused the rights given them under the Prohibition Act, but it is got to stage that some of the doctors are practically living out of nothing else and that the only form of medical practice they do now is the signing of scripts. The extent of their diagnosis of a man's case is to look at his face

and decide that he requires a script. If on the second hand you have what is going on in this island, known as smuggling; if on the third hand you got the worst evil of all—moonshining; and if finally you got the demoralizing of our police force—and all those in authority, then it is about time that honourable members opposite understood that many of us here have come to the conclusion that the whole thing is nothing more or less than sanctimonious hypocrisy. Hon. members opposite have come here and solemnly assert that they are going to have nothing to do with liquor in any shape or form and yet on opening their Budget we are told that they expect to derive \$480,000 revenue from the sale of liquor. Why not eliminate the Act entirely? I think it would be more consistent to drive liquor out of the country altogether than handle it the way it is being handled to-day. It would be more reasonable to take that attitude than what you are going to do this year. Therefore, I ask if it is the intention of the government to deal with the liquor question fully at this session. I think that it is regrettable to debate this thing in such a form as at present. We went to work last year and appointed a representative commission. That commission, recognizing the abuses that were carried on, recommended an alteration. Surely you are not going to have the further farce by letting the thing go on as it is now, but rather do I hope that the government will bring down legislation in some form or other that will meet the wishes and the views of the largest sections of this community. The House has been besieged with petitions during the past two sessions asking for a change in the present system. A commission was appointed to deal with the matter and the finding of that commission is in the hands of the government. I do not think that their report should be put aside, without some attempt being

made to meet the views of the largest number of our people in the different sections throughout the Island. I think we ought strip ourselves of the farcial notion that we hate liquor and in the same breath invest a quarter of a million dollars to buy liquor for the purpose of making another quarter of a million on that transaction. I think the principle is wrong, unsound and hypocritical.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that the Hon. member for St. John's East has forgotten his usual courtesy in addressing this House. Some of his remarks were a kind of strange, and I do not think they were well advised. When he mentioned my name I took it for granted that I was one of the sanctimonious hypocrites that he alluded to because of the position I always took in relation to Prohibition. I do not think that I gave any expression of opinion on this matter for the last two years. In fact very little has been said from this side of the House at all about this matter during that period; but several members of the Opposition side have taken occasion to refer to it. As far as the government being engaged in the liquor business is concerned, that is something that some of us cannot help. We got a Prohibition Act given us by the Morris administration and many of the present members of the Opposition were members of that government. We are in the unfortunate position that we are saddled with that Act; and more than that we have an Act on the Statute Book that two-thirds of the people are studying day and night how to break and how to evade. You take any law that is framed by God or man. If sixty or seventy per cent. of the people make up their minds to break it they will do so in spite of everybody else. Take the Ten Commandments. They are being broken right and left every day. That is the history of the world. There is no proof that the Ten

Commandments have no right to exist.

MR. HIGGINS—What excuse do you offer for your making money out of the liquor?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I am prepared to have a bone dry law. I spent sixty years in the world and during which period I can say that I never hardly tasted liquor and I expect to live the rest of my days without doing so.

MR. HIGGINS—I have no doubt but that you are prepared to go bone dry alright; but why then make money out of it.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—We are compelled to take a certain position of things; but if the people are foolish enough to pour liquor down their throats it is just as well to make them pay for their foolishness.

MR. HIGGINS—Do you contend then that you are your brother's keeper?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—If I had the power to stop the stuff from coming in I would stop it.

MR. BENNETT—What then about the money to get revenue and increase your salaries?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—When Prohibition was first talked of the revenue was taking care of itself.

MR. HIGGINS—Why put on the 25 per cent. Surtax? Why not make the outside fellows pay?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I think this debate is rather premature. The Commission have tabled their report and there might be something satisfactory arrived at in that report. Both sides of the House will have an opportunity to discuss it later.

MR. MOORE—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to bring in a Bill this year?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On Saturday last I received a copy of the report of the Royal Commission from His Excellency the Governor. I did not read it, but I immediately got copies made by stenographers. This

afternoon I got some copies and tabled one in the House so that honorable members would have an opportunity of reading it. To-morrow I expect to have more copies available when all honourable members will, I hope, be supplied. I do not know what is contained in the report. It appears to be dry, but it may be interesting.

MR. MOORE—The reason I asked the question was that last year numerous petitions were presented by members on both sides of the House—petitions that represented some twenty thousand people. These people are entitled to some consideration surely. Their sentiments are being re-echoed to-night at the Casino theatre where three thousand people are assembled advocating the abolition of the present liquor system, and, in all probability, Mr. Chairman, you will have these people here at the Bar of the House before an adjournment to-night. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister has intimated his intention of bringing in a Bill to remedy this present condition of affairs.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I never said there would be.

MR. MOORE—Well then we will live in hopes.

MR. MACDONNELL—Mr. Chairman. Although at the risk of being classed among those who are foolish enough to pour liquor down my throat—but I will take good care not to pay too much for it—I would like to ask the Hon. Mr. Jennings on what grounds does he contend that there should be a continuance of the present Act or that the Act should be in force at all. He just said himself that sixty or seventy per cent. of the people were endeavouring to violate it. Well is not that positive proof that the Act came into existence through trickery and deceit?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—No. The Act was made on principle.

MR. MACDONNELL—It is very bad principle to have to stand for legisla-

tion that was enacted contrary to the wishes of, at least, fifty per cent. of the people, much more seventy per cent. as stated by the Hon. Mr. Jennings himself.]

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom" without amendment.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain "Resolutions respecting Civil Service Salaries."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. MacDonnell 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.

TUESDAY, May 31st.

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

FROM MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the following answer to question of Mr. Moore, No. 1, on order paper of May 21st, 1921.

Cost of two trucks (including sea insurance)	\$18,461.19
Exchange at 14%	2,584.57
Freight and exchange on freight (about)	939.00

The late Government authorized the purchase of the trucks, and I know of no reference to a reduction in the number of horses for the Fire Department as a reason for the purchase. As a matter of fact the number of horses has been reduced by three since the fire trucks were purchased. There has been a saving but it is difficult to say what it is. As a result of the purchase of the trucks the higher levels of the town are now protected in the event of fire occurring there at the same time as the outbreak of a fire on the lower levels. This was not the case before.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would again ask your privilege Sir, to refer to the matter of supplies for the fishery for destitute people around the Island and I again ask the Prime Minister through you, Sir, what arrangements have been made with reference to the half million dollars which I understand is about to be allocated for the purpose of helping out the needy fishermen. Is that amount to be allocated out of the half million granted by this House few days ago? I would like the Prime Minister to tell us exactly what arrangements he has made with reference to that amount so that wo

may be able to get in touch with the supplier and the fisherman who are now awaiting an answer. You know it is a great hardship to the fishermen from the different outports and there are a great number of men in Conception Bay, Placentia and St. Mary's and the Southern Shore who are very much disturbed also. It is now the first day of June and we would like to know what you are going to do and we would exhort you to do it quickly. Despatch means everything in this case and it must not be put off. You have got to give the supplies and put the men to work and the quicker you relieve the situation the better. If that half million dollars is to be allocated the quicker the representatives on this side of the House are made aware of the arrangement the quicker will that sum be distributed. I understand from the members of the district that Placentia proper has not been touched although the district as a whole has done fairly well. Many got relief and while I am here on my feet I would like to throw the suggestion out that many of them who want to get relief still owe much money from last year's account and I would like to know from the Government what steps they are taking to protect that public money being handed the fishermen. If the fishermen receive supplies partly through the Government and partly through the planter or the merchant, three months from now there ought to be a fairly good voyage on hand, then their creditors from last year may come in and pounce on them. The Government ought to make some provision in this direction and have the advance to each and every fisherman out of this half million dollars made preferential and while we are here now with this House in session, we should protect that amount and protect the fishermen and the country at large. That

is really the position and I had a case of it only to-day when a man came to me wanting two hundred dollars and I happened to ask him whether he owed any money or not. I found out that he owed about seven or eight hundred dollars. What's the use of my taking that man to a merchant and say to him that the Government are prepared to advance fifty per cent. to the fisherman. The merchant will answer back even though the Government advances him fifty per cent. and I the other half, what is the good if his creditor of last year seizes upon him. This feature has not been considered by the Government to my mind. We should protect that half million dollars in as much as the amount advanced to each and every fisherman ought to be made preferential. I think a bill ought to be brought in to safeguard the amount because I believe eighty per cent. of that money can be gotten back and I would like to ask the Prime Minister what are the details in connection with this half million dollars provided for the purpose of supplying the fishermen which I presume will be allocated in a few days. The members for the districts are only too anxious to attend to the matter immediately and there is no reason why there should be a number of men in town and kept here for such a long time. There have been numerous representations coming from the Outports enquiring whether advances are obtainable from the planters at least in the Western part of the country. I will have more to say later.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The last point raised by the leader of the Opposition is a point well taken. That point was the subject matter of discussion between myself, some business men and bankers and has been under the consideration of the Government for the past ten days whereby some scheme might be devised to pro-

tect the total advance preferably by means of a preferential claim on the voyage and the first fish caught as it is the case in liquidating these kind of debts in the ordinary course of getting supplies. I anticipate that a bill will be introduced in this connection. It is very important that those supplies should be protected. The first point as to whether it is the intention of the Government to appropriate the half million out of the loan known as the fishery loan the idea in connection therewith has been under the consideration of the committee in the matter of Placentia Bay relief. It will be strictly per capita and either in cash or by way of a bank guarantee. The cash will be given when the money is available and it will be divided on a per capita basis. The representatives of the various districts are handling the money of the districts so far as the portion is concerned. Some districts will not be handling any portion at all but other districts will be handling it in the interests of the fishermen. But there will be a commissioner appointed for each district for the purpose of distributing the money. As to Ferryland and Placentia Mr. O'Reilly has been asked to take the matter with regard to Placentia in charge and it has been attended to. The Board of Works Departments' money does not come under the jurisdiction of the Assessor except where the district availed of the opportunity of putting up one dollar for every two advanced, making in all three dollars for supplies. That was the general idea but each individual district has to be handled by its own commissioner, as the situation in each district is different, for instance the District of Carbonear, of which His Honor the Speaker is the worthy representative. The same applies to Placentia and Fogo and any other district involved.

Each district shall have to deal with its own particular problem through its own commissioner per capita share being provided for and the per capita share will be appropriated from the loan referred to. Again referring to the preferential claim question, the matter came into prominence two days ago when a man owed four hundred dollars on last year's account. The matter was discussed and as his voyage might be seized upon he found that the best remedy was to declare insolvent and then there are a large number who do not know that the writ of execution is preferable. So a statute shall have to be enacted this session to have the matter adjusted.

MR. WALSH.—First of all I want to offer my sincere thanks to the Government for the assistance rendered by it. When this question was first raised by my colleagues and myself it was pointed out that owing to the large area of the district and the large number of people involved a very large amount of money would be required to be of any great value. We asked for the sum of two hundred thousand as we estimated that that sum would be necessary to put all those men to work. We thought with the opening up of Bell Island and Grand Falls there would be a lot of employment for our our people but these avenues of employment have not been opened up and Mr. O'Reilly has informed us that our accounts are overdrawn by sixty dollars and to-day at least some one hundred men are in the city from St. Mary's and Trepassey, some of them having travelled miles and miles and some of them merely had the price of their ticket here and no more funds. I do not care if I ever go back for re-election but I am interested in having them put to work. My wife and children could tell you some pitiful tales about the men who come to my home and some seven years ago when I came in-

to public life some of them could help me but now they are seeking help from me. I do not blame any particular class of men but I am interested in the remedy and I especially appeal to the Prime Minister that in the allocation of this five hundred thousand dollars the entire district will be considered and I hope that will be at an early date. We have been asked to pay board bills for some of those men amounting to two hundred dollars and I do not agree with the position that we should be called upon to pay them. I have a list now of the men in the city and they number over one hundred and some seventy-five more to come. And this does not touch Placentia Bay at all. Placentia and St. Mary's need the help more than any other part of the country. And I would appreciate an early reply as to the steps to be taken so that I may be able to tell them to hang around for a few days longer and if they are not to be considered I see no hope for those people but I feel sure the Government does not intend to have one-half of the Island fishing and the other half starving. So far as Placentia and St. Mary's is concerned the money has been allocated to the best of our ability. There were a couple of cases where some got the relief when they should not and I want to say that if I were on a jury dealing with this kind of a contemptible person I would put him down in jail. I trust that before the Committee rises or immediately afterwards, that the Prime Minister will intimate as to what we are to expect so that we may be all able to tell those who are here and prevent others from coming in.

CAPTAIN LEWIS.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to appoint a commissioner for the district of Harbour Main with respect to the hand-

ling of our portion of this five hundred thousand dollars.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The matter has not been considered yet.

CAPTAIN LEWIS.—There are two hundred men prepared to go to the fishery if they see there is any money available. There are two hundred others wishing to attend the shore fishery if they had the means so to do. We would like to know where we stand in this matter so that we can tell our people. There is another matter and that is the twenty cents export tax which came down in the Budget. I consider this a great hardship to the fishermen of Newfoundland. It is forty cents on foreign vessels. Chartered vessels shall have to pay forty cents per quintal and this is very far reaching. Twenty cents is the tax per quintal in sale. For myself I say this is a mistake to have them pay that tax. For every five dollars the fisherman gets you take forty cents from him. The fishery of this country at the present time is paralyzed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The matter to which you refer will be discussed on to-morrow.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I do not intend to prolong the debate but I wish to comment upon the question raised by Sir Michael Cashin and referred to by the Prime Minister, and that is the preferential claim matter. This is really a very serious matter and it ought to be dealt with immediately. Some of the constituents of the Prime Minister and Mr. Bennett came to see me but on account of the money they owed I say that if they caught any fish the other fellow might come in and grab it. I think the matter ought to be immediately fixed up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—So far as the respective portions for the various districts concerned it is mat-

ter for the respective members to take up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I am ready to suggest a commissioner if you will permit me. I do not want it all on my shoulders but I will do what I can to assist the Government and if the work is not too heavy and if the Commissioner I will name will work with me, I will be only too glad to commence right away. I wish to name the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Jennings. If he will assume the responsibility for Port de Grave district I feel we will work together harmoniously. If the Prime Minister will make it clear that it is possible to go right away with this matter and if the Minister of Public Works will assume the responsibility, I will begin to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As he is a departmental officer there might be some question whether he could assume those duties. I feel sure that Sir John will appreciate that position.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I cannot appreciate the point, because Mr. Jennings is too good a man to lose in this connection. And as to this matter of preferential claim this Bill ought to be attended to right away. I am not going to allow Baird, Job, Smith or somebody else to take the security I have from me. The other day an article appeared in the Advocate saying that I was not supplying at all. But they forgot to say that I had not taken any guarantee from the Government. I have supplied some men without this Government money because they will pay me I am sure if they get the fish. I have asked the manager of the Advocate to have this adjusted. I want the country to know at large that the supplies I give out come entirely from myself.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I agree with the previous speakers re this preferential claim and I think as early as pos-

sible it ought to be brought forward and finalized. Only to-day through the courtesy of the Minister of Public Works I was handed a telegram from Bay of Islands asking what was being done with regard to supplies for the coming fishery. Another message from Woods Island came to hand relative to the same matter. In the Port au Port peninsula last year they were not able to pay their bills and there are some seven hundred men there dependent upon the fishery.

MR. BENNETT.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if St. John's West is included in this allocation?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No arrangements have yet been made.

MR. BENNETT.—There are many men in Petty Harbour and Maddox Cove who are desirous to get some of this relief.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—These men are very reliable and industrious and I would be only too glad to have their wants attended to but I think they will not need this guarantee but I guess their real desire is to be protected against last year's creditor. If there was anything to be done it would be necessary to have a Commissioner, that is an outside party.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Acts—1918-20."

At a quarter past four of the clock, Mr. Warwick Smith on behalf of the Moderate Prohibition Committee, appeared at the Bar of the House, and presented certain petitions respecting a modification of the present Prohibition Law together with a suite of Resolutions passed at a Public Meeting in St. John's on May 30th which latter were then read to the House by the Clerk.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speak-

er and gentlemen of the Moderate Prohibition Committee, the report of the Commission appointed to go into this matter was received a day or two ago and I expected to see it in this afternoon's Telegram to which it was forwarded for publication. Up to the present moment the Government has not had an opportunity of considering the draft of the Bill which the Moderate Prohibition Committee has forwarded them. We appreciate the fact that the present measure is not working out satisfactorily and that something more is at stake than whether a man does or does not obtain a certain quantity of liquor; it is a question of the maintenance of the moral strength and fibre of the people which are being weakened by the present system. This system tends towards the development of law breaking through smuggling and the obtaining of scripts for purposes other than medical. The whole question is one that is well worthy of the closest attention of yourselves and of this House and the government will take the earliest opportunity of considering it.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the subject of the confirmation of an Agreement between the government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker. I beg to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider resolutions for confirming an agreement between the government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited. I may say that the D'Arcy Exploration Company is a subsidiary company of the Anglo-Peruvian Oil Company, Limited, which is the largest Oil Company in the British Empire. It is, moreover, not a

company that speculates, nor is it a promoting company. The Company is a bona fide operating company to find out whether we have any oil-bearing lands in Newfoundland. For the benefit of the House I would read a short extract that will give an accurate idea of just what the Company is. The Chairman of the Company and of the Anglo Persian Oil Company is Sir C. Greenway, Bart. The British government nominates two directors and at present they are Lord Inchapec and Mr. E. G. Packe. The Company was registered April 14th, 1909 to acquire a concession granted by the Shah of Persia to another company formed in 1903, to search for, develop and sell petroleum within the empire of Persia. The concession holds good for 60 years from May 1901. The Company has also acquired the whole of the issued capital of the British Tanker Co. Ltd. (3,000,000 pds.) British Petroleum Co. Ltd. 3,000,000 pds.; D'Arcy Exploration Co. Ltd. (50,000 pds.); Home-light Oil Co. Ltd., (500,000 pds.); National Oil Refineries Ltd, (300,000 pds) Petroleum Steamship Co. Ltd. (362,582). The capital of the company is (25,000,000 pds.), of which 17,500,000 pds. has been called up. The British government holds 2,000,000 ordinary shares of 1 pound each, 1000 Preferred pds. of Debenture Stock. shares of 1 pound each, and 199,000. That, Sir, is the Company which is back of this agreement; and, shortly, the meaning of the agreement is this: The Company shall have two years in which to prospect and survey unoccupied Crown lands for oil, and as they prospect they are to furnish the government from time to time, with reports of what they do and what they find. If they discover oil, or think that oil is likely to be found in any particular area, they will form what is called a "test area." The total test area will not exceed 3,600 sq. miles, which they claim is only a reasonable oil field. In order to hold a test area

they must sink a well in every 12 sq. miles within six months after they have taken it up. The other words of the agreement are those usually contained in any similar agreement. The Company have expressed a keen desire to have Labrador included in the agreement; but, owing to the Labrador boundary question, it is impossible at the present time for us to include Labrador, but we have worded the agreement so that if it is found that we have jurisdiction after the Boundary dispute has been settled by the Privy Council, they may go there.

Section 9 provides that the Company shall commence its geological investigations in the summer of 1921: Provided this agreement has been ratified by the Legislature three months prior to the 31st May. This, of course, has not been done, but I have been in communication with the Company, and they have assured me that they will commence operations in Newfoundland this summer in spite of the fact that the agreement has not yet been ratified. The consideration in the agreement in the event of the successful working of oil is that they will pay to the government 12 and 1-2 per cent. of the value of all oil obtained by them at the casing head. Their operations must be continuously carried on. I think the agreement will commend itself to the House, and I therefore move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I quite agree with the Resolutions and I am in accord with anything that tends for the advancement of the country, and I believe that we should encourage outside people to come in here to test the possibilities of the country; but at the same time there should be some section inserted in the Resolutions protecting ourselves in the event of this agreement not being carried out. If the industry is not started up in two years, as stated in this agreement, there should be a penalty provided

whereby some concessions would be allowed to the country. You are giving this company a grant or license to go on all Crown Lands throughout the country to do prospecting and after this agreement is passed and ratified by this House the Company need not start for two years if they so desire, and need not do a stroke of work in Newfoundland. Consequently, I think there ought to be a clause inserted in the agreement providing for a penalty in the case of their failing to live up to their agreement within the prescribed time. We do not know who or what is behind this Company or what the intention is of that Company. Various constructions can be put upon it. However, I have not had an opportunity to read the agreement through yet.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Section nine shows the intention.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Yes, but they can tie up exploration work for oil on Crown Lands for two years, and I think that there should be some safeguards put in the agreement. Looking at it from a Layman's standpoint I think the Company are in a position to tie up this industry if it suits them. They are the greatest people of the world, according to the explanation given by the Minister of Justice, and there is no reason why there should not be safeguards provided before this has gone too far.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No. Although section nine is not of much use now, it shows the bona fides. The Co. really intended to come out this year, but it is not their fault that they have not done so. When this agreement was drafted it was their intention to come out this year; we can provide for any safeguards when the Bill is under discussion in Committee.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker. I support the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition as to safeguards and I am glad to find that the Hon. Min. of Justice takes that attitude also. I

would also suggest to the Minister that the Resolutions be left stand over as for to-day and clean it up to-morrow and in the interim to have a draft prepared.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker. I remember here four or five years ago a number of gentlemen from Water Street did a lot of oil boring at Deer Lake. Will this Company affect them? I remember the late Hon. John Harvey, Mr. Job and others spent a lot of money there trying to develop the Deer Lake property.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No. This Company will deal entirely with unoccupied Crown Lands and will not interfere with any property belonging to any other person where oil boring operations have taken place.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker. I am not quite clear on the explanation to section one of the Resolutions which says that the company are to have the exclusive right for two years. I do not see in any section of the Resolutions where the Company asked for exclusive right for a period of two years over a certain area they may choose; and section one goes on to say that the company will prospect for petroleum and kindred products. Now would it be possible that this company may take in any area in any section where any other mineral may be found and would they be given exclusive right to that area so that others may not be permitted to operate there.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No.

MR. WALSH—I think this House should encourage as much as possible outside capital and, if possible, try to develop our mineral resources, though I think this House should be very careful in dealing with Companies from outside, as most of us have no opportunity of finding out what their intentions are or what their standing is. On numerous occasions very attractive propositions have been presented to this House heretofore, ostensibly for the purpose of developing our min-

eral wealth, and some members in the House on more than one occasion saw eye to eye with the promoters and gave them certain concessions for the inducements held out. But later it was found to be another attempt made to get hold of some lands or water power. Personally I believe that there is great mineral wealth existing in the country and that it should be developed. Whilst I do not doubt for one moment the bona fides of this D'Arcy Exploration Company, still I would like to have it made compulsory for this Company to spend some stipulated amount of money for this proposed work before asking us to discuss and pronounce upon this Bill. Take the great Newfoundland Products Corporation a few years ago. I strongly supported that measure in all seriousness and in all sincerity, because at that time there was an intimation in the Bill of a certain amount of money to be spent. But we all know what happened afterwards. The framers of those kind of bills are sufficiently cute to make the language read so that the ordinary layman, who have not the education on legal points, may think they are alright when they really are not, and suddenly the people wake up and find that the promoters of the Company have escaped the obligations they were under. Personally I have great hope that at some future time the great mineral wealth of Newfoundland will get a square show. I have great hopes that the millions of dollars worth of mineral wealth that is snugly hidden away in the valleys and hills around Newfoundland may get an opportunity of being intelligently prospected, and then we will not have the spectacle witnessed in this House this evening and witnessed for the past six weeks—hundred of men waiting to get supplies to participate in the only industry we have apart from Grand Falls and Bell Island. We are absolutely dependent on the codfishery of this country at present. From my ex-

perience, though, the great copper ore mine of Little Bay, Notre Dame Bay, would be employing a thousand men to-day only for bad management and dishonesty. And Little Bay is not the only place where there are large deposits of mineral. In other sections of this Island there are all kinds of deposits of minerals such as gold, silver, nickel and all the minerals that are essential for the different industries all over the world. I would like to see the Department of Agriculture & Mines not only encourage an intelligent search for minerals, but I would be a party to voting \$50,000 for such work, or, if necessary, vote a reasonable amount for a start and convert that vote that is at present in the Budget for a Model Farm to such a purpose. Put that amount of twenty five or thirty thousand dollars for the paying of competent men to do the prospecting work. There are lots of competent men in Newfoundland. Why there are good practical men walking the streets of St. John's to-day and who thirty years ago carried on that part of our industries. Put in charge men who have travelled throughout the country, men who know the mineral bearing sections of the country and who know the kind of mineral that any particular rock is likely to bear. I trust that at this particular time, especially now that the fishery is not what it used to be and people are looking around for other avenues of employment, that the vote for the Model Farm and for experimenting purposes will be used to encourage what may prove to be the salvation of Newfoundland. I remember when a boy in Notre Dame Bay an old gentleman named Toms came out from the other side of the water and began operations at Sleepy Valley with one man and a pick and shovel. The first day they went to work they cut a vein of copper six feet wide. I remember myself when they developed that very seam. They went down 100 feet and

found six feet of solid copper. There was not any money spent there since to determine whether there was any further copper there or not and development was stopped because of lack of funds. Up at York Harbor some years ago I had the honour to sink a shaft and to bring boulders of solid copper without a peck of earth on it; but the lode was never discovered. It was reported favorably on by a gentleman who held a responsible position in one of the largest copper companies in Lake Superior. Right at Blow Me Down where one of the great est copper mines existing this side of the Atlantic Ocean, irresponsible men had sufficient authority to be able to put aside the recommendations made thereon. Take Pilleys's Island mine. That fell through, through mismanagement. Take the great silver mine at LaManche, Placentia Bay. The sea was allowed to come in there and the mine was destroyed. Mr. Speaker, I will avail of the opportunity to deal with this matter again, but I could not let this occasion pass without having a word or two to say. I trust that the government, before ratifying this agreement and giving this company exclusive rights for two years, will see that a sufficient amount of money will be spent for that period. We want to safeguard ourselves as much as possible.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I would like to say for the information of the hon. member that there is a guarantee in the contract now for the spending of money. The hon. member will understand that for the first two years no money can be spent, as that period will not be used for providing machinery, but for the bringing out of geologists, etc., but at the expiration of that two years or when they decide to test the places in any areas by sinking wells it will cost them the machinery and labour necessary for the sinking of a well; and if the well is not sunk in six months they have no further

claim to the property. I understand that the cost of a well is about 15,000 pds. In New Brunswick they have an exclusion concession and may drill on any part of 10,000 sq. miles. They have drilled 5 wells at a cost of over 100,000 pds., and so far have not struck oil in commercial quantity.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker. I just want to add a word or two on the lines followed by Mr. Walsh. I am glad that we have a Company of standing and prestige coming in here, and, as contemplated in this agreement, to determine and develop our mineral and particularly our oil wealth. It has been always a matter of great wonder to me what the possibilities of Newfoundland really are in this connection. I think that Newfoundland—speaking from experience and the knowledge at present available—has rich mineral qualities and second to no other part of the British empire. When one realises that it is only just the mere fringe of the country that has been explored and the returns from that fringe have shown a good percentage of mines, it shows that only a small proportion of the country has been surveyed and explored. That is very creditable indeed. But what about the great bulk of the country that is unexplored? This country is a vast and enormous country for its population and we have a vast area that possibly has not yet been scratched. We have not the faintest bit of scientific knowledge as to what the possibilities of Newfoundland are as a mineral country. Personally I believe we have great possibilities in this respect and I have always felt and always advocated that this country would have spent money well and much to our advantage if we had secured in the past highly qualified scientists to come here and investigate, explore and properly survey the entire interior of Newfoundland. If this Company that is now contemplating exploration work here will do no oth-

er good and even if it never strikes oil it will settle for always the question as to whether or not there is any oil here. As referred to by Mr. Moore, the member for Ferryland, several local capitalists started developing the region of Deer Lake a few years ago. There were undoubtedly good indications there at that time, and there was a lot of shale taken therefrom and sent to England, and the assay of that shale was reported to be very rich, but evidently the thing fell down for the want of either capital or enterprise. If there are good indications in that section of the country and the development of that was not carried out to the fullest extent, well here is an opportunity for developing a property that is lying dormant and that otherwise would not have been properly developed. I commend these Resolutions to the House and I feel sure that good results will ensue. Anyway we will have the satisfaction of determining at least one section of our resources whether we have any such mineral or whether we have not. The only clause in the agreement that I take any degree of exception to is the matter of transfer, as the agreement says that the Company will merely come here for two years for preliminary work because that is all the agreement calls for. This I cannot understand and perhaps the Minister of Justice will explain. I do not want to be unfair to the promoters or to cheapen the agreement by having a new clause inserted.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—If any oil is found by the D'Arcy Exploration Co they will transfer their rights to the Anglo Persian Oil Company to do the developing and to carry on the work. They cannot have a Syndicate that is not approved of by the government.

MR. BENNETT—That is quite satisfactory, and I give the Resolutions my hearty support and I only wish that we will have other companies to come here and develop our resources, and

let us see what we really have. I believe from the opinions of men who are experienced in mining matters and who have done some exploring that this country have great possibilities as a mineral country and anything done with regard to the development of those possibilities should receive the fullest endorsement of this House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the subject of Civil Service Salaries.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. This is a matter which appertains specifically to the Committee of Ways and Means. Although it is in the form of a separate Bill I will take the liberty of introducing it by special notice and to ask the courtesy of the House to consider it when debating the Budget. The Bill is exactly as I intimated to the House some days ago, namely, to provide that all those who received voted salaries under the Civil Service Act should have deducted therefrom ten per cent. on all salaries up to and including five hundred salaries; and in addition thereto fifteen per cent. on a salary on the next five hundred and twenty per cent. on a salary that exceeds one thousand dollars. As those salaries relate specifically to the committee on Ways and Means, I would specifically suggest that instead of debating them separately that those salaries be dealt with in Committee and to which departments they specifically relate.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister seemed to have labored hard this afternoon in giving an explanation for the reduction in the salaries of civil servants. I do not agree with those Resolutions before the House and I do not agree for more reasons than one, first of all that the Prime Minister should decide to touch at all the salary of the official receiving anything under \$1200 a year. Why go back and check him up from 1914 up to now instead of taking a general view of the surroundings to-day and compare it with 1914. I would like to flour as against \$6 when the war take the House back to 1914 for a few moments. I do not think there is any comparison between conditions in 1914 and now. Look at the enormous prices that we are called upon to pay for goods now and the low prices that prevailed prior to the war. The fishery is held up at a standstill. I think that is apparent to all in this House. The fisherman is paying to-day in the vicinity of fifteen dollars a barrel for flour. The civil servant is practically in the same position as far as the necessaries of life are concerned to-day. He is paying anywhere from \$14 to \$15 a barrel for flour. Many of them have to go and receive credit from the grocer, not having the ready cash to purchase, and the usual profit is tacked on that. Take a civil servant living in St. John's to-day, who is getting \$1200 a year. The reduction on that amount, according to those Resolutions, is going to be \$165. You must first take into consideration the class of man that he is and then take into consideration the high cost of living in St. John's. He has to pay enormous rent, probably three or four hundred dollars a year, as rents to-day have increased to considerably more than what they were before the war. He has got to appear respectable at his work in the department to which he is attached. Then he has got to support his family properly and

educate his children. All that is necessary and has got to be provided for. How then can you cold-bloodedly come in and cut down that \$1200 a year to practically \$1000? I think it would be far better to go into the civil service to-day and prune out the many useless officials that are not at all necessary. Send them about their business and let them look for employment elsewhere; but don't reduce the salaries of all officials who are paid \$1200 a year and less. You are putting all that class of official in the one category. You are going to reduce all their salaries and practically make beggars of them. You cannot expect from that class of man any returns in the future, because a man who is not properly fed and not properly looked after loses all spirit and all energy to work. When we come to discuss the Budget I hope to point out the many reasons why you should not reduce the salary of a civil servant who is getting \$1200 or less. \$1200 a year is \$100 a month, well that is a very small amount for a family man to live on in St. John's now, when you take into account the taxes he is called upon to pay, the high price for coal and provisions and the various other obligations that he has to meet. To come in here and attack that class of men for the purpose of retrenchment, is, in my opinion, the last resource, you should resort to instead of being the first. This will be shown to you before this Budget is through, you should have practised retrenchments in other directions and allowed the salaries of civil servants of this colony receiving upwards of \$1200 a year to remain as they were. Why not cut down in your department of Education, as was pointed out to you here last night. I want to say to the Prime Minister this evening that if he wants to get back to 1914 conditions—and you have to get back there if you want to make two ends meet—why not dispose of some of the extra officials

that were taken on since that period? I would like to ask how much was spent last year on extra officials?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Roughly \$26,000.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is there any reason why these extra officials are needed to do the work that was done previous to the war? Our revenue for 1914 was about six million dollars and it is probably about the same now. You have to get back to 1914 conditions unless you want to hand this country over to Canada.

Are you going to do that by coming in here with a budget in which the Auditor General has screwed down the salaries of the Civil Servants making a saving of \$231,000. You stop there. You have made no other reductions except in the Marine and Fisheries department, but there you had a staff of officials such as cullers, commissioners and other friends of the Minister that have cost the country an enormous sum of money. Last year you tacked on 10c. a quintal on fish, and now you tack on another 20c. The cost of living the Prime Minister tells us is about 30 per cent. reduced. I do not agree with you. Coal, flour, butter, dry goods and many other essentials of life have not been reduced 30 per cent. There is no comparison between now and previous to the war. If he is in earnest we should get back to conditions before the war. Here we are with an educational department costing almost a million dollars. If you are in earnest why not lop that department off altogether. If you have the interests of the fishermen at heart Mr. Minister you should be one of the first advocates to instruct the Prime Minister to carry out this policy of retrenchment in your department. But what do we find? Not one cent of reduction in your department. Still you come in here and talk about taking off \$200 off the man getting \$1200. Your department is costing the country between eight and nine hundred

thousand dollars a year. Are you not prepared Mr. Minister to cut down expenses in that direction? If you are not then it is waste of time for us to come in here. You know what is creeping on us. You may put up a bluff for a while, but bills are going to be piled up, in all directions. When this House opens again, with what is in view at the present time, there is nothing for us to expect but a deficit of four or five million dollars. We cannot look to the fishery. Here we have the principal fish merchant in the country, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a circular which I have in my possession, tells the fishermen that the most they can expect is \$6. or an average of \$5 per quintal. So that allowing a million and a half quintals that would be about nine million dollars.

Now add to that the other business of the country. Grand Falls is closed down. Bell Island is practically closed; lumber is gone down to about one-third its price last year. The very most you can expect as the earning power of the country is twelve million dollars. Put your duty at 50% and it will give you six million dollars. Now where does that land you with the estimates that you have brought in here.

Now the Prime Minister comes in and tells us that the only thing he can do is to reduce the Civil Servants \$231,000. Why are we losing time here taking off \$231,000 if our position is going to be anywhere near my forecast. There is no earnest effort made by the Government to reduce the cost of running the affairs of the country. Reduce the educational grant back to what it was in 1914. It was then about \$300,000. Sir Edward Morris boasted here in the House that it had reached that amount, and here we are in our darkest hour asked to vote three times that amount, and there is not an attempt made by any man on

the other side of the House to reduce that enormous figure. These are the representatives of the underdogs, and still there is not one of them who is willing to get up here and tell us why they are voting these estimates.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot get six million dollars revenue this year. You calculate \$900,000 from Sales Tax. We have asked you how you plan to get it, but you say that you have not yet got it from Canada. When you add that Sales Tax you add another 15% to the fishermen of the Colony in addition to the 25% surtax. Now we ask you on behalf of the Civil Servants who are receiving from \$1,200 down, not to attempt to make any reduction. If you cannot do that then send down one of your cullers to cull out some of the people who are now under pay and who are giving no returns to the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Now you are talking politics again. My hon. friend naturally shifts off to the political point quite frequently. I am not asking the civil servants to go back to the standing of 1918; I am asking them to go back a little which is less, however, than the proportionate drop in the cost of living. I will try and have the matter in connection with the wholesale prices tabulated in time for use when we get into Ways and Means. Reference has been made by my hon. friend to the tax on fish. Having regard to the catch being this year 120,000 qtls. short of last year, the tax will be a straight one of 30 cents.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—How do you figure it all out.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Last year it was figured on a 30 cents per qtl. basis.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—In my opinion the catch will be about 1,350,000 qtls. this year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I judged that more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of this will

go out in local bottoms; it will be shipped in Newfoundland owned vessels or those registered here. That means we will lose 10 cents a qtl. on what I judge to be more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the catch. But we will gain 10 cents a qtl. on that portion which will be carried in foreign bottoms. That portion, the salt bulk to the States and Canada, will stand the same as last year in all bottoms. There will be a saving to the fishermen by that readjustment.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It will not give each of them a stick of tobacco.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That depends on the price of tobacco. Of course I have not been so long in the Finance Department as Sir Michael. I handle finance as other men handle golf, not as a regular business. But I handled the Surplus Trust Fund to show that we can pay our bills on June 30th.

MR. HIGGINS.—I have heard that one can make figures talk as he likes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am satisfied we will come out with a surplus.

MR. HIGGINS.—How will you pay back what was taken for War and Naval purposes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The war cost us about 30 millions. If we have regard to the pensions and liabilities for soldiers and sailors, hospitals, etc., the capitalization will work out at between 20 and 30 millions. During the years of the war period there was a splendid revenue and the Government felt justified in making payments out of current account. It was not necessary to raise a fund to meet the situation as it was in January of this year. It was necessary to get 3½ millions. In December the Opposition concurred and realized that Newfoundland needed finances and there was a strenuous period to face. It was desirable that

the Surplus Trust Fund should not be added to. We had credit and put back what we had taken out of capital account.

MR. HIGGINS.—But is not that what you have a Surplus Trust Fund for. Why didn't you put it back straight.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We were taking 6 millions while we only needed $3\frac{1}{2}$, so as to have $2\frac{1}{2}$ left.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You put it back to try and justify your loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Grant for argument sake that we did; were we not justified in getting a million extra.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Why did you not do so right straight.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We paid \$1,400,000 which could be called capital war expenditure. Of that we have a balance of \$400,000 which could be treated as a surplus fund. The money is there as a million for the benefit of the Colony no matter what you call it.

MR. HIGGINS.—Instead of calling it a war loan, why not call it a boost loan.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Why not call it a bust loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The bust factory is not on this side of the House.

MR. BENNETT.—These are current expenses; the pensions are the same and are not chargeable to the trust fund.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—These were not paid out of current account; they were paid out of the amount voted by the Legislature. When we came into office there was a claim for \$400,000 on us which we took out of the Surplus Trust Fund as it was the most convenient place to get it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Don't you call that frenzied finance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—But didn't we get it back again.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You only got your justification for the loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We got the loan without submitting any financial statement in the sense that there was no written document.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I said a few days ago I would pay the bill if you would telegraph the agents for the confirmation of your statement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—And now I accept your challenge.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—And then you will send a code message saying not to forward it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad to see the gentlemen outside the Bar are enjoying your joke.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—They got more sense than a good many inside the Bar.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I thought you were going to say "more than me." The men out there are all right. Now the figures which I have submitted in connection with the percentages are as accurate as can be got in the circumstances; those dealing with the invoices have been obtained from the Assistant Collector. All are reasonably correct. I move that the Committee now rise.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I will not have much to say, Mr. Speaker, at present, as I take it this question will come up again later in debate. The civil servants who supported you were looking for a Liberal-Reform government and they got it with a vengeance; I hope they are happy now. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that to cut a man who is doing an honest day's work for a small salary is hitting below the belt. If he has a family of 5 or 6 and is in the civil service at \$3.25 per day, he can only start to be a rogue immediately you cut it. If he is reduced how is he going to school, feed and clothe

his family on less than \$1,200. I am in accord with the Leader of the Opposition that if you have too many civil servants in the country, let them go somewhere else to work and it would be better than giving them only a half salary. The Hon. Prime Minister states that the necessities of life have dropped 30%; in other words 70 cents now is the same as a dollar last year. I do not agree with this as there is really no difference. Take the case of sugar; it was high when it was under control, while others were paying 12 cents a pound for it we were paying 25 because of mismanagement. That cost the Colony \$130,000 which might have been left for the civil servants. Then turn to and consider the other expenses that could have been avoided; take the codfish on which money was squandered to no advantage but really with disaster. The Colony will find this a loss of \$400,000 which, with the other, will amount to \$530,000. We would not be debating the cut of salaries now if this had been left alone. Through rank mismanagement the civil servants are now face to face with the situation of increased taxation. I agree with the Prime Minister that some is necessary but if it is done right you will not be taxing the fishermen but will let them go on as ever. Some little things of course did happen that probably could not be provided against but if the handling of fish had been left alone there would be none of it left in store here to-day and the country would be far better off. As Sir M. P. Cashin said, interference with trade has been the cause of all the trouble. You are asking to-day for taxes in order to raise what was squandered on the railway; taxing the people to raise money for fads and expenses that should never have taken place. There are many ways, I think, by which you could avoid cutting the pay of the

civil servants and these I will point out as we go along on the Estimates. I hope when this question comes up again you will reconsider the cutting of these salaries. Imagine a man in the Custom House with \$500 a year and who has 5 or 6 children, having 10% taken off his salary. It is an absolute joke. There are men there who are doing practically nothing and it would be better to let them go about their business elsewhere. Instead of sending them, however, you send Mr. Jas. McGrath with a salary of \$1,700 on the Daisy. You are adding on new expenses and keeping others on at the old salary. I cannot vote for this kind of thing. If I were in the Customs with 5 or 6 children, and had my pay cut I would beat the Government at every opportunity, even to the extent of letting a man get through with a keg of rum. Imagine such an official's pleasure on realizing that on July 1st, he is to get a \$50 cut. Take the policeman—are you going to cut them 10% or more though they are beating around day and night in all kinds of weather to protect ourselves and property and to keep law and order. Are you going to reduce these men, most of whom have large families. Again you are putting on a Sales Tax which nobody understands. I don't—and no man on Water St. understands what it means. One has one idea and the other a different one. And then you come in here after wasting millions and ask us to cut the unfortunate who can barely subsist, such as the policeman who you will meet on duty at all hours of the night and morning. If you knew the men in the civil service whom I am helping to carry along from month to month you would not do it. Put your proposition on a business basis and I will back it up. The men who are not getting a decent salary should try to get something else; I

wonder how they can stay in their positions. When the cut comes they will get it in the neck. I am glad to see that His Excellency the Governor is to be reduced. As Sir M. P. Cashin said, I care about neither Governor nor Judges, I am glad to see them cut; they can stand it better than the policeman, the man in the Custom's night or day boat, the man who pilots the ship into the harbor or the man who labors on the wharf. These latter are entitled to the best consideration of the country. When you put the tax on fish also, the fisherman is the one who will pay it whether he likes it or not. Yet I am told that this is a fishermen's government. I am going to move before it goes through the House that this tax be reconsidered. Knowing something of the fishing industry in all its branches I ask that it be left severely alone. This money would certainly be taken off the fishermen. I would not attempt to expound the law to you, Mr. Prime Minister as that is your profession and you know too much about it, but I will take dictation on fishery matters from no man in the country, not even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If the catch this year be 1,300,000 qtls., it means the fishermen will have to pay about \$270,000 in taxes. If you want to encourage both the men and the industry, in view of the poor conditions of the markets abroad and the prevailing conditions here you ought to try and raise in some other way than by taxing the codfish. I know perfectly well that the money is needed but this is no way to get it. No man who comes to my wharf to sell fish but will have to pay this tax.

The Committee rose till 8 o'clock.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—At the hour of adjournment I was discussing the fish tax and what it means. But getting back now to the matter of salaries of the civil servants, I feel there are

many things that could be done without taking \$230,000 from the men who are drawing under \$1200. Men getting above that can stand some moderate reduction, but I cannot see how those drawing below that can even exist. I think that if the Hon. Prime Minister would take my suggestions the civil servants need not be cut. I suggest that the Model Farm vote for instance be done away with; last year it cost 60 or 70 thousand dollars. Then abolish the department of Shipping and if that were done there would be no need to touch the civil servants who have families to support. I was also speaking this afternoon about the police; I do not see how you can touch their salaries. It simply can't be done. The men are always at the service of the public; they have only 15 days off during the year, and surely the Government will not attempt to cut them when the votes for the Model Farm and other departments which are not necessary can be abolished. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that the Assistant-Collector gave him a statement showing a reduction of about 30 per cent. in the cost of living. I would like to point out that in 1918-19 sugar was high and it is just as high to-day, molasses and butter and flour are the same. These articles are essentials and in fact meats are even higher, and if men are to have a chance to help the coming generation, by rearing them up with well fed bodies, I do not see how they are going to do it if their salaries are cut. I know something of food prices and no matter what the Assistant-Collector may say he saw in the Custom's invoices there is no reduction in retail shop prices. As one man said a few days ago we can now use Canadian butter for cooking and Newfoundland for table purposes owing to the difference in the price. This is an article that is largely used by the fishermen. You know that no man with this surtax on can expect any material drop in prices

without a change in the foreign countries. I know you got to get revenue, but I think you can do it without touching the civil servants. In Nova Scotia the government started to economize and they thought the printing of the Hansard etc., unnecessary. A lot of this kind of thing could be cut off here. The Education grant could also stand a clip easily. I ask the Hon. Min. of Education if it is right that Mr. Solomon Whiteway is being paid \$3,600.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—His expenses are not being paid. He is only getting what he is worth.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But there are a lot of men not getting what they are worth and that is why I am up here to-day. I will sit down if the Prime Minister will give me an assurance that there will be no cut on the \$1200 men. If Mr. Whiteway is worth \$3600 the others are worth \$1200. There can be no justification for increasing his salary and you ought not increase it by \$600. I do not begrudge any man his worth and I believe that Mr. Whiteway has good qualifications, but I do think it is very harsh to come here, and perhaps through a misunderstanding, vote for a cut on those who can least bear it. I think the principle is unfair. I think that for Dr. Burke, Deputy Minister of Education, \$3300 is not necessary. He would not miss the reduction but the man with the small pay will feel the pain of it. I believe, Mr. Minister, that you are in sympathy with my ideas. Is it true, sir, that the eleven teachers now training abroad are being paid just as ever. That is an expense that could be done without; we have no Normal School built yet for them or Mr. Whiteway, and we don't know when we will. If a man does not get salary enough to send his children to school, Mr. Whiteway will be of no service. Neither will Dr. Burke be if the children cannot be sent to school and trained up as good citizens. Mr. Whiteway ought to be proud of us, we are so kind. Cut the pay of the Governor and Judges if you like, but give the backbone of the country a chance to bring up their offspring decently. The Hon. Prime Minister tells us what he would do if he were running a corporation, a limited concern, how he would pare it and fix it up. But he is really the trustee for a corporation that is not even limited and he must deliver the goods. You can't make chalk of one and cheese of another. Now what is the sense of printing all these debates and sending them to all the papers in the country for publication? Who wants to read next November what we are saying now—the fishermen will get nothing out of it. If you are going to economize let us have it in proper form and I will support anything that is right and just. Now take these resolutions as to the reductions. I will support them if you will guarantee to protect the man who is only existing to-day. If you start to cut after the \$1200 I will support it, but I cannot help anything that is totally wrong. May I not appeal to you, Mr. Prime Minister to reconsider this matter. I know you have given it thought, and I believe it hurts you to bring it in. Remember the children—would you or I like to be on \$1,200 and have 5 or 6 children; I don't think we would be able to put boots and clothes on them or send them to school. It is no good to have big educational institutions if we cannot pay our civil servants enough to allow them to send their children to them. I ask you on behalf of those men who supported and were loyal to you to reconsider the idea of cutting them below \$1,200. After all if you can float along, if you can manage to keep the country off the shoals I do not see what you would save by this that would be worth talking about. I do not believe that the saving on the \$1,200 cut will amount to \$30,000. I have not figured it out, but I do not think that at the most it will

be \$50,000. You can easily save the necessary money. Take your railway policy; you can save a whole lot on that. I know you have lost a lot of money this year, and I hope the mistake of last year will not be made again. I do not intend to make it you can easily give the \$1200 men their salaries.

Here is a book prepared by Dr. H. M. Mosdell, managing editor of the Daily Star. I understand it cost \$3,600. You know it is all very well to get up and vote away this money as no body outside sees it, but as surely as chickens come home to roost the people will not stand for it when they learn of it. Just think \$3,600 for a book Mistakes have been made, but you should decide to cut out the Hansard and all this unnecessary printing. It is no good; a man will take up this book and simply throw it aside. Other governments have made the same mistake perhaps in this government printing, but it is time for economy now though not the time to cut our greatest asset, the working man, or touch the \$1200 man who is trying to bring up the next generation. If the Prime Minister will be good enough to tell me now on behalf of the government that the \$1200 man will be left alone, I will sit down and be glad that I have done a better turn for them than I expected when I got on my feet I do not want Mr. Speaker to criticize unfairly or bring in anything that is not before the Chair, but I must say again to the Prime Minister and the government that they must absolutely discontinue all interference with the codfishery. I listened to-night to a conversation in the Crosbie Hotel between two suppliers and one of the horrors they had of supplying was the thought of the tax on fish. You know that if the fish is not caught and something done to help the country along you will not be able to pay the \$1200 men or give Mr. Whiteway or Dr. Burke a salary. I take it, Sir,

that it is essential for us to decide on some policy to send these men who are waiting here to go to the fishery whether they come from Trepassey or Port de Grave. I read to-night that the King's Cove boats had been out and returned loaded. You will not be here long as Prime Minister or I in Opposition if you don't start to produce, to catch, the fish which is so essential to the colony. I want to be fair to you, sir, and to the government. I never did much supplying and I do not know much about it. I have done more this year than in my 20 years' experience. I was known as the fellow who bought fish for cash. I am prepared to assist yet and to squander my money if it is to be squandered, as I say to you right now, sir, that I made it out of the fishermen. That's why I say get down to work. I do not want to unjustly criticize you as I know you have a difficult problem to face and I will gladly give you advice or assist you to let them get out of this House and about their business. Here is a telegram Sir M. P. Cashin just passed me—it's the same old thing as you and the other members of the government have been receiving. It says we can't get supplies; we can't do anything about the fishery. It comes from Arnold's Cove. It is the same old story and I would like you to-night to tell us the arrangements you have made to take place to-morrow. I thank you, Sir, for the aid you have given my district. I am doing my best to keep the men there away from able-bodied relief. The money for roads and bridges has done a lot of good and I thank the Minister of Public Works for his co-operation. I am willing to do all possible for my district. I want you too to let Mr. McRae go back with the insurance on foreign vessels fixed up. There is another side to this story but I will not discuss it till it comes up in the Budget. He told me this evening he had sent a telegram to his brother Frank, in Mr. Grace, to dis-

continue supplying if something is not done as to this fish tax. You ought to decide to-night to help the McRae outfit as it is a large concern. Many men from my district go to the Labrador with them and I do not want to have more to deal with than I can help. The past 18 months experience in the fish business ought to have taught us a lesson we should not soon forget. There ought to be some way of getting taxes without putting it on the main industry of the country. It has been the history everywhere that where the government touches industries they in variably upset the apple cart. If something be not done everyone will be looking to you to do their business. I will refrain from further discussion of this till we get it in Ways and Means, but I will fight against the taxing of salaries till the figure is set at \$2,000 and then you can do what you like. You must remember that you cannot tax the goose that lays the golden egg that is the fisherman and the one who is only getting enough to exist on. I want you to reconsider your decision and tell us you have decided not to touch the \$1,200 man or to interfere with the cod-fishery.

MR. BENNETT—I have listened, Mr. Speaker, with much interest this afternoon to the discussion on this Bill and particularly to the references to the reduction of the \$1200 salaries. I claim to know something of why they were increased. Prior to the War it is a well-known fact that the minor officials in the Civil Service were receiving only starvation wages; they were absolutely living from hand to mouth and not getting sufficient to provide the ordinary comforts of a home. By the table submitted it will be seen the increases were given to those who had under \$1,000; they were given by Sir Edward, now Lord Morris to try and even up the inequalities and to make amends for the wrongs of years past. As the situation became more acute all the salaries had to be

considered and a sliding scale was adopted whereby those receiving the higher rates would get only their proportionate share of the advance. It has been contended here this afternoon that 70 cents is now worth \$1 of last year. But I think that when you come to have a proper auditing of the situation and consider your Budget, your dollar will not be worth a cent more than it was 12 months ago. I don't think that the people have properly digested the facts. Looking over the Estimates I see the Hon. Prime Minister expects from the Special War Tax \$1,147,500 and after that \$900,000 from the Sales Tax. That is about 2 millions direct taxation and instead of the person who imports goods adding 25 per cent. on the cost he will have to add 50 per cent to meet what he will have to pay. Under these conditions I submit that the civil servant to-day who is to have his salary reduced, as contemplated in the Resolutions, will find himself in a worse position, when you take it from a sympathetic viewpoint, than he was in 1914 or 1915. I think that by cutting his salary you are depriving him of getting an ordinary decent living. This two million dollars of extra taxation will have to be paid by every man, woman and child in Newfoundland. The cutting of the smaller salaries in the Civil Service is not going to prove as beneficial as is anticipated or what is looked for here this afternoon. You take beef which is a large item in the home of any family. It is not ten per cent cheaper than what it was twelve months ago. There may be some articles that have cheapened, but as a general rule the reduction in food commodities has been very low indeed and the reduction will not be as low as it is now when the additional taxation, as contemplated in the Budget, is put on imported goods. We all appreciate and know that the government have to retrench and that every one should contribute towards that re-

trenchment. We all have to live cheaper to meet the altered conditions, but it is no use to reduce to the extent so that people cannot live at all. It is no use to have a civil service that will be disorganized or to have people that will be discontented or to resort to means that will only enable people to get sufficient to keep body and soul together. That would not be proper or it would not be right. You cannot expect a starving man to contribute taxes in a state of starvation. He has got to get enough to keep his family alive. There is no better way to get returns from the civil service or from other service than by properly paying him. Take the Police Force as was cited here this afternoon. To-day they are a credit to the country. We have members of the force in this House every afternoon, men as good as you will see anywhere. But that was brought about by properly paying them and properly appreciating them. Not many years ago the police force was depleted and prostituted and good men left the force and went away to try and keep their families from starving. What is true of the police force is true of other ranks in the civil service. Take the Firemen for instance on whom we must depend for our safety. Are they going to have their salaries cut and made discontented? Are you going to expect men to go and risk their lives for the protection of property without sufficient payment? Take the staff at the General Hospital. The nurses there have given creditable service. Many of them went across and nursed the soldiers, the sick and taken up work in the various hospitals that are in existence in this community. I say it is indecent for the Government to cut the salaries of those women to help to pay your deficit. Look at the work the nurses at the Lunatic Asylum have to perform. Why it is a wonder that you can get women to work there at all for forty or fifty dollars a month. And then the

retrenchment axe must be used to lop off their salaries. I repeat that such a procedure will tend to demoralize the service. Now whilst I sympathize with the government in what they have to contend with, I say that they are ill-advised in reducing the smaller salaries, because we are living under altered conditions, and the situation in this and every other country is different since the war. People have learned to live differently and people have learned to be more respectable and it is only this last few years that they got a chance to know what the comforts of life were. It is like putting the hands of the clock back when you bring in legislation of this kind and cut out every desire on the part of people to become good and respectable citizens. We are confronted with the peculiar position that last year the government thought well to raise the salaries of the three Judges of the Supreme Court \$1000 each. The matter was discussed here and the Minister of Justice made a strong plea for these people and that they should be put on the same level as the Provincial Judges of Canada, perhaps, very heroic, very right and very proper; but the question is whether it was advisable to raise these salaries after this House closed last year. Judges of the Supreme Court are to-day getting \$7000 and \$8000 a year respectively, which is considered to be a very respectable and substantial salary for any man to receive in this community, especially under present circumstances. It is not so long ago when the Colonial Secretary of this country received only \$2000 a year. A man like Sir Robert Bond filled that office and did the work for \$2000 and which was considered quite a decent salary ten years ago; but to-day that amount is considered a mere pittance. If we can afford to increase the salaries of the Judges, I have no fault to find with it because we have a Bench that everyone has the fullest confidence in and

that everyone trusts and respects, but I say this advisedly, as I have already said before on one or two occasions in this House that we should cut our garment according to our cloth. If we can afford to pay the Judges their present salaries by all means pay them. It may be argued their salaries will be reduced this year, but not to the extent of the amount that it was increased last year. Since the House met last year, we have the case of Sir William Lloyd, the Registrar of the Supreme Court. He was appointed by this House at \$3600 a year. Sir William Lloyd may possess qualifications above the ordinary Lawyer or the ordinary man, but after the House closed last year another \$1000 was tacked on his salary making it \$4600 a year. In my opinion that is a very handsome salary for a position of that sort in a country like this, and further I am told that the occupant of that office makes very large fees in addition to his salary. I have no means of knowing what those fees amount to but I have heard they amount to a substantial sum. I have no doubt that he makes considerable fees as Administrator of estates, and things of that kind. Well if it is possible for a government to grant salaries of this character, surely there is nothing illogical about the position taken by the members on this side of the House, namely, that underpaid officials should not be victimized and lopped off to meet the increases for higher paid officials. I understand that \$230,000 is the amount to be saved by reducing the salaries of civil servants. This amount will be so much blood money in very many cases. It will be an untold hardship on very many capable officials, and after all it is not the higher up officials that deserve sympathy, because men occupying high positions in the Government offices and getting high salaries, if they do not like it they can go at something else. That class of men are not going to

feel it; but it is in the man who have been working along and living in routine for a number of years and who are unfitted for anything else other than the jobs they hold at present who are going to feel it hardest. Take a man who has been in a Government office for thirty years on a small salary. He has not got a dollar put aside for a rainy day or if sickness overtakes him or any member of his family he has to curtail to meet any additional expenditure. Well I say that that is an untold hardship on a man of that kind; and it is an untold hardship on the policemen and on the firemen and on the nurses. I was at the General Hospital this morning speaking to some of the nurses. They said to me "surely you are not going to cut our pay?" I said as far as the Opposition are concerned they have no such desire and the only thing I can advise you to do is to pick out a delegation of the best looking nurses you have here—and I suppose that will include all—and approach the Bar of the House and address the Prime Minister and see what effect it will have on him. Perhaps, out of the goodness of his heart he will re-consider the blow he intends to strike.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not the blow but the pressure.

MR. BENNETT—We will leave it at that. I do not intend to delay the House unnecessarily on this subject, because when we go into Committee on Ways and Means we will have an opportunity of expressing our opinions on the different votes as they come along; but I would certainly emphasize the desirability of the government re-considering the question of cutting any salaries below \$1200 a year, because I think that it is false economy. I do not think that the government will be anything in pocket at the end of the year as a result of this form of retrenchment because efficiency in the public service is absolutely essential and must be maintained. The

thing is too infinitesimal to help Newfoundland. We got to think on larger lines than this. What we must think of is how the country is going to recover from the position into which she has drifted. There are other and more effective means of curtailment than this cutting of small salaries can possibly be. It has been pointed out here already that we have a service in this country that can be very easily dispensed with. It almost takes one's breath away when one realises that one million dollars a year is being spent for education in this country—and still going up. Well now it's alright to talk in favor of education, and I would be the last person, perhaps, in the world to say a word against it, but I say we can only afford a certain amount for that purpose. In my opinion there is more money wasted on the department of education than there is in any other department in the civil service. I was astounded last winter while there was a trial on in the Supreme Court in which a man was accused of the death of his child in an important settlement in an important district and that within a few miles of St. John's. I never heard of such absolute ignorance. Children were let run wild without the advantages of an idea of elementary education—from the youngest to the oldest. Still we are told of the great advantages of education in this country. I heard of some things that happened in this country that are almost unbelievable. Why its like the dark ages, and I heard from clergymen of things that they have seen, that are a reflection on our civilization. And still we are asked to vote nearly a million dollars for education. It is high time that education entered the homes and tried to enlighten the people a bit first. It is a waste of time to send children to school and people living in places with schools right next door to them and they do not know what the schools are for. We are told that there are eleven men in

Canada and the United States training to become school inspectors. Can any sane man tell me that that is a proper way to spend money, under present conditions. I say the educational system we had for the last twenty years is sufficient for us until such time as we can afford something better. What advantage to us is it going to be to have men going around inspecting schools if most of their time is to be spent in holding consultations with school teachers, as I heard it explained. I think if I was a school inspector I would get around to all the schools of any of the denominations that I had to visit in one summer, and I think that if there was a little more energy and industry displayed on the part of those who are high up in educational circles and if they spent less of their time here in St. John's that there would be a great deal more improvement in our educational system than we see in the country at the present time. Any how I protest and protest vigorously against a continuance of such expenditure of public monies for men going away and training for anything at present, I care not what it is. I think those would be inspectors should be ordered home like the Fish Commissioners were and made go and earn their living at something else. The idea of having a crowd of fancy inspectors going all over the country, is, I think ridiculous. Talk about economy, why it is a delusion and a snare. It is like the Estimates. Last year we were asked to pass Estimates and we find to-day from the statement of Supplemental Supply, as tabled, or in other words the money not voted last year by this Legislature amounts to \$1,151,000, not including the \$380,000 that was spent on fish. It is an absolute joke for a government to come in here and ask us to pass Estimates and then go out and spend half as much again on Executive responsibility. The Prime Minister last year deplored the system of Supplemental

Supply and sad it was vicious and improper, but he himself has outheroded Herod in this instance. Never before was there such an exhibition of extravagance as demonstrated in Additional Estimates or Supplemental Supply for the year 1920-21. This Legislature is the proper place to vote the people's money. We are the representatives of all the people of the country no matter which side of the House we sit on. We are the appointed trustees of the people to look after their money and after their interest and to see that no money is voted that is not properly cared for. But Responsible Government becomes a joke when you go out after the closing of the House and add hundreds of thousands of dollars to the expenditure and deny all the representatives of the people the chance to say whether this money should be spent or not. Here are the additions to the Estimates that we passed last year. Last year we voted \$50,000 for the Agriculture and Mines Department additional expenditure \$45,000; additional expenditure Postal Telegraphs \$66,000; additional expenditure Public Charities Department \$131,000; Finance Department \$35,000; Marine & Fisheries Department \$86,000; Justice Department \$39,000; Contingencies Account \$68,000; Liquor Control \$107,000 Dept. of Colonial Secretary \$6,000 and Department of Public Works \$425,000. The total amount not voted by this Legislature last year plus \$380,000 for fish is \$1,151,000. What guarantees have we got that the estimates that we pass this year will not be augmented by the time we come back next year—if we ever do come back. Consequently, I say that it is folly for the government or any member of the government to say that the affairs of this country are not in a serious condition. It must be remembered that the earning power of the people is cut in two. A few years ago the earning power of the people of Newfoundland was over forty million dollars or \$800 per fam-

ily. To-day twenty millions would be a conservative estimate of the earning power of the people or half of what it was in 1917-18 and 1919, and we can only earn one dollar where we earned two before. We can only afford to spend one dollar where we spent two before, I care not what your estimates are put down for or what revenue you expect to get or what you expect to save by taxing salaries. I say the earning power of the people to-day is only half of what it was three or four years ago and the expenditure of running the government, through extravagance has increased from six to eleven millions of dollars. Now it is only a matter of common sense as to what is going to be the result and I do not think that the Government is taking that seriously enough. The situation should have been gone into with that care and attention that it requires. The Prime Minister may have considered it, but I doubt very much if any member of his Executive have sat down calmly and deliberately and thought of what is going to happen during the coming year, particularly next Fall. What is going to happen in this country after the 30th of November next? That is the question. I have no doubt that the great bulk of the fishermen will be supplied for the fishery and that the government are doing all they can in that direction, but what is going to happen after the fishery is over. A man has got to think first of his family for next winter. The expense of outfitting a man to-day for the fishery is such that five or six dollars a quintal for his fish will not pay to keep his family for the Summer and him for his labor. It may be sufficient Fall seasons, but if he turns his catch back to the merchant who supplied him he will have nothing left for the winter. The merchant to-day is supplying mainly on Government guarantee and to the credit of some merchants they are doing the best they can. I know of one merchant, Mr. Walter

Monroe, who has given out almost every dollar he possesses to supply Newfoundland dealers in the hope that he will get proper returns. I think that a man like that deserves the highest commendation of the entire community. But the unfortunate part of it is this. If the price of fish is going to be where it is estimated to be next Fall and even if many do have a good voyage what position are the merchants going to be in to give supplies for next winter to their dealers. That is why I say that the situation is going to be serious in this country from the 30th of November next until the end of January of next winter and that is why I say that the government is not sincere in devising ways and means to meet that contingency. I appreciate what has been done already this Spring, but what is going to be done when this present session of the House of Assembly closes. Every member on this side will be absolutely silent, and unable to do anything without power and without influence, and the government will have to assume all responsibility for looking after the people next winter and now is the time to consider the matter. It may be said that the thing is hopeless. Well I do not think that it is hopeless. I have ways and means in my mind that I think can get over the situation effectively, and, if that course was taken, without any sacrifice of our independence, I believe that the situation can be provided for effectively. I do not know whether the government have any such thoughts in their minds—I hope they have. I say that this House should merely adjourn this year and arrangements made so that an emergency session could be called without any delay should any great crisis arise.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I would like Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two as to the scale of salaries. In my opinion, so far as the discussion has gone, I don't think it is a question of

whether the salaries stay as they are or go back to the 1918 standard, the first thing to decide is, what is a decent living wage for many of the civil servants. Till you do that everything will be wrong. You must arrive at the minimum salary. And, if I might, now put it to Hon. Dr. Barnes, who is holding a position that needs not much work, to evolve some scheme for a standard where a man can live decently and not go above it. The civil service is in an absolute muddle at present as positions are awarded as the result of pull. The Prime Minister for two years has done nothing and some may say how can he do anything without making trouble. I say by competitive examinations. Unless you do that nothing will be proper. When the Estimates come up I will refer to this again. Before taking my seat I wish to refer to the circular letter of Hon. Mr. Coaker which has been read by the Prime Minister. That circular created one of the greatest sensations in the history of this House. It was written by the same man of whom the Prime Minister said things that all we are saying now can in no way compare. The points made were just as strong. This letter too is just as strong. I was really puzzled by the position of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this House. His was only an act of attrition, not an act of contrition. It is only a half-hearted contrition as it was inspired by the fear of the devils and hell as he described this side of the House. He sees only the small space of the floor between him and it. He fears the punishment of his misdeeds and the appointment of the Commission to enquire into the same and fire him into what he pictures as the Hell of the Opposition. His is a happy conception indeed, but as Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett pointed out the three leading denominations of the country are well re-

presented in that region. He says he is a representative among clowns, and I can only think he refers to the Prime Minister and his other associates. I hope the Prime Minister will disabuse him of that impression. The Hon. Minister of Marine, I am glad to learn, is not going to leave the Port Union men orphans. This reminds me of the story of the boy who went to college. His father spent a lot of money on him, and when asked what he was going to be, the boy said, a poet. The father expressed the hope that he would be a mute and glorious one of the type of Milton. When he turned out a politician, the father was sorry he was not mute. Now as to writing the epitaph of Hon. Mr. Coaker, I suggest that he be no longer tormented by the fear of Hell to which is due his breakdown. I am sorry that the Hon. Prime Minister does not hurry up the Commission to enquire into his conduct and put him out of pain. He should grant that Commission that has been so much talked about. And then—let the finding of that Commission be his epitaph. It certainly would be a fitting one. With all things in connection with his career duly weighed I think his best act is his retiring from political life. But,

No longer seek his merits to disclose
Or draw his frailties from their dread
abode.

Let them rest in Port Union. That place has been his guiding star; there his sun rose and there it set for him; Now he has hied him away to his own select portion of the country—and may he have many happy years there.

MR. WALSH—I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words. I did not intend to speak but as Sir M. P. Cashin brought up the matter of supplies, I would like to point out that the proportionate share should not enter into consideration. The sum of \$500,000 was voted last year to buy

fish but none of it went to Fortune or St. Mary's Bays; \$72,000 was used to purchase the salt which is stored at Port Union; there was \$120,000 for cutting pit props and in St. Mary's and Placentia we got \$12,000 of it and yet again there was \$100,000 for cutting stuff for cars in Twillingate District but none of it went to the westward. It has to be paid up by the taxpayers of the West as well as the North. I thanked the Prime Minister for what he has done for Placentia and St. Mary's but I asked for a loan of \$200,000—a loan, not a gift. If industries were taken up as Sir M. P. Cashin pointed out there would be no need to send so many people to the fishery. But after hearing the document by the Hon. Minister of Marine in which he tells the people of the North that they will be supplied and assisted by the Government, I do not think it fair that members on this side of the House must be pleading day after day for men who are just as good as any in the country or Empire. I will not make a lengthy speech now as I have met the Hon. Prime Minister and he agreed to meet me at 11 o'clock in the morning.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—If we are not still in session.

MR. WALSH.—I hope you do not mean that as a slur, as an insinuation that I am holding up the House. As we suggested I am prepared to adjourn now if you will only promise to do something. But if there be any shilly-shallying, if these men are to be compelled to come here indefinitely, I will hold up all legislation in this House to-morrow unless removed by the police force for which Sir John Crosbie has been pleading this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had recommended that the Resolutions be refer^d

red to the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was so ordered.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the cost of the two motor fire engines imported here last year for the Fire Department, also the original bills both for the machines and for the freight and other expenses thereon; also to say if the argument in favor of buying these machines was that it would enable a reduction in the number of horses in the Fire Department, and if the number of horses had been reduced, and if not why not; also to show what saving if any has been effected by the importation of these engines.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I may say this question was not brought to my attention to-day but I will answer it to-morrow.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if it is the intention of the government, in view of its announced policy of economy and reduction of expenditures, to cancel, as from July 1st, the use of a motor car for the Inspector General of Constabulary, seeing that this car is mainly used for the private convenience of that official and the members of his family, and would it not be in the interests of the public to adopt this policy and use the money spent on this machine in maintaining the salaries of the firemen rather than to cut their salaries as is apparently proposed under the Estimates now before the House?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

The Government has no information as to the privileges given him by the late government.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his Department is carrying out the work of opening Day's Pond, Bona-

vista, and if it is being done on the recommendation of the government engineer, to lay on the Table of the House copy of his report advising the same, and if on the recommendation of any other person to table copy of the report of said person. Also to state the estimated cost of the work, the number of men that will be occupied in carrying it out, to say from what fund the money is being taken to carry out the work, and if it is from special relief fund, is the amount provided more than the per capita allowance to which the District of Bonavista is entitled, and if so on what ground is it being given and what provision is being made for all the rest of the settlements in that district.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

No work is being done at Bonavista except such as is covered by the appropriation of last year for Day's Pond operations. Out of the \$100,000 allocation a certain portion was for that district. The work is being completed with that and a portion of the district grant. No extra expense to the Colony is entailed at all.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, if Messrs. Kerr and Rober, experts now here from the United States in connection with railway affairs have been brought here at the instance of the Railway Commission, the Reid Newfoundland Co., or both; what is the nature of their duties, how long will they be engaged therein, what remuneration is there being paid, and what portion, if any, is to be borne by the Colony?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am informed that the gentlemen referred to have no connection with the Railway Commission. Their visit is due entirely to the instigation, if I may use the word, of private members of the Reid Nfld. Co. I do not know

their duties. They are receiving no remuneration from the Colony.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement from the Auditor General certified by that official, embodying the financial details furnished by him to the representatives of the Bond Brokerage Firms who negotiated the recent loan of six million dollars for this Colony, and also copy of the Minute of Council authorizing the raising of the said loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No financial details were furnished, verbally or in writing, by the Auditor General to the men who negotiated the loan. I beg to table a copy of the Minute of Council.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is correct that the Imperial Tobacco Factory and the Colonial Cordage Co. are planning to close their factories as from to-morrow, May 31st, if so, for what period are they likely to remain closed; what number of employees will be laid off, and what steps if any, is the government proposing to take for the relief of these people?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I received a communication from the Tobacco Co. and the Cordage Co. to the effect that they desire a protective tariff put on while we are in Ways and Means. Both these factories are already well stocked. At a meeting some time ago the Cordage people stated the imported goods was cheaper than they could produce.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Can you tell me if tobacco was taken out of bond two days before the Estimates were tabled, and the price raised 10c. per lb.

MR. MOORE.—And still these people are looking for more concessions. It is a great thing to have a monopoly in this country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If

the tobacco were taken out, it would be pretty keen business.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education why the grants for sparsely settled places and for school buildings have been reduced in the Estimates for the coming year, and the grant for inspection increased, and to state what services adequate to the expenditure are given for the latter outlay?

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—There has been a reduction for schools as in view of the hard times the vote will be able to stand it. The increase for inspection is in accord with the grant of last session.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House copies of all cablegrams, radiograms and telegrams between his Department or any officials thereof and himself, and his replies thereto during the period of his absences from this Colony, from the 15th November 1919, up to date, and a statement showing the cost of the same.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I ask that this question be deferred.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister why tenders for the recent loan were not sought from various firms of bond dealers in the United States and Canada with a view to securing the best terms possible for the Colony as was done in the case of previous loans as for instance in that of 1919 when several different syndicates tendered, and what was the reason that induced him to restrict his dealings to only one syndicate when by putting the loan to competition much better terms might have been obtained?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There was no need of publicity at the time and as a matter of fact, but that it had been negotiated direct, a few days later it would have been difficult

to close as the article in the Tribune had appeared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—We find here in a paper that in Manitoba bonds were selling at a good rate.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—But none of the people were writing against their own resources.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That is no justification.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We will deal with that in Committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I will read your letter to the Tribune.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You mean you will read part of my letter but later I will get my letter from the editor of the Tribune with the deletions made.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I don't know about that. I am only an outsider.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to appoint Mr. E. Collishaw to be High Commissioner for this Colony at Washington, and if so what salary and allowances will be paid to him in connection with that position?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Collishaw is not being appointed.

MR. SINNOTT asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works, from what date the payment of \$90.00 a month to Mr. Albert Salter for special services as adviser to the Public Works Department began; how much he has received on this account up to date, and if it is the intention of the government to reduce his salary in the same way as the salaries of other public officials are to be reduced?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—All the information has been given before in answer to Sir John Crosbie. As to the latter part of the question I think he will be reduced like the others.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education (a) If any amounts from the Augmentation Grant

are being paid to the supervisors now training abroad; (b) Is any such amount from such grant being paid Mr. S. P. Whiteway; (c) What are the amounts paid in each case?

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—They are being paid for out of Augmentation. (b) No. (c) I will have the amounts to-morrow.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a comparative statement for the past ten years showing (a) the amount annually paid to lobster fishermen all over the Dominion as compensation for the spawn lobsters returned to the water; (b) the cost annually of government inspection; (c) the inspectors connected with this service, giving the complete list of same showing date of appointment of each; (d) the districts mainly concerned with the lobster fishery.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is being looked up by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is always prompt in forwarding information and we will likely have it to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I beg to draw the attention of the House to the following article which appears in the Daily Star of recent date. (Reads article.) In this we have the first suggestion that McGrath is leader of the Opposition in the Upper House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—He is acting as such, in place of Hon. Mr. Ellis.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Ellis is the leader; we have nothing to do with Mr. McGrath. I hope now you will all listen to this as it is a clever article. As a fisherman would say it is sailing pretty close to the wind. I read the article a few days ago and asked the Prime Minister if each paragraph was correct.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It

is grossly disloyal; if a soldier had written it in war time he would have been shot.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—“The fishery is being conducted as usual.” Is that statement in the article correct? If so I must be dreaming. A few days ago we had a petition here from a man who supplies over 20,000 people asking for aid and I now ask can this article be correct in stating the fishery already shows better returns. It is signed R. A. Squires.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Sir M. P. Cashin has drawn attention to this message. I am the author of it but I wrote it in an even more aggressive form. I have a letter from the editor of the Tribune who as he had a lot of matter from McGrath did not let mine go in. Mr. Steele of the Nova Scotia corporation, finding McGrath's message injurious, came to my house at night and stated their bonds abroad were being prejudiced by the article. I said I was sorry if any Newfoundlander was hurting them but ours for the loan had already been sold and the transaction closed. A day or two after I announced the closing of the bonds this article of McGrath appears. Whether it was written in good faith or not I will not now discuss. I do say that if it had been written by a soldier in war time, as McGrath did in our hour of need, he would have been taken out before a firing squad and shot.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—No, no, you are wrong there.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It is the basest, the most treacherous and the most dangerous article to a Colony that a cur could be guilty of writing.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Do you know if what was contained in that article was the truth and if it was right or not? And do you know who wrote the article I just read?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The article you just read was a digest of a cable I sent to the New York Tribune.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—In the face of that, you knowing of Harris's petition and of the general depression in this country, you have gone out and raised that Loan under false pretences.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Supposing I did.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You talk about loyalty. Where were you from 1914 to 1918? You were one of the men who took to the woods. You hid when those men who are looking for relief to-night went and spilled their blood for you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I was doing as much for the war and got less out of it than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—During the term of office of the National Government, under the Premiership of Sir William Lloyd, we came in here, at the instance of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and passed a law to prevent you as Attorney General from collecting fees from the estates of returned soldiers and sailors. Ask your colleagues if that is correct?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. member lies.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You will find it in the Hansard.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I shall be delighted if you will look it up.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—There is no more doubt about this than there is about the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that you were the black rascal. That is also in the Hansard if you go turn it up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is what your job is.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You are not going to hand me out any old kind of

bluff you like. I served through that war and I think that I did my part and when you were not to be found. But now we find you eulogizing the soldiers. What have you done in the way of enacting new legislation for their benefit? The answer is—nothing.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad my hon. friend thinks that he did something for the war and thinks that he got nothing out of it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I am sure of it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—But to get back to this point. I propose to go where I like and there is one man in Newfoundland that will not stop me from going any place that I like; but I succeeded in putting the Hon. Leader of the Opposition where I liked.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What do you mean by that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Here is the article written by Sir Patrick McGrath to the New York Tribune:

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What is that to you?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It would be a great lift to you, if we did not succeed in getting the Loan.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I don't know anything about McGrath; I am not responsible for him.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—But you are in daily conference with him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—And I am in daily connection here with you too.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Exactly, and in spite of that I cannot make a gentleman out of you. By the interruptions of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition while I was reading that McGrath article one would be almost inclined to think that Sir Michael wrote the article himself and yet he says he does not know the real author of that article. That article was published in the New York Tribune on

Wednesday, May 18th, and it received subsequent publication in allied newspapers at the same time. I have received letters from scores of people in the United States, some of them from Newfoundlanders and some of them not, calling my attention to this dastardly article, appearing as it did contemporaneously with Bonds on the market would naturally have an effect. A prominent gentleman in New York who is not connected with any newspaper there, with this comment of his: "The enclosed does not tend to sell your Bonds here, does it?" I have also here a commercial clipping from the "Globe," dated May 20th, an article written by Alfred W. McCann.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If it were against Newfoundland I would say that Alfred B. Morine wrote it, but being in support of Newfoundland the author is Alfred W. McCann.

MR. MACDONNELL.—He must be an Irishman, the name sounds Irish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, an Irish name of one who is loyal to the Irish in Newfoundland. The article reads as follows: (Reads article.)

That is one of the articles which, up to the present, I have received from the New York press in which the press of the United States, realising that an effort was made by McGrath, in their opinion at least, to endeavour to hamper the flotation of bonds in New York, is dealing with McGrath and that is not the only one who will be dealing with McGrath before the incident is closed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Would you mind telling me the source of the letter signed McCann? If you can't tell, I'll tell the source. It is a man, one of two candidates of yours, who ran in Harbour Main district for election and was defeated.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It is delightful to know that the Hon.

Leader of the Opposition, after six week's campaigning and spending his hard earned dollars, succeeded in getting his two men elected in Hr. Main.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It's consoling to know that I trimmed you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You trimmed me. I wonder if this is what you call trimming me. I went into an Opposition constituency where it was generally conceded I did not have a ghost of a chance of election. The result was that I was not only returned to office but increased my majority, and what was looked upon as a hopeless fight turned out to be a Government triumph and a Government victory. Do you know, Sir, that the worst curse that could come on this administration would be to have the two candidates, you referred to, on the Government side.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I can give you the address of McCann. You inspired that article and sent it to Devine to get it in that paper. My friend, Mr. MacDonnell thought that McCann was an Irishman in the United States. You cannot find an Irishman in the States who would touch that article.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You mean to say that no Irishman in the United States would attack McGrath.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—No, but there is no man there who would allow himself to be made a tool of by you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Fortunately, I usually select nner tools, rapiers, not bludgeons or sandbags.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I would like for the Prime Minister to describe the term loyalty, because this term before the war and after the war mean two different things. I want to tell the Prime Minister that when the time comes to have a court martial in this country, whether it will be a military court martial or the court martial of an outraged people that McGrath, ev-

en when he is damned will find himself in good company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I know of one or two others who will be associated with him.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I want to hear your definition of the word loyalty; then I will give you mine.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We will have to move the House into Committee of the Whole to discuss that matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad that the occasion presented itself to-night to deal with this matter, as I wanted to have an opportunity of getting on the Hansard the McGrath article.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is not everything stated in that article true?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Why I would not think of defaming the man's character or to insinuate that he ever told a lie in his life; his character is beyond any question of doubt for truthfulness.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You seem to judge another man by yourself.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Sir John accused me of very many things since this House has been in session and he now tells me that I judge another man by myself. Well, now Sir John have not you judged me by yourself?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I would not attempt to do that. What I strongly object to now, as I objected to it some days ago when the article appeared in the "Star," is for blaming me for having knowledge of what McGrath wrote. I am not McGrath's keeper. I do not care what McGrath said or wrote. But I would like to call the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that what that article contained was a correct picture of the whole situation. There can be no question at all about that. To-night the fishermen are here in this House looking for supplies I can see them here from my own dis-

trict as well as from other districts, and I endorse McGrath's statement that they are looking for something they have not yet got.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act further Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Venereal Diseases" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. Minister of Posts, Minister of Public Works, Dr. Jones, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Fox.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister to put the Motion for an Address to His Excellency the Governor first on the Order Paper to-morrow in order to facilitate matters.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I was anxious to make progress with the Loan Resolutions, and I would much prefer having the Minister of Marine and Fisheries here during the course of the discussion on the address.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—There is no necessity to have him here, and, in my opinion it would be better that he would not be here while the debate is on.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If he is not here by Thursday we will go on with it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Thank you.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, I would crave your indulgence for a few minutes to present a petition on behalf of a number of motorists in the city. There are 150 names to the petition and an equally large, if not greater, number will sign the petition in the course of the next few days. I shall reserve comment upon it for the pre-

sent and will merely read the petition to the House. (Reads petition.) And it being past midnight

WEDNESDAY, June 1st.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

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

MR. FOX asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, late Inspector of Pickled Fish was discharged from office; how long had he been in the employ of the Government; did he hold office under Commission; if so to lay on the Table of the House a copy of said Commission; under whose authority was he dismissed and when; was it under Order in Council, if so to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Minute of Council relative thereto, together with all correspondence and other memoranda dealing with this matter.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to furnish a list of the officials in his department showing:

- (1) The length of service of each (giving as near as possible actual date of appointment in each case.)
- (2) The special and particular work done by each.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, for a list of the officials in the Department of Finance and Customs, showing:

- (1) The length of service of each (giving as near as possible the actual date of appointment in each case.)
- (2) The special and particular work done by each.

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to

furnish a statement for the past ten years showing:

- (a) The number of men employed each year in the lobster fishery.
- (b) The number of packing stations each year.
- (c) The number of cases of lobsters put up each year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the quantity of pit props cut as relief in this Colony during the past winter and a list of the parties who cut same who have notified the Government that they are unable to make a sale of the stocks in their hands and to state what action the Government proposes to take with a view to disposing of all this material?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence between the late Postmaster or himself, or both and the C.P.R., in connection with a Cable service and between the last Postmaster General, himself, or both and the Anglo American Telegraph Company in regard to proposals by that Company for a service in conjunction with the Postal Telegraph.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if Mr. E. Collishaw was in Toronto or New York during the time when the negotiations for the recent loan for the Colony were in progress, and if so, did he furnish the Bond Brokers with a statement in regard to the Colony's finances on which the loan was raised, and is he the missing link in connection with this transaction?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to question one the information is being prepared. As to the third question Mr. MacDonnell will appreciate that the reply will necessitate a great deal of research work. As to the list asked for I will have that to-

orrow. As to question four in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I have asked the Deputy to prepare the reply. In response to number five I have to say that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has been asked to prepare the information.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—In reply I have to say that my department has no copies of the matter herein referred to.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Dr. Robinson was in Canada in relation to this matter and there was a lot of correspondence and Dr. Robinson reported to the Government in reference to this matter. The Department ought to have a record of it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—We have no record of it but I think the Department of the Colonial Secretary may. They at the time asked to have it returned. I will ask for it. I remember I asked the Department for it last year. I will try and have it for to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to question seven I am not aware that Mr. E. Collishaw was in Toronto or New York when this loan was in progress. I am not aware that he was ever approached by the brokers in question and he certainly had nothing whatever to do with the matter in question. He is the missing link in this matter.

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.

THURSDAY, June 2nd.

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

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, I

crave the indulgence of the House to bring forward a matter that is of the utmost importance to the industrial life of the Colony and especially to the District which is represented by the hon. Prime Minister and myself. Last evening upon taking up the papers I saw a notice therein which I shall read before making any comment upon it. The notice to which I refer is as follows:

To the Employees of the Colonial Cordage Company, Limited:

We regret to be compelled to give notice that work will cease in this Factory, one week from this date, and that we shall have to dispense with your services from 8th June, 1921. For many months we have been operating under difficulties, and stocks have been accumulating. This is the only industry in Newfoundland which has no protection against the production of countries where labor is cheaper, and where conditions are more favorable. We are now faced with an increase in duties on the ingredients used in our manufacture, and no corresponding duties placed on the foreign article with which we are obliged to compete. This means that the home made article will be driven from our own country, and the foreign made article will take its place. We have represented these facts to the Government, and so far have no assurance of redress, and it would be unwise for us to continue to pile up stocks, which might at any time be swamped by the dumping of the produce of foreign countries, admitted free of duty. We regret the severance of the pleasant relations existing between us, in many cases from 20 to 30 years, and we assure you that it is with great reluctance we are compelled to serve this notice.

COLONIAL CORDAGE CO., LTD.

Mr. Speaker, when I read that notice I felt that this was a very serious matter and one which, as a member

for the District most concerned and considered the extent to which it affected my constituents, I felt it my duty to investigate with a view to ascertaining if possible what it was that brought about the necessity for the closing down of the Colonial Cordage Company's plant. I accordingly waited upon the general manager of the Company to discuss the matter with him and to see if in some way the plant could not be kept in operation. It is a serious matter when, in addition to all our other troubles, we have a concern like this upon which one hundred families are dependent for their livelihood going out of business and the consequences are such as one trembles to contemplate. However, I feel that in bringing this matter forward here I will have the sympathy of the Prime Minister whose constituents these people also are and there is no doubt that everything possible under the circumstances will be done to have the thing properly adjusted.

In the course of the interview to which I have referred I listened to the following statement with regard to the manufacture of the products of this concern, especially with regard to lines and twines:

THE COLONIAL CORDAGE CO. LTD. MEMORANDUM.

The local manufacture gives employment to many Newfoundlanders, the imported article gives none

The only argument against placing a duty on imported Lines and Twines is that it would increase the cost to the fishermen. This would not be the case where they use the local article.

There is a duty of 10 per cent. on fishing hooks; we would suggest that if benefit to the fishermen is intended it would be much better to take the duty off hooks which give no labor here, and give the ten per cent. protection to Lines and Twines which do. This would benefit the fishermen as well as local labor, and would at the same

time tend to increase the Revenue of the country. A fisherman uses 100 hooks for every line used.

The remission of duties on articles which we use in manufacture would not be practicable as we sell many of these to the trade, and separation would be impossible, besides this it would tend to confuse the Customs.

Particulars of cost of manufacture of one dozen fishing lines, together with the duties payable by this Company.

Cotton, \$1.20; Tar, 10 cts. duty at 20 per cent., 2.0 cts.; Paper, 4cts., duty at 15 per cent., 0.6 cts.; Burlap, 20 cts., duty at 15 per cent., 3.0 cts.; Labor (flat), 45 cts.; Mill supplies, 30 cts., duty at 25 per cent., 7.5 cts.; Overhead expenses, 20 cts. Total \$2.49. Total duty, 13.1|10 cts.

The above figures show a penalty to the extent of 5 per cent on the local made article in its own country, whereas the foreign made comes in free of all duty

The gain to the country by protecting, or at least placing this branch of industry upon an equality with the foreign made lines is very considerable.

1st.—Duties collectable under the new tariff if the industry continues, enumerated above . . . 13.10|100 cts.

2nd.—Interest gain of revenue on amount paid for flat, viz., 4c. at an average; duty at 35 per ct. 14.71|100 cts

3rd.—It is of great economic advantage to the fishing industry that stocks should be carried by this Company where it is immediately available, rather than that merchants generally should carry overlapping stocks, the interest and general charges of which are difficult to compute, but which are inevitably added to the selling cost of the foreign made article which in turn falls upon the fishermen.

Total 27.81|100 cts.

Or roundly 28 cents for every dozen lines made in the country. The average output of this company exceeds 30,000 dozen per annum.

This number of dozens at 28c. per dozen brings in a return to the revenue of the country of well up to nine thousand dollars in this branch alone. Inversely, if this work stops the revenue loses and receives no compensating gain from the foreign made article

The loss to the revenue does not stop here.

For without the aid of the line and twine branches to enable the Company to carry its overhead expenses, we could not hope to compete with our rope competitors in our comparatively restricted market. Consequently, the stopping of the line and twine branches necessitates the closing down the entire plant.

Our estimate of the total amount of revenue collected directly from the company and indirectly from our operatives is well over fifty thousand dollars per annum. On the other hand if this factory closes down this revenue ceases and in addition an added burden will be placed upon the resources of the Country in finding relief or employment for our out-of-work operatives.

MR. BENNETT—I submit, Sir, that that is a very clear and concise statement of a position that should no longer exist. If we are to exist as a country at all we must in every possible way and by every possible measure protect and encourage our local industries. Here is a case of one hundred families who are depending for a living on that institution, an institution, which, owing to the increased duties that they are faced with and the unfair competition that they are called upon to enter into, have to close down. The Ropewalk during the past winter have been kept practically in full operation and have accumulated large stocks of ready-made materials; and it is no great hardship on the Company to cease work, but it will come on those, unfortunately, who can least afford to bear it. I appeal now to the Prime Minister to see if something

cannot be done. I know he is as much interested in this matter and in these people as I am and I hope that he will see the justice of making an alteration in the tariff that will not in any degree bear heavily on the fishermen of the country. I would suggest an adjustment of the tariff on all lines and twines and hooks, as I believe that it can be done without any loss to the revenue. I, therefore, thank you Mr. Speaker for allowing me the privilege of putting those views before the House and trust that the Prime Minister will give the matter that attention and consideration that its importance merits.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. May I crave your permission to thank Mr. Bennett for drawing the attention of the House to this matter which is of such importance to the country generally as well as to the constituency which we jointly represent. On Monday morning last I had a communication from the Colonial Cordage Co., the tenor of it being somewhat similar to what Mr. Bennett read in the report this afternoon, the position of the Company being that they desire to have an import duty of ten per cent. on all lines and twines imported into the country. I might say that the Manager for the Colonial Cordage Company formed part of a very large deputation, representing local factories, that waited on the Government some time ago in an effort to secure some protection for local industries, particularly with respect to the dumping of surplus stocks of foreign manufactured goods into Newfoundland and their desires in that regard have been fully met in the Resolutions by the insertion of the dumping clause which disposes of one of the points referred to in the report which was read by Mr. Bennett. The question of the rebate of duty on the remaining portion of the materials used by them in their manufacturing operations would not be of any practical benefit

to them, under the circumstances. However, an effort is being made in the Sales Tax, which are embodied in Resolutions now in the course of being drafted and which will be submitted to the Committee on Ways & Means for discussion, to give preference to local manufacturers generally and by which the Colonial Cordage Co would substantially benefit. The question of the tax which the Company desires to have removed has been referred to a Committee of Council for consideration and discussion. The situation that they have large stocks on hand and that they have given an assurance that, if the tax is put on lines and twines, they will not have to increase their prices the coming year is before the Committee of Council for consideration, so that we hope when we get into Committee on Ways and Means to discuss more fully the whole facts. The major portion of the facts referred to this afternoon were given in the letter I have received from the Colonial Cordage Company; but I would be much obliged if the hon. member would let me have a copy of the memorandum he has. As I said before, the entire matter is one that the government have under careful consideration.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Speaker. With your permission I would like to add a word in support of the appeal made by Mr. Bennett this afternoon with reference to increased taxation on the products of the Ropewalk. I think we will all agree that the Rope walk, at the present time, is a great institution in our midst. One hundred families, as has been already stated by Mr. Bennett, are receiving their support in that direction. Putting the number of families down at practically \$1,000 each, they are no doubt paying into the revenue of this colony \$30,000 in addition to the \$50,000 revenue, already estimated in the memorandum that was read to the House this afternoon. With reference to the Prime

Minister's remarks that part of the memorandum has been covered already by the dumping clause in the Budget. I do not agree with him. The line of goods at the Ropewalk never finds its way into this colony in this form. The Ropewalk manufacture lines and twines and ropes and cables of all descriptions, and I never heard in all my experience—and I have had some little experience as Minister of Finance and Customs as well as in the supplying of bankers and fishermen generally—of any goods in the dumping class coming through the Custom House that belonged to the Ropewalk. There is no such things as "dumping goods" in this line at all. Take cables for vessels that are made at the Ropewalk. They are looked upon to be as good as any cables manufactured in Canada or the United States. I have sold cables, which were made at the Ropewalk, to American and Canadian vessels and from which I subsequently received testimonials from stating that the material and the make up of those cables were just as good if not superior to cables that are turned out in Canadian or American factories. I happened to meet Mr. Monroe, the Manager of the Ropewalk, this morning. He came as a bolt from the blue to me when he stated his position of having to close down that institution, if the present tariff was enforced. Practically two hundred operatives have been turned out of employment. I think that the government are going too fast in that direction. One time that institution had a subsidy; to-day they have no subsidy in the way of encouragement from the government. In view of the large amount of employment given by them within the past six months and with the consequent piling up of huge stocks, I think that special consideration should be given them. To-day they cannot dispense with the enormous stocks they have on hand. Mr. Monroe was telling me that they have sufficient stocks on

hand to last for about six months. That is due to the depression generally that exists all round the Island. I think we should make haste slowly in this matter if it is not our intention to put two hundred employees on the street. I know it is not the intention of the government to carry out a programme that will make over one hundred families or four or five hundred people destitute. Not alone that, but I do not think that the fishermen of this Colony should not be taxed any more than what they are at the present time. To-day they are called upon to pay for cod-netting something like \$1 a fathom, compared with about 40 cents retail before the war. Now if the government is going to tack on any more duty for this class of material it will make it impossible for any fisherman to make two ends meet under any circumstances. Many of the fishermen along the Southern Shore have their traps set in the Atlantic Ocean, without any shelter whatever. I know that on numerous occasions traps have torn up over night there by the sea. If that work is to be carried on in that section in the future in Newfoundland, the price of codnetting will have to reduce instead of advance. Surely you are not going to drive right at the heart of this industry, without taking all the evidence into consideration.

I do not think that the dumping clause in the Resolutions as outlined by the Prime Minister here this afternoon, does not touch that industry at all, because there is no such thing as second hand lines and twines and rope coming into the country as it is an impossibility to get fishermen to use second hand material; they always want the best. If they find any ropes or lines moulded or mildewed they will not have anything to do with them. Consequently, I think the Prime Minister will find that the dumping clause in his Budget will have nothing whatever to do with this industry. I think we should go slow in this matter and

when the Budget will come up for discussion we will have more to say about it. I think the statement read by Mr. Bennett this afternoon to this House is deplorable in the extreme and that this great industry, after a quarter of a century operating, has to close its doors on account of taxation and put one hundred families out of employment and take bread and butter from four or five hundred people. This must either be an oversight on the part of the government or simply a desire to get revenue, without considering the sources whence that revenue comes or whether it is got justly or honestly.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to amend the Act Cap. 40 of 11 Geo. V. entitled "An Act respecting the maintenance of certain public roads."

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker. With your permission I would like to present a petition from a number of motorists of this city along the same lines as the petition I presented yesterday, asking for an amendment of the present Act. I shall have no comment to make, as I take it that the Amendment of the Hon. Minister of Public Works covers the matter.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Hon. the Min. of Justice gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 87 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series).

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Loan for General Purposes of the Colony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr.

Speaker. I would crave the indulgence of the Opposition with a suggestion that I desire to make, and that is, that instead of taking up this notice of motion to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the amendment of the Income War Tax Act, 1918 20 that we go into Committee on the Loan Resolutions. The Loan has been floated on the basis of 98 3-4 with 11 per cent. on exchange. Exchange is fluctuating and on yesterday or the day before my advice from New York were that if I closed the Loan then the Colony would have got 99.04 instead of 98 3-4. Thus will be seen the advantages of closing the Loan as speedily as possible in the interest of the Colony, If it is possible to close the Loan on Monday next I could finalize all arrangements with the Bank of Montreal and it would save a considerable amount in exchange to the Colony. The transfer of such a large amount of money from the United States to Newfoundland in one block is a matter that would materially upset exchange, so I am advised by our New York agents, and in addition, I am informed, there will be certain large remittances to other countries, amounting to many millions of dollars taking place within a short time. Consequently, the advices I have secured, in so far as it is possible to get any definite information, intimate that if this thing could be closed immediately and arrangements made with the Bank on Montreal on Monday, we would be in a much better position as to terms than we otherwise would be. I hope that during the month there may be a fluctuation arise that will be beneficial to Newfoundland in this connection. I feel that the whole country would sincerely appreciate if we disposed of this Loan Bill as promptly and with as less criticism as possible, have it assented to by His Excellency the Governor so that all the necessary arrangements could be finalized to en-

able us to take advantage of exceptionally favorable rates. The whole matter will come up in Ways and Means for discussion and the figures in connection with the Loan will be submitted. Consequently, I crave the indulgence of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his associates to consider this matter and to ask that this motion of mine stand deferred and that we immediately proceed with the first item on the Order Paper.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker. I quite agree with the remarks of the Hon. the Prime Minister that exchange is fluctuating day after day. It may be up today and down to-morrow. On Monday next it may be 10 per cent instead of 12; but I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that the matter does not rest with the Opposition, because it is only within the past week that we have heard of this Loan and this Loan could have gone through, and any criticisms we have to make will have very little to do with its passage through this House. While we have a considerable amount of criticism to offer to this Bill as to why and how the Loan was raised and all the other details in connection with it, still we are prepared to suspend the rules of the House and put it through all its stages this afternoon, if considered necessary in the interests of the Colony and if we are to save money under it. Speaking on behalf of the Opposition, we are prepared to suspend the rules of the House and get down to business immediately, because I can see the awkward position the government is in at the present time. The government needs the money for many reasons and particularly to pay their bills in relation to railway expenditure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the entire country will appreciate the patriotic attitude of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in this respect, and on behalf of the Govern-

ment I thank them very much, because every dollar that we take advantage of in exchange is not a dollar in the way of advantage to the government or the Opposition, or to any individual members but in the interests of the entire country. I, consequently, move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on these Resolutions.

MR. BENNETT—Whilst we are waiting, I want to add a word to what the Leader of the Opposition say re these Loan Resolutions. I am quite in accord with the efforts of the Prime Minister to have this money transferred as soon as possible. We on this side of the House have been endeavoring to obtain the official correspondence which took place or rather the financial statement given when this loan was under negotiation. But the Prime Minister gave us an assurance that no such statement was given, but Mr. Steele who represented the various firms came down here and got all the information necessary. I also asked for the Minute of Council and only yesterday was a copy of the same furnished the House. This Minute of Council embodies some facts which do not go to the kernel of the situation. This is the only official document that we have throwing light on the condition of this loan and I am quite in accord that this matter be put through right away.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act to authorize the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colo-

ny," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time presently.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister and with the unanimous consent of the House, the Bill entitled "An Act to authorize the Raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colony," was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, by unanimous consent the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to authorize the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, with unanimous consent the Bill, entitled "An Act to authorize the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colony" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice 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 the Income War Tax Acts 1918-20."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— (Amendments to the Income Profits Tax Acts 1918-19). I just make the formal motion of submitting these amendments to the Committee of the Whole and ask for a report by the Committee of Ways and Means one section of which is already set out in the Budget. I might say the amendments are merely technical which have been suggested by Mr. O'Reilly which will facilitate the working out of the matter. These will be considered by the Committee of Ways and Means. I know that the members opposite will notice that the printer in this matter is not accustomed to do Government printing and consequently he has printed the Resolutions and the bill on the same sheet.

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 recommended that the said Resolutions be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Ways and Means.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered accordingly.

Motion for an Address re Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Speaker, this address to the Governor asking for an investigation into the various allegations and insinuations against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was adjourned some days ago by me as at that moment it appeared to me that as it was late in the evening and that it would require much more time than there was then at our disposal to deal with this matter. As the Opposition has facilitated the Government in the passing of this loan bill which is very essential to the Colony I regret to have to take up the question of making personal ob-

servations in this matter but I will confine my comments to the private statements of the position of the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I shall speak in a different tone than I would have had I spoken on the matter a few days ago. The suggestions that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is guilty of using the advantages which he derived from his position in the Government to further the interests which he represents is entirely without foundation in fact. Just so long as these statements came from political opponents of his just so long as this Minister of the Crown is representing certain constituencies, just so long will the Opposition use the opportunity to have this a subject of discussion and consideration in this House. The matter then came to the point when Sir John Crosbie, the hon. member for Port de Grave, made certain definite statements based upon the information of Mr. J. Sellars every item of which reflects very seriously upon the Hon. Minister and then the Minister took up the matter and decided that at the first opportunity Mr. Sellars and certain other gentlemen should be examined upon oath and then have the actual facts given to the public. Just so long as this matter amounted to party politics in which the Minister of the Crown is submitted to a political attack the question of enquiry is out of the question. But when it came to the point that there were certain allegations based upon the statements of gentlemen of high standing in the community, the Minister himself desired that at the first opportunity he would like to have these persons given a chance to prove their statements or else deny the charges so made and then apologise to the Minister. It was decided that the best way to have this worked out was to invoke the aid of the Public Enquiries Act. On the 14th of May I received from the Minister of Ma-

rine and Fisheries the following letter: (Reads as follows.) "In view of certain allegations or insinuations made by Sir John Crosbie in the House of Assembly, to the effect that I received for myself and the companies in which I am connected, certain advantages with reference to salt and fish purchased by the Government, I ask that a commission be appointed under the Public Enquiries Act to investigate into the subject matter of those allegations or insinuations." The letter was addressed to me as Prime Minister and I received on the same day as it was written. I for myself have gone into this whole matter with much considerable detail and I have come to the conclusion that it is wise and expedient to have this matter probed under oath so that there will be a satisfactory proof that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had profited nothing nor had the companies he represents profited anything because of his holding the post of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Nor was it used by him to benefit the allied interests to which he is connected in any financial way whatever. This appointment of this commission will give the Opposition an opportunity of seeing for themselves that the Minister has not merited most of the severe censure which has been heaped upon him. This enquiry will undoubtedly prove to the public that not alone did he conduct himself properly in those transactions referred to but not the slightest advantage whatever was taken by him on behalf of himself, any companies he represents, or any companies in which he has an interest, because of his associations with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister is delighted that this opportunity will be afforded the public and the members of this House under the Public Enquiries Act to prove upon oath the veracity of the statements referred to and I feel cer-

tain that the hon. members opposite are glad and will agree with the suggestion of the Minister.

MR. HIGGINS.—Following the example of the Prime Minister I shall not unduly delay the time of the House. The extraordinary attitude taken by the Prime Minister is the completest justification of the Opposition for the course which has been taken in this matter. The Prime Minister has announced, and it is the only way out, for himself and party, the appointment of a commission under the Public Enquiries Act. That statement coming from the leader of the Government is the best endorsement possible of the strength of the position taken by us and is the strongest indication of the necessity that not alone should the motion be really considered but it should be carried out. This is not a personal matter. The conduct of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was of such an extraordinary nature that it should be enquired into. It is absolutely drawing a red herring across the trail to say that it was an attack on the Government or on the Minister. The Resolutions simply stated facts gathered from questions asked here in the House. They started off with the fact that certain moneys belonging to the Government of the Colony were placed under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It happened that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the Hon. Mr. Coaker. A certain amount of the money was used to purchase the cargo and pay the freight of the "President Coaker." Then they go on to state in the second paragraph. (Reads paragraph of Address.) It was clearly an embezzlement of public moneys. The Hon. Mr. Coaker was president of both companies, and he was acting in the dual capacity of a Minister of the Crown and president of these companies.

Then paragraph 5 states: (Reads paragraph 5 of Address.) At the time this

5th paragraph was read here in the House there was no knowledge of the extraordinary incident that subsequently occurred. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries stated that he had no connection with the cargo that Joseph Sellars was the person who owned the fish and that a cheque had been given him for the fish. We soon found out, however, that that cheque did not show the real transaction. It was only "colourable," as the Resolutions state, because it was immediately followed by the tabling here in the House of a cheque back for a like amount. Surely that is a matter of grave public concern. Even in our charity for him surely it is not personal to say that this was a most extraordinary transaction, sitting down in his office and buying from himself, making out a bill to himself, certifying his own bill, giving a cheque to Mr. Sellars and having a cheque sent back to him from Mr. Sellars for a similar amount. Time there was when the Minister himself would not be satisfied with this. Time there was when the Minister would hold up to public ridicule any person involved in such a transaction and would demand the most searching enquiry and not one such as that of which we have happy memories, where no one was allowed to act as counsel, when the Commission determined whom they would call, and just what examination he would be put through.

Don't flog the dead horse too much, gentlemen. We bemoaned him here the other night when the Leader of the Opposition read that famous circular. In justice to him, in justice to the day when you thought more of him, don't go back on him and treat him as the commonest type of political heeler. Say to yourselves we don't want our worthy president to be put up before the country, before an ungrateful public. See to it that you act as pall-bearer in a decent way. Give him a dignified funeral. Accordingly we are asking

for a state funeral. If the matter is so serious that he wants an enquiry, let the commission be of such a character that their judgment will reinstate him without blemish in public life. If he can raise the price of fish, let you raise him back to public life.

I say in all sincerity to hon. members opposite that if the enquiry is carried on as one was recently carried on, no matter how honest his concern for the needs of the people, public opinion will be that something was whitewashed; but I think the explanation ought to be given before a Board that will leave no doubt. It is desirable from the standpoint of the Hon. Minister himself that such a Commission be appointed.

The paragraph 6 goes on to state: (Reads paragraph with reference to expenditure for salt.) That is the second matter of enquiry. Nothing can be more serious than that. Sixty or seventy thousand dollars taken from the treasury of the country without any minute of council by one who happens to be Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He takes it himself as Minister of Marine & Fisheries, hands it himself as president of several corporations and then appeals to himself in his third capacity as leader of the Government for the time. There are different reports from the Auditor General regarding this matter. The first report stated that it had been bought by some concern, the second that he had been told this by some person, and the third that it had not been sold but stored. Not one cent of money was paid to the Colony for this salt, but as soon as a question was asked in the House \$4,000 were paid. If the statement is true the man perpetrated a criminal act. If it was merely stored he had no right to buy any of it. If he bought any of it then comes the inference that he bought all of it. The unfortunate transaction has made the Minister worry. The hardest thing a

man can have is a bad conscience. No hell can be worse than when a man's conscience worries him. Hence it may be that this is the hell which is referred to in the celebrated circular of the Minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say regarding this second enquiry, it is an enquiry regarding the handling by a Minister of the Crown of a large amount of public moneys. Surely that cannot be said to be personal. Can any Minister act as he likes without being responsible to anybody. The kindest thing we could do for the Hon. Minister is to have an enquiry. It is unfortunate that the price of salt has gone down, the question is whether the salt would now be stored or bought. That is the question that agitates the public mind. We are asked to cut \$230,000 off the poorly paid Civil Servants but we must not enquire as to the expenditure of such an amount as half a million by a Minister of the Crown. Must we close our eyes to this enquiry. We do not know whether or not the salt is now stored at Port Union.

Then paragraph ten states: (Reads paragraph.) I think that that is a point that no member on either side of this House can disagree with. The constitutional bed-rock principle is admitted. I have heard of men connected only in a legal way with business concerns who had to resign as Ministers of the Crown. Surely you cannot call this a personal attack. It is a pity that the fates have played it so that the man who only a few years ago set out as the real exponent of democracy should be involved in such a transaction as this. Now the leader of the House should see to it that as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is about to retire from public life the post which has caused him endless trouble and as we have had sufficient examples of this type of man that this should not be condoned as an example for others to follow, that we are taught

aright and will not on any account take the precedents set by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a pattern, and that the country at large will be assured that matters will be conducted along lines of principle and honour henceforth so let him see to it that proper, safe and honest justice is rendered by the tribunal which the public will have confidence in. A commission appointed by the Governor in Council is only a joke in this country. In order to be fair to him and ourselves, in order that the public should have no doubt in this procedure and in order that it shall not prove a failure as in the past, I think the hon. members opposite will support the motion before the chair. I support it not in a partizan spirit. The circumstances surrounding the whole case speak for themselves. The allegations indicating or purporting that he as Minister made out an invoice to himself, issued a cheque by himself to himself and that he did many other things in like manner, involving a large sum of money, should be enquired into and I trust that despite the assurance of the Prime Minister that a commission will be appointed along the lines indicated, that the Minister will satisfactorily explain his conduct and I hope that those who in the day of old listened to his sophistries and advice will not forsake him in his decaying days but will see that he is given a fair trial which is necessitated on account of his actions, the result of a frightful mistake.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker. Just before the motion is put to the House, I would like to say that I am quite in accord with Mr. Higgins. First of all I think it would be advisable in the interests of the Minister the most complete and far reaching enquiry should be made by a tribunal which this country will look up to but the idea which has been suggested that this matter should be referred to a commission ap-

pointed under the Public Enquiries Act is too ridiculous for words. This Act says that this commission will be appointed by the Governor in Council if the circumstances warrant it. Coaker is de facto controller of the government and leader of the Governor in Council. Following Mr. Coaker there is Mr. Squires and he comes out and says this afternoon that the allegations against the Minister are without foundation in fact and we can imagine the attention which the Prime Minister is going to pay to the personnel of this commission and the conduct of this investigation the previous ones of this kind which have gone down in the history of the country as the most ludicrous and unjust and which are ever before the attention of the people. The working out of the Woodford Affidavit Commission conducted to lessen the respect for law and the administration in this country more than all other agencies put together. It was a horrible sham. Those who could see to it that the proper conclusion would have been arrived at, were excluded from the sittings. Are you going on in the same way? There was not one on the Commission who was willing to enquire into the matter. Are the members of the F. P. U. going to allow the Minister to take his medicine? No the public will again look upon the whole thing as a farce. Are we going to have our children's children recognize that in the year of grace nineteen twenty one when a serious charge was made against a Minister of the Crown that the people had to take their coats off to see to it that the best tribunal in the land was to be the judge. Are we going to have this done? I hope not. I am quite in accord with the remarks of Mr. Higgins that there is no partizanship about this motion. And in the interests of that great personage Mr. Coaker, those serious charges against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the result of his association and union with

the government should be enquired in to in a manner which will be above suspicion, but when the commission is to be one under the Public Enquiries Act it will be looked upon as a mere joke. When the Prime Minister says that the allegations are without foundation in fact then we must assume that Governor in Council will not deem it expedient to appoint the commission. Yet he says that this commission will be appointed under the Public Enquiries Act. I want to know where is his consistency. Who is going to do it? I am sure the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not going to do it, and I am certain that Mr. Foote will not because they are afraid of the Coaker element. Is the Minister of Justice going to attend to it? Who is the member of the Executive Council who will stand up here and demand that this enquiry be at once instigated into those charges? When are we going to arrive at the time when the Governor in Council will deem it expedient? An other instance of throwing dust in the eyes of the public. I suppose if it is appointed it will meet in the boiler room of the House of Assembly or the Tower Room of the Court wherein no one of impartiality will be admitted. This will be another example of what happened during the bank crash. There was a big wave of public disapproval followed by a determined decision that no commoner will go to jail when it is possible to secure him an escape because of the fact that the bank directors at that time too easily made good their get away from the tolls of the law. This same rotten administration of justice was effected last year during the Woodford affidavit Commission. The public have come to the conclusion that there is one law for the poor and one for the rich. Men of wealth and influence can always make their get away. But the man who smuggles a jar of rum into this country from St. Pierre not alone gets into trouble but the whole detective force

and the justice department do their best to get after this scoundrel. If the police discovers a man with a beverage containing over two and one half per cent. of alcohol the whole of the detective force is on its head trying to land the poor unfortunate individual. Instead of having a proper administration of justice we have always had the authorities trying to let them clear perhaps not intentionally but actually at any rate. All this frightful conduct has had the devastating effect of lowering the moral tone of this country. We should try and have our constitution obeyed and have the law and order of the country respected. We want to avoid having our people know that discrimination is shown. I want to say that if there is a charge that is serious and which warrants a proper enquiry then let the best tribunal in the land be the judge, that tribunal which is impartial and will see to it that justice is rendered. The Prime Minister last year wrote a pamphlet entitled "the trail of a serpent" and the serpent was A. B. Morine. He told us about the doings of this man and what he did when he was a member of the Executive and at the same time the solicitor for the Reid Newfoundland Company. I want to say he is misjudged man and much of this ballyragging is without foundation in fact and it is high time for this scurrility and villification to stop. Three years ago anything done by this man was thought very highly of by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but to-day this very same Minister would go to his neck in water to have something happen to A. B. Morine, he would do anything to have him ostracized. What is flesh for the goose is flesh for the gander. If A. B. Morine should have been shut out of public life what should be done with Mr. Coaker? who is a member of the Executive Council, President of the F.P.U., and he controls the Government side of the House, he is also President of the

Trading Company. He is also chairman of the Railway Commission. He is Minister of Marine and Fisheries as well. He is the leader and in control in fact of the government of the country and in addition comes into this House, sworn not alone to obey the dictates of his conscience that his powers be used for the benefit of Newfoundland, but sworn to follow the dictates of the Union which sent him here. What did he do? Is he any different from Mr. Morine who was drummed out of public life 20 years ago because he gave legal advice to the firm for which he was solicitor. His conduct was not a circumstance to Hon. Mr. Coaker's, but still it was a reason for you to wax indignant and write a pamphlet entitled "The Trail of the Serpent" which was sent all over the country; you did this because he had occupied a Ministerial position while solicitor for the Reid Nfld. Co., and put him out of political life; that is vote with the Opposition. Morine was a terrible character—you tell how Governor Murray dismissed him, how indignation meetings were held all over town and the people swayed to petition the governor in the case, and how the latter asked for his resignation. But you do not tell how he came back in triumph. I hold no brief for Mr. Morine, but it is positively indecent for us to go on criticizing one who does not deserve one half the structures and censure showered upon him by the political hot-heads of the country. He is a man that raised his family in this country, and has conducted himself in a manner that does not warrant the vilification heaped upon him for 20 years. As I said before, to censure him is now almost a tradition. To-day when the government papers have nothing else to talk about they jump on Morine because he was a candidate for the Opposition two years ago. This has gone on too long—it is time for someone to point out to the country the members of the Government are not

fit to tie his shoe strings. Say what you like about him he stands out prominently because of his ability and clear-mindedness in connection with the affairs of the country. And that comes from one who has had intimate knowledge of him and from one who is not biased in his favour, but who wishes to take an impartial view of him. I think we should recognize his ability and give him his due meed of praise for his general characteristics. I think it is time we realized that we cannot allow things to go on in the administration as they have gone on. It is time to realize that when a Minister of the Crown has most serious charges preferred against him, an enquiry should be conducted on such lines as will leave no room in the minds of the people for comment. The Hon. Minister himself sees the need of the enquiry and asks for it. If the charges were trivial he would not do that. I take it for granted he sees how serious they are if there is a single individual on the other side of the House who wants to see him cleared, then it is his duty to see that he be tried by a tribunal so constituted that it will leave no doubt whatever with the people that it was fairly and properly conducted. We should no longer have a ravenstony justice such as we did a few months ago when the Hon. Prime Minister himself was concerned and a "SCOTCH verdict" was returned. I do not think it at all fair to the government to have such. It would be better for them to say it is true, than that it is not. I do not think it fair to the Hon. Minister of Marine to have such a verdict brought in in his case. The only way to see there is a proper investigation and a correct conclusion reached is to see that the tribunal is one that will perform its duty fearlessly and strengthen the confidence of the people to feel that all such matters will be properly dealt with. Therefore, I say, the House should take this resolution, see that it is put through pro-

perly, and not leave it in the hands of the Governor-in-Council, who is only Hon. Mr. Squires or Hon. Mr. Coaker, and would be appointing himself his own judge. If the man in the street is arrested for stealing surely none will think he can come into Court tomorrow and try himself. Are we going to have this position in this instance. Because he holds the Government in the hollow of his hand, when he is brought to book and the public demands an investigation, is he to say: "I will have an enquiry. I will appoint the judges and have every step possible taken to preserve my reputation" Are you going to have this situation? You should have this thing done right. Let the government have the Commission sit immediately, and report, but do not let them think for a moment they are going to get away with any stage play, and that we will allow it. Mr. Coaker says in his letter of May 14th to the Hon. Prime Minister that he wants the enquiry; and the government say they will have it. I do not think it will ever sit. Everyone will remember last year when the Commission dealt with the case against the Leader of the government. They grew tired of waiting; every expedient was used against the appointment of the Commission; after two long months Commission was appointed and eventually sat; but with what result we do not yet definitely know. Suppose the government will not accede to the governor appointing the Commission asked for in this resolution, but they say they will do it, you can mark my words we will never have it. Still they ask the Opposition to join hands with them and believe in their bona fides. The country will not tolerate the state of affairs such as pictured in these resolutions. The government say the things asserted are not taking place and are trying to wriggle out of the holding of the enquiry. But the Opposition will not allow them, and I say further that the people of the coun-

try will not allow them. The charges are serious enough, goodness knows, to warrant us in insisting that this investigation be proceeded with and carried on properly. It is only turning it into a farce to think that the people will tolerate the charges being investigated in the manner indicated by the Prime Minister here to-day. Therefore it is in the Prime Minister's own interests to see that Hon. Mr. Coaker does not rest under a cloud the same as he does himself. I think the honorable gentleman is indeed unfortunate in having to put up with such a verdict as was returned in his case. If I were in his position I would rather be convicted than remain under such a cloud. He should give his experience to his colleague and see that in the future he will not be left to labor under the same shadow as himself. I suggest that in their own interests the F. P. U. members should see their leader cleared as surely they cannot support a leader whose reputation is besmirched. They should see that the tribunal to proceed with the charges against him is a properly constituted one and if they do not, they are doing something which will be to their own lasting discredit. I heartily support the resolution and I ask them to insist that the Commission appear above suspicion in the least degree.

MR. VINICOMBE—I rise to support the resolution before the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and in doing so I wish to do it with fairness to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has told me that he is as innocent as the child unborn of any wrong doing. If so, I don't see why the Prime Minister should refuse to allow these resolutions to go through to-day; but if he has any doubt why should he not let the judges sit on the Commission. Last year an enquiry was held on himself, and all in Court who saw the three men on that commission saw that they whitewashed him. If the same three sit on this they will want to mix salt

with their whitewash to do it properly. I believe this will happen in the same way as last year. As Mr. Higgins has pointed out Mr. Woodford went into that as a layman, but you had your lawyers. He had no opportunity to have legal counsel. It put me in mind of a play I once saw with a court scene in it and I think you want to make the same out of this case of Mr. Coaker's. The Hon. Mr. Coaker tried to play his part but failed; he tried some desperate things but failed and at last put himself in the hole. If he is innocent you will have this commission, but as Mr. Fox has said, you will not agree to it. Why should you sit there and say you will form a commission yourselves if he is innocent. You sir, went to Bell Island and said that Mr. Higgins was Reid's solicitor. But you were Reid's fools and you were the biggest, if we are Hon. Mr. Coaker's clowns. I want to show that you are fools. You lost 2 millions on the railroad last year, and were you not fooled into doing so. If you call it by any other name I will use it. Here we have these resolutions and we are told the Commission will be formed. Surely we will have no more of this whitewashing. The three judges have been asked for. Hon. Mr. Coaker does not say he wants a committee, and I believe he will go before the three judges. The Woodford trial was a mockery of Court proceedings. One day I went up there to listen to the evidence, and I did not think the men interested belonged to St. John's because when one had to go to Woodford's house at 10 o'clock in the night, another accompanied him as far as the Post Office to post a letter. He actually did not know that there was a Post Office in the East End. That will show what a farce that Court was. And then another time they hauled down the blinds so that people could not see what was going on.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It was not a farce, it was a funeral.

MR. VINICOMBE—It was almost your funeral. I think the Hon. Mr. Coaker is big enough to say he will go before the three judges. I believe he will not stand for the same thing as last year. I do not know to-day whether you or Mr. Woodford are guilty as there was no real trial and now we have the same proposition as to the form of the Court and perhaps the same three men will be appointed and make as good a job of it as they did in your case. They may even use the brush better to-day. I think the Prime Minister ought to say right straight out that the government accepts the resolutions as placed before the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, just a word before the vote is taken on this matter. I have already spoken upon it at some length, and I do not now intend to delay the House very long. It was I think on the 12th of May that this petition was introduced and it is now June 2nd, which means that the petition has been side tracked by this House. This afternoon, after three weeks have elapsed, the Prime Minister comes in and tells the House that no definite charge has been made against the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, nothing but insinuations. Now Sir, I am not going to make a speech on that aspect of the matter, but I would like to put it to any fair-minded member of this House or to any man outside of the House who has followed the debate on the question it from the evidence that has been adduced here and from the statements that have been written by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, himself to the various companies associated with the organization of which he is the leader, there can be any doubt in the minds of the government that there is something in the conduct of the Minister which should be investigated. It is easily understood, however, why the government are not pre

pared to have his actions made the subject of enquiry. He is their chief; he is the man who is keeping the Prime Minister in his seat to-day; he is the man whom the Prime Minister is courting and he is the man who is now deserting this House to-day. He is in a degrading position and there is not one of his army of followers on the other side, the F. P. U. members, has had the courage to rise in his place and attempt to put up an argument in his favour for the simple reason that they know it is impossible to do so. As to the charges in this petition it is only necessary to take the salt scandal to show whether or not it is insinuations that have been made against the Hon. Mr. Coaker. I was told in the Board of Trade rooms that this cargo of salt was imported by four Water Street merchants plus Mr. Coaker. It was brought in here by arrangement amongst these men, and they allowed it to go to Port Union. That was sometime in June or early in July and it looked then as if there would be a good fishery and the merchants who were interested in the cargo would not allow the Hon. Mr. Coaker to have more than half of it. In spite of that, however, he took three quarters of the salt off his own bat and without consulting them at all and they, of course, strongly protested against his action. He was going to send the steamer back to St. John's with quarter of her cargo on board, but the captain would not agree to take it unless he was paid extra freight on it and the balance was subsequently landed at Port Union. The fishery then took a twist and the Minister of Fisheries realized that he was not going to make as good a thing out of that salt which like the sugar was purchased at top notch, as he at first hoped he would. The Hon. Mr. Coaker then took another thought when he saw the fishery dropping off, but he took good care not to tell his colleagues what he intended doing. They

did not know who was going to pay for the salt and for some time that was a matter of controversy at the Board of Trade but ultimately by persistent questions in the House it was found that it was paid for by the government. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice were absent from the Colony at the time and did not know what was going on and when Mr. Coaker found he had a gold brick on his hands he immediately started out to unload it upon the Colony. The other responsible ministers, or I should have said irresponsible ministers who were here did not dare, if they knew what he was doing, to object. It took me four days in this House to find out from the Prime Minister, who had the Minister of Fisheries seated next him all that time, who had instructed the Deputy Minister of Finance to issue the cheque for the salt to Mr. Coaker, but after that time we are told that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself went down to the Finance department and, without a minute of council or any other authorization, told Mr. John Keating to issue him a cheque. Mr. Keating erred in this instance altho' as a rule he is careful to issue no cheques without a minute of council. Anyway, this time Mr. Keating issued a cheque for seventy odd thousand dollars which he handed over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the salt which he had previously taken for himself because he thought that he was going to make a big spec. These are some of the facts of the Salt Scandal and these are facts which the Prime Minister knew when he got up here and told the House that merely insinuations and not charge had been made against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Only insinuations, when we have the proof that the Minister of Fisheries deliberately takes the people's money and uses it for his own private purposes. We are only a joint stock company and responsible to the

people for the proper expenditure of their money; do you call it decent then for an hon. minister to act as Mr. Coaker acted when he found that he stood to lose from two or three dollars on this salt. And that is not all the story Sir. We do not know yet how much of that salt is at Port Union. We do not know if there is a grain of it there nor does the government know, but asking questions in the House and after learning from a report of the Auditor General that \$4,000 had been received on account of some of the salt that had been sold we were still in the dark as to whether five thousand tons or ten thousand tons still remained at Port Union. The salt for which the Auditor General received the \$4,000 was sold in June or July, certainly not later than August and that money was held back till now. Then we are told that we make insinuations and not charges against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

In a circular which I read a few days ago addressed by the Hon. Mr. Coaker to his companies there is proof positive that he is using the money of the country for his own private ends. We have succeeded in driving him from this House and he is now in Port Union or somewhere else in the North spending the people's money. That is a safe position for him and his followers on the other side who have not the courage to get up and say a word in his defense are now waiting with their heads bowed down to vote against this motion. That's the position they find themselves in to-day from Dr. Barnes down. They are like a bunch of men who are dumb and indeed they might just as well have been born dumb for all the say they have. Why, you would have to stick a pin in them to make them even squeal. Then the Prime Minister gets up and in a low and solemn tone, like a man reading an obituary over a corpse, tells us that only insinuations have been made against the Minister

of Marine and Fisheries. And I thank you Sir, there are University men on the other side. Take Dr. Barnes for example, who has not even the excuse of saying that he was away when Mr. Coaker put thru his infamous salt deal he is as dumb as the rest. Then we are told that we are insinuating. Did not Sir John Crosbie bring in proof of the Minister's action in connection with the President Coaker's cargo? Is not Mr. Sellars himself prepared to come to the Bar of this House and state that he had nothing whatever to do with that cargo except to swap cheques with Mr. Coaker, and did not Mr. Coaker bring into this House a statement with regard to the same transaction that was utterly false? and here are these men who should be attempting to defend him absolutely dumb because not one of them, not even the Prime Minister, can get up and say a word in his behalf; even his old secretary over there in the corner has nothing to say in his defence. Then we are told that we may have an enquiry into this matter; well, as Mr. Vinicombe has said, it is not much odds whether we do or not, if the results of such an enquiry should prove to be anything like those of the enquiry that was held in connection with the Woodford Affidavit. That whole thing was arranged by the Prime Minister and carried out according to his direction. The whole thing was known to be true; Mr. Woodford went to the Prime Minister and gave him a proposition which he accepted. The Prime Minister even met Mr. Woodford early in the morning to finalize matters; a job was arranged for him and the salary named and then they shook hands upon it. Mr. Gibbs and his colleague went to Mr. Woodford's house at night and peeped under the blind to make sure no one was in and then when he got in he wanted the shades drawn. The Prime Minister then appointed a commission to inquire into the facts and the best he could get was a Scotch

verdict. I am not going to waste time going into that now, but if you want a definite charge against the Minister of Fisheries. I will make it. I make the charge that the salt that was stored at Port Union was owned by four merchants of St. John's and he, the Minister of Fisheries was the fifth owner. He took that salt hoping to dispose of it to advantage to himself and when he found that he could not do so he turned it over to the government and went down to Mr. Keating and ordered him to give him a cheque for it. I would say to the Prime Minister tell the whole story to the Governor and let him deal with it. If the others of your party desert you let them go. It will at least go down in history that you acted the man in that respect. Never mind the support of those men who are afraid to do their duty, that is not the kind of support you want if you hope to get anywhere. Kick them all out as they deserve and you will be the better for it. Could there be any more conclusive proof of that than the fact that this matter has been here for the past eighteen days and not a man of them has said a word. Now we are going to pull the curtain down and we shall see what happens.

Upon the motion of Sir M. P. Cashin (May 12) seconded by Mr. Bennett, that an Address be presented to His Excellency, the Governor asking for the Appointment of a Commission to enquire into transactions, connected with the purchase and sale of Fish by and to the Union Trading Company, Ltd., the House divided, when there appeared for the motion:—Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis—(13); and against it—Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr.

Gosse, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(15), so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Questions

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

FRIDAY, June 3rd,

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Walsh from Placentia Bay, re Women's Franchise.

Mr. Cheeseman from Civil Servants re salary reductions.

Mr. Moore from Bauline, re Fishery Laws.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Vinnicombe gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

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

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there are any arrangements made for the printing of debates. We have not had a word of the debates in the Government press, is this to continue through the session. I think some arrangement should be made with the Printers' Union to have them printed. I think some consideration should be given one of the city papers, as it has given us as fair a report as can be given. That paper is the Evening Telegram. I have no doubt that the proprietors of the Evening Telegram would be pleased to receive a subsidy from the Government, considering it has been able to give a synopsis of the proceedings. Whilst I am on my feet I would take

this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the Prime Minister on his elevation to the Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. This is an honour that has been tendered to Newfoundland by His Majesty the King. The Prime Minister is in the happy position of being the reciprocant of that honour on account of the position he occupies, and we on this side of the House join with his friends in extending our felicitations. We are sure that he will wear this honour with the same dignity that he has worn other honours with.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as peculiar that a petition of this kind should be presented by a member of the Government. I understood from the Prime Minister that the decision of the Government with regard to Civil Servants was decided upon. I presumed at the time that the matter had been discussed. If that is the case I cannot see the sense or reason of Mr. Cheeseman presenting these petitions to-day. I wish to say that when a petition from a member of Mr. Cheeseman's constituency came before this house, I am sorry to say he did not show himself so energetic in supporting it as he is to-day. In presenting that petition Mr. Cheeseman may or may not be sincere, I do not know, but I think it improper that it should have to be brought into this house at all.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting that petition and I agree with the last speaker. To have a member of the Government come in here and present a petition asking any prayer to the House that he has already decided upon, he is not sincere. If Mr. Cheeseman, as already pointed out, is sincere then the only course open for him, if this petition is voted down, is to take his seat away from the Gov-

ernment. It is not consistent to come in this House with a policy and tell the country you are supporting it, and come in here with a petition. Perhaps the hon. member for Burin is going to support this petition. That is the right course for him if he is consistent. We have already on this side of the House discussed many of these salaries that have come up, and I would like to see Mr. Cheeseman, when the estimates come before the House take the stand he is taking this afternoon. While I am on my feet I would like to mention the fact that within the past six months the Government made an agreement with certain planters for lumbermen, to cut pit props for relief purposes, at, I think, \$6 per cord after the first day of June. Just as I came in to-day I was handed a telegram by a gentleman who is prepared to make an offer for the pit props but could not find the Minister of that Department in the city, or could not get any satisfaction at the Department. I think the matter should be attended to at once and I bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister or any other gentleman who is interested in it. These pit props are North and West, mostly North, and the people have told the Government that they cannot sell them or export them. This offer is what I look upon as a good offer. He is prepared to make this offer and close an agreement with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if that is the gentleman in charge. I will read a telegram received from a gentleman in Montreal. If the public moneys of this country are taken from the Treasury and paid for that purpose there is no reason why the members on the Government bench should not get together and dispose of these pit props. These pit props have been offered for 19 C.I.F. and from what I can learn freight from that part of the country

to Montreal to-day for delivery would be something like \$8.50. To bark that wood, and we are looking for labour, would be about \$2.50 or \$2.00 a cord.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I had a letter from a man who is getting it done for \$1.75.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If we get 19 C.I.F., Montreal for \$20,000 pit props, and I understand the estimate of what pit props are in the hands of the Government, is \$35,000, that would dispose of practically all of them. Here is an offer for 20,000 at 19 C.I.F. which means \$6 cost price, \$8.50 for freight, \$2.50 for barking and Mr. Jennings says \$1.75, that is \$17.00 and commission 5%.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Does the freight include the loading?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Loading would be about \$1 a cord or \$1.50 at the outside.

HON. MR. WARREN.—They estimate about \$3.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I do not think so. This is a sporting offer.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—It is an expensive job loading.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It is according to where they are stored. Do you not think somebody should get interested? This message stands good for only 24 hours and the Minister could not be found in his office this morning. He is supposed to be in charge of this relief work. It means \$120,000 to this country. I just throw out the suggestion.

MR. SAMSON.—Mr. Coaker has charge of that work and he is in Port Union.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is it because Mr. Coaker is in Port Union that nothing can be done? Mr. Coaker may never come back.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Samson is slightly mistaken, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is in charge of that work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Here is a broker in the city to-day with an offer, going round to the Government Departments looking for the Minister and he cannot be found, nor can the man get any satisfaction at the Department. We are being told that pit props cannot be sold, and this offer means \$120,000 to this country, and it is up to somebody to get busy in this direction, if they are serious, and not let everything go by default.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, as I was coming through the gate of the park I was met by Mr. Fred. Hue who told me he was approaching the Opposition with a view to bringing the matter up.

He said he had been looking for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and I understood from him that he had not been able to see him, but had a consultation with Mr. Turner, the deputy head of the Department, who is the official in charge of the detail work. I told Mr. Hue I would get him in touch with Dr. Campbell at 4 o'clock, when he would be at the Legislative Council, and Mr. Hue could then discuss the matter with us any time up to 6.30. The proposition is an exceedingly sporting one, but we have to allow for loading which is estimated at \$3.00; insurance would also have to be included, also freight and handling, and it is very doubtful if the Government could get near what it cost them. However, it is a business proposition, and Mr. Turner, who is the business head of the Department and is a very capable man, will do his utmost to see the matter attended to.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—This gentleman has seen Mr. Turner, and although Mr. Turner may be a very capable man, still he cannot do anything until he has first seen the Minister, and nobody can be found to take the matter seriously. It is a

good proposition and I know enough to say that it can be loaded for \$1.00, no matter where it is stored. It is supposed to be in the nearest place for shipping as the gentlemen could get it. Anyhow I am not much interested in the matter only I would like to see something done. After another three or four months the season will be over and navigation closed, and as you know, the market is falling every day. Our shipping department, I am sorry to say, I do not mean the Ministry of Shipping, I am referring to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is not a credit to this country. It is a long story about the fish and I had another telegram to-day. Coming to the other matter again this message only stands good for 24 hours, and if there is not an answer to-day the thing is off. If the Government is in earnest we want to get to work before 4 o'clock and take the matter under consideration. Here is \$19 C.I.F. held out to the Government and if we can get our money back from this source then we should get to business. It means \$120,000.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I might say in regard to the cost of loading, several of those men who are handling pit props are not willing to enter into an agreement to cut, bark and load less than \$11 and they want \$12.00. I might say that one contractor in Badger Brook has already sold the amount of his cut.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I cannot understand that if a man is prepared to take a contract from the Government, he is not prepared to bark them for less than \$4 a cord more.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That might be an exception.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Again there are people who are looking for employment.

MR. GOSSE.—Mr. Speaker, I am not very well acquainted with this proposition but at the same time I

figure out from what Sir Michael Cashin has said, that the purchase price is \$6.00, freight \$8.50, the barking \$2.50 and the loading \$2.00, which is all \$19.00, and if we can get our money back and really dispose of the pit props for \$19.00 then I consider it a good proposition. It may be that Dr. Campbell, or whoever has to do with this work, may have something better to offer and may realize perhaps \$8.00. But at the same time I think that if we can get our money back we are doing well, and in doing that we have also given labour, and I understand from Sir Michael Cashin that this bargain is to be closed to-day. Really I cannot see that we could do better unless some of the hon. members, who have quite a lot to do with this kind of work, can see a better proposition. That is the way I look at it and I take this thing as I see it. Now as I still look at it I think it a good proposition, and I think the Government ought to realize if it can get the same money back. Seeing that it cost \$6.00 in the first place and they can get \$19, I think they can get their money back or pretty near it. Some hon. member of the Government side may know more about it and say more, but seeing as I do now I think it a good proposition.

MR. MACDONENLL.—Mr. Speaker, there are a few things to be considered besides the falling market with regard to these pit props. One thing is that they should be barked at once. If it is left much longer it will cost the country three or four times as much, and if the Government does not intend to bark them soon it will be too late. They should be barked now as it is the proper time. Personally, I think if that proposition can be put through it should be taken advantage of. If there are 30,000 cords cut that would come down to, I think, about 25,000. This offer would then dispose

of practically all the pit props in the hands of the Government. The loading depends upon the location. In St. George's all the pit props are stored in one place and it is an ideal place for loading, and I think \$19.00 would cover all expenses. I think it is an excellent proposition for the Government to get its money back.

MR. FOX.—I beg to support the motion that the Government take advantage of this offer.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I am much interested in pit props and especially this proposition before the House. There has been considerable work done in the district of St. Barbe and taking into consideration the firm from whom this message came from and how reliable a firm it is, I think the Government ought to take the matter into consideration right away. I would like to see the barking as well as the other work in connection with this matter carried on. I would like the Government to come to a decision right away.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if he has been notified by the Imperial Tobacco Company of its intention to suspend operations indefinitely, the reason given for the same, the number of employees who will be discharged, and what action if any, the Government proposes to take in the matter?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Chairman of the Railway Commission, if it is correct, as stated in the public press, that all members of the Reid Nfld. Company's staff have been notified by the Railway Commission that on and after June 30th, the Commission will not be responsible for the payment of their salaries, and if it is correct that the Government is taking measures to establish a Receivership for the Reid Nfld. Company with Sir Wm. Reid as Receiver, and if not what

other steps the Government is taking to cope with the contingency of the failure of the Reid Company to resume the operation of the Railroad system after the last day of this month?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs, if it is correct that instructions have been given the Assessor's Department not to levy the Income Tax on Mr. Albert H. Salter, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the said letter, and to say why an exception has been made in the case of Mr. Salter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, when the Government proposes to establish the Model Farm in out-port sections of the country promised by the Minister during the General Election campaign and subsequently, and what does he estimate will be the cost of such establishment?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works, if he has instructed his Department to refuse to pay for coffins for patients who die in the General Hospital, even if the relatives of these people are unable to furnish the same, and what provision is being made for the burial of these dead persons under the circumstances?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is the intention of the Government to raise a loan from the Bank of Montreal after the closing of the House in order to pay the interest on the Public Debt due on the 31st of December next, or whether he estimate that he will have sufficient money remaining out of the present loan in spite of necessary expenditures on account of the railway, to meet this interest when it comes due.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the

Prime Minister, if the statements made in the last Circular issued by the President of the F. P. U. charging the merchants with removing the Fish Regulations are correct, and whether this removal was not really undertaken by the Government, and did not the Prime Minister attend meetings of the Exporter's Association and declare the readiness of the Government to remove the Regulations if the trade considered it desirable to do so?

MR. MACDONNELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister

- (a) If any arrangements are being made or contemplated, regarding the taking of a census this year.
- (b) If the Government intends to carry out any programme of redistribution of electoral seats and re-adjustment of district representation, as outlined in the Prime Minister's Manifesto?

MR. FOX asked the Minister of Public Works, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in detail all receipts and expenditures of the Road Commission to date, together with copies of all return sheets, vouchers, etc., covering said expenditures.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House what amount has been sent from his Department to Mr. Martin Phillips of Twillingate, since Nov. 15th, 1919 to May 31st, 1921, and what amounts are his total commissions to date.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: If the Government paid for any cargo of salt imported into this country last season; if so, what cargoes and the names of steamers which brought such cargoes.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary, to lay on the Table of this House a copy of the original

report of the commission to enquire into and report on the salaries of the Civil Servants.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House what amount of moneys has been sent from his Department to Mr. Martin Phillips of Twillingate, since Nov. 15th, 1919, to May 31st, 1921 and what amount are his total commissions to date?

CAPTAIN LEWIS—With respect to one of my questions re the Ropewalk, I may say I have had considerable experience re the use of the products of that concern. During the last few years that I have been fishing I have used the lines made by that company and they gave the greatest satisfaction. Some five years ago some fishermen and myself had an interview with Mr. Monroe and he took our opinions on the fishing lines and other things which are used daily by the fishermen with the result that there was a decided improvement made and the most of us deep water fishermen use those lines. There are cables made by the Ropewalk which we got elsewhere and we have used them to the greatest satisfaction. I think it is a great mistake that this industry should have been allowed to close. These cables are required by vessels coming in here at the shortest notice. And the same thing applies to the lines. These cables will not be able to be gotten here unless they are imported from Boston. So therefore I think it is absolutely necessary to have this important industry kept going.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On yesterday Mr. Fox asked a question re the inspector of pickled fish. That matter was attended to by a Minute of Council of date 16th July, 1920, copy of which I am tabling and in that month a copy was sent Mr. Fitzgerald. There is no further correspond-

ence. I will try further. There was no necessity for the continuance of Mr. Fitzgerald and also there was no vote in the estimates for his salary.

As to question one I have asked the secretary of the Railroad Commission to furnish the information. I will have it to-morrow. I have no personal knowledge of Mr. Morely or his observations. I understand the work goes out of existence in June with the cessation of the Railway Commission Act. As to question number two, the Imperial Tobacco Company wrote me on May 26th reading as follows: (Reads). Mr. Hartnett says they have a large stock on hand and in the ordinary course of business it will require two months to dispose of it. Of course they are depending upon the development in trade to do so. He also asks that the duties be taken off the material which they use and a duty imposed on the imported article. This matter is on the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee in Council. With respect to the third question: The secretary of the Railroad Commission has notified the foreman that after the 10th of June next that the payment for wages shall not be made on the cheque of the Chairman of the Railway Commission. No steps have been taken nor has it been considered by the Government with respect to the appointment of a receiver in the person of Sir W. D. Reid or any other person. The Company has not forwarded any satisfactory proposition as to the operation of the road after the 1st of July next. They have not formally forwarded any proposition but they have made certain suggestions as to the operation of the line under certain circumstances after the end of June next and the assumption of its liquidation. There has been no written correspondence whatever re this matter.

MR. BENNETT.—I submit that this is a very important matter and the

Government ought to take steps immediately to let the House know what is going to be done with the road. This matter ought not be let slip by.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

The matter has not yet reached any definite form but the matter is being attended to. It is infinitely more satisfactory to dispose of matter personally than through correspondence.

With respect to question four, no instructions have been issued by the Finance Department. With reference to question five, the Government does not propose to establish a model farm. As you know there is a stock farm in the West end of the City. The animals will be provided by the stock farm. There is no intention on the part of the Government to develop stock farms outside the city, that was favoured some time ago but the grants have now been cut in two by the Estimates.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

With regard to question 5, I may say the messenger did not come to the department and therefore I could not prepare the information in reply. I am familiar with the position though. I must say there has been no such order but during last summer there was a case to this effect. A patient died at the hospital and the relatives asked that the body be sent home and when the bill came to hand the total of it was nearly one hundred dollars. Then there were instructions given to the officials of the Public Work Department that if a patient died and the relatives wanted the body sent home the department would pay as much as would be required if the person were buried in the city. The exact amount of the bill was about eighty dollars to be correct. The coffin and the railway fare accounted for the larger part of the sum and then there were two other incidental expenses, perhaps carriage in motor boat and then by

horse and carriage. I do not care to give the name of the district as it is immaterial. On the railway they charge double for the conveyance of a coffin.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to question seven, the Government has not considered the raising of a loan from the Bank of Montreal for the purpose of paying the interest on the 21st day of December next. I hope the income derived from the Estimates will be sufficient to meet our obligations. With reference to question eight, I have not had the opportunity of reading the circular referred to and if the leader of the Opposition will do me the courtesy of providing me with a copy I will look into the matter. I will table the answer to the remaining part on Monday next. Re the ninth question, arrangements are contemplated and progress to some slight extent has been made as to the beginning of the taking of the census this year and the Government at a subsequent session will require a passing of a bill to complete the returns.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Government intends to introduce some legislation with regard to the redistribution of electoral seats and the re-adjustment of district representation especially in view of the fact that Woman franchise may be granted.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—As to question ten the answer is being prepared. With respect to number eleven the department did not get time to prepare the answer. I have no objection to tabling the answer. I feel sure the honourable member does not wish to hinder the road accountant in his work.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An

Act to Authorize the Raising of a sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colony" without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the D'Arcy Exploration Company Resolutions:

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman. While I recognise how desirable it is to bring capitalists to this country, and to have our mineral and other resources explored and investigated, I do not think this agreement is going to place this country in a position that is most desirable. This agreement is objectionable in many cases. First of all Section 1, gives to the company the exclusive right during a period of two years of prospecting all unclaimed Crown Lands. That is a very wide concession; it practically gives Newfoundland up, for a long period, and gives to a group of capitalists the exclusive right to prospect for oil throughout Newfoundland, and continuing down we realize that the agreement really means nothing to this colony, but means a tremendous lot to this company. We practically give to the D'Arcy Exploration Company the exclusive right to explore Newfoundland for oil for their own purpose. That is objectionable, the least of which is that this Company can go all over Newfoundland picking out the most likely sites where they think oil is likely to be found, and if they find any they keep the information to themselves, and deny the benefit to Newfoundland, and then after two years they come to the Government for protection. Have these lands open to everybody to search as they will and explore for oil as they will and then let them come to the Government for protection. I think it is very objec-

tionable to tie up Crown Lands in this way, and give the exclusive right, for a period of two years, to search or explore this colony for any mineral. What do we get from this contract. We get nothing. Newfoundland may benefit on a percentage basis from the oil as taken from the wells, but returning to the contract we see that there is nothing binding upon the Company, Supposing the Company sinks these best wells, the result may never be known to this country; it may be kept secret from the country. If this Company finds oil it is not reasonable to expect that they will part with the information. After spending their money. In giving Newfoundland up for that period we are preventing capitalists from coming in because they have not information enough to go by, and another company has a monopoly. That gives the colony no protection. First of all the Company gets certain rights if they commence, and secondly they forfeit certain rights unless they begin a vigorous prosecution. Supposing they worked from daylight to dark sinking wells, would you call that a vigorous prosecution? Supposing they said we have vigorously prosecuted the sinking of wells, what of it. The whole agreement to my mind is too one sided. It gives to this group of capitalists the exclusive right to enter upon Crown Lands and explore for a period of two years; that is a monopoly which is objectionable. It means depriving any other company or any other private enterprise for exploring in Newfoundland for that period. It also deprives the natives from prospecting for mineral in their own land.

HON. MR. WARREN—Where is that stated? Where are they prevented from prospecting on their own land.

MR. FOX—I mean all Crown Lands of this colony. It confers upon this Company a monopoly which is objectionable and for such a long period. We have certain lands tied up for that time. If this colony would benefit by

giving this right there might be some excuse, but we do not get a single penny for this concession. We do not only give this company the option of searching for oil, but we give them the option of getting every bit of inside information, which they may refuse to give up, and that is a disadvantage to Newfoundland. The fullest possible information should be obtained about our mineral resources, but this does not give us any information; this means that this Company comes in here and has a right to prospect for two years, and all information it gets it may retain for its own use and benefit, and Newfoundland will be worse off in ten years time than it is to-day, because this will prevent other capitalists from coming into the country because they have not the information that his Company has. I think it is very objectionable. Supposing this Company finds four or five oil wells, and they sink only one well, it is a very easy matter for them to give out the information that the only well worth while is the one they are working. The whole thing is a sporting proposition. You will not find an outside group of capitalists, with a two years' monopoly, give out information. I think it is objectionable from the view point of that monopoly. I object from the view point that we ourselves are deprived from the right that is given to this company. I object from the very view point that the intention of this Act is spoiled by itself. If this Act is to give publicity to Newfoundland and bring forth information dealing with its mineral resources, this Act destroys itself. Right across the face of this Act is written an Act to prevent the future exploration of Newfoundland, because instead of giving publicity to the mineral resources of Newfoundland it will have the effect of closing the lid down. If this Company strikes oil it is going to keep the information to itself, and we will find that we are after giving away to this

group of capitalist rights which should be employed to the benefit of Newfoundland. We should give the benefit to the outside world to come and explore for themselves and take their chances of striking oil. For all these rights we get nothing. Now the Hon. Mr. Warren and the Hon. Mr. Foote are authorities on this kind of thing and I would point out to them the many flaws in this agreement. Supposing some man went to the Hon. Mr. Foote and asked him for a concession for two or three years to search his land for mineral and paid him nothing, would he do it. Yet with all that experience he sits on the Executive Council and allows a proclamation of this sort to go forth and be outvoted. They have the right to prospect over the whole of Newfoundland for a period of two years and not have to pay a cent.

It was drawn up cleverly or foolishly—cleverly in the sense that no liability whatever is laid on the company, or foolishly in that it is drafted in this form and the Legislature is expected to pass it. Everyone will agree on the need of exploring the country and with that end in view let us join hands, bring in the capitalists, get worth-while information and see that every source is tapped to supply them with the same. But it should be done as a business proposition and the giving away of rights should be guarded. This agreement gives this company a monopoly and debarbs outside business people from coming in here and sharing in the advantages that might be derived if the matter were tackled in a proper manner. Personally I cannot support this Bill. Let them take their chance with everyone else and take pot luck as to the result. Let them come in here and undertake their borings, etc. and file their application in the usual way. They are said to have lots of money and they will not miss fifty or one hundred

thousand dollars spent on exploring work and if they strike oil and seriously intend to prosecute their findings and develop their areas and then want concessions from the Government, they will be considered. What we are doing is giving concessions and getting no returns. In respect to Section * I am not an expert in oil and do not know the value of the oil in hand but the chances are, it will amount to something. It seems too indefinite for the giving of the concessions outlined here. If they want a monopoly for two years let them pay for it. If they have such money as the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill says, they can well pay for concessions from this Government. We want the money—and if we are to part with anything let us do so for cash. Even if a substantial charge is put on it I hesitate to think the Crown Lands will be given away for such a long time and the outside prospectors barred from coming in and the sons of the soil be debarred from their inherent rights of going over the land and finding what they way. Let the people of the country get the advantages if any are to be derived. We are altogether too fond of throwing our arms around the necks of outside benefactors and welcoming them to our shores, of throwing up the rights of the people and giving concessions, only to wake up and find it a false alarm. If a survey is to be attempted let it be done in a sane manner. Don't block the proper survey of the country by the like of this thing which the Government proposes. On general principles it cannot be ratified; it gives away everything and gets nothing in return. It is purely hypothetical; this company may or may not find oil, sink a well or examine an area. They are not subject to any fine or forfeit. In ordinary business when a man agrees to do anything he puts up a bond to reimburse the man he is getting the con-

cessions from in case of failure to carry out his contract but here these people are coming in and getting everything but giving no return and then they talk of rights to test an area. If these rights are worth anything let them be reduced to a dollars and cents basis. Therefore I think we should be cautious in giving away our rights. There is no doubt of the fact that Newfoundland is peculiarly fortunately situated in the sense that she has unlimited mineral resources; the wealth of her seas are perhaps inconsiderate with her wealth of the soil. Are we going to create a monopoly and deprive the country of that wealth. Take any lucky mineral finds here; were they obtained by giving outsiders all the rights. Were they not obtained by the man from here who was fortunate in his search and took part in prospecting that was open to all and who in view of his find encouraged others to go and prospect for themselves. This is the first time in history a monopoly is to be conferred on outside parties to come in here and prospect. Suppose they do strike oil, do you think others will come in and prosecute the search further. Don't you think they will have the pick of the areas; they may not use them as they should and they will not only be abandoned by themselves but tabooed, while any worth while will be snapped up for themselves. They may for instance have 5 good areas and operate only one; under this agreement they can do this and deprive Newfoundland of the benefit of the others being worked by those who should come in here and find them for themselves. We are to get nothing in return. The percentage of oil may or may not be a valuable asset in the future. We may find in the future that this is altogether inconsiderate with the rights given away. And still you contemplate tying up our resources for 99 years on the off chance of a percentage of the oil from the

well that these people may sink. Take the ordinary Crown Lands and see the procedure that is to be followed in getting rights. They are obtained in a far more difficult manner than by these people here. There is not a paragraph in this agreement but is to the positive advantage of that company, and in my opinion you will find nothing to compensate for the advantages it is proposed to give them. The Colony is not protected. I object to this on principle—I object to it because of its indefinite character. First I object to it on the grounds that it is a monopoly. We had a most telling experiment that if they were worth anything the end of one, the fish monopoly of last year, and of its effect on Newfoundland. Are we going now to give all our minerals to this party and do without them ourselves in future. This destroys all initiative. Will they conduct a tour of Newfoundland's oil areas; they may do it so as to throw dust in the eyes of those who may follow them on a similar mission. They may do this deliberately, and from a mere business viewpoint it may be justifiable. If they think 10 areas are oil bearing but not workable as a paying financial prospect at the moment, what will they do to keep others from getting them? They will put out the report that they have investigated for themselves and found it not worth while to deal with these lands at all. Take the case of Bell Island which is said to be practically one junk of ore—only 2 or 3 spots there are being worked. There may be other spots there just as valuable commercially but they remain idle. Why? Because the people think that if they were worth anything the companies in charge of the mines would take them up for themselves. The premises may be wrong but the conclusion is justified by the circumstances. The companies encourage them in their belief. May we not have the same in regard to the oil-bearing areas. This

company may locate 10 or 12 spots but not undertake to work them all—they may use a few and leave the others idle, taking the chance that prospectors coming after them will say that if they were any good the D'Arcy Exploration Co. would have taken them up. It will kill independent prospecting for all time. I propose that the Government suggest and carry through a thorough survey of our mineral resources, but don't shut the door on all hope of learning our resources by ratifying an agreement of this sort. If it be necessary, take the money, enough to pay for the survey, have a bureau of information open to all the world and encourage capitalists to come here by showing them the department where the information is obtainable. Advertise the fact first of all and have reliable, beneficial information to attract them. Let them investigate for themselves; when they strike a spot and think of working it, if you consider they are in earnest, give them the concessions but not before you see what you are going to get in return. Don't give a monopoly; don't destroy initiative; don't say we will have a great survey and in the next breath give all the rights to a company who may or may not do anything. I do not know who the D'Arcy Exploration Co. are except that they are a subsidiary company of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., and they may have plenty money or not. I have seen lots of circulars issued by companies which looked great on paper but how far did they justify their face value. I have heard so many stories of concerns coming here to build up the country, to put Newfoundland on the map, that they read like the fable of the Arabian Nights. Let them pay for their concessions; we have had too many promises during the last 18 months. Some leaders of the Government were going to bring us into the land of promise, and so they did, as it was only the land of promise

and that was all. We want something else in future. We are in need to-day of financial assistance, we have certain things to sell, and let us sell them for dollars and cents, not for promises that certain things will accrue. Every bit of ore is a part of Newfoundland itself; every drop of oil on the West Coast is part of Newfoundland itself.

Every time we allow anyone to export from this country any mineral or anything else of that kind, we allow him to export a portion of Newfoundland itself and if they are going to do that, I say let them pay for it. Further, the supply of oil in this country is not going to prove limitless; the experience of other countries has proven this, and like them we may very soon find that some day our oil, if there is any, will be all gone and we have nothing left. In other words we will find that we have sold our heritage for a mess of pottage. If this is a part of the program of the Government to explore Newfoundland, then it is in keeping with the rest of their program. It is the same old story; they have had draughtsmen, artists and writers busy with brush and pencil, men who are worthy of better things, pushing pens and painting pictures of what is going to be done and when all is finished the whole thing will turn out to be without results.

You are giving a two years option to a company who may or may not make returns to the country, in other words you are giving a two years monopoly to this company and at the end of that time you give them three years more and that is five years and then our rights are sold, our freedom is restricted, initiative is discouraged and industry is killed. I have come to the conclusion that public contracts of this kind should be made with people only after they have been found to be what they profess to be. In other words, to reverse the well known axiom

of British law, let a man be doubted until he has proven himself to be what he professes. Now, how have these people proven themselves? By coming along here and getting a poor par-blind, soft-hearted government who were not aware what they were doing, to confer immeasurable benefits upon them and what is worse, we don't know what we are going to get out of it. We have no rights over these people and if they do not keep their contract we can do nothing about it. Can we go down to the Bank of Montreal and say to them "you have broken your contract and you must recompense us for it?" We cannot and I look upon the whole thing as a sham; I cannot see how any Government in their sober senses can ratify such a contract. The company is come to a pretty pass when, while ostensibly encouraging outsiders to come in and develop our resources, we go to work and give a monopoly to one company. Can we hope for the proper development of the country under these conditions? Newfoundland cannot afford to be philanthropic; we cannot afford to say to outsiders we want you to come here and we will give you a warm welcome; we will treat you as hospitably as we can and we want you to see for yourselves what we have to offer you. We must be in a position to say to such people we have mineral here if you are prepared to pay for it. A, B, C and D are areas containing oil or mineral and if you want data concerning these areas, you have only to go to the Agriculture and Mines Department where it is kept for reference. If you think the chances of any of these areas turning out successfully, we will give you a lease and then if you want concessions, come in here to the House of Assembly and get them but for every dollars worth of rights we give away we want one hundred cents. We have not done this. We have heard of industries that were going to be started from one end of

the Island to the other, industries that were to revolutionize the whole industrial life of the country, but this was all merely for the purpose of fooling the people and they woke up to find that all these things were but empty dreams.

What we want is a proper geological survey and to get this we must have the right man. It will not do to put a newspaper man in the job as I understand is the intention of the Government. We had a man in the late Mr. Howley whose ability was never properly recognized. His work was truly a labor of love because the paltry pittance which he received for his services was not enough with which to keep him in text books. His like will never be seen in this country again. We should attempt, if possible, however, to get a man to measure up to his standard and pay him for the work he is expected to do and then when the necessary information has been got, we should give no concessions to any concern that has not proven itself in dollars and cents. This agreement is a joke and a pitiable joke at that; it is on a par, however, with others that will be brought down here before this session closes by which we will be asked to give away all we have for nothing. I object to this on principle because the principle is vicious in every aspect of it. And then, as if all the rest were not bad enough, we have clause 8 which provides that they not alone get a monopoly but gives them the right to transfer their rights and that not alone may they keep to themselves what information they may get but if they are so disposed, they can give it to their particular friends. I repeat that the whole thing is vicious and means the final closing of the door against Newfoundlanders who may be desirous of embarking upon the exploration of their own country.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few sug-

gestions as to the phraseology of this Bill. I do not wish to offer any obstruction to its passage but merely to make a few helpful suggestions, the first of which is with regard to section 2. This says that the Company shall be entitled during the prospecting period to enter upon all the unoccupied lands and every part thereof (other than such parts thereof as to which the Government has prior to the date hereof alienated the mineral rights or as may be occupied by settlers or by buildings of any description). Now, I would like to have this more clearly defined as in its present construction it may be taken to mean the lands a man has cleared or upon which his house is, while it may not be taken to include say twenty acres of uncleared land which he holds under lease. I would make that portion of it read "All lands granted, leased or applied for." In the same section, with regard to digging, I would like to know whether digging here means digging merely in the course of a survey or for the purpose of sinking wells. I presume that it would not mean for the sinking of wells. Again in the same section it is provided that the Company shall furnish the Government with reports of surveys and all necessary maps and plants relating thereto. I think we will have to amend that. The word "necessary" may be taken to mean necessary to the Company or to the Government. If we have not all the maps that may be made showing the location of all minerals that may be found I hardly think it would be good enough, but if we could get these we would be getting something in return for the concessions we are giving.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The Company is not going to survey for anything but oil.

MR. MACDONNELL.—It is possible, however, that something else may be found by them during their survey, and

it would be well for us to get report on it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not know whether the party now on the way out here has a mineralogist with it or not.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Now with regard to section four concerning the matter of arbitration. In that section the arbitrator to be appointed as between the Company and the individual to whom compensation has to be made is to be appointed by the Government, but in section eleven which also deals with arbitrations three arbitrators are provided for, one to be named by each of the parties and one by the Supreme Court. It appears to me that it would be better to adopt this plan in both cases. The individual should have some appeal, but under section four he would have none.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—There is no appeal in either case.

MR. MACDONNELL.—But if the form adopted in section eleven is good in one case why is it not good in the other.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That was in the agreement when it was handed to me, and I thought it best to leave it as it was. It is a matter of opinion whether there is more protection in section eleven than in section four.

MR. MACDONNELL.—With regard to section five, what is the number of miles for each area?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Twelve.

MR. MACDONNELL.—There is something ambiguous in the beginning of that section, which says that if the company shall at any time from time to time give the Government notice that it desires to test any part of the unoccupied Crown Lands not exceeding a total area of 3,600 square miles the company shall be entitled during the remainder of their prospecting period and for a period of three years

afterwards, without payment of any further consideration to the Colony to test the land comprised in any area by sinking therein such test-wells as it may think fit. Could that not be taken to mean one well for the 3,600 square miles?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They must sink one well for every twelve miles.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I understand that in the United States they sink three wells for every ten miles.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes, but these are what are known as proven areas. They take a section for test purposes and if they find oil they can sink from three to eight wells per acre, but they must sink one well in every twelve miles in order to hold the area.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Now, in section 6, I object to the manner in which the ninety-nine years lease is to be granted. The ordinary way of granting such leases is to have plans and surveys of the area to be leased made. If you have not the grant defined clearly on the ground, a man prospecting for mineral may be afraid to go too near the other man's area. Unless you have these grants defined clearly on the ground and have the plans in the Department of Agriculture and Mines, you will have endless trouble. I would throw out the suggestion to the Hon. Minister to have a select committee appointed to go into all these things so as to save trouble as far as may be and to as far as possible save litigation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman I have no objection to having the proposed amendment to section two inserted in the Bill. I think that section four is alright, with regard to arbitration. I agree with the observation of the Hon. member for St. George's as to section 6. A proper survey should be made in accordance with the Crown Lands Act before the Company

get their lease. We can put that in when we go into Committee of the Whole again on this Bill and in the meantime I can consult with the Hon. member and draft his amendments.

With regard to the position set up by Mr. Fox, member for St. John's East, I must confess that I am at a loss to understand his attitude or his criticism of this matter. In the first place he stultifies his argument by saying that he does not know who the Anglo Persian Oil people are. I do not think it is right for him to criticize that Company, without having first ascertained who they are. I thought I did my best a few days ago to explain who they are. Now if the Hon. member will make enquiries he will find that they are the biggest oil people within the British Empire. I would like to tell the House that this agreement now proposed to be made has the British Government behind it, with the Newfoundland Government. That was intimated to me when I was in London last year. The British government are anxious to find all the oil they can within the Empire, and with that in view a similar agreement has been made with Alberta and since it was made big discoveries of oil have resulted; also they have an agreement with New Brunswick, where they are in possession of ten thousand square miles and where they have thus far spent one hundred thousand pounds, without having found any oil. At Trinidad and most of the West India Islands the Company are hard at work looking for oil. A few days ago the leader of the Opposition suggested as an amendment that the prospecting work should be commenced before the 10th of July next, fearing that the Company might not carry out their agreement. Yesterday just before I came into the House I received a telegram to say that the expedition party were actually on their way here on the S.S. Scandinavian. The exact copy of the message reads: "Geologists

sailed yesterday on Scandinavian for Newfoundland". There is no doubt at all as to the bona fides of the Company. As to their wealth I may say that their capital is twenty-five million pounds, of which 17,500,000 pds have been called up. The British government holds two million ordinary shares of 1 pound each, a thousand preference shares of 1 pound each, and 199,000 pds. of debenture stock. I would like for the House to compare this agreement with what could happen under present conditions. As the Crown Lands Act reads to-day these people could come in and prospect for oil, without asking our leave, under section 48 of the Crown Lands Act and we would know nothing about it and we would not get a thing out of it, but under this agreement the Company have got to start operations within two years and in consideration of that we give them a 99 years lease during which period they pay us 12 1-2 per cent. and if this proposition is going to be a paying one and they work it continually for 99 years they will pay us 12 1-2 per cent. for all that time. It is all very well for the hon. member for St. John's East to talk of stopping people from rushing in here looking for concessions, but I have not seen any of that great rush taking place. There was an oil bearing area here about ten years ago at Parsons' Pond, but that has been at a standstill for some time; and there was another belonging to the Newfoundland Oil Fields Limited and for which the British public were soaked to the extent of one hundred thousand pounds. Then we have private interests here who started to work for shale at Deer Lake, but nothing has been done with this. I understand they have endeavoured from time to time to have those oil areas properly prospected. I do not know what the reports have been on this property. However, the Anglo Persian Oil Company are quite willing and very anx-

ous in coming in to have all arrangements finalized by which the areas can be worked. I think that the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett has the right impression in his head concerning this agreement. I am of the opinion that the proposition is a good one. The Company have to pay us for the oil they get which they would not otherwise have to pay, & they took the course of getting a fee simple grant. As we go into this agreement section by section, I would like to deal with the suggestions of Mr. MacDonnell, member for St. George's, and put in the amendments that are considered desirable.

MR. MOORE—Have the Company got to give any reports of their work.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—We say to them you got to prospect and give us reports of your surveys and we will give you two years to do the work. I might say that I hope that amongst this expedition that is coming here will be mineralogists as well as geologists—men whose chief study has been oil—who intend to comb Newfoundland with a fine tooth comb. There are large areas in Newfoundland that have never been touched at all and in going through the country prospecting they may probably strike some other kind of mineral. I do not know whether this Oil Company intend to handle any other minerals, but I hope they will. However, that is another point; but under the agreement they only ask for oil, no other minerals being mentioned.

HON. MR. FOOTE—Mr. Chairman. It strikes me that the gentlemen opposite overlook one point. There is a patriotic element in this matter that has to be considered. As is well known generally the British Government are prospecting throughout the British speaking world for the purpose of getting oil. The United States are the competition with them and recently the competition became very keen and very strong between them on that very

point. Consequently, I submit, Sir, that in considering this matter we should do so from a patriotic standpoint and not be too critical. The intentions of the British Government, we all know, are good. As the Attorney General has said, this Company that is making an agreement with the Newfoundland Government have made similar contracts with Alberta and New Brunswick and at both places, particularly at New Brunswick, they got more concessions in the way of territory to explore than they are looking for here. I think then in discussing this matter that we be not unmindful of this patriotic element and deal with it accordingly. The Bill appears to me to be very fair. The company are not asking for anything too much. The country for centuries past has been practically without development, and I think that we should encourage these prospectors and capitalists to come in here, particularly as we have before us the cases of Alberta, New Brunswick and other parts of the Empire. As far as I am personally concerned, I will give the Bill my strongest support, mainly from a patriotic standpoint.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman. I rise for the purpose of giving my support to the Bill. I do not do it from any patriotic standpoint; I do it from the standpoint of a Newfoundlander, I am not concerned so much whether this Company is English, American or of any other nationality, except for the purpose of discovering in all parts of the British Empire whether oil is available or not, because oil in the future will be absolutely essential for the safety of the British Empire. Oil to-day is taking the place of coal in every respect, particularly in relation to our Navy. Any member of this House who considers that we are legislating any of our rights away has fallen short of the true conception of the idea in the Bill. This is a Company with credentials that are unques-

tionable and of high standing and of such a character in the Old Country that we can accept the statement of the Minister of Justice that they are men who mean business and that we will not run any risks of having our rights sacrificed. They are merely asking for two short years and for priority with regard to the exploration of our oil areas. I am of the opinion that we have not sufficient people of that kind coming in here to explore and find out the possibilities of this country. We should not lose any opportunity in helping a serious effort that might be made to discover whether or not oil areas do exist in this country. I would like to see it go further and see some capitalists come in here to enquire into all our mineral resources. I would like to see many companies coming in here on the same lines, as contemplated, to conduct a complete and investigation with a view to discovering the mineral throughout the length and breadth of the country. We have been unfortunately isolated. Our interior is made the home of the wolf and the bear. Outside of Bishops' Falls and Grand Falls the rest of the country is absolutely undiscovered. Well here we have a Company with any amount of capital behind them and with an equipment thoroughly able to investigate and discover really what our resources are. If this Company do discover oil it will bring a considerable revenue to the country, because by its development we will receive 12 1-2 per cent. of the profits of the Company. We have not had sufficient explorations or developments in the past, that is the great trouble. Here we have a great big Island with its resources practically unscratched and our only hope for the future is to have these resources developed. Therefore, I give my hearty support to the Bill and I hope that the Minister of Justice will see to it that this Company will not be impeded in its enterprise, and I hope that next year a further

Bill will be introduced and investigations and surveys made and all information possible secured for the development of the entire country.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman. In reply to the Hon. member for Burin, I would say that I admire to a certain extent the position he took in his plea that the House should regard this matter from a patriotic viewpoint. Might I point out to the hon. member that in this enlightened age the only form of patriotism that we know of—and I think the people of Newfoundland generally know it as such—is the patriotism that pays; but before I depart from my reply might I put this position to him. Supposing Mr. Foote holds timber areas on the West Coast and upon which he doesn't even know whether there is any timber existing there or not, and I go to him to-morrow and ask him for a free option on it for two years, what would be Mr. Foote's reply?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—You cannot compare the two cases.

MR. FOX—His reply would be that he would not part with it until he sees the ready cash for it, and not alone that, but the man who offers the most cash to Mr. Foote would get the first option of it. Arguing on that principle we know propose for patriotic purposes to tie up all the oil bearing areas in Newfoundland and give our rights to this Company. In reply to the Minister of Justice I would point out that the recent amendment to the Crown Lands Act prevents any one from coming here to prospect and to stake off areas. The amendment to the Crown Lands Act stands on its own feet whether this agreement passes through or not.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—The amendment to the Crown Lands Act says that the Governor in Council shall have power to withhold from lease or license all or any minerals in any particular area. That does not mean oil.

MR. FOX—You passed a Minute of Council against anything of this kind being carried out and this Company, under the law as it stands to-day, could not get a fee simple grant for nothing.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency, the Governor, in the Council Chamber.

And Mr. Speaker and the House being at the Bar of the Council Chamber, His Excellency the Governor, was pleased to assent to the following Bill: "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for the General Purposes of the Colony."

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 informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively: "An Act to amend the Profiteering Act, 1920" and "An Act Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for Special Purposes" with out amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 106 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of Lotteries'" with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the said amendment was read at first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 6th, 1921.

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

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

MR. LEWIS—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, whether seeing that the Dry Dock in the West End is the security which the Colony has at the present time for the operation of the Railway in lieu of the \$250,000 provided by the Railway contract, he is satisfied as to the condition of the Dry Dock, especially of the South Side of the same that it is in safe condition and likely to remain so for sometime, or whether it is rapidly deteriorating and in danger of collapse with the result, apart from the danger to life and property, that it may be as a security greatly diminished in value, and whether he has any report from the Government Engineer on its condition and if not will he instruct that official to make a report on its condition and lay the same on the Table of the House without delay?

Mr. Lewis asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to notices published in the daily newspapers, copies of notices posted by the Colonial Cordage Co., to its employees whereby all these employees are discharged as from the 8th of June, the reason for such given by the Com-

pany being that the rope making industry has no protection, and that although representations have been made to the government nothing has been done in the matter, and for the Prime Minister to-day if this is being considered by the government, and if so what action has been taken in regard thereto and what number of employees are involved in this shut down of the Ropewalk?

MR. VINICOMBE—Asked the Minister of Public Works if it has been reported that a number of people in a settlement in his district broke into some stores and stole two barrels of flour which they distributed amongst themselves; whether Constable Chafe was sent to investigate, and whether he reported that all of these people were on the verge of starvation and that but for taking this flour they would have perished, and whether he reported that all of these people were on the verge of starvation their relief, and if so to state the nature of such measures.

MR. MOORE—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is correct that Mr. E. Collishaw some months ago threatened the Railway Company's agent at Grand Falls with dismissal because of some assumed cause of complaint which Mr. Collishaw had against this official, and whether the Railway Agent had come to St. John's to deal with the matter, and what position Mr. Collishaw occupies which entitles him to act in this matter towards officials of the Reid Nfld. Co., or of the government, and will the government take steps to see that Mr. Collishaw is not permitted to interfere with these officials of the Railway Co. in future.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any representations have been made to himself or any member of the government with regard to the condition of the number of fishermen at Port Union and vicinity, to the effect that these people are in dire distress at present through non-

payment of monies due them by the F.P.U., for fish put off to that Company last autumn on a promise of payment about the end of January, and whether the government is taking any steps to relieve these people and if so to state the nature of such relief measures.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, what steps are being taken by the government to carry into effect the promises of the Minister of Fisheries that an exploration of the waters off our coast would be undertaken by one of the steamers obtained from England last year with the object of adding to the information available to our people to assist them in securing better catches of codfish.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to procure and furnish to the House a statement showing the number of motor cars licensed in each of the past five years, the amount paid in taxes thereon in each of the said periods, and the amount in each year held by the St. John's Municipal Council and the amounts distributed amongst the different electoral districts.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked the Min. of Public Works if Mr. Albert Salter purchased stocks of gauze or other material for the General Hospital and other public institutions and if so to lay on the Table of the House the original bills for the same, and a statement of what Commission, if any was paid Mr. Salter in connection with the said service?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if Mr. Albert Salter has been appointed by the Government to adjust all matters of Fire Insurance in connection with government buildings and otherwise, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the distribution of such Insurance made by Mr. Salter and a statement of

what sum, if anything, was paid him for this service?

MR. MOORE—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what quantity of material in tons (silt, gravel or rock) was removed by Dredger "Priestman" from the Dock and Waterfront Premises at Port Union during the season of 1920, if such dredging as performed was considered public or private work. If private was there a contract signed with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the performance of this work and at what price per cubic yard or ton. How many days was dredger engaged at this location. Was this work as performed paid for by the Company owning the premises dredged. What was the total cost of work done; what amount was paid the Department of Marine & Fisheries for same, and if not paid why not?

MR. MACDONNELL—Asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs

- (1) Upon what principle are the mail-clerks selected for the trains and steamers;
- (2) Is there any precaution taken to see that all mail clerks get fair play in this matter;
- (3) How many trips has the supervisor of mail clerks, Mr. Bradbury, made on trains or steamers since his appointment;
- (4) To furnish a copy of any reports furnished by the said supervisor.

MR. FOX—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if the Government is as determined to retain the H.M.S. Cambrian here to protect the opposition from the projected invasion of Northern Fishermen as indicated in the Evening Advocate of June 3rd inst., as it was to bring the said warship here to protect the government from an uprising on the part of the outraged and oppressed citizens of this section of the country, the fear of which uprising had origin only in the heated imagination of a government conscious of its

wrong doing, but no foundation in fact?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—As to question three, the Relieving Officer saw that the people were looked after. Some time late in April drift ice came in the bay, so that these people were unable to get in touch with the Relieving Officer, and there was no telegraph communication with the place. I am aware of all the facts re this matter, but it seems that a few of the people broke into a store and appropriated two barrels of flour. The constable of that place is named Tuff. I have no knowledge that he reported these people as being on the point of starvation, and I know every precaution on the part of the representatives was taken when there was any sign of destitution.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—With reference to question 4, I am not aware that Mr. Collishaw threatened the person in question. He may have done so, so far as he could in the capacity of a private citizen. Mr. Collishaw has no connection with the Railway Commission whatever. But just as any private citizen he may report any one to headquarters. As to question 5, no representations were made to the Government or to me with respect to the matter in question. With regard to question 6, no steps are being taken to have any exploration of the fishing waters of Newfoundland during the coming year. Money expended on such a purpose to my mind would be misapplied. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries some time ago said that it might be a splendid proposition. As to question 7, I have asked for a statement and probably it will be ready to-morrow.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—As to question 8, Mr. Salter did not purchase any such material for the government but he got us on to a party whereby a purchase was effected and three thousand dollars were saved. He got no

commission as he is under salary from the government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to question 9, Mr. Salter has not been appointed Fire Insurance Adjuster for the Government nor has he been retained for any insurance work of any kind.

In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I have directed the attention of the Deputy Minister to the matter in question 10 and it will soon be prepared.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I will probably have the answer to question 11 before the session closes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to Mr. Fox's question I would say that, as you are aware, this warship was not brought here to protect the Opposition from an uprising of the fishermen down north. I quite agree with him when he says this matter has no foundation in fact.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I asked him two questions which have not been answered.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Deputy was asked to get the information and I will redirect his attention to it.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled 'Of Lotteries,'" was read a second time and agreed to and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendment had been concurred in without amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In moving the second reading of this amendment to the Lottery Act I may say this amendment is an addition to

section six. Reads. The Act formerly provided that the object must be a charitable one but the Upper House wants the whole of the proceeds devoted to that purpose.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Just when, or at least before, the Committee rose at the last session, the hon. member for St. George's made some suggestions re some amendments that might be put in these Resolutions and I have had the advantage of an interview with the hon. member and we have allowed two amendments which I think will be concurred in by the House, otherwise the agreement might be allowed as follows. The next one is really an addition to last few words of section two. The next amendment is to section six which is really a reproduction of sub-section three or section four of the Crown Lands Act. The interpretation of section six may be according to some an actual lease of the land but that is not the case, it is merely lease of the oil or such other material in question.

MR. FOX.—First of all it might be an advantage to the Colony to have a Company of this sort in our midst but I suggest that the Colony should not part with these concessions without getting a commensurate return. It is not right to give away the entire products of this country for nothing. All those objections of mine made on Friday last still hold good. I do not wish to impede the Government in any respect.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—We are not giving this Company anything except the exclusive right to go

search for oil. Anyone may come and under the Crown Land's Act sink a well and acquire a fee simple grant instead of what we hereby lease for ninety-nine years and when there is a fee simple grant the Colony gets nothing. This Company is paying twelve and one-half cents on all oil produced and I think that is a fair agreement so far as the Colony is concerned. At the present time everything is deadly dull and no one has ever shown any anxiety at any time when anyone came here and searched for oil. If this Company did not come at all some speculators may come and get the lands or the oil and then try and sell it to the Company or some other company at an exorbitant figure when these individuals should not have had the lands at all. But this Company is prepared to pay twelve and one-half cents on all the oil produced.

MR. FOX.—First of all there are many points for discussion as to the proper policy for the exploration of the mineral and oil resources of Newfoundland, on the part of the Government. This agreement with this Company is going to shut down the door on all future aggrandisement for this country in this matter and you are beginning at the wrong end. We ought to adopt some exploration policy of our own and not give the benefit of our country's resources to someone else for their own particular benefit. The mere fact of being allowed to prospect is a very valuable concession in itself. This Company will certainly keep all the information it acquires. I think if the Government contemplates any geological survey of Newfoundland it ought to be organized at once and let an outside corporation do it. The consideration given for this two year's option is inadequate and as far as this Company coming in under the Crown Land's Act why that could be obviated by the Governor in Council. My real objections is the other monop-

lies running with it. The information this Co. acquires will never be disclosed try how you may. They are not going to give it away and benefit competition. Twelve and one-half per cent. on the oil may or may not be worth anything. The hon. Minister thinks this is a very valuable return but how long will it last? Public enterprise ought to be the policy of the Government and I believe the future will show that our Newfoundland resources could have been handled to much greater advantage. The Government ought to handle this matter cautiously. I ask the Government does it intend to find out about our mineral resources and if it does it ought to do so right away but this is a wrong way to go about it. I think it is a great mistake to give this Company all the valuable rights which this agreement gives it for two years, the right to explore the country exclusively and to have all the monopolies incidental thereto. We can never expect to have competition or competitive bidding for our valuable asset oil, once this company gets this monopoly. This is not square to Newfoundland. She is in need of funds at the present time. We go into the outside market and if the D'Arcy Exploration Company wants the stock offering they have got to pay for it. In consideration of the sum of one hundred thousand dollars we give this option of two years. I would suggest that. This company merely wants to advance all its financial interests but what about Newfoundland? I do not know of the Persian Oil Company. The whole thing is confused. We enter into a contract with the Persian Oil Company actually but the prestige of the Persian Oil Company may or may not be behind this D'Arcy Exploration Company. If the British Government is behind the matter let the contract be made with the British Government. What guarantee have we but to-morrow the D'Arcy Company will be wound

up. Let the contract be made with the main company. I realise that Newfoundland wants development but not in this way. Incidental hereto I wish to point out that if you follow the railway you will notice that it taps the main water powers of Newfoundland. There ought to be a nationalization of the water powers of our country. We have a fortune in our grasp with regard to electrical power. A few months ago the water power on the St. Lawrence River was producing five thousand horse power and a Company paid one million dollars for the right of it. We are letting hundreds of thousands of this horse power to go to waste. Therefore we should be cautious as to how we gave away our rights and in this case we are giving away a particularly valuable asset. The civil service is being reduced three hundred and twenty thousand dollars, so let this company pay one hundred thousand dollars towards the upkeep of this service. This service has done more for Newfoundland than all those companies put together. We ought to have our ablest men ascertain the possibilities of our resources so that we may know where we stand when fraudulent speculators come round to grab up what is going. Unscrupulous individuals have come here and bought timber rights and other rights and then re-sold them when in fact instead of timber they owned a bog or a moor. It is up to the Government to stop this kind of crime. This information ought to be guaranteed by the Government. This information ought to be obtained from some Departmental head so when John Jones goes to London to sell some rights out here the party buying will not be so misled that he will not know whether he bought rights out in China or in North America. It is time to stop this menace. We are on our knees at the present time begging for money and here we are disposing of our valuable assets for nothing. I

cannot go to any individual like Mr. Foote who is now leaving the Chamber, and get from him an ownership of his timber rights or some other property unless I pay hard cash but now the Government of Newfoundland are disposing of the entire oil bearing properties of Newfoundland for nothing. If we do not get this money we are going to the wall. As to section five I would suggest a forfeiture of all the Company's rights unless the conditions have been fulfilled in the opinion of the Government. (Reads.) That means nothing. Who in the name of the world can say what is a vigorous prosecution and sinning of an oil well. I suggest that it will be absolutely subject to the approval of the Government. Add the words "to the satisfaction of the Government." Again you ought not allow this Company to transfer its rights to anyone outside Newfoundland. When was this contract signed?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—About a fortnight ago in London. There was no execution by this Government nor was a representative of Newfoundland present.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, what does the amendment mean?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—We only give a lease of the oil in the land.

MR. FOX.—How did you amend it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I will read it. (Reads amendment.)

MR. FOX.—I do not think it proper to lease something intangible, the same as you lease land under the water.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—We can lease the water.

MR. FOX.—You are critically wrong in leasing the oil, not the area.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—According to the Crown Lands Act the area is leased.

MR. FOX.—You will have to go about it in a different way.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—You can lease the water power.

MR. FOX.—You lease the utilization of the water power not the power itself. If you make a shipment of petroleum to England to-morrow, you ship part of the lease. I think Clause 5 should be placed to the prosecution of the Colony. The action of the Government is absolute stubbornness on their part; they are running their heads into a halter. There are many objections to this thing. It is objectionable on the first principle. The cart is placed before the horse. The Hon. Minister now says there is no liability on the company.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member seems to have such faith in our oil possibilities and fears that we are giving them away. He evidently has not studied the oil boom of the last few years. The Parsons' Pond people disposed of their shares; the prospectors went to England and got £100,000 of capital. They sunk it in finding oil on areas that were non-existent and the shareholders were soaked. The Deer Lake Co. tried to develop areas but with no result. Mr. J. D. Henry, one of the most prominent oil prospectors in the world, has been at Parsons' Pond for years and I would like to point out that Parsons' Pond Inlet, etc., were held as possibilities of Newfoundland but nothing came out of them. The Anglo Persian Oil Co. are getting what the others left, they say they will give 12% of their oil for it and they can come in and pay for it. I am only anxious to get them in. They are not a bit too anxious to come and may say explore the country for yourself. I hear they are in no rush to come and pay 12½% of the oil even if they get it for nothing. Now we can say whether they are sinking a well vigorously or not. If you penalize

them they will become half-hearted and probably throw up the proposition but I hope they will find oil.

MR. FOX—Under your arrangement the arbitration will have to go to the Colony and will cost millions as all other arbitrations do. They will not consider their private arbitrator wrong when opposed by the Government. If there is anything on the side it will be given to the corporation. It is done every time as the Colony pays every time. Hon. Mr. Warren says I have every faith in the possibilities of Newfoundland. We differ; he should say Newfoundland is flowing with oil; he is putting the cart before the horse as usual.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—You say the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. are getting something great.

MR. FOX—We have some 42,000 sq. miles here in Newfoundland and we don't now if there is oil anywhere.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—We are anxious to get them in to explore.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—They can do the exploring now for nothing and why stop them when we are anxious to get them in.

MR. FOX—Look up the manifesto of your leader. I recognize your Hon. Mr. Foote never read it as you said in your campaign you did not. Though in the past you have failed to scan that important document I ask you now to look at it and see the great possibilities he, the Hon. Prime Minister, spoke of then. You are cutting the salaries of the civil servants; put the money to the purpose of exploring and then say we have conducted a proper survey; tell outsiders, here are the lands and plans of the areas. Let them come in and develop them but always remember that we have to be paid for them. Don't start at the wrong end. Can the Hon. Minister tell me these people are looking for only oil? May they not get knowledge of other minerals and monop-

olize the information; stow it away in their vest pocket and we would receive no benefit from it because the government professes to believe one thing and are doing something directly opposite. We cannot penetrate your intelligence to show you that you are wrong. We have sufficient data already before us to show that Newfoundland as an oil bearing and mineral field is a great country. Why not get down to work and have the information that is necessary prepared for capitalists coming in here instead of waiting for them to come and find it out for themselves and leaving us in ignorance of what they find. I think in this you are going the wrong way to work; instead of collecting data and getting it into the proper department we are leaving Newfoundland once more at the mercy of speculators. In the words of the well-known pees, we cry "welcome to the stranger." I suppose most of you hon. gentlemen on the other side have not even read this contract.

MR. SAMPSON—We have it by heart.

MR. FOX—If you have it by heart then you are very remiss in your duty to the people who sent you here if you allow it to go in its present form. However, I will give you the benefit of the doubt and I say that the hon. members on the other side are prepared to pass this although they do not know what it contains. Reverting to the indecent spectacle of the presiding officer of this Chamber having to send out for the members of the Assembly to come in here and make up a quorum, gentlemen who have so much interest in the affairs of the country that they leave the House and retire to their room to smoke cigarettes. Is that the way to fulfil your obligations to your constituents. Is it not in agreement with all the rest you have done to justify

your existence as members of this Legislature? And then you cannot get up and express an opinion. If the Opposition can be credited with talking too much, it can be well said of the Government that they do not talk enough. The silence of the Government benches is so marked that you can feel it, but surely they can open their ears if they cannot open their mouths. I say, Sir, that hon. members are derelict in their duty in forsaking this Chamber during the consideration of such a measure as this and I refer to it in order to safeguard them from such conduct in the future. Now, listen to this. I do not think I should spoil the context by omitting to read the text: (Quotes from Coaker circular).

MR. FOX (Contd.)—He has to suffer the indignity of being compared to Mr. Coaker, the man who ruined Newfoundland. Is that the position he has to face to-day. It was said some years ago by Sir Edward Morris when he took up his paper and read an obituary notice of one of his friends written by Judge Prowse, "It is another terror added to death." Is that the position Mr. Bonar Law has to face to-day. Added to all the ills he has already likened to Mr. Coaker. I don't think that is right. If this Circular were coming up for discussion here this afternoon, I would move the deletion of that sentence. With regard to the statement by Mr. Coaker that he has to suffer Hell here I am sure his supporters are in agreement with him in that matter. If we are to judge from their frequent absence they don't want to be here either, they seem to be anxious to escape Hell too. The point of my argument is that it is neither conducive to your interest in public affairs, nor consistent with the obligation of the office you have assumed that you gentlemen

should absent yourselves so much, but in particular it is not fair to your great leader, because he is great. Whether he is right or wrong he is great. We know that when he wanted some money to help out his political associates he went down to the Treasury and took half a million dollars. That was great, although it was wrong. Mr. Hibbs the member for Fogo did the same thing only he got only eighty dollars. That is where the distinction comes in. Mr. Coaker took something worth while. Now before I depart from my criticism of the Government because of their indifference to their duties of office I want to urge these members not to absent themselves so frequently. Mr. Chairman. I see that the Minister of Justice who is the father of this bill is absent and as I cannot discuss this bill in his absence, I will take my seat until his arrival.

MIN. OF JUSTICE—I understand that the honorable member wants to ask me a question.

MR. FOX—No, but I might want to do so during the discussion of this bill, and your presence is necessary. If you are unable to remain here for personal or public reasons, I would suggest that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—That is not necessary. Mr. Fox has been talking of matters which have nothing to do with the subject before the Chair but if he will confine himself to the matter in question, I will remain.

MR. SAMSON—It is up to you Mr. Chairman to see that Mr. Fox sticks to the subject.

MR. FOX—Surely Mr. Samson you are not going to insinuate that the Chairman has been lax in the per-

formance of his duty here this afternoon. I have found it necessary to criticise the members of the Government individually, but I don't want to have to criticise the Chairman of the Committee in his official capacity.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I rise to a point of order. This discussion between Mr. Fox and Mr. Samson is entirely out of order. It has nothing to do with the subject, and I ask you Mr. Chairman for a ruling.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman, you are surely not going to give a decision on this matter without hearing the pros and cons. I had a passage-at-arms with Mr. Samson and Mr. Warren saw well to break in upon our little stage play and rise to a point of order. I submit that with the serious duty that is yours that you cannot come to a decision without hearing both sides of the question. You cannot say Mr. Warren is right. You stand for justice and fair play in this House and to give you a chance to reconsider your decision I am going to take my seat.

MR. HIGGINS—There are certain obligations one owes to a colleague, and before I am asked to vote against Mr. Fox, I would like to hear the point of order.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Fox's remarks were not relevant. My first point was with regard to what he said previously in the afternoon. My last point was with regard to his remarks in reply to Mr. Samson, which I claim were out of order.

MR. HIGGINS—I want to hear the words used by Mr. Fox, which you take exception to.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I refer you to the Reporter.

MR. HIGGINS—If those are the words to which you were referring I

cannot see anything the matter with them.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—They are irrelevant.

MR. HIGGINS—I say that Mr. Fox was quite right. He was delivering a quiet gentlemanly admonition to Mr. Samson, who was himself out of order, and as far as I can see he is the only one who was out of order.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I don't agree with your decision Mr. Chairman. The Resolutions are about oil, and if you read the Circular referred to you will find that it refers to oil, and how can Mr. Fox be out of order when he is discussing Resolutions which are about oil, and this Circular which is also about oil. I think your decision is nonsensical.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman before you comply with Mr. Warren's request for a ruling, I take it you can see the nonsensical aspect of that request. I have stated that before we could vote on such a matter we would have to know the point of order, and we asked for the information, and there is nothing in it. A new aspect has now been introduced. I want to say here that Mr. Coaker's opinion on Fishery matters in this country is worth something. He said that the Fishery in this country is gone. That is his ultimatum. He said our hope lies in new industries. We are discussing new industries, and in the hope that this one will amount to something it is quite right the greatest authority in Newfoundland on our present industry. His opinion has never before been questioned, and I don't believe it would be now if he were here, and because he has gone out is no reason why his opinion is not worth as much as ever. Mr. Fox I think was perfectly in order. Their friendship in the past is well-known

They were colleagues in the Sealing Bill, and now they are together in oil, and I think that when Mr. Fox looks after the oil which Mr. Coaker so badly wants he is perfectly in order.

MR. FOX—Mr. Jennings was about to make some remark.

MR. JENNINGS—Seeing the lateness of the hour I will defer my remarks until later.

MR. FOX—Do you contemplate moving that the Committee rise. I am perfectly willing to extend the courtesy of permitting you a few remarks if you desire to make them.

MR. JENNINGS—I was just going to refer to a verse in Holy Writ which says, "The fool uttereth all that is in his mind, but the Wise Man keepeth it in until afterwards".

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I think this is out of order. I don't think that a debate on Scripture has anything to do with oil. This is developing into a Comic Opera, but it is delightful to see Mr. Warren get a little ginger into him. I am very glad he woke. Heretofore he has been a silent partner in the government. He is the man we are looking to for Law and Order I was astonished at him. I think something must have happened to him He must have been to a wedding this evening. As Mr. Jennings has been quoting Scripture and Sir Michael Cashin has been trying to pour oil on the troubled waters, I suppose it is in order for me to congratulate the Minister of Justice, on the ginger he has shown this afternoon.

MR. FOX—May I express my deep regret that Mr. Jennings who has occupied such an enviable position in our esteem, should see fit to make such a retort to Mr. Higgins. I don't think he meant it, because he must know that if he regards himself as the

Wise man that the other man must be the fool. I don't think Mr. Higgins deserves that and I am sure that Mr. Jennings did not mean to place him in that category, and I will now take my seat to give him a chance to retract that statement.

MR. JENNINGS—I meant no reflection on Mr. Higgins.

MR. FOX—When Mr. Jennings got up I felt like reminding him of another quotation. I have a circular from Mr. Coaker in which he talks about Hell, and knowing that Mr. Jennings and Mr. Coaker think as one, I felt that his mind must be running on the same subject, and he would naturally think of the ruler of that region. The quotation is "The Devil sometimes is able to quote Scripture". I was going to remind him of that, but recognizing the fact that he has made amends to Mr. Higgins I will do him the courtesy of not making that remark. Now coming back to this discussion on the point of Order do I understand Mr. Chairman that you are going to give a decision on that matter without hearing what I have to say. Will you not rather say to Mr. Warren "You may be very important and have much influence, but your words do not carry weight enough which would entitle me to say you are right before I hear the other side of the question, therefore I will ask Mr. Fox to advance certain arguments in his favor before I give a ruling, and I will take my seat until you think this over. I don't want you to sully your record of the past eighteen months. You have acquired a reputation of being equalled by few and surpassed by none, and I want that record and reputation to go down through the years sacredly and jealously guarded. You might give a decision without weighing the facts sufficiently but you must ask

yourself what will the members who will be here in twenty years time think of that decision. The words of great men live after them. We know what Caesar said when he crossed the Rhine, and what Napoleon said when he crossed the Alps, and what Mr. Coaker said when he resigned his position as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and we don't want it to happen that what Mr. Hibbs said in 1921 will be unknown. I ask you to be cautious. You are our Guide, Philosopher and friend in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN—Mr. Fox, you are out of order now.

MR. FOX—How can I be out of order when I am discussing the point of order raised by Mr. Warren, and supposing I were irrelevant I am speaking in your interest, I am helping you in your onerous task as Chairman of this House. You are not alone useful but you are ornamental. It is a pleasure for us to look at you and realise that not only are you in the position of Arbitrator in this House, but you are the personification of all the personal graces, and that your presence here goes a long way towards enlivening what would otherwise be a very solitary existence.

MR. CHAIRMAN—You are out of order.

MR. FOX—Give me a chance to defend myself. No man is condemned without a chance to defend himself, I won't take long and then we can go on with these Resolutions. Mr. Warren is unable to sustain his point of order, and asks you to sustain it for him. You cannot walk on both sides of the street at once. You can support Mr. Warren and turn down an Opposition member without a hearing. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions with some amendment and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company Limited" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act further respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, when we were on this order paper Mr. Sullivan, who was particularly interested in this bill, was absent. Now that he is present I move that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole on this bill (An Act respecting the cutting of pit props for certain purposes).

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I might again explain that this bill is merely to confirm certain acts done by the Governor-in-Council some time ago. I recently had a session with Dr. Campbell and others to determine how \$19 per cord would work out, and owing to the uncertainty of the means of transportation it would appear that the offer of \$19.00 would be entirely problematic. Mr. Hue was not prepared to make an offer himself, and his principals were not prepared to make any offer that would involve taking any chance. I may say that Bow-

ring Brothers and other firms have been interesting themselves in the matter, and it has been handled in a very business-like and thorough manner by Mr. Turner, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The decision that was reached at that conference was that the government could not see how it could work out \$4.00 per cord for delivery at that point. Negotiations regarding the sale are still going on.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that applies in this firm that makes that offer, Munn & Co. of Montreal, is a good firm, and it will be a long time before you get such a good offer again. Bowring Brothers have troubles of their own with pit props and should not be asked to handle this matter. The message stated that this offer was only for to-day, and I think it should be accepted without delay. I venture to say now that you will not be able to beat that offer in the next six months I think it would be a great mistake on the part of the Government not to accept this offer.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I wasn't here when this pit prop business was discussed before the House, I understand the government has been offered \$19.00 per cord c.i.f. At that figure the government will lose at least \$2.00 per cord. The first cost is \$6.00, the cost of transportation will be \$6.00, making \$14.00 so far. Added to these must be the cost of barking sawing in four foot lengths, and loading which will amount to at least \$7 more. That will make \$21. This does not include the 15 per cent. which will be lost in barking, the exportation tax. So that the Government will get practically nothing out of selling at that price. If the coal strike was not on in England I have not the least doubt that a considerable lot could be sold with the bark on.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to know very much about the pit prop business, but do I understand that the government is paying \$6 per cord on the bank without barking? That is the cost on the bank is \$6, the cost of loading, etc., \$7, and the freight will be at least \$10, making altogether \$23, or a loss to the government of \$4 per cord. There is no use trusting to Bowring Brothers to sell these pit props. Bowrings lost a fortune on pit props during the last two years of the war. I think some capable man who understands the matter should be put right on to the job of getting a sale for these pit props. The quicker it is done the better for the Colony. I do not think that the government is going to get that offer later on.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me the suggestion of Mr. Sullivan should be very seriously considered by the House. While as the hon. member for St. John's West says it was understood for years the export of unbarked wood was not permitted and while we have here the A. N. D. Co., the West Coast companies and the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. in selected areas, it cannot be denied that we have spots that are unsuitable for working as there are no water powers there and the acreage is not such as to interest buyers. There may be interests to weigh against this however. It may be difficult to say which areas export may be allowed from and there is need of a careful survey and one would have to see which would be commercially profitable for the export of wood. It should only be for a limited period; Mr. Sullivan says 5 years. I do not think any wood should be allowed to be exported without reforestation laws. It is time to look to the future of the timber of the country. When Mr. Blackstedt was here he spoke of the

laws of Sweden in this respect. They are very strict and are rigorously carried out. If we could utilize the fire swept areas and those adjoining so that reforestation would take place, if only for 5 years, it would be highly beneficial. In Sweden for every tree they cut they plant 5 I think, and if we did the same I do not think Newfoundland would stand to lose, especially when you remember for the next 3 or 4 years employment will be of paramount importance as it was during the past winter. The selling conditions have been unique for some time past. There was a great demand for a time for pulp wood. I saw a number of telegrams and as Minister of Justice received several myself, asking if the export of pulpwood were allowed and as to the law in this respect. These came from law firms in the United States. Newsprint was then \$140 a ton; now it is \$80 or \$100. Then the mills everywhere were in full swing but now the men are on strike. The bottom has fallen out of the pit prop market because of the strike.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—It had fallen out before the printers' strike.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It was out before that strike was thought of. I will quote the Montreal Star to show the state of the pit prop, pulpwood and paper markets at the time. This utterance was brought about by the publication issued by the Bank of Canada. (Reads article.)

It goes on to say the outlook is favorable. With these prospects in the price of pulp and paper it is only natural to suppose the demand for paper and wood in these mills would be large. (Quotes article again.)

MR. SULLIVAN.—What does the \$140 mean?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is the price of pulp. That is a later article than I read before. So that when permission was given to cut the wood to give relief in September

last, the Government was assured of a profitable return; despite the fact that there was no fish regulations in other countries but then came the printers' strike and since then pulpwood has been a drug on the market, then came the big coal strike which paralysed industry in England and the props became a drug. If the props are taken care of now the market is bound to recover and I believe the Government will find a way to avoid the loss which now seems to be staring them in the face. Mr. Sullivan brought the subject up and I think it should be seriously considered. Perhaps it is outside the scope of the Bill and I may not be right in discussing it here but if we have reforestation I think it would certainly be a good thing.

MR. HIGGINS.—As this was really brought up, Mr. Chairman, by my question to the Hon. Prime Minister in regard to pit props, I would like to say a few words on it. I desire to associate myself with the line of thought laid down by Mr. Bennett. We should not be swept off our feet and influenced to depart from the line that has been laid down for a quarter of a century. We hear a lot about distress but I subscribe to the ideas of Mr. Bennett as to the difference in view to be taken as to the export from Labrador and Newfoundland. I only suggest a line of thought but as far as I am concerned I think the idea of pulp mills on Labrador is crazy. I think exportation from Labrador is a totally different proposition than from Newfoundland. It is not a matter of distress and I think the best way to view it is if there are certain areas practicable for pulp, let these only be considered. I approach the matter in the same spirit as Mr. Bennett and do not wish to be misunderstood. There is much force in the contention of the member for Placentia but I trust that the Government, if they take up the proposition, will remember that the men on

the Opposition side approach it with some bias, Labrador No 1 will be a distinct proposition. The season is too short to have mills there. As to Newfoundland, we have been hearing of her water powers but we should tread warily. Five years will do a lot of destruction and I think the member for Placentia will agree with me that there is not sufficient intelligent information as to the timber possibilities or water powers to warrant us in coming here and deciding this thing right off. There is no one here can say that certain areas should be allowed for export purposes. I think Mr. Bennett has struck the right note and I hope the Government will understand that this is not a policy of the Opposition, that the party is not committed to it, and I think the member for Placentia will see that. No matter how much we would like to see it, the matter is too heavy a one. There is no data available. I know of fakirs selling timber limits that amounted to ponds; their only cruising was done up and down Water St. and I don't think we should be guided by that kind of information. The export I trust will be dealt with under a separate Bill and I hope we will have extra data when the Bill will be brought down.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Attorney General has tried to be clear as to the Government's stand last year. There is no need of him explaining the position to the Opposition. They contracted for \$6, what they thought a fair price, with pulp up in the air and the props badly wanted, but I don't think there will be so many soakers as here in selling them, even as wharf shores. Bowring Bros. have been almost cleaned out and others have also lost heavily. Here's the whole thing in a nutshell. You agreed to cut and take the props on the bank at \$6 a cord. The result is you cannot ask a different figure now—now you can't get them away

for \$6. They are not worth cutting. If the Government loses \$130,000, they did the work with good intentions, but it looks to me they will not be worth cutting and exporting for years to come. You can't attempt it with benefit to the Colony. I fully agree with Mr. Bennett and Mr. Higgins. I do not think it would be profitable to try and export them; even if we do lose them by fires it would be better. As to paper mills on the Labrador I don't see how they can be worked there effectively as there is only 4 months for shipping from that coast. The Minister of Public Works and Capt. Jones know that navigation is open there only 4 months. Nobody wants to go there to cut pit props. The great lesson we got is that what the Government undertook last year with the best intentions, has proved a total failure, that's the answer.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I would like to say one more word, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sullivan is perfectly right, it is not our stand to favour the proposition, it is not our position to oppose it. What will we do with it if we do not export it. It will be there for hundreds of years till it burns or blows down and we will get nothing out of it. If anyone goes into this business of barking they will have the proper machinery and it will be cut in standard size. I don't see why we should oppose it because it was done before. And I will go further and say I think a Bill should be introduced to amend the Crown Land's Act so that in the case of anyone holding property and not developing or working it within a reasonable period, it should revert to the Government. I know of cases in St. George's where men have land tied up so tightly that they will not even give their sons enough to build on. The whole Crown Land's Act should be put through this House and remodelled. With regard to the operation of mills there are thousands of places where

such cannot be carried on but if the people in these places want to cut the timber let them do it and I will support it.

MR. WALSH.—I think, Mr. Chairman, the policy of establishing mills is very commendable but as I have already pointed out there are different areas where there is not water or sufficient timber for mills and while I am in favor of such places as Grand Falls I do not favor the export of the raw material. But such places are very few. At Black River a whole lot of capital was lost and there is now nothing there but the skeleton of the plant. Sufficient timber was not found near the mill to warrant going ahead as at first intended, and other places are the same. In Placentia and Fortune Bays there are areas with timber not sufficient for the operation of mills but the people there would be glad of the work of cutting it. The Government should remember that we are passing through a period that is unique, the handling of pit props is tied up owing to the mines in England and Wales being tied up and the demand is not such at present as it may be in the future. Now, I think the suggestion made by Mr. Higgins, Mr. Bennett and Sir John Crosbie to go slow in this matter is a very commendable one but in the meantime we should not allow the House to close until we have all the information—and I am sure sufficient can be gleaned for the purpose—to enable us to bring in a Bill that is hedged around with those safeguards that will prevent destruction but at the same time give sufficient employment to our people to keep them from want in times like the present. In the early days of the session Sir John Crosbie asked fire protection and was informed that \$40,000 extra had been spent the past year which sum was to combat fires that were sending up in flames thousands of dollars worth of our most valuable timber. It

is all very well for hon. members to say that what has been cut the past winter has been destroyed but the fact must not be lost sight of that the cutting of that timber prevented much want in various sections of the country. The mines of Great Britain require much of this kind of timber and we are able to supply it for an indefinite period if reforestation is carried out. I understand that the Grand Falls Mills have tried that but as Mr. Sullivan has said, these people have so much available material already that they do not care much whether they go into this extensively or not. Another point is that timber cut in Placentia Bay and vicinity is not easily available for the Mills because it is cheaper to ship a cord of pulp wood to the Old Country than it is to ship it to Grand Falls. In closing I would say that my only desire is that the people will get the best possible out of any policy that might be pursued and the Government would do well to consider this thoroughly. We have heard much of the Labrador areas but it must be remembered that people on the other side will not spend money on this isolated section while they can work the South West Coast which is open to navigation all the year around. I want to assure the Chair and the House that if a Bill drafted along the lines suggested is brought in it will have my hearty support provided it has such safeguards as I have previously mentioned.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election

Act, 1913" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill to Amend the Election Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, this is the Women's Franchise Act. As a result of a meeting between myself and a delegation of ladies interested in this matter I learned that they were of the unanimous opinion that the age limit for women voters should be placed at twenty-five. But for one dissenting voice, these ladies were also of the opinion that the Act should be confined to giving women the vote while one of the number was of the opinion that they should not be debarred from being eligible as candidates. She was, however, outvoted. The construction of this Act is very simple, merely providing that women over the age of twenty-five and of sound understanding should be qualified to vote as men do at present, and in no other way. They will not be qualified to stand as members of the House of Assembly nor will they be eligible to become members of the Legislative Council, so far as I am aware. In England the age limit is thirty while there are certain qualifications but in our Act there are no property qualifications and they must only be of sound understanding as in the case of men and twenty-five years old. As this Bill meets with entire approval and as woman franchise is a recognized principle of political science, I have much pleasure in moving that it be read a second time.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I do not quite agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that this Bill is a simple one; in my opinion it is a very important one.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is of the utmost importance. I

said that the Bill was simple in construction.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I am opposed to the principle of the measure in its entirety and I do not think that this House in its present form has any right to deal with a matter of so far-reaching importance, in short, I do not think that it is competent for us to amend the constitution of the country and if we do so to the extent of doubling the number of electors we are over-stepping our powers. I do not say that it is not legal for us to do it but I do say that it is not ethical that we should deal with a matter of this kind without submitting it to the people. There is no more reason why we should pass the measure this year than last when it was so artistically given a six months hoist. If there was danger in passing it last year it is doubly so now. When we go to the country next year it will be no time for experiments of this kind, there will be business of far graver importance to engage our attention. It will be hard enough, moreover, for the men of the country to give proper consideration to the questions that will have to be submitted to them instead of putting them to people who have no political experience whatever. This is not a matter of sentiment; it is not enough to say that women should have the vote; it is not sufficient that there should be but a negative good from a thing of this kind and unless any hon. member can rise to his feet here and say that the granting of the franchise to women has done good elsewhere, I will not be convinced that we should consider it. Now, why was this Bill introduced? Simply because we have petitions here from a number of women and the manner in which the signatures to many of these petitions were obtained is sufficient to warrant our accepting them with the greatest reluctance. Some of the women who signed them actually thought they

were signing something to reduce the high cost of living and before the Bill goes through I shall produce the names if necessary. Then take the number of signatures on these petitions; there is no indication that the majority of the women of the country want the franchise as there are only seven thousand signatures altogether and perhaps twenty-five per cent. of these are men. I can easily understand how men came to sign these petitions, many men would not care to refuse any request of a lady and others would simply take the line of least resistance. We have no mandate from the people to do this nor have we a request from either the women or the men to change the constitution.

Now, there was a petition presented to this House containing twenty thousand names asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. These were certified signatures but the very men who refused to touch the petition with a forty-foot pole come in now and say that we ought to pass this Bill which is the result of a petition containing seven thousand names, many of which were obtained by doubtful methods. Where is the consistency of this? I do not believe that the Prohibition Act should be amended on the strength of a petition but I do think that twenty thousand signatures are sufficient to have the matter put to a vote and the same thing should be done in the case of the Women Suffrage measure and let the men vote on it as well as the women. We are told that the women have the vote in England and that they have women as members of parliament. That is true, but I think this country can do very well without a Lady Astor. We are also told that they have the vote in Australia and Canada but that is no reason why they should have it here. I do not believe in the theory of following the

crowd. I was going to say that I had seen the suffragettes in England in their natural state, but I did see them there when they set fire to the letter boxes and caused other destruction of property as a means of gaining their ends and I had the pleasure of hearing Mrs. Pankhurst. I believe that the members of Parliament in England allowed the measure to go through because they were actually intimidated into doing so and as soon as they got the women in the House they saw the folly of ever having permitted it.

Another argument that is put forward in support of the contention that women should have their vote is that of their war record but I do not see how people can allow their minds to become so warped. A woman who would make an excellent Red Cross nurse might be hopeless as a politician. Now, I wish to say that I intend to oppose this Bill at every stage and especially when it comes into committee. It is not that I think women are not good enough for the vote, it is rather that I think the vote is not good enough for women. When we come to equal rights for women, I believe that the women themselves would be the very first to object to the principle when they realized what it really meant. Equal rights would mean that one would no longer need an introduction to a lady to address her because one does not need an introduction to a man if he gets on board a train and wishes to enter into conversation with him. He simply drops down beside him and starts talking and if the same thing applied to women all a man need do would be to sit down and start talking to the first pretty girl he saw, regardless of whether he knew her or not. The same way a man would no longer give a lady his seat in a tram if it happened to be filled because I am sure I would not give my seat in a car to any hon. member of this House,

nor should I raise my hat to him if I met him on the street but I do take off my hat to ladies of my acquaintance. The thing is hopeless and I know the women themselves would be long sorry to see it work out to that extreme.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Law Society Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I may say, that although it appears to be a long amendment, it is put in that shape in order to make it as clear and as explicit as possible. It is the sole purpose of the amendment to provide that any Law Student who has served in the Forces of the Crown during the War should have his period of service as a Law Student or Articled Clerk shortened in each case by a year. The Bill is in line with similar Bills introduced in other British Colonies by Law Societies. In brief the whole amendment amounts to this: Any Student at Law or Articled Clerk, who, during his period of service, left his Articles and went to the War as a soldier should have a year taken off his articles; further, any one who has served in the Army and who, since the war, has decided to study Law shall have a year taken off. By running through the Act it will be noticed that only section 50 and 53 of the Law Societies Act are the sections amended.

Sub-Section one of Section 50 remains the same, except for the addition of the following words: "Provided, however, that the Law Society in case of Students of the Law who have served with the Forces of the Crown, may at their discretion reduce such term of five years to any term not

less than three years." The addition of these three lines is made to the other sub-sections two and three of section 50, but there is no other change.

Sub-sections one, two and three of Section 53 are amended in the same fashion and adding the words "Providing, however, etc." The rest of the Act is exactly the same as it stands on our Statute to-day. I have, therefore, much pleasure in moving the Second Reading of this Bill.

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 War Measures Act, 1914."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Bill, as now in Committee, is somewhat different from the way it reads in Second Reading. After conferring with certain members of the Opposition, certain changes were made in the Bill to meet certain contingencies that may arise, so that this is the final draft of the Bill made by the Solicitor of the House and with the concurrence of the Opposition. My Hon. friend, Mr. Higgins, senior member for St. John's East, will be able to check the accuracy of my statements as I proceed. In 1914 an Act was passed and under three operative sections, Nos. 6, 10 and 11 vesting in the Governor-in-Council certain specific authority to be used in certain specific cases. In 1916 an Act was passed amending section 6 of the 1914 Act. Section 6 was struck out altogether and replaced by section 2 of the 1916 Act, and a more powerful section. This Bill has the effect of repealing sections 6, 10 and 11 of the 1914 Act and section 2 of the 1916 Act, and which repeal covers all the operative sections of the Act and takes out of

the hands of His Excellency the Governor-in-Council all the executive and active powers formally vested in them, under the Act. All the other sections of the Act remain the same, because they only deal with the carrying out of what has been done regularly and legally, prior to this date, by the Executive Government.

MR. HIGGINS.—Instead of cancelling the Act entirely, you cancel only the empowering sections. At the same time it strikes me that, under section 8, the power is still left in the hands of the Governor-in-Council.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We can meet the views of the Hon. Member by providing that the Department of Justice can have no power under that Act. As a matter of fact there is no power in existence under that Act.

MR. HIGGINS.—With regard to the idea of protecting the Colony at large or indemnifying anyone against some thing that has already been done, I cannot see how any person can suffer in law, even with this Act not in existence.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—But there would be no machinery by which a man's claim could be substantiated, if the entire Act was repealed. The Act itself never contemplated that any more than the operative sections should be wiped out. They did it by Proclamation in Canada.

MR. HIGGINS.—I cannot see why this whole thing should not be wiped out and let us get clear of this War Measures Act altogether.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—I think that it would be unwise to do so and I do not think it would do any good.

MR. HIGGINS.—Nor do I think it could do any harm.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—You may take away some rights that a man has.

MR. HIGGINS.—Under this War Measures Act a man gets no rights

at all. As a matter of fact there are no claims outstanding I don't think.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—There might be.

MR. HIGGINS.—Even if there was, a man's defence will hold good supposing this Act is repealed to-night. If something was done ten years ago under the Law at that time and certain steps are taken now by a man and a claim is made, surely his right is not taken away and surely his defence is good to-day, even with the elimination of this entire War Measures Act. Personally I oppose the Act in its present form. It is the one thing on which we have debated considerably in the early part of the session. I do not like to have skeletons or relics on the Statute Book that may mean nothing on the surface, but that may conceal something I think the Prime Minister should give this matter more serious thought and bring in a straight Bill repealing the whole War Measures Act.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—When this matter came up I went into it and found that in Canada they had exactly the same Act there. They carefully issued a Proclamation and wiped out all the empowering clauses, as contemplated when the Act was passed, but left in everything that was not empowering and they must have done it under advice and for some reason. The main thing that I had in view was that these particular clauses of our Act should have been cancelled by Proclamation, as intended when this Act was passed. In 1916 the Legislature passed an Act that the empowering clauses should have a further period of six months after the Proclamation, whereas the 1914 Act should have been cancelled upon the issuance of the Proclamation. Supposing if we wiped out this Act to-morrow and that the Governor-in-Council had done something at some previous time, under the authority of

the Act, and before this indemnification clause was taken out, what plea would you have to a claim?

MR. HIGGINS—The claim holds good even after the Act is repealed, as I have already pointed out. Anything we do from this moment will be perfectly legal and will neither impair or benefit any injury done previously under the War Measures Act. I do not think that we should be guided by what was done in Canada nor do I see any reason why we should; but I see no reason why this whole War Measures Act should not go out lock, stock and barrel. I think that the Hon. Minister of Justice is too good a lawyer to admit that it is sound and logical for us to do something because Canada did it. We are going to repeal the Fish Act, under the War Measures Act,—and surely no one will contend that there could not be numerous claims under that act according to the argument of the Minister—then why not repeal them all at the same time? Let us bury them outright in the name of God. The war is over and I think it is time for this War Measures Act to be over too.

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.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to question 14 of Order Paper, June 3rd. I have not yet received the answer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will look into that.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker With your permission I would like to ask the Prime Minister to give Mr. O'Reilly instructions with reference

to guarantee respecting my district. Up to this afternoon Mr. O'Reilly said he had no instructions whatever. I would like to know when the guarantee of money be forthcoming.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The morning after we had a discussion in the House arrangements were made regarding your district and another district. I will ask the Minister of Public Works to explain what happened. He got the communication from me.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—All the road money is spent and considerable relief was given thereby.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It appears that we have to take this case up as an entirely new proposition. In all the other districts the arrangement was that one-third of their road grants was to be put up as a guarantee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You got no returns from the other districts re road money, but in my district it is a different matter. We got returns for our road money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The programme was this, The district put up one-third of their per capita grant and the first loss in connection with the guarantee was to be borne out of the district grant.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—This is the first time I have heard of this arrangement

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That was the arrangement made with Placentia district four weeks ago. The total guarantee was \$75,000 and \$25,000 was the amount they had to put up against loss.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—But we are receiving returns from our road grants. The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Sir J. C. Crosble gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sullivan 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.

TUESDAY, June 7th.

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

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Rev. George Patten and others asking that a small sum of money be set aside as annual grant to pay for a ferry on Come by Chance Gut. At present the people are unable to get from one side to the other unless through the courtesy of some neighbour. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the Prime Minister's attention to question number 8 on the Order Paper of May 30.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. gentleman I might say that the Government did not at any time inaugurate any modification or correction in the Fish Regulations. An Advisory Board, appointed by the trade and the Government, had all to do with the carrying out of the Regulations and making any corrections that it thought necessary. Owing to various substitutions taking place some members going out of the country, the personal of the Board was constantly changing, and the opinion of the Board would of course change with the personnel, but every action taken by the Committee of Council was on the recommendation of the Board. No recommendations were made by the Governor-in-Council in the first instance, nor did the Governor-in-Council in-

augurate, modify, or remove any regulations.

MR. MOORE asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how much it was paid Messrs. Bowring Bros., Ltd., by the trip, the week, the month or the year for the wharfage of the Government steamers, how much was paid them for other services in the same way in connection with the use of Bowring premises for these boats.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN asked the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of customs revenue collected for the eleven months ending May 31st of the fiscal years 1918-19, 1919-20 and 1920-21 and of the total revenue for the eleven months in each of these years.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the attention of Hon. the Prime Minister to this statement in the circular issued by the President of the F. P. U. on April 22nd and published in the Evening Telegram, in which Mr. Coaker states that "the Government is working out a plan to help outfit schooners so as to get all possible away fishing," and to ask what was the nature of the said policy, and what practical steps were made to give it effect and why was nothing done in this important matter until nearly a month later the opposition party raised this matter in the House and only then did the Government take any steps to put this policy into force?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if it is correct that the Government has rejected the proposition of Mr. F. H. Hue for the purchase by him of the pit props cut for relief work last winter and is negotiating with Mr. E. Collishaw for the sale of the same and, if so, and the negotiations are in

writing to lay on the Table of the House copies of the letters and, if not, to table a statement of the basis on which the negotiations are proceeding.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works if it is correct that the Government has decided to leave a large section of the Tuberculosis Sanatorium vacant on the ground that there is scarcity of money to operate it, although there are scores of people applying for admission, and if so, cannot the Government economise in other directions rather than to persist in the inhuman policy of denying medical aid to suffering humanity; and also that I will ask him on to-morrow to lay on the Table a statement showing the total number of patients who can be accommodated in the Sanatorium and the total number at present there, the total cost per month of the institution, the cost per day of each patient and the increased cost per month which would follow from admitting the patients necessary to fill up all the beds?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table a statement showing the amount received per month since the beginning of the year as fees from patients admitted to the General Hospital under the terms of the notification published in the newspapers last December by the Board of Governors that every patient after January 1st would have to pay a fee of \$1.00 per day?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman of the Railway Commission if any of the coal from the mine at South Branch which is being operated by the Government, has been used in any of the coastal steamers on that section of the coast and if so to lay on the Table of the House copies of the reports of the engineers of the

steamers using the same with reference to its quality?

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has received any notification from the Reid Newfoundland Company of the intention of that Company to call for an arbitration in regard to the new situation created by the Government, through its Railway Commission, participating in the operation of the railroad system during the current fiscal year and if so what action has the Government taken or does it propose to take in regard to this claim for an arbitration if such has been put forward and if any correspondence has taken place between the Reid Newfoundland Company and the Government and, if so, to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the same.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the following information: If Robt. Rice, J.P., N.P., of Twillingate, is a British subject and if not why was he made a Justice of the Peace?

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Minister of Public Works (a) Is the motor ferry service between Branch and St. Joseph's to be operated this year? (b) Are tenders being asked for said service? (c) If tenders have been asked for and received, to lay on the Table of the House copies of all such tenders and all correspondence in connection with said services.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—As to question one. In reply to the hon. member I would like to say that according to the agreement between the Government and Bowring Bros., it has to pay three hundred dollars monthly for the rental of their premises, including their store on the South Side in which is stored coal, etc. That is the only agreement existing between the Government and the party in question.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—What does that cover?

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—That covers the cost of sending any ship whatever by the Government to the premises in question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to question two. I will take this up with the Assistant Collector and will probably have the reply soon.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to question three. As to the matter to which reference is made, out of the five hundred dollars appropriated for Public Works came the money for this matter which was supplemented by the general arrangement subsequently reached. As to the circular dated the 22nd of April 1921, it has reference to the idea of the appropriation of a sum to enable the fishermen to get supplies.

As to question four. Mr. Hue's proposition has not been rejected nor has it been withdrawn. There has been no negotiations with Mr. Collishaw as to the matter to which reference is made. It was pointed out he would not pay more than three dollars per cord and he was asked to get in touch with his principals. The difficulty is largely due to the fact that the cords are required to be cut into four feet lengths. An effort has been made to get a figure from various contractors.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—As to question five. The reply is being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It is important that we should get an answer promptly to this question. There are at the present time one or two patients at the General Hospital who should be inmates of the Tuberculosis Sanatorium. I understand from the Superintendent there is more room for other inmates. I think that very singular. You built that institution for the accommodation of suffering humanity. I hope it is not held up for the want of funds. I would like to get an an-

swer very soon. It is time to have the Tuberculosis hospital put into shape. I would like to hear from the Minister in charge as to the intentions of the Government in the matter. Dr. Keegan cannot look after these patients. They ought to be under the supervision of Dr. Rendell. There is room for forty beds in there according to him and there are hundreds of applications.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The hon. gentleman knows this is no part of the question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I want the Minister to understand that these patients came in from my district, and I was instrumental in getting them in.

MR. MOORE.—I was down at the Hospital, as I was brought there by one of the patients, and it was pitiful to hear one of them, a woman, crying that nothing could be done there for her. I rang up Dr. Rendell and he said the old ward was filled up but there was further room for forty beds and it was up to the Government to take action.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—As to question six. In reply to the hon. member to section 16, of the General Hospital Act, Vol. 1, Con. Stats. This applies to the whole question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It cannot apply to the whole question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Although there is no reason why I should answer this question yet I will read on behalf of the Minister, section 16 of the Act. It provides as follows, (Reads). I might say there are no fees in existence.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to draw your attention to the question on the order paper. Here it is (reads). The Minister cannot offer me that as an explanation. He used to be a very straight man but he is learning to be like the rest of them and twist it whenever he can.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I

again refer the hon. gentleman to that section. The question has nothing to do with the Department of Public Works.

MR. HIGGINS.—Why did you not say so before? You ought not to have monkeyed with law. You did not know till now what that section provided.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Yes I did and I must take the credit for that. I read this Act over several times. The point I wanted to make was that the entire business of the imposition of fees, etc., and the collection of the same did not apply to the Department of Public Works. The Finance Department handles all this.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As I am pro tem the Minister of Finance and Customs I will reply that no fees have been collected to date. The notice was published by the Board of Governors but still no change has taken place.

Question 7. I have asked the Secretary of the Railway Commission, Mr. Hall, to prepare that information.

Question 8. No communication has been received from the Reid Newfoundland Company in this connection.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—As to question 9. I do not know whether Robert Rice is a British subject or not. If it is found he is not, his Commission will be cancelled. The appointment was made upon the recommendation of Mr. Jennings, the senior member for the district. He was born in Twillingate and is the son of a former magistrate of Greenspond and consequently is a native of Newfoundland as far as I know.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You will find that he is a naturalized American citizen.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Question 10. I beg to table the reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On yesterday when we were in Com-

mittee of the Whole on the War Measures Act, 1914, Mr. Higgins discussed the matter with the Attorney General and I suggest that we go into Committee of the Whole on this bill and have a select committee appointed. I move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on this Bill and have it referred to a select committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The committee cannot refer it to a select committee.

MR. HIGGINS.—Amend the motion.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914." It was moved in amendment that the said Act be referred to a Select Committee, which amendment was adopted, and it was so ordered.

Mr. Speaker appointed Hon. the Minister of Justice and Mr. Higgins to be the Select Committee.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Society's Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited," was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—On the last day when we were in Committee of the Whole on the Estimates, I gave a summary of the various departments. Each departmental head will handle his own work as we approach the estimates and in the absence of the Minister of Finance and Customs it is necessary for me to give the information as an amateur with reference to this department. On the first page special Statute provides for the vote. On page two we come to the detailed work of the department and the changes are found on page four. Page four provides that there shall be a salary for one inspector of railroads instead of two as heretofore and consequently the sum of twenty-two hundred and eighty dollars is reduced by one-half. Mr. Liddy resigned. Page is the interest on the Public Debt.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Before the passing of these votes, I would like to go back to the loan which we passed a few days ago at the request of the Government but rather hurriedly, and point out that this loan cost this Colony an enormous sum of money. I quoted the other day from an adver-

tisement in a New York Paper. (Reads). This is a matter of record. I would like to first remind the House that previous to the putting of this Loan on the market no tenders were called for which is a very unusual procedure and one which has cost this Colony a quarter of a million dollars. That Loan should have been put on the market as the two loans in 1919, which procedure called for tenders for the required amount in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland. The tenders were received from several financial firms in the United States and Canada. The tenders were opened here in St. John's on a certain day as set out in the advertisement in the presence of the agents of the several firms which tendered for the loan, and in the presence of the Finance Minister and his Solicitor, and the lowest tender was taken, and that loan cost this country \$135,000 or thereabouts. The loan was closely figured on by the financial firms and the competition was keen, the firm securing the raising of the loan being Wood, Gundy and Company of Canada. I understood from its representative who visited here some time ago that the firm lost a considerable sum in the matter of that Loan. That was no business of the Government of that day. And I want to point out to this House and the country at large that we asked for information from the Acting Minister of Finance and Customs first for the financial statement furnished for this new Loan, and secondly if there were any tenders for the Loan, if I may so call it, and the answer we received was that no financial statement was handed out to any company or firm in Canada and the United States. On asking the Prime Minister why he did not ask for tenders re this loan, he said the reason was that if they did so, they thought the opposition agents would make it so hot for the Government that it was

doubtful according to his statement if they would get a loan to meet the country's financial obligations. That excuse is not good enough for this House or this country. The country has to pay the piper. The loan outlined by the Prime Minister in the absence of the Finance Minister was closed on the figure announced to this House, namely at 98 $\frac{3}{4}$ %. We were getting 98 $\frac{3}{8}$ % for every hundred cents on the basis of the terms of the loan which was according to the rate of exchange on the day when the loan was passed over to this country whether the rate was ten, fifteen or twenty. But I want to tell the House that we have lost, in my opinion, a quarter of a million dollars, in as much as previous to the taking up of it in New York we were receiving from 104 to 108 for our 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ % bonds payable in New York. Now we find here in this advertisement that this firm of underwriters have been undertaking this at 88 as announced by the Prime Minister or in other words in New York funds, we have received 88 for this loan at 12% here in Newfoundland, giving us 98 $\frac{3}{4}$ %. Well now here is the position, the underwriters of this loan first asked 88 in New York making a difference between 88 and 100; then the underwriters published this advertisement to the public of the United States and said we have \$6,000,000 on hand to sell Newfoundland fifteen years bonds at 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ % making 5% on the transaction. Now I ask any member on the other side to take his pencil and figure on \$6,000,000 at 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ % and he will find that the underwriters first put aside for themselves \$330,000. Now you say they are selling them at 93 $\frac{1}{4}$ %, a good investment 15 years from now payable in gold. In the meantime there is 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ % interest payable in New York funds. They will make six and three-eighths profit. First figure 5 3-8 for themselves, then they induce others to purchase the bonds

after making \$330,000 and then their customers here are floating these fifteen year six and one-half bonds payable in New York funds. The customer purchases these bonds and the sum total of the amount made by the broker and by the customer on this transaction is the difference between 88 and 100 in New York funds, or 12% on \$6,000,000, equals \$720,000. First we have to subtract from this loan that sum and then yearly pay 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ %. We are getting there 98 $\frac{3}{8}$ %. Before we put this on the market we were getting here for our Newfoundland 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ % bonds, 108 in United States and Canada, and I claim, if that loan of \$6,000,000 was raised in the proper way as Lord Morris did and likewise the two loans I raised in Canada, this Colony would be a quarter of a million dollars better off. Take the firm of Wood, Gundy & Company who underwrote this loan of 1919. This firm was looking round, hungry for business but it never heard a word of this new loan till it was signed, sealed and delivered in New York, and the Yankees put it all over us.

The only excuse that is given is that if the Government had put this loan on the market and made the fact known to the world that we were looking for it, the terrible men of the Opposition would have painted such pictures of depression and of the country's position financially that nobody would touch it. That might sound very well but it is not business; that is not the way to raise a loan, it is not the way we raised loans when I was in the Finance Department. We advertised in the Canadian and American papers for the last loan we raised and we received tenders from the various financial concerns, The agents of these concerns met in the Finance Office where in the presence of them and the Minister of Finance the tenders were opened and the lowest one accepted, and even

though I do say it myself, that was the cheapest and best loan ever floated in Newfoundland. In this case even that \$720,000 does not cover the loan and I take it upon myself to ask the Government if that is good enough. To get one man down here from the United States and whisper in his ear that we want a loan and to give away as was done here \$720,000, it is not decent and the Prime Minister is not doing justice to himself. He is laying himself open to suspicion and to criticism and then he tells this House that he got this money for 98 but with the exchange at 12 we lose \$720,000 and then we are told that only for the Opposition the Government would have done this thing in a business like manner. However, it is only in keeping with the other things they have done. Just imagine the Prime Minister trying to stuff it down our throats that he did not furnish the agent with a financial statement. True he did not furnish him with a statement of the country's present financial standing and the reason for this was that he started to float this loan in January while he was in New York. He handed out to the different firms then the statement that we handed him when we handed over the Government, a statement for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1920, but they never saw the financial statement for the period from 1920 to date; the Prime Minister was wary enough for that and I will give him credit for it. He was trying to cover up his tracks but he cannot cover them up where I am. He was ten months in office and he hands out a statement that he received from us when he took over the Government and it was on that statement that the loan was raised and not on the statement covering the period from 1920 up to the present. The story of that would be if he told it, "We came into power in November 1919 and with the Govern-

ment we had handed over to us a surplus of four or to be exact three and three quarter millions. Now that is gone along with the current revenue and we have not enough to pay the interest on our debt and we have to dig down into the surplus put away during the past three or four years charged to surplus trust." We are out on this loan no matter how you look at it and if that is not the easiest thing the Yankee have struck for some time, I don't know what it is. You went up and asked them for a loan of \$6,000,000 and they gave you \$5,280,000 instead of \$6,000,000 in American money and you will have to pay that back in 15 years along with the \$720,000 at the present rate of exchange. The Prime Minister said that the exchange would balance but that is not so and I shall deal more fully with that when we come to the Budget. Here we are mulcted by the Yankees for \$720,000. This loan should never have been needed if the Prime Minister had kept to his promise to reduce taxation. Did he not say repeatedly in his election campaign that the Morris and the Cashin Governments had overtaxed the people by over \$9,000,000 but what did he do about it? I'll tell you what he did. We handed over the Government to him and he came in and increased the estimates from eleven to twelve millions and spent the three and three quarter millions that we had put away for a rainy day. He increased the salaries of his men in this House from \$200 to \$1,000 and increased the salaries of the departmental heads from \$2,200 to \$4,000 and they voted these increases themselves.

We are wrong in this loan because the Prime Minister did not try to carry out his promises to the people. If he had reduced his estimates from nine million to seven million he could have reduced taxation by two million

dollars and still have four million dollars to his credit, but instead of doing that he went along and spent as he went like a drunken sailor. Then he went away for five months and left the Revenue was \$300,000 and the a blank cheque. Up to the 30th June \$4,000,000 surplus was gone.

I made a reference here to a matter, a sorrowful one if you will. We left certain works unfinished when we went out of power and I went to the Sanatorium to see what had been done I found that there was room there for forty patients but although there were over a hundred applicants trying to get in there they could not get admission because the government has to economize. They need economy and the way they practice it is to economize on God's afflicted. How long are the people going to stand for that? A short 18 months ago you came in here with clean hands and we handed you over the reins of power with the sins of ten years, but nevertheless with a surplus of four million dollars. You betrayed the trust placed in you by the people when you failed to reduce taxation and now you find yourself in a sorry plight indeed. In 1894 the revenue of the country was \$1,790,000 while the expenditure was \$1,750,000. To-day the interest on our public debt is two and a half million dollars. The reason for part of this is that we tackled on fourteen or fifteen million dollars during the war and we may get some of this back, but look at the position to-day as compared with the year of the Bank Crash. The latter was the worst in the country's history until now. To-day our Estimates are \$11,000,000, but if we want to meet our obligations that estimate must be cut down five or six million dollars. You have tacked on six millions to the country's debt in one short year and spent four millions besides, and now I ask what have you to show for it? You spent three millions on the railway and now you tell the House and the

country that the government is thru' with it and you are going to close the House without telling the people where the country stands with regard to it. You do not know what the Reids intend doing nor do they know themselves, at least if they do they have not seen fit to tell you their plans. If you are prepared to go on spending money like this on the railway, on fish, salt, pit-props and other things, where will the country be at the end of 1922? I am not saying this for talk sake, and I ask those in sound of my voice to take home with them what I say and ponder it well. If the Reids do not run the railway someone else must do it and you will have to make provision for it. Last year we voted a million dollars for railway purposes and after the House closed the Premier went away, and the Minister of Justice, the only other responsible member of the Executive went with him and no sooner was his back turned than the hon. Mr. Coaker took it upon himself to appoint a commission to run the railway which you had denounced. They were away for five months and they made no protest against what he had done and after the Premier came back it still went on. It is hard for the average man to understand how a person could so vigorously denounce a policy and then allow a brother minister to do the very opposite to what had been outlined. Now, here's what happened. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice come in here with a mandate from the people and immediately the House closes they go away and leave everything in the hands of a man who is not responsible to the people, but who is merely responsible to company only and he, without calling this House together, appoint a commission to take over the railway. The first we know of it, and I believe the first that fifty per cent. of the members on the other knew about it, was when the announcement was made in

his newspaper and it was advertised that the railway was being operated by this commission. This man takes two and a half million dollars and uses it in his experiment. We have been able to get at that much but we have not been able to get at the rest, and now he has taken to the woods. I am not speaking disparagingly of him. He is a hard worker and all that sort of thing; but as far as the finances of this colony and the keeping of this Colony on a straight and sound basis are concerned he is a political fool. There is not a man on the other side of the House who is prepared, after I take my seat, to get up and contradict any statements I have made. Not even the Minister of Public Works will get up and try to justify what was done by that man, in the absence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice and since. Still these people on the other side of the House, with one or two exceptions, will come here and act like dummies while these Estimates are being voted, and Newfoundland has got to put up with this sort of treatment, despite the promises made by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto. The Prime Minister forgot his promises and abandoned his ship and left her and her people to one man who is not here to-night and who has not been here for the past ten days. That one man took charge of the government of the country, the financial standing of the country and the mercantile interests of the country and he destroyed the whole lot of it. There are men within hearing of my voice now, strangers who have appeared in this House for the first time, who have been destroyed by him and who are this evening looking for a little balm to put in their wounds. Take the fisheries of the Colony. Is it not deplorable to think that to-night there are three or four hundred thousand quintals of fish in Newfoundland and you cannot sell a cod's tail of it? Then when you come to think calm,

and coolly, this fish, all of it, would have been eaten months ago, but for the conduct and the rule of one man. Within the past eighteen months this Government have dropped at least a half million dollars per month, or ten millions in round figures. Can any man in this House get up and justify the expenditure of that huge sum of money or can they show anything for it? There has not been a mile of railroad built, not an industry of any kind has been opened up. There is nothing to show for the expenditure of that ten millions, in addition to the loss of revenue, except that they can point to some improvements made to the railway, and even that is questionable. Take the many other scandals attached to these Estimates. The steamers that you purchased are now in the harbour of St. John's eating their heads off. They are not an asset to-day; they are a liability. What else have you got? Can any member of the government point to anything else to show for that ten millions of dollars. Now the three millions of a surplus is gone to make up the deficit in the revenue and the other six millions is gone to pay for the mistakes you have made since you came into power. Still the Prime Minister gets up in this House and congratulates the country and its people on having this six million dollar Loan raised for the benefit of this colony, but he did not tell that he loses another \$350,000 on that transaction. The fact is that he was delighted to get any amount of money and he was prepared to pay any price to get it. He was not prepared to put the Loan up to auction, which he should have done. On the 30th of this month the railway question will be before this House for discussion, if the House is sitting. Now I would like to ask is it the intention of the government to close the House—like you did last year—with that very important matter coming to an issue on the 30th of June? On the 30th of June you

will find that you will not be able to run the railway any longer. You will then hand it over to the Reid Newfoundland Company, who have already intimated that they cannot run it owing to lack of finance. Now you cannot fence off the railway; it's a public utility and you have to operate it, if the Reid Company do not take it over. Are you going to let the Governor-in-Council take two or three millions of dollars, as they did last year, to spend on this railroad? Surely you are not going to act in this fashion. If that is your object, why open this House of Assembly at all? The Prime Minister has told us that the Reid Company will take over the railroad again after the 30th of June; he has also told us that the Reid Company have not placed any programme before the Government nor has the government anything to show that the Reid Company will operate the railway. Then is it not your duty, as Prime Minister to keep this House open and have this important matter discussed fully and have some definite programme arrived at? Personally I do not care whether you keep it open or not. I am only appealing on behalf of the people of the country. I would have liked to see the House closed a month ago. But the position is what are you going to do about it? Are you going to advance another two or three millions? If you are, where are you going to get it? Perhaps, what the Prime Minister has got in the back of his head is that when he goes across to the Convention shortly he will have a little chat with the Prime Minister of Ottawa and ask him to take us over. Surely the Prime Minister must have some programme to submit to the House before the Budget passes and before we are finished dealing with the Estimates. Now it's the duty of the Government to tell this House and this country, with as little delay as possible, what they intend doing. You may go on committing sins day after day, so to speak, but your sins will find you out. Last year you spent money right and left, but this year you have not got the money to spend. You are badly in want of money as a Government and you have one of our hospitals closed down owing to lack of funds. Now very soon we will have the railway closed for want of money, apparently. But in the interest of the people of Grand Falls and the West Coast and the people living in the bottom of the different bays around the Island the action now, because conditions are different entirely to what they used to be. The days of five hundred and a thousand schooners coming here at any one season of the year are gone. All traffic is done now mainly by railway. Surely goodness before the Estimates and the Budget go any further the Prime Minister will rise in his place and tell us and the country his programme in that direction. It is not going to be good enough for the Prime Minister to abuse the Reid Newfoundland Company before the closing of the House and let the matter end there as far as we are concerned. You have to tell us where you are going to get the money to carry on the railroad. Last year you had the money and gambled it and it's all gone. Any common sense business man is looking forward to the 30th of June to see what is going to happen the railroad. I am of the opinion that one of the most troublesome things on the hands of the government to-day is the railroad. I want to know how you are going to handle the situation? If it is for the benefit of this country I am prepared to handle it with you. But surely you are not going to close this House, and by Minute of Council take over the railway and we will hear nothing at all about what happened for another twelve months.

Now I think I have explained the Loan pretty clearly and I think I have convinced quite a number of

people in this House and outside this House that this Loan is not as lovely a thing, as was outlined a few nights ago by the Prime Minister. The Loan that was raised by the Prime Minister has cost this Colony \$720,000. Your interest bill is fully two and a half millions and here we are with this six millions tacked on to the public debt of this colony, after making a few United States men a present of practically \$350,000. The only reason given by the Prime Minister for this bungling is that he was afraid to tell the Opposition that he was going to raise a Loan. Why did you not do your business above board, whether we liked it or not, and then even if you did make a mistake the country would respect you after. You have acted the coward and the country has got to pay for your cowardice through the nose. Personally, I object strongly to voting for that interest, but it is now an obligation on Newfoundland and as a member of the House and a representative of the people I have to vote for that interest. But, as I have already stated, that interest and public debt that we are faced with should never be there; and there should be part, at least, of the four million dollar surplus that we left you in the Treasury to-day, if not for your misrule and maladministration. In summing up this whole thing to-night you have not only spent that four millions of dollars and not alone spent the six million dollars that you have just borrowed, but you are asking us here to-night to vote these amounts.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House listened with a great deal of interest and a great deal of pleasure to the very excellent address made by the Leader of the Opposition on our financial situation and what the future outlook is for the country. There is no man in this House—and I doubt if there is a man in Newfoundland—better qualified to express an opinion on the financial

status of Newfoundland than the ex-Minister of Finance, Sir Michael Cashin, and any words falling from him in this connection cannot be regarded lightly or cannot be taken merely as the political ravings of some irresponsible politician, but, as he said himself, rather should it be taken as coming from a Newfoundlander who is desirous of playing his part in the interest of and for the betterment of his native country. People who have endeavoured to think seriously in this country cannot help from being struck by the general apathy of the people with regard to our present situation and our future outlook. It is almost impossible to-day to create any interest in this community into our public affairs, because we are absolutely drifting to a precipice of financial annihilation. Hon. members of this House seem to lull themselves into a feeling or a position of false security and are evidently unaware of the rude awakening that may come to them in a few short months. One is astounded on taking up the Budget Speech and looking at the comparative statement therein contained and to see where we are likely to land and to see the position we must naturally arrive at, according to our present and past experiences. As I pointed out before to this House, the running of a country is like the running of any business. If the business is run by competent men, who will have due regard to economy and efficiency, it will succeed. Economy and efficiency are the predominating factors in the running of any business. Similarly are they the two great essentials in the conduct of a country. The good business man will make up at the beginning of the year an estimate of the amount of business he expects to do during the course of that year; he will make an estimate of the amount of help he requires and the general outfit he considers necessary to conduct that business, and he will pretty well tell, if

he is a shrewd business man, how he is going to come out at the end of the year, under ordinary conditions; but I would like to point out before we are through with the Budget by what means of reasoning does the Prime Minister arrive at the figures he submitted in his Budget Speech. He must realize that here in Newfoundland, practically since 1914, we have been on the crest of a wave of prosperity, with overflowing revenues, with increased earning powers, with the price of fish, the main commodity of this country, increased in value by about two hundred per cent. and it is absolutely superfluous and superficial for us to think that we are in a haven of continuous prosperity when, as a matter of fact, we are merely blown up as if by an explosion, and that we got to come back very rapidly and very quickly to mother earth and shake our selves to realise that we are just where we started. That is the position with regard to our revenue. Before the war the revenue for the year 1913-14, according to the Budget or the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, was \$3,618,328; in 1919-20 it was \$10,597,000 or an increase of about seven million dollars in six years. The revenue from 1910 and 1911 up to 1914 was practically the same each year and did not fluctuate outside of about a hundred thousand dollars at the most. The revenue for the year 1914-15 did not increase beyond about four hundred thousand dollars, but from that year to the year 1918-19 it increased over six millions. In the year 1919-20, as already pointed out, the revenue of Newfoundland exceeded what it was in 1914-15 by over seven millions of dollars. These are the figures of the Prime Minister himself. The reason for these fluctuations has been the inflation in the prices for our products, such as fish, oil, herring, lobsters and other commodities. We were a food producing country, in a sense, and

naturally got inflated prices for our products and the earning powers of the people increased proportionately; and when the earning powers of the people cannot continue to buy as much dutiable goods, owing, as has been pointed out in this House on one or two occasions by the Prime Minister, to the high Ad Valorem duty; the revenue becomes inflated considerably. Now I submit that if the revenue of Newfoundland collectable for the years 1913-14, 1914-15 or 1915-16 was \$4,600,000 at the most for any one of these years, what assurance can the Prime Minister give me to-night that the revenue for 1921-22 and for 1922-23 will not go back to what it was in pre-war days? Is there any more people in Newfoundland to-day? I question whether there is as many people in Newfoundland to-day as there was in 1914. You must remember that in the year 1914 we lost over 300 men in one or two sealing disasters; and in the war we lost from 1200 to 1400 of our young men, besides the emigration that has taken place. The question of Newfoundland's population for the year 1921 compared with what it was in 1914 will be decided this year when the Census are taken. The ordinary increase in populations is generally estimated at ten per cent. every accounting paid viz ten years.

Now, as I said before, some honorable members of this House seem to be lulled into a state of false security by the figures of the Prime Minister's Budget Speech, done simply to make the Budget look acceptable; but when we come to an analysis and a diagnosis of the matter there is no answer to the statement that I have already made, and I defy any member on the other side of the House to-night to tell me by what means we can get a bigger revenue this year than we got in the year 1914-15. If that is so how is the Prime Minister expecting to collect eight millions or twice as much as we got in 1914-15. After all,

the question is are our people going to earn more this year than they did in 1914-15? Are the people going to get better prices for their products and is there any hope of their getting this year more for their fish than they got in 1914-15. That is the economic condition of Newfoundland. The people can only earn a limited amount in a country where our resources are so limited and which are so much affected by the conditions of foreign markets. This country is dependent to-day mainly for the marketing of its product on the bankrupt countries of Europe. We are dependent, not on big, prosperous, wealthy countries, but on people who can scarcely afford to buy anything sufficient to keep body and soul together. You may sell a little fish—and very little at that—to the United States and get your gold for it, but in order to sell the major portion of our staple product you got to go to those countries where the people are struggling from the effects of the great crisis through which they have passed and which affected them more than it affected us. They cannot pay the prices any way commensurate with the cost of the production of fish, as experienced in this country. The cost of catching fish must be made up on the outfit and expenses generally, and the cost of living must be considered; and it is conceded to-day that you cannot catch fish and cure it and sell it at five or six dollars a quintal at a profit. Is there any hope for a bigger price than that this year? I have not heard a solitary man say there was. I met a certain business man the other day and who, on being approached about the price of fish next Fall, replied that he could not tell and was not prepared to express an opinion as to what the price was going to be; certainly he was not prepared to say that it was going to be more than five or six dollars. Nobody here knows whether it will be three or four dollars or not. One

time in this country the price was down to two dollars a quintal. And here we are going along lulled in a state of false security, and if the government of this country had their own way to-night they would suspend the rules of this House and put legislation through and close this House, without giving the question one moment's consideration as to what is going to happen between now and the time the House is called together next year. Anybody who cannot see a crisis coming must be asleep. There is a crisis coming in November and December next that will stagger this country as it was never staggered before. Now I do not want to be written down as a profit of evil, but I say this if this country can get through this winter, without asking for some outside assistance, I will be very much surprised. We had the spectacle last year of an emergency arising, because of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries considered it essential in the interest of the Fishermen to take certain sums of money from the Treasury and pay them so much per quintal for the fish they had to dispose of I have no doubt that he was actuated by the best of motives, but his action was wrong, and vicious, and unconstitutional, and if the same position arose again, I feel sure that he would act differently, because he knows now that he was wrong, that he had no right to take that money for such a purpose without the consent of this Legislature. This Legislature is the only source from which any man can get authority of that nature. You are only the Stewards of the public trust, the Custodians of the public welfare, and no man has any right to use this power, to get money to save himself or others without first coming here and getting the sanction of this Legislature. This Legislature is the only safeguard for the constitution of Newfoundland. Some of the Ministers of the Crown have the flippant idea

that as soon as the lock is turned in the door of this Assembly, that they must hide away to places where they have no business whatever, and where they can do no possible good. It appears to me that safeguarding the interests of the public of Newfoundland is only a secondary consideration to them, in comparison with their own personal pleasures and comforts. This House is unaware of the intention as regards the Railroad policy for the coming year. I stated here the other day that this House shall not prorogue until that is known, and I repeat that statement now. It may adjourn for a month or two months, but it shall be in session for the year so that we can be called together within twenty-four hours to meet any emergency that may arise, and I will be very much surprised if we are not called together before the 31st of December. Speaking about the Revenue, the revenue for 1914 was three million, six hundred thousand dollars. Why to-day the interest on the public debt is two and a half million dollars. Honorable members will realise from a business standpoint what is going to be the result. Financial ruin and disaster. It is all very well to talk of raising loans. The Prime Minister has told us that he raised a loan of six million dollars for which we got only five million dollars. The other million is eaten up in exchange and commissions and rake offs. Seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars was the amount estimated by Sir Michael Cash in this afternoon. We have to pay four hundred thousand dollars more interest this year and where are we going to get it. We are not getting enough now to pay one half of our expenses.

There is another thing which is confronting this House, and that is that it is not right for one man to represent five Ministerial offices. The hon. the Prime Minister is acting as Prime Minister, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of

Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries was wont to expatiate from this side of the House upon the fact that the Min. of Agriculture and Mines, and the Min. of Justice were not present in this House as members. They were in the Upper House and for the whole session he kept harping upon that and very often drove Lord Morris with his back to the wall in defence of that position. Mr. Coaker was right and the present Prime Minister was one of the men we were then defending. Mr. Morrison and Mr. Blandford were defeated in Bonavista Bay, and Mr. Blandford was Min. of Agriculture and Mines and given a seat in the Upper House. Mr. Squires was defeated in Trinity Bay and he was given a seat in the Upper House as Min. of Justice, and Mr. Coaker and his followers took exception to the fact that these two gentlemen were not members of this House. How does Mr. Coaker condone the present situation? If it was wrong then it is wrong now. Here we are discussing the Budget at a most critical time in this country, and although I regret the circumstances I say that it is deplorable that there is not a responsible Minister in the Chair of the Min. of Finance and Customs to take hold of this matter and give us the benefit of his knowledge and essential information. Mr. Brownrigg, owing to a serious illness, is unable to attend to his duties, but someone else should have been appointed. It is not good enough for the Prime Minister to represent all the Ministerial offices. There are only two ministers outside of him, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Works, that are of any account. The Shipping Department is only a transitory one, and the Department of Posts and Telegraphs is not so important, but I say that the Minister of Agriculture & Mines and the Minister of Marine & Fisheries should be here debating supply, and the Budget, and the many things

appertaining to their different Departments. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries is deliberately keeping away from this House, and he has not given any explanation. It will be very hard to steer the Colony through the financial shoals which beset her and will beset her until the next session of this Legislature, and unfortunately it seems that we will have nobody to steer her during the next four or five months, because if we are correctly informed the Prime Minister intends immediately after the closing of this House, or before it closes to hie away to the Old Country, for what purpose God only knows. I don't, because I think that his place is here. The shepherd doesn't desert his sheep when the wolves are around, and the Leader of the Government should not desert the country at this time, and it will be a great aspersion upon the Government if the Prime Minister goes away and leaves these important offices without someone to attend to public administration. It is true the Minister of Justice will be home but I take it that he will hardly be flattered if he is called upon to devote his entire summer going from one office to another to see that things are in order. I don't think he will do that, and I don't think he should be expected to do it. The Prime Minister's attendance in London is not necessary. It might bring additional honours to him, but it will be of no advantage to Newfoundland. If we are to judge from the experience of other Prime Ministers going over there. I have yet to hear of any Prime Minister who went over there bringing back one word that would be of any advantage to Newfoundland, and I have eighteen years' experience in this House to judge from. These are International affairs that are being dealt with over there, and the only thing we have to consider is our share of the War Indemnity, and that can be ad-

justed without the Prime Minister's presence there. However on his shoulders be the responsibility. He will if he goes there avoid a lot of extra work and worry because the unemployed people of this town will want to interview him often during the summer. He wants to get a little relaxation from the troublesome experience he has had in the past three or four months, but he would not have been subjected to these experiences if he had acted differently, and I am sorry that he is not here now that I might tell him my opinion of his management of affairs of the unemployed in this town. I hold in my hand here an editorial published in the Star yesterday. I will refer to it a little later on when the Prime Minister comes back.

I want to endorse the statement made by Sir Michael Cashin regarding the railroad, and its operation. This is a most important matter and we were told here the other day that no decision has been arrived at in this connection. The Government have not given it any consideration. Reid Nfld. Co., have not given any idea of what they intend to do. The Prime Minister is probably going away a week from to-day, and are we going to have a repetition of last year. Is this Legislature going to be ignored and unconstitutional methods adopted with regard to this Railroad. It is too serious and far-reaching a matter to be lightly passed over, and we must insist that this House does not close until such time as the government is in a position to let us know what the policy is regarding the Railroad. It cost us last year two and a half million dollars and if it costs that this year where are the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs going to get the money to pay for it. It will need more extraordinary methods of finance than we have ever heard of. Surely we will not raise another loan

to pay for what we will lose on the Railroad next year. Surely the Minister of Finance and Customs will not waste any more money on this project without knowing where we are going to get off. Or is there some big scheme behind this, something which does not appear on the surface? Do the gentlemen opposite realise that the people of this country are getting very suspicious as to what you intend to do? Do you realise that the people are beginning to think that you are going to sell us body and soul? Do you realise that they think that the visit of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of Newfoundland to the Old Country, at the same time may lead to an understanding to force the people of this country into Confederation, but this much will have to be understood, that such a thing must not take place without the consent of the people of the country. Every man in the country must have a vote on that subject. Canada would not dare to take Newfoundland in unless Newfoundland were satisfied to go. She doesn't want another dissatisfied country like Ireland on her hands. She will not bring in dissatisfied people, therefore the plan may be alright but something has to be said before it is finalized. Talk about the lack of employment and the necessity for conserving the resources of the country. The other day I tried to point out the folly with regard to the Salmon Rivers whereby fifteen thousand dollars is saved. It is false economy. Never before this year was there such a demonstration of the work of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board in the protection of the Salmon Rivers. The Rivers are swarming with salmon, never before has such a quantity been known. People are making their summer's wages catching salmon, and it is fortunate that we have a market right here at our door, in the Cold Storage Plant giving good prices, and everything possible should be done to en-

courage this industry, and we are doing our best to destroy it by dispensing with the Wardens. Nets will be placed in the rivers which will prevent the salmon from going to the breeding grounds, but if the Wardens are kept on this will be prevented, and hundreds of fish that would otherwise be destroyed will come back to the people to catch them next year. It is deplorable to say that we can find money for all kinds of madcap schemes and experiments. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines went away last year at an expense of fifty to one hundred thousand dollars for Pigs and Sheep and Cattle when this is not an Agricultural country at all. Farmers can import their own stock and better stock than he has brought in here, and there was no necessity for any large expenditure for stock, as the stock that is here is most suitable to the country, and cannot be improved upon. There are farmers here who can give him tips as to stock. Still we are spending thousands of dollars on this madcap scheme, as mad as one can imagine under present circumstances. Any policy that can endorse that and leave the fisheries of the country unprotected is criminal. This stock farm is costing from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars a year and we are told that the Tuberculosis Hospital next door must be closed up, as the Government cannot afford to provide beds for these suffering people who are dying for the want of proper treatment. I said at the start that the government was in a state of apathy, that they are not awake to the true state of affairs in this country.

At 6.30 Mr. Chairman left the Chair 'till 8 o'clock.

MR. BENNETT—When the House arose for recess, I was about to conclude my remarks with reference to the different matters which arose during the consideration of the estimates and I was at that time referring to the article which appeared in yester-

day's edition of the Daily Star. Criticisms of certain representations made by me a day or two ago when I submitted a memoranda from the Colonial Cordage Company in relation to the position of that company under the new tariff introduced by the Prime Minister last week. I drew attention to the fact that the criticisms that appeared in that paper were not all together according to the facts, and I deplored the circumstances wherein an organ supporting the government saw fit to make those statements which were not conducive to the industrial life of the community. I endeavoured to point that the Colonial Cordage Company the owners of one of our most important industrial institutions, provided the means of the livelihood for a very large number of our people in the West end of the city. The principal items in which they are interested are lines and twines, the material which was used therein came in duty free and consequently they did not come under the new surtax. The management of the Company asked for the protection of having a ten per cent. duty on all the imported lines and twines because that is largely the greater part of their business and they would otherwise be unable to compete but now they have to pay additional tariff. They have given notice to their employees that they were unable to continue operations under the present circumstances. They have during the past winter played the game and kept the services of many men when they could have dispensed with them, but owing to the present circumstances brought about by the present administration in spite of the fact they had piled up large stocks with the hope that during the present season they would all be disposed of with profit they are now forced to close down.

They are now unable to compete with the imported article and they request that a ten per cent. duty be put

on all lines and twines imported but there was no consideration given the request. In this country we have peculiar industries with peculiar circumstances surrounding them. Yesterday we were considering a Bill re the cutting of timber for exportation because the Government last winter to help out the unemployed in this country, gave orders for the cutting of pit props and they have been cut to the extent of thirty thousand cords the Government guaranteeing six dollars per cord or in other words the total sum of one hundred and eighty thousand dollars. And it has since transpired due to the depreciation abroad it is impossible to market these pit props without the Government incurring a very serious loss. It was shown that if the Government marketed them to-day they would lose the total amount they guaranteed, namely the sum of one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and if the Government has to lose that amount the employees of every description, the man on the wharf, on the roads, in the cooperage and workshop of every description, will be called upon to pay their respective portions of that deficit. And I wish to point out that to add ten per cent. duty on all the lines and twines manufactured by the Colonial Cordage Company you are placing one hundred families into the state of starvation and I am sure that the fishermen of the Northern and Western parts of the country and outside the city will be reasonable enough to contribute this small duty on all the lines and twines imported to save this institution and to secure employment for this one hundred families I am not speaking on behalf of the Company but on behalf of the people of the West end of St. John's they who have put me here, I am supposed to represent their interests well and safeguard them and I would be derelict in my duty if I did not endeavour to

bring home to the Government, especially the Prime Minister the seriousness of having such a large industry closed down which should merit some small consideration of the Government. We have the situation in this city when there were demonstrations right at the Bar of this Assembly, the men came here orderly and quietly and laid their case before the House with respect to the lack of employment. The difficulty was met partially and the men were satisfied to some extent. But what is to be done in the future and no matter what occurs the position has been aggravated by the possibility of a very large industry closing down, throwing hundreds of employees out on the street. The Government has been badly advised in showing such a lack of sympathy in this case and so it will be apparently with every such case here in St. John's. Every industry is struggling along and it has been necessary for all the manufacturers to meet together and endeavour to explicit their products. They adopted the medium of advertising largely so as to keep the fact in the peoples' minds that the money must be kept within the country. They have started a campaign to boost home industries and show that there products are equally as good as the imported article. But this article which I read before recess instead of following along these lines, went to prove to some extent that the home made article was not as good as the imported one. If this kind of thing continues all our factories will have perforce to close down and I think the Government has been very indiscreet in not taking up the policy of encouragement of home industry. In Canada they have started a programme to do this very thing and they are succeeding very well. Every article worn can be obtained ready made in Canada. That is why Canada is getting over the war conditions

--because of its industrial policy. The present Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Meighen, is a protectionist of the first waters and he is for everything made in Canada and all for Canada and there is a big future ahead of her because they are on the right track the track that will tend to build up their country. It is unfortunate that this House constituted as it is devoid of such men as Mr. Meighen as such a juncture as this. We want financial giants to grapple with this matter of finance and properly manage it. This town to-day would be a very sorry town indeed were it not for the industrial institutions. They have been the saving of Newfoundland and if we want this to continue we ought to seriously consider this matter and willingly give our money in the purchase of the home made article. Newfoundland cannot exist if we do not buy our own made products.

Literature was sent broadcast writing them down as incompetent to run industrial concerns. We have here the Estimates which we may call the table of expenditure of the public moneys earned by the people; every dollar referred to in this book has to be earned by the people just as a man has to earn the barrel of flour for his family. If there be no encouragement to build up the industrial enterprises, it is a sorry day for this Newfoundland of ours. Look, I say, at the situation. You don't need to be an old man to remember the time when the father was the only earner for the family; except perhaps one of the girls were out in private service. The father then rolled flour, stowed fish or did other work to get a barrel of flour for his family; they eked out a miserable existence. You remember him tramping the streets in his blue guernsey looking for a day's work and as thankful for it as if it were a gift from Heaven. That day is over and the

sons and daughters are working and where they lived in hovels before they now dwell in comfort and prosperity brought about by the efforts of those who had faith in the industrial possibilities of Newfoundland. I think it is matter of general congratulation and that the citizens of St. John's are to be complimented on being such an orderly people. I think all will agree with me that on occasions that have arisen they have been decent and orderly and there is not one instance of disorder or of law breaking. As I pointed out this evening this will continue as long as the people are getting a square deal and are contented. I have warned the Government that unrest is seething in the ranks of the public. You have brought a warship here for the purpose of quelling disturbances. Was this done to overawe the working men in their just demands, to lead firing parties to scatter those who were demanding their rights, or was it for the protection of the Government or even as it was said the other day, the Opposition. There is no need of a warship or armed force here; there is no need of His Majesty's ships cruising in these waters to intimidate the people as to what they should do, because the temper of the age is democratic and when the people know they have rights they will fight for them. I suggest that if this is all her business here she be released at once. We want no warships here; our people are too decent, too orderly and too patriotic. The members on the Government side of the House as I pointed out this afternoon, do not realise the seriousness of the situation; they have been lulled into a temporary sense of security, by the fact of having raised a 6 million dollar loan. But we have to pay back our debts which will take most of that, we are getting back to pre-war prices and the pre-war days of revenue of 3 or 4 mil-

lions. I refer you to the Budget Speech of the Hon. Prime Minister, acting for the Hon. Minister of Finance, which shows the revenue of 1915 was \$3,600,000 and of 1919-20 was 10 millions. Everyone knows the reason for that. Our increased earning power and inflated prosperity. During the last few years we had money for everything; the people bought plenty goods and the revenue swelled according to their earning power; we got \$15 for codfish and the revenue rose to 10 millions. But again I ask, what is going to happen with a revenue of only 5 millions. There is no assurance that we will earn one dollar more this year than in 1915. We are going back to pre-war days and pre-war revenues. But are we getting back to pre-war expenditure? I say we are not; we are not making the garment suit the cloth. It is absolutely absurd for the Hon. Prime Minister to come in here and make up his Estimates of getting 8 millions. I prophesy right now that he will not do it. Now how about cutting down expenditure. We will only have a revenue of about 5 millions and how are we going to make up the deficit. Do you think for a moment that any financiers abroad are going to give us money to make up the difference between our revenue and expenditure. When a crisis arose as it did last year when the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought it fitting to take half a million for his own purpose without the sanction of this Legislature, I say he committed a constitutional wrong. We should be ready for a crisis and that is why I say this House should not close till Dec. 31st., if necessary, or until we are ready to rise to the emergency. If instead of preparing now, this House closes in a few days with the Hon. Prime Minister going to England, and a crisis arises, there is nothing left but to do things on Executive responsibility,

We have had enough of the Executive assuming legislative prerogatives to themselves. The passing of these Estimates, I think, is a duty on this House of a most serious nature; every dollar we vote away we commit the country to, and in going through these votes every opportunity to retrench should be sought and seized upon. **But retrench in the high things, the big salaries, the luxuries and the high-flying projects of the Government.** What was good for Newfoundland before the war is good to-day. Get back and right the wrongs that have taken place since you came into power; cut out the unnecessary salaries. You made an effort in bringing back the fish commissioners; now do the same with the others. Again, while I agree with the ideals of the Hon. Minister of Education, and of putting education on a higher basis, let us do so, I say, only when we can afford it. It is like the ordinary man who wants a piano. If he can afford it let him have it by all means, but if he cannot, let him stick to his accordeon. Let us have the expensive educational machinery if we can afford it, but not by throwing the burden on the shoulders of the people. I should be long sorry to hamper the educational efforts of those whose duty it is to attend to the same, but there is a time in the history of a country as in that of a private family when you must cut out luxuries and stick to necessaries. It seems to me **that a lot of the trouble is due to lack of unity;** in the country, the same as in the House there is no confidence. The House is divided against itself and the country is the same. Unfortunately in this country, prejudice has been allowed to enter by men on both sides and to do harm in the administration of affairs. It is time to speak fearlessly and for you in the Government to realize we are not here to do a whit of harm against the pro-

per administration of the affairs of the country. It is our business to criticize and to lay bare the faults and tell how you have conducted business. A government that is sound, efficient, and has a clear conscience, would court that enquiry. We have been endeavouring since the opening of the House to obtain information as to what has happened the last eighteen months. We have been given a considerable amount but are waiting for a lot more. Members on the other side will remember the circular, of which many of them got copies from Hon. Mr. Coaker, wherein he was pleased to describe those on this side of the House as clowns. I do not know why he should make such an objectionable assertion as many on this side were associated with him in the government before. I do not know what is his definition of the word but I should be sorry to call him a clown. Is it because in the heat of debate some may have said things that were not exactly parliamentary that all should be classed as below his consideration. Do they think that because we are on the opposite side from them that we are here to do them or their districts harm. I do not know of anything that occurred this session that was offensive. I know the feelings of some of them towards the Opposition—and also towards the Government. The trouble is that we are in two camps and divided on lines that are not in the best interests of Newfoundland. A member has told me on this floor that this thing cannot go on, we must have more co-operation, more representation, and the different denominations in more harmony—and he is right. I have been through several political campaigns with different leaders and have yet to know of any difference because a man goes to another church. I am of a denomination that I hold second to none, I will give way in no respect in my

religious feelings to any man, inside or outside the House. But I am tolerant and I wish there was more of that spirit. There is such a thing as a man exploiting himself through his church or religious societies. What is the history of Newfoundland but of men coming in, using those of their denomination to mount to power and then turning their backs on them. Let anyone challenge me and I will name many such in my 30 years of experience. It is the spirit of tolerance we want. It so happens in this House that the leader of the Opposition, Sir M. P. Cashin, belongs to the Roman Catholic denomination. I think he is an ornament to that denomination, and as a citizen he is an ornament to the city in which he resides. He came out in the last election to lead a party and he had men behind him who believed in him as a man. A large section of the people did not accept him for various reasons. It is an unfortunate thing that there cannot be more unity and understanding here; that the colours cannot blend more and make it a better country. It is a matter that I deplore from day to day that Newfoundland is divided as it is—but the remedy is in the hands of this House and of the people. There is prejudice blind and bitter without reason, but I never spoke to improperly use religion in this House yet, and though I had to fight a hard battle last year, when one considers the array of energy and influence I was facing, I bear no animosity and bow to the will of the people. I hope to so conduct myself here that I will never be ashamed to go back to them and I care not who I am with as long as they stand for right for the country. And it is not likely there will be the same line up of this side the next election. Sir M. P. Cashin has intimated publicly that he will not lead; he has had his day and is ready to give another man a chance. It is

only what I expected him to do and is characteristic of the man. The situation we will have to face is need of a united front. I do not mean an amalgamation of parties but I think the country would have been brought off the rocks if the proper crew were on board to bring her out of danger. I hope in future we will have more openness and above-board dealing, and when a member on this side stands up to address the House those on the Government benches will not treat him with silent contempt as has been done all through the session, but will realize that there is some good in Israel. I prefer to remain where I am at present, but I am ready, and I think my colleagues feel the same, to give assistance to the Government. It is not mine, nor our, intention or desire to hamper, but to get the spirit of confidence abroad—confidence in the merchants, the banks, the industrial concerns, and unless we do something of this kind I fear we are on the downward path to ruin and disaster. The loan spoken of this afternoon by Sir M. P. Cashin has proven disastrous.

This loan cost the Colony an enormous sum. Sir M. P. Cashin has proven that it has cost us \$720,000, in other words instead of getting six millions we got only five millions two hundred thousand dollars. Is not that an awful cost? It certainly was an attractive proposition for financiers and while I say the Prime Minister did well to get that loan, I think that it should have been advertised. If it had been, it might have saved the Colony hundreds of thousands of dollars, but for reasons best known to themselves the Government saw fit to deal quietly with the gentleman who came here representing two or three American firms. I thank you for your patience, Mr. Chairman, and I trust that the suggestions that have been thrown out will be accepted in

the spirit in which they are meant.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, when I heard the Hon. Prime Minister introduce the Budget to the House some few days ago I fully realized that poor old Newfoundland had met her Waterloo. The story was so clear, so concrete and so clear that to me at least it was unmistakable. It reminded me of the father or the man who having by long years of work and by a knowledge acquired after years of experience built up a prosperous business, handed it over to his son with the result that the boy who thought he knew so much more than his father, soon wrecked the business and put it on the rocks.

Unfortunately, in 1919, the country, for reasons best known to itself, and the people having had their feelings worked upon by arguments that should never have been taken into consideration, passed over the control of affairs to a number of gentlemen who knew nothing at all of the duties and responsibilities they were undertaking. These men, who thought they knew so much were left with a surplus of 4 million dollars accumulated by their predecessors during their years of wise and successful management, but in eighteen calendar months that surplus was gone. It is a sad story and it was sadder still that the country did not leave still repose its confidence in the people who were in charge and allow them to bring Newfoundland through the period of tribulations and reverses to which now, under inexperience and ill management of her affairs she has now succumbed. However, the people thought fit to do otherwise and it is they who must pay the cost.

We thought last year that we would have a revenue of 11 million dollars as against an expenditure of 10 millions but what did we find?

The expenditure was nearer \$13,000,000 than \$10,000,000 and I ask how long can Newfoundland stand that. I say, Mr. Chairman, without fear of contradiction, that she can never survive the period of trade depression and demoralization that she is now passing through. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the past year carried on at a rate that he had never anticipated in his previous calculations and now in a circular which he issues to his followers he says that he is living in Hell.

He did not mean that the Hell in which he was suffering was created by us on this side of the House; he meant that the Hell which his own actions in the Government and in the Executive had created for him and it must have been awful indeed because I am told that remorse of conscience is after all the real Hell, and what is more, Mr. Chairman, I know some other gentlemen on the other side of the House who are also in Hell. In this Budget the acting Minister of Finance, the Leader of this House, estimates an expenditure of \$8,375,000 with an estimated revenue of \$8,224,000 but I wonder if the Prime Minister in making up that Budget looked back to the years of 1911 and 1912. I think I am safe in saying that he did not. The total imports for 1911-12 were \$14,733,490 and the exports \$13,847,809, making a total trade of \$28,608,299 and to run the country then it required \$3,142,491. Now let us look at 1913-14. In that year the imports were \$16,112,365 and the exports \$14,672,889 making a total trade of \$30,685,254, and in that year it required \$3,923,000 on which to run the country. These are facts that cannot be disputed. These figures are taken from the Journal of the House and there can be only one conclusion drawn from them; there can be only one result

when a population of 250,000 people have to bear a debt of \$52,000,000. In the year 1915-16 the imports were \$18,969,493 while the exports were \$16,427,336, making a total trade of approximately 36 million dollars and in 1918-19 the exports were 26,892,946 with imports of \$30,153,517, making a total trade for the country of about 57 million dollars. Again in 1918-19 the exports were \$33,297,184 and the imports \$36,780,616 giving a total trade of some \$70,000,000. In 1919-20 the imports were \$40,533,338 and the exports \$34,865,438, making a total of \$75,398,776. That is the total trade for the fiscal year of 1919-20 and now let us review the prospect as it is presented to us today. The estimated revenue for 1920-21 was \$11,200,000 but all we could collect was \$8,224,104.18. Now I ask any hon. gentleman if that surplus left by the Cashin administration for a rainy day had not been reserved, what would have been the position of the Government? Figures talk; figures are facts and they cannot be got away from. Now that is going to be the total trade for the coming year from which we are to derive a revenue of \$8,307,000. Nobody can dispute figures and now I put this position to the House. If the total voyage of fish for this year, and the estimate is a large one, is 1,500,000 qtls. at six dollars per quintal that gives us \$9,000,000 added to which we may have three or four millions of exports of various other kinds, giving a total of exports of \$12,000,000 and this with imports of ten millions which is as much as they will be, gives us a total trade of twenty-two million dollars and now I ask where are you going to find the revenue? You cannot borrow any more and as I have already said, Newfoundland has met her Waterloo.

Now, take this surtax of twenty-five per cent. which is suggested to

be put on top of the ten per cent. surtax already in force. It looks all right on paper but twenty-five per cent. is an enormous additional tax. Have you given a thought to what it means? A man importing one hundred dollars worth of goods last year had to pay 40% duty with the surtax of 10% which amounted to \$44 in duty altogether. Add to that the additional surtax of 25% and you get \$55, or exactly \$11 more than it was one month ago. That is one point that is clear and concrete. Another factor which gives cause for grave consideration is the Sale Tax. I don't know what that Sale tax is and I doubt if any hon. member on the other side of the House knows what it means. This is estimated to bring in \$900,000 and it means that it must hit the man who pays it or otherwise it could not realise that \$900,000. The surtax is in my judgment not a just one. The 25% added on was all right if the coat were cut according to the cloth. Mr. Chairman and hon. gentlemen of the Executive and of the Government, do not live too long in a fool's paradise because that is where you are now and the words once used by an hon. member of this House now passed away to describe a similar situation are very appropriate to this occasion and I will repeat them for your benefit. "It is the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat." That is the position in which Newfoundland finds herself to-night; that's where we've got by Liberal Reform and may the Gods save us from any more reform. What is the life of the Reformer? He usually meets his Waterloo. Look at the great reformer of our fisheries, the man who was going to change the whole order of things as far as our staple industry was concerned. What has become of him? He has de-

sorted this House for the past ten days; he is gone and no one knows where he is or when he will return and that Sir, is the life of the reformer. The Minister of Education over there is another who preached the doctrine of Liberal-Reform. Liberal indeed he has been where he himself was concerned but I fear he has forgotten the Reform part of the bargain entirely, and such has been the history of the Liberal-Reform Government.

I am somewhat astounded, Mr Chairman, at the circular of the 22nd April issued by the Minister of Fisheries and at many of the things it contained. The words went forth from the mouth of the greatest prophet this country has ever known on fishery matters, from the mouth of no less a prophet as the Hon. Mr. Coaker himself that the main product of this country is not the fisheries. I ask the member for Burin, Mr. Cheeseman if this is so where is the West Coast going to get off? I say, and I fear no contradiction, that there never has been and never will be anything to touch the fisheries so far as Newfoundland is concerned. The fisheries are Newfoundland's birthright and they were so long before we were here and they will continue to be so, and yet we are told that we have to go to the interior for our greatest and most valuable products. I will say in a few words if this is so, nobody will take a trip to London this season.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister and his cabinet have considered this Budget well before bringing it down here. Have they given to its compilation that mature judgment which its importance demands? I do not think so because if they had it would not be before this House to-day. I believe that it devolved upon the Prime Minister to compile it and I have to congratu-

late him upon the energy he has displayed in this as in other things. He has done his best to answer questions asked here during the session and to dig up information that we wanted but he has nobody with him to either give him assistance or to give him advice and many a good man has gone astray for the want of wise counsel which is undoubtedly the case with the Prime Minister. He is a man who is acting in many capacities but like the Hon. Mr. Coaker, when he tried to act as Minister of Fisheries, Prime Minister, Chairman of the Railway Commission and at the same time head of a large business, he fell down on the job because no man can do four men's work and the Prime Minister will find that the same thing applies to him. He is Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Colonial Secretary and now he is Minister of Marine and Fisheries as well until I send Mr. Cave down after the House closes to take charge of that department and Mr. Coaker will go back to Port Union and to oblivion and my genial and hon. friend will try to develop some practical good for his native land.

And next we come to the question of Railroads. Oh, poor old Newfoundland! Reid has had greater fun at the expense of the government than any man ever had before. We were told during the election campaign that if we voted for the Liberal Reform government we would be able to ride across country in pullmans. Well, they were elected but altho' they were liberal to the Reids but again they for got the reform end of it and the railway has cost them in the vicinity of \$3,000,000. The most funny thing about it was that while the government has been running the railway the busiest months they had were the months that proved the worst financially. Like the man in a store who af-

ter a busy day finds that his receipts are less than when there was nothing doing, they found their worst months to be those in which the railway was busiest hauling freight and passengers. This was shown by figures produced in this House and now we have arrived at a point where the government say to the Reids we will pass back the railway to you at the end of June. I wonder will they. I have heard of men having been offered a present and refusing to accept it, and if I am not very far out in my calculations, that will be the case with the Reids.

There is a Railroad Commission today who have issued and sent out circulars telling all the officials that after the 30th of June next they will not be responsible for their salaries, and, I am told, that if the Reid Newfoundland Company are not prepared to take it over and operate it that the whole thing will go into liquidation or into the hands of a Receiver. Once the crowd begins to know that the railway is going into the hands of the government and to be run under government control in the future, the three million dollars that the government lost within the past twelve months on the operation of the railroad will be only a mere fleabite to the deficit that is to come, because the government can no more run a railroad as a paying proposition than I can disappear now from my place in this House. Take the six millions of dollars that you borrowed. That is all gone and accounted for as follows: at least \$2,500,000 for railway purposes; \$500,000 for the St. John's Municipal Council; \$500,000 for Public Works; \$1,000,000 as refund to Surplus Trust Account and \$1,500,000 reserved for general purposes. But this last mentioned amount is no more in reserve than I am in Dr. Barnes' place now. You know Dr. Barnes and every member of this House is aware that instead of having a surplus on the 30th day of June next that this Colony will start out in debt

and nothing less than \$750,000. That is your position, in debt instead of having a surplus. You naturally ask me why I say that. There is a lot of outstanding bills and accounts that are not estimated for or accounted for at all in this Budget. I fear not successful contradiction to-night from any many in the government to prove to me that the statement I have made is not correct. I wish my Hon. friend Mr. Foote was in his seat in the House so as I could tell him something about finance. I want to tell you Mr. Prime Minister to-night that your own figures show my words to be absolutely correct, because there is not in your estimate of Supplemental Supply anything telling of the \$400,000 that was spent to purchase Labrador fish last year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The \$380,000 that was paid for Labrador fish is charged as a debit to us and we have taken no credit for it. It is already charged in Surplus Trust Account.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Would you mind showing it to me?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I shall be delighted to do it.

SIR J. CROSBIE—What have you estimated to be the loss you have met with on pit props. These are some of the bills, that I have already referred to, as outstanding and unpaid. Has the Prime Minister made any estimate in Supplemental Supply for the loss on salt.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, it is all included in Surplus Trust Account.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I say a lot of these outstanding accounts are not alluded to in these Estimates and I say that we got to start out, with every dollar that we borrowed spent, in debt on the first of July next, and there are no figures submitted here to show anything to the contrary. As was so aptly said by Sir Michael Cashin, we could easily have a substantial

surplus on the 30th of June next, but for the way that our public monies were wasted and thrown about by the present administration. Now I do not want to condemn the Minister of Shipping to-night, but I want to make this statement, that, in the purchase of these steamers that are now lying in the harbour of St. John's, the Minister I feel quite satisfied in my mind, did not know anything about the situation. I think that was already proven in this House by his answers to my questions. The position is that we have paid out a half a million dollars for steamers that are not worth a Jewsharp to Newfoundland. I say that because I happen to know a little about steamers.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The amount paid for that fish is included in sum totals, if not in details.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That is the trouble about this whole business, we cannot get the details.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that the sum of \$380,000 paid for fish is charged as a debit and we have taken no credit for the value of the fish. Respecting the matter of salt. The sum of \$77,000 was taken as a debit and against that \$23,000 was credited. That is accounted for in the \$1,022,000. These figures were checked by the Auditor General and certified by him to be correct.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well it is like a Chinese puzzle to me, I cannot find it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Sir John is right. It is not in this. It should be found in Supplemental Supply, the total vote for which is down here at \$1,151,000

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That means, after adding the \$380,000 paid for fish, that Supplemental Supply will in reality be at least \$1,531,000 instead of \$1,151,000, as shown here in the Estimates; also add to that the loss on pit props and I do not know how much more. Personally, I do not blame the

government for their attitude in connection with the cutting of pit props last winter in order to save able-bodied relief. I would, perhaps, have acted similarly if I were in the government. I would have attempted to get back something for the money expended. If you do not get any money in return for these pit props, well that is purely an accident and it is something over which the government have had no control whatever. But the fact still remains that it is to be debited to the colony. It is piling up our public debt and it is money that we have not been told about in this House up to the present and when its going to be added up, and included in the sum total, it will be seen that matters are much worse in Newfoundland than you Mr. Prime Minister even anticipated yourself. Well what are we going to do about it? Sir Michael Cashin pointed this out already this evening when he intimated that he intended to live in this country and remain in this country and that he was speaking for and on behalf of the people of Newfoundland in all honesty and in all sincerity, because he has been trying to see some way out of the darkness that we have got into.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the Hon. member will permit me, the \$380,000 is included on page 3 of the Budget and it is intended as an expenditure under the Audit Act.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But that is not all. There are a lot of other things. Let me tell you a story about auditing. The bookkeeper of the place furnished the books and the Auditor went over them and scrutinized them and gave a certificate for everything to be correct as far as he could see. But that bookkeeper, a clever sort of fellow that he was, kept in the dark a lot of things that the Auditor did not see. Personally, I do not lay any blame on the Auditor General whatever, but when some of the bills come in and he has to pass them he will realize

that there is something wrong in Denmark. How long has this sort of thing to go on? What are we going to do about it? Now I am a great believer in education and would like to see all the facilities possible available for the purpose of educating our people, but when the burden becomes such that the people cannot stand it and the taxes are so great that it means hunger then I say cut it out. Put it in its proper place and spend less money than we are spending today. That is one of the ways that the government can turn and do some good in the way of economy. Cut out this nonsensical department of Education and go back to where we were a few years ago. As I told the Hon. Minister of Education here the other day, hungry children cannot learn and if we tax them they cannot produce, well then why not depart from this path of spending money lavishly for this useless department. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that there is not going to be enough fish caught in this country this year to pay the revenue that is estimated in the Budget and you got to cut down in every department to save the colony from bankruptcy and I am afraid, even after doing all that I suggested, you will not be able to save her then. The Hon. Mr. Coaker, the great authority on all fishery matters, has said that \$4 for Labrador and \$5 or \$4 for Shore will be the prices that fish will fetch next fall. Then the earning power of the people will be much less than I told you a little while ago, and by the time you throw out West India and damp out of the Shore fish it will lessen the total value of our fish products by about seven or eight million dollars. I contend that any man with the smallest bit of judgment could have saved this situation. I saw commercial men who made the same mistakes as the government made. They thought the good times were on for ever. They thought the streets were paved with gold; the government also

thought this. But what do we find today? We find, through lack of judgment on both their parts, a total collapse all round. I told a man recently that we had to get back to pre-war days and the quicker we realized that the better. If the government had seen the dark days and stopped the expenditure that was taking place how much better would we be in Newfoundland? Take this loan that has been raised by the Prime Minister. I do not suppose, Mr. Chairman, that ever before in the history of Newfoundland was a Loan raised behind sealed doors, and I suppose there were some misrepresentations made to get that loan. Do you know that that Loan could have been floated on much better terms than it was if Wood Gundy and Company, who handled the previous loan for this colony, and others had an opportunity to bid on that loan and no such amount as \$750,000 interest would be charged to the colony. My youngest boy could do better than get this loan at 88 and I will tell you why? At the time you accepted 88 for it in New York our 6 1-2 per cent. bonds were selling there at 94 and we allowed New York Brokers to haul off 5 and 8 profit. That is what happened exactly, with a single stroke of the pen 5 and 5-8 was taken off this Colony and no opportunity given to anybody to float this Loan, except three or four American brokers; and then the only reason given to this House is that the government were afraid to tell the Opposition, fearing the Opposition would stop the raising of the loan. If we got that loan at 98 3-4, it means that it will cost this colony 6 and 7-8 interest on the six million dollars, a happening that was never known before in the history of Newfoundland. Why was not some other firm called in to tender for this loan. If bonds were sold at 94, plus interest and exchange, which netted practically 104, why were we ticked off with 98 3-4? Its the worst piece of bungling in fi-

nance this colony has ever known, and the only excuse given by the Prime Minister for it is that he does not know very much about finance. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars appears to be a small amount comparatively, but if the government had saved that on the raising of this loan, it would have enabled them to go on for another year without having to cut civil servants salaries. Mr. Chairman, look what this bit of frenzied finance has cost. It make one's blood boil to think that any New York Brokers can put one over on us in that fashion and can look upon us in the words of a one time member of this Chamber, that Newfoundlanders are too green to burn. We members of the Opposition know and realise the responsibility that is now upon the shoulders of the government and I feel that the responsibility is very great, and I feel that gladly would I do something to help them in this emergency. I do not say that in any spirit of sarcasm, because I can see the hard times thru which we are passing. I stated in this House some three or four weeks ago and I repeat it now. I am not so satisfied with conditions or that there is any likelihood of a silver lining appearing in the dark clouds ahead, as my hon. friend, Mr. Bennett, who tells us that Newfoundland can be pulled out of the mess she is in. There has got to be some awful suffering take place to bring her back to normal. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that Newfoundland has not yet seen the dark spot at all. It is only the shadow we have seen of the darkness, so to speak, as I said some weeks ago. If government, with the assistance they have given, can manage to start out fishermen and we can get them all away from here, it will be a good thing. But there is another entirely new situation that has arisen and that has to be grappled with. There are people in Conception Bay who were depending on Bell Island for a living

and which industry has been closed down for a considerable time past. If something is not done for the people in that section of the country, the unemployment problem will be more acute. We got to find some sort of labour for these people to-day, because they got to produce a portion of the revenue that is required of them. If something is not done and done very quickly to solve the unemployment question nothing will save the greater majority of our people in Newfoundland. And I want to serve notice on the government that if they cannot devise some scheme before next winter whereby men will be enabled to lay by something for their families, I want to say that when that hour arrives it is going to be a terrible one of reckoning, and anybody who has got any foresight at all can see it in the distance. Again I say to the Prime Minister, what are we going to do about it? We have got to do something about it. We are only just clear of one problem when another comes, and they must be handled. If we don't do something, make some attempt then I say that we are going to be in a very sorrowful plight. For instance take my district to-day, Port de Grave. I know the condition there to-day, just as well as the clock is striking when it strikes twelve. I know the position of my people, and I want to say that I know that your government has endeavoured to assist them in getting away. You are doing what I think is your best in this matter, and I don't intend to condemn you for it, but as you say yourselves, and it is generally admitted, we must make producers of these men if we can, and we are endeavouring to get the most of Conception Bay to the fishery, but there is another crowd who don't go to the fishery don't go to the Labrador in my district, and the question they ask me so often is. What can I do this summer, can you get me a job? and my answer is that I cannot, and if these

people are unable to earn their winter's supplies I fear that there is trouble brewing. Let me look at this taxation just a minute again that you placed on the twenty per cent. It cannot produce the amount estimated in your Budget Speech, and I will tell you why, and I want you to prepare for what is coming. The Customs Surta~~x~~ increase one million one hundred and seventeen thousand five hundred dollars. There is no more chance of raising that money than there is of raising twenty million, and I will tell you why. Here is why. The men last year the labouring men who in the past couple of years could earn from fifteen to twenty-five dollars a week, will not the coming week earn more than ten or twelve. Then what is the good of your surtax. The earning power is not in Newfoundland to-day to produce the revenue as forecast in this Budget. It cannot and will not be produced because we have not the earning power nor the purchasing power for the coming year. Take my district where they could earn untold money in the manufacture of Hoops and other essentials for the fishery and could get good prices for them. They are to-day unsaleable. Only yesterday a man followed me from the Royal Bank of Canada to my office and from there to the wharf, a man I have known for years, a Cooper, who begged me to take one hundred and twenty half drums from him at forty cents each which last fall were worth ninety cents, and he said he had not sold a drum for the past three months. What can he give towards the revenue? I know what he can give and it is very little, and that is why the estimate for the coming year is impossible. I want to tell you that next session you will be dealing with something else besides the revenue, if something is not done to save the situation we will be introducing a little problem from the Canadians. They will be able to dictate terms to this Colony for Confedera-

tion, and our birthright will be sold. That is the reason why I want to ask the Prime Minister to-night to reduce this thing wherever possible, and say to Dr. Barnes that the vote for Education must come down to a position where we will be able to meet the revenue. I am sorry that Mr. Cave is not here as there is a matter here I would like to call his attention to. When Mr. Bennett repeated a statement which has already been made by Sir Michael Cashin that he will not go to the country again as leader, Mr. Cave looked at me with his cute little eye, and said, a chance for you Sir John. You bet there will be a chance for me when I go, and I am going down to Bonavista Bay with Mr. Windsor and Coaker.

MR. WINSOR—Beware of defeat.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I am not afraid of defeat and that is where I am going to put you and Mr. Coaker to the mat.

When that change takes place and the two cards are laid down before the country there will be two Protestants standing out, and the cry of Cashin will not again go forth to the country, and the fight will then be on even lines, and Newfoundland will have a chance to get her rights once more. Mr. Bennett said that his religion is second to none. That is every man's right. I am a Methodist and was born in that Church, and with all deference to Mr. Bennett, mine is second to none, and I hope and trust that Sir Michael Cashin has the same opinion of his religion. It is not his fault nor my fault where we were christened, but where I was christened I shall remain, and to my fellow Protestants in Newfoundland I say this now. The next fight there will be two Protestant leaders, and it will be equal and there will be no headlines in the Morning Post to tell what Crosbie said to the Protestants or Catholics. I say to this House that for twelve

years I served under Sir Michael Cashin as a man, and not under his religion, and I consider him just as much of a man now as ever I did, and all I hope and trust is that you will be here to give the service to your country which you owe it as a Newfoundlander. Newfoundland has been blessed and she has been cursed. She has seen dark days and she has come back, but as I see her to-night, it is like a fisherman told me this morning in my office. Here is what he said to me: "Sometimes you will develop a cancerous growth which can be cut out which surgeons under operation can destroy, but Sir, he says to me in his own quaint way, Newfoundland is caught to-day with fifty-two million around her neck, and the cancerous growth cannot be cut out. It has spread so far that there is no good left. That cancer or inability which has ruled her the past eighteen months cannot be removed because it is too late. How true that is has been brought home in the past few days here.

I just want to say before sitting down there is a matter in the Estimates which when they come before the House will have to be considered seriously, and with the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and Mr. Foote I was going to say, I forget he has no job, and the Minister of Public Works, and the Prime Minister, we may be able to do something to assist yet, and I would like to ask Dr. Barnes to-night to give the Educational vote careful consideration before it comes before the House, because he will agree with me that something has to be done to save the situation. Under taxation I see that there is a tax of twenty per cent. on codfish. I agree with the Prime Minister that the revenue must be raised, but I was hoping that could be cut off, but apparently it can't, but there is one which will have to be con-

sidered and that is the forty per cent. on what is known as fish shipped out in foreign vessels. We cannot afford to pay that tax. The fishermen will be forced to pay that tax and the merchants will take it off, and we have not enough schooners either to take away Labrador fish. What we have here to-day which is practically a liability on us is three masted vessels, which take up to ten thousand quintals. Six or five or four thousand quintals is almost impossible to see on the other side. The smaller the cargo the easier it is to sell and the better the price and that is the reason that I would like to ask the Prime Minister before we get to it to have this reconsidered, it must be reconsidered, because we have not enough small vessels here to go to the Labrador and take the catch away, without using foreign vessels. Mr. Cheeseman knows that it is a mistake to send a large cargo away to-day, the smaller the better, and you cannot send across cargoes in a three masted vessel, which will be suitable to the Trade, and in the absence of the Prime Minister I suggest to the Attorney General, don't pay any attention to Mr. Halfyard for a minute, I am telling the House that this forty per cent. is a mistake. It was put on with the idea that it would protect our own shipping. It is no protection. Our own class of shipping is too large to proceed across the Atlantic with cargoes of fish. There is more danger with them of the fish getting bad. Mr. Gosse knows it is a mistake to put eight or ten thousand in a Labrador vessel. If we cannot use Danes or Norwegians or that little English vessel the fishery cannot go on, and I am asking you to have this taken down before we get to the Estimates, so as to have it discussed, and possibly you may be able to bring in some plan. I am sorry the Prime Minister is out because that could be arranged. I

think he has some idea which may be satisfactory, but he told me of it in a personal conversation, and I am at liberty to tell it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think that will be dealt with in Ways and Means.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—If that matter is adjusted it will help the situation. Now I am sorry my hon. friend Mr. Coaker is absent but I read the News this morning and I felt hopeful of seeing him again when I saw that a special car was sent after him, so I am looking forward to seeing him to-morrow, to see what a week's work on the farm has done for him. I heard that he was taking a week's rest like Bonar Law, who went over to France to play golf, and now Lloyd George is going. All the great men are going, and as Mr. Coaker will be here to-morrow we will know whether that week was beneficial to him, and if it was, I suggest that Mr. Halfyard take a week off, and I will not criticise him for his absence. But we will be glad to see Mr. Coaker back again. I don't think he should go away and leave us. I mean that you know. There is something lacking here since he went away and I hope to see him here to-morrow better than when he left. With regard to the President Coaker's cargo he will probably be able to tell us something about it, and I tell you now I don't intend to criticise him any more about the President Coaker's cargo. But in all seriousness Newfoundland is to-day in a serious position, and let us all try to look at it as men should, and I am satisfied to-day that this Opposition to a man, if we can discuss some sane policy to do so. We may differ on it, but I think you will find that when it becomes us to act as men that we will fill the bill. I feel satisfied that is the intention. I don't want to delay the House, and I am satisfied nobody on this side want to do so, and what I

am going to say I am speaking for Sir Michael Cashin.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—Sir Michael Cashin is not gone yet.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—No but when he does go you are coming over with me. You cannot resist me, in other words I have unconsciously developed a side to my character which I knew nothing of, and that is hypnotism. I can hypnotise you. Whenever I try to speak seriously you interrupt me.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—I am sorry for interrupting you.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I forgive you. I forgive your interruption, but as I was dealing with the serious side of this thing, I want to say, I want to see in this House, and the Opposition must see it or we won't allow the House to close. We want to know the railroad policy for the future in Newfoundland, and for the sake of Newfoundland we of the Opposition want to join hands with you of the Government to do our best for the old Colony, and I am sure Sir, that you will be with us in heart in that, if we differ in other matters. It is too big a thing for the Executive, and in justice to the Government, this matter should be laid before the House as soon as possible for discussion to see what can be done. The answer may come back to us that the Reid Nfld. Co. has not told us what they are going to do, but Reid should be made aware that he has to tell us his plans, and not lay the responsibility and expense of three or four million dollars without a vote in this House. That is what must be done, and you can get through the Estimates in a reasonable time, but we under Sir Michael Cashin's leadership want the policy laid down in connection with the railroad, and I may tell you now, no odds what may or may not happen, and I am voicing Sir Michael Cashin's opinion and the opinion of the Opposition,

the House will not close until we have the policy of the railroad for the future. Now the quicker we have that the quicker the House will close. I am asking the Government to-night to do this. Some member on the other side or on this side of the House who knows nothing of the matter may be able to give an idea to someone who will be able to elaborate it. It is not always the brilliant man who develops the best schemes, and we may be able to devise some scheme to operate the railroad in a way not so detrimental to the Colony in loss. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is out, as I would almost feel like asking him for an assurance to this effect. I know how big the problem is, but as I am about now to take my seat, I would like you to let us know, Mr. Attorney General if this will be done, and the business of the House will be facilitated. I just want to say now that I notice that personal attacks have ceased in debates, and I hope this will continue. Any criticism I have made is not of the man but as a Minister in a position, and I don't know whether I have to thank the Printers' strike or not but I can glance over the Star and it is becoming very nice. I can read it now.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—You will be able to buy one soon and take it home with you.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I don't have to buy one I get it free. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is absent as there is one thing in the Budget Speech which has not been mentioned.

The Prime Minister's budget speech would have been perfect for the Prime Minister if he had forgotten that. I will not say anything harsh, but I will say now in the spirit of a true Newfoundlander, I will forgive him. It is this kind of stuff that get the back up on the part of the Opposition. We are now in a position to go ahead with the business of the House, unless Mr.

Coaker comes back and causes a disturbance.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to review the various subjects of debate in the budget as my three colleagues on this side of the House have so ably done. I think the hon. members of the Government will appreciate the fact that the course that we have followed has been forced upon us by the peculiar manner in which Supply, Ways and Means and the Budget have been placed before us. The figures that are contained in the Estimates tabled are so abnormally large, so much greater than what was expected, that one is tempted to ask if there is any use in voting on them at all. So it happens that we have had the matter of Supply debated more as Ways and Means. I think the Government should have a chance even yet to alter their plans on the various votes that we are about to take. This House, and this House alone, has the authority to vote supplies. The Government in the last instance must shoulder the responsibility for the kind of estimates they bring down. It appears to us almost like a tragedy to bring in estimates beyond what the country can shoulder. I think I speak the minds of the House when I say that we should have the discussions that we have had from the members on this side of the House. Especially will we appreciate the Leader of the Opposition for the intelligent manner, the brutally logical way, in which he has criticised the whole matter. I think the lesson that we ought to take out of the big thoughts to which he has given expression is that whilst it is easy to sit down here and pass vote after vote, where it is humanly possible to cut out votes we should do so because of the probability of the people not being able to pay. The people should be asked to pay only such expenses as are absolutely necessary. I realise

the unfortunate situation of the Government during the past year, I must also remember that the people have chosen the Government, have elected to make the gentlemen who at present occupy the Government seats their bed-fellows. We on this side of the House must see, in as fair a manner as possible, the weak spots that we think that the Government ought to get over. I think it is a pity that the Government have not proceeded about the estimates in a different way. Everything is left to fatter, and that one man finding himself with a multitude of jobs has performed the work in what might be called a lazy man's way. The tariff that we were promised would be adjusted has not been touched at all. We have simply got the old method of taking up the Customs returns, and by adding 25% to everything that people eat and wear we get the necessary returns. Of course, it is an absolutely unscientific way. It is a great disappointment to the people of the Colony, because we were sure that there was going to be a tariff reform. It is simply the old idea that just at the time the House is going to meet someone figures out that we are going to be short and they slap on 25%. Most of the votes are the same as last year. There are a few changes; but what I think is the most grotesque cut of all, the most unworthy of all, is where they say that as we need another couple of hundred thousand dollars we will cut it off the Civil Servants. If we are going in for a reduction, if we are going to start the idea that there must be a reduction in Civil Servants salaries, then why not say that we will get back ourselves to the position of two years ago? If we are going to have a cut at all, are we going to cut the man down who is barely getting enough to live on while we retain the big amount voted us last year? The man who is getting \$1,200 is being cut

\$200 while we continue to get three times the amount we were getting up to last year. It would be much more to the point if the members would say to those Civil Servants who are getting a miserable pittance we will not cut you but we will cut ourselves. Thirty-six members at \$1,000 means \$36,000. Now suppose we cut down to \$300 that would mean a saving of about \$25,000 and it would not be necessary to cut the man who is getting less than \$1,200. Why cut him, the man on a miserable salary, \$20 or \$30 when if we add together all the cuts possible right here in the House, we can wipe off all need of doing it. Let us get back to what we had before and in later years if someone thinks fit let him vote us back again. Why not set the example here in the House. There is \$27,000 here in one shot and no one would be hurt; nobody in this House would be hurt by a cut of \$700. If any man is coming to this House merely because of the salary he is certainly asset to it. Save this \$27,000 and save the necessity of cutting the greater number of civil servants. Take those holding Ministerial positions; why not cut them this year? Not one of them who is listening or who is absent from the House at the moment but realize that he can get along without \$2,000. They have been elected and accepted responsibility at salaries of \$2,760. There can be a saving here of \$1,300—why not cut off that. On 8 or 10 Ministers this with the other \$27,000, would bring it up to \$40,000 which would obviate the necessity of cutting the man on a pittance. Why not do it? Before going on with the Estimates let us do it. I do not suggest this to embarrass the Government or to gain political kudos, but if we are going to cut the pay of the civil servants who are working day in and day out and depending on it to gain a livelihood for themselves

and families, we ought to see that we who are not depending on it and only serve here periodically, take the biggest cut off ourselves. I ask the Government to see the wisdom of not cutting the small man. I will go further and say that there is no occasion to cut a single one of them because as I pointed out the other night all you've got to do is alter your programme and trim back the things referred to which will not make any alteration as far as commerce or the ordinary life of the people is concerned. Let my good friend, the Hon. Dr. Barnes, swing back to some other phase of educational life if he will or to one of the half dozen departments, which the Hon. Prime Minister is looking after. The latter is a man of many capacities and one often gets confused as to which department he is representing when addressing him. Let the Deputy Supt. of Education swing back to his old position for a year; let the other crowd who are sojourning abroad and being paid substantial salaries, be treated as the commissioners were and recalled. If they won't come home, let them look for jobs abroad. If we are serious about this proposition we will remember that the man who has retired to Port Union—whether forced or voluntarily—the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, took the position that the fish commissioners should be called home as the country could not afford to keep them. If the conditions be such that the country can't afford those who went to look after her affairs, surely you will agree that those who are now looking at baseball games abroad or the men training for the Dempsey-Carpentier fight, can be recalled and the educational programme left lay in abeyance for a year. I am not opposed to it but I think it can stand a delay. We have done without it and struggled along for years and the saving on that would be \$60,000. With

the other \$36,000 this would make \$96,000 which plus the estimated surplus of \$100,000 and the Model Farm grant lopped off we have the \$230,000. Then why cut the civil servants? To do so is totally wrong. What right have I to come in here and reduce a man who is serving the state. Do you doubt if it were put to the people whether the wages of the unfortunate man with his green-with-age coat and three-quarter pants handed down from his father or the educational and Model Farm votes was to be cut, which they would vote for. Not a man who is eligible to vote under the Election Act which says that everyone voting must be "of sound mind," and not a man in Newfoundland, but would say cut out the Model Farm and let the blue ribbon winner stand aside but don't cut the small salaried man. I think the Government in embarking on this idea have missed the basic principle in meeting the difficulty. And the principle is this, that the salary of no man serving the state should be touched unless it is absolutely unavoidable. We have no right to say he shall work for less unless we are compelled to say so. But we are not compelled to say this as I have showed. Secondly it is not necessary, as the Estimates themselves contain votes that can be dispensed with. Can any man tell me seriously that we have the right to go and cut the civil servants, to reduce the expenditure of the men who are serving the state, simply because you have made a bungle of the railway policy. I picked up the Star this evening and I saw in it—a Government organ—under the heading of "personals" that the private car of Hon. Mr. Coaker had gone to Port Union and he would return to-day. Has he a private car? I saw it in the Government organ. Do I understand that he has a car swinging up and down the line to suit his own convenience and the civil

servants are to be cut to pay its expenses. It is true or it is not. If it is not we see however that he can have a special car even if he does not own it himself and if this can be done in these trying times, surely it is not going to be paid for by the companies which he is associated with. This jerrymandering shows that everything up there has gone to pot. You say that a Receiver is to be brought in in connection with the railway—that will cost more than the whole operations of last year. It has been suggested that this House should not close till this railway question has been settled definitely. I agree with that, and say that we cannot close with the uncertainty hanging over our heads as to where we are going to get off on that matter. When that railway question came up, I stated, and I repeat it now, as one who has been through the mill, that you cannot make a railway pay in this country at all; you never can unless there are totally changed conditions in the Island, unless there is more inter-town traffic, a great industrial growth, or you change your plans and get in the tourists by taking the lid off Prohibition as I suggested before. You can never make it pay as the hauls are too long for both freight and passengers; to-day you have trains going over the country with only an odd passenger getting on or off with long distance between and barrels dragged hundreds of miles for a mere bagatelle. This will not pay the expenses of the crew to say nothing of the other costs. Why go on with this piffle as to what is ahead for the coming year. Reference has been made to the Hon. Prime Minister going to the country on a manifesto one of the main planks of which was the cleaning up of the railway. We were told a Commission was to be appointed to straighten things out and we would be able to see where we stood this year. Twelve months have gone

and to-night we are treated to a statement in the Budget that the railway problem is an intricate one and needs much thought and if the Reids do not take it over we must find out where we stand legally. What an indictment of a lazy Government. There never was a Government whose laziness was so pronounced. Their policy in all things is let her go, let her drift along. One says I am the Prime Minister; another, I am the Minister of Shipping; another, I am something else—but thank God nobody got my job yet. There is nothing done—twelve months have passed and to-day we are in the position that the men constituting the Government come in and hand us this. The only thing they are to be complimented on is their gall, their supreme nerve—if some others had it they would make a far better success of life. Nobody of hon. gentlemen ever fell down so flatly. They are the embodiment of nerve, the personification of gall; and they come in here after 12 months and tell us they have a terrible problem to face. The railway has always been a problem; it is beaten out from being a problem; it is like flogging a dead horse to talk about it as a problem; it has been a problem as long as one can remember. And then we are told you must put it in the hands of a receiver or take it over, and that is what you will have to do as you cannot let it close up. You will be in the position of a man closing up the books of a concern; if the estate cannot pay him the one who engaged him must do it. How can you expect one to take your effrontery seriously is simply wonderful. Talk of Newfoundland being the sport of historic misfortune, of Newfoundlanders being too green to burn; why such things are not in it with this. I can't understand how you can sit there and look wise and happy and say we will hand out something next year. We are ap-

proaching the Estimates in the same spirit as other things were dealt with and laid on the table of the House. Everything is happy go lucky. If the Hon. Minister of Finance is ill, well someone else will look after his department; and so it goes on. The whole thing has come to the stage today that as long as the Hon. Prime Minister can hand out some old thing the others will say, what odds, we will get along somehow. I think I have now dealt with the Estimates but later I may have a word to say on some phases of them. I do not think the Government have any reason to be proud of the job they have made of these Estimates. It is the same old way of swinging along, of trying to find a way out, of "God is good," and if we have been led away by our leader of old perhaps the Hon. Prime Minister, the artist in slinging words, will keep us out of trouble—he may do better than the blunt old chap we had before. There is this difference; you have to read it now to see how you are being fooled. He wrote that he was among clowns and living in Hell daily and would have to go to Port Union and live there. But the new Moses is smooth and polished and will promise many things. But we have no results as far as the Budget indicates, we will not have the people satisfied that the cutting of the civil servants and keeping our own salaries is right, and further the great majority of them will feel that we have cut them when there was no necessity. That judgment will be on us in 12 months if we are spared. You will remember that when we went into Supply 12 months ago almost the same burlesque was handed out to the public. We then had a tariff consisting of a reduction in Bologna sausage, and in spite of the fact, as I understand, that the Ministers have lived on it for 12 months, they are back with hungry faces looking out for them-

selves and in spite of the depression and the present crisis they are going to cut those who cannot do without the money and fall back on the lazy man's way of handling the Estimates. It is not my intention to delay the House further but I ask the Acting Minister of Finance to give thought to these resolutions and not ask us to vote these reductions of civil servants. We would all regret it and you can't carry it out anyhow; there are some you cannot reduce or there will be a general tie up. The Hon. Ministers know whom I refer to; and in other cases if the men are cut they have to become dishonest; if they have no other avenue of income and are in positions of trust you will compel them by temptation to be dishonest. It is a great mistake to try and save the country at the expense of those who are serving it. You are starting at the wrong end; you cannot continue to hold your own salaries so high and cut the small man. When I come to the Budget proper in Ways and Means there are some aspects I wish to criticize but I would like to say, and I think I speak for the others on this side, that the attitude taken by us to-night is only by way of review and without the idea of getting down to a general line of action and when we get down to it I hope our criticism will not be taken in the spirit of being captious or carping. But as I see it, and they too, we must have some definite standing as to the railway question. We ought to know what the service, if any, is going to cost us before leaving this House. I do not think you can ask us to extend the courtesy, granted by us in forwarding other matters, so far as not to wait for this. I think it is not fair for the Executive Government alone to deal with such a question and it is not right to blindly close the House without letting the people know where we stand. We approach this,

not in the spirit of captious criticism, but to learn the truth and I say to the Government that we expect some definite remarks on this subject till later when it comes up for discussion again.

MR. WALSH—After listening attentively, Mr. Chairman, to the criticism by Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Higgins and other members of the Opposition I cannot allow the occasion to pass without a few remarks. I might say in beginning that the aspect of gloom and depression and despair outlined in the Estimates is obnoxious to me. I would wish to be able to compliment the government and recall the utterances that went forth when we were discussing the first Budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance. It will be recalled that the government were then asking the House to increase the civil servants expenditure by two millions that we could not afford. It was asked for, not for petty party purposes, but by such men as Sir M. P. Cashin who had handed down one of the finest records as a finance man in British North America and produced remarkable surpluses. I might say here that while I had not the pleasure of hearing his valedictory, I heard Sir John Crosbie say he was about to retire from the leadership of the party and will never again appeal to the country as a leader, I do not know if this is correct as I have not heard it from himself, but I want to say it is unfortunate if he has been compelled to arrive at this decision and it will be an unfortunate day for Newfoundland when she is deprived of the wide experience, integrity, honesty and ability of men like Sir M. P. Cashin. I will reserve comment on what might be the causes of such a decision till a future time, but I want to state right here to-night that if he remains, and there is not another man in the public life of the colony to do so, I will stand by Sir M. P. Cashin to the end. And notwithstanding what has been said, and notwithstanding

what we know to exist, if the people as a whole to-day knew part of the reason which lead to the decision of Sir M. P. Cashin, it would not be sufficiently strong to place him on this side of the House. As to the Estimates we are discussing I regret that the Hon. Minister of Fisheries is not in his place now. If he is absent through illness he has my sympathy, but if it is because he is sulky or not prepared to come here and hear the criticism I am directing towards him because of his public career, he has my condemnation, not my sympathy. He is one of the most prominent officials in the colony and played a leading part in the legislation of the last 18 months and it is an unfortunate state of affairs when we find the man who posed to know so much of the staple industry of the country sending forth this pamphlet which states that the fisheries are no longer important and we now turn our attention to the interior. This is one of the most serious, one of the gravest statements ever made by a public man. Under the department presided over by him, there are many subjects which I would like to discuss and I for one would like him to be here. A short year ago I rose from my place here and asked him to pay attention to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, as I had a largely signed petition from the people there for a fog alarm. He rose and publicly pledged myself and colleagues that its erection would be proceeded with. What do we find to-day after the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars? Placentia Bay is still without the fog alarm. As a matter of fact we went so far in August when we saw what the conditions were going to be like as to suggest to the Department that the preliminary work be undertaken so as to relieve the destitution to some extent. We went so far as to get some of the most important men of the Bay to write to the Hon. Prime Minister on the subject.

He very courteously referred it to the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries. I saw the reply and it said they knew nothing there of a fog alarm for Placentia Bay. I don't think that is good enough and I for one wish to enter my protest and I regret he is not in his place to-night. If he were there are several matters I would discuss with him. And I want his followers to understand that these matters will be discussed with him as a public servant, not as the head of his companies. He is in a position of public trust and is as responsible to the people of Placentia Bay as he is to those of other districts. Again in these Estimates we find votes that are not at all necessary. Sufficient will not be found for the men safeguarding our coasts and employed along our rivers. We will find that some of these after years of service have been dropped altogether despite the fact that we who run the affairs of the country have large salaries. I see by the Auditor-General's report that after the House closed last year you raised the salary of the Chief Justice by \$1,000, of Judge Johnson, \$1,000, of Judge Kent, \$1,000 and of Sir Wm. Lloyd \$1,000. You did this on Executive responsibility. I have no doubt these gentlemen do special and important work which entitles them to these salaries, and if the country can afford it they deserve it. The Chief Justice gets \$7,000; the other two judges \$6,000 each and Sir Wm. Lloyd \$4,600. After the House closed you voted the salaries of these men so that the top-off which you knew you would have now would not affect them at all. But the poor man, the river warden at Bonavista, Twillingate, Placentia Bay or some other part of the Island who has \$120 a year you have no hesitation in coming in here and cutting. You have no hesitation in docking the poor man in the Customs service 15 per cent. I think Mr Chairman that while I want to sympathize with the administration because

of the conditions which they are up against and their lack of money to carry on the affairs of the Colony. I want to sympathize with them on their lack of ability and on the state of affairs for which they are responsible, because in 18 months they have converted one of the most prosperous countries under the British flag into a land of destitution. When we went out of power we left an Exchequer of 3 millions for the rainy day. It was left there by the wise and judicious management of those who were forced to vacate office in November 1918; it was left there because as any men of foresight must have foreseen, these conditions would be on us after the war. But you came back from the polls intoxicated with the pride of victory and went blindly into the Treasury with only one object, to satisfy yourselves and friends. The money was handed out right and left and the followers of all sections of the government were satisfied. Now we have this spectacle after 18 months; we find that not only have we no surplus as predicted by the Hon. Prime Minister when he delivered the Budget Speech and estimated we would have at the end of the year \$100,000 but we have a deficit of \$700,000, not to speak of the railway muddle. Referring to this I endorse what has been said by Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Higgins. This House cannot be allowed to close as last year and despite the able address one night by the Hon. Prime Minister in dealing with the railway and despite the fact that much he said had my support, it is not good enough to stand here and preach one doctrine and go out and practice another. It is his bounden duty to see that when he himself departs for the other side, that men are not appointed by this House to form a commission to handle the railway and the affairs of the country. It has been said by Mr. Higgins that he saw by the paper that Hon. Mr. Coaker had a private car leaving town

for Port Union and that he would be back in a day or two. It is not good enough to have the taxpayers paying for that car for Hon. Mr. Coaker or anyone else. I remember when the railway was held up by snow and my constituents returning from Grand Falls were held up three weeks. Finally after that time they arrived at Placentia. I had numerous telegrams from them and I and my colleagues did what we could. We had to appeal to the Hon. Prime Minister, and I want to thank him for his courtesy in this direction, when these men were held up and the steamers were delayed by ice and they could not get to their homes at points in the Bay. We were notified by the men that the money they had earned at Grand Falls, and Badger was exhausted. They wired in to ask if their tickets from Grand Falls or Badger were not good to take them home even if they had to go to Port aux Basques and return down the coast. I and my colleagues had to go to the expense of sending these men home and I have in my pocket the third or fourth bill I have received from the Reid Newfoundland Co. in connection with the same.

Mr. Chairman, it is not good enough for me it should not be good enough for you, and I am surprised if hon. gentlemen do not rise to the occasion, and put a stop to this thing. There was a time when the old day coach was good enough for the hon. gentleman and it should be good enough for him to-day and surely if he is to have a private car it is not too much to ask for a second class fare for the fishermen that provide it for him. I repeat that I do not think this is good enough and I join hands with Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Higgins in asking the Prime Minister not to let the House close till something definite is done to deal with this matter of the railway. True it is a serious proposition to handle and I sympathise with the government in what they have to

undertake for, as Mr. Higgins has said it is difficult to make a railway a paying proposition in this country anyway, but an effort must be made to do the best possible under the circumstances as we cannot cut it out altogether. Now, getting back to the cutting of the salaries of the Civil Servants. The amount saved by this means will only be a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and if you do it you will be depriving many families throughout the country of their livelihood. You are depriving men of their support who have grown up in the Service as well as men who have disposed of their other means of support and who are now depending on the few dollars they get as civil servants. Again there are men in the city with large families who will be absolutely in want if you cut their salaries. You would be doing them an act of justice if you served notice on them now that their services are no longer required.

Now, you may ask what you are to get this \$230,000. There is one department that has been under fire quite a lot recently and I am going to have another shot at it as I think it can stand it. I am glad to see the honorable and genial head of that department, Dr. Barnes, in his place because when I have anything to say to a man I like to say it when he is present. We are asked to vote a million dollars for the department of Education; we are asked to vote large salaries for those in that department and to provide picnics for a chosen few who are now being trained in schools abroad. The trade Commissioners who were appointed to represent Newfoundland in the foreign markets have been recalled, it being evidently found possible to dispense with their services and why cannot we curtail on this Educational expenditure. Now the Hon. Dr. Barnes before the House closes will have an opportunity to justify that vote of one million dollars, he may be able to justify it in his own eyes but I doubt if

he will find it easy to do in the eyes of the country at large. There are a dozen specialists or whatever it is they are known as living in big hotels in the United States at the expense of the men who daily come to the Bar of this House pleading for assistance to carry on the avocations by the means of which they can earn their living. The hon. doctor and his assistants are drawing \$15,000 for their work in the department while fifty teachers in the outports must live on salaries that do not exceed \$300; the whole fifty of them are not getting as much as three or four in the department. Now, can the Hon. Doctor justify that? You try to clip the salaries of the under paid civil servants and yet you come in here and ask for a vote of a million dollars while I know places in the country where children are actually running wild for the want of a teacher. You can see ads in the papers day after day "Wanted a Teacher for Placentia or Greenspond or some other place, must be an A.A. and be a musician as well" and the ad. always winds up with "Salary \$450." Now, can you justify that? I know settlements where there are from twenty to thirty children and where there has not been a school for years and no attempt whatever has been made to deal with these places or to rectify the wrongs that have been done them. I want it to be distinctly understood that I mean no distinction on Hon. Dr. Barnes; I am referring to him as the Minister of Education and I criticise him because he owes it to himself, to the country and to this House to see that all extras at least for the present are dispensed with. To-day you have dozens of people away training, you have an office with all the trappings of a large department and yet there is no chance from the time when all the work was done by one man in the Colonial Secretary's department and surely when people come daily to the Bar of the House asking for help and considering

all the other circumstances surrounding the condition of the country, it is not unreasonable to suggest to the hon. minister that he should chop off at least \$250,000 of that vote for this year. That would give him three quarters of a million, and I think he could very well get along on that for the present. The Dept. of Agriculture & Mines shows in the Estimates at a slight decrease but I think for the same reasons I have already mentioned much more might also be taken off this department, especially considering the heads under which the money is to be spent. The most important vote is cut out, namely that for a geological surveyor. That is the one vote I had hoped to see here and it is the one that was the subject of so much discussion last year. When I vacated that office we had under consideration three very likely men from which to choose as an incumbent for that post. There was a gentleman named Campbell of Glasgow University and altho' there is a Campbell in the department now there would no doubt be room for two. There was also a man from Canada and another belonging to the United States. All were men who had labored long years in the great North West and were widely experienced in the geology of the North American Continent. You can never expect people to come here to develop our mineral resources unless we can supply them with the necessary data. It is futile to expect any reliable company to come in here on any other conditions and consequently I am skeptical and suspicious as regards the D'Arcy Exploration Co. I am disappointed too when I see that the vote of \$5,000 has disappeared from the Estimates, but I am still more so when I see \$30,000 here for a Model Farm. This is not and never can be an agricultural country in the true sense of the word and although the Minister of Agriculture may be pardoned because of his unbounded enthusiasm as an agricultur-

ist, because I believe he is in earnest. yet that is no reason why the country should go on voting tens of thousands of dollars that will not make her a return of five per cent. I believe that Mr. Coaker was sincere but that too was no reason why he should bring the country to the verge of bankruptcy by the trying out of his wild experiments. Now, Mr. Chairman it is a pity that more consideration is not given to these votes of the Educational and Agriculture and Mines Departments for if there had been we would be saved the obnoxious spectacle of coming in here and cutting the salaries of Civil Servants. I asked the question a few days ago about Old Age pensions. Now, this is something I am particularly interested in, and I remember when as far back as 1918, I occupied a seat on the Opposition side and I often made appeals to the people who now sit on the other side for the old worn out fishermen who were good enough to approach at election time, when we would go up to them and say Hello Uncle John or Uncle Jim, how are things going. How old are you now, I think 'tis time you were on the Old Age pensions list. When the gentlemen on the other side occupied seats on this side we heard a lot of what should be done for the aged fishermen, but when the scene was changed they were silent. I have here a list of old men from every district in the country whose ages range from 75 to 92 who have applied for the pension. There are five pages of names from Hr. Main district alone, perhaps most of these came in as a result of the by-election as I heard there was a commissioner appointed to register them. There are twenty from Port de Grave and between 35 and 40 from Hr. Grace, (I would draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education to that). He is gone, I wonder if he knows these names are down in Mr. Wood's office waiting to be put on the Pension list. The well

represented district of Bonavista shows only ten or twelve while Placentia and St. Mary's, a much smaller district has fifty applicants. There is something suspicious about that. Take the district of Carbonear, a very small district and with a small population, with fifteen applications unfilled. The district of Bay de Verde was apparently well looked after by the Minister of Shipping. Only four applications from his district have not been attended to. Trinity, a large district with practically the same population as Placentia, have nine applications on file in the department, although there are fifty for our district. Fogo was well looked after, there being only four from there. What relieves my suspicion, if I had any, with regard to discrimination, is after coming to the district of Twillingate, which is represented in this House by the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues. There are about the same number of applications from that district and from people who have not been able to get the old age pension, as there are from Placentia and St. Mary's. Burgeo and La Poile only a few; Fortune about a dozen; Ferryland 15; in all something over two hundred old worn out fishermen who have applied for the pension but have not yet received it. There may be two hundred more around the country who have not applied. Surely in consideration of what had been promised in some of the manifestos of a section of the government, and not only men, but women were promised this pension too—there is not going to be a hypocritical attempt on the part of hon. members on the other side of the House to deliberately codd these poor people. Almost every other day I receive communications from my own as well as other districts asking for this pension and people who have applications in expect to know the reason why they cannot get it. I think it was in 1909 in the Morris government that this

vote was first inaugurated. Four hundred old worn out fishermen were taken in at the start and it was followed up year after year and that number increased. Surely if the present government want to maintain what they stand for, namely, liberality and reform,—although I fail to see their liberality or their reform except to vote away millions of dollars on wild cat schemes—they will see that these 200 old age fishermen will receive the pension that they are looking for—men who are beyond their labor and no longer able to go out and toil. Mr. Chairman I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.
And it being past midnight

WEDNESDAY, June 8th, 1921.

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

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of the Department of Militia from 1st April 1920 to March 31st, 1921.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of Select Committee on the War Measures Act as follows:—

**REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE
ON WAR MEASURES ACT.**

We beg to report the draft amended bill herewith for adoption by the House

St. John's, June 8th, 1921.
(Sgd.) W. R. WARREN,
(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS.

On motion it was ordered that this report be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 8.

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

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Spinner's Cove in the District of Trinity requesting that if a census is taken that they be included in the district of Bonavista.

MR. ABBOTT.—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of in the district of Bonavista, asking that a postal communication be established.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave Notice of Question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Question two. The Government neither directly or indirectly has not made any representations to the Imperial authorities that a warship be stationed here. There was no correspondence.

Question three. There has been no definite communication from the Reid Newfoundland Company with respect to the decision of the Government as to the operation of the railroad on June the 20th. It is probable that we will hear within a few days.

Question four. I have asked the Deputy to prepare the information.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that a couple of questions asked by me of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have not yet been answered.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I

have given instructions to Mr. Stirling to get in touch with Mr. Hutchings of the Department and have it prepared.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—This is the Richard Kelly who filed the affidavit against Mr. Woodford. It is a nice thing for the Government of this country to pay this man \$62.00 per month as his price in this matter when the Government says it is running matters on economic lines.

CAPTAIN LEWIS.—While this question is before the House I wish to say that the Minister of Posts had as many as seventy-five applications for old age pensions from people in the District of Harbour Main but they were not heeded but they answered Kelly's by paying him \$62.00 per month. Kelly has been many days away from his office and I would like to know the number of trips he has made and the amount of repairs he has effected. This job was never in creation until Kelly unseated Dr. Jones and Mr. Woodford and if the Government intends retrenchment this is the first job they ought to dispense with. They ought though give the old age pensioners their consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Before proceeding with the Committee of the Whole on supply, with the courtesy of the Opposition, I suggest that certain items on the Order Paper be dealt with. On yesterday, we referred a bill re the War Measures Act in which Mr. Fox is interested, to a Select Committee consisting of the Attorney General and Mr. Higgins. That Committee brought in their report later in the day and I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Before the passing of this Bill, I wish to bid good bye to this Act. For the first time since 1914, peace is declared and it is time to get rid of this most dangerous act on the statute book. Since peace was declared in 1918 this Act was kept

in force here in Newfoundland and has been the curse of the country ever since. Last year the fishery rules were brought into existence by enactment in this House but afterwards they were found to be imperfect in their action when the test case came before the Supreme Court and the merchants who brought on the case got a decision in their favour, but this War Measures Act was availed of to carry out the rules and to-day Newfoundland is out of pocket millions of dollars; therefore I take much pleasure in bidding this Bill good-bye and I hope it will never return in our day. This Act was the ruination of many men, especially Mr. Penny who lost \$60,000 on fish. He had sold the cargo of fish in question but under the War Measures Act he was not allowed to sell it or export it rather. It was held over for months and to-day he is penniless. That Act was in the hands of unscrupulous men and Penny and hundreds of others are ruined to-day on this account. You know the man who ran this country with a high hand and used this Act to do so. You are some of his company. And to-day you are some of the pall bearers and chief mourners to that weapon with which he destroyed Newfoundland.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Before this Bill passes to abolish the War Measures Act, I would like to say farewell and to use the words of Sir Michael Cashin this country has lost hundreds of millions of dollars on account of its use in the hands of unscrupulous men. Rules re the fishery were found to be destructive by a decision of the Supreme Court but the government of the day under the leadership of Sir Richard Anderson Squires used this Act to get over the difficulty. To-day the government as well as the Opposition including the Minister of Shipping are the pall bearers and mourners and I do not know whether Mr. Coaker is dead or alive. I saw by the

Star that a private car is gone, but apparently he has not yet reached town. It is beautiful weather for farming and perhaps he is down at Port Union turning up bog. It is a pity that he and others prostituted this Act. This is one and only one measure of the government that I can readily support. It is time to have it removed from the reach of irresponsible people. There is a smile on Mr. Cheeseman's face and I guess he is glad too.

MR. CHEESEMAN—You are right.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—This is one convert and I see another in the person of the Minister of Shipping. I am afraid I will have too many converts soon. I want to say of Mr. Jennings that anything I had to do with his department was done with the highest respect to him, and this is not taffey, and I want all on this side to know it, that all I had to do was to write a letter to him and everything was all right, but I am back to the War Measures Act again. Bonar Law is gone. Coaker is lost, Lloyd George is ordered to be arrested, amen, the War Measures Act is gone.

MR. MACDONNELL—Just one word before this Act is wiped off the statute book for ever. I am aware of the Minister who introduced this Bill.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE—The Prime Minister.

MR. MACDONNELL—Thank you. That makes it all the worse. In one breath the Prime Minister tells us peace is declared and in another informs us that a warship has been brought here. We on this side do not know where we are. The Min. of Marine and Fisheries has seen fit to desert us, and I suggest that the Minister of Education find out where the Minister is by a algebraical problem using the two terms x and y . This War Measures Act has been used during the last few years to make war on the best interests in Newfoundland. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries

will be remembered by it, because he used it to make war on the fishery of this country. The rules proved to be abortive according to the decision of the Supreme Court and like the golfer he called to the caddie to bring up the mashie. He used this Act to get over the matter. Then the chief member of the government will be remembered by it as he used to overcome the difficulties in the matter of sugar.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House to refer to a matter of grave importance. The position, Sir, to-day is that as the Labrador service is to be run by the Ranger, Diana and Sagona, it will be impossible for the Conception Bay crews to get to the Labrador. In proof of this statement I say to the Hon. Minister of Shipping that from Cupids alone there will be 41 crews aggregating about 180 men, women and children which means that the Diana, considering their motor boats and other outfits, will not be able to clean that place out. The Ranger, as the Hon. Minister knows, will be wanted for Carbonear: and Hr. Main, Briggs, Clarke's Beach, Bay Roberts and Spaniard's Bay will have no accommodation whatever. Something must be done to change this condition of affairs. The Hon. Prime Minister, like myself, wants to get all the people of Conception Bay to the fishery. You, Mr. Speaker, as the representative of Carbonear, must realize that these three boats will not take them down. I want to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Shipping; I want other arrangements made. If from Cupids there will be 41 crews with 11 motor boats, that will fill the Ranger to capacity. I know as a matter of fact that she will not take these boats on deck. There will be considerable crews from Hr. Main, Port de Grave, Bay Roberts, Hr. Grace, Spaniard's Bay and Bay de Verde and as the service is constituted you cannot get them down. As you remember, the Edmund Donald, Ran-

ger and Sagona were engaged, but I don't know if the Diana was or not. I had messages then and some people even came to see me as to the matter of getting down. I hold no brief for the Edmund Donald, and I don't care what you do in the matter, but I do know that the most popular boat with the people going to Labrador is the Edmund Donald. I happened to be the acting manager or agent for the Edmund Donald, but that cuts no ice with the government. The owners supported the government; just now I think the government and individual members, of the company are not friends, but that has nothing to do with Conception Bay. She is the most suitable boat and will give the best service to those who are entitled to the best. You ought to consider this matter and decide on the best boats to get these people down. If you trust to those three boats you will not find them suitable as far as I can judge from the knowledge I have, and I wish Capt. Gosse was here, as I know he would endorse what I say. He knows the position. I am appealing to get these people to the fishery so that they can produce the revenue. You Mr. Prime Minister can see my position. Another matter which has been brought to my attention, and which I and the Hon. Minister of Shipping have discussed in a casual way is that of the passenger accommodations on these three boats. The Sagona was run by the Railway Commission and after the 30th of June by the Reids. There was a great discrepancy in the fares, on the Sagona the price was \$17 and food provided and on the Diana, it was only \$6 and find yourselves The people prefer the latter rate. Under the late government that was arranged with the Reids, and I think it ought to be held to now. It may cost the government a little, but it will be a mere bagatelle to the already long list of expenses. I say to the Hon. Minister that I protest against Brigus

being cut out as a port of call for the season.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—It has been advertised as a port of call already.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like it decided now so that I could telegraph my constituents that the Edmund Donald will be put on, and if it is necessary to do so take the money from my road grant and take the people down to Labrador. I will work in harmony with the Minister to get them down, not only from my own district, but from any others as well. The Hon. Mr. Warren who was formerly the representative for Port de Grave will sympathize with me in the position. I want the same rates as on the Ranger and Sagona. I am sure the Hon. Prime Minister will agree with me on this in the interests of the people, even though the owners of the Edmund Donald are not now in favor of the government; we are bigger men than that; give us the Edmund Donald and she will take 600 people against 250 on the other boat, and will also have space to carry their motor boats and outfits. I know that the Hon. Min. and the Hon. Mr. Warren will agree with me. I regret that Capt. Gosse is out of the House as he is acquainted with this subject because he goes to the Labrador himself. I ask for an answer, as I want to give it to my people. As to the matter of rates, a rate was fixed on the Glencoe to take the people down the Straits, and if it was fixed on her why should it not be on the other ships. I appeal on behalf of the whole of Conception Bay.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—Replying to the member for Port de Grave, I wish to say that for the last three or four weeks the Sub-Collectors from Brigus to Western Bay, have been finding out how many people are going to Labrador. According to them there will be about 800. Figuring out as we have with the arrangements for the Labrador—the Diana and Ranger going and the Sagona following—we think these

can clean all the places up. The Ranger is going to Western Bay, Carbon-ear and Hr. Grace and will take about 300 or 350 people. The Diana calling at Hr. Main, Brigus, Cupids and points along the coast will take another 300. The Sagona leaving on the 15th or 20th of the month will take about 250. That I calculate will take up the 800 or 850 which according to the Sub-Collectors will be all those intending to avail of the boats. As to the rates on the Sagona I interviewed the Railway Commission this morning, and they promised to take up the matter and let me know what they would do I think they will accede to the \$6 rate. The Edmund Donald is an excellent boat, but to my mind she has one fault I was informed by men who went down in her last year that while she has splendid passenger accommodation and space for taking the motor boats and outfits, she is not fitted to contend with ice and if as usual they meet it they fear for what will happen. That is the only reason I did not avail of the Edmund Donald this spring in trying to effect the charter. On the other hand the price charged for her last year was outrageous. She cost \$10,000 for a month besides coal etc., amounting to \$19,000 altogether which for the trip was excessive. This year we thought we could get the people down cheaper. I would like to say that as far as the figures furnished my office and the information of the Sub-Collectors go. I think the three ships would clean up all going to the Labrador satisfactorily.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—The expiation of the Minister and the information of the Sub-Collectors show they don't know what they are talking about. There are 41 crews and 11 motor boats in Cupids alone, and the Diana cannot carry them. You say the Ranger is going to Western Bay and Carbon-ear and will clean up these points; but what about Hr. Grace and the other places.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—She will clean them up too.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am glad now that you brought up the matter of the price charged for the Edmund Donald. She was chartered to the Reid Nfld. Co. and the amount received as shown on the books in my office to-day does not exceed \$9,000. The friends of the owners must have been getting the price. Your charge is totally incorrect. You might have paid it but the others got it. I don't want the people of Conception Bay, in view of the existing conditions, to suffer for want of a boat. I say that the whole thing as far as the Conception Bay people to-day are concerned, is impossible. You certainly cannot move them in these boats. Say the Edmund Donald is no good and get the Eagle if you like; but a fourth boat is needed to move them. I hope you will do something right away as I want to telegraph my people that the extra boat is arranged for. The Edmund Donald does not bother me. I want the service for the people, and I say that those of Cupids will fill the Ranger. These Sub-Collectors who gave you the figures are asleep; they do not know their way around after dark. The idea of the ship calling at Western Bay first is only with the object of christening your own child first. I do not blame the Minister for that; but I want the people of Cupids christened there and I will not be satisfied till I get an answer. I have put this plainly to the government and the Prime Minister, and I ask for another boat to carry down the crews. I have been open enough to say take my district grant or supply for the purpose; but get them down. That's the point. They have gone down for years like cattle but the few dollars necessary for the extra steamer would make no difference. When we go in under Canada it will cost us a few dollars at right.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am sor-

ry for the political reference the last speaker has made before sitting down.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Forget it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This is an entirely new matter that I will be glad to take up with the Minister of Shipping when the House rises.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—This is a half holiday, and I will be satisfied if I get an answer to-morrow. If the Minister will answer it then I will be satisfied.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—If the Diana and the Ranger cannot accommodate the people I do not see why another boat cannot be put on.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Sir John Crosbie has said that I know something of the conditions, under which these people go to the Labrador. There never was sufficient accommodation and while I had the honour of representing Port de Grave I was bombarded with requests as to boats and the ports to be called at to bring the people down. I hope the government will see their way clear to get the fishermen down as so much depends on their success at the fishery.

CAPT. LEWIS—I would ask leave, Sir, to say a word or two on this matter. I endorse all that Sir John Crosbie has said. Knowing the conditions as I do, I say that the Diana and Ranger are no better than cattle boats; and I have letters to produce in (this respect that would make the government sit up especially as to the Diana, while she was on the service last year. If there is now an opportunity of getting a better boat we should lose no time in getting her. I am pleased to know that the people are taking up the prosecution of the fishery notwithstanding the setbacks they have met, and I will be delighted to learn that they are preparing to go and get the revenue from the deeps which a bountiful Nature provides. I am pleased to know that they are so determined and we should make every provision possible for their comfort. The few thous-

ands saved in this transaction by not putting on the needed boat will not save us from bankruptcy. You could not spend it better than in arranging to take them to Labrador. One boat it is said will sail on Monday, the other on the next Monday and the third on the 20th. As you know there will be a rush of those who are trying to get trap berths. This will be discrimination and those who cannot get passage on the Diana or Ranger will be at a disadvantage as the others will be six days ahead of them. I think you should consider this fully and well and see that there is safe accommodation. I am informed that the Ranger will not get out of Western Bay as she will be filled by the people there and of Carbonear. I understand that the Sagona will take only women and children. It is said there will be more men than ever, fishing this year. You will have to take their families and boats etc., and if it does cost a few thousand more it will be money well spent as it will be put to the convenience of the people.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to permit the increased railway fares at present in effect to be charged by the Reid Nfld. Co., after July 1st next, seeing that in the United States and Canada there has been a reduction in railway fares since the beginning of the year as part of a general movement to reduce the high cost of living and if the government does intend to permit the railway company to charge increased rates will he state the reasons which the government considers justifies such a step on its part?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the government either directly or through His Excellency the Governor, has made representation to the Imperial Authorities that a warship be stationed in this port all the summer and giving as a reason therefor, the fear that disorders may

take place, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copies of any communications in regard to this matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked hon. the Prime Minister what steps, if any, have been taken by the government to prepare for the contingency of the Reid Nfld. Co., refusing to operate the railroad system of the Colony after July 1st and if any negotiations are in progress between the Reid Nfld. Co. and the government with the object of arranging a new contract or other agreement for the operation of the road during the next year!

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As to question three the government neither directly or indirectly has not made any representations to the Imperial authorities that a warship be stationed here. There was no correspondence. As to question three there has been no definite communication from the Reid Newfoundland Company with respect to the decision of the government as to the operation of the railroad on June the 30th. It is probable that we will hear within a few days. As to question four. I have asked the Deputy to prepare the information.

MR. MACDONNELL—I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that a couple of questions asked by me of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries have not yet been answered.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have given instructions to Mr. Sterling to get in touch with Mr. Hutchings of the department and have it prepared.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What quantity of fish the schooner "President Coaker" discharged, what are the qualities. How much was destroyed unfit for food; what amount was paid for cold storage under agreement before said vessel arrived and what amount is paid per month now for said cold storage. How

much has been sold up to 5th June and who has control of selling said cargo and what price was paid for what has been sold to date.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—Asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraph to lay on the table of the House the following information: "If Richard Kelly of Holyrood is in the employ of the Post and Telegraph Department? If so, what are his duties and what salary is he receiving?"

CAPT. LEWIS—While this question is before the House I wish to say that the Minister of Posts had as many as seventy five applications for old age pensions from people in the district of Harbor Main, but they were not heeded, but they answered Kelly's by paying him \$62.00 per month. Kelly has been many days away from his office and I would like to know the number of trips he has made and the amount of repairs he has effected. This job was never in creation until Kelly unseated Dr. Jones and Mr. Woodford and if the government intends retrenchment this is the first job they ought to dispense with. They ought to give the old age pensioners their consideration.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the War Measures Act—1914."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the general expressions at the departure of—I was go-

ing to say an old friend—an old enemy. The War Measures Act was enacted in 1914 at a special war session of the legislature and it was enacted for a very high and a very specific purpose. I think that it was at the suggestion of the British Government that it was put on our Statute Book in the first place and I think that in every other part of the British Empire was past similar legislation. The object of the Act coming into existence at all was for the sake of the Empire and for the sake of Newfoundland and it was not anticipated or never contemplated that it would be put to any use; it was absolutely intended to go on the Statute Book of this country as a precautionary step during the period of the war. All through the war that Act was on the Statute Book and it was never applied until a necessity arose which was not covered by any other Act. In other words it was put on the Statute Book for the express purpose of meeting cases of emergency arising out of the war. The War Measures Act was a very safe and a very necessary piece of legislation when properly and judiciously used. It was availed of by the last administration in a proper spirit and for a proper purpose, and as has been stated here already this evening, it remained for the present administration to prostitute that Act for their own selfish and ulterior purposes and that is the reason that we gladly subscribe to its passing and to its obliteration from the Statutes of Newfoundland. To allow it to remain on the Statute Book, under present conditions, would be putting a weapon in the hands of irresponsible individuals who will not stop and have not stopped in the past from carrying out their own personal and ulterior designs to the detriment of the whole country. The War Measures Act was capable of doing anything or being used for any purpose,

There was no limit to its powers and to the powers given to the Governor-in-Council thereunder, except the tearing up of the very constitution itself. As I have said before, Mr. Chairman, on many an occasion in this Chamber, the rights and the powers of this legislature should not be voted away or given away to any body of men in this country, because of the viciousness of such a principle. But I see the door is being closed this afternoon and the Act, in its entirety, is to be wiped out and no longer can the legal and legitimate rights of the people be interfered with. The object and the purpose that stood behind this enactment, known as the War Measures Act, was for our Imperial and Colonial safety. The danger of having such a powerful weapon in the hands of unscrupulous and irresponsible men, men who have exploited the War Measures Act in every conceivable fashion for their own advantages, individually and collectively, is about to be taken away, however, and for that we are very thankful. I am very glad indeed that the Select Committee who considered this Bill have in their report suggested the entire obliteration of the Act from the Statute Book of this country, and in doing so these gentlemen have performed a public service. They fulfilled a duty, which was entrusted to them, fearlessly and properly and I hope that their finding will have the endorsement of the entire House. I hope that every member of this House will vote out of existence a measure that has been so very aptly designated this afternoon, prostituted and put to uses to which it was never intended. It was used not as in a time of national crisis and not as in a time of emergency or not when matters of a national or Imperial character were at stake, as it ought to have been used; but rather was it used in a time when selfish interests were at stake by irresponsible

individuals who really did not know the trouble that they were bringing on the country. By the use or rather the misuse of this Act by the present administration it has cost this country millions of dollars. This is the one piece of legislation that we on this side of the House subscribe and gladly subscribe to in order to wipe out a measure that will put in the hands of those men who form the present Executive Government, a weapon that they at any time may use for their own selfish or personal purposes. Now that it is dead I want to join with others on this side of the House in paying it a tribute of disrespect and I hope that neither this country or any other part of the Empire will ever re-enact such an Act to be used in the way this one was.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, as a result of the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John's West, I feel I am compelled to say something on the subject matter now before the Chair. The War Measures Act was a very necessary Act. Under that Act great good was accomplished for Newfoundland and I can substantiate that assertion by citing an instance where-by the War Measures Act brought untold benefit to the country. During the time of the Tonnage Committee and before the Department of Shipping was in existence, conditions in connection with the marketing of our codfish was anything but desirable. There was no trouble to get any kind of a price for codfish, but the great trouble was tonnage and how to market our products. Conditions that arose were such that it was found impossible to effect insurance on cargoes of codfish in sailing vessels going to European markets because such vessels had to pass through the war zone. Sir John Crosbie has a perfect knowledge of the matter of which I speak. The trade along Water St.

and in fact all over the country was very much agitated over the situation that had arisen and fish purchasers contended at the time that it was useless to buy fish if they could not get it to market. For two or three weeks matters were at a standstill. Nobody would ship fish to market unless insurance could be got on the cargoes; When Lloyds refused to issue insurance the National Government effected insurance on Government account to the extent of a million and a quarter dollars and sent vessels with fish cargoes across the ocean, through the war zone to the fish markets. This step was taken under the War Measures Act that we hear so much about. The National Government, of which I was a member, took a wonderful risk and there was a great possibility at the time of having imposed on this country a liability of a million and a quarter dollars. Providence, if you will, favored the National Government and practically all of that fish reached its destination. I think, if I remember rightly, only one cargo was lost. The insurance premiums were so high that the Government of that day made money on the transaction, and that is one reason why Sir John Crosbie had a balance in favor of the Shipping Department when he vacated that office. Supposing it had turned out the other way and those vessels had never reached the other side. Don't you think there would be a loud cry from the people throughout the country over our attitude and would not we be asked what business we had to jeopardize the people's money. However, luckily it turned out all right and the country benefitted millions of dollars by the use of the War Measures Act at that time.

But what I object to is for the hon. member for St. John's West to make the accusation he did against the administration who used the War Measures Act during the past year or

two. He accused us of having prostituted that Act for our own selfish and ulterior ends. I think that statement is unworthy of the hon. member. If things turned out wrong in 1920 when there were scarcely any risks to be taken and turned out alright in 1918 when the risks were great, surely that is only a matter of luck. As a member of the Executive Government I may inform the hon. member that I am prepared to take my share of the blame for whatever was done. I throw back in the teeth of the hon. member that anything done under the War Measures Act last year was done for selfish motives; it was done for the best purposes and for the best interests of the country generally.

MR. BENNETT.—The way to Hell is paved with good intentions you know.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I am sure that those who take a leading part in the Government of to-day exceedingly regret if anything they did turned out detrimental to the best interests of the country. Measures were brought into being last year with the object of relieving a desperate and trying situation and the ultimate object of bringing good to the whole country. What was expected did not materialize and the advantages that should be derived were not derived, owing to the lack of unity and co-operation; and not alone that, but everything possible was done to defeat the object hoped to be attained. That is one of the reasons that we are left in the position we are to-day. I hope that the War Measures Act will never have to be used again, and I hope that Mr. Bennett will give us the benefit of the doubt, as what was done by us under that Act was done in the best interests of the country and not to serve any selfish or ulterior designs.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Minister of Posts

and Telegraphs has revived and I am pleased to see him once again to his feet. He is looking much better now. He told the story of the War Measures Act during my absence from the House this afternoon and stated how that Act helped me to make money for my department. It was partly correct, but otherwise absolutely wrong. When the War Measures Act was used properly it was alright, but when it was prostituted it was all wrong. As Mr. Bennett has told you, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions and that is exactly what happened to you Mr. Halfyard. Your intentions were good, but it was a curse that befell this Colony the day that you used the War Measures Act to control something about which you knew nothing. It was such men as you Sir, who prostituted the War Measures Act. Not even the great Coaker himself could outwit the greatest governing factors the world has ever known—the law of supply and demand—and that is my answer to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. People who used the War Measures Act in the National Government knew how to use it and when to use it. Yes, I made money out of insurance under that Act, because the Government was practically forced to take up the question of insurance and deal with it at that time; but I am afraid that there are people in this country, particularly the member from Trinity, who do not know the first rudiments of war insurance or marine insurance or any other kind of insurance. What has been said by members on this side of the House concerning the prostitution of the War Measures Act to satisfy the personal spleen and selfish desires of certain members of the present Executive I reiterate now, because the War Measures Act was never intended to be used as it was under the circumstances in the Smith-Shipman case in the Supreme Court. It was

never intended to prevent a man from conducting his own business properly. Consequently, it was a curse to this country and nobody knows that better to-day than the Hon. W. F. Coaker, who said in his circular to a section of the people of the country, "I am living in Hell while I am in the House of Assembly." It was not Hell, it was the remorse of conscience that was troubling him and which is worse than Hell. If the War Measures Act had not been enforced by the present Executive Government, and of which Mr. Halfyard is a part, concerning the handling of our fish products we would not be in the serious position we are to-day. Men would have been allowed to conduct their own businesses properly, our commercial fabric would not be tumbling down about our ears and millions of dollars belonging to the people of this country would not have been scattered to the four winds of Heaven; and then the Minister of Posts & Telegraphs says that if there had been unity and co-operation under the War Measures Act that the fishery rules and regulations would have been successful. Business men, if they displayed any intelligence at all, could not possibly unite, under such rules and regulations. What do you find to-day as a result of the regulations? You find a fisherman going around town with a yaffle of fish under his arm all day, unable to get a purchaser and begging merchants to take it at any price. As a matter of fact fish is practically unsaleable in St. John's to-day, and the great Liberal Reform Government are responsible for this state of affairs.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—There are lots of places outside of Newfoundland he can sell, Nova Scotia for instance.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Coaker, after a long search, could not find any outside of Newfoundland; he better send you next.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I am not going to listen to personalities.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You'll take your medicine.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I did not refer to you personally, but in your capacity as Chairman of the Tonnage Committee.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—And I am referring to you as a member of the Executive Government. When I was a Minister of the Government I was able to take any amount of criticism and I got it too. Now you take it.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I'll take it, you are only injuring yourself.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You can't injure me, you who was small enough to dismiss a little 16 year old girl because her father had voted for me.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—My demeanour is judged by intelligent men.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Your demeanour is it Mr. Halfyard, why you are not even full measurement to get up and tell me that this War Measures Act was used properly and correctly in 1919 and '20. I regret that you should have so far forgotten yourself as to be a party to such infamous transactions. Save me from myself you ought to say. It would be far better if you had acted differently than you did in connection with one Richard Kelly of Holyrood, whom you gave the position of Telegraph Repairer in payment for signing the affidavit against William Woodford. When I ran my department, it was in a business like manner and my record stands before the country to-day. When every country was in want of food and tonnage I produced both of these two great essentials for this country. I do not claim to know it all, but I bow to no Minister of Ship-

ping that you have had here yet. When I ran the Prospero and Portia I had a credit, after leaving the Department, for \$135,000, for which amount I now hold a certificate from the Auditor General. Does the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs know that when I left the Shipping Department in 1919 this country was paying \$17 a ton for coal and a few months after the people were called upon to pay \$21 a ton for it. Does the Minister know anything about that? The idea of a man getting up and talking about how that War Measures Act was used, when as a matter of fact he does not know whether or not it is fit to eat. May I say that I support the Act for the reason that it is no longer required on the Statute Book of this country and I support it for the reason that the present Government are not fit to have such a dangerous weapon in their hands and a weapon which they might use in the same way as they have used it during the past eighteen months. That is my answer to the Hon. Mr. Halfyard.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—We have been called misfits and incompetents by members on the other side, but I reiterate that Sir John Crosbie had luck at his side; because there were certain things contemplated and mooted to be done, under the National Government, that were not done, and if they had been done there would have been a different story to tell. Now I would like to ask Sir John Crosbie who it was suggested that the Newfoundland Government endorse and guarantee the Roumanian Bonds?

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You remind me of a sparrow flying around a blackbird, saying if I were you I would put my head under my wing. I have not yet discussed Roumanian Bonds and before I am through with discussing them you will have got more than you bargained for. I know all

about what happened in connection with the Roumanian Bonds and I was going to tell you about the Escasoni too, as I was afraid you did not know anything about her. You and your associates who were with me in the National Government know that I did my part like a man, and when I was wanted, day or night, I was always on the job. You know that when your master, Mr. Coaker, or Mr. Lloyd wanted me I was always to be found and your mind is narrow enough now to come and ask me about Roumanian Bonds. The very man who saved you and I from endorsing them and the man who kicked hard against our doing it was Sir Michael Cashin. That is the man who strongly objected to it when you and I might have been weak enough to sign them.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I am glad you admit it.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I want to tell this country that Sir Michael Cashin was the man who saved you and I from falling into a pit hole and saved this country from being burdened a million and a quarter of dollars. That is an open confession of the transaction. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the rest of the Executive of the National Government, with the exception of Sir Michael Cashin, were prepared to endorse the Roumanian Bonds with a guarantee from the Government. And then you get off the chestnut that I had luck with me. You remind me of the fellow in Cobalt called lucky Martin. The only difference is that I am called Crosbie. It was not luck that you said followed me; it was a bit of common sense and ability that I exercised in connection with the Shipping Department and I got that long before I met you.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—You know luck follows ability very often.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I am begin-

ning to agree with you now. I would like to point out how the present head of the Shipping Department has been handicapped by the crowd who sits in the Executive. The right place for him when he took charge of that department was in the Executive and he should not have taken dictation from anybody else. No man could run the Shipping Department, under the War Measures Act, or any other Act, to be ordered about to do things by men who do not know the stern from the bow of a ship. The War Measures Act, as it was used in 1919 and 1920, was the greatest curse ever known to Newfoundland, because it was in the hands of men who did not know how to handle it. Now do you understand that?

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the Hon. Mr. Halfyard as to my reference to the War Measures Act under the present administration. It was quite right and proper for the Government to take authority during the war under the War Measures Act and to insure the fish that was leaving this country for foreign markets. It was absolutely impossible to get insurance outside and the National Government had to take a chance, and that was one of the reasons why the War Measures Act was put on the Statute Book, namely, to provide the necessary machinery to legalize any course that would be considered advisable to adopt, arising out of the war; but when you come to interfere with the legitimate trade of the country or to be used by a person in the heat of disappointment and to serve his own personal and ulterior purposes, then you are using it improperly. We all know of the famous Smith-Shipman case; this firm, it will be remembered, made application to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a permit to export fish to the United States. They had the gold in the Bank to pay a high

price for the fish that was here and they wanted a permit for to export the fish that they had ready for shipment. There was no fault to find about the price that was paid for the fish or the quality of the fish, there was no reason whatever as to why the shipment should be meddled with; but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wanted to know every detail as to the private business affairs of Smith and Shipman and because he did not get that he refused to issue the permit. The Company appealed to the Supreme Court, through their advisors, and asked for a writ of mandamus to issue to the Minister of Finance and Customs. The judgment of the Court was that the Regulations were Ultra Vires to stop the shipment of fish; then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries finding his authority nullified, applied the War Measures Act and thereby disallowed the fish to be shipped. That is why I say the War Measures Act was used for personal advantages, because I have no doubt that if the fish had been bought from Mr. Coaker there would have been no difficulty about the shipment. It was evidently bought from some merchant, not a political supporter, of Water Street, but that did not satisfy the caprice of Mr. Coaker and to get even he prostituted the War Measures Act for his own political and ulterior motives.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, unlike some of my colleagues I cannot express regret on this occasion, but rather extreme pleasure in saying good bye to the War Measures Act. I quite agree with Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett in their replies to the Hon. Mr. Halfyard and I think that it would be far better for Mr. Halfyard if he had played the role of the apologist rather than the role he has played. I have often wondered at the ominous silence displayed by the members of the Government for several

weeks past. Evidently they must have recognized that before the people would take them seriously that they would have to explain away too many of their misdeeds during the past eighteen months. Some of them had the wisdom to keep their seats and say nothing; others including Mr. Halfyard, made a hopeless mess of it. It is perfectly correct that the War Measures Act was designed with the best purposes in view. There was the laudable object of assisting the Empire and aiding in the war work of Newfoundland generally and if that Act had been carried out for the purposes intended everything would be alright. But it was not used as a War Measures Act and it was the misuse of it rather than the use made of it that brought forth such antagonism. The Hon. Mr. Halfyard attempted to draw an analogy between the use of the War Measures Act under the Cashin regime and the use of it under the present administration. The question of insurance on fish cargoes going across was a very wise and proper act on the part of the late administration. Premiums were excessive because of the great risk that had to be taken to see that no disaster befell the staple article that went overseas at that time. The thing turned out successfully, not because of luck as Mr. Halfyard would have the country believe, but, because the transaction was put through by competent men.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—What did competent men have to do with the safety or otherwise of vessels crossing the Atlantic?

MR. FOX.—When the late Government went figuring out their chances for carrying out their operations successfully they had the wisdom to see that no great hazards would be taken financially. They knew, as they had it figured out beforehand I presume; that if many losses in vesels were met

with that they would be reimbursed sufficiently by the precautionary step that they had taken, namely, the high insurance premiums. But when you come to talk of the use that the War Measures Act was put to during the past 18 months, it is enough to make the Hon. Mr. Halfyard and his colleagues hang their heads in shame. As Sir John Crosbie put it, the Act was prostituted to serve their own ends and their own personal purposes. The Act was alright in the hands of men of prestige and experience; but when in the hands of a group of irresponsible and unscrupulous men it had only one effect and that was the crippling and ruination of Newfoundland, and, after all, it is only what we could expect. I make this statement, without fear of contradiction, that not alone was the War Measures Act prostituted last year and used for personal and ulterior purposes, but that the exports of Newfoundland were held up mainly in the interests of the fishermen of the F. P. U. The Western fish was held back while the Northern fish went to market. Penny's fish was held up while Mr. Coaker's was being sold; and perhaps the reason was that Mr. Penny was not a supporter of the Government. The War Measures Act was also used to safeguard further the interests of those who sent Mr. Coaker, Mr. Halfyard and other members of the Union to this House. Mr. Coaker wielded that one weapon more than any other over the heads of competitors, because as Minister of Marine and Fisheries he was in a position to know everything that went on relative to the fisheries, under the fish regulations. He was head of a large corporation and he could make his plans accordingly and he would not be human if he resisted the temptation to always keep one lap ahead of his competitors. Take that message read by Sir Michael Cashin with reference to the ten

thousand quintals of fish which could have been sold in Montreal. He would not let that fish go because it was not offered at his own price. Would the Hon. Mr. Halfyard kindly explain that away and then explain why Coaker undersold the Regulations in Oporto and other markets and then ask this country to believe your statement that the act was not put to a nefarious use and not put to selfish and ulterior purposes.

The hypocrisy of the whole thing is sickening. Newfoundland is ruined to-day in many respects, in particular has she been brought to this condition by the misuse of this act in their own selfish and private interests. Everything Sir John Crosbie said this afternoon was correct, and everything Mr. Bennett said was correct. The War Measures Act, says the hon. member, did good for Newfoundland. It did good when it was used properly. It was in its misuse that the wrong was done. How the people of the West Coast tolerated it is beyond my comprehension. Death came to them in the most horrible manner. Bit by bit these people were ruined. It was done by people who had no pity in their hearts, and then you talk to us about the laudable uses to which it was put. Go to the West Coast and see the very people who loathe the very name of the War Measures Act, and hate the name of the Administration. Talk about the "Deserted Village." In Newfoundland to-day there are many deserted villages owing to the misuse of the Act by the Administration. You may try to give explanations, but you will never be forgiven for the acts of the Squires-Coaker Administration. It is sickening to see the results that have followed. It is a tribute to the law-abiding instinct of the people of Newfoundland that such a thing was allowed to go on. I venture to say that in no other country in the world

would it be permitted without the people rising in a body to oppose it. You might well thank your stars that you were governing such a law-abiding body; not that you governed them well, but because they tolerated your acts. Go to Mr. Harris and Mr. Penny and tell them that you had good intentions. Mr. Harris may well be sorry that he supported your government that has brought him to ruin and the four or five thousand families that are depending upon him. The wages of sin is death. And then the hon. member comes in here and says that he is prepared to take his share of the responsibility for the results. It is an easy matter to say that and ask the people to accept it, but put it in a money denomination. You were not there to make mistakes. You were there as public trustees. You deserve censure from the people, and the authority taken from you that you have so misused. The people have to pocket their sorrows and their loss, and then you come along and say that you are prepared to take your share of the responsibility. If the man who is responsible for this condition was handling a private business not only would he be dismissed from office but he would be held for criminal offense. The only thing that saves you is the fact that you are in a position to defy the law. Take that instance of the swapping of the cheques. If he were manager of a private concern and did a thing like that he would be punished by the law regarding such criminal conduct. The owners of the business would say to him not only have you trifled with money belonging to us but you are untrustworthy and unfit to handle our business. Now he is afraid to come up here and face it. He is a Judas and he knows it. The Kaiser ruined Germany, and he is now hiding in Holland. Instead of comparing himself with Bonar Law he had better compare himself with a man of at

least equal prominence who practically brought the world to ruin. Good-bye to this Act. Yes. We will never bring Newfoundland back to the position she occupied before Mr. Halfyard and his colleagues took this War Measures Act into their hands for their own purposes. All the water in the sea will never wash you white. Go to the people and get your verdict on this Act. The people are determined that you will never again become the trustees of the funds of the Colony.

MR. VINICOMBE—Mr. Chairman, before this Act is repealed I would like to offer my sympathy to the government in the loss of a very dear friend, but although a friend to the government a foe to the country. Of the Executive I find two members in their places. Mr. Halfyard got up, and he has come in for a lot of criticism. Mr. Warren is just as responsible for the things done under this Act as Mr. Halfyard is, but lawyer like he held his tongue. Mr. Coaker and Sir Richard Anderson Squires could not stay in the House, it was so heartrending to witness the departure of such a dear friend. I am not going to detain the House, but I only want to say that some people connected with the government thought this Act was only a laughing stock. The Chairman of the Food Control Board thought it was something to amuse the people with, and although his name is Mews I am afraid he did not a-mews the people very much with it. I have asked the question in this House as to who is responsible for someone getting ahead of the government in this deal. Mr. Gosling has been blamed, but he denies it.

We have been told here that this War Measures Act has been a good thing for this country, but the sugar control does not seem to indicate it. I am glad that it was given to a select committee of Mr. Warren and Mr. Higgins, but I think the Prime Minister is so depressed about its departure

that he could not stay in his seat. But I stand here this afternoon to congratulate Mr. Warren and Mr. Higgins on throwing out the measure altogether. I think Mr. Halfyard agrees that it should be removed, but like a lawyer he put his foot in it. I have great regard for Mr. Warren, he being a great friend of mine and born in the West End, but I am surprised that he should work against the district that sent him to this House. Now he comes in and says that it was done when he and the Prime Minister were absent from the Colony. It is a godsend that this measure is being taken off. I would suggest that Mr. Warren get a lot of order papers and send them to all the public schools and ask the teachers to give the children a holiday. Have a salute fired from the warship to-morrow at twelve o'clock, and properly celebrate the passing of this famous Act.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Chairman, I am afraid it is a case of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. To my mind, martial law is obnoxious to any liberty loving people even though there may be a state of war existing and the greatest care and caution should be taken by the government that any step to stifle free speech is not a too extreme action and I for one heartily support the removal of this Act from the statute books. Even though this Act is gone still the Executive authority of the government remains and with this weapon the government can do as it sees well. When the House closed last year the government did what they liked with the railway and this in an instance of it. If there is sufficient following they can vote hundreds of thousands of dollars on executive responsibility despite the protest of the Opposition. I am glad to have the opportunity of saying a farewell word to this Act. I would like to see an amendment to the whole constitution making it essential to bring in all legislation to be discussed

here. That brings me back to the rail way problem. During this very session you ought to put your cards on the table and do what should be done, and not wait till the House closes. This is a very important subject to the people of this country. We are faced with the position of the absence of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and with the exception of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of shipping there is no executive member of the government present. There should be a protest from both sides of the House on this account. Many of those present day after day do not draw the big salaries like those who are absent. They are not here to answer reasonable criticisms after they have practised discrimination on the people of this Dominion. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has used his position for the selfish ends of the interests he represents and he should be here now in his place to answer. If he is suffering from ill health well he has my sympathy, but he is still a servant of the Crown. No matter with what party or government Mr. Coaker and his following is allied there will be discrimination by him for his own selfish ends. He will control any government He is the dictator and the manipulator At any time when the Minister of Marine, puts a scheme before the Executive Council they have to put up or shut up, no matter whether they are in favour of it or not. It's no use of my dealing with the Act any further. The previous speakers who are much better qualified to deal with the matter have done so very exhaustively. But there is one feature of this War Measures Act that they did not touch upon and that is that this Act is bordering upon military law. If the story is correct the government is responsible for the bringing of the warship here, and some of the officers came ashore and asked where the row was,

and I have not heard this denied by any member of the government. This is a disgrace to this country. But still we hear the vilification of Sir Patrick T. McGrath and others in the press. I hold no brief for this gentleman, but yet I see that all he stated in his reports to the New York papers was quite correct. When I first came into public life eight years ago, although Sir Patrick McGrath supported the party of which I was a member, yet he was not a personal friend of mine. I have read the article which appeared in the New York papers, and all he said was correct. Men came here day after day looking for supplies, and there were appeals from the whole island as to what the government intended doing. If this is the report which is responsible for the bringing of this warship here well it is a standing disgrace to the oldest Colony of Britain which has sent its sons and daughters to help the mother country in the time of distress. These men came to the Bar of this House quietly and decently, and it is their privilege to do so if they have a grievance to disclose and enquire about. If they were any fire arms exhibited it would be all right to bring this ship here. I hope the past addresses will be of some effect to frustrate the government in any future attempts to have such high handed conduct as we have seen in the past.

CAPT LEWIS—I wish to add a word in farewell to this obnoxious War Measures Act before it passes the House. A good deal has been said and great deal more may be said in relation to it. I must offer my congratulations to the Prime Minister for bringing in this Measure, and I hope this Act will be put aside for all time. The ground has been well traversed by the preceding speakers on this side of the House, but still the House may be kept here the next twenty-four hours in discussing it further. It came into force in 1914 and to my mind had the

government been wise and judicious it would have been wiped off the statute book when peace was declared. This Act has been the cause of a lot of destitution. In 1919 the New York buyers came here to purchase fish with a handsome figure and through the efforts of Messrs. Smith and Shipman the rules were upset by a decision of the Supreme Court, but then the government put into force this measure. I regret the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here. He indeed used this act to his own selfish advantage. The Minister of Marine said no when many sought to sell their fish in channels different than those through which the Minister wanted it disposed. This is why the fishermen of today are coming back to the government looking for supplies. This Act should have been lifted eighteen months ago. The people should have their choice as to what they would do with their fish. I hope and trust that it will be never necessary again to have another War Measures Act enacted. Before taking my place I would like to refer to the grave responsibility the Executive government took upon themselves during the past eighteen months. I think during the present regime some legislation re the railroad. This is the place and time when a matter of this kind ought to be discussed. We are here for that purpose. We are not here to help increase the taxation of the people, but to relieve it. Two millions of dollars have been saddled upon the tax payers because of the handling of the railroad by the railway commission. Previous to last year there was a deficit of five hundred thousand dollars, according to the returns of the Reid Nfld. Company. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice were absent from the country when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook this matter. On this account there has been increased taxation to the extent of thirty-five per cent. We are now faced with a

deficit of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The road has not been improved nor has the passenger traffic. Where are we to come in. Why should the Executive undertake such a deal as this. This is the time and place to handle it. If we are to put through legislation or learn what the Reid Nfld. Co. will do, this is the place for it, and I join with the other members of the Opposition in the idea that this House will not close till this thing is straightened out. It will remain open till August if necessary, and we will speak against time, as it is most important that we should not be taxed three millions next year, as we were the last. Even the roadbed was not done this year. Then there is the matter of the terminus at Placentia and I repeat this House will not close till we hear what legislation is proposed. This is one of the most important questions of the day. The War Measures Act was important as it brought trouble of all kinds in its trail. Look at the conditions we meet as we go up the West Coast. I am sorry that Mr. Small is absent just at present as he might tell us how his district was served through it. Mr. Penny, a wealthy planter of Ramea, was sacrificed. He is here in town now, and if he could tell his story at the Bar of this House, it would bring the members of the government to their senses by showing them what is due to the War Measures Act and the Fish Regulations. These unjust laws brought about the conditions which we have to cope with to-day in trying to get the fishermen to the fishery; and believe me, without the fishery we will have no revenue. We positively must have the men fishing. Now after Mr. Penny take the example of Mr. Harris, also of the West Coast. His business has been fully ventilated in this House already. He sent a petition here voicing the grievances of the people of Grand Bank and Burin, and as we all know, the prayer of that petition was

not granted or agreed to. Through the Fish Regulations and the War Measures Act he suffered like Mr. Penny. These are only two of the West Coast merchants who were virtually ruined but there are many others. Come right here to St. John's and see how many brokers now running who were here in business last fall. They were doing business with the people of New York, but not one of them is buying fish to-day. The men who are here with fish to sell are finding the greatest difficulty in disposing of it as there is no competition nor outside buyers, and they have to take whatever is handed them, \$4 or \$5 a qtl. The War Measures Act drove our best purchasers out of the market; when that was enforced last season you cut the prop from under competition in this country in buying, and this is why I to-day am heartily in accord with it going into oblivion, and I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister in the resolution to repeal it and sink it for all time.

Mr. Chairman, when we rose for tea I was pointing out to the House the effects of the War Measures Act in connection with the exportation of codfish and particularly Labrador fish and to prove that my remarks were bona fide, I want to point out that there are 19,000 quintals of Labrador fish, purchased with the money taken under the War Measures Act, now in store at Tessiers and other places. This fish is held here and the only comfort the Government can bring to themselves is that it will be in the market in September or perhaps late in August and they expect to get returns for the money that has been expended for it. Through the enforcement of the War Measures Act that \$500,000 was taken from the treasury by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and it would never have been taken had not the War Measures Act been enforced. That 35,000 qtls of Labrador might have been sold before

the five hundred thousand dollars could have been got in the usual way, as I understand American buyers had \$100,000 here for the purchase of fish and these 35,000 qtls would have been consumed and the money in circulation and there would have been no loss as there certainly will be now. The President Coaker's cargo was sent to Genoa where some of it is now in store while some more of it was thrown overboard. One thousand and eighty-six quintals of this fish which was shipped as number 1 will only be paid for as number 2 by the purchasers. On that 35,000 qtls. of fish the country will lose not only the \$350,000 that was taken to purchase it but other losses will be incurred on it as well and that is one of the reasons why I am glad that the War Measures Act is to be wiped off the Statute Book.

Again, leaving the fish and coming back to the matter of the Food Control Board and sugar, I understand that all this was done under the heading of the War Measures Act. So much has been said on this already that it is not necessary for me to go into it now at any length any more than to say that the whole thing was a mistake, a heart-rending mistake. We were taxed twenty-five cents a pound for sugar when we should have been getting it at twelve and a half cents, and now as soon as the Food Control Board goes out a duty is put on which will be, with the addition of the new surtax, equal to the cost of sugar in New York. In that market the price of sugar is five cents while the duty in this country, plus the surtax will I think amount to five and a half cents. If it was not for the Food Control Board, dealers here could have had enough stocks to last the country for six months before the extra duty was put on and now instead of paying 15c. per pound for it

as we will have to do, we would be able to purchase sugar at 12c. and all this can be traced back to the War Measures Act. I am glad that at last it is to sink into oblivion and I trust that never again, at least in our time, will a War Measures Act be enforced in this country.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the House longer than to place myself on record as saying good-bye to this measure which is at last to be wiped off the Statute Book of this country. I had the honor of a seat in this House when the War Measures Act was passed and I am glad to be still here when it is going out of existence. Since that time some of our finest young men have gone forth to fight for their country and while some of them have returned many others have laid down their lives and are to-day sleeping in France and Flanders.

The War Measures Act was alright up to eighteen months ago because the men who were in the Executive up to that time saw to it that the measure was not prostituted but since then it has been used with discrimination, to the betterment of some districts and to the detriment of others, including the District that I have the honor to represent in this House. As I have said, I do not intend to delay the House and the debate might have been closed long ago if it had not been for the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. I am wholly in accord with this Bill and I compliment Mr. Warren and Mr. Higgins who I understand were responsible for drafting it and finally I hope that never again in our time will a War Measures Act be placed on our Statute Book.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill goes through I would like to make a few comments thereon. I think that this agreement is a very good one and I hope and trust that the operations of the Company will be successful. One thing, at least, we will be able to know as a result of this proposition and that is whether or not we have any oil in Newfoundland. I think that the terms and conditions of the contract are very favorable indeed to the country, and I would like to say, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the introducer of the measure, that I happen to know some of the men personally who are directors of this Oil Company. They are men of very high standing in England and men who are just as anxious to find oil as we are. From the information I got on the other side the British Government will be better pleased than they have been for a long while if oil is struck here. I must congratulate the Hon. Mr. Warren in getting such men of such high financial standing to come here to develop our resources. I think that if they strike oil that it will be one of the best things that ever happened Newfoundland. I endorse this Bill and give it my hearty support.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the confirmation of An Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, and the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd.

It was moved in amendment that the matter be submitted to a Select Committee consisting of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins.

The amendment was agreed to, and it was so ordered.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, for some weeks past there has been on the Order Paper the following: "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd." I might say for the information of the House that this agreement was arrived at during the absence from the Colony last summer of the Attorney General and myself. While in policy it is a very excellent contract, yet in draftsmanship it is not as perfect as is considered desirable. Sir William Lloyd, Registrar of the Supreme Court, who in conjunction with Mr. P. J. Summers, Deputy Minister of Justice, were the draftsmen on behalf of the Government. The contract actually signed was the draft contract which never came back for technical revision. Under these circumstances, I am going to move as an Amendment that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee of five, namely the Attorney General, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins and myself, to consider the matter referred to.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Before going

into Supply, I think the information promised by the Prime Minister with reference to the Sales Tax should be furnished. I do not think we should be asked to go on with the Budget or the Estimates until it is explained where and how he proposes to get the \$900,000, as outlined in his Budget. At all events we made considerable progress this evening by wiping out the obnoxious War Measures Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—When we go into Committee of the Whole on the Budget I will bring down printed Resolutions in connection with the Sales Tax.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Perhaps you may have some information that you will let us have to-night relative to this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have not brought the papers in connection with that Sales Tax business. I have a draft prepared of what the proposition is, but I was not going to submit it until in final form. I propose to have it ready for to-morrow afternoon.

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.

THURSDAY, June 9th,

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

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, June 10th.

The House met at three of the clock

In the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SINNOTT.—Mr. Spenker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Placentia and St. Mary's asking to have the old road from St. Bride's to Branch repaired.

The petition is a reasonable one and the request one which the Government should not hesitate in granting. I am quite aware, of course, of the exceptional conditions that confront us at the present time and the consequent scarcity of money at the Government's disposal but to us that is all the more reason why this work should be undertaken without loss of time, as the employment which would be afforded thereby would prove a particular boon to the people of that section just now. Many a good man of today has seen, and rightly so, the inestimable benefits to be derived for this country from the development of tourist traffic and in this we must follow the example of other countries or fall behind. I cannot state too emphatically what a good road in this section will mean and why this old historic mail road with all its historic associations should have been allowed to fall into disrepair and disuse is a mystery to me as well as to many others. There is only the bridge over Rocky River Falls to be rebuilt and surely what our grandfathers could do we can do now. I have here a picture of the old bridge and I would like the Prime Minister and the members of the Government to see it.

I shall not dwell, Mr. Speaker, on the splendid sport with rod and gun which is to be had in this section, suffice it to point out that there is the Colinet River, Rocky River, North Hr. River and South East, while the shooting in the way of partridge, black duck and geese, to say nothing of the noble caribou, the emblem of our regiment, is the best to be found in any part of the country and who

that has visited Fulford's Hotel does not want to return there again? Now that the terminus is to be taken from Placentia, give us this motor road for the convenience of the hundreds of people who will be affected by the change. What with the Cape Shore where the sheep-raising industry could be developed to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, Cape Lance where cattle raising should be almost as extensive and add to this the twenty-five hundred people living out of the fisheries and you have some faint idea of the fruits that are to be derived from a good motor road between the points I have named. There have been families with fish in their stores which they were unable to market because of the lack of transportation facilities and although the codfishery is the sheet anchor of the country, let us not forget the land and all that is sure to accrue to us from its development.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition and I want to fully endorse all that my colleague has said in connection with it. I think that when it is realized what the opening up of this road will mean in the development of tourist traffic, because for scenic beauty and the other essentials necessary to encourage tourist traffic this section has no equal in the country, the amount that will be required will not be regarded as unreasonable. In the United States there are thousands of persons starving for the very things that this country has to offer and I would once more appeal to the House to give this matter the best consideration.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker. I wish to congratulate my learned colleague, Mr. Sinnott on the very able and eloquent way in which he has drawn the attention of this House to a matter which is of the utmost importance, I want to congratulate him be-

cause of the able and statesmanlike manner in which he has put forth the appeal to get back to the land. It is true that the fisheries are the country's mainstay but the possibilities of the land must not be overlooked. I reiterate all that Mr. Sinnott has said and I cannot too emphatically urge upon the present administration the necessity of having this road attended to at once and it is certain that anything that is spent in the work will be returned two-fold.

What we want is that bridge put across Rocky River and we want it done this year. There is no reason why those magnificent salmon pools and those rich agricultural lands should not be there for the benefit of the people of this country as well as for the benefit of the sportsmen from outside. Some of the very finest salmon pools we have in this country are situated on the Branch River. I noticed that the Prime Minister proposes to lease some of the salmon pools of the country, well here is an opportunity for him to lease some at Branch and some of the pools in St. Mary's Bay. Let us build that road at South East Arm at Placentia. It is well known that the pools at S. E. Arm or N. E. Arm, Placentia, are unequalled in any other part of the country. Respecting this agricultural land on the Cape Shore, if the Government gave this matter their earnest consideration, it would give an opportunity to the people there to market their cattle and their agricultural products and their fish and not have them, as in the past, hung up there indefinitely. It would prove a great boon to the district and to the people generally and a great source of revenue to the country if the prayer of the petitioners is acceded to. I strongly support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, Mr. Sinnott, and ask that it be given the careful attention of the Min-

ister of Public Works, not to have it side-tracked, as happened in the past.

HON. MR. FOOTE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lawn asking for a special grant of two thousand dollars for the purpose of rebuilding a road, known as "the highway." I might say that this section is part of the main road and over which there is considerable traffic going on. The petition, therefore, deserves every consideration and I give it my hearty support.

MR. CHEESEMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague. I might say that if the request of the petitioners is acceded to it will not alone be a benefit to the people of Lawn, but to the whole district. I feel that the most careful attention and earnest consideration will be given this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House the following:—

Statement of Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1920.

Statement of Imports and Exports of the Colony for the year ended 30th June, 1920.

A Comparative Statement of Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1919, and 30th June, 1920, showing increase and decrease for the year 1919-20.

A Comparative Statement of Revenue received at each of the Outports for the years 1918-19 and 1919-20.

A Comparative Statement of Light Dues showing collection at each Outport for the years 1918-19 and 1919-20.

A return of the Bank Fishery for the year 1920.

A Statement showing the Revenue collected on goods, wares and merchandise imported through the Post Office.

A Statement showing the movements of Shipping during the year ended 30th June, 1920.

An Abstract of Shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1920.

MR. LEGROW tabled report of the Select Committee on Pensions and Gratuities to Newfoundland soldiers and sailors who served in the Great War.

On motion the said report was received and it was ordered that it be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, in connection with that report just tabled by Mr. LeGrow, in the absence of Mr. Small, Chairman of the Commission, I want to say that we were unanimous in our findings, and that, as a matter of fact, we went a little beyond the scope of our commission and we suggested that an Insurance scheme be considered by the Government. I think that the Prime Minister has already heard of something in relation to this matter. Many men have come home from the war wounded in such a manner as not to be able to get insured by any insurance Company and we recommend that the Government do something in this matter. We have also asked that applications of returned soldiers be given precedence when vacancies occur in the civil service, and we trust that this matter will also receive the earnest consideration of the Government. We are aware that to meet all the recommendations made in the report would involve a large outlay at the present time; but I am sure and all are convinced that the Government can meet the first mentioned recommendation, without having to vote anything extra, as we know that there are sufficient money outstanding at the Militia Department to cover same.

MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence for a few moments while I make a suggestion, and I am

sorry that the Minister of Shipping is not in the House. Several recommendations have been made to me in relation to the sailing of the Labrador steamer. A great many of those people who are going to the Labrador are of the opinion that the steamer will be sailing too early for the convenience of all concerned, owing to the fact that most of these fishermen have only been supplied this present week and they feel that they will not be ready to go by the steamer sailing on Monday next. In the recommendations that have been sent to me, I have been asked to bring this matter before the Government with a view to getting the steamer detained until June 20th or thereabout so that all people who are going to the Labrador will have time to make preparations. I am in a position to know that the greater number of these people have only received their supplies within the past couple of days and some of the outfits are yet in St. John's and have got to be delivered in various points in Conception Bay. Consequently, they cannot make ready to go by the steamer sailing on Monday next. I trust that the Government will give this matter serious consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the hon. member would discuss the matter personally with the Minister of Shipping that he probably would make more progress in five minutes than he would for the whole afternoon if discussed by the House. I think the Minister of Shipping is engaged now discussing some departmental matters, including the subject matter referred to by the hon. member; but he is due back in the House shortly when no doubt he will be glad to take the matter up with the member for Hr. Main.

MR. LEWIS.—Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to call the attention of the Prime

Minister to a question I asked in connection with the sanitorium and to which I have not yet received any reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I may say that the answer to that question was typed and will reach here in due course. The answer in effect is—though I cannot guarantee the accuracy of it as I am only speaking from memory—that at the present time there are 80 patients in the Sanitorium, which had a total capacity of approximately 130 patients. The estimated cost for the supplying of the Sanitorium on the basis of 80 patients is in the neighbourhood of \$67,000. It works out at \$2.30 per day per patient to increase the occupancy to 130 patients for which it would be necessary to take a vote for \$109,000. With respect to the question of distribution. Generally the districts are fairly well represented. However, I will be glad to lay all the information in detail on the table of the House when it comes down.

MR. SULLIVAN.—The reason why I ask for this information is because I have now a couple of young girls from Sound Island and Hr. Buffett; also a couple of boys who are in the incipient stages of consumption and if something is not done for them at once it will be too late, because immediate admission to the Sanitorium is their only chance of getting cured. It seems to me to be cruel on the part of any Government to curtail by debarring those who are afflicted, from getting a chance to enter that institution, which was provided for the purpose expressly of alleviating this terrible scourge—Tuberculosis. I, for one, am prepared to go to any length to see that necessary funds are provided to carry on that institution. There is no doubt that Tuberculosis is prevailing on a large scale in this country. As we have the accommoda-

tion, I do not see why it should not be carried on, no matter what the expense, fill up the institution and give those young people, who are afflicted with this terrible scourge a fighting chance for their lives. I know of a half dozen patients belonging to my district who are waiting to go in there now and I know that we have recommendations from the nurses who were sent to Placentia Bay by the Government to have those patients put in the Sanitorium at once. If it is a question of a hundred thousand dollars to carry on the work, as it should be carried on, let us vote it. We will fritter away twice that amount within the next 12 months. Let us act in the interest of humanity. I would impress upon the Government the desirability of providing a sufficient amount for this purpose when dealing with the Estimates.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker. With the observations of the Hon. member I entirely concur. The institution is there and nothing will give me greater pleasure if the Legislature will vote the necessary funds to carry on that institution. The present Estimates provide for the capacity of the institution as it came into their hands and even with a slightly increased occupancy of about twenty. When we are dealing with this vote, provision can be made.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Then you will have my support.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table the reply to a question asked some time ago respecting the Sanitorium.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I endorse all that has been stated by Mr. Sullivan. This Sanitorium was undertaken and founded in 1918 by the late government on behalf of humanity. I understand, as a matter of fact I know, because I visited the institution, that there is room there for 50 more patients to-day. The door at that institu-

tion is being knocked down there daily by people looking for admission. Owing to this condition of affairs at the Sanatorium there are down at the General Hospital several T. B. cases who are mixed up with the other patients. Still here we are day after day and prepared to turn a deaf ear to these poor afflicted people. Are we to take it this afternoon that the government does not intend to move in this matter. Do you intend to put it off from day to day until after the House closes, and then tell the public that they can wait until the House meets again. I think that for the sake of humanity the government ought to open the doors of the Sanatorium to the public. We have Dr. Rendell in there who is a very capable man. He is willing to do his best, the place is completed except for beds, and here we are with the excuse that the government cannot afford to pay two dollars and a half daily for this purpose. Is that good enough? That is apart from politics altogether. We have hundreds in this country suffering from this White Plague who could be saved by proper treatment, and here we are splitting hairs over the amount it will cost, and the only excuse the government has to offer is that every district is represented in the Sanatorium.

THE PRIME MINISTER—No such statement was made.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I don't care where the people come from who are there. If the accommodation is there it is your duty to see that that institution is provided with beds, and not allow this House to close and that institution go by default for another year because you have not a vote for the necessary money. What did the building you purchased in St. John's West a few days ago cost? Why did you purchase it? This will have to be answered and a little later on I will tell why. There is room for fifty more beds in that Sanatorium and there are hundreds clamouring for admission

and not one man on the other side of the House will lift a finger to help them.

If that is representation I don't know what representation is. I was at the General Hospital the other day, I have a couple of patients there who are in an advanced state of T. B. having hemorrhages every other day, and Dr. Keegan says that they should not be there at all. Dr. Rendell has room for fifty more patients in the Sanatorium and he is not allowed to put in an extra bed, and we vote thousands of dollars for useless measures, but we can't afford to pay two dollars and a half a day for the sake of suffering humanity. Now I hand this warning to the government that, unless something is done in this matter, I will air this subject before the House closes. I was into the Sanatorium a few days ago and it is a lovely place with all modern equipment, except for the lack of beds. Mr. Jennings you are in charge of that Sanatorium. What have you to say?

MR. JENNINGS—The water supply at the present time is not sufficient for any increase in numbers. We had a hard time to manage on it all the winter.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Is it not correct that you refused to put beds in there, you said that the government could not afford it. That building is there and you are receiving five thousand dollars a year for looking after it, and you are not doing your duty, you should tell the government what you need for that institution and get a vote for it.

MR. JENNINGS—I am not paid for looking after that institution.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Is it not part of the Public Works Department, and are you not in charge of all public buildings? Why don't you place a vote in the Estimates for that place and ask us to vote for it. When you were in Opposition you were heart and soul for this project, and now that you

are in the government you won't carry it out. Hundreds of people are dying for want of treatment and you are to blame because you won't make representation for one hundred thousand dollars for this purpose.

MR. JENNINGS—It is up to this House to vote the money.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You bring it before the House and we will vote for it. I will not sit down under this state of affairs. I will discuss this subject again in this House, and you had better take notice and get those fifty beds put in. If you have not the money take up a collection, and I will start the collection this afternoon with one hundred dollars. It is preposterous to keep these suffering people waiting for treatment which they need so badly.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker. I regret that owing to a severe cold I am not in a condition to talk very distinctly, but I feel it my duty to make a few remarks in connection with the subject before the Chair. The initial cost of building the new sanatorium was provided by the late government, but the actual cost to complete and furnish it, cost several thousand dollars more than this amount, in fact including the water supply it will exceed one hundred thousand. In relation to increasing the number of patients this is next to impossible till the new water supply is ready. One of the difficulties with which we had to contend the past year and which caused considerable anxiety was to arrange for a sufficient supply of water for the use of the institution and we had to resort to artificial means in order to meet the demand which was considerably increased when thirty military patients were transferred from Jensen and Escafont.

In the reply to question tabled today is the number of long term patients under treatment there. I find

that quite a number has been there over a year, four were admitted in 1918 and two has been there since 1917. When patients have to remain under treatment for such a length of time it proves that there cannot be such a number of patients treated at the Sanatorium comparatively as at the General Hospital.

Among the 80 patients at present treated at the Sanatorium 31 are military. Among the Districts, St. John's East and West has 23 patients. Trinity 8, Ferryland 8, other districts from 2, 3 and 4. A few districts have no patients there. There is one important fact in connection with this question which we cannot afford to overlook. Great care should be taken in the admission of patients in the advanced stages of this disease on the purpose for which the institution was primarily intended will be defeated, viz., the treatment of T. B. in the incipient stages of the disease when a cure is hopeful. We have to admit the unfortunate fact that there is enough people suffering from consumption in this country to fill the Sanatorium to its uttermost capacity.

If that class of patients was admitted without discrimination it would be impossible to admit the class of patients who has a chance to be cured. Opinions have changed considerably since the tuberculosis campaign was first started and I have heard statements by several medical men this past year expressing a very doubtful opinion as to the possibilities of curing T. B. Dr. Jones would be more capable of expressing an opinion on this matter. We have carefully considered all the plans of providing a suitable water supply. The proposition made by the Municipal Council in this respect was submitted to the Board of Works and after giving the offer serious thought, it was not considered feasible, particularly in view of the fact that a suffi-

cient fire protection could not be guaranteed and we were also informed that the Council considered that the city supply would be possibly overburdened by such a demand as would be necessary for the supply of the Sanitorium and Insane Asylum combined. There has been obstacles in the way of getting the pipe line completed but no delay has occurred through neglect of the work and we hope to have the whole thing completed in a few weeks. No one would be more pleased than myself if it can be found possible to operate the Sanitorium to its full extent.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the statements made by Sir Michael Cashin in this matter, and I would ask the Government to give this its due consideration. I think it is only in line with the principles we have ourselves admitted in this country. Sir John Harvey started the campaign against this White Plague. Unfortunately this country is particularly afflicted with this terrible disease. There is no form of affliction more pathetic than Consumption, and whatever side of the House we are on we ought to see that this work of mercy is carried out. The Government should bring in a vote for that purpose as it is only from the Government it can come. Those of us who are in good health ought to thank God, and the least we can do is to see that the best possible is done for those who are suffering from tuberculosis. Nothing should appeal more to us than the thought that we can prolong in at least comparative comfort for a year or so the life of a person suffering from this affliction. And right here in St. John's where there is such a lot of this disease I can endorse the prayer of those who set out the great necessity for putting in these beds, and so do I join in telling the Government that so far as we are concerned we will vote any amount

that they put in the Estimates for this purpose. It is the duty of the Government to do this even if they have to make sacrifices in other directions. In our estimates we cater to the people in their strength; let those in their strength make some sacrifice for those suffering from this dread disease.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in this connection, as I think that every member of the House has a particular interest in this subject. When I heard the other night that the Government did not intend to put any more beds in that Institution I was astounded. It is incredible that the Government should take this attitude after the late Government going to the expense of putting up that institution to cope with this dread disease, Consumption, from which so many of our people suffer. I think that the Government are falling down on their job when they intimate to us that they intend to keep those new wards locked up for want of funds. I know something of that place, I was in the Government when it was erected, and it was intended for the benefit of returned soldiers. Jensen Camp was only a temporary shack, and was insufficient and this Sanitorium was to take its place. It was represented that the building on Signal Hill was no further good and it was decided to abandon it, additions were made to the Sanitorium to meet with the military and the other cases which might arrive from Signal Hill. It was not in the minds of the Government as to what it would cost to maintain this Institution, because they realised that it had to be maintained at any cost, and I care not what you cut down, I will not be a party to any reduction in the vote for that Institution. It must be maintained in its fullest capacity. If this place is abandoned for want of funds it will be a monument of dis-

grace to the government. Rather than this let every member in this House sacrifice his Sessional Pay, let the Civil Servants be cut in half, before the people suffering from Tuberculosis are left to die for want of proper treatment. We built that place and let us use it, because the necessity is great and if we don't use it Tuberculosis will increase tenfold in this country. This is bound to happen if the people suffering from this disease are allowed to remain in their homes. Mr. Jennings has said it could develop into a home for Incurables. I contend that this place has a record for cures second to none on this side of the Atlantic, outside of the highly scientific institutions, and the expense in view of this is a trivial matter. If the government say they cannot open the new addition to the Sanatorium because of an insufficient water supply, then when is the water supply going to come. They are at it over a year now. We always had sufficient before with the help of wells, and electric pumps, and if the water supply will be there this summer, take a vote and open the rest of the wards. I endorse the remarks of Mr. Sullivan, and I think they should be endorsed by every member of this House. The vote in the Estimates for Tuberculosis should be sufficient to meet all requirements.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House long at this time. Admitting that Mr. Jennings is right and that there would not be one life saved in the Institution, look at the numbers who might be saved indirectly, by getting these people out of the way, away from home where there may be six or seven children, and if we only did that would it not be of a great benefit to humanity. With reference to the late Government not voting sufficient money for this Institution, they thought at the time it was enough. I

admit that it might be necessary to spend an equal amount on the water supply to that which has already been spent, but would it not be better than to spend the fifty-eight thousand dollars which you have spent on the water supply from the South Side Hills, for which you will get no return whatever, except the connection with the Sanatorium. You should have been able to make some deal with the City Council in connection with the water supply.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

In reply I might say that we tried hard to make a deal with the Council but they refused us the right of connection, or rather they retained the right to connect all along the road, and we would have to pay them a rent, and they would be able to collect all taxes.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Even if they did reserve that right would it not be better than nothing. Surely the Government have enough power to come to some understanding with the City Council. Here they are getting a source of revenue and they are not prepared to give one cent to the Government. The city is moving West and it will be only a few years before that would be a source of revenue to the Council.

DR. JONES.—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in seconding the suggestion, in fact demanding, that there shall be no retrenchment in the Sanatorium. There can be no doubt that it is the best place to get cures in the first stages of tuberculosis. It is a very poor excuse to say that it is an institution for incurable cases. I have in my district cases that have been benefited by treatment in the institution, and they will, we hope, be a benefit to their families for many years to come. After all it is the poor people who keep up this institution, and they get very little out of it. The districts

contribute per capita to the support of the institution, and I believe the Government would be well advised to increase for its' support.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support what has been said regarding the Sanitorium. I am surprised at the attitude of some of the men here, even the attitude of the members for Trinity. Only last week I had a communication from Torbay from a man 42 years old. This man has been laid up with Tuberculosis, and the Prime Minister said in his manifesto that he was going to fight vigorously against this dread disease, but now he is decreasing the vote. Surely the members for Trinity have something to say on this measure. I am not joking about this matter. It is my duty to get up here in the House because it has been brought to my attention very strongly this week. I hope a sufficient sum of money will be put aside for this purpose.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that the Prime Minister did not carry out his intention to appoint a Ministry of Health. I think we would have got very much better results from a Ministry of Public Health Department than from either of the two new Ministers appointed. It would be an easy matter to put a medical man in charge. He does not have to be responsible to this House or to anybody in the country. I hope this vote will be sufficiently increased to maintain this institution on a proper basis.

SIR M. P. CASHIN gave Notice of Question.

MR. MACDONNELL gave Notice of Question.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles."

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Minister of Public Works the

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to amend the Act Cap. 40 of 11 Geo. V, entitled "An Act respecting the Maintenance of certain Public Roads."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—With regard to the scale of the fees to be imposed I understand that they would be from \$100 down to \$50.00. I think the Secretary put up as good a fight as he could to keep them up.

MR. HIGGINS.—I have no personal knowledge as to what actuates this varying fee. However I think it is unfortunate that the ordinary type of motor man has the impression that this Road Commission is run by the Government. They think that the fees are converted into a political machine and if this is correct I quite agree with their contention that this should no longer continue. If there be anything personal in my remarks I think the Chairman will have a chance later to deal with it. In the district of Harbour Main with which the hon. member for Fogo has been so much identified, the great bulk of the money has been spent but I am quite aware that the great bulk of the motor driving is done up in that district. When in the district during the last bye election I was given to understand that the hon. member for Fogo in his capacity of Secretary of the Commission promised all sorts of jobs with regard to the work of the Commission up there, and out of this grew the impression that this commission was a political machine and the Secretary will readily see that if such be the case the owners of cars would certainly be justified in resisting it. The way of the reformer is hard and perhaps the secretary thought that the best results could be obtained by getting the assistance of politicians. He

was looked upon as assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines during the snow shovelling escapade in the district during the bye election. As yet nothing much has been done in the East end. The people really think there has been a breach of faith. I supported the road idea because of the enthusiasm of the mover of the bill. I trust that the hon. member for Fogo will understand the personal aspect I have given this matter and this is the explanation of the great amount of dissatisfaction in the non-payment of the taxes and they will never be collected.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—In relation to the political aspect, from my knowledge of the work of the Road Commission, I say there were no politics mixed up in the work at all. The Association appointed a foreman and the work was done under its direction and the largest sum of money spent was done so under its direction. The Commission spent their money on the purchase of machinery and they refunded to the Association the sum of four thousand dollars and all the work was done out in the Harbour Main District because that thoroughfare was said to be the best one for the try out. It was never mooted at the Motor Association meetings that politics should play a part. I just make that statement to straighten out matters.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I contend that these Resolutions before the House should be put aside at the present time. The previous speakers have spoken my sentiments in the matter. But I wish to point out that if ten thousand dollars of the Government money was spent there should be a statement of its disbursements.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—All the information obtainable was tabled.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—The machinery cost the whole of this sum. I am

going to object to the handling of this matter by the Road Commission any longer. The Board of Works is the proper factor to do this. Owing to the financial condition of the country this vote ought to be cut out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—This vote is not in the Estimates.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Then it should not go in the Estimates. Our roads are used mostly by the motor car owners and they should be taxed and it is to their advantage to spend some money on the improvement of the roads because to use the words of the Attorney General they would save their tyres. The machinery that was imported ought to be such that it can be used anywhere. I understand that it was only used in the district of Harbour Main but when I was up there some little while ago there was no improvement at all except at Fox Trap Hill. I will support these Resolutions if the money is handed over to the Minister of Public Works. But I am going to oppose any further vote by the Government. Any further sum of ten thousand ought to be immediately used to the benefit of the Tuberculosis Hospital.

MR. BENNETT.—I rise for the purpose of not merely objecting to the Resolutions but to the present constitution of the Road Commission. Three are appointed by the Motor Association, three by the Governor in Council and then there is the Minister of Public Works and the East and West end road inspectors. I claim that constitution is wrong. The Government has six members on the Commission. I am not in accord with the idea of cutting out the ten thousand dollars but let it be spent by the Motor Association and let that organization have the benefit of the two road inspectors but let it run in a non-political way. Then there would be more confidence in the whole thing. It is the opinion of ninety-nine per

cent. of the people that twenty-four thousand dollars were spent between here and Kelligrews. I will read some extracts from a letter I have here which was addressed to Mr. Fox from the Motor Association. (Reads.)

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Does it say how much was spent on machinery.

MR. BENNETT.—Yes. (Reads.) I take it that the ten thousand contributed by the Government was spent on machinery. The Association decided to buy machinery at a meeting which I attended and they bought some before this Bill was introduced. As to how much was spent may I address the question to the Chairman?

MR. HIBBS.—In reply to the hon. member for St. John's West, I may say that amount spent on actual road work was \$7,600. As there appears to be a confusion between the Road Commission and the Association I think I should make an explanation. The Road Commission was brought into being last year by an Act of Parliament but the Motor Association was already doing road work on the Topsail Road. The Association spent a lot of their money and they spent it in anticipation of this Bill. They were looking forward to the Road Commission coming into existence. I always contended that it would be improper to have the roads built by a private organization. The Provincial Governments of Canada built their roads from taxes they imposed on the car owners.

If you go through the States or the Provinces you will find that when it comes to public highways they are controlled by the Public Works Department, and I think it should be the same here. I have come in for a lot of friendly criticism and I will reply in the same good spirit. Perhaps it is unfortunate for me that I am Secretary of the Road Commission and was born in Harbour Main District, and the most unfortunate thing of all was

that the road building was started there. But I am going to tell the House and the gentlemen of the Opposition right now that the Commission was not and will not be used as a political machine. I will substantiate that statement. It has been pointed out here that the work was begun there because an election was coming on but it was really finished and forgotten long before that election was held. Further the sum of \$7,500 expended on the section was spent where the Motor Association had already began; there was absolutely no discrimination as to the giving of labor and that was one of the points the Commission clearly laid down. I knew when I touched such a matter I would be criticized, but I am prepared to prove I did not use the work for political purposes as I consider doing so an abomination. Mr. Dawe, a thoroughly capable man, was the foreman and I gave him explicit instructions in writing on this point. I think I have passed that letter to the member for Harbour Main. This is a copy (reads letter). I think it unfair for the gentlemen on the opposite side to say the work was used for political purposes as the statement is absolutely incorrect. As to the use of the machinery I think Sir John Crosbie was a strong advocate for it last year, while now he is equally strong in condemnation. I then objected to the Association handling the money and I called attention to the fact that we had men here who had built roads in Canada and I felt they were capable of doing the work here. Sir John stated that the Canadians having machinery could build good roads, and said it would be impossible to do the work here without it. Now the object is criticized.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I have not started to criticize you yet.

MR. HIBBS.—We will be prepared for your criticism. Last year we im-

ported a tractor, a grader, a sacri-fyer, a crusher, etc., and of all these, one only may be criticized, name-ly the grader. Without the oth-ers it would be impossible to build roads to stand motor traffic. There are sections where we can't use the grader, from Topsail Hill up the shore it is impossible to employ it, but I understand that there are sec-tions in Ferryland District and other places where it can be used.

MR. BENNETT.—I beg to remind you Mr. Hibbs that I asked you for statistics. I asked about the money that was expended and when I get the information I will finish my re-marks.

MR. HIBBS.—I will give the in-formation. The total amount collected from all sources was \$22,408.94; in-cluding the \$10,000 from the Govern-ment. From that we expended \$19,611.82; we spent \$9,005 for machinery, \$165 for freight and \$635 for the scarifier. The total for machinery was nearly \$12,000. Then we had to pay for horses, carts, tents and other equipment which the Motor Associa-tion purchased. We reimbursed them in part for that and spent about \$7,500 in work. The remainder went in inci-dents that could not be termed ac-tual road work I might say for the information of the gentlemen oppo-site that the Municipal Council re-tained \$6,000.00 out of the total taxes. They are entitled to the money levied on motor trucks which are confined practically to St. John's. This amount-ed to \$1,520 which must be deducted from the amount collected. This year more machinery has been imported including a tractor, two spreader waggon, a sprinkler etc., at a total cost of \$4,058. That gives us a full equipment except the roller. You can-not consolidate the roads without this machine, and it would cost about \$5,000. The sprinkler can only be used with the roller. We got that first as we are waiting for a gas roller, not a

steam one. This kind is now being built and the order has been placed.

MR. BENNETT.—I thank the mem-ber for Fogo for his information be-cause the figures submitted by the committee of the Association were, not intentionally no doubt, rather con-fusing and would lead one to the con-clusion that \$24,000 was spent for road making purposes.

MR. HIBBS.—When the letter was written I think the figures included taxes that had not been paid.

MR. BENNETT.—The statement of the Minister of Works shows an ex-penditure of \$19,823.09 and that of the member for Fogo, \$19,611.82—here is a discrepancy.

MR. HIBBS.—The total was \$22,408.94 made up of about \$12,000 for machinery, 7 or 8,000 for road mak-ing and the balance for tents, horses and other equipment.

MR. BENNETT.—I still reiterate my contention that this work would be better done and receive the endorse-ment of the public if it were done by the Association without assistance. The Inspectors fear there is trouble ahead for the Commission as there is an idea abroad that it is a political institution.

MR. JENNINGS.—I am delighted it is all out of my hands.

MR. BENNETT.—I have no doubt of that, as I know you are not the kind of man who stays up at nights looking for jobs like that. I think the Asso-ciation with the co-operation and as-sistance of the Road Inspectors would do better than the Commission. I do not think we should spend the public money, especially that large grant from St. John's East and West which is not contemplated in the Estimates. The Association could take the roads, do them according to their own lights or ideas and display their ability in roadmaking in certain sections. I think it is up to the Association to show that they can give returns, to

those paying the taxes. If you mix up their money with the government's and there is any blame to be attached in connection with the work, one will be blaming the other. Dual control is not to be desired; dual administration is improper for public affairs. This work should be apart from government control and if that policy be carried out, I believe all the motorists will assist because in the Association there are men of all political shades and those not of the same shade as my friend on the other side would quite naturally not be satisfied with the work of the Commission. I hope the government will see the force of what I say; that this will bring trouble on them and the people will refuse to pay their taxes if they carry out their intended arrangements. The member opposite may explain away the Hr. Main situation but the people have very strong convictions as to what happened there.

MR. HIBBS—Some 99 per cent. of them think it was alright.

MR. BENNETT—You do not know them all—but you did not lose your opportunity. I do not blame you for that, but men outside the House will not want their money misused, and if we do as you propose we will destroy the whole object of the movement. We want good roads and the motorists should pay for them, but the people want their money spent fairly, and we need some Association clear of politics. The gentlemen now in charge of the work are novices. They do not know anything of practical road-making; they may have read something about it in books and no doubt are doing their best. Canada is not the ideal place for road-making and there are Commissions there that the honorable member would be ashamed to be associated with. We do not want to take all our ideals from Canada—we have cleaner politics here than they have. And when it comes to a specific tax let it be spent by those

who have no axe to grind or for a definite political purpose. I do not say the money was deliberately squandered or misapplied, but it is strange that it was laid out in one direction and you may recall that the member opposite says the work was done last fall. Did not the government intend to have the election in the fall. It was spent from July to September and then the work ceased as there was to be no election till the spring. The Motor Association could do nothing with the snow on the ground, but when it came the snow-shovelling brigade was brought in, and their doings in Hr. Main will never be forgotten. The honorable members says they were paying for the work; and that is right as the money was squandered, thrown to the winds. I know something of snow-shovelling thru my experience in St. John's West. When men wanted that work there I told them they were wasting their grants, as if they spent them on snow shovelling, the roads would suffer the next year because for the sake of getting in and out to their doors for one day, they were wasting their money. The sun or rain would come perhaps in a few hours and wash the snow away. The public money for roads, bridges etc., was wasted as the \$10,000 was spent in Hr. Main last spring. Let us be responsible; it will bring no kudos to the Opposition, but put the money in the hands of the Motor Association with your experts assisting and let it be spent as allocated by the Association. Then the saddle will be on the right horse and the Association will have to account to the people or go out of existence. I agree with Mr. Jennings in not being ready to go on with the Commission, and though he got no salary, none was earned the way the money was spent. Give the advantage if possible to the owner of the Ford car, but tax the man who can afford the touring car higher; only let him see his money is properly applied

and not used for political purposes. If you don't adopt some measure of this kind your taxes will not be half paid and the Magistrate's Court will be kept going to make the people pay what they are not willing to pay under a Commission.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Speaker. Last year we came in here and voted ten thousand dollars for a special work. Then we thought the government was in earnest and we thought that the money would be applied properly, in the several districts surrounding St. John's. All the proceeding speakers omitted to state that the money was misapplied. That money was spent for political purposes in Harbor Main. Not a cent was spent in Petty Harbour, Torbay and other places. The intention was to spend the money in repairing the roads in the vicinity of the city and then as far around Conception Bay as possible. During the bye-election up in the district of Harbor Main, Mr. Hibbs promised the people work to the amount of thirty thousand dollars thinking that he would gain the district, and he even went so far as to spend some of it in advance by sending out articles of food to be paid for in work for the Road Commission. But he evaded giving Mr. Bennett all the particulars. I will not vote for the passing of this sum. Should we tax the people to save their cars? And again the Minister of Public Works tells us that there is not enough money to carry on the service of the country. The matter with regard to the running of the Sanitarium, on today's Order Paper, was discussed and the argument you put up was that funds were not available to run it, but are we then going to vote ten thousand dollars to run motor cars? With other matters of far greater importance, will the Minister of Public Works who is not a politician, say he is going to vote to wipe it out? If so, I will sit down. And to-day we

are told there is not enough to carry on the sanitarium.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The vote for the sanitarium has been increased this year by thirty thousand dollars.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Reads. This is the information tabled by the Minister of Public Works. That is, fifty more can be accommodated. Everything is in full swing in there and to run it will cost \$100,000. (Reads). To furnish this institution properly and have it fully equipped the cost would be at an outside figure \$120,000. I take it that this institution should be looked after to relieve the suffering people who are craving to gain admission. Therefore we should not be losing time in discussing motor cars. Let the owners of cars pay for the good roads, but let it not come from the general revenue of the colony. Are we doing what we were sent here for, if we sanction this kind of thing? The whole fund any way ought to be in charge of the Minister of Public Works, and not in the hands of this representative from Fogo, who will not even let the snow fall in Hr. Main during a bye-election, and now we find that the sum of \$5,700 is charged up to road accounts for that district, and the roads out there have to suffer for it all. It is really none of my business because there are two able representatives of the district present who are well able to fight for their rights. No, I do not believe in taking this sum from the Public Treasury and handing it to a certain class of men.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—What about the sum of ten thousand taken from the district of Twillingate during the Fall of 1919 and spent in Harbor Main?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You ought not to be digging up old sores. I voted for this amount last year because I understood, and rightly so, that the money was to be used to re-

pair the road right down to Bay de Verde. But it was not. They went to work and bought a lot of machinery which you cannot sell to-day.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I am really standing neutral in this matter of the purchase of machinery.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Yes, it was a case of a crowd of politicians putting it over an innocent man. First the chairman of the commission went out to Harbor Main, and then the Minister of Agriculture and Mines went out and spent money wholesale snow shovelling. Just imagine, a Minister of the Crown. You are too honest, and too innocent a man to know all about this. While on my feet I want to ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for information with regard to this pit prop matter. I was handed an offer by two gentlemen the substance of which you are already familiar with. Since then we have discussed the matter, but nothing has been done, and the pit props according to contract have been handed over to the government. The offer was not attended to and the men interested wrote a letter to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. But I ask you are you earnest in this matter. Here is the letter. (Reads). I would like to ask the responsible Minister would he be good enough to list en or perhaps it is a joke. Now on the back of it all Mr. Hue handed me this message received from Montreal. (Reads). And here is a further memo signed by Mr. Harvey. (Reads). I would like to ask the responsible Minister whether this a fact? If this is an example of the kind of business men we have in the government of the present day, then no wonder the country is in such a bad financial state. To-day there are thirty thousand cords on hand, worth one hundred and eighty thousand dollars, and yet you are so careless that you will not extend the ordinary business cour-

tesy of a reply in the matter to men who are anxious to buy.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
What is the date of this letter?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—To-day's date.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—The Government has so far found it impossible to get a reasonable figure and Mr. Hue has been asked to make a reasonable proposition. A man called upon me this morning on this matter,

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Is there any writing?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—No.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You do not know how to write. As usual there is no writing. It shows your state of mind.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Fred Hue is not the kind of man one ought to write a letter to.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—What is wrong with him. You said Bowrings were going to take over this matter, insinuating that Hue was not all that was desirable.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Hue's associates were told that if they made a reasonable offer they would get the pit props for less than \$6.00. We estimated eight dollars for freight, four dollars and fifty cents for peeling and sawing etc., ninety five cents for commission and ten cents for some other expense making the total cost thirteen dollars and fifty five cents. The government would then get five dollars and forty-five cents per cord. I said if he would offer the government five dollars per cord he could have them and he said no.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—That would be unreasonable. Here is a business proposition and here is the answer given by Dr. Campbell. The Prime Minister made sure not to have anything so that he may be able to

quibble. This is a frightful position for the Minister of the Crown to be in.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We looked into the matter very carefully.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Patience ceases to be a virtue when we have to put up with this kind of thing. Why this would stir the Indian down at Cash's door. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what does he say about this?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—This is the first I heard of it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—This is a lovely situation. This is not good enough for the people of Newfoundland. One of the principal members of the Executive Government only hearing of this matter for the first time. This is disgraceful when you have hundreds of thousands of dollars in your grasp, and at the same time there are so many people dying for want of medical attendance. In the days of old, matters of this nature were dealt with by the whole executive government. But the procedure is different now.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The best thing to do is to make an outright offer, and I think the government ought to consider that.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hibbs stated in the House this afternoon that a large amount is still outstanding of last year's taxes. I rather admire the lenient way in which he has treated the collection of these accounts.

Now as regards the government not putting that \$10,000 in the estimates this year. That practically excludes the proposition made by the motor association last year. For every 50 cents put up by the government there would be \$1.00 put up by the motor association. I personally think that the government is bound by that provision. Concerning the resolutions therefore Mr. Chairman I support the schedule, the idea that the road commission be made non-political, and

that Fords and Chevrolets be put on the same basis as other cars, and so much per unit of horse power.

DR. JONES—Mr. Chairman, I was very glad last year to give my approval to the proposition that money spent on the road be spent as profitable as possible, yet I think that the commission was not comprised as it should have been. The Motor Association gave \$2.00 to every \$1.00 given by the government, but the Association was allowed five. Mr. Hibbs selected a foreman who was a strong supporter of the government, and there was gross discrimination in giving employment to men on the roads. The facts were that no Cashin men were employed. It is their money as well as it is yours. Now as far as the schedule is concerned it appears to be a little ridiculous. It is the intention to reduce the Ford and the Chevrolet to the same basis as other cars.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I am in favor of these resolutions, because there certainly was discrimination last year in the fees collected from the Motor Association. I cannot congratulate the Road Commission on the work they did on the roads; it is very unsatisfactory. I think it would be much better if the government had nothing to do with the expenditure of this money. In view of the stringency of money this year I think the government ought not to take \$10,000 for this purpose this year.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The measure of last year was not a party but a private one, and was dealt with by the House as such, but if the Opposition feels that we should suspend this section of the Act of last year it will meet with the sympathetic approval of the members of this side. It was merely introduced then and none of us knew what it was till it came down.

MR. HIGGINS—That is my feeling and as a member of the Association I

regret to say that any man with respect for himself would feel better if being paid out of the motor taxes than if the roads were being done out of government funds.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Will the member for St. John's East put in a section suspending the one in question for a year.

MR. HIBBS—As I am identified with the matter I may say I am in accord with the principle of economy, but I think this is false economy. The labor problem is one of the biggest of the day, and we have to get a lot of employment at once. Bell Island is closed down, and as every member knows many are idle. The members for Conception Bay know that many men are out of employment. I fail to see the sense of cutting out the grant of \$7,500.

MR. HIGGINS—That is not the point I am making, but it is better not to use that \$7,500 this year for the moral effect it would have, and I put it right straight that this is not the time for it. My position may not be a popular one with the motorists, but I do not think it would be bad if the Commission went out of business, and devoted some of the money to the roads that do not take the aspect of motor driveways.

MR. HIBBS—Bye and bye the government will be called on for money and we are under way now with the machinery, but then it will be handed over to someone who will not see the work done. I don't think it is fair to cut out this money just as we are getting down to work.

MR. HIGGINS—How much are you going to get for taxes?

MR. HIBBS—About \$15,000.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If you get \$15,000 and the government gives \$7,500 making \$22,500 which will all be spent in this work it means an expenditure to the laborers of \$22,500 with a cost to the Colony of \$7,500; not that this should be con-

tinued as a principle, but looking at it from the point of expediency in view of the present labor conditions.

MR. HIGGINS—I recognize the primary motive was getting down fees and under this reduction there will still be substantial fees, but my point is that this is no time for road building at all.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—But if by putting up \$7,500 we could secure the expenditure of \$22,500 it would be a good thing.

MR. HIGGINS—The Motor Association will spend it anyhow; it is only collected to spend. For this year instead of giving \$7,500 to motor roads we ought to give it to something else.

MR. HIBBS—The roads will be used by the motorists anyhow.

MR. HIGGINS—The class of work done by the Motor Association is good as far as the rounding off of curves and the removing of boulders which have been on the roadside since Capot discovered the Island is concerned, but the idea to the minds of most men is the fixing of the roads when they cannot get supplies for the fishery. The money is used in the wrong direction. Why not the member for Fogo consult with his colleagues on the Commission and report to-morrow. As I see it, now you are bound to give it unless you suspend this section. I think it worth his while to put it before his colleagues.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I wonder if we would now go into Committee stage on the Bill.

MR. BENNETT—I wish to endorse what my colleague of the East end, Mr. Higgins has said as to the moral effect of this grant of the government as all are agreed that economy is the note of all proceedings at this time and we should all be actuated by the idea of not granting money unnecessarily this year. If given for labor as the Hon. Prime Minister says it will be endorsed by the House, and I will

agree. Last year \$22,000 was collected, there was a grant by the government of \$10,000 and as Mr. Hibbs said some \$12,000 was spent for machinery horses, tents and supplies. He also informed us that on equipment this year about \$3,000 or \$4,000 has already been spent which will not go on labor, but takes half the money right off. I appreciate the desire of the honorable member to have funds to carry out his programme, but from the point of economy, he should see his colleagues and arrange to carry on under a reduced scale and retrench as in other directions, and I support the suggestion of Mr. Higgins which should be considered in committee.

MR. MOORE—I do not think we should spend \$10,000 for road-making for the use of motorists after the picture that has been painted here this afternoon of conditions in connection with the Sanitarium, and I for one will not vote for it. Let the joy-riders pay for their roads if they want them. They can afford it. There is a constituent of mine in the General Hospital who has to get out, and yet cannot gain admittance to the Sanitarium. It would be better to spend the money in providing for her there than in joy-riding.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions with some amendment and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act Cap. 40 of 11 Geo. V entitled 'An Act respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works if it is correct that no money allotments have been received at Port Saunders and other

places in that vicinity in the district of St. Barbe although a settlement farther south has received a large sum and if this is the case what is the reason for this discrimination and how long does the government propose to permit this to continue?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Min. of Pub. Works is at a meeting of a Select Committee and I ask that this question stand over till a later hour.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that Mr. J. M. Devine has been sending communications to business people of this Colony on the official paper of his office in New York reading as follows:

New York, May 12, 1921.

Dear Sir,—I have established a buying and selling service here which covers the entire United States. If you have anything to sell get in touch with me. If you are wanting to buy goods of any kind in this country, please let me hear from you.

I am in close touch with the various manufacturers, jobbers and retailers, and feel that I can do a lot of good for you. If you are needing to be introduced to reputable business houses, am at your service. Your success in business largely depends on your buying right. Failure often comes through lack of profit and trying to match up with a competitor who has bought at a lower price.

All my 25 years experience in Newfoundland business coupled with many years of buying knowledge in the American market now lies open before you. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF IT.

WRITE ME FOR INFORMATION. Ask me for prices of anything you are needing. Put your proposition before me. You must buy at a lower price if you want a better profit. All

your enquiries will receive my personal and prompt attention.

Yours very truly,

(Signed.) J. M. DEVINE.

and to say if the Government in appointing Mr. Devine to his present position in New York understood that he was to run a private business as well and to use his office for private gain, and if the Government proposes to permit him to continue to operate the Trade Commissioner's office in New York on that basis and if so what guarantees have the Colony that he will give any attention to its business and will devote himself exclusively to his own and will the Government take measures to instruct Mr. Devine to do the work for which he is paid and abandon all private business as is the practice with Trade Commissioners of other countries as for instance the Canadian Trade Commissioner during the period he was established in St. John's?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As to the printing of the notice I am not aware if Mr. Devine gave notice to the people of this country on the official paper of his office or otherwise. I have asked him for an explanation. I may say that his writing to the business people here may be due to his receiving the information that his term of office will expire shortly.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and he said he had an agreement for over a year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The year ends on June 30th, and he has been notified of his recall.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Who am I to believe, the Hon. Prime Minister or the Minister in charge of the department. Mr. Devine's family has just gone away and the Minister is not so absent-minded as not to have given him particulars as to his job.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He has been notified that his services are not required.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You said he had been engaged for over a year.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have no recollection of that. He has been notified of his recall anyway.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how it happens that, in view of the statement in a circular of April 22nd, to the members of his Union as published in the Evening Telegram of Friday last, he advises them that this country can no longer rely on the fisheries to support its people, but advocates the reliance, instead, upon other employments on the ground that so much fish is caught elsewhere that the world's markets are over supplied he nevertheless for the past eighteen months insisted on putting into effect a policy which jeopardized the markets we have for our fish in foreign countries and inflicted enormous losses upon all engaged in the fishing business in Newfoundland?

HON. MR. COAKER.—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement certified by the Government Engineer showing the increases in first-class passenger rates and the average increase in freight rates on the trains and steamers of the Reid Newfoundland Company annually from the 1st of July, 1914, up to date.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will ask the government engineer to get the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—To ask Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House a statement signed by the Auditor General showing the total cost of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland 4th series from the time the revision was begun up to date, showing (a) the names of the legal gentlemen engaged in the revision and the amount received by each of

them; (b) the amount paid for printing the first revision which appeared two or three years ago in paper covers and (c) the amount paid for the present edition of four volumes and also to say if an addition to the vote now before the House or any other sums will be asked on account of this service?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—The names of the legal gentlemen engaged in the revision and the amount received by each of them were:

Dec. 26, 1914—The Attorney General, Hon. D. Morison, K.C., (Chairman of Commission); F. J. Morris, K.C., C. H. Emerson, K.C., B.E.S. Dunfield (Secretary), M. Furlong, K.C. To each of the above \$500.00, making a total of \$3500.00.

Dec. 20, 1915—Commissioners as above, seven at \$500.00 each	\$3,500.00
Jan. 19, 1918—B. E. S. Dunfield, Secretary	3,000.00
Sept 24, 1918—Hon. D. Morison, K.C., Chairman	3,000.00
Jan. 2, 1919—B. E. S. Dunfield, supervising etc.	789.00
Sept 18, 1920—B. E. S. Dunfield, supervising. etc...	1,000.00
Mar 2, 1920—B. E. S. Dunfield (Secretary), balance of ward	2,500.00
April 30 1921—Hon. D. Morison (Chairman) Award	4,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$21,289.00

The amount paid for copies in pamphlet form was as follows:—

July 17, 1917—Daily News	\$429.25
Nov. 5, 1917—Daily News	352.00
April 24, 1918—Daily News	727.60
July 19, 1918—Daily News	256.00
Sept. 23, 1918—Daily News	188.00
Oct. 4, 1918—Daily News	110.00
Oct. 16, 1918—Daily News	200.00
Mar. 1, 1919—Daily News	232.00
Oct. 15, 1920—Royal Gazette	4.90
	<hr/>
	\$2499.75

(c) The amount paid for the pres-

ent edition of four volumes and also to say if an addition to the vote now before the House or any other sums will be asked on account of this service.

The amount paid for the present edition of four volumes, not including the sums itemized in Sections (a) and (b) of this question is:

Daily News for printing and binding	\$35,622.40
Carswell & Company, binding	450.00
C. O'N. Conroy, Arbitrator	25.00
Shea & Co'y.—Insurance...	218.28
Nfld. Express Co'y—Freight	69.74
	<hr/>
	\$36,385.42

There are bills to the amount of \$6,000.00 still outstanding on account of the Consolidation of Statutes, mostly for printing.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister if any representations have been made to the government with regard to the conditions of affairs at Port Union, namely, if the F. P.U. plant there is virtually shut down, only half a dozen men employed thereon and if, as a consequence great distress exists amongst the people and if any steps are being taken by the government to afford relief, and if so to state the nature and extent of the same.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No representation has been made to the government as to the matter to which reference is made.

HON. MR. WARREN—I was asked a question by Sir John Crosbie two days ago, as to Robt. Rice of Twillingate, being a British subject, and if not, why was he made a Justice of the Peace I have made enquiries and find that he is a British subject having been born in this country.

MR. MOORE—I asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an answer to question No. 10 on the Order Paper of June 6th It is important and I want to get it.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—I will give it if you wish to take it verbally. The dredge's log book shows a total of 6,750 tons dredged in that vicinity. The original daily report of the dredge has already been tabled in the House. It was public work and there was no contract.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—How is it that the only amount paid for the dredge was paid by Mr. Hickman. The log of June 28th shows the dredge was at Port Union for 24 days, and dredged all around there, but there was no charge for her. She was at Bell Island and other points and there was no charge for her. If she is a free gift let us know, don't keep the information to yourself. She is for the general benefit of the country and I don't see why one man should pay and the others not do so. She worked at Port Union for 26 or 27 days, and not a cent was paid for her. The only returns from her were from Mr. Hickman for dredging in St. John's

THE HON THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that I have made arrangements with the Marine and Fisheries department for her use in St. John's West and the parties using her will pay all expenses and replace all parts that may be broken. If this work is done in the West End Mr. Hickman and the other people there will benefit.

SIR M.P. CASHIN—What is the explanation of one paying and the others not doing so

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—For years she has been on public service; she was at Long Pond and other points where dredging had to be done near the public wharves.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—It would be better if the Hon. Minister of Fisheries would explain

THE HON THE PRIME MINISTER—I am doing so as Mr. Moore said I promised him an answer, and I am giving it. The dredge is going into service under arrangements by which

the parties using her will pay all expenses.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the War Measures Act—1914" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of An Agreement between the Government and The D'Arcy Exploration Company Ltd.," was re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V. Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move that a Committee of the House be appointed to consider the question of the Further Operation of the Railway.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow move the Suspension of the Rules Respecting all matters now before the House or to come before it.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 13th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 13th.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Customs Returns for the year 1919-1920.

Hon. the Minister of Posts tabled the following Report:

To the Honourable, the House of Assembly:

To the Legislative Session Convened:

The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on a Bill entitled.

"An Act for the Prevention of Venereal Diseases, beg to report the said Bill as hereto annexed—marked "A".

(Sgd.)

JOHN C. CROSBIE.

W. W. HALFYARD.

W. B. JENNINGS.

W. E. JONES.

C. J. FOX.

On motion this Report was received and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions regarding the Branch Railway to Argentina.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved that a Committee of the House be appointed to consider the question of the future operation of the railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, I move that this order be deferred until to-morrow. I might explain that the position in connection with the railway is that when the House opened about ten weeks ago it was thought highly probable that the Government would be in a position to submit at this session of the Legislature some definite proposition that would be acceptable to the Reid Newfoundland Company on the one hand and to the Legislature on the other. The Reid Newfoundland Company have not found themselves in a position to submit any definite proposition, nor have they submitted a proposition of such a character that I would submit for the consideration of this Assembly. The railway problem

in Newfoundland is probably the most serious problem that this Colony has ever been called upon to face. During the past year the railway has been handled by a Commission, and, as a result of that, the Government has had the advantage of acquiring considerable knowledge of the handling of the affairs of the railway, its finances, its profits, its losses, besides much information concerning accounts covering a period of many years past. Experience has also been secured by Mr. T. A. Hall, Government Engineer. This ought to prove of value in the discussion of any practical proposition with a view to finding a solution of the problem with which we are at present confronted. It was my hope that hon. members of the Opposition would favorably consider the idea of the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to deal with this railway problem, the Committee to consist of an equal number of members of the Government and of the Opposition, the Auditor General, the Government Engineer and Mr. Pill, who is the Railway Auditor. A Parliamentary Committee so constituted would be in a position to ascertain the full facts, and without any consideration whatever of political partisanship give valuable thought to a problem which is a most pressing one.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, before coming to the next motion on the Order Paper which is to move the suspension of the rules of this House, might I ask the Prime Minister what is the intention?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would ask that that motion be deferred.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—For how long?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Until to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is it the intention of the Prime Minister to move

the suspension of the rules to-morrow?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—To-morrow, or at a later date, as may be most suitable.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—It is unusual to ask the House to suspend the rules, without any financial business of the House attended to, without one line of the Budget or the Estimates passed and with the many other financial matters to come before this House untouched. Certainly I have never heard of anything like this done before in all my thirty years experience as a member of this House. We are here to-day with the full Estimates before the House and not one vote passed yet. I think it is not only unusual, but it is indecent and impossible to ask the Opposition to pass the Budget and the Estimates under suspended rules and to rush all the business through within a week. Why it is only now that we are starting to do any business; up to now there has been practically nothing done. Surely goodness the Government is not going to try and stuff this sort of thing down our throats. You have no justification whatever to come here and pass the Budget and the Estimates in a couple of days, and this especially at a time when depression and gloom prevails all over the land and when we are asking for eight millions of dollars revenue for the next year. There is a considerable amount of information to be furnished yet in connection with this matter and it behoves the Government to re-consider their attitude. I serve notice on you now Sir, that we members on this side of the House are going to give this motion all the opposition we can. We have a duty to perform and we are going to perform it in a right and proper manner. It is indecent to suspend the rules under existing conditions and there is no precedent for it.

We got no information as to the sales tax. Are we a crowd of statutes to have men like you come in here and dictate to us like this? The railway is most important and it should come before the House. The Prime Minister says it has to be studied well, why did he not study it? Surely you are not going to repeat last year's conduct. This is no matter to have a minute of council do the needful for. Since you have handled the railway we have been saddled with three millions of dollars and now notice is served to suspend the rules. This railway matter needs a lot of discussion and here is the place for it without restrictions. I am not prepared to go on any commission within forty-eight hours and I now ask you to reconsider the motion to suspend the rules of the House. I do not think it is proper. You say we have no time. We must sit here for another month or six weeks. Does the hon. gentleman care? The Government is not prepared to carry on the railway nor is the Company. Are you going to leave the country under such conditions. We also want to discuss the financial situation on its merits. Between now and Saturday you want to put through the Budget, Supply, Ways and Means and the railway problems together with two other bills. We are not going to allow it. That is the verdict.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition I would point out that both the Budget Speech and the Estimates have been before the House for many weeks and have been fully debated. A portion of the Estimates has been passed. The debate on both matters has been adjourned from time to time at the request of hon. members opposite. The Government has been ready for many weeks in connection with both matters and the delay has been at the request of the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition and of hon. members opposite. The responsibility for the delay in connection with this and various other items on the Order Papers rests entirely upon the Leader of the Opposition and a limited number of his followers.

MR. HIGGINS.—I think you might defer this motion until to-morrow. Better still to defer it all together. I would like to make it clear to the members opposite that there is no desire on this side of the House to keep any member here longer than is absolutely necessary but on the other hand I think the Prime Minister will realise that had we been finished with the discussion of the Budget we would be following the practice. I would like to say that the position we take is this. In the matters of great importance we have always accepted the principle of the British Parliamentary procedure and that is to have no suspension of the rules at all with regard to money bills. We do not want to be in the position of blocking the suspension of the rules but we want the progress to be made along the lines which we think should be followed and we would have adopted a different attitude than this if only matters of minor importance remained but the remaining matters of chief importance. Not alone is it unfair but you are in the position where it is impossible to bring in the suspension of the rules at this stage. I would suggest that the motion be withdrawn from the order paper and when we have progress in a few days time and the important matters have been considered then it would be proper and reasonable to give a notice of this kind. It is unfortunate that you are in the position that you cannot do this without the consent of the Opposition but I think that this consent will not be unreasonably withheld. We have arranged Ways and Means and Sup-

ply in a general way but the item of grave importance to our people is the problem of taxation. We have no desire whatever to impede matters but I would suggest that this motion pass away. We can dispose of some of the items on the order paper in a short time. Then only Supply, Ways and Means and the railway problem remains. We should not suspend the rules as that would not be in the interest of the people of this country.

MR. BENNETT.—I rise to point out like the leader of the Opposition and my colleagues the futility and absurdity of putting this motion on to-day's Order Paper. The Government were ill advised when it suggests this procedure at this juncture of the Session. It savours of trying to rush matters of the utmost importance with undue haste. I quite appreciate the desire of the members opposite to get to their homes and I feel that the members on this side will facilitate matters as much as possible. The legislation yet to be passed is the most important of the Session and the most important we have had for many years. It would cast an ignominious stigma on this country if we permitted the suspension of the rules at this stage of the session. It is wrong in principle and it is what we would expect from the Government. We should and must get unlimited for the discussion of these very important matters. We have our duty towards the public and that duty must be performed and our duty is to consider these matters of grave importance with caution and deliberation. This question of the railway should have been brought up a month ago. It is an open secret that it has been a God send to the Government that the Opposition has kept the House open for the past six weeks as there was no legislation to be brought forward and now you ask the suspension of the rules when you have legislation ready. But this has had nothing

to do with it at all. While it is true we may have been rather prolix in our debate but you must consider that desperate situations require desperate remedies. However I trust that the criticisms from this side will be brief and to the point. As to the discussion of the Budget it may be more lengthy but it will not be unduly prolonged. As to the railway it ought to merit the earnest consideration of the Government. It is a problem bristling with difficulties but the combined wisdom of both sides ought to find a way out. I hope the Prime Minister will give us a clear statement of all that appertains to the railroad. It has been merely guess work with us in the past. I therefore submit that the Government reconsider this motion and until we clean up the main features of this important matter now before the House then and then only should we move the suspension of the rules.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My motion is that this order be deferred, so why the debate at this stage?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The Prime Minister remarked that we delayed this House and that the debate on the Estimates and Budget is over. We were looking for information from a Minister of the other side who has been absent for several weeks. He is the head of the chief department of the public service and surely the Prime Minister is not in earnest when he tells us we delayed the House. The Prime Minister represented four departments and for the past ten weeks I have been here every day and I will remain here till all the business is over. I am surprised that the Prime Minister would move such a motion. The railroad has not been disposed of nor has the Budget, Ways and Means, Supply and the Bell Island Ore tax.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Speaker, I

feel that this order should be taken off the Order Paper altogether because there is an implication that it is necessary because of the methods pursued by the Opposition. We have met here and gone through the Order Paper day after day and adjourned at 4.30. This order means only one thing, namely, that the Government are trying to hold the Opposition responsible for the state of affairs that now exist, and for that reason the Opposition should oppose it, not only now, but at any time. The Government got themselves into this mess and now let them get themselves out of it as best they can.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister why it is that no progress has been made with the building of the new freight sheds in St. John's authorized under the Loan Bill of last year and the early erection of which was promised at that time, and why does not the Government proceed at present with this public work the necessity of which was then claimed to be very great, seeing that just now there is widespread distress among the working people of this city as a result of unemployment and the starting of this work would do much to lessen the extent of such unemployment.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Railroad Commission decided last year that they would not proceed with the erection of a freight shed at St. John's. The freight shed is not about to be proceeded with because the Commission has no funds available for the work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement signed by the Government Engineer, showing the progress made up to May 30th on the completion of the fifty freight cars under construction for the Railroad setting out (a) the number of cars actually completed and ready for use, (b)

the stages of completion of the remainder, and (c) the dates on which any or all will likely be delivered as ready for use.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I might say the information is being prepared, and I will table as soon as it is available.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement signed by the Government Engineer giving an estimate of the additional Revenue received by the Railway Company during the current fiscal year through the increase of one cent per mile on first class passenger rates put into effect when the Commission assumed the control of the Railroad a year ago.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The reply to that question is also being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if the Government Engineer has made during 1920 the tour of inspection of the Railroad, provided under the Railway contract, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copy of the same and if not to say why such tour of inspection was not made; also to furnish a special report from the Government Engineer showing what improvements, if any, were made in the railroad track, bridges, etc., between January 1st and June 30, 1920, by the Railway Company, and since the first of July 1920 by the Railway Commission.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The reply to that question is also being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House, a statement showing what sales, if any, had been made up to the end of last month

of Labrador fish purchased on behalf of the Government last November, the amount paid for the said fish, specifying its actual cost and also the amount for expenses and the amount received for it when sold, showing the total loss thereon and also the loss per qtl and to state where the remainder of this fish is and when, if ever, he expects to sell it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply to that question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House an estimate of the losses sustained by the fishermen and the business people of this country through the operations of his fish regulation policy since the present government took office in November 1919 and if he intends to propose any measures to recoup these people even in part for these losses?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply to that question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to introduce any labor legislation at the present session as promised by him in his manifesto and if not, why not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the Government to introduce any labour legislation during the present session.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, regarding question 5 and also the answer, what does this mean. I would like for the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to tell us more about this matter than is contained in his reply. "It is the opinion of his department," his reply says, "that if there were any losses, etc." But was it not the Government that took off the Regulations. Is it too much to ask the Hon. Minister to get up in his place and tell us about the loss on

the Penny cargo? Not a cent has been received on that cargo to this date, and then we have an answer like this handed to us. Now I may ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he intends doing about the Penny case? This man was offered \$60,000 for his fish, but he followed the instructions of the Minister and he hasn't got a cent for it. He is now here in St. John's, and he wants to know who is going to recompense him. After taking his fish and dilly-dallying with it for five or six months you have not a word to say to him. Think of what that man has suffered mentally since that cargo was loaded. Now the only reply you can give us is "The King can do no wrong." He is here looking for the \$60,000 robbed from him by you, and you haven't a word of any kind to say to him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation at the present session with regard to the railway situation and if not, why not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It is the intention of the Government to introduce railway legislation at this session.

MR. HIGGINS.—If you intend to provide work for the men some funds ought to be put in the hands of some one to provide the same. But after all if a number of men register and cannot get work the difficulty is that there is no comfort to the men even then. The Government ought to give some thought to this matter and see what can be done.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Government does not intend to give St. John's East or West any larger per capita grant than any given to other parts of the Island.

MR. HIGGINS.—I do not think it is fair to put it that way that St. John's

East or West is not going to get more than any other part of the Island. The men living outside the city are in a different position. They only want to get supplies for the fishery and they have already been assisted. Instead of those supplies for the labourers and the mechanics you ought to provide some sum to be expended on some public works. I am anxious that the Government do something like this to set it off against the supplies given to the fishermen. The men living here in the city have many items of expense than the resident in the outport has.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that the dredge is not to be operated this year but that her officers and crew are to be paid full wages and if so is it intended to apply the same principle to all other branches of his Department?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This question re the dredge I have to say all the crew have been paid off with the exception of the engineer.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I understand the dredge is being handed over to some merchants along Water St. Is this correct?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am getting a loan of the dredge for certain responsible persons in my constituency. These parties are going to pay for its cost of operation.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Might I ask the Minister of Marine what was the revenue derived from the dredge last year and what part of the country was dredged. Nothing was collected for this work last year as far as I can see. I do not follow the Prime Minister when he says he is taking over the dredge as she is public property. It belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and she cost this Colony \$37,000. Last year she was at Port Union, the home of the

Minister of Marine and the tax payers are paying for the work he did there for him. Jennings got up here and say there is not enough of funds to run the sanitarium. I wonder if Mr. Scammell, a man of the other side who is above the rest and knows something, is prepared to stand for this? The work at Port Union cost ten thousand dollars and not a cent paid. The Colony has dropped \$37,000 on account of the careless handling of this ship. I understand she also worked at Bell Island, well the people there had a perfect right to her use just as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for nothing. I for one object to this tinkering with the public moneys. Those days if you want a train or a ship you can have it although you have not the money to pay. The manifesto of the Prime Minister made beautiful reference to the railway, the dredge and one hundred and one other things. It reminds me of an old fashioned almanac. Will the Minister in charge get up here and tell us about the dredge? This is the work of the so-called Reform Government I thank you.

MR. FOX.—Before this question is disposed of I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might the dredge be sent to dredge the gut at Quidi Vidi? Her services are very badly needed down there.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You may have her on the same terms as the West End.

MR. FOX.—What are those terms?

MR. HIGGINS.—This is a public matter.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes, it can be done.

MR. MacDONNELL.—I have asked several questions about the dredge. I suppose when we have no railroad we will get home on her instead. I object to the West or East End getting her when other parts of the Island are neglected.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—St. John's West is not getting the dredge at the expense of the Colony. The entire cost is being paid by the St. John's people themselves and not out of public funds.

MR. MacDONNELL.—I understand that She was sent up to St. George's last year and a lot of time was wasted. The Captain looked at the Codroy and tried for about an hour and then went away again without doing anything. I do not know whether any enquiry into the matter has been made by the Government. I think the whole matter is regrettable.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I just wish to remind the Prime Minister as to what he said in his manifesto re the dredge. (Reads.)

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if Mr. J. M. Devine holds his appointment in New York as Trade Commissioner under a written agreement, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the same, and if not to state the substance of the oral contract under which he is serving as Trade Commissioner.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Herewith are copies of Minute of Council and letter of appointment of Mr. J. E. Devine as Trade Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United States of America.

"Copy of Minute of Executive Council.
November 19th, 1920.

"On recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. J. M. Devine to be Trade Commissioner for the United States of America, at a salary of \$4,000 per annum, and travelling expenses."

"Department of the Col. Secretary,
St. John's, Newfoundland.
24th November 1920.

"Sir,—

"I have the honour to acquaint you that His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to appoint you to be Trade Com-

missioner for the United States of America, at a salary of \$4,000 per annum, and travelling expenses."

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS.

Deputy Colonial Secretary.

"J. M. Devine, Esq., City.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—According to the circular issued by him he is engaged in the second hand business and dry goods business. I would like the Prime Minister to take the matter in hand.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—His contract terminates the 30th day of June next. Notice were given him by both the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Deputy Colonial Secretary.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Shipping

- (a) How much salt has been sold from the cargo of the "Henrik Lund" and what quantity remains.
- (b) How much of the salt has been sold for cash and how on credit;
- (c) Why any sales have been made on credit and to table a list of the parties receiving same; and
- (d) To say in any event if the F. P. U. or any of its associated companies has been giving any of this salt on credit and if so why?

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—This information will be tabled to-morrow as this is the first time I have seen the question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister when the people of this country may expect him to put into effect the promise he made in his Manifesto in November 1919, to reduce taxation and lessen the cost of living in this country, and to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the percentage of increases in taxation which the new taxes as told by the Budget now before the House would involve to the great mass of

the people of this country from now onwards.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to what extent if any, is the Government involved in the proposed development of the copper mines at Tilt Cove and Little Bay as mentioned in Mr. Coaker's circular of April 22nd. to the members of the F. P. U., as published in the Evening Telegram of Friday last and what justification, if any, is there for Mr. Coaker's statement that from 2,000 to 3,000 men are likely to be employed in those mines and how does he reach the conclusion that the outlook for copper properties in this country is a favorable one at the present time when the fact is that all over the world copper mines are being shut down because of the low prices of product and the small demand for it and also to lay on the Table copies GALLEY—476

of any documents in relation to the proposed developments of these properties which the Government may have in its possession.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government is proposing to continue in its employ in any other capacity the Trade Commissioners who are being recalled from foreign countries at the present time, and if so to state the positions to which they are to be appointed and the salaries that they are to be paid and also to show what economy, if any, will result in such a case.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—With respect to the tabular information I am having that prepared. This is with regard to the increased taxation under the new schedule. As to question thirteen, the Government is not involved in any development of the mines at Tilt Cove or Little Bay. As to question twelve the taxation is being reduced. With reference to question fourteen I have already partially answered it. No arrangements

have been made with any commissioner for any period of service after the 30th day of June next.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—What are you going to do with Mr. Goodridge who has been in the public service for the past twenty years? It is not good enough to throw him out on the street now. This is all due to the fishery regulations again. I would like to know the policy of the government in this relation.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Goodridge's case is an exceptional one indeed. His services terminate on the 30th day of June next. If there is any suitable vacancy I will certainly favourably consider his application. At the present time I do not know of any suitable vacancy in the public service.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I do not think it is fair to treat him like this. It is another proof now even the fishery rules have affected private individuals.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Goodridge deserves favourable consideration and will receive such from me.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I know he has a wife and family to look after. If he had not been in the civil service he would have had more strings to his bow. There is nothing against him so far as I know. Is not the Minister who made that position not prepared to say a word on his behalf? Get up and say whether you think it is fair to put this man on the street after his twenty years in the public service?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—All the trade commissioners on the other side deserves the special consideration of the government. I feel sure that every member is anxious to do something for Mr. Goodridge. The leader of the Opposition says this is due to the fishery regulations. It was pointed out in the Budget that retrenchment was necessary and when there had to be any

cutting off we could not make any distinction. If it were not for the necessity of retrenchment, these men would remain. I stand by the idea of Trade Commissioners, and I think there has been nothing better than them in 20 year, but now we have to do without them.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Min. of Marine and Fisheries and the Prime Minister I am not defending Mr. Goodridge, but his case is a particular one, and I am not prepared to go through with this salary for Mr. Devine.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Nothing is being voted for Mr. Devine or Mr. Goodridge as Trade Commissioners.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But will he not be paid out of contingencies afterwards. It is the same with Mr. Bernard. I have no brief for Mr. Goodridge, and I am not upholding his cause for personal reasons, but I want all treated alike. We cannot afford these Commissioners, and we should agree to dismiss them all. His case is an exceptional one and there will be no Mr. Devine in New York if Mr. Goodridge is dismissed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he means by a raid being made on his department. I understand he meant to retrench and never thought we would see the day when you would be raided. I am very sorry for you, Sir.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Finance and Customs if Mr. H. R. Brookes has been engaged by the Government to draft a scheme for the working of the proposed sales tax and if so what are Mr. Brookes's special qualifications for that task and what compensation is he to receive for his services?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Brookes has not been so engaged. When we are in Ways and Means

this afternoon or evening, I hope to table these resolutions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to secure His Excellency's assent at once to the anti-profiteering Bill which has passed both houses and to appoint a Commission in accordance with the terms of the bill to investigate the prices at present charged for (a) hard bread, (b) fresh meat and (c) hard coal in view of the apparent fact that the cost of these commodities is much higher than is justified and if not, why not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I hope that the opposition will facilitate an early prorogation of the Legislature when the matter would be considered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—This question is of great importance to the fishermen and I would like to point out that it is time to appoint this commission. Why are you reluctant in making the appointments. Now take the case of hard bread, an article largely used by the fishermen. It costs about \$10 a bag while flour is from \$11 to \$12. Every fisherman knows—even if the members here do not—that one barrel of flour makes two of bread. You can get flour for \$11 1-2 wholesale according to the Trade Review figures, and if that is true why is bread \$10 a bag. It means that although most of the fishermen have been supplied nothing has been done by you. Don't you think it time to appoint this commission. Flour can be imported and sold for \$12 and enormous profits are being made off the fishermen as the St. John's men and the upper ten do not allow hard bread inside their doors, but the fishermen must have it and are paying 75 per cent too much.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Government is quite prepared to name the commission.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You promise it, but another of your neglects is as to the meat which is imported at 10c. a

lb. and sold at 45 or 50. This is not in keeping with your promises in your Manifesto to the people. If this is the manner in which you are going to carry out your Manifesto it is time for someone here to say something about it. There are other things that will be referred to later; we are only discussing parts of it now. Take the matter of oil casks, you are going to prevent the fishermen from having them in duty free. I will ask the Hon. Min. of Marine more in that direction as I think he is still interested in the subject.

MR. MOORE—Is that the policy of the government as to oil casks?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The policy is that the oil in casks will pay the same duty as that in bulk last year the Government made a change so that the casks would be imported and be available for the fishermen. The duty was taken off the oil so as to get the casks into the country. A very large number did come in, but later the fishermen were unable to sell them and the Imperial Oil Co. are buying the old casks and sending them to Halifax to be re-coopered, re-filled and then sent back here. Representations have been made to me that the coopering work being done there ought to be done here. The particular reason for the change last year was that the fishermen wanted the casks for use in connection with the fisheries.

MR. MOORE—You say that representations were made to you.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. MOORE—The Imperial Oil Co. are running it all. I know a man that got in 25 barrels and is getting it cheaper than from the Oil Co. by 8 cents a gallon. I represent a large number of fishermen, and I want to see further into this matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—The Hon. Minister of Marine was asking last year for the casks to be duty free. Now here is the point; the oil in 40 gallon

wooden casks is to-day being imported and sold 5 cents a gallon cheaper than by the corporation. I own that as outlined by the Hon. Minister of Marine last year it gives the fishermen a cask that will not compete with that made by the coopers here, as it is not the kind they make. They can be stowed away for years. But it is a hardship for the fishermen to be deprived of their kerosene oil barrels. What are they going to put their oil in? They have always used them and to-day in stopping them you are using a two-edged sword, because you are increasing the duty on the men you did not hope to do it on, the fishermen, and you are up against a corporation which is heading in that direction and pulling the strings to have the steel barrels come in. You are granting them a duty on these wooden casks in which the fishermen using kerosene and gasolene could get it 5 cents a gallon cheaper. Surely you are not playing into the hands of this monopoly? If you put this duty on you kill all chance of competition. The Hon. Minister of Marine is here and knows what he said last year—that it would be good for the fishermen—but now he is turning on them. You or I can import the oil cheaper than the Oil Co. will sell it. I know a firm that got in 50 barrels a few days ago, and can sell it 6 cents cheaper than the Oil Co. That story will be told further on when we come to the Budget. The Hon. Minister advocated the duty free last year, and turn up the Hansard, and it will show it, but now he is putting the duty on the fishermen.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The change is doing nothing more than putting it back to the point where it was two years ago.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You should not do so. Why did the Hon. Minister of Marine last year ask differently; that type of barrel is not made here, and this is one of the greatest hardships

that can be put on the fishermen. Ask Hon. Mr. Jennings about it.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The duty was taken off to get the large quantity in; the large quantity did come in and the casks are here today; hundreds are being offered for sale.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—The price of \$1.50 is dear when they are getting \$64 for oil.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Imperial Oil Company purchased casks to ship them to Halifax and have them brought back filled.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You will make a great mistake if you do it.

HON. MR. COAKER—The fact is that the fishermen are not buying oil in the wooden cask, but in the steel drum; and they get it 9 cents cheaper in the steel one.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Why hamper the firms who are generally importing oil.

HON. MR. COAKER—As to the cheap lot; we wanted last year to get the wooden casks and the way to do it was to take the duty off. A large lot of oil was sold here through the Imperial Oil Co. and they asked for a rebate and said if they did not get it they would turn off the men employed. Every barrel has now to be re-coopered here at the Southside and they claim it costs \$2.50 a barrel to have it done. There was such a demand for steel barrels that we thought there would be no claim for wooden as there are about 50,000 in the country now.

MR. BENNETT—I ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if there is any information in his office as to these oil companies when they were first incorporated. I think it was arranged that they should sell at 5 cents less than they are selling now, and this is a breach of faith on their part. They got concessions from the Municipal Council to erect tanks on the Southside and as far as my recollection goes

they agreed that the price of oil would be satisfactory, but now it is a monopoly. I think the government then was aware of the possibilities of the monopoly and took the opportunity of guarding against it.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will ask the Deputy Colonial Secretary to look it up in the old records.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Before going any further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Standard and Imperial Oil Companies are practically sharks. If you get in their clutches you have as much chance as a snowball in the hot place. They are now out to get the money they imagine they lost last year. It is a calamity when men can import 50 barrels, and sell it at 8 cents a gallon less, but are held up to suit these companies. Whether we want wooden barrels or not I think Mr. Bennett is right as to the correspondence. We should not allow the consumers to pay for it; no matter if it is Rockefeller, if the money is to be taken, take it for duty and don't allow the Standard Oil or Imperial Co. to put it in their coffers. I know of 50 barrels being imported, and even if they pay only 5 cents duty on it, they will make 3 cents. If all steel drums are going out to the fishermen it will be only a few months when there will be no wooden ones. We got to have so many to overcome the difficulty, and I think if the Prime Minister will ascertain how many empty wooden casks were sent to Halifax for 1919-20 he will see how it is. Mr. Oldford is as cute as a black fox. There is not a surplus of casks in the country to-day if there is a good oil output.

HON. MR. COAKER—There are 50,000 or 60,000 casks here.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You should make a rule to cover these fellows who are inclined to take things on their backs and run away with them. I would beat them by putting a tax on them.

HON. MR. COAKER—It might be done by putting it on them direct.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Put a tax on every gallon of oil they run off.

We cannot afford to allow them to beat us. I saw one of these men in here when the Budget was read, and I saw his face light up when the announcement of this duty was made. Now, it is a fact that 35,000 casks are needed each year for the packing of cod oil.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—A lot of cod oil has gone out in tanks the past few years.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But it has to come in from the fishermen in casks and you cannot get away from the fact. You'll find single mercantile firms in the city employing more coopers than the Imperial and Standard Companies combined.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Co., Ltd.," was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V. Cap. 25, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Cod-fish" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery'," was read a third

time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill in relation to the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Newfoundland.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act Cap. 40 of 11 Geo., entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads,'" 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Prevention of Venereal Diseases."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I moved the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means for the purpose of introducing Resolutions with respect to Fire Insurance Tax and the Sales Tax. That respecting the Fire Insurance Tax simply means that companies will now pay the same rate as was paid under the Business Profits Tax which was five per cent. Under the Business Profits Tax, which is no longer in force, the tax was levied on business done in St. John's only but it is now provided that the tax will be collected on all the business done throughout the Island.

With respect to the Sales Tax Resolutions, several copies of which I have had typed for the benefit of hon. members until the printed copies are available, it will be noticed that a distinction is drawn between local-made and imported goods and also between excisable and non-excisable goods. In the case of excisable goods the tax is slightly less than in the case of goods on which no excise is collectable, that is, in the former the tax will be $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ while in the latter case the tax will be 3% so that on the whole it works out equitably. With respect to the collection of the tax, the Department of Finance will attend to that in the case of goods on which excise duty is payable and it will be done in the same manner in which the excise tax is collected. The tax on all other goods will be handled through the office of the Tax Assessor. Raw materials will not be affected as will be seen by Schedule A; under Schedule B, fishery and agricultural products of all kinds are exempted. This tax is estimated to produce a revenue of \$900,000 or perhaps a little more.

MR. BENNETT.—The true position is this, that you remit five cents to the manufacturer on the one hand and charge him twelve cents on the

other. Why do you allow the raw material to come in without charge?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. We will discuss that later. The remaining sections of the Resolutions deal mainly with the collection of the Tax. I, consequently, beg to table these Resolutions and ask that they be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—These Resolutions are so serious and far-reaching that one becomes dumbfounded in considering them. In my judgment, with this Tax and all the other taxes that the people of the country are called upon to meet, it will be utterly impossible for a person to live in this country. In fact the whole thing is impossible and I am going to import my own goods from now on.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I fully appreciate the position taken by Sir John Crosbie. We have submitted a statement showing the shortage that has to be met. This shortage is to be made up partly by a Surtax and, as is estimated here, a Bill is being drafted covering the Sales Tax to secure revenue of \$900,000 to \$1,000,000. We must get this or some other tax to take its place, if we want to pay our bills on the 30th of June next. We must get the money or do without it. We must look the situation straight in the face. If we can collect this tax in any other way that is humanly possible and in a way that bears more easily on the people, then there will be nobody more prepared than myself to consider such a proposition.

MR. BENNETT.—According to these Resolutions, a man can get in an automobile, without paying any additional taxation; but the man who gets in molasses must pay additional taxation. I say that this principle is radically wrong.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My hon. friend is in error.

MR. BENNETT.—But it is legislation in favor of the rich man, who can import his own groceries, his cloth and everything else that he wants; whereas the poor man is not in that happy position.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I shall be glad to see that such verbal change is made in Committee (if change is necessary) as to fully meet the point raised by Mr. Bennett.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What percentage of revenue do you figure out you are going to collect, according to your eight millions of total revenue stated in the Budget?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Included in this eight millions is the \$900,000 which we expect to get from this Sales Tax or some other corresponding tax; and \$1,117,000 that we expect to get from the Surtax.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What will your total estimate of revenue be?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The revenue for the coming fiscal year will be made up as follows: Customs \$4,470,000; Surtax \$1,117,000; Posts and Telegraphs, Crown Lands and all the other miscellaneous revenue listed in the Budget Speech and based upon returns from these sources for the last few years makes a total of \$8,404,000.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I am inclined to agree with Mr. Bennett. This is a rich man's tariff.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If there are any loop holes through which the rich man may escape taxation under these resolutions I would be glad for my hon. friend to point them out and I will see the chance of escape is effectively stopped.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I think you are right up against it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There is no man who can better appreciate that position than the Hon.

Leader of the Opposition, owing to his long experience in connection with the Finance and Customs Department. To find myself compelled through the illness of the Minister of Finance and Customs to handle this department in addition to my other responsibilities is certainly a disadvantage.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—In Canada, they had to change this Sales Tax every other day.

MR. HIGGINS.—I think that every fellow who can will be saving up now to import direct.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 14th.

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

On motion the notice for Suspension of Rules was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

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

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if the Government proposes to make any contribution towards the War Memorial now being inaugurated in this City and if so how much money it proposes to devote to this purpose, and if not what is the reason for its decision not to contribute?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The plans in this matter are ready and it all depends upon the policy of the Government.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to introduce any Prohibition Legislation at the present session and if not, why not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is now before the House.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House what quantity of empty oil casks were exported from the Colony for 1919 and 1920 for each year separately.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have asked the Assistant Collector to let me have a report.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House the names of all Inspectors employed by him last season in connection with the inspection of fish and how many have been dismissed to date, and what was the amount paid to each inspector for his services?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I will have that this afternoon.

MR. BENNETT asked the Minister

of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House copies of returns received from the following persons for work allocated in the District of Bay de Verde as per statement tabled recently:

Jas, Kennedy, Western Bay . . .	\$350.00
Geo. Case, Salmon Cove	290.00
Chas. Moores, Freshwater	350.00
Robert Kelloway, Perry's Cove	355.00
Wellington Crummev, West.Bay	100.00
Wm. Jacobs, Northern Bay . . .	75.00
Jas. LeGrow, Broad Cove	30.00
Stephen Blundon (Chas.)	20.00
Thos. Sutton, Bay de Verde . . .	60.00
L. Stockwood, Gull Island	20.00
Samuel Stockwood, Gull Island	20.00
Samson Rose, Salmon Cove	300.00
Wm. Brennan, Adams Cove	50.00
Allan Kelloway, Spout Cove . . .	200.00
Wm. Wilcox, Western Bay	25.00
Eli Parsons, Salmon Cove	130.00
Joshua Tucker, Burnt Point . . .	100.00

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I hope to have this as soon as possible. The accountants are very busy now working till midnights at times.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to questions two, three and four on yesterday's Order Paper.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I saw Mr. Hall and he said he would get it as soon as possible.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would say that the Government has no intention to introduce any legislation

with respect to salmon pools but it has been referred to the Game and Inland Fisheries Board for consideration. It has limited finances. The Board informed me through two of its responsible members that it will take up the matter of salmon pools and in due course it will be in a position to discuss the matter with the Government. With respect to the Reid Newfoundland Company, I have not heard either directly or indirectly, officially or unofficially of any preferential claims by the company against the Government.

MR. BENNETT.—With regard to the salmon it will soon be too late to do anything. The wardens have been given their notice to quit. Mr. Rabbits told me now he had been notified to terminate the services of the various wardens. The salmon will soon be up in the rivers and I know that voluntarily the Salmonier and Placentia rivers will be protected by those who frequent them. I have already heard of cases where the rivers have been netted and the police have had to get after the law breakers. We have had a demonstration of the immense number of salmon around the coast this year and I know of one man who has made four hundred dollars through catching salmon, this being the result of the policy of past Governments and I hope it will continue. The Reid Newfoundland Company has established cold storage plants along the line for the reception of salmon and the S.S. Digby which will soon be leaving here will take away three hundred tons of this product and I think this industry can be developed with a small outlay. I hope the Government has some intention to further this matter and will do so without delay.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—I agree with the tribute paid to that board. It is an unpaid body of gentlemen who have taken to heart the in-

terests of Newfoundland with respect to fishing and shooting. The work of those gentlemen has been immense but as the Government finds the financial situation of the country unprecedented and saw the necessity of cutting out any expenditure not absolutely necessary, the question of curtailment was discussed with the Board and it was decided that such sum as will be necessary to keep the secretary on and the board kept together will only be voted. It is hoped that next year the Government will be able to see its way clear to do better in this important matter. I discussed the matter of curtailment with two of the leading members of the Board a curtailment which will be unpleasant, a curtailment which will be hard to work out, a curtailment which will mean sacrifice to many and I know it is a pity that such a good work will have to go into abeyance for a little while anyway. I hope the time is not far distant when this vote will be fully justified. Where any money can be saved it has to be saved not because the Opposition has made us do that but because we want to make a big effort to get back to pre-war revenue and post war expenditure.

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 Cap. 40 of 11 Geo. V. entitled "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The Bill before the Committee now embodies the change contained in the schedule as set out in the Resolutions the other day. There is no necessity for a further explanation.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Before this passes through I wish to say that though I have no objection to tax the motor cars yet I would like to know whether the Government intends to vote ten thousand dollars this year to the Motor Association?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This is not included in the Estimates but it is statutory liability. Under the Act which was passed last year the Government is legally liable to pay one half to the Motor Association of the amount subscribed by its members. If the members paid taxes up to ten thousand the Government would have to pay five thousand. Ten thousand is the limit.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I cannot agree with the Prime Minister that there is any justification for the voting of any part of this amount to the Motor Association for the coming year. I object to it on the principle that we cannot afford to pay this amount to repair roads for the motor cars. I will agree with taxing the owners more instead of taking this sum from the Treasury. Yet we cannot run a hospital for the want of funds. There is a considerable number of six people wanting to be admitted and this sum expended around Conception Bay will be of little value. If the machinery is doing such good work there is no necessity to vote this ten thousand. The roads are now in splendid condition. Anyone who has been out the Topsail road must admit that if he is honest. On account of the condition of affairs around the Island we have got to be economical to meet our interest next year and other liabilities. We cannot afford to squander one cent if we want to keep our heads over water and I doubt if we can do that then. When the sales tax was read yesterday Water Street was paralyzed. It is the greatest stroke yet! A quintal of fish next year will be only worth four dollars and in one

stroke the earning power of the fishermen is cut off one hundred per cent. Cut out this ten thousand and forget the motor cars. Only to-day I received a telegram from the district of Port de Grave and I am ashamed to read it for the House. If this sales tax is enforced what chance has the family man got?

Why, it's a calamity, an absolute calamity. I must earnestly ask the Hon. Prime Minister and the Government to do away with this \$10,000 vote. Go down to the Militia building this morning and see the crowd enrolling for work in this city and you will not hesitate to cut this off at once. It is a joke to have a man go in there and swear his reasons, the number of his family etc., for looking for work. It will be the same as the returned men who had to go in there and write a note to John Smith or some other mythical gentleman. The Government has to provide a job for him to-day. I want to know what this \$10,000 is intended for. The Hon. Prime Minister has elaborated on the work to be done in Conception Bay, but we have not enough money over there to jingle a penny on a tombstone. You may smile, Mr. Chairman, but how far will \$10,000 go in Port de Grave. It must be saved for the purposes which you and I know it must be saved for—to meet the liabilities of the Colony. If to-day, as is really happening, I am receiving messages from Port de Grave district endorsed by clergymen and other reliable men to the effect that a family of six are starving there, what is the use of holding up money for a university. Is a university good for hungry children? How much could you or I learn if we had nothing to eat or drink. We have got to the position to-day when something must be done, and I want it done. No one realizes more than the Hon. Mr. Coaker that 100 per cent. of the revenue or earning power has gone from Newfoundland.

We have to try and get it somehow. Now take the railway; look where we will be as far as that is concerned on July 1st. I understand from the Hon. Prime Minister that we are going to give it up. Let me tell him now that we cannot do so. If he gives it up the Reids cannot run it, some 2500 men would be thrown out of employment and if we want to run in it we will have to cut out the Sales Tax etc., and bring in something that we can all understand. Bring in something practical. I appeal to you Hon. Mr. Coaker and the Hon. Prime Minister to put things right. I was surprised yesterday when these resolutions came to me that you on the other side had not seen them till they were chucked at us. Come out Mr. LeGrow and assert your manhood. Why are you a dummy when the people you represent are affected. These resolutions came to me and you knew nothing of them. I doubt if the Hon. Mr. Waren knew of them. I have been told the Bond administration was a one-man Government, but this is an autocracy. Bond could run a Government, but this one man can run you all—and then you come in here and ask for \$10,000 for me or someone else who can afford to drive over the roads. Tax the drivers, but not those who cannot afford it. It didn't strike you as you are not able to see it. I never saw these resolutions till yesterday, but we got the first news of them and you knew nothing of them—there was no party meeting on the matter. I bet the Hon. Prime Minister cannot explain them even now. A Chinese puzzle is not equal to it. You are trying to kill the very grounds that our trade as we have it to-day is built on. I want to say now that when any one man, be he the Hon. Prime Minister or the page brings in resolutions to kill the trade of the country I cannot help taking the same stand as now. Imagine him saying that if I buy from Messrs. Marshall or Ayre I have to

pay it, but if I buy direct as J. C. Crosbie, there is no such thing as a Sales Tax. I am able to buy and bring in goods from abroad, but if I do so the man with whom I am now dealing is finished and so are his clerks. It is so preposterous it makes my manhood come to the front at once. Have you Hon. Mr. Warren or Hon. Mr. Foote ever thought of this thing. Eaton, in Toronto, and Fairweathers etc, can make fortunes without any taxation and compete with those who built up the trade of the country. The outsiders can go free. No thought was given to this measure. I can understand you on the other side looking surprised as you knew nothing of it. The Hon. Prime Minister throws it on the table and says take it or leave it. But Ayres got to pay and Thomas Eaton goes free. Are the Government going to sit and see these establishments which have the interest of Newfoundland at heart, knocked out of business. You are giving the outsiders a premium to do business in Newfoundland and yet we are told you are going to give \$10,000 for motor car roads. Cut it out, Sir. Let me put the case to you Mr. Abbott. There are 100 people say in Bonavista who buy boots from Templeman. They have to pay the tax, but anyone can buy direct from Eaton and not pay it. Are you going to stand for the like of that Mr. Cheeseman. Imagine where yours or Harris' or Buffet's business will be if Eaton pays no tax while men who have been in the business a hundred years, and employ large numbers have to go out. Don't go back to Port Union Mr. Coaker till this matter of finance is fixed up; stay till it is straightened out. Even in Port Union, Eaton will do the same trick and you will have to pay because you have built up a business in Newfoundland. And still we are asked to vote money for motor roads. I will not pay; I object to taxing the poor man. I will now put it clearly—I can im-

port butter, sugar etc, for myself and not pay the 5 per cent., but the man on my wharf who buys a gallon of molasses from me has to pay up. I do not believe it struck you like that Mr. Jennings. I saw something today where a man bringing in wool from his sheep has to pay a tax on it.

HON. MR. COAKER—That is exempt.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Local manufacturers are not exempt

MR. SULLIVAN—There is nothing about it in the resolutions.

HON MR. COAKER—Wool is covered by agricultural products. It is not the intention to tax anything local.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You mean to say that wool will not be taxed. If they buy wool and make it into blankets which are taxed. This tax is a crucifixion on the man who has to produce as he has to pay the whole bill. It is hopeless for the Colony. If something is not done about this I'll tell you something and you mark it down—if you tread on the worm it will turn and if you insist on putting this through you will soon be on this side in the cool shades of opposition. I believe there is still enough manhood on the other side to assert itself in this job. I want to say right here, that I think this is most objectionable to the House and to the gentleman on the other side to allow this vote of \$10,000 to build motor roads to go thru when it is so much needed in other directions. Take 8 millions for the voyage of fish—and I think the Hon. Min of Marine will agree that it will be a big one if it reaches 8 or 9 millions. Take it on the total and multiply it by 5 and it gives \$400,000. And the fishermen got to pay every dollar of it with the exception of what is collected on the surplus stuff from Grand Falls. The worker has to pay it all, and the well-to-do will go clear. You cannot put this on. The Canadians tried it but it takes a big staff to car-

ry through. I do not know who brought it in, but it is a curse to us, inflicted perhaps unconsciously. Today a man goes to Assistant Collector LeMessurier to get \$100 worth of goods. The duty on it say is \$40, plus the 10 per cent. surtax which makes it \$44. Then LeMessurier says, what is est, it is up to \$200 and before he is the freight and the man says -25. Before he gets it out, if the man is honest he has to pay \$10 over and above everything else. It cannot be done. You've got to change it or you Mr. Chairman, will not be chairman very long. I didn't intend to get into this this evening, but the \$10,000 for motor roads got me, and I had to protest. I want to say to the Hon. Attorney-General and the Hon. Minister of Marine who are the only men on the other side of the House—that this \$10,000 has to be a drop balance. Cut out the educational and farm votes etc, I want to educate the children, but you cannot do it with the money which you have at present. You must remove this cancerous growth with the same determination of the surgeon performing an operation. When we come to Ways and Means I will prove to you that we can save a million. If you realize this, as I do you will see that the man who does not assert himself now will go down in history a poltroon. You can adjourn the House and go out and make the Hon. Prime Minister carry out your ideas and give the fishermen a chance to live properly. I put the position to you now in concrete form. There was no party meeting and it was not seen till given here by Hon. Mr. Squires. Are you going to stand for it? Are you men from the Westward going to put up with it. Adjourn and decide the matter. The responsibility will be on you Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Windsor, Capt. Jones and Mr. Abbott and the Hon. Mr. Coaker, and if the Hon. Prime Minister will not bow to your opinions, if you allow this leg-

islation to go through, the Lord have mercy on the country. I strongly object to this vote of \$10,000, but am prepared to support any measure of economy brought in by the government, and why I am prepared to do so, is because I do not want to see the Canadians take away my birthright. When I am passing out I want to do so where I was reared and where I made my wealth. I want Newfoundland for the Newfoundlanders. If the Hon. Mr. Coaker takes no steps, I say he has sold his country, his birthright and mine.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I'm afraid the remarks of my hon. friend are getting a long way away from the subject of the debate. This is merely an amendment of the Motor Tax Act, and has nothing to do with the Sales Tax which will be discussed in Ways and Means. The Prime Minister said yesterday that he was prepared for suggestions from the Opposition with regard to the latter. In relation to the \$10,000 the understanding is that if a certain amount was subscribed by the motor owners the Government would put up two dollars for every one put up by them. If you want to cut that out the only way is to repeal that clause.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That's what I want. The Minister of Public Works said that the motor tax and the Sales Tax were entirely different things, and this is one of the times Mr. Jennings and I fail to agree. I say the Sales Tax is the tax by which we must raise that \$10,000. When the Motor Tax was first introduced I advocated taxing the motorists more than we were doing, and I say now that any man who can afford to run a car can afford to pay the tax. Now I would ask Mr. Jennings if he saw these Resolutions at a party meeting before they were brought down.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The whole matter was discussed before it was brought in

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But the Sales Tax was not, and I want you and your colleagues not to be fooled into doing things which you know to be not right. Now, will you agree to cut out that \$10,000?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—To do so we will have to repeal that clause and those in favour of doing that may not be in the majority.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—What difference about the majority. I suggest that the \$10,000 be cut out and the work that you are doing for it be paid for by the horse power. Let the man who goes to Broad Cove pay for it.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, while I have been out of the House I understand that Sir John Crosbie has been discussing two matters, the first of which was the Sales Tax and the other the Motor Tax.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Did the Minister of Justice have to go out and tell you that?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—My honorable friend will remember that he has a very clear voice, and moreover I was just in the next room and could hear his remarks quite distinctly. I heard my honorable friend discuss the Sales Tax and I might say that we will deal with that in Ways and Means when the copies of the resolutions are printed. I have deleted three or four words to cover certain points raised by Mr. Higgins and the changes will appear in the Resolutions when printed. With regard to the next point, it is quite true that the particulars of the Sales Tax Resolution while they were under consideration, but it will be remembered that no Minister of Finance does discuss resolutions of this sort generally prior to their being introduced, because the only protection he has against such changes in tariff as might be contemplated being made known outside is to keep them to himself. I spent four years in Executive Governments, and eight years alto-

gether under the leadership of Sir E. P. Morris, and at no time during these periods were matters of this kind discussed more than a day prior to their being introduced.

With respect to the \$10,000, that vote is not in the Estimates, and if my hon. friend desires that no money be paid out under the guarantee of last year, there are two ways in which it can be prevented. One is to defeat the Bill and the other is to add a resolution providing that that particular section of the Act covering the vote be suspended for one year. This Bill is not a party measure nor was it discussed by committee of council. It was introduced on behalf of the Motor Association and when the measure was brought in by the Attorney General last year he expressly stated that it was not affected by party considerations. The motorists asked last year that if we increased their tax and gave them a proportionate share of the money for road repair work they would be agreeable to such an arrangement, but this year a Bill comes in on behalf of the Motorists asking for a reduction, and if the vote of ten thousand dollars is to be cut out, it can be done as I have suggested, by defeating the Bill or on the other hand, it can be done by adding a resolution to suspend the section under which we have to pay the money. While there is one aspect of the hon. gentleman's position with which I agree, I believe, nevertheless, that the Good Roads Commissioner can do good work, and as the Council has not enough employment to supply all who need it at this juncture, this would be a very feasible solution of the difficulty. I cannot agree with the policy enunciated by Sir John Crosbie of cutting out everything because that would be to cut out a great deal of labour, and if we must provide labor this is an excellent avenue by which to collect the money to provide it. Whatever is the sentiment on this side of the House I

will have to concur with. I am prepared to support Sir John Crosbie's motion to suspend the operation of this section for one year, otherwise it will have to be relegated to the scrap book.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would gladly vote this \$10,000 if it would help labour. This will go for machinery though, and the labourers will not get enough to buy cigars. Well I now understand five thousand will go for material. I move that this ten thousand be cut off and returned to the Treasury. I move that if extra taxes are required tax the motor cars to get it. Will you Mr. Prime Minister second it? I want you to say what you intend doing. You are a lawyer, and you understand what I mean. I have had a lawyer over here to draw up this motion. Is it worth while to get the solicitor of the House to draw up this motion?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—When your motion Sir John is properly shaped I will do something.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I do not care what the men on Water Street think about this. I want to save ten thousand for this colony. Mr. Solicitor would you mind drawing up this motion?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—When you are ready Sir John I will go on

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am always ready and willing. What I say I am prepared to stand for. Here is the motion—moved that section six of said Act be repealed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The operation of the motion should be that this section be deferred rather than repealed. There is quite a difference between the two as you will see. I will second the motion that it be deferred.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Very good.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would like to say a few words re this bill. I introduced it here last year.

We ought to get away from the origin of the Act. The originators of this matter came to the House and said if we double our taxes will you pay half of the amount collected; if so we will improve the roads in the neighbourhood of the city. That was the proposition I came in here with last year and as I then said it was not a party measure. It was an attempt to make the roads in the vicinity of St. John's permanent roads and I am very much convinced that according to the work done there would be a big saving of money in the long run under this system of road improvement. The commission has a roller and various other road making implements and eventually it will be better financially for all concerned. I know that under the present circumstances it is imperative to cut out this vote, yet it is a breach of faith with the motorists to do so. And I am sorry that it has to be abolished for one year.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I wish to say that if the motion is that this vote be suspended for one year I am prepared to support it. We had last year a considerable lot of trouble to make up our minds whether we were justified in voting this amount for the construction of roads in St. John's. But we got over the difficulty as the motorists were disposed to be very liberal in taxing themselves. The Government had good reason for not putting this vote in the Estimates.

MR. CHEESEMAN.—First I do not know where to begin. There have been a good many matters before the chair this afternoon. I am not personally interested in cars as I am not at that stage yet when I can have a car. I was opposed to this vote of \$10,000 for the motorists. I think there are several reasons why this vote should not be put through this year. This year we have an extra

allocation of \$500,000. Out of this St. John's and Harbour Main got \$110,000, so this is a convincing reason why this vote of \$10,000 should be dropped. I will discuss the sales tax at a later date. I want this House to understand that when I read the resolutions this morning dealing with the sales tax I came to the conclusion that it is impossible to carry them out. If this goes through it is just as well to hand over my business to the Canadians. Eaton's catalogue is now known as the Family Bible. This subject is not now before the chair and I will discuss it later. I am perfectly in accord with the motion to suspend this \$10,000 this year. I get a lot of rides in cars here and when times are more favorable I will help them out.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—With regard to what Mr. Cheeseman has said re the surtax, I want to say he has proved himself a man. He has asserted his manhood and I think there are others over there who ought to do the same as I know they are of the same opinion.

MR. MOORE.—With reference to the motion of Sir John Crosbie I am glad to see that my remarks of the other evening are about to bear fruit. The Prime Minister said this \$10,000 was badly needed because of the scarcity of work. Well if he wants to give a few men a few days work let him put the sanitarium into shape to relieve the sufferings of a few wanting admission to the institution. I am going to support the motion before the chair. On Sunday I went over the road from here to Bauline, some eighteen miles and I want to say that this is the best road in the country, although the Road Commission has had nothing to do with it. I am glad this vote is to be dropped.

MR. FOX.—Just before this vote goes through, I want to say I agree

with the principle of economy. But there is true economy and false economy. It will have to be shown whether we are right in dropping this vote. From the Old Cove Road down to Long Pond there is a road which is incomplete and it will take ten thousand dollars to complete it and the moneys already spent will be wasted if it is not completed. The question of unemployment as referred to by the Prime Minister is typically one for the Government to handle. In every country a problem of this sort is always solved without delay by the work derived from some construction of a public nature. Things have not been carried out as they should have been. The workmen have had grievances and they still have them owing to the fact that they have not been properly adjusted. There was a solemn contract perhaps without the usual legal aspects but it has not been carried out properly.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, for fear of being considered inconsistent I want to say that I advocated the Game and Inland Fisheries Board receive their usual allocation, because I thought it false economy and bad policy to leave the salmon rivers unprotected particularly in view of the fact that the splendid work done by that Board in the past ten or fifteen years has born such good fruit. We have now what might be developed into a great industry in the salmon fishery. We have a facility for marketing our salmon now which we had not before. Through their efforts salmon are plentiful and we have demonstrated this year what it is capable of becoming and to what extent it can be developed. Now I made that plea for economy and I am sorry that the Government saw fit to cut off that grant.

In reference to the resolutions before the chair as far as the cutting off of that grant for the development and

improvements of roads is concerned it is false economy to withhold that grant. Mr. Fox has pointed out the advantage of having good public roads. I join with him and I say in view of the fact that the motorists have asked to be taxed two to one for the purpose of improving roads that it is false economy for the Government to withhold that grant. We will have to spend money on employment and in what better way could we spend it than in building public roads. They are an asset to any country, and to the capital city. The Motor Association is a body of men without prejudice, they have devoted their time and energy to doing something for the good of the community, and they ask us to come in here with an adjusted tariff or motor tax so that taxes will bear heaviest on those who can afford to pay them and lightest on those who cannot, they merely ask this Legislature to contribute their small quota to the work they have in hand. Now let us picture an incident. Take the road between here and Bay Bulls. That is partly in the district of St. John's West and partly in the district of Ferryland. It is a road greatly used, there is an immense flow of traffic on it owing to the people of the different settlements coming to and going back from the city. The Motor Association says we will put that road in first class condition, and we ask the Legislature to contribute one dollar to our two dollars. I think that is a very fair offer and particularly so in view of the fact that it will give employment which is much needed, and we will get some return for our money. I regret that Sir John Crosbie has taken the position that he wants to cut out the grant voted last year. I don't think it would be right for the Government to do so. The Motor Association has gone to the trouble and expense of getting machinery, and the roads they

have built this year are capital. I am glad to testify this afternoon that my mind has changed since the last time I spoke on this matter. The work this year is much better than last year. I consider that the money last year was not spent in a proper way. The money was spent last year in certain districts very freely and with the purpose of laying dew-drops for politicians and members of this House. I don't think that will be repeated, and when I raised a point this afternoon as to whether it was a Government measure, I contended it should have been and I hope to prove that point before the House closes. Members on the other side of the House last year voted for that measure although they spoke against it. I could not find the speech of the Minister of Justice in the Hansard when he introduced it. However I think that the Prime Minister was very lax this afternoon in supporting the proposition of Sir John Crosbie. This is not a party measure and we can say what we like of it, and I would state my opinion even if I had to leave the Opposition. I say that it is unfortunate in view of the statement of the Prime Minister that the grant should be cut out on these grounds. We need every dollar to employ the people and before this summer is over we will know that to our cost. The situation is again becoming serious in this town, and avenues of employment will have to be provided. If the men on this work are to be discharged because of the cutting off of this grant, if the Motor Association is to be curtailed in employing labour because we will not keep to our bargain it is a serious matter. I say again, Sir, it is false economy. The Motor Association is comprised of a body of men who volunteered for this work and they have only one-half representation on the Road Commission. They should control it when they pay two dollars to

every one of the Government. It is an outrage when the Government appoints three Commissioners and then Mr. Jennings, and two Road Inspectors making a total of six and the Motor Association can appoint three only. Then the Commission appointed by the Government are all supporters of the Government. There is not one member or supporter of the Opposition. Does not that look like party politics? The only safeguard we have is that the Motor Association will see to it in future that this work will not be carried on to suit the objects and aims of certain politicians, and not to the satisfaction of the people who contributed the money. The Motor Association doesn't want politics in this matter, they don't want the Road Commission to be a political machine, they want to see the work done, and I hope and trust that this is the last time I will have to refer to the operations of that Commission with a shadow of doubt as to their good intentions. I believe that in future we will have a new order of things. If the Road Commission realises that the job is too big for them and the Motor Association says we will do it for you, then I say it is false economy not to accept that offer, and give them every assistance to relieve the burden of the unemployed of the country. I therefore wish to subscribe to the Resolutions as they now stand. I do so with the best of intentions, and with due respect to those whose opinions might be different I say that it is not right to refuse this grant which will be the means of improving the roads and at the same time give employment to the people who need it so badly.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made

some progress and asked leave to sit again

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled "Of The Auditing of Public Accounts" was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Mr. MacDonnell 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.

WEDNESDAY, June 15, 1921.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of Auditor General on Municipal Accounts for year ending December 31st, 1920.

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question .

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—With reference to that last question I think the honourable gentleman suggests that I described the bank managers as a lot of shylocks. That is not correct. I specifically referred to the manager of the Royal Bank of Canada as a shylock.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House all the papers which he received from Ottawa with reference to the Sales Tax, so that the members of the Opposition may have an opportunity of considering the scope of the Canadian measure to the same effect and the manner in which it is operated

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—The only papers received from Ottawa was a copy of the budget speech. I have received other memorandum from other parts of Canada, I think I have them here with me, and I will table these this afternoon.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if any negotiations have taken place between himself or any other person on behalf of the Government and the Commercial Cable Company with regard to the recent delivery of traffic by that Company in St. John's and if any such negotiations have taken place to lay on the Table of the House copy of all correspondence in relation thereto, and if the negotiations have been conducted orally, to table a summary of their nature and effect.

THE HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I might say that matter was taken up with the Minister of Justice, and I think he expressed it as his opinion that they have no right to operate here.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister, what steps if any he has undertaken to make good the promise made to the Legislature at the last session, that he would, during the visit to England which he was then planning, secure the services of a competent English lawyer skilled in our railway contracts and our relations with the Reid Newfoundland Co. and if he has not taken that step why not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—The honourable, the Attorney General accompanied me to England and he conferred with counsel in England with reference to this matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to continue, after the 30th of June next, the Minister of Shipping, seeing that the Premier at the last session intimated that this Department would go out of ex-

istence on the 31st December last, and that there is a great need for economy and a reduction of expenditure in the Public Service of the Colony, and if it is the intention to continue this Department what is the justification for so doing?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—The Governmen has been considering having the work of the Department of Shipping done by the Marine and Fisheries department after the 1st of July.

MR. MacDONNELL—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister (1) Is it the duty of the Government to procure employment for men in this country who are idle through no fault of their own? (2) If it is not the duty of the government whose duty is it, or is it anyone's duty?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER member knows, provided \$500,000 for

—The Government has been considering fishery supplies. In a measure it is the duty of the Government to procure employment.

MR. McDONNELL—For a long time we have been considering the rise and fall, the suggestion and evasion of the duties of the Government. Up to the present I have taken no part whatever but I have become sick as to this matter of hair splitting, trickery and bare faced lying. Yesterday I asked a question of the Prime Minister whether or not it was the duty of the Government to give employment to those who were out of employment through no fault of their own, and he answered it was to some measure yet the Prime Minister was a firm believer, whether or not he considered the strain on this country, that this country should enter the war, and he did not stop to think whether this country could withstand the financial strain, but when it comes to the question of living in this country he says in some measure the unemployed ought to live. I think it is the chief function of the Government to see to it that its people get a

living. If the present Government has not properly handled the finance of the country in the past, or if it is incapable in the present this Government has no right to exist. The industries of the Country have been crippled by this present Government no matter what their intentions were. Our people are in one of two positions; they have got to live or die. Secondly, they have got to live as a result of their employment. The men of Newfoundland are not the men who will live by charity. They want to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. The other position whether we have got to live or die depends upon the Government. The Prime Minister says in a measure we may live. The Prime Minister says is it wise for them to live. This is no answer from the Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that the more that emigrated, the better for the country, and the less engaged in the fishery the better for it. But the Prime Minister goes further and says why should we live at all, let us get off the earth. I want to state here seriously that there are people in this country who are not prepared to get off the earth yet at the dictation of the Prime Minister. There are people here who cannot find means of livelihood, and if they have to die they will not die starving. I have heard a lot about law and order, and I have heard too much of this, and I now that it is not the duty of any one to incite the people, but when the blood shed comes the guilt will be upon those who failed to check it. You are absolutely incapable of holding office. I am prepared to stand for anything I say. Here we have a House of Assembly here constituted twenty-three to thirteen, here is a Government with plans in the back of its head for the provision of labour, and the result is there is a labour bureau where the men register their names and family history, and then they are told to wait

a while till something turns up. This is merely a medium for the irritation of the people. Here we have a Government because of the old dead theory of ten years life it is afraid to have anything to do with the railway as it may be said it was catering to the Reids. Why do you not engage five thousand men and properly ballast the road. Do your duty and bring in a railway policy and get the men to work. The other day when the proposed company which would engage some eight thousand men wanted concessions on the West Coast to start a big project you were afraid to grant them because of the prattle in the newspapers and this is the solution why ten thousand men are now out of employment, because some one tells you you are doing wrong in giving away these concessions. Do you want to preserve the country to be a graveyard. That will be a lot of good to dead women and children. You are not giving away a national asset because you want to make a gigantic monumental graveyard. The Prime Minister tells us that in a measure it is our duty to see that the people get work so that they may live thereby. You are not there to put the people out of their homes and then take advantage of their plight to get them out of the way. The people will soon dispense with the Sirs of this House of Assembly. I am sick of this talk. You say the people should wait and be peaceful. Not every one is accorded with a peaceful death. When one is dying of starvation it is not a peaceful death. Wake up. Give them an opportunity. Are we keeping the country's resources for the children that will never be born? It is bad enough to see this Government incapable but when it has the ideas and will not utilise them then it is many times worse. These theories we have heard how grand it is for a man to die for his country. Should a man die that his brother may starve? He should die that we may

be freer, but the working out of this theory results that they were fools to die. They died that others may starve. Be fair and tell the people you are incapable. Do you think your patience is superhuman? By specious, hair splitting reasoning you try to ward off the day when they will take the matter in their own hands. You are to be pitied rather than castigated. Get out or else the people of the country will put you out.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
—I regret that the honourable member for St. George's made his remarks without any feeling of responsibility. He suggested that the Labour Bureau was a farce. Monday the Bureau opened and two and sixty registered. It was impossible to secure work for all. In a few days it will be possible to secure employment for many others. Major has told me that exactly five hundred and eleven have registered. Of that number three hundred are necessarily cases requiring immediate attention. Of that number one hundred and fifty have been secured work. I feel sure that when the honourable member knows the facts he will not say that Major Butler has fallen down on his job. In view of these facts I think very good work has been done since the Bureau opened on Monday last.

MR. McDONNELL—The Prime Minister as usual has followed his customary practice I regard this bureau as a farce. I did not say Major Butler had fallen down on his job. I do regret that he is being named the goat for a delinquent Government. As the Prime Minister is so apt with figures he may give us an account of the matter.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
—One hundred and fifty have been arranged for.

MR. McDONNELL—Yes, but you say that five hundred and eleven have registered suggesting that that is the only number of unemployed in the coun-

try. I have been talking with a lot of the unemployed and I take their word for it, and there is a far greater number than that unemployed. The Government is altogether incapable to handle the problem.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—For three days work, the result is that one hundred and fifty men are given employment and I think that is very good for the Government.

MR. McDONNELL—You have to select the brains of some other person not in the Government to look after this matter. You go into the highways and the bye-ways to look for some one to make the scape goat for those who have fallen down on their jobs. Major Butler cannot take the blame off the shoulders of the Government. You have but two choices either get out or be put out.

MR. SULLIVAN—I wish to say a word or two with reference to this very serious matter. I think you have got to be faced with this trying problem during the next twelve months, and it is just as well for this House to be ready to deal with it and not wait till it is too late. Not only is the cry for work heard here, but it comes from all over the country. I am sure that the Prime Minister has no idea of the condition of affairs in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. We were instrumental when we showed up the needs of our district, in getting assistance for the many outports helped out. The members for this district were made the scape goats for the action of the government in assisting the people of this country even in a small way in providing the bread winners of starving families with some work. But the government has not done enough. We got one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to help them out. When I was on the Select Committee I said we wanted two hundred and fifty thousand dollars and the opinion got abroad that this district was getting too much assistance from the Govern-

ment. On the understanding that we put up \$25,000,000 we got a loan from the Government of \$50,000 and the Government put another \$500,00, but out of this we got no share at all. It was shown that every merchant in the district was insolvent and the conditions prevailing there were more critical than elsewhere. The amount was too insufficient to carry them through. We have been receiving wires and appeals every day from the different parts of the district. Yesterday I received a telegram that fifteen families were starving in Trepassey. They need immediate relief. I telephoned the commissioner of Charities and he said he could do nothing. What is he there for if he cannot do anything to relieve the distressed? I also had a telegram from Thos. Wakely of Haystack saying that nine families of Woody Island could not get supplies for the fishery and he said something ought to be done to prevent a riot. The Government ought to take this matter seriously. As sure as I stand here, when the House closes you will have to spend large sums on Executive responsibility to handle the matter. It would be better to take it in time. The member for St. George's has spoken of the unemployed in St. John's, and I think the same applies to his own district. I believe that all on this side of the House will support a measure for the unemployed to-day.

MR. HIGGINS—I wish, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the views of the members on this side as to the unusual situation being dealt with in an unusual way. All will recognize that at first blush it appears a harsh principle to lay down, when money is such a big factor in running the country, and when we are laboring already under such a heavy burden, but the fact remains that just as one has to make sacrifices as a man, a citizen and a christian on behalf of his sick neighbour, to-day we are bound to share the responsibility imposed upon

us by living in a community where our fellows are in want. It is the duty of those living in the country to saddle themselves with their own burdens and those of posterity in order to help those who to-day are out of work thru no fault of their own. This is a principle of government that cannot be denied. The unfortunate position the Government is in is that as they have been elected it is their duty to carry on the affairs of the country in a financial way. The burden I admit may be heavy and call for unusual steps being taken, but that does not alter the fact that their duties carry that responsibility. No matter how unpleasant it may be, if we are going to have the large numbers of unemployed continue so for months, the country is bound to provide for them and the best way to do so is by public works. Just as one is bound to see that his fellow man does not starve, you are bound now to see that those who are willing and able get work even if it be unnecessary. Bring it down to the local aspect as far as St. John's is concerned. The Hon. Prime Minister has referred to 511 men being unemployed and registered. It goes without saying that this is the minimum because it may safely be taken that no man will put his name down unless he wants the work; no man wants to put his name down and be cast in any job unless he wants it. If 511 have registered there must be many others who have not done so as they realize that all cannot be employed at once. I think you will find it correct that in the Islands to-day nine out of every ten men are out of work. In addition to these heads of families who up to now have been earning steadily, a serious condition has arisen in that those who were helped by their daughters working in factories have now lost that aid through these concerns being closed up. That loss is so serious that the 1000 men who are out of work represent only a minor part of the trouble.

Some up to now have been supported or helped by their daughters, but these are now among the unemployed. Scores of women with invalid husbands or children did sewing at the clothing factories, but that avenue is now stopped and you only see the minimum of those not working when you look at the roster of 511. If we could say there was only 511 idle and one-third had registered for work it would not be so bad. But I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister to the fact that there are 1000 men and double that number of women and girls I recognize that as far as giving help is concerned, it is difficult—it is not easy to be found by the state—but surely you can see that there is enough provided to bridge the present difficulty I will put it in a practical way. In the month of July the Municipal Council hope to find employment for some 400 or 500 in the laying of water pipes, but the trouble now is to bridge that period. That is the acute pipes, but the trouble now is to bridge that period. That is the acute trouble. Some 700 will not be difficult to meet the situation now and I put it before we go into committee. I missed the conclusion of the debate on the Roads Commission a few days ago, but I understand you are to leave the Government contribution over for a year. Why not the Government contribute that amount? It would be no extra donation beyond that of last year and could be spent in connecting up with the Portugal Cove Road. That amount plus the Motor Association's money would be sufficient to bridge the gap remaining. That is a practical suggestion and I ask the Hon. Prime Minister to take it into consideration before we go into Committee. It is idle to talk of plenty work along the waterfront or of hundreds, refusing work along other avenues; the truth is the work is not there and the stage has now been reached where a man's first instincts come back to him. The

member for St. George's has touched in his eloquent address on the fact that in advanced parts of the world the children are looking to the strong arm of the father to bread the poor man will not go back on his first instincts. He has to provide somehow for his young and this is the spirit actuating the men in all sections of the country to-day. It is a great tribute to the working classes, especially in this city where 1100 or 1200 are looking for employment, that there have been no disorders. These people did not require anything to awe them to put them in fear, but remember that the worst man to start is the quiet one. The worst man in the labour trouble or row is the one who is quiet till he starts in. It is absolutely imperative that the Government take steps to deal with this situation. I draw no distinction as to party where the demand for work is concerned, but if the people with their god-given right to live here ask for a living, the country has to provide it and all of us if we have a dollar must share it with the man who is not working. This is Christian charity, and not only that but statesmanship and good citizenship. I support in all good faith the plea of the member for St. George's, and I hope the outport members will excuse me when I refer particularly to St. John's as these conditions are always here. I know from personal association that many men are going along from day to day in the hope of something being done for them and they do not want to act in any way, but that which is orderly and in obedience to the law, but if they are kept in their present position a few days longer it will be beyond reason not to expect an aspect to develop that this House or these men do not desire. As to the burden we already have to bear I repeat the moral adduced by the member for St. George's. The cause he said was the war and the big expenditure was due to the war. The whole point of it

is that the soldiers who died did so that their brothers might live and if we agree with those gallant lads who are sleeping across the water we will not break faith with them. As the member for St. George's also said all their ideals will be sacrificed, they will have died in vain if we do not accept their burden. I ask this in the spirit not so much because I am on this side, but because this is no time to play politics and as the member for St. George's said, though he used strong words, if we fall in this we tell the men who died for us that they did so that we might starve. This is no time to talk of the obligations that are to be and I will refer to them later, and support the measure incurring them. If the Government sinks the country in debt outnumbering the present liability by ten millions, I will support it in order to feed the people and they are not doing right if they do not do it. I ask that this matter be given the earliest consideration and I say the government would be perfectly justified. Looking at it even in the meaner sense—from a standpoint of politics,—I say the money would be well spent.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
—I ask the leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, though I know I am out of order to refer briefly to this subject. The situation as far as St. John's is concerned can be arranged within half an hour. We are now handling a total of 250 men in St. John's West irrespective of whether they belong to St. John's East or West. Some \$4,000 has been expended and the work is still going on. I have instructed Mr. Bambrick to confer with the Road Commission and offer \$2,000 out of the road grants if they will put up another \$2,000 to bridge over the period referred to. That is I asked if arrangements could be made for the immediate expenditure of \$4,000. The situation arose this morning and I had not time to confer with Mr. Bennett, but I think he will concur. I understand how my

honorable friend is situated in the East End. Major Butler was told by Mr Parsons he could not handle any more men.

MR. HIGGINS—His money is all spent.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—My grant is less than yours

MR. HIGGINS—The situation in the East End is that this work is counteracted by the scarcity of labor along shore. I will give all the grant so long as the work continues.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have handled 350 men out of mine, and if you can do the same it solves the situation.

MR. HIGGINS—Our money has all gone to the Council while you spent \$4,000 and two-thirds of the men are not from St. John's East at all, though the \$10,000 has been eaten up

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—While we are working to the capacity of 350, many men are not willing to engage at that work. We will have about 150 more on to-morrow. The East and West End Road Inspectors are conferring as to Freshwater Road, and work has been arranged for there

MR. HIGGINS—Why not follow my suggestion?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is a matter for the House. I have told Mr. Bambrick we will put up \$2,000 and let the Commission provide the same amount to help over the situation. I think that the criticisms directed at the Labour Bureau are not justified. If in 24 hours after the first day of registering more than half the men are employed, I think it is good work. I hold no brief for Major Butler but he did his work well and went around to the wharves and Road Inspectors seeing about the men. The situation is daily becoming more relieved. The Colonia Cordage Co. will be going in full swing shortly and the Tobacco factory will reopen in a day or two which

lightening up will be exceedingly welcome.

MR. BENNETT.—I should like to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, and I want to approach the subject with the feeling that we are not talking politics. This is too serious to view from a party standpoint. The plea of Mr. MacDonnell and Mr. Higgins must bring home to the people that the situation is becoming more acute every day and I must say I am surprised and disappointed by the reply of the Hon. Prime Minister as to how the situation is to be met. I had an opportunity a few days ago to congratulate him on the establishment of the Labour Bureau as it is a good idea and no better man to head it could be found than Major Butler who is sound in judgment, good-hearted and ready for service as ably proved when his country called, but his duties are only of a clerical nature and no doubt he has done well. But we are faced with a situation that cannot be answered by \$20,000 or \$30,000 or work for a few days and we have now come to the point where we must insist on a declaration of the Governments' policy. The House will be closing in a comparatively few days but the people can clamor as they like and there is no one to say what is to be done. This question must be looked at broadly. It is not alone those who have registered that must be taken into consideration but the hundreds who have not and who are in every way as worthy of being looked after as the former. The Prime Minister has said that some of the factories will be opening up in a few days but since the Sales Tax has come up for discussion I have had the opportunity of getting the views of some manufacturers on the question and I learn that a meeting is likely to be held to consider the matter of whether or not all the factories will close down. The Sales Tax

is nothing but a piece of discrimination against local industry and it is not only the present time that we have to look to but the months that are to follow when this House is no longer open. What of the coming Fall and Winter? These are the periods which we must consider seriously. Almost anyone can find work in June but a different story will be told next winter. Is not my suggestion that this House should not close till the end of the year worthy of consideration under the circumstances? True the Legislature only prorogues from period to period but a month might elapse before it could be called together should an emergency make that necessary and that emergency may arise at any moment. I sympathize with the unemployed because I know just what the situation is to-day and I know too what capable, hardworking people our men are and how quiet and reasonable they can be in times of adversity such as the present. The situation is appalling. Go down to the wharves of the mercantile firms visit the factories and you will find everything at a standstill. The people are only now waking up to the fact that we are suffering from the after effects of war and as has been pointed out, surely if this country was good enough to fight for, her people are good enough to keep from starvation. We hear much talk about road grants and road commissions but this only goes to show that the Government is not awake to the real gravity of the situation. They have not been amongst the people to know the true position. It may be all right till the House closes but what lies beyond that no man can tell.

I have heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries make the statement that he is not worrying about the present but that he is appalled to think what is going to happen next fall. I spoke to a merchant recently, a man

who has on more than one occasion proven himself a real friend of the people and who has now placed his all practically at the disposal of the fishermen, and I asked him how he thought he would come out of it. He replied that he was confident every man he supplied would bring their fish to him, that they would give him every cod's tail they had. But, I asked, what will you do for them in November? He said, "while I am supplying them now, I cannot support them next winter," and then in spite of that we are to close this House and have the people knocking looking for help and finding no one at home. I say the Government must take this matter up seriously without loss of time. It has been prophesied that times will be bad the coming autumn and winter but they may be much worse even than we anticipate and something worthy of the occasion will have to be done. It is not good enough to hand out pauper relief but we must provide work that will give our people the means to stave off absolute want.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting what has been said in connection with this matter of the unemployment problem and particularly what has been said by Mr. Bennett. It is a sheer waste of time to discuss the spending of two or three thousand dollars now and I think the suggestion of Capt. Lewis that a special loan be raised to supply employment for the people throughout the country is a good one. St. John's is not the only place where work of some kind is imperatively needed, especially when you come to consider the closing down of Grand Falls, Limeville, Bell Island and other places which gave employment to thousands of men from all parts of the country and who are now thrown out of work. I regret too that the rosy picture printed in the Government

papers of the big project to be started on the Humber that was to give employment to five thousand men has not materialized and I join with Mr. MacDonnell when he says that this matter never came before the House to give us a chance to consider whether or not it was right that these people should be given the concessions that they required. The matter of the Bell Island Ore Tax has been on the Order Paper almost since the opening of the House but we have got no further with it yet despite the fact that its settlement might mean the opening of operations on the Island on something like the old scale and I learn now that a number of men who left Bell Island for Sydney and other points in Canada to seek employment have been deported, having been sent back here because they could not comply with the requirements of the Canadian Immigration Laws in the matter of the amount of money necessary to enter that country. These men have been sent back here to be fed as paupers. Now, Sir, this is not a matter to be made a political football of nor am I talking politics. As Mr. Higgins has said the two sides should get together on this thing and make a serious effort to deal with the situation. If we are to take over the railway from the Reids, can we not get some reputable company to come in here as contractors and borrow five or ten million dollars to put the railway in condition and thereby give work to thousands of our people? There are, at a conservative estimate, at least ten thousand men out of employment in Newfoundland to-day and I know that there are from three to five hundred in my district who cannot go fishing because they cannot get the ordinary supplies of food, oil, clothing, boots, etc., I have thanked the Government for what they have done in issuing what supplies they have but as I pointed out, nothing

less than \$200,000 could be counted as adequate for this purpose. Besides the usual number of men who always went to the fishery there is now the additional number of those who formerly worked at Grand Falls and other places and we have sheafs of telegrams coming in daily telling of the awful conditions that are prevailing, conditions whose gravity is being constantly increased. Never mind what the cause of the present situation is; that has already been fully discussed, but let us get together and solve the question of how to apply the remedy. All cannot go fishing, it is true, but we have telegrams telling of the fact that men who were always independent fishermen are now unable to get the smallest supplies and one telegram in particular from a man named Picco, a reliable man who comes from the very best stock and who was at Marystown waiting to go fishing, says that he has given up the whole thing and he has now gone home to die of starvation with his family. There are twenty owners of Western boats in that neighbourhood who are in the same position. I do not blame the Government for these conditions but I shall blame them if they do not arise to the occasion now and I appeal especially to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who knows what conditions are in the North. I think it is an insult to instruct the Poor Commissioner to send out poor relief at this day in the year. That is not what the people want and I can assure the Prime Minister that any scheme that will be evolved to deal with the matter will have my hearty support. We had no hesitation in sending over to England during the war and getting ten or fifteen million dollars and why can we now not come in and ask for five millions to meet this emergency. I shudder to think what will happen if we close this House without providing adequate em-

ployment and I subscribe to the suggestion of Mr. Bennett that the House should not close at all and I ask the Government to take this to heart and let no such consideration as party politics stand in the way of their doing their duty in this respect.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker, if I might be pardoned I would like to make some explanation in connection with my remarks of yesterday with regard to this \$10,000. I was accused after going out of the House of wishing to cut that amount out altogether and so deprive laboring men of the work that it would afford. Now, Sir, I want to place myself on record as being prepared to vote \$10,000,000 if necessary to help out the situation that exists to-day. My point was that this \$10,000 is no good whatever to the unemployed because it is already spent and in any case it would only go to make good roads for a few motorists around the city.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the matter now before the Chair. The Prime Minister said in answer to a question that a labor bureau had been established and he tried to insinuate that Mr. MacDonnell said Major Butler had fallen down on the job. Now, Sir, I heard something of that kind from the Prime Minister before when he charged the Municipal Council with having fallen down on their job.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I said the Council had fallen down on the labor bureau.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Well I say you should fall down on your knees to the Council and thank them for helping you out of the hole. When that work was undertaken first, five persons out of every seven thought the money was the Government's and not the Council's but the fact was that it was the people of this City who have to find that money. Now you come in here as the representative of St. John's

West and as Prime Minister and say we will guarantee you employment but you have fifty thousand dollars which was picked out to build a new long bridge which could well be spent now at other work. There is no urgent need of a new Long Bridge as yet and when we want that we will be able to get it some time when conditions are better than they are now. St. John's East spent \$10,000 while your district spent only \$4,000. You said that our allocation was larger than yours which might be true but we gave the ten thousand dollars to the people who needed it right away while you are only spending yours now. Then again look at the difference in the size of the two districts. In St. John's West there are Broad Cove, Horse Cove, Thorburn Rd., Kilbride, Petty Hr., Maddox Cove and the Goulds, while in St. John's East we have Middle Cove, Outer Cove, Logy Bay, Torbay, Flatrock, Bauline, Pouch Cove, Shoe Cove, Biscayan Cove, Cape St. Francis, Portugal Cove, Bell Isld. and Quidi Vidi and the money is not nearly sufficient to go over the district. Now we are told that Major Butler has 150 men provided but let me tell you Sir, that Major Butler has his hands full.

I was registering at the Council office one day in the absence of Deputy Mayor Mullally and my heart went out to the men who came there looking for work and crying bitterly because their families were without a bite to eat. There were mechanics and coopers amongst them and many of them Sir, were from your own district of St. John's West. All this talking back and forth is a waste of time when you have \$50,000 that you could spend now. If there was \$200,000 voted at this minute for St. John's I do not believe that there is a member on the other side who would not vote for it, and why should they not when \$50,-

000 was given to the fishermen of the outports?

I know if the Prime Minister brought in a vote for \$100,000 to give out work that not a man on the other side of the House, even Mr. Targett, whom I know have friends of his unemployed, would oppose it. I think the time of the House is taken up this evening in a good cause. Some members who have spoken said that they were not making politics out of this thing. I am not concerned what I make out of it, because I owe my seat to the working people of St. John's. Mr. Bennett said that he came in daily contact with laborers for a number of years, well I do not believe that there is a member on either side of the House who has been mixed up with laborers as much as I have been. Therefore, I will make use of my voice in this House to do anything I can that will be of benefit to the laborer. Now all this talk could be avoided if the Prime Minister would take that \$50,000 that is now in the possession of the Municipal Council and give immediate work with it. Surely goodness, as a representative for the district of St. John's West, he is now going to allow men and their families to be hungry while there is \$50,000 available to do work at the Long Bridge. The Long Bridge can remain as it is to-day until we come to good times and which will come when we get the Government. The working class of people generally thought and they think to-day that the \$50,000 earmarked for the Long Bridge work had been given to the Council by the Government. Now it is up to the Prime Minister to give that money to the Council to give work to the unemployed right away. The remodelling of the Long Bridge can be done without until the year before the next election, if you like, as at that time you will need to do a lot of things I am informed that some 70

or 80 men are to be employed on the Thorburn Road with Road Inspector Bambrick. I hope and trust that any men belonging to St. John's East, who go to Major Butler, will be put to work, although Thorburn Road is in St. John's West and I hope there will be no discrimination used, because as Mr. Higgins pointed out, when we spent that \$10,000 out of our district grant on that water line, two-thirds of the men employed belonged to St. John's West and there was no discrimination in connection with the matter. That work was done under Mr. Coaker, City Council Inspector, and Mr. Parsons, East End Road Inspector for the Government, never even saw the road. I would like for the Prime Minister to know that there are more men out of employment at the present time than he thinks. He may come across a couple of men who do not want work, but he should not form his opinion by that. He must remember that there are some men in this community who will not go to look for work, under any circumstances, because they are ashamed. The Prime Minister should take full responsibility on his shoulders for present conditions, because, after all, he was the one who said that he knew the tension was going to come and that he was preparing for it. Now apparently he did not prepare very much for it. We heard from him also how he was going to reduce taxation and everything else, while to-day the people are more overburdened than ever with taxation. Now the only one man in this House who can settle the unemployment problem to-day is the Prime Minister and I would again ask him to do with that \$50,000, as I have already stated. With regard to this Act that was discussed yesterday, I may say that I was heartily in accord with giving \$10,000 to the Motor Association, because that amount would go anyhow and we will see some re-

turns for it by giving it to the Motor Association. I am not in favor of the amendment of Sir John Crosbie and the Prime Minister. One does not know how to take the Prime Minister on this matter I might say, owing to his inconsistent attitude. However, I would ask the Prime Minister in the interest of humanity to think of the sufferings that is going on among the people of St. John's and particularly among the people of St. John's West, which district he represents in this House, and I hope that he will see that the \$50,000 that I have already referred to will be utilized to give work to the unemployed.

DR JONES.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of endorsing the very able plea put up by my colleagues on behalf of the unemployed. I can quite realise, as I can judge from what I saw myself, the great deal of distress that prevails in the city to-day; but we must not lose sight of the fact that this thing is general throughout the entire country and anything that may be done to provide employment should be done in general. This will involve the expenditure of a large amount of money, but as my colleagues have pointed out, no sacrifice should be too great to try and procure work for those in need at this particular juncture. We have in our district seven-eighths of the people depending on their daily labor for bread. Within recent years the people of Hr. Main district have depended to a large extent on Bell Island and other centres for employment. If the present serious condition continues all through the summer months, we can only expect an appalling state of affairs next winter. Consequently, I say that something should be done now and done quickly to provide employment to enable the working classes of the country to keep their families for the next twelve months or so. After that conditions may be entirely different;

but at present the people are faced with an appalling situation. I trust that the Government will earnestly consider the request that has been asked of them and that they will provide adequately for all the districts throughout the Island. I wish to compliment the various members who have spoken for approaching this subject in a non-partisan manner; at the same time I wish to emphasize the fact that people in the outports are suffering just as much as people in the city for want of employment, and I again trust that the Government will consider the case of the outport man in a similar manner as in the case of the St. John's man.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised that members on both sides of the House showed a great desire that they did not want to be accused of talking politics while expressing their views on this motion. Now, Sir, I do not care whether I am accused of talking politics, socialism or anything else. I do not believe in a man who talks in that strain no matter what side of the House he is on. He is afraid to discuss something that hints at the very life of this country. We have in this country at the present time a serious state of affairs regarding the labor problem, and it must be considered that Sydney, which used to employ a considerable number of our Newfoundland men, is practically closed down, and it should be known to the Government that instructions have been issued not to issue any more railway tickets for Sydney. The Limeville Quarries are closed down in consequence; Bell Island is practically closed down and it should be known to the Government that Grand Falls is not like to resume operations and that the Company there are not going to relent one wit on the stand they have already taken. Still we get the illuminating suggestion from the

Prime Minister that the House voted some road money and that it is all spent. This is not what we got to consider. This is not a public work in the same sense as roads and bridges. This is an entirely different matter, because you have the usual channels of employment gone. This is not a question of roads at all. No doubt it will be a source of comfort and consolation to the people of this country to know that a few more dollars will be devoted for roads and bridges, and when that is spent the same old process will go on again. The Government are in the unhappy position that they pauperized the fishermen. You got the fishermen to come here for what is practically pauper relief this year; you put the workmen of the country out of business and you now come in with a few dollars to spend on roads and bridges as a solution and as a general cure all. You now come here quibbling with ten thousand dollars. Now I want to make this statement straight. A Government, which lives on the people and the chief thing in the Government at the present moment, particularly in the Executive of the day, is that they are living on the people of the country, is a Government of parasite. I say further that the position does not make the man. A man may hold the highest position in the land and yet be totally incapable of his duties. Therefore, we do not bow down to him because he holds a position in the land and yet be totally incapable of his duties. Therefore, we do not bow down to him because he holds a position in the Executive Government. One of the greatest authorities on human nature among the poets was Burns who said: "That a parasite is only a parasite if it falls on the head of a queen." Consequently, I say that the parasite in a Government should be rooted out and politically destroyed.

That is absolutely the position. It is no reply for the Prime Minister to get up and say that MacDonnell criticized the labor bureau and that he talked politics. That is not the solution. Take the railroad which would employ thousands of men, why not take that as a proposition, ballast the railroad and put down new rails. Do not be afraid to handle such a policy as that because Reids name is mentioned. If you are not capable of handling that, get out and those who can handle it take your place. If we are bankrupt let us go bankrupt in style. What does it matter whether we go bankrupt with ten millions in debt or fifty millions. You have got to run the railway in this country whether you like it or not, because it is a public utility, just as you got to run lighthouses and post offices. The way that you operated the railway during the past year, or rather the way in which you hopelessly mismanaged it, has put the country in the position it is in today, and, as a result of that you have got no claims against the contractors, and you come here now with no definite proposition from the contractors as to whether they are prepared to operate the railway after the 30th of June next. If you cannot make any contract with the Reid Newfoundland Company make it with somebody else. Make a new contract with new conditions, because you cannot run the railway to-day, under the '98 contract. I say here to-day in my place in this House that this Government is utterly and absolutely incapable of dealing with any situation that is facing this country to-day. You come down here with a Budget stating how you want money and that you propose to get it by sticking on taxes, irrespective of the import tariff. It is a lazy government's job or a lazy man's tariff. I do not know which of these is right to call it, nor do I care which. You tried to move the suspension of the rules of

this House at 24 hours notice to leave the country in the position when the House closed as wise as when it was at the opening, and worse than that you expect the people to stand for it. I hope that before this present day's session closes we will find that something definite will be forthcoming from the government to take hold of something worth while in this country. I characterise this work on roads as poor relief, wilful waste and extravagance. I wish some proposition or some suggestion would be made this evening to deal with the whole situation. It is no use to close this evening and have me or somebody else get up to-morrow and talk the thing over again. That is no good. There has been too much talk already and too little done. That has been the great trouble and it is the fault of the government, and not the Opposition. There was a time that you had a news paper to place the sins on the Opposition. It was the saving of you as a Government that the Opposition talked for a couple of weeks. After the Address in Reply was disposed of in the early part of the session, you came in day after day with only enough business before the House to last the session from 3.30 to 4.30. You were always hoping for something to turn up. You were either utterly incapable or totally indifferent of the wishes and the wants of the people of the country. Why not get down to business properly now, and never mind voting this \$10,000 to make a motor boulevard. The main issue for you is to try and get the people of the country to live in the country, because by your silence and incapacity and negligence you are simply fostering a policy of exterminating the people of this country. Remember there is no work for them outside and they got to live here and to die here. That being so, give them a chance so that they may starve to death.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker.

Somebody in this House during the course of this debate has brought up that vote for the Motor Association and apparently that somebody thinks that I did not want to give it for labor. That is absolutely incorrect, I made a motion, seconded by the Prime Minister, that the extra \$10,000 that was left over, instead of giving it to the Motor Association, be saved for some other purpose. That was my position. Now I will make a proposition with the consent of the Prime Minister, that the \$10,000 be given to St. John's East and West for immediate work. Have it earmarked and sent out to-morrow and probably put another hundred men to work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Motor Association in connection with that vote of \$10,000 were putting up a similar amount out of their own funds.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—But the Motor Association are taxed by law anyhow and they got to put it up. However, if it is necessary, tax the motor man who drives around in style with a view to being able to devote more money for labor in St. John's. I think I have made myself clear on that point so that everybody will understand my position in the matter. Earmark this \$10,000 for the benefit of the unemployed and have Major Butler see that those who are most in need be sent to work to-morrow morning.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I second that.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like to say that I am in accord with certain references made in connection with the problem of unemployment. I know that the position is very serious in St. John's, as was so well pointed out by the members for St. John's East and West. I have a district, His Honor the Speaker has a district, and the members for Mr. Grace and Mr. Main have districts where the question of unemployed is more serious than what it is in St. John's. The other members that I have referred to can

tell the story just as well as I can. I am in receipt of messages from my district stating that seven or eight families who are in a state of starvation and I have been doing my utmost to assist. If the Government can see their way clear as suggested by Mr MacDonnel, to set us some big proposition at present, and which I know as well as the Government is very difficult, it would bring about a solution of the situation in as much as all those out of employment would be put to work. If the government will endeavour I will give them any assistance I can. You have got to find money for every other form of employment, unfortunately, just as you found money for the supplying of the fishermen; and if Mr MacDonnell's statement, that orders have been issued for no more men to go to Sydney, and I have no reason to doubt that statement, I am astounded so far as my district is concerned. Do you know anything about this Mr. Prime Minister?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think they have all the men that they can handle for the present at Sydney, but I think the situation will be relieved within a week.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If that is the position, we are up against it harder than I thought. I do not know what is going to take place in Conception Bay within a week, I fear what is going to happen there, because I believe that the men employed at Bell Island now will be laid off. I believe that some big proposition has got to be found and the quicker the better to get employment for all our people.

MR. LEWIS—Mr. Speaker. I must take this opportunity of thanking the Government and the Prime Minister for the treatment he has given the fishermen of Harbor Main but that is not all. They are only part of our population and as we have heard from the St. John's representatives they are only forty thousand whereas representatives of the other two hundred and

twenty thousand occupy seats on the government side of the House, and we have yet to hear one of these gentlemen give an expression of opinion as to the conditions in his district, which are not better than that of the labouring classes of St. John's, because when we get down to rock bottom and go to Bonavista Bay and Green Bay and White Bay we will find that the greater number of the labouring classes there found work at Grand Falls, and as far as we can learn there is no light to be seen with regard to a settlement of the strike there. I think it is the duty of the Government to take up that matter with the Company and see if something cannot be done. Coming back to the district of Hr. Main I might tell the Prime Minister that a great number of our men have earned a livelihood at Bell Island, Grand Falls or Sydney and early in the session a bill was introduced dealing with the Bell Island companies, and that bill was withdrawn. It is still on the Order Paper or was, but it has not been brought before the House and given the consideration which I consider is its due. I was told that that Bill was the cause of Bell Island closing down, also Port aux Port, as to whether that is correct or not, I am open to conviction, and I would like to be set right if I am wrong. If that is correct I think it is the duty of the Prime Minister to bring that bill in and suspend the rules of the House as we did with the loan, pass that Bill to the satisfaction of the Companies, and let the men who are anxious to get work get it. All the destitution is not in St. John's. Some of the outports are as bad or worse, and I can understand that the government is facing a difficult problem, but if the government is not big enough to handle it they should do the next best thing, and I say from my place in this House that now is the time when we want a good man who can rise above politics.

I think when our fishermen have to pay seventy cents on a barrel of flour it is time to do something. The few days work that have been supplied by the Government is only a drop in the bucket. The same thing applies to the general tariff. One dollar to-day is only worth thirty cents. It is time for someone to take hold of this situation and we want a man big enough who will throw politics to the winds, and cut off every useless expenditure. You should cut off that three hundred thousand dollars for Education and reduce taxation. I know that the government think it necessary to increase taxation, but there is another way around it. The man who can afford champagne should be charged for it and the lady who imports silk stockings should be charged higher duty, or the man with the automobile, but not the fishermen. A man goes to the fishery and catches sixty quintals of fish. He gets five dollars a quintal and that makes three hundred dollars. He has to pay two hundred and ten dollars to the revenue and he has ninety left. What happens to him? By the last of November any man who can get his passage money will be gone from the country. You are filling too many positions Mr. Prime Minister, and you doubled that tariff without due consideration, and handed it to the people of the country. You are fooling the people or you think you are, but they will not be fooled.

Getting back to the unemployed I agree with Mr. MacDonnell that we have to get some big proposition. We never had a crisis like this before in Newfoundland. We had one similar in 1886 under the Cochrane Government, they built the Placentia branch of the railroad at that time to relieve the situation. At that time the pay was seventy cents a day, but it was as good as two dollars now. Something must be done. Sydney is closed to our fishermen. Only two weeks ago a man went from Holyrood to Sydney. He

had not twenty-five dollars in his pocket; he was put in jail and kept there for two nights. The people cannot go away and it is up to Newfoundland wherever the money comes from to provide for them. It is just as good to go to Canada with a little larger debt as it is to go in our present condition, and Mr. Prime Minister if you cannot fill your positions let a By-election take place or put another man in the position of the Minister of Finance & Customs, and give the labouring class a chance to redeem themselves, and exist in this, their country.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the country as a whole and the unemployed in particular are indebted to the Opposition for the manner in which they have discussed this very serious situation. I am sure also that they are indebted to those members of the government who contributed in such an able manner to the debate this afternoon. I refer now to the fifteen or twenty members of the government who with such a wealth of detail discussed this matter. It signifies the interest they take in the matter, and I feel sure that country will appreciate that interest.

Now with regard to this matter I feel that if the unemployed are as impatient at the action of the government as I am then the situation is correctly described in the Telegram, when it says that this country may expect at any moment the riot that has been anticipated. Some four or five weeks ago this matter was brought before the House, and for the first time in the history of the country a delegation of the unemployed presented themselves to the Bar of the House, and described the position to the government and the opposition giving the fullest possible details, and requesting the prompt action in the matter, and the proposal suggested was met with in the same manner as that of Mr. MacDonnell this afternoon. The

Prime Minister said that the matter would be attended to immediately. He told Mr. Higgins yesterday that the question could be settled in half an hour. Six weeks ago he said the same thing. I move the adjournment of the House that Friday and an immediate meeting, and he said that the source of all complaint would be removed within twenty-four hours, and ever since that day agitation has been increasing daily in this city, and I am saying to myself is it not futile for the Opposition to get up here and ask the same thing again. Are you made of stone? Not one man on the other side of the House has spoken on this matter in support of an appeal that should have the support of every true-blooded Newfoundlander. Your silence, Sir, will be your epitaph. It is a sign of your incompetence that you trifle with a matter that might entail serious consequences, and then your pitiful silence this afternoon. God help the country when serious situations such as this one are being handled by a crowd of incapables like the present government. You may laugh Sir, but you would be better engaged in an attempt to right this matter. I have had a hard time to restrain myself for the past six weeks, but I have realised the delicacy of the situation, I have realised that a word may be as a match to gunpowder, and I have used every effort to comfort myself on this question with all the seriousness at my command and have foregone my usual criticism of your actions and asked you in God's name to do your duty to the people. My God the Prime Minister smiles in the face of the destitution in Newfoundland to-night. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. If he goes outside and walks the streets of the city he will see things that will almost break his heart, and then we are told how we should conduct ourselves, and these poor people throughout the country are asked to comfort themselves in a law abiding manner, by a govern-

ment that has not a single justification or right to be in the position of authority that they are in to-day having failed lamentably in their duty to the people who sent them here. Look at what the Telegram says to-night. I saw this letter yesterday afternoon. Perhaps when the Prime Minister received it he smiled in the same way as he did this afternoon, when I was attempting to appeal to him on behalf of the starving families of Newfoundland, and it is not only in St. John's that this applies. Before I read this I want to say to Mr. Coaker and his followers that I am coming daily into contact with his constituents. Yesterday a man from your district came into my office and he cried in my presence. You would need to be a man of stone to stand it. You would want to be constituted as the government is to realise such conditions and then smile. That man told me he had five children and a wife home. He came here looking for work and assistance and left them a week's grub and no money. He was not successful in his quest, and he came in and spoke to me yesterday about it and he cried in my room, and I don't want to witness such a moving spectacle again. Go around the city to-night. Give up some of your social activities and go around the back lanes. Go to the homes of this Committee of the unemployed and see what you will find, and then come here and smile at the members of the Opposition when they appeal to you in the name of common humanity and charity, and in the name of God to do something and to do it quickly. Here is what The Telegram says, as follows

May I ask the honourable gentleman whether Mr. Ayre has been replied to?

THE PRIME MINISTER—No. He has not. I received the letter yesterday afternoon and put the matter in the hands of Major Butler.

MR. FOX—Is this a case of sending the fool further? Did you not consid-

er, Sir, that Mr. Ayre's letter was entitled to a reply in the ordinary way. Do you not recognize that whatever he may be in your opinion he represents a committee of the unemployed, and he in his official capacity deserved from you in your official capacity the courtesy of a reply. Is that how you handle important matters of this sort, that instead of dictating a reply to that letter, you stated you were giving the matter your attention, and then passed it on to somebody else to look after? Is that how you are attempting to placate the feelings of these people, to keep them under control, and amenable to the advice of their committee. I suppose that to-morrow or next day that you will again smile if the riot which the warships were intended to quell breaks out. Are we going to be treated like that always? Are you going to strangle every attempt at co-operation made by this Opposition, in an endeavour to properly handle a matter of such serious nature as this. Have you any realisation of the true situation? Is not the country to-night facing a terrible situation? This matter was brought before the House six weeks ago and not alone has no effort been made to solve the situation, but a deliberate attempt has been made to drive the people to do something desperate. You cannot go on with other matters and leave this matter in slings. You cannot disregard the conditions that are continually becoming more serious and more imminent. Now are you going to do anything or are you not? You are daily making Newfoundland unfit for people to live in. You are crushing the people in every possible way. As Mr. MacDonnell says this afternoon, it is a lazy man's way of finding revenue. There is many a man in Newfoundland to-day that is longing for the day when he will be able to shake the dust of Newfoundland off his feet, because this is becoming a country where they cannot live. Most of you

come here day after day and do nothing more than put your heads in your hands. If I wanted statutes I would go down to Mr. Cash's and get the name of the man that he bought his from, and I would bring them up and put them on the Government benches, and they would be just as useful as most of the members opposite. I appeal to you to-night for the last time, in God's name, in the name of the country do something, not only for the situation in St. John's, but for the whole country. Give up party politics, and the idea of trips abroad or to neighbouring continent, and tackle the biggest problem that has ever faced the country. It is not a question of digging rocks out of the roads. Have you not the initiative that will bring forth some scheme that will meet not only the present day situation, but that will be a benefit to the whole country. If you cannot do that then at the very least have the common decency of stepping out of office. I consequently second the motion for the adjournment of this House so that this serious matter may be handled at once.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the motion Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Mr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis—(13); and against it Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Acting Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(17); so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair till 8 p.m. Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of

Titles" was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MACDONNELL—You are simply asking the people to throw away \$25,000. Ask the man in the outport to compare this and the clip of \$3,000 off the C. H. E. and see what they will see. The Hon. Minister thinks we could do without the Primary Grade; perhaps he is right—\$3,000 is too much for that, but \$25,000 is not too much for a fancy fad. The Hon. Minister may justify it, and I am not surprised. It is a grand thing to have a motor car or yacht if one can afford it, but the Normal School and Supervisors are luxuries we cannot afford. These are no better to our educational system than is the bouquet to the coat of the man who wears it. I say this in no disrespect to Hon. Dr. Barnes, or Dr. Burke, his deputy, who I believe is second to none in Newfoundland. I say that he has studied harder along these lines than any man in the country, but he should be put to better work than Deputy of a defunct department. He is capable of better work. The suggestion that these two men be put where they will rust out at a salary of \$9,000 a year is something I don't believe in. The staff alone costs \$12,800 and of that lot, one stenographer and one clerk or deputy minister as the case may be, is enough. The Hon. Minister's salary of \$4,000 should not be voted this year, as he is not essential. His appointment only keeps us longer in getting the annual reports as they come through him and this, I hear, is the only thing he is engaged on. I do not speak thus merely in the spirit of criticism, but the de-

partment is no good in the sense that we cannot afford it. Neither can we afford to have the supervisors. In this matter of the Educational Department due consideration has not been given as to the grant for the sparsely populated sections. The criticism will not be noticed I suppose as it comes from this side. If I point out how you can save \$25,000 it will not be done. Still we must have the bouquet of \$12,500 a year, simply because you are going to have it. You say here in the Estimates that you will have it; you intend to have it. I am prepared to go into the details when it comes down, as I know something of this matter. I worked in the department and was paid \$100 a month and had to pay my own expenses. A fortnight's expenses often took my month's salary, and I had to go home for a month in order to square myself. Now there are men being better paid for being trained than I was as Assistant Superintendent. That was not in the day when the money was spent on fads—now it goes from the bouquets and ornaments. Now Mr. Chairman, there is another department which I state is overstocked with officials, the Postal Department. And I further state that it would be more decent of you if a certain number were fired, who can be dispensed with here or outside the country than to reduce those who have been there for some 40 years in some instances. Look in at the windows in the general room of the Post Office at any time and you will see that some of them are doing nothing; what is everybody's job is nobody's. Because the place is overstocked all must suffer the reduction of salary. Why not reduce the number and get them all down to a living wage. I do not think you can economize unless you do this.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—May I ask what you mean by saying the department is overstocked.

MR. MACDONNELL—I will give the details when we come to it and the

details of those who have been appointed since you took charge and who are incompetent. I know of the man who you bragged about having a knowledge of geography and being able to tell all about how many Russians were captured at the front while the war was on. He might make a good navigator, but is no addition to the Postal staff. I say that in that department you cannot economize except by discharging the surplus help. Now as to the revenue and the estimated expenditure. I am not prepared to make a prophesy, there are others more experienced who will deal fully with it, but I will say that for a government who started out to abolish abuses and clean up taxation you have fallen down worse than any administration in our history. Whether others would do better or not, I do not know. That is a hypothetical question. You now want to rush everything through as you did last year and afterwards take up business on Executive responsibility. You want to take the Railway of which I spoke this afternoon, and hand it over to a receiver. He will receive something when he gets that road alright. We had a suggestion here a few days ago that something be done. You said that something would be, but nothing has yet resulted. The railroad is another ornament now which you took over at a loss of two and a half millions. I hope you will profit by your experience in running it and do something before the House closes. Somebody must do it and it is your job, Hon. Minister of Marine. As far as I can see, Mr. Chairman, right through both the Budget and the Estimates you have simply and solely taken the line of least resistance. You want to save so much money and you simply say, cut the civil servants. You save \$10,000 or \$15,000 by cutting off the men who are responsible for the lobster service of the country. From the answer of the Hon. Minister of Marine I find in this

table there are more factories now than ever. On the West Coast alone where the most work in this line is done—at St. George's etc., great operations have been carried on, and I attribute this to the man in charge of the supervision, Mr. Morgan. He is dropped from the Estimates this year. As a result more barm will be done in connection with this fishery than in the last five years. Take the placing of the young lobsters in the water. If there be no supervisor these will be canned and shipped abroad. Two years of this will kill the fishery. Perhaps you think this fishery is not worth while looking after, but it is to the people who are engaged in it. I ask the Hon. Minister to reconsider this matter. When the vote comes up, Mr. Scammell, the honourable member for St. Barbe, I know will support me, and have this vote continued. I will not delay the House longer, but will now close till these matters come up later in detail.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I said a few days ago that when these Resolutions would be brought in, I would have a few words to say, and I feel that I may do so to-night, Mr. Chairman. First of all I am satisfied that this Sales Tax will be for ever known as Sir Richard Anderson Squires' Chinese puzzle. If one should say it is not a puzzle he cannot understand it. There is not a man on Water Street knows how to handle it. These resolutions came out on the 13th of June, but because they were not arranged to suit some party they were called off at 11 o'clock this morning and the cute man got away with a considerable slice of the revenue. They were kept so secret that even you men on that side of the House did not get a copy of them. And yet they are so stupid that 20 or 30 merchants got away with the revenue. When I am dealing with these I will point them out, and I will also point out the man who asserted himself and showed he would not stand for men

getting things in privately, and not being taxed. They took him outside and tried to give him the soothing syrup, but they are giving the fishermen a dose of bitters. They sent the word forth—you, Mr. Cheeseman, the members representing the F. P. U. fishermen, their great friend, Hon. Mr. Coaker, the Hon. Min. of Posts, who is always thinking about them—you sent the word that they are to pay 40 cents more per barrel for flour. If I dreamt my suggestion was going to cost the fishermen 40 cents more per barrel for flour I would not have said a word about it. I believe the Hon. Prime Minister must see something in his puzzle for the legal gentlemen. I think he realizes that the average man who sends his clerk to pass entries now will want a lawyer with him and have to pay him a fee. That's what it seems like to me. When the Hon. Prime Minister went to the country, and the Minister of Public Works who was out with him and my great friend the Hon. Minister of Shipping in Bay de Verde district, you told the fishermen of their heavy taxes, and said their dollar under Sir M. P. Cashin was worth only 28 cents. But give us your figures now. It is not worth par—he spends his first dollar altogether and on the second is allowed only 10 cents. The Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries said, "we will reduce taxation, we are the Liberal-Reform Government." The Hon. Minister of Justice in Fortune Bay said, "we will reduce taxation." I do not mind the lawyer telling it, but when the Minister of Public Works and the Hon. Min. of Shipping do so, I am positively shocked.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I did not talk like that

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You had the Hon. Prime Minister's manifesto with you. The man who associates himself with the one who tells a lie is as guilty as he who tells it.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Don't talk theology.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am a past-master in that.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—What does the Bible say about the liar.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It says he will go to Hell. That is what I read in it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Your church says all men are liars.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It was only Joseph Hocking said that. Are you trying to develop this House into a comic opera. Can you and Mr. Winsor laugh so heartily when you are bleeding the fishermen and laborers of the country. You cannot realize it. Come Capt. Jones be true to Green Bay, when the Hon. Prime Minister is asking you to-day to vote against the manifesto which promised so much reduction in taxation, but to which he is so untrue at present. Don't vote against the reduction which you promised. What do we find? Instead of reduced taxation we have this Prime Minister's Chinese puzzle. The government says we will make the fishermen pay thru the nose, and the fishermen's friend is the one who did the trick. Have you thought this thing out, Mr. Prime Minister? Are you not sad when you think of what it means? If you had the brains with you that you had in the national government, this would not be here to-day, but you have not got a man who can handle the situation. Your Executive can only be compared to nine men lost in the wilderness.

Now, just think out these Resolutions and what they are going to entail. A man goes down to Mr. LeMessurier to-morrow to pass entries on goods and produces his invoices, he may have forgotten his freight bills and has to go back for them, then when he returns to the Custom House he is asked for the bills of his

cartage, insurance and a few other things and back he has to go again to get these and by that time it is 4 o'clock and he passes no entries that day. When he does come to pass his goods thru the Customs he is up against it again. On a hundred dollars worth of goods he pays say 40 per cent duty, making it \$140; 10 per cent on the \$40 makes it \$144 and 25 per cent. of the \$44 brings the total up to \$155. Add say \$10 for freight, and it is brought up to \$165, then for cartage, insurance and labor add another \$5 and you have \$170 on which you will then pay the 5 per cent. sales tax or another \$8.50 bringing the \$100 worth of goods up to \$178.50, and if that is not a Chinese puzzle I don't know what it is. And now I would ask "Who pays?" Do you know Mr. Abbott? Mr. Cave does, I can see by his smiling face. Does Mr. Cheeseman know I wonder, or does Mr. Guppy know? No answer; all hands seem to have passed away. Well, I will tell you who pays. The fishermen—and yet this government is the fishermen's government and in its ranks is the fishermen's friend. Now, what do we find next? We have done away with the inspectors yet we are forced to pay 20 cents a quintal on the fish we export, that means another 20 cents a quintal that the fishermen have to pay and it is 40 cents if the fish is sent out in foreign bottoms. The fisherman cannot get away from that—he pays every time. Now I ask was it necessary to create this tax? No, the country is simply suffering the penalty of having a man in charge who is incompetent and incapable of running a government. Let me review the year that has passed. Ten millions of dollars have gone from the Treasury almost as fast as the snow was shovelled in Harbor Main district last winter. It is lost and gone forever and instead of being a benefit to the country the result has been only an absolute liability. If, when this government was re-

turned to power, it had been composed of men who were capable, men who were familiar with even the rudiments of political economy, they would first of all have sat down and looked the position confronting them squarely in the face. They would have seen that the whole thing was tumbling, they would have seen that the condition of the country was a serious one for, it required only the judgment of half a man to see what was bound to happen. But, instead of that what did they do? Look at the enormous sum of ten winds of Heaven, and not one bit of million dollars thrown to the four good done for the country. Take the sugar scandal, the salt scandal, the fish scandal, the purchase of useless ships and all the other scandal, and it will be seen at once that everything the present government touched was a hopeless failure. Take the army of inspectors and commissioners—the men who were sent to represent this country in the markets of Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal—who did not know a fish's head from its tail nor a codfish from a sculpin, and who were sent away at a cost of which no one knows the extent. I have here the expenses of Capt. Walter Kennedy which amount to \$2,500 apart from his salary, or to go further, three thousand and odd dollars altogether; and then when he comes in here and sits down to listen to the debates, even that is charged on his expense account yes, even if he comes in to go to a picnic the country has to pay for it, and still you are going to reduce taxation.

I am going to tell this House and the country that the inspectors have been going around doing nothing. Eighty-three codfish inspectors were let loose last May and these cost the country \$34,285 and then you men of the North can come in here and sit down under that, knowing that these inspectors were not worth a nickel to Newfoundland. Now, here are the names:

Inspectors Employed During the Summer 1920, and Amount Paid to each for Services Rendered.

Michael Power	\$120.00	Wm. J. Burse	167.41
E. Power	840.00	Leonard Hurst	450.00
Stephen Bradbury	1100.00	John Lewis	163.33
Richard Hollands	692.30	T. Kennedy	82.50
John McGrath	304.99	M. Collishaw	420.00
Jas. J. McGrath	170.53	Stephen Handcock	100.00
E. R. Penney	2000.00	Wm. Anthony	76.66
Jas. Martin	100.00	W. A. Jennings	48.00
Jas. Walsh	200.00	Martin Phillips	380.00
Wm. Jackman	303.33	Fred. House	100.00
John Daly	785.43	Pat. O'Toole	133.33
Richard Tobin	250.00	Geo. Burse	200.00
J. F. Downey	100.00	Giles Taylor	259.71
Martin Finney	437.53	John Kenny	649.11
Michael Kelly	333.29	Thos. G. Ford	600.00
Jas. Parmiter	322.55	Giles Miles	600.00
Geo. Shea	200.00	Thos. Walsh	493.33
Nath. Gosse	243.45	Samuel Efford	251.20
John Smith	301.70	Moses Bartlett	200.00
Jas. Conran	300.00	Nicholas Smith	289.00
Pat. Delaney	303.33	Thos. Roberts	220.00
Jas. Crocker	266.66	Wm. Bath	603.33
Wm. Gosse	286.66	Hubert Pike	230.00
Ebenezer Hutchings	301.90	Joseph Williams	10.80
S. R. Winsor	1907.00	Martin Gosse	150.00
Joseph Keels	340.00	Jas. Carroll	536.66
Abram Morgan	263.33	John Norman	413.32
Jno. Wescott	290.00	Wm. Pomeroy	70.00
John Cody	900.00	Ed. Barter	147.00
Ed. Hawkins	200.00	Thos. Hillier	500.00
John Hickey	218.46	Fred. House	280.00
Patk. Sears	50.00	Capt. Geo Jones	266.00
Samuel Baird	422.80	Arthur Earle	200.00
Robt. Bishop	160.00	Richard Tobin	50.00
Wm. Connolly	290.00	Michael Power (Supervisor)	1200.00
Sam. Leftrage	754.00		
John Mayc	386.86		
John Hurley	480.00		
Josiah Hiscock	777.00		
John Breen	608.00		
Jno. Snelgrove	480.00		
Obadiah Pond	808.00		
Andrew McGrath	480.00		
John Walsh	668.00		
John Knox	540.00		
Robt. Downs	590.00		
Michael Dwyer	480.00		
Michael Fitzgerald	288.00		

Total \$34,285.04

Now, look at the last name on the list. Surely we have money to throw away. I suppose it is a case of "Well done thou good and faithful servant." Here is a man employed at Baird's, a man receiving a salary to look after the shipping of the fish of one of the largest exporters in the country, and yet he is appointed supervisor over everybody else's fish and now you tax the fishermen of the North to pay his salary and cut that of the policeman who is safeguarding our property and making it possible for you

and for me to sleep comfortably in our beds at night and getting the princely pay of five or six hundred dollars a year. The salaries of these men must be cut so that you may go down and throw a bouquet, a big red rose at Mr. Michael Power. Ah, Mr. Mr. Coaker, how you could have fallen so low as to allow yourself to be used like that is beyond me. Scripture applies to you there alright. "Shun evil companions," and the sooner you shun your present leader and the others associated with him and get back to the true fold, the better it will be for you. Is it fair to tax the fishermen as you are doing under these circumstances. Talk of finding employment for the unemployed! Why, you are simply putting a dollar in his hand to-day and taking it back again to-morrow, and the most unfortunate part of it is that you will collect no taxes out of it after all because the fishermen under these conditions cannot produce. The Prime Minister told me this afternoon that the Tobacco factory and the Ropewalk were about to open up which is indeed welcome news but there will not be much left for them because not only are you taxing their raw material but you are taxing the very laboring men working in them. Is there any encouragement for manufacturers in the fact that you tax the labor in their factories? That is just what you are doing and the question that I cannot help asking myself is "How long is this going to continue? Take that great eyesore, the S.S. Lobelia, which has cost the taxpayers of this colony \$78,000 and which is now lying in the harbor opposite our premises where she is a nuisance. There are a lot of other steamers for which a half million dollars was spent last year by the Liberal Reform Government, and none of them are suitable to take ten Labrador crews from Conception Bay. Instead the Government had to go and charter the Diana, Ranger, Seal and Sagona,

which arrangement is going to cost the Colony a large amount of money and this is going on while all the Government boats are laying up doing nothing. However, I think it is cheaper to have them tied up in view of the fact that they are absolutely useless for the work they were intended for; also their consumption of coal is very great. What better instance than this do you want of the inability of a government in the handling of the commercial and nautical affairs of this country. Take your Prospero and Portia to-day. Do they pay? They certainly do not. They cannot pay any more. One thing I notice in these Estimates is that the subsidies for the Prospero and Portia are decreased. This is only mere camouflage. This means that you will be robbing Peter to pay Paul. You are trying to get the public to believe that you are reducing your Estimates for these steamers. These steamers cannot be run as a paying proposition, under present management. They can not be operated with any less subsidy than they had a year ago. I thoroughly agree with the reduction of expenses in connection with the Coastal service; but I have an idea in the back of my head that when the House is closed that all these Government steamers will be put on the road again by the executive, and that it will cost this colony as much this year for operating them as it cost last year. Oh Mr. Coaker do save us from a repetition of that, because if you don't, you will be taxing the people further next year and I don't think they can stand it any longer. Now we come to Education. I think Dr. Barnes will agree with me that something must be done, if at all possible, to have this vote cut down. I would really like to see the vote for education cut because I do not think we can afford to pay for it on such a large scale. Furthermore, I do not think that we can produce sufficient revenue in this colony to carry on a policy that has for its object the

appointment of inspectors only. At present it is difficult to pass along Water street without brushing against a couple of inspectors. If the government is serious about reducing expenditure, why not start right in at the Department of Education and save about ten large salaries. Send Dr. Curtis back to the business he belonged to first and tell him for me to continue preaching the Gospel. Send any other clergyman that is there now back to their former jobs. Don't you think I am right Dr. Barnes? Now I want that to go forth to Dr. Curtis to-night, as coming from my lips, and to any other clergyman holding a similar job. Send them all back to the duties they were intended for. Instead of paying them \$2700 or \$2800 a year of the taxpayers money of this colony. Send Dr. Barnes back to his old job again. Tell the Deputy Minister of Education who is drawing \$3600 a year, to go out and earn his salary. The quicker they go back to their former positions the better for the colony. Take Mr. Solomon Whiteway. No doubt he is well qualified for the position, but when it comes to paying him over \$4000 a year I am against it. Mr. Whiteway is getting up to middle age, and he could have done more fishing. He is now prancing about somewhere in the States. If the government is going to apply the pruning knife, I hope they will use it in good shape. Dr. Barnes is a man whom I know is absolutely sincere, but he knows we cannot carry that burden under present conditions. We must get back to pre-war conditions whether we like it or not. The earning power of the people of the country is back to prewar times. The fishermen who produces the fish is back to pre-war conditions. In fact h's fish the coming season will not be as valuable as it was in pre-war days. Well then why all this lavish expenditure. The Prime Minister himself admits that money has to be found and that he must tax the people to get

the necessary revenue to carry on the business of the Colony.

I have here before me an answer to a question asked by Sir Michael Cashin concerning some of the salt that came into this port recently. The answer was prepared by the Minister of Shipping. I won't read it to the House because I am afraid; and I am afraid that when the day of reckoning comes that there will be another strange story to be told about that wonderful cargo of salt. If that cargo of salt is not watched very carefully, there is going to be another big debit for this colony and another opportunity for the Prime Minister and his crowd to increase taxation. I notice that the estimated revenue of the Prime Minister for the next year is \$8,408,000 and his expenditure \$8,307,000. Now this huge expenditure should be stopped, but how can it when men are wanted every now and then for a political game, and they have to get paid for it like R. Kelly, of Holyrood, did. Kelly came to St. John's and waited on solicitor Gibbs and Barron who made out a petition against Mr. William Woodford and for signing that petition Kelly is paid by the fishermen's friend the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, \$62.50 per month. The other gentleman who signed that famous petition was one Hynes who was given the position of Customs Officer at Kelligrews. Two loyal men and true. I would like to ask the Prime Minister why Mr. James J. McGrath was not dismissed as well as all the rest of the fancy fish inspectors. James flew into the arms of the Prime Minister, who said James thou shalt not be without a job. I will take care of you James for betraying the labor candidates in the West End of St. John's. Go to Chaplin's James and get a Custom's uniform made with nice brass buttons on it, and then depart for Placentia and proceed aboard the yacht Daisy. Now Mr. Cheeseman are you going to stand for this fellow McGrath

being foisted on the West Coast in your district. Why was not one of those men at the Customs House, who are tripping over one another there, be put on this job if it was considered necessary. Then again for being faithful to Richard Anderson one Foley is poked into the Customs at a substantial salary. I would also like to ask the Prime Minister if the Advisor General of the Liberal Reform Party, Mr. A. H. Salter, is going to be continued in the public works department at \$1380. I suppose I will hear the story from my friend Mr. Jennings. Now I want to tell of a transaction how Mr. Salter saved money for the Public Works Department and I wish he was here while I am telling it. A man came to me last Fall and bought fish at \$9 a quintal, and then sold the same fish to Mr. Salter for the Board of Works at \$11. That is how Mr. Salter is saving money for the government and that is how he is re-organising the department of Public Works. This is the man who was going to save untold money for the Colony and this is the man who is responsible for the taxing of the fishermen of the colony to give him \$1380 a year and for which he gives about five minutes of his time every day. Oh pardon me Mr. Chairman, Mr. Salter doesn't have to go to the department at all, he has a private telephone connection, a la convenient, and he does his business over the phone with the Minister of Public Works. This man Salter is paid \$1380 a year for doing nothing except losing money on the government and because he is the closest friend that the Premier has got; whereas an unfortunate civil servant drawing as low as \$500 a year and with five or six children to support is going to have his pay cut. Then we have the big hearted Minister of Posts and Telegraphs dismissing a little girl because her father voted for me. Now, as I said before, you got to get back to pre-war rates and conditions, but I do not agree with

the principle of starting in to cut down the smaller paid officials. Begin at home first and cut down the Ministers salaries, if you are serious about the matter, and cut the salaries of every member in this House.

And any man who cannot afford to spend his time here, he had better stay somewhere else. In 1921 you have added on to the fishermen of the Colony an interest account of four hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars which can never be removed. Four hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars and then you are forced to tax them again on flour. In the past in my imagination I can see the bands playing for Mr. Coaker when he arrives at Port Union, a horse and carriage with five hundred men drawn around it saying to him, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." I can see the Advocate full of the glorious news, but never again will that happen. The story will be this to you the next time. "Weighed in the balance and found wanting."

Now we have three million dollars gone up. I was going to say West and perhaps it would be right because it is the West End of the city, gone upon the railroad. In one Calendar year three million dollars, cold dollars squandered, and not one penny for the Colony out of it. Oh, Mr. Cheesman, how can you stand it? I saw you rising last night to become a man. Don't let them fool you any longer, because they have no more idea of constructive policy, than I have.

THE PRIME MINISTER—Hear, hear

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Oh, no I was going to say, than I have of going to the Moon. What better proof do you want to-night that Sir Richard Squires is the most incompetent man who ever sat in that Chair than the condition of the country. Hear hear, how are you.

THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, I am right here.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You are, but you will not be there very long, take

it from me not for very long. The present Prime Minister is the most incapable Prime Minister that ever the Colony had, and the Colony and the crowd who helped to put him there, realise that more fully to-night than ever I did. If Sir, you had had your country's interest at heart or on your mind at all, you would not have gone to London and stayed there five months after the speech you made about the railroad, and allow that three million dollars to be wasted as it has been. If you had one drop of blood loyal to Newfoundland you would not have done it. You went there at a time when you were not needed, when the Minister of Justice was there, when you should have taken the care of Newfoundland on your shoulders instead of funking it. That is my answer to you for Hear, Hear. Then the best answer you can get is that this railroad policy in the past year was never intended by the colony or the House. You shirked your responsibilities and allowed other people to handle them. I don't hear you say Hear, Hear to that.

Fellow countrymen. Here is your Manifesto. Don't call them that any more. Say, "Bow down you slaves, bow down. No man in this House knows better than Mr. Coaker, no odds what he may say or think, he knows that you have no more constructive policy in your make-up than the man in the Moon, and if he were to make an open confession to me to-night that is what he would tell me. For Mr. Coaker I have some sympathy left, he did stick to his job, he did stay behind, and try to do something, but you flew at the first opportunity you had. The doors of this House were no sooner closed than you deserted the country. Mr. Coaker made mistakes and bad ones, but he thought he was right, but you hied away to London. For a man who tries to do something and fails you can have some respect, but for the man who shirks his job, I have

no respect for whatever. Now here the other afternoon we were talking about Trade Commissioners and saving money. Do I understand Mr. Coaker that Mr. Devine is called home.

MR. COAKER—Yes, he is called home.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Thank you. I have nothing further to say except that I don't want him to be treated like Mr. James J. McGrath, to whom when you called him home you gave another job.

Now we have forty rooms in there and no money to pay for their upkeep. That is efficient service alright. We can't put Tubercular patients in that institution although we have a ward vacant there. The government to-night has not enough money to fill it up, and those suffering from tuberculosis have to remain outside. It was a proposal and it ended there, and do you not smile when you think how you coddled the thing? Not a thing that you promised so seriously in your Manifesto has been carried out. The Reid system. Did we not double her up in good shape the past twelve months? Reids never began to take the money from the colony that she has lost under your management. Three million dollars passed over to Reids without hesitation and then we are told of the people who are robbing the public. Never was there an election that someone did not try to make a bugaboo of the Reid Nfld. Co. Why how history repeats itself here. The revenue is good. By jingo how true that is about yourself, and you thought it was the other fellow. You thought it was for Sir Michael Cashin you were writing when you were writing your own obituary. Did not Mr. Coaker put her at full speed ahead without a reverse gear at all? He did not hesitate at all, he did not even change gears. he was in such a hurry to put her where she is now, and to-day he is bowed down with shame for his own native country. You do not deny that

do you Mr. Coaker? You do not deny that Newfoundland to-day is in a helpless mess. She will never come back again to herself. There are a crowd of people going around who say, Newfoundland has been in deep waters before, but if they thought for one minute, they would realise that this is the storm that wrecks her, a total wreck. In the days of her hard times before there was no great demand for a big revenue to meet her expenses and she had not fifty million dollars of a debt around her neck. Never before did she spend eight million dollars in eighteen months, and she has no more chance of coming back to normal than I have of flying. There is only one hope and that is what not man has the nerve to do. Wouldn't the Prime Minister like me to tell him what? I won't. At the present time she is in a rut and she cannot come out of it until stronger men than the present government are in control, stronger men than those who have been running her on the rocks for the past eighteen months.

Postal Telegraph Service. Great service up there. Mr. from Brigus sent me a message as he was leaving there. The message arrived at twelve thirty at my office, and so did he. Make a note of that Mr. Halfyard and look into it. That is the improvement of the Liberal Reform Government.

Agriculture. I think in Supplemental Supply outside a vote last year of fifty thousand dollars there was forty-five thousand dollars for Agriculture, and what have we got for it. I have a package of papers down in my office with a lot of pedigrees. The man from Prince Edward's Island the bosom friend of the Prime Minister, if he had been against him in politics he would be the worst in the world, has cost the colony in Supplemental Supply forty-two thousand dollars. Eighty-seven thousand dollars to send Dr. Campbell to Toronto to bring down a

stock of cattle here in the West End some of which are utterly useless to the country and some more very good, but the best thing to do to save taxation is to give this stock away, because it will only mean another heavy bill next year. We are going to have a model farm, and as my colleague Mr. Walsh says we got down from P. E. I. and Toronto cattle with ribbons on them. Eighty-seven thousand dollars to get cattle with ribbons that every day are costing us a fortune. Send them to the farmers to take them off your hands and save the colony this useless expenditure. Mr. Coaker has made an effort to cut his department down, and why Mr. Prime Minister should this waste be permitted. But you don't mind, it is the colony's money. Why do you not cut out that useless department? and distribute the stock to the farmers to keep for a certain time, who understand what is required. Can you expect Dr. Campbell to care what he does in Newfoundland? He won't care what happens, like you ought to.

Prohibition. Bone Dry. She was going to be a Prohibition country and a man then comes in here and talks prohibition, prints Cashin's Script. What a terrible fellow you were Sir Michael to give that fellow that case of whiskey. What a frightful thing to do. Now the man who had that script photographed and printed and sent forth to the country comes in here with my friend Mr. Jennings and tells us that he expects to get a revenue of four hundred and eighty thousand dollars out of liquor. No more closed bars, the good old Controller has to open up. It was a crime for the past government to give out a bottle or a case but now with a Prohibition country. Well, imagine a fellow in New York reading this. He hears that Newfoundland is a prohibition country, and then he picks up a newspaper, perhaps the Star and finds that from liquor we are expecting a revenue of four hundred

and eighty thousand dollars. He is mystified. What a pitiful sight, when you have to come here and tell us that you are going to charge enough at the government bar to get that amount, and then we will spend that on Education. I think if you go back to the old figures when we had open saloons the total revenue then did not exceed four hundred to four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, but now that she is bone dry we are going to get four hundred and eighty thousand dollars revenue. My old temperance friend, I see has departed from this House to the Speaker's room to have a rest. He does not want to be told about this. Mr. Jennings does not want to be told that he has become part and parcel of a saloon, but that is what he has done, and we are gone bone dry. Lovely.

The high cost of living. What is the meaning of this book at all. How can a man if he is honest read this and remain a part of it? Mr. Targett doesn't like it.

MR. TARGETT—Yes, I do.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—He does not like to hear the news that he is part of a saloon. I can remember the time when he was a true temperance advocate. Did you hear of it Mr. Halfyard? the high cost of living. No, you didn't. You didn't hear of the Resolutions before you came here I wonder does the Prime Minister ever think of this thing? You can take this up now and he tells of the cost of duty on things imported into the country, and to-night he comes in here with a tax that you don't know from a Chinese Puzzle. You were going to adjust this matter when you came into power. Now you are taxing the people another million and a half dollars. Mr. Cheesman are you going back to tell old Burin what has happened, to tell the story of how the Prime Minister played you false, how he has taxed the fisherman again. How

can you stand it when you read this thing.

MR. CHEESMAN—I never read it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—How can you go back with this on your conscience and Mr. Foote who told them all he was going to do for them, when a man such as you stood here as you did and told the Prime Minister that you would not vote for those Resolutions before the Chair, and forced him outside that door to fix them so you wanted them fixed, not as you personally wanted it, but as the fishermen of your district wanted it, because you are a true Newfoundlander. Are you going back to your people to tell them that you are part and parcel of the taxation that is grinding them down. You never intended that that should happen. You thought you had a man who could run the ship of state, and now you know as well as I do, that he has made a hopeless mess of it. Do not have it said by your children in years to come that you were the man in 1921 who downed Newfoundland and sent her crawling to Canada. I would rather take that desk by Mr. Walsh. The Government will say if we can keep men like Cheesman quiet until, the House closes then we will not bother with them any more. It will be too late then. Don't let them fool you any more. Prove yourself a man, and show your country, that you have a man's spirit.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—“Be of good cheer,” he goes on to say. Not in the history of this country did you meet such a crowd of people looking for “be of good cheer,” and they have looked in vain to the man who has the reins of power. He can't give them any cheer. He has proved himself absolutely unfit for the job. “Rally to my banner, the banner of the Liberal-Reform Party.” They were sturdy men then, but they are down-hearted to-day. You have failed as no other man in the history of the country has failed. In his famous

manifesto he tells us that the day of hunger and tyranny is over, but during the last twelve months we have passed through more hunger and tyranny than in the quarter of a century previous. He has interfered with the business of the country to the detriment of everybody in the country, and to-day we find ourselves practically into bankruptcy. "A body of young Newfoundlanders," he says, "will be given a chance." She hasn't taken a course since she left. She has been drifting on a lee shore for the past eighteen months. And then he goes on—"The sturdy sons of oak." Mr. Chairman, the sturdy sons of oak, Sir, are sitting on your left, and I tell you candidly I don't want to see any more oak in this country. I hope she will never be touched again as she has been bled during the past twelve months. I hope she will never again be placed in charge of a man who knows nothing of the business of the country.

Now we are told that on the 30th of this month that if the Government does not run the railroad she will go into the hands of a receiver. I would like to say to the Prime Minister, think over that plan carefully. This country cannot stand another new financial wreck, but I might say as Mr. MacDonnell has said, "If she is going to be a wreck put a deck load on her," but the only thing is she will not be insured with Lloyds. I am not finished at all. As the various votes come up I will have more to say.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the remarks of the last speaker, and have noticed members on both sides of the House smiling in spite of the seriousness of his remarks but I might tell you that the district I just came from is not smiling. I have not been in this House for a number of days. I have been in my district trying to over-

come the terrible condition that exists, and I want to say now that while we are here in this House; as we have been for some months—talking from one side to the other and doing nothing to help the people of the country the country is drifting to absolute destruction. I have met people during the past week when addressing various public meetings who show in their faces unmistakable signs of extreme poverty.

The Government has tackled the supply question. I am confronted every day with the matter of supplies. Everybody is looking for supplies. If the Government wanted to help out the fishermen of the country why did they not go about it in a better way? The amount of supplies that the Government has placed at my disposal is only enough to make a deceiver out of me and I decline to be a liar for any institution. Now Mr. Chairman I have been out of my place in this House for several days dealing especially with the district. As Harbour Grace knows I have done the very best that I could under the circumstances. This is not a solution and I cannot find that the Government has any constructive policy to lead us out of the difficulty. It is not proper that we should be here talking at one another to no effect while the country is drifting to ruin. I am only a young man in the House and if I made any mistakes allowance will be made for it But I want to say now that I am not going to stay with anybody who is not big enough to rise above party politics and handle this situation irrespective of party differences. In the early part of this session I heard Sir John Crosbie say that the great enemy of the country to-day is Mr. Hawes. The Hon. Mr. Coaker agreed to the same opinion. Coming from these two experienced men there must be some truth in it.

Why then have we not pursued some policy to rid the country of this menace. We go ahead and supply for the catch and make no attempt to create a new and safe channel for its disposal are we merely building a fools paradise for the fishermen to live in a few short months.

I have had personally to stand for a lot of things. A number of men in my district have as high as one hundred quintals of fish in their stages unsold. I knew nothing of the Government buying fish last fall. I heard it hinted and mentioned it to a member of the Executive Government, he said I could not listen to all I heard. You can't go on fooling people that way. I decline to be fooled by anybody. **All the people must be treated alike.** I have their complaints direct to the House. One time a protest was made because their wages were cut from \$3.30 to \$2.50. Now these people were serious and they were reasonable, and if they had somebody strong enough to get up and explain the situation of the country to them, if they had been told that people all over the country were in destitution and want, they would have been willing to accept the \$2.50. They would have understood the situation. But instead of that you try to fool them.

I do not know whether there is anybody in this House who has a solution for the situation. I might say as a member of the Government I know of no scheme. If there is anybody in this House or out of it who can come forward with a solution he will have my support. I do not want to be a party to sitting here and doing nothing for the country.

Now, Sir, coming back to Harbour Grace District. I want to say to the people of Harbour Grace District through the reporters' box, that I appreciate their confidence in me; and I want to say further that I am not

going to stay here another minute until I see some proposal brought in to solve the situation. I know of many hungry men in my district and I want to tell them that I have spent all my energy on them. Nothing real and lasting is being done for them. You can't feed this country on poor relief. It is merely throwing dust into the eyes of the people. Something better, something bigger must be done and I am for the man who can come forward and save the country. Look at the situation with respect to Bell Island. We have had a bill on the Order paper for several weeks, and it has been deferred, deferred, deferred. Nothing whatever is done to overcome the situation so that the people can get steady employment. I do not know whether that thing is hampering the companies in their operations or not. But no effort is being made to get this great industry going. This operation is the very life of the people of my district and Conception Bay generally.

The situation is serious, but I do not think it is hopeless. I know of dollars and dollars that can be saved. For instance why is not that vote for the Agricultural Department cut out altogether at least for the present. We have made mistakes, I have made mistakes. I supported the Fish Regulations last year and I did it sincerely. I voted for the Regulations, and the way I understood it was that it was subject to the Governor-in-Council. Now, Sir, if that is true, when we came to the point that we were losing consumption the Regulations they should then have been stamped out. There is where the blame is on the Executive Government. All losses made through the regulations are therefore due to the Executive Government, and the point is this that I have no confidence that after the House is prorogued the ex-

ecutive Government will not go on doing the same kind of things. I know that some of the members of the Executive Government will admit mistakes, but what guarantee have I that they will not make the same mistakes this year.

These vital things could not be tampered with as they are if we had a strong and active public opinion. Unfortunately this is not so but nevertheless I take the liberty to express my opinion and will back it by my actions. Opinion is not lacking but it does not get a fair opportunity to act and thus regulate the action or inaction of governments. I am not prepared to wait for actual ruination but will place myself in the hands of the people so that they may use me to express themselves in time to save the country from absolute bankruptcy.

I heard Mr. Coaker, in the first of the session appeal strongly for a coalition Government. I do not believe that he was appealing for every man on the other side. There are some who have no more experience than many members over here. I do not believe for one moment that he made an appeal to the entire Opposition; but he appealed to certain men on the Opposition side whom he thought were men of ripe experience, if I understood his language correctly, for a coalition. With this I concurred and I believe all thinking men will agree that the situation confronting Newfoundland to-day demands that party politics should be cut out and a united effort made to bring the country back to prosperity. In place of this the Government persists in the destructive policy of increased taxation with the result that even the experienced business men of Water Street of the very best houses, are thrown into a state of chaos not having confidence enough to go ahead with their purchases. As far as I am personally concerned, I have tried

to think out the best plan to help the present situation, because I am convinced and I am absolutely confident that with the present doings and with no more before us than we have in the way of policy to pick up the country again that we will soon meet collapse and destruction, and, as a Newfoundlander, I do not want a seat in such a Government. Now, Sir, in a word here is my position. I want to tell you straight that I am putting Newfoundland ahead of everything else. My hands are absolutely clean, although I do not pretend to perfection, and there is not a single man on either side of the House can say differently. I am standing on my feet tonight as a Newfoundlander for Newfoundland. My position plainly is this: I am not joining the Opposition because the Opposition have not come out and taken a stand that I could depend on nor have the actions of the Government been such that I can depend on them. I intend to take my own stand, which is in the centre of this House, until some man or men whether he or they be from the Government the Opposition or outside the House, is big enough, cold enough and strong enough to stand out prominently and try and evolve some scheme or some policy that will be the means of saving this country from destruction—even though I know the problem is going to be a hard one—and the man or the Party who are prepared to do that, I am with them. I want to be straight and fair with the Government and everybody else. I have played the Government straight and fair as best I knew how; but to be honest and conscientious in dealing with our country's affairs I have to admit that I do not up to the present moment, know of a Government policy calculated to bring this country out of its present deplorable condition. Consequently, I am not able to be a party to the present ad-

ministration any longer. I may say that I have also done my very best for the District of Harbour Grace, which District I have the honour to represent in this House, and I am not afraid to trust my future in the hands of my constituents from Bay Roberts to Hr. Grace for an election at twenty-four hours notice. Some may be inclined to think that I am talking from a political standpoint, well I would like to disabuse their minds of any such opinion. I have played the game fair, square and right in my own best judgment. I want to tell both the Government and the Opposition to-night, that I do not want to be with the Opposition side or the Government side: but I will be on the side that can show me how this country can be saved. Until then I am going to take an independent attitude and take my chances. I want every man in the country to understand my position clearly and correctly.

With these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I must again repeat that to the first man who will come out with a definite program that will tend for the betterment and the uplifting of this country and its people, I will give my undivided support.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we all feel glad to-night on hearing the views expressed by Mr. Archibald in connection with the situation respecting the district of Harbour Grace. He has not had the benefit of attending here very often during the session and not at all of attending any party meetings, except on one or two occasions, because of the responsibilities of his district having kept him among his constituents. I entirely agree with his views that at this time, the proper place for him or any other out-port member is in his constituency, rather than listening to the debates in the House of Assembly. There are many district matters and certainly a

multitude of detail matter which would be more satisfactorily handled to the districts, to the country and to the people as a whole, if the representatives for the various other out-port constituencies had the opportunity of being in their constituencies instead of in their seats in the House of Assembly. That does not apply primarily to the districts of St. John's East and West, or to Hr. Main, which is so near to St. John's; but to the other districts, particularly to those districts represented by Government members. It has been a hardship to the Government, as a number of our men have found it impossible to attend this session of the Legislature with any degree of regularity. Mr. Goss, member for Hr. Grace, has been absent for some days; Mr. Small, member for Burgeo and LaPoile, has been absent for a considerable time and there are other representatives, who are attending this Legislative session daily and who should have been in their constituencies long ago. The particular section of Hr. Grace district to which Mr. Archibald refers is one that is not a fishing community. It is not interested chiefly in fishing, and, therefore, is not privileged in availing of the guarantee with which some districts are identified; but is interested and dependent on labor in connection with fishing. A very large portion of the people of Hr. Grace depend on work at Bell Island and other such miscellaneous form of employment. Numbers of men go to Sydney and to the United States and Canada. The curtailment that has taken in those centres has created a labor situation in the district of Hr. Grace which will be very difficult to face. The curtailment of operations at Bell Island has not alone affected seriously that constituency, but it has seriously affected other constituencies, particularly districts of Hr. Main, Carbonear and Bay

de Verde and all those districts have similar problems to face in regard to labor more severe than districts in more extern sections of the Island where fishing is supreme. To a more considerable extent the district of Twillingate is involved in the question of labor in that the closing of the Grand Falls plant had the effect of throwing out of employment a very large number of men. Thus the labor problem is one added to the fishing problem. And while there has been no substantial solution of the fishing problem and while the labor problem generally has been somewhat relieved by a vote from this Legislature a few weeks ago of five hundred thousand dollars, I think that, if the various members had been able to be in their own constituencies, instead of being here, and be in a position to give their own personal attention to these matters, both these problems would be in a far more advanced stage of solution than they are to-day. The advantage of having an expression of opinion from Mr. Archibald in connection with public affairs in this House has not been the advantage of the Governments' at any of our party meetings, because, as I have already stated, the responsibilities of attending to his district matters were of primary importance. The fact that he has given considerable attention to Hr. Grace district—as to my own knowledge he has handled with marked success many situations in connection with relief to the poor and in connection with fishery matters—is a matter of general knowledge. The fact that Mr. Archibald has taken the intermediary position of an independent seat in this House is one that may add materially to and for the benefit of debate. His views in connection with debate will, I feel sure be entirely from an independent standpoint in connection with our public affairs in so far as it will lend to the clarity

of debate and in so far as it will in a general way be helpful to the Government of the community. As pointed out by Mr. Archibald during the course of his speech we as a Government, had to listen a great deal to the multitude of attacks made upon us by the Opposition at this present session, attacks which we, not as a Government, replied to. We have been here day after day, and with many evenings thrown in, considering the various problems as they came up and listening to all sorts of criticisms, some helpful, some constructive and some with a tendency towards destruction; but any additional views which my hon. friend from Hr. Grace will have the opportunity of advancing and any additional light he can throw on the problems that are confronting us will be very happily and very gladly received by this administration just as the views expressed by my hon. friends opposite from time to time have undoubtedly tended to clear the atmosphere of the whole House. The Legislature is where Legislators represent the entire people of the Island of Newfoundland. From to-night we have to forget the division line of party politics, because as Mr. Archibald has pointed out and as has been pointed out on many occasions before from both sides of the House, there are other questions and other problems far and away beyond the question of mere political affiliations. The Opposition, as His Majesty's loyal Opposition, throws in their best effort and are supposed and bound by their privileges and prerogatives so to do in the best interests of the community; also is it the duty of the Government to throw in theirs, and I know it will be the privilege and prerogative of Mr. Archibald to do likewise and I know it will be done by him, so that when legislation of a vitally important nature is

dealt with in this House, the result is not merely the result of the actions of the Opposition or the Government or the actions of any independent member, but is the result of the combined actions of the combined legislatures when legislation is passed unanimously, as was illustrated at the last session of the Legislature when the Fish Regulations were under discussion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Excuse me. I was not present. If I had been here I would have protested against them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—And if you had been present you would have voted against them. You were absent for a couple of days at the time in connection with other matters. Other policies have come before this House and were voted upon without any division; thus the program which goes on our Statute Book is the result of the combined effort of all the legislators, whether they be passed by a division of the House or by an unanimous vote. Consequently, the Government welcomes any suggestions Mr. Archibald has to make in connection with the conduct of the business of the House respecting the various matters that will come before us from time to time. I know that he will do his utmost in the interests of his constituents at Hr. Grace, a constituency that I am personally identified with and a town that I know better and have reason to know better than any other town, because it is my birthplace.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, in seconding the Prime Minister's motion I would like to say a few words, in view of what has transpired this evening. It is refreshing once in a while to run against an independent man. There is nothing like it, whether he be rich or poor, or whether he

be a member of this House or an ordinary laboring man. Independence is one of the best things that any man can possess. I am indeed glad tonight to be able to congratulate Mr. Archibald on the stand he has taken, but before going any further I would like to take him back to eighteen months ago in this House. When I was a part of the Government nearly two years ago, and after we were defeated at the polls, I will now ask the member for Hr. Grace if we did not hand over to the present Government an independent Colony, independent in every respect and an independence that could not be criticised sincerely by any member in this House? I would like to point out to Mr. Archibald that we handed over to the present Government practically four millions of dollars after a term of ten or twelve years of office. We handed over the Government because we were defeated at the polls by false cries and false statements, as demonstrated here to-night in that Manifesto of the Prime Minister's. To-night instead of this Colony being independent she is insolvent. The proof of that is the attitude taken by the hon. member for Hr. Grace. Now, if we are crying from the house tops as some people say we are, are we not telling the truth? Who has denied the statements made from this side of the House ever since this session opened? On the back of that where has the policy of the present Government landed Newfoundland to-night? You, I mean the Prime Minister and his associates, destroyed that four million that we left you during the past eighteen months and in addition to that you took another six millions and spent it, and what have you got to show for it? This young man claims he was innocent of what was going on. No doubt he was. He believed in that Manifesto when he preached it to the people in Hr. Grace eighteen months ago.

To-night he has left that party because he was deceived and because he is independent. Other men on the Government side are thinking the same way, but they are without independence. That party would not be in existence to-day, if the men on the other side were independent. Your colleagues have deceived you, Mr. Archibald. One of them is in his seat to-night; the other is absent. I wish Mr. Archibald, your colleague, Mr. Gosse was present to-night. Do you know Sir, that Mr. Gosse took the public moneys of this Colony and put it in his hip pocket for the fish that is now rotten? Do you know Mr. Archibald that Mr. Gosse took his sessional pay on the opening of this Legislature? If you do not know already, I will tell you one of the last acts that he did. He went and took a load of that Government salt that is now lying in the harbor and took it entirely on credit and then hiked it off for the Labrador. What are the fishermen of the country going to do about this? Is not this the Member who talked so much during the early days of the session about his independence? Now, Mr. Chairman, I am as independent as any man in this House to-night and I feel proud of the position that I occupy; no slur can be thrown to this side of the House by anybody in the Government. Did we not hand over the Government of Newfoundland in a perfectly sound condition financially eighteen months ago? And did not the Prime Minister raise a loan of six million dollars recently? He got that money under false pretences. He did not get it on his own financial statement; but he got it on our financial statement. The Government to-night is in under a cloud. What independent man could sit on the Government side in the light of the information that we have dragged out of you? By your mad fish policy thousands and millions of dollars have been lost and

business men have been ruined with impunity. I have pointed out time and again within the past eighteen months what independent men are in the Government ranks. Instead of carrying out the policy that they preached to the people, the Government betrayed the trust placed in them and they are reaping the whirlwind to-night. If the gentlemen representing the other districts in the Government were as independent as Mr. Archibald, where would the Government be to-night, Sir? But the men on the other side of the House are not independent. They are paid to hold their seats in this House. They are already sworn to do one thing and they come in here and take an oath to do another. They are led by the nose by one man. And as a matter of fact this country is to-day led by the nose by one man and has been led by the nose by him for the past eighteen months or so. I take no blame for the position that the country is in to-night. I am sorry to the heart that she is in that unhappy position, but I am like Mr. Archibald, I am looking for the Messiah to come and take her out of that dark position, although I doubt if she can be taken out by the present administration. Look at the latest move on the part of the government, Mr. Chairman. They are trying to rush through the business of this House under suspended rules and then when the House is closed repeat the dose that they administered to the country last year in connection with the railway when they denounced everything respecting it in all its moods and tenses and when you went away what happened? Did not the man you left in charge of our public affairs, after you left on your picnic trip abroad, take three million dollars of the surplus that we left behind us? Still to-night you are trying to put the bar on the House to keep out the people. Now what are you going to do with

the railroad, as alluded to by Mr. Archibald? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries cannot tell us nor can he suggest a way to take Newfoundland out of the rut that he and his gang put her in. Do not blame us Mr. Archibald for the unfortunate and bankrupt condition that the country is in, because we handed over an independent colony with lots of money in the chest provided for a rainy day and the government have destroyed all that and twice as much more, it will be found, by the time all their bills are paid. The government have spent from 13 to 14 millions of dollars within the past twelve months. That is the position to-night. There is only one independent man on the government side to-night. To go back to the fish business again and what led up to it is a very long story and would take me until daylight to tell it properly. We did agree to give them a trial like Mr. Archibald did, but when we found that they were destroying Newfoundland was it not the duty of the Governor-in-Council to suspend them? That was the promise that was made to us in this House last year when we supported them. But still they were kept in existence and the whole country generally was ruined as a result. The other day I put a question on the Order Paper, namely, to ask the Prime Minister who took off the regulations and by whose orders? So far I have not received the answer. And then we heard the Hon. Minister say when he came back that he believed in the regulations. No one believed he did, but he said it to get the support of those who are leading him by the nose. I sympathise with you because you have been led astray. The Hon. Prime Minister sits with his finger in his mouth but does not show the way out. Neither does the Hon. Minister of Marine. They have brought us to ruin. Fish that cost us \$10 to get out of the water, is down to \$4 or \$5 a qtl. Take the railway or any industry you

like.—Grand Falls, Bell Island—they are all, going to put up their shutters. Here we are drifting along and putting off the evil day, but there must be an end to it. The Estimates are a lie from start to finish. The first vote of \$300,000 is below what it ought to be and the fisherman will be called on to pay it. Everything else is in proportion. You are asking for 9 millions and you will never get six—how can you get it, from people who are getting pauper relief. As Mr. Archibald says, bar up the House and ask the people to come in who will do something. We want Newfoundland, but not the government. Go to the Governor and say, here is the country, put you would do if you had the same in whom you like in charge. That's what dependent spirit as the man in the centre of the House. If your case be good the people will return you to power. But as I said before you have no proposition to put to the country. You are short 10 millions which you spent over the revenue, and when are you going to end up. Get up now when I sit down and tell the outside people. Many may not hear it as there are no papers now, but tell us here as asked by Mr. Archibald. I do not want his or anyone else's support, but if I am doing my duty he will support me. That is the position I hold in this House and that is the position I will hold till I leave it for good.

MR. BENNETT—This matter is so important, Mr. Chairman, that I think I will make a few observations. I think that Mr. Archibald has demonstrated to this house and the country that he possesses a mind of his own, that his opinion is untrammelled or influenced by any man or organization when it comes to the independence of the country. I congratulate him as man to man. Since the opening day I have deplored the lack of spirit shown in this chamber and I have deplored the fact that we have not heard from the other side an expression from the oth-

er side as to what was their policy to meet the situation. We have been as one crying in the wilderness, but there has not been one word from the Hon. Prime Minister or the humblest member of the Government as to what is to be done to save the country. I stated before that the case is not hopeless and I believe the country could still be saved if we had the right men in charge. She can be taken off the rocks, docked and repaired and set afloat on the sea of prosperity again if we have the economy and business-like administration to bring about that result. I agree with Sir M. P. Cashin, and I was one of those who left the exchequer full as it never was before, that it was left so with a purpose. Two years before, we had surplus revenues and we might have had no object but our own aggrandizement. We could have made ourselves solid with the people. But we said the war is over and trying conditions will be in that it will need money to meet and we decided to hoard every dollar for the rainy day. That was the situation when we handed over the government on the 15th of November 1919. We hoped for great things from the young man taking up the reins of power and I congratulated him and promised him my support in everything he might introduce for the betterment and the furtherance of Newfoundland. But what is the effect of the election of this administration to power? As I pointed out it is an absolute travesty on responsible government for the Hon. Prime Minister to try to do the work of five departments, the Prime Minister's, the Colonial Secretary, Agriculture and Mines, Militia and Finance, and then to expect efficiency, energetic though he is. The country is bleeding as a result and the Budget is a monument of disgrace. It is not a Budget but a copy of last year's tariff with 25 per cent. tacked on to everything. No attempt was made to delve into affairs and see to the alter-

ed conditions after the war. And that was the first setback since these people came into power. The only avenue of success for us in getting light on affairs was to, ask questions daily and by that means we opened the eyes of the public as to what was on and they realized it. We have a demonstration of this here to-night when the representative of one of the most important districts says that he and the people of that district are not satisfied. The government has no policy for the salvation of Newfoundland, and I say that they are incapable of carrying along with any hope of success because of their inefficiency and extravagance during their tenure of office. I am told that things are done with the best intentions; we knew that they would turn out wrong, but forsooth they were done with the best intentions. The railroad has gone to Hell like everything else. That's how we are going to perdition unless something is done to meet the present appalling situation. As the months go by it will be worse and worse, and it is absurd to think we can go on with the fall and winter before us, with this present policy of drift. It cannot longer be allowed. It was the intention to close the House as quick as possible and the Hon. Prime Minister attempted to suspend the Rules while most of the important legislation had not yet been touched. The honorable members of the Opposition have not allowed this procedure, as it is improper to railroad legislation that may have the effect of damning Newfoundland for ever, or of saving her from the consequences which face us to-night. What we want is unity—the house divided against itself must fall; the country is looking to us to do the right thing by them. I am a Newfoundlander first and foremost, and I consider the country first and the party next, and I join hands with Mr. Archibald in the stand he has taken. The man who would not do so is not

fit to sit in this House or to bring us out of the slough of despair into which we are drifting. What difference is it to the people who are on the government, whether they are from this shore or that, as long as their rights are safeguarded and well-administered. But that can only be done when they say it is time for us to arise and stand by ourselves. Go home to-night and decide. If Mr. Archibald goes home and comes back to-morrow and sits on the government side the responsibility will be on himself. So long as there is a government that the people can look to, and be satisfied that everything is being done for the best, so long will we have prosperity in the country. But when they lose trust, when their money is squandered and poured out like water, when enough officials to employ could not be found, and when we have a dozen training abroad for something we cannot afford for a dozen years, I say recall every one of them. As pointed out by Mr. Archibald we can do without the Model Farm, but open the Sanatorium, and put the sick in there. Again we have the workmen at the Bar of the House pleading for employment. Their pay is being reduced.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is regular pay for East and West.

MR. BENNETT—While their pay is being reduced, taxes are piling up and how can they pay while they can't get work. As pointed out by my friend a dole is being given out all over the country while big salaries that are unnecessary are being carried on which shows a lack of appreciation of the real situation. I hope that your act Mr. Archibald will mean the dawn of a new era, will blaze the trail and hand your name down to posterity. You are a young man and your action shows you are not ashamed to stand for Newfoundland. Should a party arise that will be endorsed by the country, then a happier day will dawn for

her. All through the session I have tried to bring home to the House the fact that there is an absolute division here and that a house divided against itself cannot stand. We must have a government with experience and knowledge on the part of its members to get out of the present difficulties and with such I believe the country can still be saved and put on the road to prosperity.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like to say one word, Mr. Chairman, and congratulate Mr. Archibald, the representative from Harbor Grace. I felt that if from no other section, Conception Bay would produce the man to take the stand that he did. I am proud to say that I come from the same place. You, Sir, in a manly way have told the Hon. Prime Minister of your position and appealed to him to save the country. Imagine the member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Chairman, having to relate the starving conditions in his district, the like of which we have not seen and know nothing about. Mr. Archibald was in his district and lost the advantage of being at party meetings as the Hon. Prime Minister has said. He was doing his best for his district. All the members representing the F. P. U. should have been out doing their bit in the same way, and they can only blame the Hon. Prime Minister for not opening the House in January. They can only blame the man who was not ready with the legislation and the Hon. Minister of Fisheries whose absence from the country did not permit the opening of the House. It could have been done without him, and if it had been we would be out of the trouble to-day. Mr. Archibald will go down in history as a man who possessed of independent spirit took his seat in the centre of the House for the interest of Newfoundland, and I believe that Hon. Dr. Barnes will be the next, and if the Hon. Minister of Justice is not watched he will do so also. I told you that

it was written on the wall, and you have to get down to a practical plan. Mr. Archibald pleads for a man to lead the country as it is his birthplace. He tells you that when the House closed last year the Governor-in-Council if they considered them wrong should have wiped out the Fish Regulations. To-night we are up against the rocks and Mr. Archibald has to use that independent spirit that is born in him. That is the kind of man who will save Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Footo, I want to say to you that you are a free, independent man and you know that your country is at stake and the sooner we get together and do something the better. Mr. Bennett has said that the House is divided against itself, but now we have the spectacle of a man leaving the Government, and putting his seat in the middle of the House, and Mr. Prime Minister, he has thereby proven himself a better man than you, or a better man than any in this House. You, Mr. Archibald, have said that Hawes was no asset to this country. I stated that in this House last year, and we heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say the same thing here since. Now, Mr. Speaker I'm getting mixed in this thing; there are none of us who know where we are. We have heard Hawes denounced and still we find Government fish going over to him now to be sold. The Minister of Fisheries and I have agreed on the Hawes business, and he knows that if he sends this fish to Hawes now the loss will be a heavy one, and the country has to bear it. Mr. Archibald, you have taken the first independent step and I am proud of you as a Conception Bay man, and I venture to say there will be more seats where you have moved yours before very long. One leads, you know, and the others follow.

MR. ARCHIBALD—Mr. Chairman. I rise again to thank the Prime Minister sincerely for the kind things that

he has just said of me, I feel sure that I do not deserve the half of them. However, with regard to the government and my district, I wish to say that I have done my best always, and I have always been sincere. In again thanking the Prime Minister for his kind expressions of me, I might say that I have been forced to take an independent attitude because I am only concerned with the pressing problems that are before the country to-day, and may I say to the district of Harbor Grace through the reporters box, that my moving into this independent seat to-night is done subject to the approval or disapproval of the people of my district. In taking this stand in the best interests of the country generally I am sincere, and I will hold this seat independently until Harbor Grace district asks me to vacate it, or till some definite constructive policy is evolved.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.
And it being past Midnight

THURSDAY, June 16th, 1921.

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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works."

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

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 17th, 1921.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, with your permission. I want to read a telegram which I have received from Bay Roberts.

"Ranger and Diana, bound to Labrador, did not call at Bay Roberts or Spaniard's Bay. This is unfair to Labrador planters and suppliers, and a very strong feeling prevails here as season is late, and fishermen want equal chance to secure berths, etc."

That was sent me by a friend in Bay Roberts, and I thought I would bring it up and ask the Hon. Minister of Marine if he is aware that those ports have been passed over.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The Minister of Shipping will answer that.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING—The Ranger and Diana sailed a few days ago, but it was found after they called at Western Bay and Carbonear that they were filled up, and it was useless to call at Hr. Grace and Bay Roberts.

The other ship was filled up at Cupids and it was useless for her also to call at Bay Roberts, Spaniard's Bay or Hr. Grace. The Seal was to leave yesterday, but was delayed by fog till today. She is to call at Spaniard's Bay and Bay Roberts, and if not full will go to Cupids, and other points in Conception Bay. The Sagona on Monday or Tuesday will call at all Conception Bay ports from Hr. Main to Hr. Grace, and will clean up all of them. She will take in all the ports the others are not able to call at.

CAPT. LEWIS—I would like to ask the Minister of Shipping the rate on the Sagona.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—A rate has been arranged on the Sagona the same as the Seal or Diana.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE—I beg to table replies to questions 2, 3 and 4 of Sir M. P. Cashin of the 13th.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question (5).

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To move that a Committee of the House be appointed to consider the question of the future operation of the Railway.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions regarding the branch railway to Argentina.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I understand the Chairman of the Railway Commission will be in a position to table a report from the Secretary during the afternoon and ask that this matter be deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works."

HON. PRIME MINISTER—This is a bill to cover a technical claim for

having entered upon lands irregularly.

The Bill was read a first time.

HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE—To move the House in to a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the confirmation of an agreement between the Government and the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I beg that this motion be deferred.

MR. SULLIVAN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries what employment, if any, he intends to give the Statistical Clerk, whom he transferred from the Customs Department to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to keep such statistics of fish shipped under the Fishery Regulations, which are now repealed, and to inform this House, if the said Statistical Clerk is to be transferred back to the Customs Department, and if not, why not?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any representations have been made to the Government by any parties here or outside with a view to the building of steel ships in the Colony and on a guarantee by the Government, and if so what action if any does the Government propose to take in relation to the matter?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No representations have been made to the government as to the matter to which this question relates.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government intends to take any steps to investigate the methods of the Banks doing business in this Colony in view of criticisms as to the manner in which they operate and especially of his own criticism of one of these Institutions a few weeks ago in this House, which he described as composed of Shylocks, and does the Government propose to take any action to establish the State

Bank advocated by the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union in the last annual address to his organization?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No steps have been taken in this direction. There is no intention to establish a State Bank under present financial conditions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that the salt brought here by the steamer "Henrik Lund" was purchased from a mine of which Mr. Geo. Hawes is the owner and if so why; also if the salt has been sold without payment of any duty and if so why; and also if it is correct that parties purchasing this salt have been furnished the same without check or tally being made by the Government representatives in charge of the delivery of the same?

MIN. OF SHIPPING—This question should have been directed to my department as the cargo was disposed of through it. As to the mine being owned by Mr. Hawes, I am not conversant with his business and I do not know. It was purchased through a firm of brokers named Rolph.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Have you the Bill of Lading?

MIN. OF SHIPPING—It is in my office. As to the purchasing of it Mr. Piccott is looking after it with a staff of checkers as it goes on board the schooners. Salt is still on the free list.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Before getting away from the question I would like to ask if articles for Church purposes are on the free list.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—At present certain specific articles are on the free list and refunds are given. This was done illegally by the previous government. We intend to amend the act so as to get all in free.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Do I understand you are going to make alterations now.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—We want you to lift the duty now as there are goods on the Furness Withy boat that cannot be got out. I think it is our duty to do this in a business-like manner and let the churches know.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will be dealt with when we go into Ways and Means. If application be made to the Assistant Collector, Mr. LeMessurier, the goods you refer to will be all right.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—He has been referred to, but he is overworked. There is no reason why this should not be dealt with.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has yet received the report from Mr. E. Collishaw on the mission of himself and Mr. John Devine to Washington, in connection with fishery matters, and if not, when the government expects to receive the same; also if Mr. Collishaw has been paid any money on account of this service so far?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There has been no report from these gentlemen and no claims have been put in.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Don't you think it is time for them to report. They have been long enough back. It has been pronounced by the Hon. Minister of Fisheries that they were sent to Washington and would report when they got back. We will probably find that in a few weeks the House will close and he will be paid without making any report. There is no reason to conceal it and you won't while we are here.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission if any report has yet been received from the engineer in charge of the coal boring operations at South Branch with respect thereto, and how long more is the work to be continued?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHER-

IES—I beg to table the reply to that question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Marine & Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if the Commission has prepared or is preparing any report on its operations of the railroad for the twelve months which will end on the 30th of this month, and if so when will it be tabled, and if not why not? Also if such a report has been prepared will it contain any recommendations with regard to the future operation of the railroad based upon the experience gained by the Commission during the twelve months it has been in office, and if not will he undertake to have some such report or other material prepared without delay, so as to assist the Legislature and the country to reach an understanding as to the difficulty which surrounds the railway problem and the best methods of overcoming the same?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The report will be tabled in due course, I have asked Mr. Hall for it.

MR. MACDONNELL—Asked Hon. the Min. of Posts and Telegraphs to furnish a comparative statement covering the past five years showing

- (1) The number of officials in the General Post Office at St. John's, and the duties performed by each, giving name of each and date of appointment.
- (2) A statement of the same kind regarding the mail clerks on trains and steamers.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—The deputy minister has been asked to have this answer prepared. It may be tabled before the House rises this afternoon.

MR. SULLIVAN—Asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of this House all the names of the different parties who received government salt on credit from the government, giving quantity supplied to each and price charged. Also the names of all parties who bought salt for cash

from the government and price paid same.

THE MIN. OF SHIPPING—I beg to say in reply to this question number nine, that I have given instructions to have this information prepared. I hope to have it before the House rises to-day.

MR. SULLIVAN—It is a simple matter.

THE MIN. OF SHIPPING—Yes, but we are very busy at the office.

MR. SULLIVAN—How many thousands of dollars roughly?

THE MIN. OF SHIPPING—I could not say. We had little over nineteen thousand of salt. Some was sold on a four months note and some for cash.

MR. SULLIVAN—My reason for asking this question is that there was a quantity given on a four month's note. We have been asking for the men of our district till we are sick. After considerable agitation and after seeing the necessity you came to our assistance and gave us \$50,000. But this assistance has been insufficient. Some thing has got to be done for the people of Placentia and St. Mary's because day after day telegrams are coming in from the numerous men unable to get supplies.

I would like the government to give us a further fifteen thousand dollars. If the government can give us that on a four month's note renewable and chargeable on our district for the next year or so matters would be all right. That would be a better thing than giving out pauper relief. The other day we received a telegram saying there were fifteen families starving at Trepassey. It is the duty of the government to see to it that those people are looked after, and it is our duty to fight for them and do what we can to prevent any such conditions. I know the government is faced with a very hard proposition, but it knows something has got to be done to provide for the coming winter. I do not ask you to give us any further pauper relief. Give

us cash or a guarantee to the extent of fifteen thousand dollars, so that we can get the men to the fishery. This is better even if you lose every cent of the guarantee. What is the government going to do? Are we to keep continually drumming this into your ears? Now is the time to do the necessary thing while this House is in session. Let you outline some scheme by an act of Parliament so that there will be some employment when the fishery is over. We can not answer those appeals until we know your intentions. When you came to our assistance some weeks ago you knew the conditions prevailing in the district and we thank you for what you did, but it is not enough. We are appealing to the government to stand behind the people. Yesterday we had a wire from Woody Island saying the people there were starving. The Prime Minister sent across to this side a long letter he had intimating that a lot of people from other parts of the district were in a very bad plight. The magistrate would not have sent this to the Prime Minister if it were not true. It ought to prompt the government to inform Mr. O'Reilly to give the guarantee of one thousand to the merchant, Mr. Devereaux, so that the people may get to the fishery. The people from Woody Island went to the merchants of the Bay, but they have gone the limit of the guarantee so they could not get any further supplies. The Minister of Justice knows I am speaking the truth because he sent down to my office yesterday a message he had from Malcolm Andrews of Baine Harbour saying the people there were starving owing to their inability to get supplies. We are not going to let the people starve, and we are going to use the main line grants before that point will be reached. Some action ought to be taken to provide further help and unless the government is prepared to do its best in the matter, I will always use my

utmost endeavours to place the condition of the district before the government, and will do my best to obstruct every vote passing through this House until the government is prepared to realise the hardships the people of the district are up against.

MR. BENNETT. -I want to avail of this opportunity, and I consider it in keeping with the object of the question before the Chair, and this is a matter of very serious import to the people of the whole Island and especially the fishermen of the country, it being with reference to kerosene and gasolene. Through the courtesy of the Prime Minister the other day, I was handed a copy of correspondence which took place between the Imperial Oil Company and the Colonial Secretary in 1915. I was the occupant of that office at the time. I know some provision was made by the government of the day to prevent the colony being entwined in the grasp of a monopoly, as at the time there was terrible extortion being practised upon the people of the country with regard to the sale of a universal commodity in the shape of kerosene and gasolene. We have already heard the contention whereby a private citizen could import a small quantity of oil in casks, and after paying all expenses even freight, and sell it at five cents less than the imported article as sold by the Standard Oil Company. This is a serious situation and I want the government of the country to put these companies in their places. There has been a big monopoly by those companies, and the time has come when some one ought to take this matter up and bring these corporations to a realisation of their responsibilities. The communication I have is of date, June 17th, 1915, and is signed on behalf of the companies by Mr. C. O'N. Conroy. With the indulgence of the House I will read because by so doing the House will be in a better position to judge the merits of the case (reads)

This part I want to place special emphasis namely (reads). The remaining portion I will not weary the House with. I want to bring out the undertaking included in the last paragraph. When the government made that agreement with those companies it was made with the full assurance that we would be getting the article at five and ten cents per gallon off the imported article marketed in the ordinary way. Looking over the customs returns of last year there were 2,020,000 gallons of kerosene oil, and 1,234,804 gallons of gasolene imported. I am not aware whether last year would be considered an average year or not, but I would put the average at three and one-half millions of gallons annually. It has been proven beyond doubt that oil imported in small quantities can be sold for five or ten cents cheaper than the oil sold by those companies. If that is so, these two companies have robbed the people of this country of \$200,000 per year, and no attempt has been made to stop it. Still we are told that the interests of the fishermen are looked after. I say this must stop and the Prime Minister should get in touch with Halifax and enquire what it is sold there for, and we should be getting it as cheap here after making provision for freight. These are the things that should be looked after. It is appalling to think that the fishermen are being deprived annually of \$300,000 by those corporations. This is what we have to pay for the privilege for looking across the harbour and seeing two tanks built over there. The arrangement was made with the object in view that the oil should be sold much cheaper than the imported article. I know they have to get a fair profit. But they must no longer practise extortion upon the people of this country. There must be an immense saving in labour and cost of transportation because an oil tanker can come

down, and in few hours pump out her cargo into the tanks on the south side. No body ought to be able to compete with them on that account. Then the people here should get the advantage of this agreement. I want to thank the Prime Minister for having given me this opportunity of reading this correspondence. But those companies ought to be made toe the mark.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will get in touch with Halifax, Sydney and St. John and get the various cost of this commodity.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You will remember a few days ago, when we were in committee on ways and means I drew the attention of the House to this matter. There is no necessity to wait till we get that evidence, but the position is that over a year ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came in here with a proposition of getting oil, and gasolene in wooden barrels duty free. The reason being that they could be used for the storage of cod oil. There is no package so suitable for cod oil as a kerosene or gasolene barrel. I believed that was a good proposition. If I want to import ten thousand barrels of kerosene or gasolene I can do so duty free, and sell it much cheaper than those corporations. During the last three days this corporation put another cent on to the cost of oil per gallon. Yet to come back to oil barrels, we need fifty thousand of them for cod oil, and to give the fishermen a chance to get barrels for their cod oil we induce them to buy this oil in the casks duty free. They are made of hardwood, and even if we pay one dollar and fifty cents for it, you are still getting it cheaper. I cannot understand why the government put duty on oil and gasolene. Since the new tariff this company has jumped the price per gallon one cent. It is common information that oil can be imported and sold six cents cheaper than that sold by this company. This is a necessity to the fishermen,

and God knows they are taxed enough at the present time. The change may be made because those companies are owed money, and they are now allowed to increase the price. That being the case they are monarch of all they survey. I will do all in my power to prevent this going through. I will protest against this, and I think every right thinking man will support me. I would like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to explain why he is now advocating the contrary to what he advocated last year? Where are you going to get those fifty thousand barrels? You will say there is a loss when the oil is imported in a steel barrel. That I will admit, but it is very, very little. Even if they lose two gallons per cask they want them for cod oil because that barrel is saturated with kerosene, and there is then no necessity to have it recoopered again. This is the one article that always gives satisfaction. I would really like to know why you bring this proposition before us now. I am consistent on this point, because it is necessary for the fishermen. As pointed out by Mr. Bennett you are playing into the hands of those companies. They are asking that those barrels be prohibited. You are closing the gates by doing this. You are putting a weapon in the hands of those monopolists. There is nothing logical or business like about this matter. I am sure it is not the intention to do this, and I think the Minister in charge will strike this from the Budget. These people are sucking the life blood out of our people, and have driven many into insolvency. I am not here to legislate for this kind of man. Somebody else is being made sweat for their bad debts.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—We thought there would be a supply of casks if we allowed it to come in duty free. We thought that that would encourage the importation of oil in the wooden package. The oil

stored on the south side is put into tanks, and they pay duty on it, but as they had put it in casks they asked for a rebate, and thereby be placed on the same footing as their other competitors. If we did not do that they would have to send them to Halifax to be filled and then a lot of labour would be lost. Between the price of the oil sold in the wooden packages and the steel barrel was ten cents. The fishermen still buy the oil in the steel barrel, and pay more duty. The men who used the oil in the wooden cask got it duty free. First they say they can return the steel barrel for the price for which they were charged and secondly they would not suffer any loss in quantity obtained. When there is a large quantity imported in the cask when the last casks are resorted to some of them are half empty owing to evaporation. There is a considerable revenue derived from the sale of this article. If it were possible to have it admitted duty free nobody would be more willing than the government to do so, but we cannot do without the duty. The principal point of view is that we want revenue and next the fishermen will not buy in the cask thereby saving ten cents on the gallon. I am very pleased with Mr. Bennett for having got a hold of this correspondence as it has thrown a lot of light upon the matter. If the companies referred to are making ten cents per gallon they shall have to be cut down. Even if the Profiteering Act, does not do the trick then we must see that they only get a reasonable margin of profit. Therefore I ask that this Profiteering Act be enforced immediately so that we can deal with the matter. Let us have his commission immediately. A margin of four cents per gallon is enough.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—The explanation given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not as clear as it might be. He contradicts himself. If the fishermen do not buy the

oil in casks how can there be an accumulation of them? If they do not buy the wooden package how can they be sent to Halifax to be recovered? There is nothing logical in your argument. If you do not import fifty thousand casks you will make another bungle of it again. Where are you going to get them then? If they will not buy them in the wooden package there is no necessity to alter the tariff. Under the new tariff this company has jumped the price one cent per gallon, and when the House closes up further will it go. They go down in the coves looking at the heads of the barrels seeing who imported them, and they were around here when the Budget was brought down to peep in and hear the news. You said you get fifty thousand dollars in revenue so you have let the cat out of the bag. You said you wanted another one hundred thousand in revenue, and this is the way you are going to do it. By this method of putting on duty you are removing the only safety valve you had on those corporations. For goodness sake leave this oil question alone. Ask a half dozen fishermen and they will tell you the crux of the matter.

MR. SULLIVAN—This is a very serious matter, in so far as the fishermen of the country are concerned. I see no reason why the government should cut out the provision made last year in this matter. This Profiteering Act can be applied, but by allowing this oil to be imported duty free in casks this monopoly can be avoided. I remember seeing oil imported from the Texas Oil Company and other concerns, and I see no reason why it can not be imported from them at the present time. You have done your best to tax the fishermen out of existence. If there will be no casks what are they going to do, to put their cod oil in? Are we to have a repetition of a few years ago, when the fishermen had to pay a high price for barrels. While on my feet I would like to refer

to another question of importance and that is salt. There seems to be some doubt about this matter. I would like to hear the opinion of the Minister of Finance and Customs re the importation of salt. Under what Act can the salt be allowed in free of duty?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Under the Revenue Act.

MR. SULLIVAN—I am under the impression you imposed a duty on salt. Is there not an import duty of five per cent. on salt?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, on the importation.

MR. HIGGINS—To be exempt salt shall have to be placed in schedule A.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, the position I take is this, that nothing should concern us but the question what are we going to do to relieve the people in distress? Does the Government intend to bring down some concrete measure that will meet the present circumstances? We are tired of excuses. Be men and do something for those numerous suffering people. I move that further consideration of this Bill be deferred.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I will accept the motion.

MR. FOX.—I move that the Committee rise to enable the Government and the Opposition to consider some concrete proposition for the immediate assistance of our fellow creatures perhaps some of whom have not enough bread in their homes to keep body and soul together for one day. You have treated this matter in the same way as you have treated the matter of unemployment. You

have not at heart the pangs of pain and anguish to be found in those pitiful homes of the distressed. The time has come for action not theory. Come tell the people that you have abandoned every else so that you may consider their plight. Have you any hearts in your breasts to beat in unity with the starving hearts all over the country? You have failed in the biggest things during the term of your office. You have done everything in your power to bring the country on the verge of despair. You have fooled the people by your catch cries. You have beguiled them right and left. Never did such a black day dawn on this country as when the people of Newfoundland made their frightful mistake on November third, 1919. Instead of being members of a Government alive to its obligations you seem to be members of an order pledged to silence. Inaction and incompetence seems to be written all over your past actions. Perhaps you recognize the needs of the people but you have not the ability to create something to relieve the situation. You have not the genius for Government. You are for ever blindly stumbling forward, step after step into the abyss of despair and ruin. You are the Government of theories and idle fancies which is evidenced by your past conduct. It is pitiful to see to-day this one time prosperous and well to do country beyond recall. It is distressing to know the plight of our country and to realise it is in the hands of those who by their past actions have proven themselves incompetent to bear the responsibility of a government. Five weeks ago the starving men of this city, my city, came to the Bar of this House asking for help and you gave them the deaf ear, and now the condition is such that you cannot tell what may happen next. The tears of the people are nothing to you. Are the broken heart-

ed cries from the various sections of the country of no consequence to you? You have not got a dollar to give to the starving people yet you make sure that your own pocket books are fat. Still you quibble over a few hundred dollars about the repairing of roads and other matters. Now is the time to care, but you are drifting along indifferent and inactive. The country cannot expect us to bring down and formulate a policy. You are the government and it is up to you. When there is any complaint about the lengthy session the Opposition are not to be blamed, the blame is on you. The people are complaining of the absence of any reasonable policy to alleviate the present day conditions. We cannot take you by the scruff of the neck and force you to do something. What are you going to do about it? The Prime Minister is not here. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is engrossed over the official organ which helped his union so much yet on the other hand was a big factor in ruining Newfoundland. The Minister of Justice is one of the few bright spots of the government. Cannot he venture a suggestion I do know of all the government there is one man capable of doing great things, but I regret he is not availing of the glorious opportunity. I regard the Minister of Justice with affection. He has a big warm heart, and I know whereof I speak as I spent 5 years of very intimate association with him. The great in justice is being done him by himself. He should not be a member of the Cabinet constituted as it is. It is the one place he ought to shun. He had the opportunity of immortalising himself by going down in the history of this country as the strongest character ever known. He should have told the government he was not going to stand for the ruination of his district by the Fishery regulations. I have very little sympathy for the rest of his colleagues, but I have the sincerest ad-

miration and respect for him. I will abandon speaking to any member of the government except him. He has heard of the detailed stories coming in from the districts closely allied with his own. I want him to promise that this Cabinet that he can control will without delay take up this very important matter, and formulate some policy that will meet the situation. You have allowed people to go down into their graves without extending a sympathetic hand during their last hour on earth. I move that the Committee rise so that this House will have an immediate opportunity of considering a remedy. You are on the brink of an eruption of this country when you take the bread out of the mouth of a starving man and crying children. Give up this trifling legislation and get down to your task and be ready to give prompt and useful assistance to those who are nearing death.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE

—I may say that in the absence of the Prime Minister, that the government was yesterday, and is considering the best possible way out of the present situation. In a very short time a lot of the unemployed will be fishing. But there are many others who do not fish and they shall have to be looked after. This matter cannot be decided in half an hour and the government is giving this matter its mature consideration to provide employment for those who are so badly in need of work. I can assure you it is doing its best to arrive at a solution of the problem. In regard to the Bill before the House, I have no objection to the Committee rising, and reporting progress, or if the House wishes, doing nothing further. The honorable member who has just sat down has scored the government for this thing. The government did not introduce it. I did at the request of Mr. Morine. It was not before any party meeting. Out of courtesy I did it for him, and can

do nothing further than bring it before the House. The Bill was introduced so as to get titles for the people, of the land on which the Western Union Cable Co. wish to build.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—So far as the Bill goes we know little about it. The trouble is that day after day we have Bills of this sort brought in, and we are getting no further along. I am sorry the Hon. Prime Minister is not here, but before we go into Ways and Means, I serve notice that nothing will be done till we get a concrete policy handed down as to the railway. It is the object of the government to close the House in about 10 days. We are now up to the 17th of June and after the 30th of June I understand—and it is public property—that the government will not touch the road. It is also currently reported that the Reid Newfoundland Co. will not turn a wheel after the 30th. Are we doing our duty if we allow Supply to go thru without finding out what the money is for and how we are going to get it? It is the government's duty to enlighten us in this respect and our position to hold up the House till something is done. I serve notice that you should adjourn for a week, and then come in with a concrete proposition as to the railroad. Day after day we are tinkering with little minor bills that are of no interest to the people. I serve notice now that Ways and Means will go no further till you bring down the policy of what you are going to do after the 30th of June. Look what happened last year; the Hon. Prime Minister left us for months. You ate up all the spare cash and were glad to borrow more. Now you have none left, but we are asked to close the House with the most important proposition before the country not touched at all. Am I right? Am I doing my duty? It is up to you to say "here is our policy". After another thirteen days the railroad will cease working according to the pro-

nouncement of the contractor. It can't be handed over as it was last year. Millions have been spent without permission of this House and here we are to-night, 3 months after the opening, fiddling with a little bill. I give notice now on behalf of the Opposition that no votes will pass till you bring down the programme as to the railway, what it will cost and how you are going to raise the money. Till then you will not be allowed to close the House and make a deal in the dark. We, like you, have been sent here by the people. You got the trick off last year, but you will not do it now. That is plain talk, and I would like to hear from any gentleman opposite, if I am not doing my duty. I have no axe to grind, I am only doing what is right and a seat here is all I want. It is no good getting off a lot of tommyrot like you did this evening. If you do not come in on Monday or Monday week with that policy we will hold up the House. If you do not move, the railroad will not move.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal to be considered in the remarks of Sir M. P. Cashin, and I hope that something will be done before the House closes. I did not know this Act before the House affected Trinity more than another district, till I heard the remark of the Hon. Minister of Justice. I do not think it has anything to do with the holding of a house. We should not put the least thing in the way of those who have money to spend in giving labor, and I would take it as an act of courtesy on the part of the Opposition if they would allow it to go thru.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I am in accord with the Bill, but the opposition to it was brought on by trying to muzzle the speakers on this side. That sort of thing is useless. I understand the company who propose building want hard and fast titles, but squatters' rights are in evidence in that part and there are no documents from the

Crown, so this is only to copper-fasten the same, and give the company a clear title to build. We have no objection whatever to the Bill itself.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I have at all times Mr. Chairman, tried to keep myself more or less in check. I agree with Sir M. P. Cashin when he tells you that we do not intend this House shall close till we get your railway policy. May I suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister to waste no more time and while he is discussing that policy to also prepare one in connection with the unemployment problem to bring in here next week. I have letters and telegrams from my district of such a character, that if I read them before this House it would cause riots, a thing which I do not want. Some policy must be formulated for my district and the country at large. Two of the saddest cases of poverty I have ever known came before me to-day when two men from St. John's West came to my office. I will hold this story till the government adjust their policies as to the railroad, and the unemployed. The trouble is not only in St. John's East and West, but North and South, all over the country, and I have held myself in check in this House fearing to disclose what is in my breast. I will tell of one case that happened this morning, and then stop. The Hon. Prime Minister will then see the urgency of something being done for those people who are starving. I am sorry to have to tell it, but will do so as Sir M. P. Cashin touched on the railroad, and I want to touch on the matter of the unemployed. A respectable man came to my office and said, "I want to borrow \$5." I asked him why he was not at work on the roads. He said he had a ticket for work, but himself and family had had nothing to eat since yesterday morning.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—He had the ticket for work alright.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, but he

was so weak he could not go to work. The railway policy is no good unless the unemployed are looked after. The government should formulate a policy for that, and I state though it is not my duty as I am not in the government, that it can be done with little expense. But you want brains to do it. There is another case of a young man from Twillingate who called on me this afternoon. The Minister of Public Works knows about it. He has one child and is expecting another and has not a dollar to keep himself alive. Others like him are tramping around idle and something must be done. I cannot help them further. I am not an alarmist, but I want you, as suggested by Sir M. P. Cashin, to adjourn for three or four days, or a week and prepare a policy. It is not for St. John's alone, as in my district they are as bad off as ever they were here. The men want work and many are too proud to beg. I ask in all sincerity that you adjourn for a week and come back with a policy and then we will help you to put the business through quickly. If you do not act I will produce the letters and telegrams I spoke of.

MR. HIGGINS—Before the Hon. Prime Minister speaks, Mr. Chairman I would like to intimate to the Attorney-General that my comment this afternoon in no way represents opposition to the Bill. We oppose it with a good deal of favour as there are good points in it, and I think there would be no occasion for further debate, if I had a short time to discuss it with him. I think the leader of the Opposition made it clear when he stated there was no likelihood of any delay in its passage or of undue criticism, but the crux of the whole thing is that the affairs of the country are covered by Ways and Means. How it is to be voted and collected, it is up to this side of the House to see. I support entirely the suggestion of Sir M. P. Cashin when he indicates that the

time would be well spent in finding out where we are as to the railroad situation. It would be good to know what additional estimates there are for the road, and how they will bear on the people. The Government must recognize how improper it is for us to enter into Ways and Means without knowing their attitude as to the railroad. That being so, the government will appreciate that we recognize it is not easy to come down right away in the morning with a programme, but I think you should take time to consider first the railway and second, the labor problem. The time would be well spent if you took 3 or 4 days to consider, and I think not much time would be lost as to the proceeding of the House. No member on either side wants to stay here an hour longer than necessary. I think the leader of the Opposition made it clear, and I think it will be understood by all that we will be compelled to follow an opposition course if nothing in the way of a policy is brought down. We must oppose if there is no programme. The railway will involve a lot of money the next 12 months, and next we must find a solution to the labor situation. Therefore I support the leader of the Opposition in his suggestion as to the taking up of these matters. If you follow his advice there will be no delay in the putting through of legislation.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I entirely concur, Mr. Chairman, in the views of the leader of the Opposition that we should go on with the business which will take up more time than this. We are ready to go ahead and if the members on the other side of the House had confined themselves to this we would have done some work, but the afternoon had been taken up by the discussion on Ways and Means. I do not think the leader of the Opposition agrees with this practice after all, as it results in no profit to either side and time is lost in dealing with extraneous matters. It does not facili-

tate the government in its business, but means that we have to listen to debate on a multitude of matters. As to this Bill it deals with squatters' rights only, and if the Opposition think it should have been deferred it could have been done and we could have gone on. As to the railroad the report of the Commission was not available till this afternoon, and I did not have a chance to read it yet. I moved the adjournment of the discussion on it, so as to give all an opportunity to see it. That is no reason why we should not get on with the other matters on the Order Paper with reasonable despatch. I would consider it a courtesy if the debate were confined to each item on the Order Paper, and then the time would be spent profitably. I concur with Mr. Higgins and the other speakers that a programme should be before the House, and made known before the committee stages can be proceeded with to any extent. But I do not think it is good to have lost valuable time when we could have been doing business. As to the adjournment I agree and instead of meeting Monday, we will do so on Thursday, and give to the members of the Opposition who desire it, a holiday, and to our own members an opportunity to visit their homes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and recommended that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Higgins gave Notice of Question
Mr. Bennett 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 Thursday afternoon next, the 23rd instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 23, 1921.

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

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Pistolet Bay on the subject of a road. I ask that this petition be accepted and referred to the department to which it relates.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, permit me to present a petition from the inhabitants of Chateau, Labrador on the matter of the Telegraph office at that place. While it is true that Labrador is not represented in this House, I nevertheless often come in touch with the people of that place in the course of my work, and I am only too pleased to do anything for them when the opportunity arises. The telegraph office there has been closed for some reason or other, and the petitioners want to have it opened this summer. Not alone would it be a benefit to the regular inhabitants of the place, but to many Southern fishermen who go there for the summer's fishing. I should like for this petition to be referred to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs, and I would ask the minister to give the request when it comes before his notice, his best consideration.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the fishermen of Blackhead, I beg to lay before the House a petition, not in the usual form but rather as a verbal request, with respect to trap berths in that section. In May 1919, certain fish regulations were published in the Royal Gazette concerning the fishermen of Blackhead West, which I shall read for your information.

(Reads section of Regulations)

That was gazetted on May 23rd, 1919 and it was done because as I distinctly remember, there were only two

trap owners there, the other fishermen using smaller nets and being engaged principally in the salmon fishery, on which they depended very largely for their living, and if they were made amenable to the regulations other people coming in and setting traps would take their salmon berths and so deprive them of the opportunity of engaging in that fishery. For some reason best known to the government, a Gazette issued last May cancelling these regulations that had been made the previous year, and it transpired that last season three traps came in from outside, and much damage was done to the nets, and other gear of the people belonging to the place. This year a similar practice is being followed, and I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take note of the fact that the people of Blackhead are entirely dependent upon the waters surrounding the settlement for their fishing and if the fishery fails they are down and out. The place is not a regular residential district and the people have settled there only because of the opportunities it offers for fishing, and I submit it is unfair to permit outsiders to come in and take their living from them. This is a serious matter. The settlement is not a large one, but nevertheless the rights of the people who live there must be respected. The area affected is but a small one, and is merely sufficient for the needs of these people, and I trust that it will be reserved for them. I went down to the department of Fisheries this morning, and asked Mr. Hutchings about the matter, but he informed me that he was not secretary of the Board last year, that office being then filled by Mr. Goodridge. I bring it before the Minister now, and I feel sure that his well known desire to see that the rights of the fishermen are respected will be evidenced in this as it has been in other cases of a similar nature in the past.

HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I concur entirely with the remarks of my hon. friend and colleague, Mr. Bennett. These regulations are changed, as a rule, only on the recommendations of the fishermen themselves. I do not know what changes were made in the case of Blackhead last year, but I know that some changes were made with respect to Petty Hr. but anything that was done on the recommendation of the people. As you know Sir, these things do not come before the government but are attended to by the Fisheries Board.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, that is the position exactly. The Board considers these matters on the recommendation of the fishermen and they always leave it to the people themselves to say what regulations are desirable in the general interest. Why these changes were made I do not know, but I could probably find out by inquiry. Anyway the matter will be attended to.

MR. BENNETT—I might say when the first changes were made it was done on the strong representation of the fishermen of Blackhead. I am obliged to the Hon. Minister, and I feel sure that in this matter he will see that justice is done.

DR. JONES.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the statements that have already been made by my colleague, Capt. Lewis with regard to interference in district matters in Hr. Main. We have been told that there has been no discrimination, but I assert that there has been, and that it is still going on. We were confronted the other day with a charge against Hr. Main of five hundred dollars for seed potatoes of which we had no knowledge. These potatoes were given out by Mr. Hibbs or someone representing him in that district. We intend to protest against any interference with our district. Whatever Mr. Hibbs' object was this has got to stop. The Minister of

Marine and Fisheries has said that representatives of districts shall be given control of the moneys for those districts, and he should see that we are not interfered with. He shouldn't let his friendship for Mr. Hibbs make him forget that we are the representatives for that district.

I also wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the great waste of money in my district just now through the Public Health Department, owing to an epidemic of small pox. I came across four cases in Avondale and reported them to the Magistrate and he and another Doctor took charge. This is unjustifiable interference with private practice. These gentlemen have scoured the district and created an alarm which was altogether uncalled for, and as a result of their energy the Captains of mail boats have refused to take anyone to the Labrador. The same thing occurred in the case of an epidemic a few years ago. There were ninety-seven cases under my treatment, and my bill was two hundred and ninety-eight dollars which covered attendance, medicine and driving. I refused to do any further work because I was not getting enough to cover my expenses, and there was another Doctor engaged who had fifty-one cases, and he received eighteen hundred and ninety-three dollars. I got three dollars and seven cents a case, and he got thirty-seven dollars and twelve cents a case, and the man who drove him around the district was paid one thousand and sixty-five dollars. There was never any necessity for interference. I could look after those cases, and I want this kind of thing stopped immediately. I could have done this work a few years ago for four hundred dollars, and be satisfied but the Government would not pay me more than 50 cents a visit and twenty-five cents a mile, while rather than

pay me a decent fee they pay another Doctor fifteen dollars a day and expenses amounting probably to \$10 a day more.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Speaker, I crave your permission and the indulgence of the House while I say a few words in reply to the hon. members for Hr. Main. I have been accused of committing an offence which I am afraid I am going to repeat, if occasion requires, no matter what the representatives of that district think of it. I deny that I have ever interfered with the members' rights in any way, and it won't take a long time for me to explain the matter satisfactorily to this House. I have been repeatedly requested by the residents of the South Shore to do something for that much neglected section. I don't know whether the hon. members for that district are inclined to do justice to the East end or not, but I do know that for the past twenty-five years I have seen the political game played in a way that can only be termed a crying scandal. The Eastern section of Hr. Main has been looked upon as a mere rag-end of the district, and deserved, or at least has been given very little consideration. I have been a resident of that section, and as a member of this Government, I contend that I have a certain responsibility in the premises, with regard to such conduct, and I feel it my duty to see that they receive fair play, and that is my only apology for what has been termed interference. Geographically speaking, the West end of the district is fifteen miles distant from Holyrood. In this section the people have very fine harbours, and enjoy twenty-eight public wharves, while in the eastern section, a distance of 20 miles, of bleak shore, there is only five wharves. The same rule applies to post offices and other public utilities. Those are some of the reasons

why I am interested in the South Shore, and I have made up my mind to stop this discrimination, if possible. I have endeavoured to construct a small harbor at Foxtrap, so that the people using motor boats there may have some place of safety to put them. I entreated Mr. Woodford and other members of the late Government to try to get that harbor completed, but we only partially succeeded. I have had several conversations with Capt. Lewis with reference to the needs of the South Shore, and we agreed to work together in this matter. I asked the Marine and Fisheries Department for three thousand dollars for marine works this year. I have also been trying to get a public wharf at another point, to give the people a chance to land caplin for fertilizing purposes, and I hope to succeed. That is the only interference I have been guilty of, and if there has been any discrimination practised in the matter of employment in the district, it has been done by Dr. Jones and Capt. Lewis. I will wager Capt. Lewis one hundred dollars which he can donate to any charity he will name, if he can prove one solitary case of discrimination against the Government in this part of the district.

CAPT. LEWIS.—I will bet five hundred and put my cheque on the desk right now.

MR. HIBBS.—Alright, I shall have much pleasure in covering it. There has also been a lot of criticism directed against us as members of the Road Commission, but that does not trouble me in the least. Every member on the other side of the House can criticise us as much as he pleases. We are doing, and will continue to do our best dealing with all men squarely irrespective of their politics. Now, I state that the best answer I can give Capt. Lewis will be to take five hundred dollars off him. I have acted on

behalf and in defence of the people I have already referred to, and I will continue to do so as long as I have a seat in this House.

With regard to the three hundred and fifty dollars worth of seed potatoes distributed along the Shore, these were asked for by the Road Boards who knew the needs of the people, and they were given for work on the roads which was performed under supervision. There has never been any discrimination in this distribution any more than in labour, and there will not be any.

CAPT LEWIS.—I was very much interested in the remarks of Mr. Hibbs when he said that there was no discrimination, because I can show Mr. Hibbs correspondence proving that there has been, and I want him to put up that five hundred dollars now.

MR. HIBBS.—Certainly I will, here's my cheque.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to advise Mr. Hibbs not to cover that cheque in the House as it is not in accordance with Parliamentary procedure.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, since the last day the House was in session we have been handed the report of the Railway Commissioners by the Chairman of the Commission. After reading it over, I find that there are many questions that I would like to ask the Commissioners and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will now read the questions and ask to have the answers tabled at the next sitting. (Reads questions.)

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—At the last sitting I made some reference to free entry of church material.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That matter has been attended to.

MR. LEWIS.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has yet received the out-

standing returns for snow shovelling in Hr. Main district, which returns we have been asking for so often.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—One of them you can see at my office; the other is not in yet.

MR. LEWIS.—I want to emphasize the desirability of protecting these returns. Our district is charged up with having received \$7,000 for snow shovelling, and I serve notice on you today asking you to get the Minister of Justice to enforce the law in this connection. There is no reason why efforts should not be made to collect these returns and it is up to the Minister to do his duty.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Fearing the House might get a wrong impression as a result of the remarks of the hon. member for Hr. Main, I might say that I have taken every step in my power to get these returns. I first sent out a circular letter asking for these returns, followed by another shortly after. Then I requested the Deputy Minister of Justice to communicate with the Magistrate at Hr. Main and to ask him to send a constable to collect the returns; also I communicated twice myself with the Magistrate. The Magistrate promised to do all in his power to collect the returns and he did send a constable to collect them. There has been no step left untaken on my part to collect them and if anybody in Hr. Main send false returns, I care not who the man is, he will be brought to justice and made pay the penalty. As a matter of fact there is only one return sheet unaccounted for. No. 1 is here already No. 2 will be here next week and No. 3 is the one the Magistrate is now trying to collect.

MR. LEWIS.—Thank you; but there is another matter I would like to refer to and that is the interference of Mr. Hibbs in Hr. Main district. Dr. Jones and myself represent that dis-

strict and can well take care of it. I want to call the attention of this matter to the Prime Minister. Mr. Hibbs was sent to this House by Fogo district and that should be sufficient for him and his interfering tactics with Mr. Main must cease. I solemnly protest against this man having anything to do with the moneys or anything else in connection with Mr. Main district and I hope I will be backed up in this by the Prime Minister. Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, gave us the assurance that any marine or special grants to be allocated for Mr. Main District would come to us, the members.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question

Dr. Jones gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively "An Act further Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber" and "An Act to Amend the War Measures Act—1914" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively "An Act to Amend the Law Society Act", "An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Ltd." and "An Act to Repeal 10-11, Geo. V. Cap. 25, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'" with out amendment.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a

statement certified by the Deputy Minister of Customs showing what will be the price of sugar landed here, and all duties paid under the new scheme of taxes now in force in this Colony?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement signed by the Assessor of Taxes showing how many persons paid (a) Income Tax and (b) Business Profits Tax counting each individual or firm paying Business Profits Tax as one person—for the Calendar Years, 1917, 1918, 1919, and the amounts paid under each head in these several years.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House statement showing the cost and expenses of the cargo of salt imported by the steamer 'Henrik Lund' specifying (a) the first cost, (b) the freight, (c) the duty if any, (d) the wharfage and (e) any other charges.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the firm of G. M. Gosse, of Spaniard's Bay of which Mr. Geo. Gosse, M.H.A. for the district of Hr. Grace, is the senior member, has been provided with any government guarantees under the scheme recently adopted, to enable them to fit out to supply their dealers for this season's fishery, and if so, what is the amount for which the government has become guarantee in the case of that firm?

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Asked Hon. the Min. of Shipping to lay on the table of the House a statement showing—

- (a) The names of the parties who received salt from the cargo of the s.s. 'Tuckahoe' landed at Port Union last year;
- (b) The quantity of salt obtained by each person
- (c) Price per hogshead paid by the receiver in each case

(d) Whether the sale was for cash or credit in each case and the amount paid and the amount due in each case.

Also a statement showing how much of this salt remains and where it is stored.

MR. BENNETT—Asked Hon. Colonial Secretary, to lay on the table of the House copy of agreement or contract between the Government and the Avalon Telephone Company.

MR. HIGGINS—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is the intention of the government to introduce this session any Legislation respecting Pensions and Gratuities to Newfoundland Sailors and Soldiers who have served in the Great War and their dependants in view of the report tabled by the special committee who have recently considered the whole matter

MR. BENNETT—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of all amounts refunded to the Imperial Oil Co. or the Standard Oil Co., by reason of one or both these companies refilling oil already subject to duty, into wooden Kero Oil Casks?

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions regarding the Branch Railway to Argentina."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, Before the passing of this Bill I want to review some of the information received from the Hon. Minister as to the Railway. His speech was short and did not cover the ground I expected. All the work in this connection was accomplished after the House was closed last year. I would also draw attention to the fact that this was all done without the sanction of

the Hon. Prime Minister or the Hon. Minister of Justice, who were both absent at the time. It was inaugurated while they were away. We are asked this afternoon to come in here and indemnify their action. Let everything be made public before passing it. Take for instance the coal boring at South Branch. I have asked various questions and received some answers. I got a report of the Government members of the Railway Commission; there must be others. Now how many on the other side know of this or what it is about. I can take this and make a speech of 24 hours on it. It is headed "Report of the Government Members of the Railway Commission," and addressed to the Hon. R. A. Squires. He was absent when the Commission was born. I would like the country to know what the Government are doing. On August 13th, 1918 they set to take over the railway. Remember the Hon. Prime Minister and Hon. Minister of Justice were absent and neither has said yet that he was a party to it. The report goes on to say that Hon. Mr. Coaker was appointed Chairman, and Mr. Hall, secretary, and an account was opened with the Bank of Montreal. All this was done by one or two individuals. The House was closed a few weeks before the appointing of the Commission and remember that all the members were to have voting powers.

(quotes extract from report)

This is a very touching explanation. All officials were retained—and serving two masters; being paid by both. The work of a dozen was put on the auditor. It fell on Mr. Pill who had a knowledge of railway accounting gained with one of the great railway systems in the United States. He was assisted by Mr. Crummy and Mr. Dicks

(quotes extract from report)

It was not sufficient to take over the railway or steamship service, but they got to take over the coal system too. Now listen to this—

(quotes extract from report)

Now it must be remembered that two months ago, I drew attention to this statement which I got on the street, but no attention was paid either by the Hon. Prime Minister or Hon. Minister of Justice. I don't think the Chairman of the Commission was back. Now the real story is that the whole year's work caved in—

(quotes extract from report)

This is all romance to us. This is some of the information we have been digging out since the House opened. We know what is going on; the coal mine is no good. The gentleman from the United States Railway has been here in the city and told people that the stuff called coal is no good. Just imagine getting motor trucks to transport coal in January, February and March to feed the railroad and steamers. If you had to do it on Water St. then, would it be possible there, let alone in the interior. The story of this whole truck business will be told later. And here's the report of the father of it all. Water trouble is referred to as developing in the mine—it is filled with water. You couldn't foresee what a mess you were going to make of it in these two months. These are the months for timber cutting and logging, not for delving in mines.

(quotes extract from report.)

And what about the 2,000 tons developed? Is that what caved in.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—That is the coal not taken out.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—There is supposed to be a million tons in the mine that have not been taken out. If it were valued at \$10 per ton the nett loss on operation would be \$35,970. Where are we on this matter. Surely it is not too much to ask the Hon. Minister how much was spent on the trains and steamers. The amount to Jan. 1st was \$97,180—how much has been spent since? The amusing part is that it has gone on without those on

the opposite side knowing any more about it than we do. And we are now asked to ratify these things together with the Argentina policy. Neither the Hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. Minister of Education or any other of the responsible ministers have opened their mouths as to these measures. Everything was done without their knowledge. It will mean half a million before these claims are finished—there are claims for \$40,000 or \$50,000 in Argentina for land taken. It was all done by one man in the space of 9 months. Now just listen to this—

(quotes extract from report)

Last year you increased the first class fares and as a result the first class cars went out empty because ninety per cent. of the passengers travelled second class. I have asked a number of questions with regard to this report, and I hope to receive answers to them in a day or two. In it I find a reference to the steamers. Now has the Colony to pay for the repairs; do I understand that the Commission did this work and paid the cost of it themselves?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There was an arrangement to the effect that the Reids had to pay all the losses on the steamers.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—The most the Reids could and would pay was \$100,000. Now I want to know are these repairs charged to the Reids?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—They are charged to the steamers.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—But you are running the steamers.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, but Reid has to pay the loss. We used the steamers, but they get no money for them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—You paid them a subsidy.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—And you lost

two million dollars while you were running the railway although you now tell us that the Colony is not paying the cost. Now here is another pronouncement from the Minister of Railways. He hopes to get only half of last years revenue, but I would remind the Prime Minister that he comes in here with estimates amounting to eight or nine million dollars. Where does he hope to get off? The Minister of Railways is at least honest about it, but the Prime Minister is prepared to throw dust in the eyes of the people

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the report of the Railway commission that came into existence a year ago, and this is the first pronouncement we have had from the Commission upon how they spent that two million dollars. We have been in the House now for two months and so far no proposition has been laid before us as to what is to be done for the future and we come in here this evening with this white-wash Bill, and are asked to vote for it. You were prepared to close the House without dealing with this matter, simply let things drift for another year, but you have to face it and you must come down here with a policy that you are in earnest about. What are you going to do? Are you going to close it down altogether? You are hopeless; you are like a crowd of children in all but innocence. You are a lot of incapables, booblers and fumbler. Call them anything you like and you cannot stir them; they have no feeling of any sort. They are prepared to draw their few paltry dollars and let things drift. There they are with a thousand miles of railway and they don't know what to do with it. How long I ask again is this thing going to last? How long, oh Lord, how long?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman I regret very much Sir, that my honourable friend, the Minister of Justice, a young man with a bright future ahead of him and whom the country

looked up to, should bring in this whitewash bill to make legal a condition of affairs, which I know he honestly believes in his own mind is wrong. I am afraid, as Mr. Higgins has said he has got into a den, in amongst a crowd of incapables and he has fallen by the roadside. It is regrettable I say that he should bring down such a bill for the purpose of whitewashing the railroad commission. Some members on this side of the House have intimated their intention to vote for this Bill; but I shall vote against it. My reason is that I do not intend to whitewash any of the misdeeds committed by the present government. There is not a doubt in the minds of what are known as the easy going members of the Government party to-night that the present Executive are the greatest crowd of incompetents that ever adorned the Parliament in Newfoundland. They have no idea of construction in their minds and the proof of that is that they have not done anything for this country, except sink the country further in debt, since they assumed office eighteen months ago. The Hon. Mr. Foote is not in his seat to-night. He is out with his rod and flies, he is so serious about the condition of affairs in this Colony. He does not think there is any occasion for him to be here, and display his wonderful ability with the Prime Minister and the rest of his brilliant executive to try and save poor old Newfoundland from the ruin which stares her in the face. Mr. Foote does not give a thought to the West Coast that he represents here, nor is he worrying about the railroad problem. All that he is concerned over is to enjoy the company of spruce trees at Salmonier. I have before me this wonderful document called the report of the Government Commissioners of the railroad. Now the only government member who sat on that Commission is the Hon. Mr. Coaker who was described by the Leader of

the Opposition this afternoon, Minister of Railroads. The other man on that Commission is Mr. Hall, Government Engineer. Unfortunately Mr. Hall is not responsible for this railway bungling, because if he was allowed to work out his own ideas things would be different, in my opinion. I am not prepared to-night to criticise Mr. Coaker for all the bad things he has done, because I am not so sure that he is as guilty regarding these railroad transactions as the Prime Minister is. I do not think that my friend Captain Jones would allow the mate to run his vessel on the rocks, without his having a say in the matter. Therefore, there is no excuse for the Prime Minister or for the other members of the Executive. The Hon. Mr. Coaker went and tried to do something while the Prime Minister went to London and took five months of leisure and allowed his ship of state to run on the rocks during his absence. No defence that the Prime Minister can put up will allow him to escape the castigation he will some day get for his neglect of duty. The Prime Minister made an appeal to this country to save it from a crowd of grafters and the Lord knows that we have got enough, a real good dose of Liberal Reform Government. Now this coal boring proposition at South Branch that was referred to this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition is I think the greatest joke in the history of Newfoundland. Messrs. Forbes and Hatch, the two mining experts who were engaged by the Reid Newfoundland Company, stated that there was no hope whatever of making South Branch a paying proposition for developing coal. I wonder does the Minister of Justice know that? In the face of that the present Government spent \$118,000 trying to develop coal that was not there. I want to say further that out of the 2,000

tons of coal that was taken from South Branch with motor trucks to the railway siding not twenty tons of it could be used in an engine to pull a train across the country. Of course the Prime Minister does not know anything about this because he was in London most of the time.

One hundred and eighteen thousand dollars expended on South Branch, and there are not twenty tons of coal that you could use to pull a train across the country. Nobody knows anything about it and yet we are coming here and taxing the people of Newfoundland, the fishermen, to an extent that never before was heard of to pay for that piece of folly. Now if Mr. Jennings is like I am, if he is sincere, I know what he will do, he will telegraph for Archibald to come over here to-morrow, and he will join him down where he is seated. He will no longer sit on that side of the House. But I suppose it is the old story again. Many a man falls for the filthy lucre. He is afraid that he will lose his Department. I can't accuse you of that Mr. Winsor or Mr. Abbott because I look forward to both of you declaring what is right before this session is over. I remember a year ago or perhaps not quite that, reading a paper with an anonymous signature to an article, Super Six. Everybody know who Super Six was Mr. Halfyard it was Mr. Collishaw, Super six Collishaw, and now Sir owing to the misdeeds of the Government the Prime Minister will be known as Supertax Squires, because of the way the Government has handled the affairs of the country, and prostituted public moneys. How long is this going to go on? How long honest John are you going to stand for this. How long are you going to see your country ruined, bled to death? Don't you think she is worth saving? Don't you think so Mr. Abbott, the place we owe our birthright to? Get down with Mr. Jen-

nings and Mr. Archibald. You will want to watch Mr. Jennings, he don't let him do it. If you want to save your country it is your duty to show yourself a man like Archibald. Don't delay too long.

Talking about these coal mines, just imagine taking down six trucks weighing six tons each and trying to run them through Bonavista in the winter. Just imagine, Mr. Prime Minister and Mr. Warren. Did you hear of that Mr. Coaker? No he was over in London with me and it was not worrying him a bit. I wonder if Sir Michael Cashin was correct in his statement to-day Mr. Warren. You are an authority on this. Have we put new boilers in the Glencoe, and shafts in the other boats? Have we to pay the bill for this? If that is correct and I were you I would chuck the job and get clear of that crowd of incapables. The Minister of Shipping would be shocked if he saw the bills against the Government for those repairs. Talk about three hundred and fifty dollars for Hr. Main. Why the discount on this bill would enable us to send a thousand barrels of potatoes to Hr. Main. It is frightful Mr. Prime Minister. After all Sir, I have a certain amount of admiration for you Sir, but it is hard to find. I pity you Sir, you have my sincere sympathy Look at the man behind you. Not Mr. Cave, but Dr. Barnes. He is your assistant, but he must be a marvel if he is going to help you to reconstruct Newfoundland and bring her back from the rocks you have run her on. The Minister of Education knows all about the Railroad and South Branch. While you were absent I have no doubt he filled your place and he had no hesitation in telling the Commission to go ahead. The Minister in his love for Education said rather than have the vote for Education done away with, I will let the Railway Commission squander this money. It is a pity you did this Mr. Barnes. Don't do it any more. I don't think I can say any more to

you, you look so innocent, I feel ashamed to say anything to you, but I will have a lot to say to you when we come to Education.

DR. BARNES—I am expecting that.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Much comment has been directed against the Commission for importing these engines instead of employing local labour. It was absolutely wrong to import these engines from the United States, when there are mechanics here who could do the work just as well, but you know the men of St. John's West were forgotten, the mechanic was forgotten. We did not trouble anything about them. What odds about them the Prime Minister was in London, and Mr. Coaker's interests were in the North, who should care. The engines were imported here and the Americans got the money for the labour, and St. John's West got Liberal Reform with a vengeance. I wonder what Lord Morris would say if he could see this. He would be sorry to see his old district so badly handled by the young Tribuner, he would think he never represented it at all. I suppose the Prime Minister is trying to follow in his footsteps. I hear he is trying to court the Opposition. Don't try to do it Sir. It is a pity St. John's West did not have a Morris to look after them when these engines were imported. Then take this work at Port aux Basques. One of the first works of the Commission was to build new freight sheds there for freight which is not going to come here at all. It would have been much better to have kept the old sheds there and employ the laboring men. Spending money recklessly in Port aux Basques without a thought. It is only another sign of your incompetence. I cannot say to you Sir, that you are lazy but you have an awful crowd that are no good. I don't know whether you would call it laziness, but I call it indifference to your fellow man and your country and you won't get enough freight this

year to pay for oil to grease the freight engines across the country. That is what will happen and still we go on. It is too late now to lock the door after the horse is stolen, the labour so badly needed in St. John's West should have been kept here. Sir Michael Cashin brings up a question here I presume, what he meant to ask was about the three hundred dollars for Fish plates voted last year. Do you know anything about this Mr. Coaker? or Mr. Prime Minister? Were they imported this year from England or America.

THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—They were not imported at all.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I see, we have no fish plates but the money is gone. We are told that we can carry on for another year, but we can't. The day of reckoning has come. Blue Ruin Crosbie is right and I will tell you why before I finish to-night. Take this Argentinia deal. If Placentia and I don't accept Mr. Coaker's statement that it required one hundred thousand dollars to make the wharf there as good as it was twenty years ago. There are men who would have contracted for thirty thousand, and done the work just as well, and the only justification you have is that you spent one hundred and ninety thousand in Argentinia when this country required every dollar we could get. There is no justification for it at all. If you have spent one hundred and ninety thousand dollars in Argentinia so far, I am sure that before you get through with paying these arbitrations that it will take another hundred thousand. Thrown away. From what I can find it will not be any improvement on Placentia proper, and we will live to see that this is the greatest mistake the Railway Commission has made. But you must have had a motive for that, and I have often wondered what it was. I believe what you had in your mind Mr. Coaker was that once you got the Portia to call there instead of going to St. John's.

you would have a good excuse for taking the Prospero to call only at Port Union.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You know better than that.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It is a wonderful thing for a man to read another man's mind. Mr. Cave would not be able to stop it. He would bow to it like a little man. He would say, 'How glad I am to get clear of her, but I suppose if the Prime Minister objected he would stand by him and they would both join Mr. Archibald and then we would have a real government down there. That was what was in your mind Mr. Coaker, and I don't blame you.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You are wrong.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am such a good hand at guessing that I am beginning to believe I am always right. According to the report of this Commission we have to pay the bill for the repairs to the steamers.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It is Reid who is responsible, and not the Commission. The Bill has been paid by Reid Nfld. Co., The Steamers earned enough to pay the bill.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You know these steamers did not pay they could not pay. Mr. Cave can tell you the Prospero and Portia did not pay, and if they did not pay how could the Reid Nfld Co's steamers pay? They have charged you somewhere else for it, and you don't know it.

MR. CAVE—The Prospero paid last year, but the Portia did not.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I have heard that there is some brilliant fellow coming down from Montreal to have a look at the railroad situation, at a salary of \$25,000 a year—a fine situation for old Newfoundland. Are we as Newfoundlanders going to stand for it? No, I am not going to stand for it. I am going to appeal to Mr. Jennings and Mr. Jones and Mr. Winsor

to save Newfoundland from the pitfall that she is about to fall into. You know I can see how my friend, the Chairman of the Railroad Commission, fell by the way-side. I can hear the brilliant president of the Reid-Newfoundland Company say, Oh, Mr. Coakler, you have built up the North. You have handled successfully a large business at Port Union. You are the only man who can handle the railroad situation. Now you take charge of the railroad and get it out of the hole. Oh, he was cute. He knew what he was doing. He is a brilliant man. He was brilliant enough to take three million dollars from you bunch. He fooled you to the last inch on that railroad business. He laughed up his sleeve at the whole bunch of you; he not only laughed in the day time, but he laughed when he woke up at night. Of course, if the Prime Minister had been here it never would have been done, but when the captain goes away he never knows what the mate is going to do. He fooled you to the last inch, and I take off my hat to him. I quite appreciate the difficulty that the government is up against, and I think Mr. Cave appreciates it too. It is the financial situation that bothers you. If you had a barrel of sovereigns by your side all the time you would have no troubles. But you haven't got the barrels of sovereigns, and you have nothing. You have thrown the people's money in every direction, and now you are crying for mercy. You have shown absolutely no ability to handle the affairs of the country, and you have not the decency to get out of office and let better men, capable men, run the country. And then you talk to me about brains. Newfoundlanders will have to speak for themselves before very long, and the truth of the matter is this, even if I have to hold meetings and address people in the North, South, East and West of this Island, I intend to tell the country the true story and I intend to fight the

Prime Minister to the last ditch. I want to tell the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that they will pay the penalty they never dreamed of, sooner or later. Too long have I sat in this seat and allowed my fellow man to suffer untold distress from taxation and everything else. I will not stand for this thing any longer; patience ceases to be a virtue. I serve notice on the Prime Minister now brain against brain. You have heard that my coat is off and let us test it now as you never heard it before. I will let the people of this country know how their affairs were prostituted by a crowd of incapables; and what better example do the people of the country want than the enforcement of the notorious fish regulations. Fish to day is being sold here for \$2.75 per quintal, whereas if there had been no interference last year it would be fetching \$6.00. Do you know that to-day there are 32 Portuguese vessels with tonnages ranging from 180 to 543 tons on the Banks of Newfoundland to go in competition against your own fellow-countrymen. And then you with brains; you would sell your birthright for a mess of pottage. Imagine 32 Portuguese vessels are on the Newfoundland Banks to go in competition against our own fishermen who are compelled to go to the Labrador to catch codfish to feed their families for next winter. I want to tell the Prime Minister to-night that after the House closes this session that the people of the country will not stand for him to remain in that office another year. What do you find in Hr. Grace to-day, the place that the Prime Minister claims as his birth place? Public meetings are being held there by Mr. Archibald, who left the ranks of the Government and took an independent seat, and the people are denouncing his colleagues, and if Dr. Barnes had any manhood in him when he saw those 1400 names to that petition he would leave his seat in the Govern-

ment also; as for Mr. Gosse, he is not here.

HON. DR. BARNES—I was not invited.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You were afraid to take an independent stand.

HON. DR. BARNES—You cannot talk to me about fear.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If you had any manhood in you, you would not be looking for nearly a million dollars for education and have men, women and children starving, absolutely starving in the country and looking for money to buy food. Still you talk about sending those unfortunate children to school while you are squandering this money. Let me ask you as I asked you once before. What is the use of sending hungry children to school or expecting hungry children to learn? You know the answer as well as I do. Mr. Coaker, are you going to try and save yourself from a calamity that is going to befall you shortly? Are you going to get away from that crowd of incapables and are you going to sit with Mr. Archibald in an independent seat, even if no one else goes with you, and prove yourself a man? Remember if you sit any longer with that bunch you are with you will have your ability deteriorated. Leave the present Prime Minister and try and save your country. Take an independent seat and show to the country that you are a man. You told us in this House that you were leaving the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries and that somebody else was going to fill your job. Well then why do you not leave now. That crowd have no good in them; there never was any good in them. You have only once to live, so why should you sacrifice your own high ambitions with such a crowd of incompetents? What do you think of a man, Mr. Coaker, who printed the Budget Speech on behalf of the Finance Minister and who on the front page of that speech he had his own photograph and Mr. Brownrigg's on the last page? What do you

think of that for the developed brains of a big man? Have you seen that yet Mr. Coaker, or will I have to present it to you? Coming back to the railroad question again, I reiterate what Sir Michael Cashin has said. Supposing I have to spend the balance of my time here, I want to serve notice on the Prime Minister and on his Executive, individually and collectively, that this House will not close until the Opposition is absolutely satisfied that a definite policy in connection with the railroad as well as in connection with the unemployment problem is submitted by the government. Now do you hear that Dr. Barnes? You will have no holidays until these matters are fixed up. Personally, I decline to act on that Railway Commission that is mooted, and I challenge the Prime Minister now to say that he did not want me to sit on that Commission. Now I will leave it at that. What you have to say, get up and say it. I will have more to say on this railroad policy before we are finished.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few observations before the Bill goes through. Following on the remarks of my colleagues, I have to express once again my strongest protest against the manner in which the public services in this country are being conducted. I do not think that in the history of this government was there anything more objectionable or contrary to the prescribed form of doing such things done as can be found in the building of this Argenta Branch railroad. We had the position created last year, when this House of Assembly closed, Questions had been asked time and again by the Opposition for a definite railroad policy and no information was forthcoming. The House was to be closed before the Government decided to touch the railway at all. About a week after the session had concluded the Executive Council took over the entire railway and steamship services

operated by the Reid Newfoundland Company, and then started the extension of the railway to Argentinia, and the expropriation of private lands there for the purpose of building that terminal. Now we have heard a lot about the necessity of building that terminal. I think the kernel of the situation was touched by Mr. Bennett when he pointed out that this terminal was put there, not because it was a necessity, not because it was good economy and not because it was going to benefit Newfoundland; but, because it was to counter-balance a concession given to Port Union and because it was to enable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to achieve what he said he was going to achieve in the days of his golden youth. The Minister gave utterances to many expressions in his newspaper and, perhaps, it will be remembered by the citizens of this town that not the least prominent was that he was going to make the grass grow on Water Street.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That is not true.

MR. FOX—Well then history belies you. You never contradicted it before.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have, several times.

MR. FOX—If you go back to the pages of the "Advocate" you will find them teeming with abuse. If that paper did not contain the exact words I have just used, you will find expressions that are analogous such as hooligans, bums, etc. That is how you described the citizens of this town when you wanted to influence your northern outports against the city. Why there was not a word in the English language sufficiently objectionable to use in describing St. John's folk. I do not know your reason for electing to single out the city of St. John's for all your vilification. Perhaps it was for the sake of political expediency; perhaps not. However, judging your record by the results we find that won-

derful concessions were given to Port Union. It was freely expressed about a year ago that there had to be some movement inaugurated to counter-balance the concessions given to Port Union, capital of the Kingdom of King Coaker. Consequently, this terminal at Argentinia was selected by him with the intention of having this place the port of call for all steamers going west and terminal for all steamers going north. Mr. Coaker made the statement from time to time that most of the trade of the country would be diverted North and he has succeeded in making good that statement. All this is done to strip St. John's, the capital of this country of the trade that is hers by right. As a result of this Squires-Coaker administration hundreds of men, who a couple of years ago were living in prosperity, are to-day walking the streets of St. John's looking for work and in fact absolutely begging. The reason is given for building this Argentinia terminal is that to repair the old terminal at Placentia would cost \$100,000; yet they are going to spend \$200,000 to build a new terminal at Argentinia, and as a matter of fact it will cost at least \$300,000 before this terminal is finished. Is this economy? What profit will this be to Newfoundland? I think that if there ever was a scandal perpetrated in Newfoundland that this is the greatest one. We are asked to come here and indemnify those men without any legal grant or any justification whatever; to put through a document which this House should have passed upon last year. A few days ago this government came in and confessed that they had no definite railway policy to submit. They were told to take a vacation, and in the mean time to have a rehearsal of both a railway and unemployment policy. You come back to-day in a far worse position than you were when the House sat the last day. You have nothing for

us to discuss and it is sheer waste of time to ask this House to consider anything you have. To-day you present this ratification, which, on the face of it, is illegal and unwarranted. Every dollar you took out of the Treasury last year, and spent for this purpose was spent without any justification and spent contrary to the wishes of the people and contrary to the laws of the land; and now you come in and pray to be whitewashed. This report of the Railway Commission, so worded and made to suit Mr. Coaker, is a document that will well repay the most careful perusal. I do not know when the full story will be told, but I do not think that this country will have an opportunity of considering a choicer scandal than the scandal connected with the operation of the railroad since the Railway Commission assumed office in August last. If this system had been a sound one, there might have been some justification for the government controlling it; but in face of the fact that years before it dropped a half million dollars a year under the management of a private corporation and netted no profit to its shareholders and then for you to come along and saddle this overburdened country with its upkeep and management over and above \$100,000 is something that the people of this country will never forget. Now as a result of the work of the Commission it has cost this Colony one million and a half dollars up to the end of last year, including the repairs and upkeep of steamers and the cutting of hundreds of thousands of railway ties. By the way I would like to ask the Hon. Mr. Coaker if these railway ties were all cut in the district of Bonavista, and for which the taxpayers of this entire country have to pay for, or not? Some 80 or 90 per cent. are cut in Bonavista Bay.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Only about 50 per cent. There is no place else to cut them.

MR. FOX—That is very generous of you.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—Where would you cut them—on Water St.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There are no other places to cut them.

MR. FOX—Do you seriously mean to say there is no other place to cut them. Why, you can cut them in a dozen places.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That shows what you know about the country.

MR. FOX—Lay on the table of the House a list of what places you inquired into as being suitable.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It was done when I was in England.

MR. FOX—Did you enquire? Of your own knowledge you do not know the number of places where you can get them.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You may get a few on the Heart's Content line, but nowhere else. I know it of my own knowledge.

MR. FOX—I venture to say you are wrong. Bonavista Bay is not the only place where you can cut sleepers. Under what privilege does Bonavista Bay claim to be the only section where you can get that timber.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You can get them only there.

MR. FOX—You can get them anywhere. I know as much as you do about it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You will not find them on the railway.

MR. FOX—You will find them in the woods—not on the road.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You know nothing about it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There are people in other sections of the country who know something besides you.

MR. FOX—No wonder you would talk of other sections, when you took in the man who by his Fish Regula.

tions ruined the country. It would be better for you if you would look after the people. I am sick and tired hearing of your own section. Your whole policy has been to please those parts which play to your power and are palpably doing it. I tell the Hon. Minister of Marine that he is wrong in saying that his district is the only place where one can cut sleepers and if he had this country at heart he would not have gone to England.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Is that the Chairman of the Commission's job to go after railway ties?

MR. FOX—It's his job to hold down his business right through the program from soup to nuts.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You will know a lot more when you get older.

MR. FOX—If I had your experience I would know better. You ought to know better than to sink the Colony two millions in debt. Why not bring down your policy and discuss it like men.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You have got the report and you say it is important.

MR. FOX—It is important for what it does not contain. Are you the sum total of knowledge in this country. You go to your office and make up a report part of which is not to be given out to the public. You ought to be proud of it. No wonder you dropped millions when you did not stop here. If you were the man on the job you should have stayed here.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I wasn't paid for it.

MR. FOX—It was well paid for. You and your colleagues are getting \$6,000 a year and the whole trouble is, it is too well paid for. You are doing only part of the work and that part badly. Here's a report and still the Hon. Minister says he courts an investigation into what has been shrouded in mystery the last 8 weeks. It is like draw-

ing a tooth—you will only give information at the point of the pistol. As you know yourself it's a case of greasing the fat sow. This railway matter is not in the public service and has only your interest at heart. Was the building of wharves at Port Union railway work? Was it not for yourself. Is it not a fact that Newfoundland is liable for it as for everything else done under your administration. Is not everything north of Baccalieu used for your service; has not everything been built on Union premises and kept up at the expense of the Colony. In the face of this piratage the people all over half of the country are given no chance even of refusing contracts for these ties. And the Hon. Minister says you can't get them anywhere else. I can go down to Bennetts' Grove, and cut them in half an hour. By the way you talk one would imagine they were mahogany or walnut. The thing is a farce. No wonder you don't want a discussion on it. All the matters in connection with the railway policy will be discussed before this House closes, as it is important the public should get them, and that nothing be done behind closed doors. Your own estimate of the loss is one and a half millions, and you expect only half the returns of last year. That is a grand prospect truly. We are certainly paying the piper. Instead of frankly laying it before the representatives of the people here last year, and thrashing out the situation, you see the House is closed before undertaking the work. Then the Hon. Prime Minister left the country and the main service of Newfoundland was taken over lock, stock and barrel by these men on their own volition and they said we will run the railroad which Reids were to do till 1951. If it were done in a business-like way there would not be any complaint, but they saddles the country with debt. If you were in a Water St. store you would be discharged for incompetency. Your government is the

most ungodly mixture of incompetence that ever disgraced the country. You cannot even turn on this floor, but it costs the country thousands. Your record from end to end reeks of extravagance. No wonder your own men are disgruntled and Mr. Archibald left you digusted. There is no greater comment on your inability than the action of your own colleague. When criticism comes from your own ranks the people must believe that what is said is true. And the Hon. Prime Minister comes along to-night and says he had only one man that he wanted to lose. And yet he made an exhibition of himself the other night by his fulsome flattery of him and took care that it was done before full galleries. Do you think all this stage play is lost on the country. Does he think his little act of hypocrisy will take the stigma off the government. And now we have a petition from 1400 people asking for the resignation of the other representatives of Harbor Grace. Isn't it a lovely spectacle? You ought to be thoroughly satisfied with yourselves especially with this. And then we had the delightful spectacle of the honourable member for Fogo snapping his fingers and saying he will interfere with anything as much as he likes. Probably he will go to St. John's East in the next election, but he had better mind his "bobber." He is not up around Kelligrews when he is there. The East End sends three men here, and will stand to it. No wonder Capt. Lewis and Dr. Jones protested. This gallery play is alright for men of your own calibre and you may do what you like in your own districts, but you will not pass the barricades in the Opposition districts. No wonder you take a paternal interest in Hr. Main, and allocated \$3,000 for marine work. No wonder he would try to placate the people of the shore he is interested in, but his efforts failed miserably. You stained the bright escutcheon of the Minister of Works—you were sent by the

man who held up his hands in holy horror, and said he would not do such a thing. Now you cannot get the returns for the work. If the Minister of Works were the man he professes to be he would see that the law was carried out in this connection. Does not the honorable member for Fogo realize that the object of the Hr. Main people in putting us in was to keep the like of him cut. But don't overstep the boundary or you will make the same mess of it as you did in other parts of the country. And now the Argentina "railway?" Was the like of it ever known. You spent \$200,000 to save \$100,000. You repaired an old wharf and stuck the Colony for \$200,000, and still asks us to accept his bona fides and to think that this is not part of the preconceived plan to strip St. John's, to let her get no more than the least, and to make the terminals at Port Union and Argentina. But the people here thought differently. If there was one section to suffer, it was this one. Once happy and prosperous, we now see our stalwart workmen of all grades looking for employment. And it is all due to you. If you had allowed the steamers to come as before and commerce to go on, we would have work here. If you had not carried out your designs and crippled the country, things would be different from what they are to-day. But for your madcap policy conditions would be the same as 18 months ago—employment in plenty, money flowing and no dark despairing hearts which exist to-night. There has never been such a government since we first got Responsible government—never such an unholy alliance of mismanagement as there is in Newfoundland to-night. You will go down in history as the most incapable administration we ever had—as one not capable of running a bull's-eye shop, much less a country. What position are you in to-night any different, from a few days ago. Has the coun-

try to wait still for your policy, and the House remain open to tresh it out or are you hoping that your subterfuge will avail you and that the House will close without your policy being brought down after all.

This House is not going to close till the railway policy and the matter of relief have been discussed. A few days ago I had a visit from a deputation of Spaniard's Bay men who told me that the people over there were actually starving and the same story is coming in from every part of the country, but it is falling on deaf ears. The government are doing and will do nothing. There are thousands in Newfoundland to-night only waiting to get a few dollars together to get out because they can no longer live here. Of every dollar a man earns he must give the government seventy cents, that is the position. The sales tax has confounded the best mathematicians in the country. A gentleman who is civil engineer told me that he received a parcel recently and he was at a loss to determine just how to make up the duty on it. He brought the problem to me and told me to go up to the colleges with it, and he would give a prize of five dollars to the pupil who would work it out correctly. It defies the ordinary laws of mathematics to find just what duty has to be paid now. The country is going under from the burden of taxation that has been placed upon the people by the government that got into power on a promise of reducing taxation. It is as well, perhaps, to postpone my minute discussion of this bill as I am at a loss to know what attitude to take on it. The government should not be indemnified but on the other hand I see great inconvenience to the people concerned if any other course were to be adopted. Therefore, I shall postpone my discussion till the close of the debate.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words with regard to this matter before the debate

closes. I think it a great pity that we should be here discussing a Bill like this, and I cannot but wonder how long the country is going to stand for it. We postponed the consideration of the matters which are urgently demanding solution for five days and now we come back to find that we are in a worse position than ever. I am in receipt of messages from clergymen saying that the people in my district are starving and the Government are deaf to every plea. I do not wonder that one man left this House in disgust, but what I am surprised at is, that the people have let the whole lot of us stay here as long as they have. People who a year ago were in comfortable circumstances are now starving and no matter whose fault it is the situation has to be met. The great part of the people in many sections of the country are now existing on poor relief, and I would like to know how the Government expect to raise eight million dollars on that in spite of their fancy taxes and then we are wondering if the government did wrong when they stole the land from the people of Argentina.

I had thought that we would have something in the nature of a policy brought down here to-day, but we are no better off than we were when the House adjourned. I am opposed to the principle of this Bill because retroactive legislation of any kind is wrong. The government does something wrong and then they go back and legalize it. I grant that this bill is necessary, but why does the necessity exist? It is bad enough to squander the people's money, but now you are going out and starting highway robbery and this Bill is being passed to keep you out of—I won't say the Penitentiary. I say that the whole crowd on both sides of this House should get out altogether. Surely you do not want to have happen here what has happened in almost every other country, surely you do not want the

people to come in here and say to you "take that bauble the mace out of this House." I hope it won't be done, but that is what we are leading up to. If we cannot do anything in this emergency, let us all resign because we have no business usurping the jobs of better men. I do not know any way out of this mess, but there are those who do and not another day should be lost but let something be done this very night. If you have any plan put it before the House; nobody wants to steal it from you and when the government comes in here with some definite scheme they will get all the support they want from this side of the House. It is no time to play politics when the people are starving. The man who left your party said that he saw no hope; he was straight about it and now he has gone over to his district to tell the story of our incapability to the people. The Prime Minister was caustic a few minutes ago with regard to the people he was glad to lose from his government. I may have a chance of discussing that matter with him later, but I will say this now, that if he were lost it would be all the better for this country. Now Mr. Chairman, I do not want to talk any longer on this Bill; I am sick of talk but yet nobody makes a move to do anything.

MR. FOX—It has grown into a habit with you people to keep your lips sealed. If you continue the policy that you are pursuing it will be just as sensible to have a phonograph placed on the end of the clerk's desk to recite you past records. Discrimination; it is nothing, but discrimination. When the honourable member sits in his seat in this House he no longer represents Bonavista district only, but the whole country. This section of the country has suffered while other sections have grown rich at its expense. The people of the whole Colony have paid for these ties, and there should have been no discrimination in getting them. Did the honourable members on the other

side read this report at all, or are you like the Minister of Justice which did not read his leaders manifesto. The whole thing is iniquitous. This railway problem should have been handled in this chamber, not down in the Executive Chamber behind closed doors. The public should know what was happening, they have to stand the bills. If there is any further expenditure I warn the honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the discrimination that he has shown in this matter of getting ties.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, the honorable member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, has made the claim against Mr. Coaker, the Chairman of the Railroad Commission, that he discriminated in favor of some sections of the country in giving the work for the cutting of ties for the railroad. I think that charge is unfair and unwarranted. As a representative of Trinity district I had occasion to be interested in this matter. A request came to me some time in January. Many of my constituents were anxious to get contracts for cutting ties. They had been getting contracts for years. I did not take the matter up with the railroad commission at all. I took the matter up with Mr. Powell, and he referred me to Mr. Joyce. I failed in many respects with the Reid Newfoundland Company to get a contract in favor of my constituencies. As the season advanced I took the matter up with Mr. Hall. He said, yes, Hearl's Content Line was the most favorable place to get ties for the Bay de Verde branch and other places. It was impossible for them to get all the ties required, he said. When the time for payment for the ties arrived, we had a lot of trouble. I think it is most unfair to charge the Chairman of the Railroad Commission with discrimination. Of course, we all know that times are not normal. Many people were out of employment, and I took the attitude that it is better to

give the people something to do that would bring in some returns than to give out able-bodied relief.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, there is just one word that I want to say before the Committee rises. We have been discussing sleepers for some time. Might I suggest to the Commission that they would find a good lot of sleepers if they would take the members of the government of to-day. They say things just as one who was just coming out of a sleep would say. In other words a helpless incompetent crowd of men after improperly starting on a public work costing two hundred thousand dollars, and illegally entering up private lands, come in here at the last moment having had no right to build the railway, and helplessly ask us to whitewash you. Of course we will. A poor harmless incapable crowd of men. I made the statement the other night that never in the history of the British flag where it has flown, has a crowd come together so lazy and hopeless and allowed the people to give you the title of government. The Minister comes in like a well licked child and explains that the terminal at Placentia was gone, that the terminal has got to be replaced, and by what right and by what knowledge have you arrogated to yourself and the harmless crowd you are associated with, after saying that the strictest economy should be practised, the right to substitute a work costing two hundred thousand dollars. Has there ever been such an exhibition of Government? The only excuse you have is that the pier has crumbled away. I would like to see the estimate and the final figures. Let me tell you that two hundred thousand will be doubled. The claims which caused this Bill to be made will chew up this two hundred thousand dollars. There is one claim to come which will make a substantial inroad on this sum. Of course the honourable members opposite who had the delightful experience

of following this incompetent crowd have got to hold their tongues because they do not know what they are voting for. Let me tell you now that you are voting to legalise and whitewash that which was improperly begun and illegally carried out and now the government by reason of its misconduct comes to this House to be indemnified and like the leader of the Opposition I will vote for this Bill. We have never been asked to vote for any Bill of any consequence. These bills are made by men who trust in God. We all know this terminal is not giving the results that the experts pointed out it would give. The Minister has embarked this Colony upon an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars without any authority and after that being done improperly entered upon the lands of private persons with the result that the Minister of Justice is compelled to come down and draft this Bill to save the Government. Why does not the Minister get up and title the Bill "An Act to legalise the improper conduct of an incapable administration for the past twelve months." The language used in the second section is simply absurd. The position of the government with regard to this matter is a scandalous one. No attempt has been made to compensate the people for all the untold injury that has been done them by a reckless government. In order to legalise this you bring in this bill. It is like walking to a funeral. Mourners please fall in. You unfortunates are walking to its funeral and we humble people on this side represent the unfortunate public. This is one of the parts of the ritual. It is a very sad spectacle the Minister of Marine and Fisheries presents. He is like a big helpless man. For the sake of the day when we had better hopes we may say there is a justification for a decent funeral. We trust that before he vacates his post as Minister of Railways he will come down with a sincere act of repentance so as to make

some little amends for the past the regrettable past.

MR. SULLIVAN—I may say that I fully endorse all the comments of the previous speaker the honourable member for St. John's East. I am voting for this Bill for the simple reason that we cannot abandon the people of Argentina after the bucaneer practice of the government for the past twelve months. The people there are law abiding and they have sat down under it, but there is a limit to all things. During this present session I have repeatedly asked the government by question on the Order Paper and from my seat here what steps they intend to take to compensate the people of Argentina for the property they had destroyed. They put it off day after day, because we thought they were preparing legislation to bring forward. But we have been open three months and no legislation has yet come. We find no policy submitted to this House on the great big important matter the Railway in general. Nothing has been shown to foreshadow the policy of the government with respect to the railway. Yet they busy themselves with many minor bills of little importance. The Railway Commission went down to Argentina unsolicited and tore down fences, destroyed pasture lands, took away timber and in many cases destroyed the earning powers of the people's lands for this year. Yet they have not received one cent for this criminal conduct and depredations. Many of those things have not been considered during the different arbitrations. Five weeks ago the arbitrators went out there, and like the merchant of Venice they wanted more than their pound of flesh. I support this bill because of those facts. It certainly shows up the incapacity of the Government.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to say a word or two like my colleague, Mr. Higgins, with regard to the spectacle which presents itself to-day. This matter of the branch railway to Argentina

has been an uncalled for operation, and then it was improperly carried out. Owing to the great need of money the country has been put to the mat and when we should be cutting down all unnecessary expenses which at the present time is essential to the conduct of public affairs, and as well to every individual, and making sacrifices to meet the conditions which now appertain to Newfoundland owing to the results of the past three years. The Government has been criminally responsible for expending money upon this road. The whole of the Placentia line was becoming out of repair and the wharf there needed attention all of which could have been effected at little cost. The Placentia terminal has been good enough for the past forty years. I agree that it would have been good enough for the past forty years. I agree that it would have been a good thing had the first terminal been built at Argentina, but during the past few years circumstances have been such that the government could not in any case start upon an extravagant policy. It is a much better site than the Placentia one can ever hope to be. I do not know about the approaches, but I do know that it would make a good terminal. Like our Education Department there are ideals to be accomplished, but the realisation of them ought not to be embarked upon until the times are more opportune. The cost of the line in question has been estimated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at \$190,000. But before it is completely finished it will cost \$400,000. You are just like Sir Edward Morris, while he estimated that the four branch lines would cost four millions dollars, yet they actually cost eight millions. So also you are as about sincere as he was. But there is no justification for the building of line to Argentina. It was a quid pro quo. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here because if reports are correct

St. John's is going to suffer as the terminal for the coastal boats will be at Port Union and Argentina. This is unfair as the people of Argentina do not want this. This is one of the steps taken to make the grass grow on Water Street. This is one of the implements being used to effect that purpose.

We cannot refute this Bill we have to vote for it. If we did not vote for it every member of that district would have a successful suit in the Supreme Court. I was at one time a party to the building of branch lines but my vision was not as clear as it is now. I can plainly see now we have too many branch lines. It is absolutely absurd to see trains travel miles and miles without one package of freight or even a passenger. No wonder there would be an immense deficit. No wonder why the Commission could not finance the operation of the road successfully. The Government, however, has not yet given any outline of the railway policy so it is futile to discuss the matter. But I may say again I reluctantly support this Bill but it was a shameful act on the part of the Government.

And it being past midnight

FRIDAY, June 24th.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was introduced, and read a first time and it was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Com-

mittee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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 and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's," in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said Bill was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and by unanimous consent the said Bill was read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee to consist of Hon. the Minister of Posts & Telegraphs, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox and Mr. Vinicombe.

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 Cap. 40 of 11 Geo. V, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads'."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works," was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill respecting Delinquent and Neglected Children as follows:—

The Select Committee on the Bill Respecting Delinquent and Neglected Children beg to report that they recommend the passage of the Bill hereto annexed.

Signed,

W. J. HIGGINS,
J. R. MACDONNELL,
W. R. WARREN.

June 23rd, 1921.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 24th.

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

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Sinnott gave Notice of Question.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House the original bills of the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all printing supplied to his Department or any other Departments under his jurisdiction, from the 15th of November, 1919, to date.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the Table of the House the original bills of the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all printing supplied to his Department or any other Departments under his jurisdiction, from the 15th of November, 1919, to date.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of all orders for Poor Relief supplied by M. A. Bastow and Irving Parsons, also the original bills.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, the following questions arising out of the report of the Government members of the Railway Commission, dated the 15th of June and tabled here last week, with a request that he will expedite the replies to these questions as much as possible so that the House and the country may have them available before the Railway question is discussed:

(1) Was this report prepared in conjunction with the representatives of the Reid Newfoundland Company on the Railway Commission or with their knowledge, and was a copy of it handed to them or were they acquainted with its nature before it was furnished to this House, and if not will a copy be submitted to them and they be given an opportunity to reply to some of the criticisms contained there

in upon the Reid Company's management of the Railway system?

(2) What qualifications does the Minister, as Chairman of the Commission, possess to justify his pronouncing on highly technical questions of railway management; what time was he able to give to the consideration of Railway problems since his appointment to the Commission last August, seeing that from then until December he was Acting-Premier as well as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and like wise in his capacity of President of the F.P.U. had to give a large portion of his time to the concerns of that Corporation, and that during January, February and March, he was absent from the Colony altogether, and that since his return he has been so absorbed with the business of the F.P.U. and his sessional duties that he obviously could have given little or no time to Railway problems?

(3) What are the qualifications of Mr. Victor R. Pihl, appointed Auditor of the Railway system; which of the "great railroad systems of the United States" was he employed with; what was his position, what salary was he receiving, what salary is being paid him at present, and will the Colony be liable to retain him in its service after June 30th or to pay him any particular amount or have any responsibility for him in any other way?

(4) What quantity of coal was obtained by Mr. Hall when he visited Canada last September, what amount per ton was paid for the same, and was the price proportionately greater than was paid by any of the Canadian Railway Companies, and if so to what extent; also what price is being paid for coal for the Railroad at present, and how does that compare with prices of Canadian coal for the Canadian Railways?

(5) Who are Messrs. Hatch and Forbes, of the Natural Resources Department of the Reid Newfoundland Company; what are their qualifications

to pronounce on coal mines, what sums were paid them by the Colony as salaries and as expenses for their services in connection with the South Branch mine; and what is the value of their opinion as to 60,000 tons being obtainable, seeing that the mine has now collapsed with an output of only 2,600 tons?

(6) In view of the confession in this report that "up to the present this mine has been disappointing," that it fell in, was flooded with water, and that because of transport troubles the small quantity of coal mined could not be got to the Railway, is it the intention of the government to continue work on this mine, and if so for how long and to what extent, and what further sum in addition to the \$118,000 spent up to the first of April it is proposed to spend on it; also to say what the cost of operations there will amount to for April, May and June; also to furnish the report of Mr. Morley, the Superintendent of the Mine, if he has made any, and if not, to say why he has not made any, and when, if at all, he will make one; if the outcome of this experiment has not been such as to prove that this coal mine at South Branch was another mare's nest, and if the Minister was not deluded by interested parties, into wasting this large sum of public money for which there is absolutely no return whatever?

(7) If he will explain what is meant by the items "coal obtained 2,500 tons" and "coal developed, about 2,000 tons;" how much of this coal was got to the surface; how much of it was removed from South Branch to the Railway; how much of it was used in the railway engines or in coastal steamers; what is the opinion of the locomotive and steamship engineers as to the quality of this coal, and to table their written reports thereon, and what has become of the remainder of the coal and what is it intended to do with it?

(8) To table a list of all parties en-

joying free passes under the Railway Commission, and to say why the Government Engineer, the Post Office Inspector, and the Inspector-General of Constabulary should have passes, seeing that they, as well as other members of the Civil Service can have their expenses paid, and is it the practice of these officials to travel on the pass and charge their expenses to the Departments; and also if it is the case that the Auditor-General has a pass, and if so why should he be provided with such facility; also to table a statement showing the amount of increased Revenue accruing to the Railroad during the twelve months through the cancellation of passes a year ago.

(9) To table a statement showing the amount of increased Revenue obtained by advancing the first class fares by a cent a mile, to call attention to the announcement in Canadian and American papers recently that freight rates had been already reduced, and that passenger rates were to be reduced on July 1st.; to ask how he justifies a recommendation for a further increase in freight and passenger rates in this country in view of these circumstances?

(10) To table a statement showing "the large subsidies drawn from General Revenue" to which reference is made on page 7 of the Report, and to say what rates the Commission suggests to "cause the traffic to pay for the cost of its handling and transportation?"

(11) To state the reasons why the work of the Argentia terminal was not completed during the winter and when it is expected to be completed, and to say what assurances have been received from the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company that it will use this port for the shipment during the winter months of the products of the Grand Falls mills?

(12) To state the number of freight cars, provided under the agreement of the 13th of August last, completed up

to date, and when the remainder will be completed, and what was the necessity of proceeding with them in view of the admission elsewhere in the report that there will be a decided drop in the quantity of freight to be handled by the Railroad during the next fiscal year?

(13) Why work was not started on the new freight terminal at St. John's as provided under the same agreement; when did the falling off in freight begin which is now held to justify abandoning or postponing this work; what has become of the \$200,000 voted by the legislature at its last session for the erection of this terminal; is it still to the credit of the Colony, and if so why is it not applied to this work which would give employment to large numbers of people and if it has been applied to other purposes, to what use has it been applied?

(14) Why was not the provision of new fish plates authorized by the Legislature proceeded with; how does it happen that after the Legislature was persuaded a year ago to vote \$300,000 for the provision of these fish plates on the ground that they were absolutely essential to the Railway, it is now suggested in this Report that their provision can be delayed until new rails are put in; why is it necessary to have new rails for the Newfoundland Railway system seeing that the A. N. D. Co. hauls freight trains of twice as many cars and each car heavier laden, between Grand Falls and Botwood and vice versa, with rails of only the same weight as those on the Newfoundland railroad and engines of only the same capacity and what has become of the \$300,000 appropriated by the Legislature last year for fish plates is it still to the credit of the Colony and if so why is it not applied to this purpose; and if not what has become of it?

(15) Why does the Commission advise a readjustment of the railway locomotive shops when the proposed new

freight sheds on the south side of the harbor are erected, seeing that the Commission reports, as already noted, that there is neither money to build such freight sheds nor goods to go in to them if built, and what is the object of such recommendations if the Government is abandoning control of the Railroad?

(16) Why does the Commission refer to "the derelict Fortune Bay Branch" and describe this as "a railway from nowhere to nowhere;" was not this branch railway built and its lay-out approved by the Government Engineer, and how is it that it is only now discovered that it is of no value?

(17) What is the likely cost (a) of constructing and (b) of operating a train ferry from Argentia to Marys-town, and of (c) constructing and (d) operating a Railroad thence to Burin, St. Lawrence and Grand Bank?

(18) Why should the Commission as a result merely of last winter's snow conditions (a) justify upsetting the whole principles on which the railroad has been operated for many years and advise dropping certain branches and curtailing the service; (b) will the Minister table the amounts received for passenger and freight traffic on the Trepassey Branch and on the Bay de Verde branches which it is proposed to close, and on the Bonavista Branch which it is proposed to close, and on the Bonavista Branch which it is proposed to operate, and also say the amounts spent on keeping open the Trepassey Branch, the Bay de Verde Branch and the Bonavista Branch; (c) state the period for which the Bonavista Branch was shut down last winter and the intervals apart from the main shut down when the line was also blocked?

(19) Why did the Commission "spend public money far more liberally than the volume of traffic would reasonably warrant" in improving the track and equipment of the Railway line, seeing that it was only being op-

erated on joint account for twelve months and nearly the whole cost is being borne by the Colony; what was the cost of improving the locomotives described on page 21; providing the ballast and "ties" and in building the bridges, wharves, etc., on page 22; how is it that the government did not call upon the Railway Company to make these improvements and also to fill in page 23, which they are required to do trestles, bridges and do other work, on by the Railway contract?

(20) What was the cost of (a) the new shaft for the Glencoe, (b) the new boiler for the Argyle, (c) the renewal of the electric light on several other steamers of the Reid fleet, (d) the cost of the 'four months' special survey on several of these steamers and the thorough overhaul given them; (e) were these improvements undertaken at the cost of the Colony, and if so why were they undertaken by the Commission seeing that the steamers are the absolute property of the Reid Newfoundland Company instead of being, as the Railroad, the property of the Colony, leased to the Reid Company for a period of years?

(21) Why are the Commissioners of opinion (a) that the "freight position for the coming year is not encouraging," (b) why do they consider it "imperative that freight rates should be increased to nearly meet the cost of handling the traffic," and (c) what is the evidence that the Commission has diminished unprofitable running of the train service?

(22) What is the Commission's estimate of the saving that might have been effected in the matter of coal on which they comment as follows: "Your Commissioners in the course of their investigations have been struck by the carelessness with which coal and other valuable materials are distributed and accounted for," and will he table estimate thereof and also a copy of the suggestions the Commissioners have

made for properly dealing with the same?

(23) Does the estimate of loss of roundly \$1,550,000 for the twelve months ending on the 30th of this month include the cost of locomotives, freight cars, coal boring, Argentinia and other works, and if not what is the estimate of the total cost of these; also is any distinction drawn between the cost of the steamers and that of the railway, and will he show the loss on (a) Railway system, (b) on the steamers owned by the Reid Newfoundland Company, and (c) on the steamers owned or controlled by the government and operated in conjunction with the railway service?

(24) What progress has been made in the past twelve months in getting a Railway expert as General Manager or otherwise for the Railroad system, and why should it be necessary, if the Railroad is reverting to the control of the Reid Newfoundland Company; to make such a recommendation unless the public are to construe it as the opinion of the Commissioners that the executive of the Reid Newfoundland Company is incapable of operating the railroad, and if so what are the reasons for this conclusion?

(25) What are the grounds which justify the Commission in asserting (a) that "the traffic receipts will be only a moiety (half) of what they have been this year" and if such a condition of depression exists as this statement would imply, what hope is there of financing the Railroad or the Colony during the twelve months; (b) how does the Commission explain its recommendation on page 28 that "the raising of rates and fares and the provision of larger subsidies should be made in order to reduce the losses and there the Government's liabilities should cease," seeing that on page 7 the Commissioners strongly criticize "the false position of bolstering up the receipts with large subsidies drawn from the General Revenue instead of

making such rates as will cause the traffic to pay for the cost of its handling and transportation."

(26) Is not the proposal to operate trains in winter along the main line of the railroad only as far as Bishop Falls a moral breach of the agreement with the Anglo Newfoundland Company under which they established their enterprise in this country and expended millions of dollars in developing our forest resources, and will not the result of denying them railroad communications, except what they can carry on themselves be to utterly discredit this country abroad and prevent anybody else from coming in here and establishing large industrial enterprises depending on the railroad for communication during the winter months?

(27) Seeing that the fiscal year ends a week hence, and that the Commission's control of the railroad system will terminate then, cannot the general report of the government members of the Commission on the Railroad be completed in all respects except the financial one, within a few days afterwards and submitted to this House to assist it in considering the future of the railway, in view of the intimation at several points in the interim report that questions of importance will be discussed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if instructions have been issued to the Liquor Controller's Department to supply Mr. Albert Salter with liquor free of charge at his demand. If so are any steps being taken to say what disposition Mr. Salter makes of this liquor, whether he gets it for himself or any other parties, and in the latter event whom? Also to say the value of the liquor obtained by Mr. Salter in this way since November 15, 1919.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is correct that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Coaker, has tendered his resignation of

that position, and if so is it to be accepted and when, and in that event who is to be his successor?

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Education if any uniforms were supplied to the officials of his department; if so by whom were they made and what was the cost of same; if it is the intention to require the corps of inspectors now being trained outside the Colony to wear uniforms after their return; and if it is his intention to wear a uniform himself?

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that he is despatching one of the Members for Twillingate, Mr. Samson, to Europe after the close of this session to supervise the disposal of the cargo of the schooner "President Coaker," and if so will the cost be borne by the Colony?

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention to appoint the Hon. Member for St. Barbe, Mr. Scammell, as Commissioner under the high cost of living, and what are the Profiteering Bill, to inquire into Mr. Scammell's qualifications for this post?

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if it is correct that the waters of Beaver Pond on the South Side Hills has recently been granted to a certain firm or individual in this city for private, and if he is aware that the Brook known as Luke's Brook flowing from said Pond to Waterford River will be cut off, thereby destroying the sole source of water supply to the large number of persons located on the western section of the South Side Road? Public Works to furnish the names of

DR. JONES asked the Minister of the members of the present Road Board covering that portion of Hr. Main District from Holyrood to Horse Cove, inclusive, stating date of election of each and date when each member was gazetted; also to give the

name of any Commissioners appointed to do public work over such area. When commissioned and for what purpose.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked the Min. of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the cost of the Boring apparatus for wells in Fogo district with original bills of same, and all amounts in every way paid out to date.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information; How many pamphlets of his Budget Speech have been printed; the cost of same and who did the printing of same, and if it is correct the Prime Minister's photograph, is on the front cover and that the Minister of Finance is on the last page and to lay copy of same on the Table of the House.

MR. MacDONNELL asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries if he, during his visit to England last winter, gave instructions for Lieutenant-Colonel Timewell to prepare a Blue Book of information respecting the British Fisheries for ten High Commissioner's office; if so what was the object of so doing, and does he consider that the book that has been produced is of any service to this colony; if so will he say what possible use it can be and will he obtain an endorsement over their own signatures from competent authorities, certifying that the book serves any useful purpose, and if not does he know by whom Colonel Timewell was authorized to prepare and publish this Blue Book?

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House the original bills of the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all printing supplied to his department or any other departments under his jurisdiction, from the 15th of November, 1919, to date.

MR. MOORE asked the Min. of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the original bills of the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all

printing supplied to his department or any other departments or Institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works, from the 15th of November, 1919, to date.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if passes are furnished by his Department to Railway, Government and Anglo Telegraph operators, to enable them to travel on the ships operated by the government?

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay bills furnished by the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all printing done for his Department or any Departments under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, from the 15th of November, 1919, to date.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House the original bills furnished by the Daily Star and Daily Advocate for all printing done for this Department or any Departments under the jurisdiction of the Department of Finance and Customs, from the 15th of November, 1919 up to date.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Internal Economy Commission for the present session and also the original bills furnished by the Daily Star and by the Daily Advocate for printing for both branches of the Legislature during the session of 1920, and so far as have been received for the present session; also the original bills of these papers for the publishing of the debates of the session of 1919-20 the Hansard for the same year, and the Journals of both House for last year.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the original bills of the Daily Star and the Daily Advocate for all

printing supplied to his Department or any other departments under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, from the 15th of November 1919, to date.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Posts says that it is in the interests of the Government not to have the agreement with the Anglo discussed here. Here is the place to do business. It is not in the interest of this country, because you do not know what you are doing in the matter. I call upon the men on the other side independent of the Minister of Posts. When I am through you can then talk. The Prime Minister is back again. I ask him, not because of politics nor because of the hint handed out by the Minister of Posts, what is he going to do with this proposition made to this Government? Nothing has been done but it was going to be attended to. The House will close in a few days. We have been told by the Minister of Posts that it is not in the interests of the Government to have this matter discussed here. It was signed by Mr. Tranfield. I know the offer was not accepted because very few could understand it and, as pointed out by the Minister of Posts, he is also doubtful. Here is a straight offer which will pay \$60,000 to the revenue. That would mean \$100,000 during prosperous days. In 1909 Sir Robert Bond made a cable contract but the House turned it down. The Commercial Cable Company took action against the Government and the Government won. The Company appealed to the Privy Council but the decision of our Supreme Court was sustained. All through these years there was a considerable amount of friction between the Government, the Commercial and Anglo Companies. The time arrived when the Government said that if those people would not pay their taxes their

cable would be grounded. The Commercial Cable Company's bluff was called and their cable was grounded. Then the National Government in the meantime tried where they could duplicate that and the Anglo came in here and made us an offer that they would pay twenty cents for every ten words and two cents for every additional word in and out of the country whether we handled the message or not. When that offer was made the Government it was stunned and it is stunned yet. It was asked why was that offer made. It means that we could close down our cable across the Gulf. The upkeep of that cable and of the offices was \$20,000. We could put that aside and the Anglo were prepared to hand us the same revenue derived from the operation of it. The Minister of Posts cannot give us any intelligent information about this matter. He is not prepared to talk business. You sit down until I am through and then have your say. If you will not submit to this you will have to do the work the country assigned to you. This country sent you here as the Minister of Posts. This country expects you to do your duty. These people have made you a business offer and you have not intelligently replied to them. You have not tabled all the correspondence either. You are not now prepared to go into this matter with the Anglo. How dare you get up here and interrupt me! How dare you be barking like a little crackle! Are you prepared to take this offer on behalf of the Government? I ask you to decide if that is a concrete proposition. Surely if you come to the conclusion that that is a bona fide proposition you ought to accept it. Ask the Deputy, Mr. LeMessurier, what this means to the business of the country.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Why did you not do it?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I did it, as far as I could. The people put me out and that is the reason why it was not completed. The people are now suffering for it. But here you are taxing the people seventy-five per cent. and this Company is prepared to pay us seventy-five thousand per year and yet you are not prepared to do business, but you are prepared to tax the people seventy-five per cent. You cannot get up and contradict me. That is the proof. Take it Mr. Scammell. You know something more than the rest. Take that offer and analyse it and report to the Minister of Posts. If my opinion of you is correct you will tell me what I am now telling you. You won over the Commercial Company and you cannot deny it. If you did not fight that case the Anglo would have demanded taxes from you for many years. The winning of that case meant hundreds of thousands of dollars to this Colony. And after the Company paid the bill they said, we will now do business, and according to the correspondence they simply said we are coming to do business. I ask now why all the correspondence is not tabled. What is all this mystery about? The cable between Newfoundland and Canada at the present time is old junk. The Anglo offered to take it over and give the telephones here in St John's. They have since sold the telephone system for \$50,000. You kept an office going when the receipts did not amount to half the expenditure. Why do this? I am told I am a friend of the Anglo Superintendent. Do you think I am getting something out of it? Will you sit down until I am finished. You are excited. What are you going to do about it? I am now talking to the whole bunch and I challenge any man on the other side to get up and contradict what I am saying. You must see justice done Mr. Minister of Justice, Mr. Minister

of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. Prime Minister. The Minister of Posts knows less to-day than he did six weeks ago. And just imagine he said to keep the correspondence private.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Yes. The tabling of the correspondence was merely an act of courtesy.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—That is the property of the country. Never mind your act of courtesy.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Read it and that will take up the time of the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If you are a time killed you have a very easy job. I am here to do my duty and I will do it. I ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the statements I am making are not true in every particular. I ask you now when are you going to make a move in the matter. If you are prepared to take this offer tell the House so. You have lost seventy thousand dollars during the last years of the war and how long more is this going on? Why tax us and let this splendid offer go astray?

This is another instance of carelessness and neglect. I have also put a question on the Order Paper asking for the names of those owing \$60,000 to the Customs on bonds; and on the back of that \$200,000 are also due. And we are told that according to Hoyle it would not be proper to give the names of those men. Their names should be printed in large type and held up to this community. Why should honest men be taxed when the merchants along Water Street are allowed go free? Nobody here can contradict these statements. I recommended to the Customs that certain things should be done. Wholesale smuggling is going on. I brought that to the notice of the Collector of Customs but I do not know, to whom

he reports. How can we get revenue when such a state of affairs is existing at the present time? You should be collecting \$70,000 per year since you came in. When we get up here and make those statements we are said to be impostors. I make the challenge in cold blood that not a man on the other side can get up and explain what this offer means to the business of the Colony for one year. You know already what it costs to shun the Government lines. This is straight talk and it deserves a straight answer. I am prepared to put Mr. Scammell and Mr. Samson and some other gentleman from the other side together and ask them to analyse this offer and report back and I am sure their verdict will be the same as mine. I know more about this than those gentlemen on the other side who profess to know all about it. I ask for a report from these two gentlemen and from the third to be appointed. I am prepared to take their answer.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—I want to make a few remarks in reply to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition re this telegraph matter. I still believe that in the interests of the country this discussion should not take place here. Only as an act of courtesy I tabled this correspondence, which passed between the Manager of the Commercial Cable Company and myself. Mr. Saunders of the Anglo wrote to his principals in New York as to the agreement of October 1918 and he gave me a copy of the reply and here it is. (Reads.)

Now allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks in connection with this matter. The leader of the Opposition finds fault because something was not done about a thing that was submitted to him in 1918. It was not acted on then and in September, 1919, when he was Premier he had forgotten all about the Anglo pro-

position and it was scrapped as worthless. Hon. Dr. Robinson went to Canada to try and enter into something similar to that between the other companies but couldn't get the same concessions. We would have to get an office in Canso and would get 4 cents, a word which would be a good revenue. Failing to put through the business the Government of the day then tried negotiations with the C. P. R. It was the greatest bungle ever made as they were dependent on the Commercial Co. and could not do business without their permission. They were fighting the Commercial Co. and still trying to do business with those depending on that concern. If that was not a bungle what was it. He finds fault with us for not doing something which themselves failed to do. (Reads letter).

My object in reading this letter which is dated June 6th, 1921, is to show that copies of the correspondence between myself and the Commercial Co. were given to Mr. Saunders who transferred them to his principals at New York. Here we were trying to conduct negotiations and our correspondence was given to them. At a certain point the negotiations failed and they refused to do business on the basis of 1918. What we did the last few months was not detrimental to us doing business. We were prepared to do it on the 1918 basis. If there was only one company something might be done but dealing with three was a different proposition. From the revenue point the idea was a good one and I was ready to give the business to the Anglo. In duty to the people we should say let all come in for competition. The wireless company would establish stations at Mount Pearl and at Bay Bulls to get news from passing ships and said they could do business at 7 cents a word cheaper than the others. As to what

was done by the Cashin government we had a message from the C.P.R., lately asking if we would do business on the agreement drafted in 1919. I did not know there was such a draft—it was not in our department but I found it in the Colonial Secretary's. I find no fault with the leader of the Opposition talking if we can do business and get the revenue but I do not agree with him in blaming us for not doing what he failed to do himself. Here is the agreement of August 1919. I am prepared to take criticism but the leader of the Opposition should be consistent. (Reads contract.)

That is we were to stand the cost of the Canso station whereas the Commercial Co. would give it free of cost. That letter was sent to Mr. Saunders of the Anglo after the proposal was made by us. Mr. Tranfield from Heart's Content and Mr. Saunders met me and Mr. Geo. LeMessurier and we said go on and do business. The proposition is before their principals at New York now but we have no answer yet. You can't make a sugar pill of a contract and shove it down people's throats. When Sir M. P. Cashin said he could collect the \$180,000 in 24 hours I wrote to Mr. Saunders telling him of it. But what was his reply? He said if you will tell me how the amount is arrived at, I will write to headquarters.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Why did you send him that letter?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—To bring the matter to his notice. I and the Postmaster General were ignored in the matter and it was only a verbal agreement; there is nothing in writing about it. They disallowed it and there was nothing to show in confirmation of it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That is the policy of your Government to put things in writing. You raised the six

million loan without showing any writing.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—That was the greatest stroke of business ever done by a Finance Minister in this country.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I asked for all the correspondence in the matter but only got a letter which was written months ago.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—If I knew he would forward it to New York I would not have given it to him. It was a breach of trust. I am not ashamed of what I have done. I was treating with what I thought were gentlemen but I was disappointed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Does the Hon. Minister refuse to give all the correspondence I asked for. To-day he hands out a letter but said before that he was tabling all. He reads out a lot of stuff and then sits down satisfied himself. He has given an exhibition showing himself the most incompetent man in the House. I asked when finishing my remarks for the appointment of a commission to deal with this matter. You asked the Anglo for \$250,000. What for?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS. That's our business.

SIR M. P. CASHIN. I'll call in a doctor to examine you if that is the kind of answers we are to get. When you arose we thought we were going to get some important information. You said it was on since 1918 and why did you not do it. You were Colonial Secretary then.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—The Big Three were on it then.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The House then was dissolved and we were before the country. As you know you won and came back to office in November. Hon. Dr. Robinson came back from seeing the C.P.R. in Canada with information for the Government but

they were not prepared to discuss the matter. The first thing you did was turn him on the street; a man the whole country has confidence in.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—You did not treat him as such a fine man.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You got his job but are not competent like him. He had the respect and esteem of all Newfoundland. One of the first acts of treachery was committed by you. Did you expect him to give the information to you. You have not moved hand or foot in the matter. Eight weeks ago I asked you and the Government to move but nothing has been done. You are not prepared to take my suggestion as to getting the \$70,000 but you intend to put a tax on the underdogs. The wireless you spoke of was what Hon. Dr. Robinson proposed after return from Montreal, but if I remember rightly it was not considered reliable as the cable and was dropped. You were in office but have not moved since. You tried to trim it before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. You have another offer now. They will do business now if you will hand back the tax. You have a document there which says so.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—That was a quotation from the correspondence to you.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is it right Hon. Prime Minister, to hold back the correspondence to all of which we are entitled. I ask you the question, sir.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As far as I understand negotiations are pending between the Government, Anglo and Commercial, both by correspondence and personal negotiation. The Hon. Minister of Posts gave the correspondence for private information but a week later the Government found it had been sent to New York. I do not say it was sent by Sir M. P. Cashin but there was a leak as to the information. It is not the prac-

tice in ordinary business to disclose the correspondence leading up to any transaction. At present there is a proposition from the Anglo to the Government and vice versa. We have telegraphed to New York but no answer has yet been received. When we get it, the Executive Government will discuss it and when that is done it will be given out. There is one phase that has not been dealt with and that is, there has to be a special proviso that any rights which the Anglo might acquire would not in any way impede the affairs of the Empire. That has arisen and been discussed. The Anglo wants 20 years exclusive rights but we suggest 10. While the negotiations are pending, while the wireless proposition, the 10 or 20 years matter and the question as to the amount the company will pay the Colony are pending, I do not think these subjects should be matters of public debate. If the leader of the Opposition will treat it as private he can examine all the correspondence. It is not in the interest of the country to make it public while the negotiations are pending. The best evidence of that is that after the correspondence was tabled in the House here the Anglo came back on the Government with the information.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—So far as the Hon. Minister is concerned my answer is that he has nothing to conceal because there is nothing what, ever pending and neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has a concrete plan for dealing with this cable matter. As regards the proposition read by the Minister of Posts, no sane company would reply to it. All you want now is to get clear of the torment of this side and I defy you to bring anything down here to show that there is anything whatever pending.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND

TELEGRAPHS. Are you an authority on the subject?

SIR M. P. CASHIN. I am and I will tell you now that the Commercial Cable Co. will do nothing. The Anglo offered you something worth while and you refused.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—What are you wasting time for?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The idea of turning out a man like Dr. Robinson from the Postmastership and putting in a spectacle like that. Just imagine it. Now they talk of monopolies but you have only to take the matter of kerosene and gasolene which can be imported cheaper by one or two large companies than the small man can get it and Mr. Coaker, the friend of the underdog, tells us that they want to get \$100,000 but where is he going to get it? Surely not from the people of Hr. Grace who are coming in here with the bones sticking out through their skin. Then when a business proposition comes in they are not prepared to deal with it. If the Government to-day knew how to handle this cable business I am sure that it would mean at least sixty or seventy thousand dollars to the Colony.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Protection of Neglected and Delinquent Children."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—This was referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Higgins, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. LeGrow and myself. We have gone through it and have had consultations with those Rev. Gentlemen who brought this matter to the attention of the Government and the Bill as it

stands now has been examined by all concerned. I suggest that the preamble only be read.

MR. FOX.—I do not want to cause any delay but I suggest that time be given the House to consider some of its phases. It has proven very unworkable in other parts of the Empire. I ask that it be deferred until Monday.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I might say that the member for St. George's together with the other gentlemen saw as to the objectionable features in the Bill. Yet I have no objection.

MR. MOORE.—Who are the Rev. Gentlemen who brought this matter up?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Rev. Canon Bolt, Rev. Dr. Greene and Rev. Mr. Hennecon.

MR. HIGGINS.—As to the objectionable features of this Bill. The original Bill provided that the probation officers could be appointed indiscriminately. Now they will be appointed from the Constabulary. It now also provides that no acts shall be enquired into until complaint has been first made to a justice. This removes the objection that action may be taken out of mere curiosity. In the absence of Mr. MacDonnell I wish to say these remarks.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. I think Mr. Fox rose those objections referred to. The entire objectionable features of the Bill have been fully met. If Mr. Fox considers it necessary to have further time I am satisfied.

MR. FOX. When the Bill came down Mr. MacDonnell said there were some objectionable features in it but they have been removed. Yet I have not had the opportunity of studying the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the
(Something missing here.)

the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1918."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, 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 Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act (Cap. 49 of 11 Geo. V, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads,'" as read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the Concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the confirmation of an agreement between the Government and the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received 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 the Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. LeGrow took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—With regard to this Municipal Bill I may say that the Council without giving full notice entered into possession of the lands. It was agreed that they should do it and if necessary an Act would be introduced to indemnify them.

MR. FOX.—Section one may embarrass pending actions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If the hon. member suggests some proviso it may be inserted.

MR. BENNETT.—May I enquire what is the position as to Golf Avenue?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have not been in that locality for some time and I do not know.

MR. BENNETT.—Perhaps the Prime Minister may enquire.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. I will.

MR. BENNETT.—I may also say that sixty days notice is too long for the ordinary cases. Would not thirty days be ample?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think in the Bill now being referred to the Select Committee the point has been met.

MR. FOX.—I move that section three be amended to the following effect. Reads.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—May not the House now discuss Supply?

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—No, not until your railway policy comes down. You

have not yet moved in the matter. It is unfair to ask.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of this Colony" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1918."

MR. MACDONNELL moved in amendment—"That the question of the amendment of the Election Act, 1913 be submitted to a Plebiscite." which amendment was seconded by Mr. Sinnott.

By consent of the House the amendment was withdrawn.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I am certain that members on both sides are divided and I hope that we will now get down to business seriously and that the Election Act of 1913 will be submitted to a plebiscite.

MR. SINNOTT.—I beg to second the motion Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX.—Before the motion is put Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am glad Mr. MacDonnell has said that he didn't wish to be taken seriously to-night as I am not doing so, particularly as last year his present stand was taken by the Government leader by the Hon. Minister of Public Works and Mr. Guppy and himself was an antagonist.

MR. MACDONNELL.—But on what grounds?

MR. FOX.—Directly opposite to what you take to-night.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Get the Hansard and see.

MR. FOX.—I do not think the Hansard would add much to the discussion. He lost time dealing with the constitution and to-night we are tossing it up and do not know whether it will turn head or harp. We got practically no constitution here, and it is the same case in England. The United States Government can go to a glass case and produce their document. We have no constitution in fact, but in law we have.

MR. MACDONNELL.—You can't put an unwritten constitution in a glass case.

MR. FOX.—In your eagerness to deny women their rights you are also denying me the rights of the floor. We have no constitution like they have in continental countries or the States. Looking at it from the point of our constitution consisting of the laws of the land, we have to ask ourselves how it is to be changed and the laws altered. And the main source of the change is the Legislature. One of the fundamental laws is that dealing with the constitution of the House. In recent times what is known as the Election Act, 1913 is embraced within the covers of this book. It can be changed as often as the House wishes. Mr. MacDonnell spoke of the necessity of going to the people and drew a comparison with the Prohibition question. If this were carried to its logical conclusion, no law would ever be changed without going to the country.

MR. MACDONNELL.—No more there would not.

MR. FOX.—If that be so we would not be here often as we would be out canvassing to amend the Sheep Act or something like it.

MR. MACDONNELL.—It would not matter, we would have something to talk about at election time.

MR. FOX.—Mr. MacDonnell spoke of his canvassing in his district with the Squires' manifesto. The matter in that document is not exhausted and can be used later alright. Getting back to the constitutional situation, we are called here to consult or amend the laws as we deem best in the interests of the country. We are sent here for that purpose and are given wide discretion—instead of saying "go, and preach to all nations," the people say "go to the House and amend or make the laws as in your conscience you see fit and proper." We got to do our duty whether we like it or not—the people wash their hands and say: "It is your job to deal with the affairs of the country as you deem most expedient in the interests of us who sent you." One of the things we do every year is to come here and see if there is any necessity to alter or rectify the laws. In dealing with this Bill it is for us to say if we will deal with the Act to give the women the same franchise as used by us. Despite his eloquent address I am of opinion that there is no reason why the requests of the women should not be met. My friend perhaps thought the matter was going beyond the limits expected but I am going to propose an amendment that not only may they vote for those who are to come and represent them but that they may come here themselves. If we admit the principle of their right to vote we must admit they are competent to be here. He talks of the deference due to women. I do not know if his experience in the House the last 10 weeks have convinced him it would be delicate for women to be here on either side.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Their nerves are weaker than ours.

MR. FOX.—I think he is seeing things. He had visions of a female form divine chasing the people in St. George's trying to get them to a meeting before him. Much as he added to the enjoyment of the House to-night and the erudite manner in which he discussed the measure and the authorities he quoted to buttress his arguments.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Be accurate. I like generalities myself sometimes but not always.

MR. FOX.—I am the same. He spoke of the Bible and the French Revolution and one expected him to take his stone axe and say the women should not vote as they cannot wield it.

MR. MACDONNELL.—The French Revolution was not in the stone age.

MR. FOX.—I am only drawing an analogy and I am not far wrong when I draw authorities from the stone age. In saying the nomadic did not antedate the stone age it reminds me of the professor dealing with the question of how long the sun would last and illuminate the earth.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Who was he.

MR. FOX.—I have not personal knowledge of him as unfortunately we cannot always have it with the writers whom we quote to buttress our views. The professor said three millions of years. A man at the back of the hall asked him how long. Three million was the reply. Thanks, said the man, I thought you said thirty. Now this Act only seeks to give the women the franchise and see that they have the same rights as man. I am not wishing to be satirical as my friend was, but looking at it from the point of the development of the Colony I ask him how better can the country develop than by going out and sifting the material on which it must be based, coralling the best elements in the population to come here and ad-

vice how best the country can be run. Does he deny the fact that women in consultation would have the most salutary effect on the administration of affairs or that their executive ability, so ably proven the last few years, would be of incalculable assistance. Does he deny them the right. He says there are a hundred reasons against it but he has not given one to-night. He talks a little too flippantly of their war service. I think we should treat that almost with silent respect. When we look to that and ask what reward can we give them, we pay not so much attention to those on service or to those conducting tag days, but to those who voluntarily and with broken hearts gave their sons to the canons of Europe that this glorious Empire of which we are so proud might be free.

MR. MACDONNELL.—What did they get.

MR. FOX.—Something analogous to what you gave them to-night. Newfoundland should bow in gratitude to the class who suffered God knows how much—we don't. All who lost sons went through sacrificial fires such as we pray may not scorch us. We do not talk of those going to the Board of Trade Rooms with a glass jar to hold pennies—though that was commendable in itself—but of those who gave the flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone. My friend is no nearer in thought to them, because I from a full heart appreciate what their sons did for me who perforce had to remain at home, and did what I could not. Recognizing the magnitude of their performance I needs must bow to the women who bore them and perhaps, in submitting them to the sacrifice, were hurt more than those in Flanders fields. Talk of the suffrage as recompense, if we strewed their path with gold we would not come to one millionth part or title of what

they did for us. They do not ask for this Bill as a reward as they are not looking for rewards from a purblind Government because their reward comes from a higher and purer source. Their sacrifice can be known to and responded to only by God. We should not deal flippantly with this or introduce it into our calculations and therefore let us cease talking of this Bill as a recompense. We cannot repay them and they do not want it. They have distinctly stated their war services should not be considered in this and have come to the Bar and said they did not want it for 1914 or 1918. They shouldered heavier burdens than I or my colleague at the time. We therefore must forget the war services for the time. But if for a moment you consider their war services at home.

MR. HIGGINS.—Twelve months ago the Prime Minister took on himself the handling of this railway system. After appointing committees, after dreaming for months, after having a long sleep, you suddenly wake up and find that something has been done but it has been done poorly. I regret that I have to repeat those words, "You are a conglomeration of sleepy heads."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—After hearing the various epithets hurled at the Government and the criticisms of the hon. member for St. John's East, I may be permitted to wake up for a couple of minutes to get the House awake. I would like to make it clear what I said when I was asleep. As to the promise of \$750,000 I did not know the facts but I do know this. That instead of taking this from the loan it was paid out of the surplus trust account and supplemental supply was taken afterwards. As to the terminal at Argentina, there was every necessity for its construction. The one at Placentia

is to be discontinued. It was an emergency and it had to be done. As to the Prospero in the spring of 1919 negotiations were going on between the Government and Bowring Brothers. I was the solicitor for Bowring's at the time. The figures were submitted but it was impossible to arrive at a satisfactory settlement. Then it was suggested that an Act be introduced authorizing the Governor in Council to conclude the contract. It provided the Governor in Council may conclude the contract with Bowrings at no greater cost than \$100,000. When the House closed the Government both the ships the Portia and the Prospero. The Government paid four hundred thousand for the ships. That is a precedent for the present matter re the Argentina Branch railway.

MR. HIGGINS.—The thing is ridiculous. It makes me sick. I agree that if the House closed to-morrow emergency legislation could be used to send people to Labrador but how can you compare that with the construction of a branch line like the Argentina branch. It is too absurd for words.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That was emergency legislation too. There was great fear that someone would be drowned.

MR. HIGGINS.—It is extraordinary thing that since 1894 everything has been all right and safe but you suddenly wake up and believe that somebody is going to be drowned in Placentia, while crossing in an open punt.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Read some of the petitions sent to this House in the matter.

MR. HIGGINS.—Just think the Minister gives this as a justification for the building of this road. Just think the Minister says that it was emergency legislation and they could not

wait till the House opened. The branch is not yet working. The Minister does not do himself credit by doing this to save the face of his associates. The last state of the Minister is worse than the first. Every time he puts his hand to her she flounders worse. Have some spunk in you and get up and admit that you have been a rotten Government and that you have prostituted your intelligence. Admit the whole thing is rotten. It seems to me as soon as the Placentia terminal heard about this she foundered. Admit our criticisms are right.

MR. BENNETT.—In reply to the Minister of Justice, re the purchase of the Portia and Prospero. I have not heard since that transaction the true facts of the matter laid before the House. It is not true that in 1919 negotiations were taking place between the Government and the Bowrings for the renewal of the contract which expired then. In 1919 the Bowrings notified the Government that the contract would terminate and they were desirous for the formation of a new contract. Up to the close of the Legislature, the negotiations had not terminated and the solicitor at the time will remember that at the time it was deemed essential to have the Governor in Council enabled to conclude the contract. The reason why the contract was not closed was because of the extortionate price. It will also be remembered at the time there was a great scarcity of ships and the Bowrings knew it would be hard to get ships outside of theirs for the services of the Government. Not alone did they demand one hundred thousand subsidy but also an increase in passenger and freight rates to the extent of one hundred per cent. The Government realised that in three years the cost would be very much reduced but the Bowrings wanted the

contract for ten years. I was one of those who held out and refused. The Government was not aware of the powers given and I contend that any member who reads that Act will admit we had all the powers which were exercised. I will read the sections. Reads. I submit we were able to make the contract under the ordinary conditions. The Bowrings were going to send these ships away but the Government with the necessary power at their disposal commandeered these two ships. These ships paid their way under the administration of Sir John Crosbie. If they have become a liability on the Colony to-day that is due to the inefficiency of the management. Two hundred thousand dollars for each of these ships was a good bargain for the Government. There is no analogy in this to the Argentina branch railway. When the House opened last year not one iota of information was given us about this. What you have done over there is an absolute trespass from start to finish. Still nothing else can be done but pay them. There is no comparison whatever. Therefore I want to place myself on record that while I absolutely oppose the building of this branch and condemn the action of the Government I hope they will learn a lesson and nothing is left for me but to support the Bill. The criticisms we have offered will be lessons for the future Governments.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Bennett during his comments made a remark that the management of the department of Shipping is not up to the mark and that during Sir J. Crosbie's administration it was a paying department. If the department is not paying now it is not due to the fault of the management. I think the conditions obtaining are vastly different. Now there is hardly any freight offering

and how can the boats pay. It is a pity for the Minister of Shipping to let this go unchallenged.

MR. BENNETT.—I quite appreciate the remarks of the Minister of Shipping but I would like to ask the Minister of Shipping what subsidy there was?

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—One hundred thousand dollars. Nothing has changed since Sir John Crosbie was there.

MR. BENNETT.—Could you let us know about the falling off in receipts? Is the loss owing to additional charges or the cost of operations.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—There are not so many travelling.

MR. BENNETT.—The times are not so good as they used to be since you got in power.

MR. VINICOMBE.—Last year when you came into power—I can see the Hon. Prime Minister even now—every section of the railway policy was read as if a drop of blood was being wrung from his heart. His Excellency, the Hon. Minister of Marine, as the Portuguese called him, had you all in his power. I do not know what is in his mind but like Mr. Fox I think he will hammer St. John's by making the terminals for the boats at Argentia and Port Union. I know the Hon. Minister of Marine is straight and I now ask him is that so.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is not so at all.

MR. VINICOMBE.—What about building the big freight shed near the railway station—and Mr. Hall threatens to do it despite the Municipal Council.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The other was not big enough and freight was lying around everywhere.

MR. VINICOMBE.—It looked as if you did intend to hammer St. John's. It was all prepared but you fell down

on the job. We took a week off to get the railway policy in and to-day the only Bill we have is one to ratify what was done last year. As the previous speaker said we are going on the rocks and the Hon. Minister of Justice thanks the men on this side for exonerating him. He was away when the trouble was caused last year. I am sorry he is out of the House at present as he would be able to look for the new policy as the people of the country are looking for it. The Hon. Prime Minister refers to Mr. Archibald leaving him. Mr. MacDonnell left him too and he was the wise guy as he is able to go back to St. Georges' alright. But Hon. Dr. Barnes will be left if he does not do the summersault. Mr. Archibald is now in Bay Roberts and Hr. Grace and the people are flocking to him. You will have to do the same if you want to be safe for the next five years. When the Hon. Prime Minister was bringing in the railway bill last year we had \$300,000 for fish plates. I think 1920 will go on record as the year of fish and fish plates. The people have not enough to put on their plates now. The Hon. Minister of Justice says the railway was a national affair and Sir John Crosbie was asked to go on the Commission. I think that is a mistake after reading the Hon. Prime Minister's manifesto. We were told by Hon. Minister of Justice to-night that he has not read it. This brings my words true that there are three parties in the Government. That is the reason I do not exonerate him and I am ashamed of him to say that he did not read the manifesto but still stands by its author. Mr. Archibald and the Hon. Minister of Education did come in here through the Hon. Prime Minister's influence and he must be shown up clearly before they could leave him. But you sir are under no compliments to him and you ought to

be ashamed to support his manifesto even if you did not read it. You should see how the country is going and refuse to stand by him. I know the Hon. Minister of Justice since his childhood and I looked forward to some day seeing him a big man but it is smaller he is getting. I thought, sir, you were too cute a lawyer to let them handle you. There are three of you now hugging each other. My old friend the Minister of Public Works, who Mr. Higgins thought was asleep, was only dreaming of Mr. Woodford and how himself would spend the money in his department right and fair. But the first thing he does is sign cheques for \$7,800 for the snow men in Hr. Main. They built snow forts for the money up there and also snow men with bits of coal in them for eyes. He would be asleep for another hour if he saw them. You were sincere when you went in that office, sir, and I often said I'd give anything to be so pure as you but now I'd give nothing. Talking of sleepers, I think very soon you will not need to go to Bonavista Bay for them—you will all be taking a long sleep. I am tired of talking to the Executive members and now I am going to talk to Mr. Winsor, Mr. Abbott, Capt. Jones and Mr. Guppy. If you do not say something the Government will not do anything. Stand out you, Minister of Works, you know the tricks now. Get on to the rank and file and say we will leave the Government unless something is done in this matter. You have more brains than the Executive members as they talk too much and forget half of it. I'd laugh, too, sir, if I were getting \$6,000 a year like you. There was a time when you worked hard, sir.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I work harder than ever now.

MR. VINICOMBE.—You only imagine it. Don't you have messages from

your own district. Or is it possible that your's is the only district in which the people do not need help. You took a week off and still have no railway policy to bring down. That is not good enough. When I contested St. John's East I knew Sir M. P. Cashin's party would not be returned. The two guns outside on the steps of this House showed hard times were coming.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—We will take them away.

MR. VINICOMBE.—You need not mind—they are good ornaments like yourselves. Now Mr. Jennings I appeal to you. I am tired of talking to Hon. Mr. Coaker and Hon. Dr. Barnes—they will do nothing. They say to themselves, "we will hold on and get all we can." You could not blast them out of it. And Capt. Jones, are you getting it too. Didn't you get it for fish—it said so on that sheet there. And you, Minister of Works, I cannot help talking to you—you are not so innocent as I thought you; you got your job alright. Now Hon. Minister of Marine and Hon. Minister of Justice for God's sake do something for Newfoundland. She is going down further and further every day. All in the country are looking to you, Minister of Justice, for justice. Never mind thinking of your own pockets but try to get the country out of the hole. If you will show some way out we will be satisfied. We are not worrying about having the government. I am satisfied to leave the Minister of Works in his job 10 years if he will only do something to take the country out of her troubles. Give some employment—the people cannot live on a daily dole or charity. And Hon. Dr. Barnes can't you give out some suggestion. If you don't we cannot do anything. You come in here with no proposition to-day after

taking a week off to consider. You were all off on a holiday and then the Hon. Minister of Justice says, "we had no time." I bet he was off fishing. Hon. Mr. Coaker was off on a trip too while Newfoundland is being bled instead of getting you together—in a vault in the Custom House if necessary, so that none could hear you—and discussing the matter. Why didn't you do something. The House should have been open even on Saturday instead of closed. I will not vote for that Bill. Hon. Minister of Justice says he will because we did something similar. I would support it if done properly but I will not vote to ratify the taking of \$200,000 for a branch railway which was done after the House closed.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's."

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Marriages and Deaths, for year ending December 31st, 1920.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 27th.

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

On motion to adjourn, proposed by Sir J. C. Crosbie, seconded by Mr. Higgins, the House divided, when there appeared for the motion Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sin-

nott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis—(12.)

And against it:

Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Actg. Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, GALLEY—538

Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, (15).

So it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. I have here a copy of the Advocate of June 16th. With the majority of what that paper says about me I will not deal but only a small part of it. I want to read this to the House. The other part I will leave out. (Reads Extract.)

I am not concerned with the Tory Opposition nor the Government just now as you know. One night last week I moved out here and took an independent seat as you know, till such time as the Government or someone else would develop a policy or bring down some concrete plan, which will tell the workingmen what they are going to do. Now, sir, I may say to you while rising on this point that since I left this House, I have spoken to every section of Hr. Grace. I started in Hr. Grace proper, and there I addressed a meeting from the South Side, Riverhead and Hr. Grace. My next meeting was at Spaniard's Bay, Bishop's Cove Shore, and Tilton and Adams Cove and everywhere I went I found a packed meeting. Speaking at Island Cove I spoke to Brian's Cove and Island Cove. I went to Bay Roberts Saturday night and there I spoke to Coley's Point, which cov-

ers the entire district of Hr. Grace. Now, sir, I may say to the Advocate or anyone else with this delusion that Hr. Grace is not behind Archibald, that I never met one man who was against the stand I took. No that is wrong I did meet one man and that man was Mr. Alec. Squires and surely goodness nobody could expect me to expect him to back me in my opinion. Now, sir, as I stated I addressed a meeting at Hr. Grace and after the meeting this Resolution was brought forward not by me but by the electors of Hr. Grace, as follows:

(Reads Resolutions and petitions.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by eight hundred and fifty-one electors of Hr. Grace district, and I am expecting before to-morrow is over to have two hundred more signatures attached to it which will mean the entire present voting population of Hr. Grace. Everyone knows the people have gone to the fishery and when you find eight hundred and fifty-one men putting their names to this petition backing my stand in the House against the Government who are only two years old you can imagine the feeling in that district. I will place this on the table of the House for any member on either side to read, but I don't want to leave it there too long because I prize it more than anything I have or ever hope to have, because it is a proof to me, sir, that when a man takes a stand on his conscience, as mine was taken, that he strikes the average fair minded man. When I left the Government they had no policy and what better proof of that do you want than that this House closed for a week, to enable them to form a railroad policy, and when they came back here they had to appoint a Commission for that purpose. This is no time to be appointing a Commission when the contract expires on the thirtieth of June.

It should have been done long ago. I want to say through the reporters' box to the country generally and Hr. Grace particularly, I shall never forget the men who put their names to that Resolution, and backed me up before the eyes of the country, making it impossible for any sneak to say Archibald was doing things on his own hook. Now, sir, let me tell you further when I campaigned the district of Hr. Grace in the General Election, as either of my colleagues will tell you, I stated to the district that if they elected me and I came back with the Government and that Government did not do their best for the country, either through inability or design, I would resign my seat and come back and tell them. I have done that Sir, I made that promise good, and I feel sure that Dr. Barnes will rise in his seat and verify that statement. I may say to this House that on every platform in the district from which I spoke, I placed my seat in the hands of my constituents, and you see the result in this Resolution signed by eight hundred and fifty-one people, backing me up in the face of the fact that the present Government is only two years old. Now Hr. Grace cannot do two things at the one time. It cannot stand by me and by my colleagues also in staying where they are, it is impossible, but that is not for me to say, they can please themselves, but I stated to the people that if the Government failed to carry out their promises I would come back to them, and if anyone cares to read my speech, or if anyone in Hr. Grace will tell this House what I said, it will be found that I did not make one personal remark in it while putting my position before the people. I told the people of Hr. Grace that the position in the country to-day is so serious that it will need the total efforts of every man in this House, and the best

brains to be found outside of it to bring her out of the difficulty, and the position I take is this, sir. This is no time for squabbling over party politics. We should all get together and make some concerted effort to form some plan to meet conditions.

No, sir, I don't intend to delay this House any longer on this matter, any more than I want this House to bear in mind that I am not sitting here to-day as Archibald, I am sitting here as the district of Hr. Grace backed by that district, and if any man rises to fight me personally he can bear in mind that he is fighting that district at the same time.

I heard that the Prime Minister said that he was glad to get clear of Archibald. I did not hear his remark personally. Now I have nothing to say against the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government, I think that if they are fair-minded men they will state that when Archibald was with the Government, his main interest was not himself nor did he cause any unnecessary trouble, I was only interested in trying to see if something could not be done for the people, and I don't think there is a man on the Government side who will contradict that statement. Archibald has never been an office beater. Since I was elected I have not been in the Government offices many times, and when I was there it was on public business. Now, Sir, I don't know what reason the Prime Minister had for that statement, but the only reason I can think of is this: Archibald might have been fighting a little too hard in the public interest. If he has any other reason I don't know of it. When the Prime Minister stated that he can do without Archibald he stated that he can do without Hr. Grace district also. I want to be fair to him and to every other member of this House, and I expect

the same treatment in return, and I want to repeat before taking my seat, I took this stand in my best judgment, and if I made a mistake I have to stand up under it, but Hr. Grace is making the same mistake I made because they are backing me in the stand I have taken.

MR. SAMSON.—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to say a word on this matter. Mr. Archibald has reminded us that he has taken his stand because the Government was not doing what they should, and I appreciate his independent spirit, but what I cannot understand is that if he thought the Government was doing wrong, why he did not come to the party meetings and state his opinion and outline his plans if he had any, and then if we turned him down as a party, he would have a perfect right to take the stand he has taken, and he would not be there alone, but he stayed away from those meetings all except one, and he attended only three sessions of this House this year, and then he takes an independent seat when it suits his purpose, and says that Hr. Grace is backing him against the Government. I say that his action does not show any spirit of independence.

SIR M. F. CASHIN.—Mr. Archibald is prepared to vote for any proposition which is for the good of the country. He is not the man who will jump for the crack of the whip. I am surely very sorry there are not many other men like Mr. Archibald. If that were the case we would not be telling the people that six millions of dollars have been lost, we would not to-day be taxing the people and the fishermen seventy-five per cent. You have put one dollar on a barrel of flour and one hundred per cent. on some other articles. When the Budget was tabled it was proven to be in the interests of the fishermen to have a duty

on steel barrels but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries dropped during his speech that he wanted revenue and after accepting salaries and increasing them you talk of independence. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having taken this privilege and thank you for having listened to me.

MR. BENNETT.—I would like Sir, with your permission to make a few remarks. When Mr. Archibald removed his seat from the other side of the House, I took occasion to express my admiration of his courage and stand. His address at that removal impressed every member of the House. This afternoon Mr. Archibald has returned after laying his case before his constituents and asking them for their endorsement or disapproval. He said if they would endorse his stand he would return and if they did not he would never come back. He has gone to every part of the district and has held meetings presided over by men who were the chairmen in 1919. These men must also have changed their views of the Government. And he has come back with the endorsement of his district. Therefore Mr. Archibald is in a stronger position than any man in this House because of that endorsement. Why do not the members on the other side go to their districts and seek the endorsement of their constituents.

MR. BENNETT.—Is every man on the other side prepared to go and ask for the endorsement of the Government's conduct for the past eighteen months? I have no hesitation but every district would decree the warrant of disapproval. Then forsooth a man gets up here and says a man is not independent because he does not get up at a party meeting and express his opinion. I know you have not had a party meeting for over a month. Things have been tabled here which go to show that only the Prime Minister and not his Executive have known of

them. It is a joke. Every member of this House should sit in an independent seat. No man should be here to be dictated to by another. But when a man leader or Government breaks faith with the people then every man ought to get up and protest. Does the honourable members fear to say that the government has kept faith with the people? Every possible pledge contained in the Prime Minister's manifesto has been broken.

MR. SAMSON—What manifesto has been kept?

MR. BENNETT—You are young in life yet. Is that what you know? Did you ever read the manifesto of the Prime Minister?

MR. SAMSON—It was impossible to carry it out.

MR. BENNETT—Then that is the Prime Minister you will follow. Of course it was impossible to carry it out. Still you will follow him trying to do impossibilities. You are falling down on the job every time. Then you attack a man who has the blood and the manhood to get up here and have the courage of his convictions. You have got to do as you are told here, and now hold your tongue. What you right is all wrong. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the House, but I must again congratulate Mr. Archibald. I do not care if he goes back to the Government to-morrow, but I must congratulate him because having all the opportunities before with the Government he has the courage to get up and join issue with it and say that it has not done right by the country, it is not trying to save the country from the ruins and disaster into which it is drifting. He says I am not satisfied take this stand it would not be doing to pull her out of the hole. Some one else has got to do it. He then says I have no further confidence in you and that means a vote of a want of confidence in the Government as far as he is concerned. And if you went back to your respective districts for the en-

dorsation he so easily obtained I feel sure each of them would also vote a want of confidence in the present government. Would the West Coast endorse the actions of the Government for the past eighteen months? You would not save your nomination fee.

MR. SAMSON—How about Twillingate. Come down and see.

MR. BENNETT—Come to St. John's West. The people of Twillingate were asleep during 1919. But are they asleep to-day. I am sure they are not. During 1919 there were in a comatose state or perhaps they were hypnotised.

MR. HIGGINS—When a man ceases to be a subject he cannot be hypnotised the second time. That is a medical fact. Do you remember Cullen?

MR. BENNETT—The honourable members on the other side would do well to consider if the step Mr. Archibald took was advisable or not. I quite appreciate your determination to stick together. If the policy being pursued by the Government is not right it is up to you to set the government right. Here we have been here for the past three months and nothing has been done yet. We have been trying to put the search light of the public eye on the actions of the government, and let the public see for themselves and if the Opposition do not take this stand it would not be doing its duty and the country would all the more quickly drift to the precipice of ruin and financial disaster. This Opposition has been working for a purpose, and that is that this country may be saved. We adjourned last week for six days that you may bring down a railway policy. This is a very important matter and nothing has yet been done. This involves millions of dollars, and we are not going to allow this House to close until all this has been considered. We must not have a repetition of what was done last year when the House closed. You took over the railway and to-day we are faced with a deficit of \$1,625,000. This was lost on

its operation. It is not in the interest of the country to let the House close until some definite policy as to the operation of the railroad has been handed down. This is the line we are going to follow which has been outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. Has the Government the ability, can it see daylight through the proposition? If you have you have been wasting a lot of precious time. A wonderful man has arrived in the city to bring us into the promised land. He is no less a personage than the late Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If he is to advise the Government his advice will involve perhaps some thirty millions of dollars which this country cannot afford and which is not necessary to meet the situation. The government party is the proper body to discuss the problem. Were the outside members asked for an opinion?

MR. SAMSON—Yes, we were.

MR. BENNETT—What were you asked?

MR. SAMSON—I will not tell. Ask the Executive.

MR. BENNETT—Now you will not have a party meeting until the House closes. Then you will do as you like. The whole country is watching. The country wants its representatives to take an independent stand like Mr. Archibald. Mr. Archibald is one pedestal to-day. No matter who follows or who leads let us hope that a better order of things will ensue to see express their candid opinions. The Government is falsely satisfied that everything is going along all right. The working men have come to the Bar of this House to demand satisfaction and soon the business men will come and do the same. The whole country is paralyzed owing to the incompetency of those who have been unfortunately called upon to be the government of the country. Therefore I desire to thank you Mr. Speaker for the privilege accorded me to express my highest admiration for Mr. Archibald's action.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like to say a word or two with regard to Mr. Archibald's action. I will not delay the House long. Now do you see what happened when you would not allow me to proceed. Not alone has Parliament been abused but its rights and dignity has not been upheld. You jump up Sir, and ask that ten gentlemen arise. It is the first time that ten gentlemen arose in this House at the same time. I had no intention whatever of saying very much about this matter, but now I have a lot to say. Mr. Archibald I wish to congratulate you again. I also congratulate the greater force namely the district of Hr. Grace for showing its hand as it has during the last ten days. If no other district has independent people well Hr. Grace has them. That is my answer. The honourable member for Twillingate asks where did Mr. Archibald show his independence. That is a silly question to ask, but the honourable member knows the answer and the only easeup he can grasp for the pain of conscience is that we are passing through terrible times. You said Archibald brought nothing forward at the meeting, but you also said you did the same.

MR. SAMSON—I am not taking an independent seat

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Thank you. But do you know you are not showing your manhood. You are beginning to realise the Government is gone. You ought to take another week off with your King and see that things are set right. And I believe that you did not take the oath. I suppose he forgot to give it to you. He said you are one of the faithful and when you come back I will administer it to you.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It is not in the constitution.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—When a man has got to vote for a union candidate what independence has he got. He is dictated to by you. What have you got to say Mr. Jennings? Mr. Samson

were you ever at an auction at Bastow's? Well once, twice, you are going. You would not have had much of a chance getting into this House, but for the Union. There was a Samson once, but he has not come since. Exactly you have not the same strength. You also admitted that Mr. Archibald did not say any more than you or your Government did. The people of Harbor Grace are not so much against the Government as the man who crucified them. They are crying out with starvation and it has spread to Trinity.

MR. SAMSON--The boss pulled your leg once.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I pulled his a dozen times. You admit there was no manifesto carried out or read till I called notice to it.

MR. SAMSON--I did not say I did not read it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If you did you would hang yourself like Judas.

MR. SAMSON--We did not have to work on the manifesto.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—While the cat is out the mice can play. If he were here you would not speak. As to two men pulling my leg. I got an anonymous letter and a message asking on behalf of the sender and 30 others to try and get the government to provide something in the way of work to save themselves and families. His name is Caleb Reid. I do not know if he voted for you or not.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—That is old news. I got a similar message. You are in a general mess over everything and they all seem to apply to you. I sent a man from the Agriculture and Mines Dept. to survey for a railway connecting road from Lead Cove to Caplin Cove. This would give an expenditure of \$3,000; it would be a great utility and would help them out. But 30 others protested against the road and wanted a railway. This was most unreasonable and I said we cannot build one now. These very people, and I would tell them if they were here

are most unreasonable. They were offered employment and I tried to advance them supplies. Most of them got to the fishery or secured work. For that matter you can get similar messages from all parts. I defy Sir John Crosbie or Sir M. P. Cashin to meet all these cases.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—That is a poor answer and I am sorry to say you are making the matter worse. You should not say these people are unreasonable as they are only trying to provide for next winter.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—It was unreasonable to look for a railroad. Your message is a week old.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It is dated the 25th, but with you in charge it might easily be a month old or it might not be delivered at all.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—Don't be so small. Get down to business—you are talking through your hat.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If I had my hat on you would not know if I had the right to wear it or not. A message came to me a few days ago from Conception Bay, and the sender who had come by train was in my doorway when it was delivered to me. There is no excuse for such a service. You know as well as I do that the whole thing is in a bungle. You don't know if you are on your head or your heels.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—I am popular with the employees; that is a good sign I am a good man. They are expressing regret that I am leaving.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—So you are going too like the Minister of Shipping. You are a time server. Now I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice who is Sir George Bury who is now here.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I do not know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I suppose he will go over the railway and I don't believe any one in the Executive but the Hon. Prime Minister knew he was coming. If you did, it was by accident

Here we are for 12 weeks and we are blamed for obstruction, but we are only asking for a railway policy. The Hon. Prime Minister is abide with it in his pocket and we will know no more of it. You talk of independence, and yet you squander money which you knew was wrong. Mr. Archibald has reason to be proud of the support given him by his people and you would be the same if you could unload yourself like him. Mr. Archibald was right when he said he was looked on with suspicion; he went to a party meeting or spoke to me in the Crosbie Hotel. You had a bodyguard after him. Don't keep on coming in here and looking wise. Do something and stop those messages coming for assistance and get the people to work. I have lost faith in the Hon. Minister of Marine, the Minister of Justice is no good, but if you the Hon. Prime Minister don't do something quick for the Conception Bay people they will rise in their might in a way that you will never forget. They are getting tired of appealing and if you saw the sights which I did on Saturday you would do something. I never saw the same before. These are critical times it is true, but what I dislike is your indifference. The honourable member for Twillingate told Mr. Archibald he was not of the same opinion as last year. Someone may say the same to him soon. The man who does not change his mind sometimes is no good. I congratulate you Mr. Archibald—you will be here when the men who think they have the lock on the door will be gone. Men who took the position you did will be long remembered. You and I, Hon. Minister of Education owe that Bay something, and I appeal to you. You got to get legs under them, and I want to say to you, sir, that I was in Port de Grave and your district on Saturday and something must be done quickly or you will hear from the crowd. Give it your immediate attention. You are representing Conception Bay in the ex

ective and it is up to you to do something or the trouble will be on your shoulders.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—I rise, Mr. Speaker, to reply briefly, Mr. Archibald was my colleague, and I regret that he has seen fit to sever his connection with this side. I find no fault with the course he has taken. Mr. Archibald and I were two years together and I think he will agree with me that the relationship was cordial, and on every occasion he communicated with me any wish he had for the betterment of the district. I did my best to meet him.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I trust the same cordial relationship exists.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—During the election campaign he made the same statement as he has made here—that if the government was not up to their representations he would separate from it. I understand he went to the district and held meetings as he told us, but I feel slighted in that he did not invite me as I would have been pleased to have been there and present my side of the case—and there is a side. He has taken an independent stand and the gentlemen of the Opposition have made a great deal of it. Whilst he took that stand he is not the only one of an independent mind. As to the condition of the district, I appreciate the remarks of Sir John Crosbie. I have been doing my best to meet the difficulties with the means at my disposal which are not confined to Newfoundland. In Canada the railwaymen are working only 4 days a week and many are out of employment prices are high and the times are as difficult as here. Sometimes I think my friends' object is to hide that point as they are aware of the conditions in Canada and the United States. It is not due to the government here, but they are confronted with problems such as none ever met before.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—What are they.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—You know the conditions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Who brought them about?

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—It is the aftermath of the war. While the struggle was on we did not realize there was a war, but now we are up against it, and we have to face it, and I have faith enough to think the government will find the way out. When I am convinced they cannot do it I will have sufficient courage to desert too.

MR. ARCHIBALD—You will not wait till we are all ruined will you?

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—I will not do that either. I have just read through this petition, and I see there are 851 names to it. I notice by looking up the returns of the last Election in Hr. Grace that the highest candidate on the Opposition ticket, Mr. A. W. Piccott polled 821 votes and Mr. Archibald, after canvassing the district comes back with petitions signed by 851 persons, or just 30 more than the number of votes polled by Mr. Piccott in 1919.

MR. ARCHIBALD—Will you be honest in this thing Dr. Barnes, do you not recognize many of these names as those of our friends in the last Election; are not eighty per cent. of them the names of your own supporters.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—I admit that if it were not for the fact that many of the people in the District have gone to the fishery you would have had a greater number of names, but, nevertheless, as I go on to the end of the list I find many of my old Tory friends there. They are always opposed to me.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion for adjournment. I think it is peculiarly fitting and appropriate that adjournment should be taken after the frightful mess the Hon. Dr. Barnes has made of his defence of the Government. It were far better that he had kept the respect

won in this House by his silence than to have forfeited it by attempting to champion such a helpless, hopeless conglomeration as the present Government. I could understand a private member thinking he ought to get up and say something to bolster such a cause but for one of the ringleaders to get up and say to this House that present conditions are not brought about by lack of attention to their duties on the part of the Executive when only three minutes ago we have the report of Sir Geo. Bury on what should be done with the railway, and this comes to us on this the 27th of June, while the railway closes down on July 30th. Don't talk of after-war problems. God save us, it was no after-war problem that 12 months ago the House was open and everyone knew that the railway problem was as acute as it is to-day yet no legislation was taken. Now, two days before the railway is to close down you bring in Sir Geo. Bury's report for which you will pay him a fat fee although when he leaves here he will not be able to spell the names on the stations. If one crowning act of incompetence were necessary it is the bringing of him down here and expecting him to get down to local conditions in a day or two. Of course he has too much brains not to realize that this crowd is so hopelessly dense that he can do what he likes with them. You have no conditions in Canada such as you have here. The great trouble with our railway is that in the freight and passenger traffics you have to compete with water routes to seaport points and you cannot do it. It is no trouble to make freight rates to Grand Falls and other inland points but where you have to compete with coastal boats you cannot do it. If you want to know how to run the railway go get John Powell, Will Joyce, or Mr. Graham and they

will tell you what you want to know. Ask Sir Geo. Bury if he can get men in Canada to do the kind of work our men do.

I say that report is as much value as the report of the Auditors you brought down here to put Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie in jail. You invite a man in here and you'll pay him \$25,000 if a cent and he can tell you nothing about the railway, while you have men in this country with twenty-five years experience, not the Reids but men who have been actually running the railway, and these are ignored. Take the Trinity Branch for example, experts said that it would cost a fortune to put the loop there but local men go in and do the work at a comparatively small cost. No wonder people are becoming sick of it all and I say now it is time to adjourn the House till we see what the latest thing is going to be. This is the 27th of June and 72 hours from to-day the railway closes down. Do you think we are going to wait till June 30th, and then say amen to anything you might bring in? Are you going to close it up or are you going to run it? The Minister of Education says that conditions as we have them to-day are after-war conditions but what have after-war conditions to do with the \$70,000 for salt? What have they to do with the absolutely illegal principle of buying fish and all the other scandals the Government have to their credit? If after-war conditions justified the expenditure of these moneys why was not the West Coast treated the same as the North dilatoriousness and bull-headedness of the Minister of Fisheries and his blind perversity to a theory and blind faith in the Regulations which, if they were necessary at all, should have come off long before they did, that was responsible for most of it. In conclusion, I would say that it is still right and

proper that we should adjourn this House till we have seen what this great man who has been brought down here is going to say.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, when my colleague, Hon. Dr. Barnes, said a few moments ago that he had been slighted by me when I did not invite him to the meetings which I held in Hr. Grace District, he did not put the position fairly because when I took an independent seat in this House I made the promise that I would go back to my constituents and, after explaining my position to them, give them the opportunity to either endorse the stand I had taken or express their disapproval of it by asking me to resign my seat. It was in pursuance of that promise that I went to the District and explained my position. I had nothing whatever to do with the position of Hon. Dr. Barnes and I might further state now that not alone did I explain to my constituents where I stood, but I offered them my seat in this House. Dr. Barnes has sent an idea broadcast that the names on the petition that has been sent in here from the District of Hr. Grace, as a result of my action in taking an independent seat, were those of people who supported the Opposition in the General Election.

HON. DR. BARNES.—That is not correct.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—The inference that Dr. Barnes evidently desired to have drawn from his remarks was quite plain. He said that by reference to the returns he found that the vote polled by the highest Opposition candidate was 821 while I had come back with a petition signed by some 850 people and to-morrow the Government papers will feature the fact that because the number of names on the petition was identical with the number of votes polled by the Oppo-

sition, the persons whose names are appended to the former must necessarily be the same or in other words that it was only Opposition supporters who backed the stand that I took, but I want to tell Dr. Barnes that I went through the District and I know the sentiment that exists there and I know too that at least 80% of the names on that petition are those of our friends in the General Election, and now, Mr. Speaker, I shall put a fair question to the hon. gentleman with regard to the names that he sees there. I would ask Dr. Barnes to look over the names of Island Cove alone where there were 240 voters and all of whom went solid for us in 1919. He will notice on that petition the names of only 210 who endorsed the stand I took. Dr. Barnes qualified Bay Roberts and fearing the idea would go forth that I was backed by the Opposition I want to tell Dr. Barnes that the whole district of Hr. Grace is absolutely opposed to the Government to-day. If I had taken Dr. Barnes to Hr. Grace with me on my recent campaign, I would have been the worst enemy he ever had. I want to be straight and fair with him and I also do not wish to be misrepresented. I want to make this offer to Dr. Barnes and Mr. Gosse that if they will resign their seats I will resign mine and contest the district with them. That ought prove whether all the support I got was from Opposition people or not. If the people had not been gone to the Labrador, as Dr. Barnes well knows, I would have brought back at least as many names as the number that supported me at the general election. Now you will find on that list as it is now, at least 50% of those who supported Dr. Barnes and myself at the election; and there are a couple of hundred more names to come from Bay Roberts to-morrow. I took this stand on my own initiative. I did not know

when I was taking it whether Hr. Grace was going to support it or not. I resent the insinuation that I went over and brought back opposition votes. As to why I moved out of the Government, I think I have already given the reason on a previous occasion and my friend Mr. Higgins has again made it clear this evening in talking of the railroad. I want to tell Dr. Barnes that if he is sincere in the statement that he made this evening he will get out to-morrow morning, because I have been speaking to the men highest up in the Government and they told me that they do not know what will happen next. I did not leave the Government as a joke. I left because I wanted to play the part of a manly Newfoundlander. The idea went through Hr. Grace's town recently, through the Prime Minister's father, that that district would get nothing from the Government because of my stand. Well then let Hr. Grace be done dirty and I will bring a crowd here who will demand their rights. I will show that I can bring more than Opposition men too. Conditions in most parts of my district to-day, Mr. Speaker, are absolutely appalling. Go to Spaniard's Bay to-day and what do you find. You will find a few men fitting out for the fishery and the rest are all idle. What they are going to do to maintain their families I do not know. Something has got to be done for them and as long as I hold a seat in the centre of this House I will take no chance on having any one portion of my district neglected. I know of a telegram coming from my district, since I took an independent stand, asking for five hundred dollars and in return five thousand dollars was sent by the Government. That was the result of my moving out of the Government. Now I am not going to allow any false statements to go through the country that the district of Hr.

Grace was not backing me, so I repeat my offer to Dr. Barnes and Mr. Gosse. Let them resign their seats to-morrow and I will resign mine and contest the district. I am prepared to take my medicine, if they can give it to me.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. MOORE asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of uniforms made for officials of the steamers operated by his Department, since the 15th November, 1919, the price paid for the same during the first half of 1920, the second half of 1920, and up to date in 1921, and the price proposed to be paid in the latter half of this year. Also the number of uniforms given to each tailor or tailoring firm during each of these periods and the reason for the transfer in any case. Also to state what was paid for the making of these uniforms during the first half of 1919 and the second half of 1919, and by whom they were made at these times.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of uniforms made for any official of the Department administered by his office, from the 15th of November 1919, the price paid for the same during the first half of 1920 and the second half of 1920 and up to date in 1921, and the price proposed to be paid in the latter half of this year. Also the number of uniforms given to each tailor or tailoring firm during each of these periods, and the reason for the transfer in any case. Also to state what was paid for the making of these uniforms during the first half

of 1919, and the second half of 1919 and by whom they were made at these times.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House, a statement showing the number of uniforms made for Post Office Officials and Telegraph Office officials from the 15th of November, 1919, the price paid for the same during the first half of 1920, the second half of 1920, and up to date in 1921, and the price proposed to be paid in the latter half of this year. Also the number of uniforms given to each tailor or tailoring firm during each of these periods and the reason for the transfer in any case. Also to state what was paid for the making of these uniforms during the first half of 1919, and the second half of 1919 and by whom they were made at these times.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing who has been making police uniforms since 15th November 1919, the price paid for same during the first half of 1920, second half of 1920, and up to date in 1921, and the price proposed to be paid in the latter half of this year. Also the number of uniforms given to each tailor or tailoring firm during each of these periods, and the reason for the transfer in any case. Also to state what was paid for the making of these uniforms during the first half of 1919 and the second half of 1919 and by whom they were made at these times.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of uniforms made for the account of the Commission from the first of July last up to date showing:—

- (a) The number made for the railway officials, and
- (b) For the steamship officials; by whom each were made and the amounts paid for each.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House, a report from the Inspector General of Constabulary stating the result of his recent visit abroad in connection with fire fighting, or life saving apparatus for public institutions, what cities were visited by him, and what purchases of machinery, or equipment he made; also what is the cost of the horses maintained by the Fire Department at the present time, and what was the cost two years ago; how many fewer horses are employed now that motor-driven engines and other apparatus have been installed; what was the cost of this machinery, and what is the cost of operating it; and also what was paid since the 15th November, 1919 for the upkeep of the motor car used by the Inspector General, and is it the intention of the Government, in view of the crying need of economy and the reduction of the salaries of minor public officials, to permit the Inspector General to retain this motor car after the end of the present fiscal year.

MR. SINNOTT asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how much money was spent in repairs to the old public wharf at Trinity since November the 15th, 1919, and how much in removing ballast from the said wharf.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative

Council with a message, requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Scammell took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred—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.

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 adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 28th.

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

At a quarter past three of the clock there being no quorum present, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 29th.

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

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend

Chapter 210 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Warehouse Receipts and other Securities in the possession of the Banks."

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what arrangements are being made to provide for the families of those men who are being sent out to work on the roads which the Government intends building.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I might say that an arrangement has been made whereby the men going out from the different places can get a certain quantity of supplies from merchants on an order from the Department of Public Works. And we have arranged that these orders be sent out. One copy will remain in the department, of the amount of supplies and the amount will be deducted from the wages.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Thank you, I do not see for the life of me how the Government can expect men going down there and getting only \$2.50 per day to pay for their food.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It is the same arrangement as made for the railway men.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—What I am trying to get at is, if you saddle these men to pay for their food in addition to trying to keep their children from starvation, how can you expect them to do it. It will cost them at the best 50c. to live—how can a family of 5 or 6 do it on \$2 a day. They barely exist but now you are going to hold over their heads a Bill for stuff for the children while the men are down there. On behalf of the people of Hr. Grace I want an answer, if you can give it, whether you will give them the \$2 free, and even then they will be able to feed only poorly. Otherwise you are sending them on a fool's er-

rand. In this district, which is one of the most reasonable in the country, there are about 1900 of these people. I have done a lot of work for them and am prepared to do it again. They have managed to live along but now they are poor and I do not want to see the Government take part of their \$2 which they have to feed their families. It is simply ridiculous.

MR. SAMSON.—How are they paid over your way.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I employ them fishing at \$50 to \$60 a month and when some of them knocked off last year they had their own homes and ponies. You are asking a fool question. I can tell you I have given them more money as a present at the end of the season than for fishing.

MR. SAMSON.—You misunderstand me. I asked what labor have they got.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—There are no men there now, thanks to the action of the Government.

MR. SAMSON.—It is due to your indifference.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—The men here are from Spaniard's Bay. Here are 53 names from Tilton where they are perishing.

MR. SAMSON.—You had money from the Public Works Department and why did you not spend it for them. There are no special sections where we are concerned and we have a three-man district.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—We have. The Hon. Dr. Barnes looks after Country Path and Shearston, etc. Capt. Gosse looks after another section and I attend to Hr. Grace proper. These men are from above my district. I am sorry I was on that side so long. I tell you straight now that the only ones against me for the stand I have taken are the Government and one member from my district. The months will prove who is taking the right

stand. I do not want to get down to personalities.

MR. SAMSON.—I asked what work was there for 25c. per hour. It is your fault if the money is not spent.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Isn't there anyone idle in your district?

MR. SAMSON.—But I don't know whose fault it is.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—It is the fault of the administration.

MR. SAMSON.—If the money is left in the Works Department it is our fault but while I can I will spend it.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—The reason I kept the money in the Department is because there are more people on the rocks there than in any other district and the fishermen do not expect me to do otherwise than keep it for the poor who are left at home when the others have gone to the fishery. I am talking of those from Spaniard's Bay up. If I kept it to their advantage is that the reason why I should now be crossed here.

MR. SAMSON.—If Capt. Jones had one section of our district and the people were starving, and I had money, wouldn't he get it from me and not make it public here.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I'll show you the names on this petition and they are not Opposition men though the Hon. Minister of Education said so. I am fighting for my people and will not waste the time of the House with you.

MR. IEGROW.—You should both go out in the park.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—There are lots of fellows here who would be better out in the park; from the view of the workingman the whole Government would be better out there. I am not afraid to take my stand and 6 months will prove it would be better for you if you did the same. Go from Hoyles-town to the railway station and you will find the business men have not

enough confidence in the Government to buy goods to put on their shelves. The situation is too serious now for party politics. That's why I'm here this evening. If I told what some of the men on Water St. said to me, you would be afraid to stay here twenty-five minutes. Their fixtures are empty and they are afraid to import new goods because they do not know what the Government will do next. The proof that I am doing service to my district by my stand is the sending of the men to Badger to work. And the Hon. Minister of Education met them on the street and took them to hotels and paid their bills. I am on my feet in the interest of the poor, particularly of Hr. Grace. I want to know if they are to be sent to the woods to be eaten by mosquitoes and not get enough to buy oil to keep off the pests.

MR. SAMSON.—If they will not go for \$2.50 a day they must stay home.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Don't you go over there if you talk that way. I was trying to tell when you crossed me that I understand the Hon. Minister of Education had a telegram saying the men were coming back because the conditions did not suit them. I do not know the reason, but he tried to put it over on me. The district would not need help if he did what is right. I am going to put it up to the Government and see if they can handle it. I do not want to be tripped up by the introduction of personalities as I am not a finished speaker. One man over three who always took a large number of men to the Labrador, has 1,000 qtls. of fish left over and I ask the Government if they will buy it. I refer to Capt. Mose Young, one of the finest men in Spanlard's Bay and I ask the Government to take this fish off his hands and allow him to go on with his business. He bought it at the North. You

ought to crow alright but you will not sit on Hr. Grace while I am here. It is an outrage for the Minister of Public Works to say they will give these men \$2.50 a day and charge them for their food while in transit and while their children at home are starving. You ought to be ashamed. Why not be big enough to try and do something. If you will not make a job of it—forget it. Are you going to back the Government, Mr. Samson, in asking the men to pay for their grub.

MR. SAMSON.—Yes, while they have a free pass up and down. It is better to give 2 men \$2.50 each than to give one man \$3.50.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Will he have any money after feeding his children?

MR. SAMSON.—Not much—but don't be unreasonable. They will be only a few days in transit.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—You want to charge them to pay back the Government their bill. It is ridiculous. As long as I am on my feet I will show you something else that is happening in Hr. Grace. I read the petition. I am not here for a joke and I will read it now for you. It applies to Capt. Gosse's end of the district. (Reads petition.)

It is signed by 53 men of Tilton where they are destitute. If Capt. Gosse were in his seat I'd give him the time of his life to explain why they are hungry. Still you find fault with me for trying to find out why the Government are asking them to pay up. Get them the work and I will back you but what you are doing is only a joke. Building roads is only poor relief and the Colony gets no returns. You give poor relief for another six months and it will be easy enough to talk to the Government. Now, will somebody in the Government, somebody responsible, give me their word that the families of these men will be looked after while they

are in transit and until they have earned something to send home? It is mean and contemptible to consider sending these people down there to go to work and leave their families destitute in the meantime and then the only excuse that there is to offer is that this would be pauper relief. If that is all the common sense you have, for God's sake give up the job and let someone else do it. Now, I'm going to ask the question again. Will the Government see to it that these people are looked after? I am sorry to see that the Prime Minister is not in his seat and as I presume the next responsible person in the Executive is Mr. Coaker, I will appeal to him. Will the Government, the Liberal-Reform Government, do something for these people? The attitude that has been adopted by the Government is small and mean and contemptible and now when I put the proposition up to them squarely all hands get up and move out. The reason of this is, of course that I am asking for something in the interests of the poor men of my district. If I was asking for anything in the interests of the rich the response would be entirely different.

MR. SAMSON—You are talking politics now.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I am not talking politics. I am stating what is absolutely true and you know it. Now that the Prime Minister has returned, I will put my request to him. I am not asking for anything for myself and never did since I have been in this House. Are the families of these men to be charged with what they must have to put them over the period that must elapse before they can send home any of their wages or will the Government accept the responsibility for it? If that question is answered satisfactorily I will take my seat. Surely it is a fair question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I

understand that for the past day or two the Government has under consideration some road making policy. Now what is that policy? There is no money Bill before the House but I understand a number of men came in from Mr. Grace and the Minister of Public Works has a scheme for sending them to work. Now, surely goodness if you have any such scheme or program this is the place for it. It is not alone the members of the Executive who have to be consulted but the members of the House of Assembly.

You have been in here now for the last three months without lifting a hand to do anything, and all the districts are in the same position, some of the fishermen have been given a few supplies but if the first fit-out gets no returns, and I am sorry to say it looks as if that is going to happen, where are we then? The railway policy should have been considered six months ago instead of now, and as regards this road making scheme, if you have a policy why do you not tell us what it is and let us consider it here?

These poor people who have come to the city to look for employment have families at home. How can you expect them to live on \$2.50 per day with flour at \$15 a barrel. I rise to support the member for Mr. Grace in his demand that the policy of the government should be handed out here in this House, so that we can find out exactly where we are on this matter. I did not know that it was the intention of the government to do any road building, but I have since gathered from what Mr. Archibald said and from the remarks of a couple of Ministers on the other side of the House, that such is their intention. Now if you are going to send people in the woods to do road building at a couple of dollars a day you are not going to do any good; you are simply going to waste money wholesale again. I contend that it is

not good enough for us to have to glean what the intentions of the government are on Water Street. We should know what the programme of the government is in this House, and in this House only, and I would ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to build a road from Hall's Bay to Badger and if so for what purpose is it going to be built, and if you are going to pay men \$2 or \$2.50 a day? Also how is the Prime Minister going to outline a scheme to provide for the unemployed within the next few months to carry them over next winter? Many questions have to be asked and many things have yet to come before this House for discussion some of which have been on the Order Paper for the last two months. One item alone is the Bel Island ore tax proposition. This is one of the largest centres of employment in the country and is at present practically held up, there being only a few hundred men working there on half time. The companies are not going to work full time and with their regular staffs engaged until such time as they find out exactly where they are, and it is doubtful whether they will operate again for some considerable time on a large scale, according to conditions in Canada and in Europe as far as the ore markets are concerned. Why not deal with this proposition now before the House and finish it one way or the other. It is an important matter, and with this matter outstanding the rules of this House were asked to be suspended a fortnight ago.

Again we are faced with the railway. We were told by the Prime Minister when the House opened, that it was the intention to hand over the rail road to the Reid Newfoundland Company, and then we were told that the Reid Newfoundland Company were not in a position to handle it. There was nothing done at all, until now, at the eleventh hour, an expert is brought in to go over the railroad and pronounce

upon it. Now we have this afternoon a pronouncement from Mr. Archibald that the government is going to provide for the poor of this country in a certain part of the Island. What is that programme going to be like I ask? Remember this is the House of Assembly, the people's house, and I have a right to ask. I am going to back Mr. Archibald in his plea for his constituents and on behalf of my own. We are told that some 25 or 30 men arrived from Hr. Grace to-day by train and were met by Dr. Barnes, who is not in his seat this afternoon, and were taken to some merchant's place on Water Street and advanced \$40 each. We were told then that these men were supposed to travel on free passes, while rumor says that they took the train and came to the city on it. We know nothing about what happened and we cannot get any information. Why the position is laughable. The only source we hear anything from in the government ranks is from the last seat on the government side, the tail end of the party, the head is devoured and gone. If the government has any policy to employ fifty or a thousand men, let us know what it is. We have men in this country who are just as anxious to get work as the men in Hr. Grace and they need it just as badly. Still we are asked to adjourn this House this afternoon until Monday next with nothing definite before us as to what is the real position. I would like to hear a pronouncement from the Prime Minister as to whether this relief work is to be carried out, as intimated by Mr. Archibald; but it is nonsense to think that you can send men in the woods to work at \$2.50 a day, under present conditions. Men and their families cannot live on such small pay with flour at \$15 a barrel and molasses at \$1 gallon and other commodities up in proportion. Now no matter what the idea of the government is in this connection let us know the correct programme before

this House adjourns this afternoon. If you are considering a policy with a view to employing the unemployed in this country, how are you going to go about it? That is a straight question and should receive a straight answer. You cannot continually feed people on pauper relief and collect the revenue you expect to collect to-day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, when several hours ago I moved the adjournment of the House, I did so for two purposes; First, to give the committee of the House to whom was referred the Bell Island Bill the opportunity of conferring with certain representatives of the company now in town; and second, to enable a conference to take place in connection with railway matters.

My honourable friends opposite were well aware that the meeting of the Bell Island Committee was set for 4 o'clock, and the Railway conference was to take place at five o'clock. In accordance with the usual practice of the Opposition the whole afternoon has been occupied by the Opposition in worthless speeches, their object on this occasion being just as clear to the Government and to the country as has been their object on numerous other occasions when they indulged in similar practices, namely to obstruct business. The result of the words which have been thrown around the Chamber by the honourable members opposite has been that no progress has been possible in connection with the Committee on the Bell Island Bill. As to the railway conference, I propose that that conference shall take place at the hour named. The honourable members may talk until they are tired if they choose to do so. It will not interfere with my keeping that appointment. The behaviour of the Opposition this afternoon, which conduct is strictly in line with their behaviour during the entire session, will cause them to receive the well-merited and emphatic condemnation of the people

of the whole country when next the electorate have an opportunity of pronouncing upon their fitness as representatives of the people. Just so soon as an Opposition degrades itself into a body of men banded together to prevent others from doing business and interfere with the proper conduct of affairs, and handicap in every way possible the Administration in the discharge of the functions of Government, then that Opposition becomes a menace to the community and the people of the country will not be slow to record their opinion of men who would so far descend in the parliamentary scale as to be identified with such a programme. There has been a considerable amount of talk about road matters. The policy of the Administration is to provide employment in one channel or another for a large number of men who are at present out of work. The difficulties of securing employment are being aggravated by the conduct of the honourable members opposite. I have listened to weeks upon weeks of talk, mere talk, words big and small, sentences grammatical and ungrammatical, being rolled around this Chamber. Since Newfoundland has had Responsible Government there has never been a body of men under the title of Opposition, no matter how small that may be, so devoid of ideas so devoid of the first principles of self-respect and knowledge of Parliamentary procedure as the gentlemen sitting opposite who hour after hour, week after week, talk merely for talk's sake. There have been speeches made in this House during recent months at least a dozen times. A person sitting on the Government benches or in the Strangers' Gallery can tell what is going to come next when the Leader of the Opposition rises to make a speech. The conduct of the Opposition is more like the continual repetition of a comic moving picture film, than of the intelligent behaviour of sane men who are interested in their constituencies.

The roads which the Government proposed to undertake are

1. Road from Springdale to Badger.
2. Road from Bonne Bay to Deer Lake.
3. Placentia road

With respect to the road from Bonne Bay to Deer Lake, I would point out that at last session a vote was taken for that work. The road has been surveyed.

For the road from Springdale to Badger a survey was completed many years ago; and, as a matter of fact, the initial stages of the work were then undertaken. The pay will be at the rate of twenty-five cents per hour. That is the rate paid to section men on the railway. It is fifty cents a day more than is paid on regular road work in the electoral districts of St. John's East and West. Roadmaster Graham is to take charge of the road work. Mr. Graham is experienced in railway operations and is an efficient handler of men. Returned soldiers who are physically fit will get a chance to undertake this employment.

With respect to the point raised by Mr. Archibald that there should be a special poor grant out of which the families of the workmen will be supported while the workmen are themselves earning their living, I feel that my honourable friend did not seriously consider that proposition before he made it. The people of the district of Harbor Grace are not wanting public charities. They are wanting work. The workmen will support their families out of the proceeds of their labour and not on charity account.

I felt that I should make this general statement before retiring from the House to give attention to the matters of pressing importance which require consideration. However trivial a matter may be, it is much more important than listening to that class of talk which represents nothing more than such combination of words as may be necessary to occupy the time of the

House for the deliberate obstruction of business.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have delayed the Prime Minister, but I think it is unfair to this House and unfair to this country that we, as representatives of the people in this House, should not have been consulted before the Government undertook, without voting any moneys for that purpose, to go to work and start road building throughout the country. There is no programme for this work and all the information we can get is what we hear on the streets. Now this is the people's House. What are we here for and what is this House here for, if we as representatives of the people are ignored? Abolish this House altogether. One of the most important matters concerning our country is not brought in here as it should be for discussion. This sort of thing is on a par with the principle adopted in connection with the fish regulations and the taking of the five hundred thousand dollars to buy fish belonging to Mr. Coaker's friends. That money was taken from the Treasury. Mr. Archibald told us that there are a thousand quintals of fish in his district unsold. Well I might inform him that \$120,000 of that \$500,000 was sent back to the Treasury and his friend Mr. Coaker, if he was a friend, should have sold that thousand quintals for him. For the past three weeks the Government has been carrying on a policy of road building without any consent or authority from this House. I am not going to stand for this sort of thing any longer. I am going to protest against it as vigorously as I know how. We are told by the Prime Minister that surveyors have gone out over those roads and we are told that returned soldiers and sailors are to go in the woods to work and to be devoured by mosquitoes for the lovely sum of \$2.50

per day. Well may the Lord have mercy on some of the poor soldiers. What a fitting memorial they are getting. I do not want to delay the House, but I certainly do not think it is fair for the Prime Minister to come in this afternoon and announce that he has a road programme in being, and not a vote taken in this House for the money that is to be spent in that direction. That is not doing business according to the constitution that we boast so much of. The whole thing seems to be a farce. We are also told the further story that a number of Hr. Grace men arrived by train hungry and were each given \$40. Now the Prime Minister is not able to tell me where that money is going to come from. More than likely the Minister of Public Works will be called upon to pay the merchant who advanced that money and pay it out of Hr. Grace road grant. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works how many hundreds of men there are in other districts needy and looking for employment. The Government have prevented those men from leaving the country to look for employment elsewhere because they have issued orders not to sell tickets. Now they are going to let them starve in their own country.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of detaining the House on this motion, as I understand the Prime Minister wishes to meet a Committee at five o'clock. I understand that 22 men held up a train at Spaniard's Bay. I do not know whether the Prime Minister is aware of this or not. If he is there is going to be lots of trouble ahead. These men landed here I am told and were taken charge of by the government and given \$40 each. I wonder does the Prime Minister know anything about this?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There were some men who had not completed their supplies and they came to St. John's, to be handled in the ordinary course by Mr. O'Reilly.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—With all due deference to your answer, if you try to camouflage me, you may make a serious mistake. I do not want to create trouble, but I think that this is the most dangerous trap yet set for the destruction of the government and the country. The statement that these 22 men were dealt with because they wanted a certain amount of supplies is incorrect. I am sorry that the Prime Minister should be placed in such an awkward position. Dr. Barnes went to the train to meet these men on arrival.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have not sent him.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I fear what will happen if all the other men belonging to Conception Bay, who are out of employment, come here and demand \$40 each. There is no reason why they should not receive the same treatment as these 22 men from Spaniard's Bay, and I do not see why the many people in my own district should not be treated similarly. I am in receipt of messages from Clarke's Beach stating that twenty-five or thirty families are absolutely starving at home and without knowing anything about this railway policy. I have heard it from certain members of the government party that there was a proposition to build roads from Badger to Springdale, from Bonne Bay to Deer Lake and the road through to Colinet. The amount of pay agreed upon at first was \$2 a day, but to the credit of Mr. Jennings, I am told, it was increased to \$2.50. I think that the payment of \$2.50 a day for road construction is nothing short of an outrage in these times. I know that the government is groping in the dark to find something for the unemployed, but I think that if you had brought in this policy before that something better could have been done, because really after those roads are built they will be useless to the Colony. We are simply throwing out this money and add-

ing to the public debt of the Colony. This policy of road building in the woods simply means destruction and ruination to Newfoundland. I say that honestly and sincerely. It is useless to spend public monies on roads or in any other direction that will give no returns to the Colony, and then have to tax an already overburdened people to get it back. I think that the time has come when we must cry halt, and let us find some other way to employ the unemployed. I want to say to the Government that they cannot go on any longer in this way. If you continue this sort of policy you will not be able to collect enough taxes to keep this Colony going. Just imagine building a road from Springdale to Hall's Bay. What advantage is that going to be for the future of Newfoundland? Do you honestly think it is going to be of any value after the road is constructed and built?

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, July 4th, at 3 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 4th, 1921.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively—"An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery'" and "An Act for the prevention of Venereal Diseases" without amendment.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lewis gave Notice of Question.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is an item on the Order Paper relating to the St. John's Municipal Council—the second reading of the Bill has been on the Paper for some time. The Commission expired on June 30th. The Bill is now down for second reading, and I hope to proceed with and move it to the Upper House for their concurrence to-morrow afternoon. If the House agree it would facilitate business, and we could have the second reading. If we get it to the Council now they will assent to it to-morrow afternoon.

MR. BENNETT—Is Mr. Gosling prepared to retain office.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Owing to pressure of business he is obliged to retire, but I think the others will go on. Despite the assertion of Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Collishaw will not be appointed. The Commissioners will elect their Chairman.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's" was read a second time, and by unanimous consent ordered to be referred to a Commission of the Whole House presently:—

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIGGINS—I regret Mr. Chairman, the retirement of a man who has rendered such valuable services to the city. Before and after his election, Mr. Gosling set a splendid example of citizenship particularly in his efforts to get through the Charter with the idea of improving the town. His attention to his office and his example should

have been encouraged, but unhappily the public did not sustain him. I feel the House ought to extend to him the appreciation of St. John's, and I think associated with him, Mr. Ayre. The latter was most attentive to his duties and I think those representing St. John's owe it to him to publicly appreciate his work. This is the opportune time to say Mr. Gosling's example should be followed by some other gentleman and while I do not think the Charter will give greater scope, if any thing is wrong it is the apathy displayed. I hope that others of his class who have had a business training will follow him.

MR. BENNETT—I regret Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Gosling will not follow on in his work. I have had experience as a Councillor, but not as Mayor though I acted as such and know the duties of the office. Since he has been in office his greatest opponent cannot say he did not perform his duty with assiduity and attention. His departure on the consummation of his ideals, the incorporation of the Charter, is regrettable. He has sacrificed his time and talents to the affairs of the city. I regret that men like him have not come forward before, and it is up to the government to appoint his equals. Of Mr. Ayre, I say he stands on the highest pinnacle of integrity, and I am sure the House will endorse the recommendation of the representatives of St. John's East and West to acknowledge his services.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I wish to join, Mr. Chairman in expressing appreciation of the work of Mr. Gosling who recently intimated his intention of retiring from the Municipal Council which I hope will still have his advice. He was elected by the people, elected Chairman of the Commission and was father of the Charter which for a long time was in the hands of the citizens. He devoted his talents as a business man to his work and gave his income to charitable objects, which

however was a small thing compared to his services, and I am happy to endorse what has been said by the representatives of St. John's East and West of his efforts as a man and a worker for the city.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This report was received and adopted and by unanimous consent it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's." was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council, with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provision.

The Notice of Motion respecting the appointment of a Commission to enquire into the operation of the Railway was by consent of the House with drawn from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 120 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Warehouse Receipts and other Securities in the Possession of Banks'" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if the interest on the debentures of the Colony due at the end of this month will be paid:

- (a) out of the revenue for the current year,
- (b) out of Surplus Trust Fund, or
- (c) out of proceeds of the Loan obtained last month?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will be paid out of revenue for the current year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries who is the "James Davies" who was representing this Colony at an International Fishery Conference in Montreal the past week. Is it the Mr. D. James Davies who is the Public Analyst in this city; if so what qualifications does he possess to represent the country in a Fisheries Conference in Montreal. Could no practical fisherman belonging to this country be found to undertake the duty? What allowance is being paid Mr. Davies for this service? Is it correct that Mr. Davies is proceeding from Canada to England, if so is he going on public business partly or altogether, if so what is the nature of such business and what allowance is being made him therefor? Also, what is the sense of this Colony participating in any such conference and undertaking responsibilities as owing to the present condition of its finances it is unable to find money for absolutely necessary services. Also to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence in relation to Mr. Davies visit to Canada and England.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I understand Mr. Davies is in the city.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—We will have his report to-morrow

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Can the Hon. Minister tell us what instructions Mr. Davies had from his department before going

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—He was attending the International Fishery Conference in Montreal it came up last year and they asked us to take part. We sent Mr. Whiteway last Fall. There was no expenditure of money. So far as we are concerned we were bound to assist and cooperate with them. but our expenditure would not be over \$10,000. It is something on the same lines as the Norway Research Board and we

thought something should be done here. Last year we were invited by both Governments to assist as a lot of work would be done on our coast, but there would be no expenditure above \$10,000.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I think Mr. Davies should report early as this clipping from a North Sydney paper is the first intimation we had of him being an expert on fishery matters

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Nothing can be copper-fastened without the consent of the Governments.

(Sir M. P. Cashin reads extract from the Sydney Herald.)

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is it the intention to have the Lobelia go into this now and next year

MR. ARCHIBALD—I want to make an appeal to the government and they know what I say is true. For God's sake wake up and get together and do something for the country. I know of numerous men who are suffering because of the load they are carrying. I also know that one of the delegates of the government to Washington on fishery matters followed me over to Spaniard's Bay and interrupted me at the public meeting I held there. If our friend Mr. Collishaw was not interested why did he do that? He broke up the wheel of his car going there and had to take the train back. I am not sorry. He said Archibald had more heart than brains I must have had more heart than brains because I had all I could do to keep him from being broken up. Then we are told he is not interested. I suppose he was never in Spaniard's Bay before in his life, and I think it is the best thing for him to stay away for the future. The government is absolutely indifferent to the welfare of the people. You sit down there with your hand under your jaw. I want the executive to be aware that there are not some men in your ranks that will fool you all. Do you think I

would sit on the government side and have to come back discredited? No. I think it is time you do something and cut out this party politics stuff. I hope to-morrow I will not be disappointed in not seeing the question of Sir Michael Cashin fulfilled. It will satisfy me if you will show us that you are in earnest. If that will not be there to-morrow I will tell Harbor Grace more. As to the two members for Hr. Grace I want to tell you that there is nothing behind them except their two seats. Through me eight hundred and fifty one names have been sent up to this House by the district of Harbour Grace, and I have another hundred from Dr. Barnes put places Spaniard's Bay and Bay Roberts. This is enough to show a government which is only two years old. If I were in your place and there was a petition like this presented to the House I would step right out here like I did. I am out here looking for somebody to cut out party politics and make an honest effort to save the country. I know the reasons why you are keeping together, and if I were to disclose them I would shock the whole country. I know that it is not unity that is keeping you together. I have a stake in this country like we all have. What is the good of motor boat and a trap to a fisherman when he cannot sell his fish. If the country goes through we will all suffer. You all sit down like a lot of dummies. You have not got nerve enough to get somebody capable to pull her through. I am sick of what has been going on. I hope before the people kick you out some one over there will be serious enough to help out the matter instead of having your hand under your jaw and laughing at a person who is earnest. Have enough manhood in you to say you have no solution if that is the case. And I believe it so. I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here because I want to tell of the courtesy extended me by the government. I have to come in here with my cap in

my hand. You ought to provide some place for me. I will be here some time I am sure. Next thing you will say I am out listening to what is going on. But it is not worth while listening to.

MR. FOX—Just a word on this matter, Mr. Speaker. The other day the Prime Minister stated that Mr. Archibald was one of the men they wanted to lose. After hearing him we have to come to the conclusion that he is one of the men the government should not have lost. And if the Government had more men of his calibre the country would not be in the position she is in to-day. If any of his statements came from the Opposition they would have been regarded with a certain amount of suspicion, but I think he has touched the phase of the situation which should not be lost sight of. There is something besides party policy and unity keeping the government together. I am prepared to accept the statements of Mr. Archibald which merely confirm what the Opposition has said long ago. I believe it is a concerted plan by the Government to ruin Newfoundland. And the information to be tabled to-morrow will be a source of great interest. But might I ask the Minister in charge of the department in question if he is going to send any envoy's from here to look into the matter. We want more than silence when it comes to an embargo on our fish. The Minister of Justice says that the matter was taken up four months ago. Some one ought to take it up on behalf of the country and those who have already taken it up have not met with much success as what you wanted to go through went through vice versa. If four months ago the government had information leading to suspicion that the States were about to put an embargo on our fish some more effective steps should have been taken, but so far as you have gone you have failed badly. The leader of the Opposition said this afternoon that it is now too late to do anything. As usual the gov-

ernment is always utilising somebody's else's brains. Everything the government has done has been at the instigation of Sir Michael Cashin. The government has no initiative whatever. Take the repeal of the War Measures Act. Sir Michael Cashin forced that. The same may be said of the Fishery regulations. The repeal of the Food Control Board was due to the pressure of the Opposition. And what one particular policy or action on the part of the government for the past two and a half months has been carried out or performed except upon the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition? You are absolutely incapable of handling the job and all you have you cannot claim credit for because it has been forced out of you. It has Sir Michael Cashin to bring home to you the seriousness of this fish embargo. For the past six weeks this has been a live issue. And again the government has been appealed to by the suffering people, but they got no response and it will be a waste of time to further ask you for action. But I want to point out to the government that they ought to weigh the words of your one time colleague. He one time said if things were not rectified in his district the men would come up here and take the matter in their own hands. And twenty-five men came from Spaniard's Bay and the Government had to feed them and pay their bills. This shows the negligence of the government, and it is an open invitation to every other district to do the same. I do hope the country will not witness the action of people doing what the authorities should do. Further criticism as to the American fish embargo may be postponed till the information to be tabled by the Minister of Justice is so tabled. I hope something will be done to benefit the country in the matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Rail-

road Commission, to lay on the table of the House—a statement showing the amount expended between the 1st of Dec. 1920 to the 1st of May, 1921 in snow-fighting and keeping open the main line of the railroad across the Topsails and the amount received from Mr. E. Collishaw within the same period as payment of the conveyance of pulp wood from his timber area near St. George's to the A. N. D. Co., at Grand Falls, and the rate of freight charged him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to obtain from Mr. S. Smith, Trade Commissioner for Portugal and now in this city, if such is not already in the Department of Marine and Fisheries a detailed statement of the sums furnished to Mr. Smith as salary and expenses from the day of his appointment to that position up to the present time.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if instructions have been issued by the government, the Commission, or the Reid Nfld. Company, to station agents along the railway line, and pursers on the steamers not to sell tickets to people who propose proceeding to Canada and the United States, and if so to lay on the table of the House copy of the said instructions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount paid by the department of Agriculture and Mines during the Calendar Year 1919-1920 for services in fighting forest fires in the vicinity of Hant's Harbour, New Chelsea and New Melbourne; through whom were the men so employed paid for their services, and what commission, if any, did this person receive.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if representations

have been made to him from Trinity Bay proposing the extension of the Railroad from Heart's Content down the South Side of the Bay, so as to give employment at the present time, and if the government is going to take any action in this matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of the Trinity Road Board since November 15, 1919, showing in detail how much money has been spent in Trinity on roads, snow-shovelling, and other work; how much on King's Cove Line, under the Trinity Board; and how much on Indian Arm line. Also, how it is that the requirements of the law are not complied with which require the statements of road expenditure to be posted in some public place for fourteen days?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is correct that the Hon. member for Burin, Mr. Foote is going to England to represent this Colony in further work in connection with the Labrador Boundary, and if so what allowance will be paid the Hon. Member.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines what action has been taken so far in regard to the disposal of the pit-props cut on Government account during the past winter, and to state what is the present position of this matter?

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the Customs Revenue received at St. John's for the week ending June 18th, specifying, if possible, the amount received for ordinary tax, surtax, super-tax, and sales tax, and similarly the amount received during the week ending June 5th, specifying the amount under each heads above, also a statement of the amounts received for each of the cor-

responding weeks in 1918-19 and in 1919-20, and also the amounts for the whole of these fiscal years up to date corresponding with June 25th of this year.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I handed in the information as to question four on Thursday. I beg to table the reply to number five.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As to question six that information was tabled this afternoon. As to seven I have to say no representations have been made to me in the matter referred to in the question.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I will have reply to question eight ready shortly.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The answer to number nine is in the negative. As to the tenth question I will ask the Department of Agriculture and Mines to let me have a further report. As to question eleven, I have asked Mr. LeMessurier and he says it will take some time, and I feel the honorable member anticipated that as he put the words 'if possible' in his question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a list of the parties who gave bonds for duties during the fiscal year 1919-20, and have not paid the same, and the amounts due on each of them, and to ask what steps the Government is taking to collect this money seeing that these amounts are in some cases more than a year overdue, and in every case nearly twelve months overdue, and to ask him how the Government can expect other people to pay duties if these parties can escape without paying?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I think it will be agreed that this information, in the interests of business people, should not be tabled.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Surely it is not too much to ask who owes the money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Any attempt to curtail the credit of Water St. would be reprehensible.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—This is a thing that has been brought over.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This is a question where bonds were carried over and I think that Sir M. P. Cashin will agree that we should consider if it would be wise to get adverse opinions as to doing it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If a man smuggles something you put him in jail; what about the one who does not pay his bonds in the Customs. I put a name on the Order Paper as the man had defaulted and he paid up. All this was put in in my time. His building was taken over. His building was taken over for \$16,000 and sold for \$50,000. I think the placing of a list on this Table would quicken the defaulter's step to pay his bill. There is no more reason to shield him than the man who is caught smuggling a cask of rum. The circumstances may be different but one is as guilty as the other. The Colony has to pay \$200,000 in this case. Is it because this man is too strong against you and has something on you. There is a nigger in the woodpile. Let the notice go out that no revenue is to be paid—why should one pay and the other get only a paper and then be excused by the Hon. Prime Minister. Do you mean to tell me he would try to pay his bills at the Customs; no, he would try to get his other bills off on you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I think all the information should be tabled.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It would involve men on Water St. who are trying to carry on.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—A solicitor should be engaged in this matter and all the information should be tabled.

The whole thing is wrong in principle. It is your duty to know and yet you allow this thing to go on. Will you take action to make them pay?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Considerable pressure has been brought to bear on them and they have made great reductions and so can carry on their business.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—As I have said this will encourage Bolshevism—the man who has not a clean hand, as Sir M. P. Cashin says, should go to jail; he should be made pay up.

MR. HIGGINS.—There is one attitude I would like to draw attention to as to the Hon. Prime Minister's answer. I do not think he should hold back the information—the Government cannot do it. As a lawyer he can see the point I make. The Colony is owed debt—we ask who owes it. The Government has no right to give any concession. You may be courteous alright but the Colony has no right to carry on Water St. or bonds when they have lapsed. The Act doesn't entail that. They may get what they like under the Act as far as the Government is concerned but it is not good enough because while taking the bonds the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of Justice know they have no right to extend them. The unfortunate position of the Government is that they have no right to assist Water St. and if they want to do so they have to go in a private way about it and make arrangements for him to pay up. It is wrong morally to make one pay up and let the other go free. We are now levying policemen and sending men fit for more important work, to land the moonshine, and it would be more to your credit if you would waive the laws in connection with the brew of 2% and attend to Water St. One may have a pull and the other may be tarnished by having his name in

Dun's or being called on to pay his bills, but the law is the same whether he smuggles under his coat or by defaulting his bonds. Let us have the list. What happens in any club or in any entertainment—if a man does not pay he has to get out. It is bad enough for the Government to be kind to themselves or their immediate supporters but they should not be to others as if these think they can get away with it they will take advantage of it. I do not miss the point the Hon. Prime Minister makes of facilitating business but he cannot justify the winking out of sight the dragooning of one and the letting of others go. Whilst I am no advocate of Bolshevism which the member for Port de Grave refers to, I think you are inculcating the idea of one law for the rich and another for the poor. While we say it is right to hurt the rich and not the poor, this idea of pandering to the aristocracy is killing the country. Let them get out and pay their bills. We are all chasing the poor devils who cannot pay their bills. The days of living on the names on headstones and of long-tailed families have gone out. The poor devil of a blacksmith who brings in a bit of iron or the shoemaker who imports a side of leather, has to pay. If the other will not do so, get after him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of uniforms made for officials of the Customs House Department from the 15th of November 1919, the price paid for the same during the first half of 1920, the second half of 1920, and up to date in 1921, and the price proposed to be paid in the latter half of this year. Also the number of uniforms given to for the transfer in any case. Also to state what was paid for the

making of these uniforms during the first half of 1919 and the second half of 1919 and by whom they were made at these times.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I tabled it this afternoon.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railroad Commission, if he has observed a letter in the Evening Telegram of Saturday last written by W. L. Bulter of Shoal Harbor, criticizing the newly-imported locomotives for the railroad system on the ground that they are unable to haul anything like the loads claimed for them, and if so will he take steps to find out from some competent authority whether these engines are doing the work claimed for them by the Government engineer who appears to have suggested their selection, or whether they are a comparative, if not a total failure, as claimed by Mr. Bulter.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I might inform the Leader of the Opposition that I have asked for information and will get the reports to-morrow. I understand they will be favorable in every way. I was speaking to one of the engineers yesterday and he said these engines would save \$30 on coal on the way from here to Carbonear.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I wonder if the Hon. Minister knows anything of a new engine taking out 15 cars and having to drop two.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I heard something of the case but she was not working smoothly. Their haulage power is 150 per cent. greater than the others.

MR. WALSH asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works (1) If the government have definitely decided on opening or reconstructing the old Placentia Road between Colinet and Pla-

centia; (2) When will work likely commence?

Was deferred.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if Sir Geo. Bury of Montreal, now in this City, has been brought here by the Government, if so for what purposes; for what period has he been engaged, what remuneration is he to be paid, and to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence in relation thereto.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Sir George Bury was invited here by myself. There was no agreement for remuneration or specific time. There was only my correspondence to him and reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if the Government has assumed any financial responsibility with regard to the Reid Co., and the operation of the railroad or otherwise, for the fiscal year beginning on July 1st, and if so to state the nature and extent of the same, and also if it is intended to submit to this House a measure for the confirmation of such in accordance with the constitutional requirements in the terms of the Audit Act?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That has been disposed of by the information already tabled.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a list of all liquor supplied by the Controller's Department to A. H. Salter, from the 15th of November to date, and the value of the same; to say if all this liquor was paid for and if not how much of it remains unpaid for; and what steps are to be taken to collect the portion unpaid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No liquor was purchased or paid for or beyond compliance with the law he got none.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission to lay on the Table of the House the total amount of freight paid to the railway since June 50th, 1920 to June 30, 1921 by the A. N. D. Co., and in the event of this Company being closed down what effect is it going to be on the earning of the railway in freight and passengers?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It will take some time to get the figures but I will table them as soon as possible.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I would like some information on this before we go on with the railway scheme.

The Bill "An Act respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's," was read a second time.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and by unanimous consent it was ordered that they be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, 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 said amendments had been concurred in 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 for the Protection of Neg-

lected and Dependent and Delinquent Children."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children" was, on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and by unanimous consent, read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not here a few nights ago when the Argentinia terminus matter first came up. I think that in view of the fact that the people of Placentia have made no objection to the Government shifting the terminus from Placentia to Argentinia that it is a very important matter that those people should be served. From Branch right in the shore to Placentia no coastal boat calls and they have been entirely dependent upon the railway. I think the Portia did call once at Branch, but apart from that there is nothing but the railway and those people

should be served. With regard to the wisdom or otherwise of the movement, I have nothing to say, but this I will say, if the terminus at Argentinia proves more beneficial than at Placentia, the people of Placentia will be the first to congratulate the Government on the change, but as one who has had a little experience in Placentia, I would advise the Government to keep up the old pier at Placentia for a few years at least, until we are convinced that we can do without that terminus.

With regard to the situation as outlined by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I don't think that will be workable. If a train leaves here with passengers, freight, etc., and all this will have to be dumped off at a certain point, where there is a crossing it will cause a lot of trouble. Now while this Bill is before the House and while we have to consider the operation of the railroad for another year under Government supervision, we should come to some concrete conclusion with regard to Placentia and the railroad. I don't think it possible to maintain a special engine to go one and a half miles, nor would it be right to dump off passengers at Freshwater Valley and have them walk to Placentia, and I think that this Bill should be deferred until some plan is arranged to deal with the situation. I have been accused in parts of the district by Government heelers who were trying to make it uncomfortable for me, with regard to this matter of trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Now I have never placed myself on record as for or against this change. Anything that would benefit the greater number of the people in my district has always had my support and that is my attitude with regard to this, and I want to place myself on record in this way to refute the arguments of certain unscrupulous party heelers who have

taken the trouble to convey to parts of the district that I was in favour of the change and to others that I was not in favour of it. I could hardly expect to escape the assassin; but in the presence of the Government and Opposition I want to say that I was never consulted nor had I an opportunity of expressing my opinion on this matter, and now I want to ask that the Committee rise and give the members for the district a chance to consult with the Commission, so as to adjust this trouble with regard to the serving of Placentia.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I would like to point out to the hon. member that this Bill has nothing to do with the operation of the road, it only deals with the payment of the Arbitrations, and therefore, it would not do any good to raise the Committee.

MR. WALSH.—If Mr. Coaker will give me an undertaking that he will meet the representatives of the district to-morrow morning, I have no desire to hold up the Bill.

MR. FENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I think it is just as well that the position be understood with respect to this bill. I took the position when the bill came before the House some days ago that it had nothing to do with the operation of the road, but merely to do with the paying of the people for their property. The Government went in there, took the peoples' lands, removed their houses, some of which I understand were damaged beyond repair, and destroyed property generally within some distance of the track. Now they find that they had no authority to arbitrate on the matter, and this bill is to enable the arbitrations to go ahead so that these people will get paid for their property. If we do not give them the authority to arbitrate, it will simply mean that many poor people will be forced to take ac-

tion against the Government to get paid for their property. The only way that it can be done is to vote this bill through. Some people who are opposed to the Government have the idea that in supporting this bill the Opposition support the entire railroad policy. That is not so. It does not involve the Opposition in any way. I am anxious to see this bill go through because I want to see these poor people paid for their property. They have been long enough without their money.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Chairman, I am as anxious as anyone to have these people compensated. In order to prevent any misunderstanding I am prepared to support the bill and let it pass. As we are to deal with the general policy of the railroad to-morrow I will have an opportunity of dealing with this matter. I hope the Government will deal liberally with these people, and I have no doubt they will, when they see the damage that has been done to their property.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I might say that if the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's will give me a plan I shall be glad to submit it to the Reid Newfoundland Company.

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 Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister and by unanimous consent, read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to

the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to get some further information as to the advances that are being made to men going to work on the Hall's Bay and other roads.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Each man requiring supplies is given a written order on some merchant to supply him with goods. The order afterwards is kept in the department of Public Works. The amount named on the order is to be deducted from the man's earnings. And I think that is only reasonable. When the two first men came, I said it was rather an unheard of thing. When a man has any certainty of a job he ought to be able to go to his supplier and get his supplies. But there was no other way out when this was not obtaining. That is the system. It entails quite a lot of work for the department.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I thank you, Mr. Jennings, and I say I am quite in accord with that. If a man gets a twenty-five dollar advance he certainly ought to pay it back. And there is no one in my district who wants it otherwise. But there is no merchant over there who will advance one cent. The Prime Minister might know something about it. In the district of Port de Grave the fishermen there are in the same position as the men who came from Spaniard's Bay to go fishing. My men shall have to be treated the same as the men from Dr. Barne's district. If the government will do that I will have nothing more to say.

CAPTAIN LEWIS—We are in the same position in Harbour Main as they are in the districts of Hr. Grace and Port de Grave. Since the work started, applications for passes from three hundred men have been received but only thirty have yet gone. A number of the men are destitute and are asking for food for their families be-

fore proceeding. The local merchant will not advance but what brought this? It has been the result of the extravagance of the government and still the government continues to finance the railroad and the Reid Co. and still you say it is unheard of to ask for an advance. Here we are to the 10th of July and we have men out of employment since last October. Yet we hear that there are bonds amounting to \$250,000 unpaid, and if you press them for payment there will be more financial embarrassment. In the district of Harbor Main we want our proportion of this labour, otherwise you will have a big number coming into the city from the district.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Has there been any shadow of a suggestion that your men will not be employed?

CAPT. LEWIS—I have a telegram here saying that about one hundred men are about to return as they are seeking an increase in wages. We want our proportionate part of this work as we contribute our share in taxes. Our men will stick it. They built the railroad across the country and they will work. They want some advance for their families and they will pay it back to the department of Public Works when they earn it. If our men do not get passes they will come to St. John's and I hope they will be treated as Dr. Barne's men were treated when they came from Spaniard's Bay.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I would like to say a few words on behalf of the men from Hr. Grace. I met this morning a number of men on the train who were going to Badger. They were from Tilton. Now I understand there have been passes sent to Bay Roberts, Tilton, Spaniard's Bay and other places, and I presume that those sent to Tilton was the result of the petition I presented to the House. May I ask the Prime Minister about Hr. Grace?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Send in your list.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I presume that this assistance will be given if necessary.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Where needed, yes.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I understand six ty passes have gone to Bay Roberts?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I did not hear.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I want the same treatment for Hr. Grace. I wish also to say after enquiry from some of the business men in Hr. Grace that they will not risk any advance on the basis of wages at the rate of two dollars per day.

MR. MacDONNELL—Notice of question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Just a word, Mr. Speaker. I think this road building is rather premature. What provision has been made for the payment of the cost of those roads.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Resolutions will come in during Ways and Means and then this will be dealt with.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Ought we not first bring in some plan?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As soon as we get into Ways and Means there will be an explanation.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—How does the Minister of Public Works propose to pay back to the Treasury the money paid out on his signed order? One hundred men at twenty-five dollars would be twenty-five hundred. The member for Hr. Grace could not get any one in his district or in the city to advance fifty per cent. of the supplies, but you give any one who blows in and tells his story a certain sum, and then he goes his way. What does he mean? You also give out a thousand passes and then you wonder why the railroad is not paying.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—What are you going to do?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Tell us how you are going to get back the mo-

ney you are now paying out without any string on those people?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—It is not paid out without some good recommendation.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Brown merely signs a receipt and goes his way. Surely you are going to tell us what you mean? There is some sense in supplying the fishermen as he has a motor boat, and its accessories, and has a certain backing inside and outside of this House, and your chances are fifty-fifty, but this is an entirely different thing.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I have told.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You have told us how you are going to pay it out, but not how you are going to get it back.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I said it will be deducted from the wages of the men.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You will send men out on the line, and there will be a charge of twenty-five per cent. on their goods. The Public Works department is out twenty-five per cent because of having to send a man out to dole them out, and other costs. But how are you going to deal with the man who does not go to the fishery. I know of a number of those cases.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Give me the names.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—This is no place to give the names, but it is the place for the head of that department to tell the House how you are going to get back that money. How long can the country stand this? We are not getting half the revenue we got last year.

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—If every one is so untrustworthy as that what can we do?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You are only an innocent abroad. You are not as old as you look. Can the Prime Minister tell us?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I have told you.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You have only begun at the A.B.C., I do not know if there is a man on the other side able to tell me.

CAPT. LEWIS—I will ask the Min. of Public Works if the government is doing the supplying along this line?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The department places the orders for the provisions and they are sent out to the store keeper and the bills as well.

CAPT. LEWIS—What do you charge for a barrel of flour?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The charge is ten per cent.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—This is a different scheme than has been heretofore. What check have you on this?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Who is in charge?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Allan Parsons, a well experienced man

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—What number of men are employed?

THE MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Three hundred men are on the grounds

MR. WALSH—This road bill arose out of the unemployment problem. The passes issued will cost the government \$40,000, the cost of sending and bringing home those men. The road to be built Colinet and Placentia is a good idea. I am also in favour of the road between Badger and Hall's Bay, and I know something of the desirability of opening this important road. I hope the Colinet-Placentia road will afford some employment to all those men from Conception Bay who are looking for work.

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred?

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.
Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 5th.

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

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a matter of privilege and the occasion on which I rise is an important one. I want to ask Dr. Barnes, through you Sir, a question and I am sorry he is not in his place in the House. I will, however, in his absence, if the rumor is true that a number of men from Hr. Grace town who boarded the train this morning to come on to St. John's were sent back without being allowed to reach the city?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think it is true that ten or twelve men got on board the train at Hr. Grace this morning.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—They started out but do you know if they reached the city?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Dr. Barnes is in the district; he went over last evening and no doubt when these men found that he was over there they did not think it necessary to come in here.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Are you sure that Dr. Barnes went over last evening; was he not in the city this morning?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I understand he went over last evening.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Can the Prime Minister tell us what actually happened this morning with regard to these men?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I heard a rumor that these men were on the train coming in here to go to Badger but Dr. Barnes being in the

District, I presume he fixed matters up for them over there.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I don't know what happened to these men. I understand they came as far as Woodford's and that a detective was sent on board the train and told them to go back to Hr. Grace. Now, I want to know who authorized this to be done.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I presume the Inspector General instructed the officer as to his duty.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Do you not instruct the Inspector General what to do in cases of this kind?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes. In case of trouble the Department of Justice instructs the Inspector General.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—What does the Minister of Justice know about this matter?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I only received the information from the Inspector General about 12 o'clock.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I wish Dr. Barnes was in his seat. Now, what do you intend to do Mr. Prime Minister?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—All I know is that these men started out to come to St. John's and there being no member of the District here, Capt. Gosse having gone to Labrador and Dr. Barnes being in Hr. Grace, Detective O'Neill went on board the train and sent them back. I do not know the names of the men but I can get them for the hon. member.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Is this the first you heard of these men?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No, I heard of the matter between 12 and 1 o'clock.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Evidently I can get no information, there seems to be none to get. Now, I want to know if Dr. Barnes intends to discriminate against the men of Hr. Grace town. The Minister of Education went to

Spaniard's Bay and gave the men there actual cash to come in here.

MR. SCAMMELL.—You are not encouraging it are you?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—No, I am not encouraging it but if you want to know who is I will tell you. It is the Government who are encouraging it. I do not want personalities at all; but whatever happens in that district I want to know about it. I want to know if these men are looking for supplies or not and if they are whether or not they will get them?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It all depends upon the standing of their district funds.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Did Dr. Barnes get the money he is now distributing out of district funds?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I presume he got it out of the Loan guarantee in the ordinary course.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Why the Loan guarantee was all used up while I was on the Government side. I dare say I will have to go home to my district to find out the information I desire. Now I resent the idea of the Government or any member of the Government sending detectives to stop any men from Hr. Grace from coming to St. John's. Why did not Dr. Barnes or some other member of the Government go out and speak to these men properly. Anyway what is the idea of sending a detective there? Was it to put a crowd of hungry men in jail so that their families could die of starvation? Why did you not ask me to go and talk to them? I will make this offer to the Prime Minister. For the future when any men are coming from Hr. Grace district, if Dr. Barnes and Mr. Gosse are too cowardly to go and meet them, get in touch with me and I will meet them, but I absolutely and bitterly resent having a limb of the law sent after them and I hope it will not happen again. No doubt Hr.

Grace resents this idea as strongly as I do and when I go back I will tell Hr. Grace that the information concerning this episode was not given to me when I asked for it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is an unfair insinuation to make. This thing happened this morning. I have nothing before me of a documentary character. I merely told you the rumour I had heard and that was all I knew about the affair up to the time you asked me the question. Now you insinuate that I am deliberately withholding something. Surely the hon. member knows that such an insinuation is not fair.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—If you had said that first I would not be talking now. You did not speak first when you were asked the question, but after the Attorney General answered you got up and said you heard the rumor.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I was only telling you as far as I knew the rumour. I said I knew nothing of a definite character that I would put any expression of opinion on. I heard that a number of men were coming from Hr. Grace to go to Badger. I received no information or instructions in connection with the matter at all. If I had any information, I would be only too glad to give it to you.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Who instructed Detective O'Neill to go after those men?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I will take all responsibility for it. O'Neill happened to be somewhere around Holyrood at the time. I will take full responsibility for O'Neill boarding the train and persuading these men to go back to Hr. Grace. These men had no tickets and took charge of the train.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Was Detective O'Neill instructed to get aboard the train or what did he get aboard for?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Yes, he was instructed to get on board, because these men had taken charge of the train.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Whose fault was it that this thing happened?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am not prepared to say.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I want to tell the country and the Government right straight now that the Government themselves are responsible, because they paid men to come here and they put them up in hotels here.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Do you insinuate that I had anything to do with it?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—You helped to do it and paid the money for it too. Why was not Detective O'Neill acquainted that Dr. Barnes was proceeding around the Bay in a motor car and telling men that he was going to fix them all up with money that he had. Of course nobody knows anything about that. However, they are going to be fixed up and they should be.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I suppose you are glad to see that.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Certainly I am. Would you be glad to see a hungry child fed? I am, I care not where the money comes from, and I suppose everybody else in the House would too, outside the hon. member for St. Barbe. Now the reason why these men were coming here by train from Hr. Grace was because the Government gave other men in that district money and they did not see why they should be discriminated against. They are not law breakers in the ordinary sense. They came here looking for equal rights and you cannot blame them. There are other parts of this country who got more poor relief than the district of Hr. Grace did, and they got it in the way of pit prop cutting. In the district of Twillingate the small mill men were given a guarantee by the Government that they

would take their cuts, if they could not sell anywhere else. Consequently, these districts are fairly well off as a result of this relief. In our district Bell Island is closed down to the laborers and things are bad. That is the reason Hr. Grace men got to come here for something to do. I resent any further insinuations coming across the floors any more and I am going to see that Hr. Grace is going to get her share of what is going. I notice that the sum of \$80,000 was allocated to Bonavista to build a channel.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That work is not going on. It was stopped last week.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I doubt it, because I know from a man who was working there a week ago. It is the same old story. Certain sections of this country are being looked after and others are not. Well I am going to see that Hr. Grace district is going to be looked after, but I am not going to encourage them to be law breakers. As I said before, if you have not a man in the Government to meet these men from Hr. Grace, I will do it. The whole thing is your own fault, because you have paid men to break the law. The next thing probably you will find is that the whole country will rise up in their might and then you will look around and try to blame Archibald or some other man who is not responsible for it. I think Dr. Barnes got a splendid job now in encouraging people to break the law.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of saying a few words.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—The hon. gentleman is out of order.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Well then I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—The hon. member will understand that he has

to get ten hon. gentlemen to stand and support his motion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Why is this necessary? Have you been over to Hr. Grace lately in a motor car too?

HON. THE SPEAKER.—Has the hon. member any regard for the rules of the House.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—No, I have none whatever. We are come to a pretty pass now when our mouths are to be closed and be deprived of the liberty of speaking.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—Your motion is not acceptable, unless you get ten hon. gentlemen to stand.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Whether it is acceptable or not I am going on and the House can deal with me as it likes. There has been no parliamentary rules kept here since this House opened.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—Whose fault has it been?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Yours for not filling the job as you should.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—If this House sustains the ruling of the Chair, you will have to take your seat.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You did this same thing to me a few days ago. You cut out me and allowed other gentlemen to speak for three hours. Why am I subjected to such indecency.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—My ruling is that ten hon. gentlemen have got to stand before you can proceed.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There are two laws in this country and that was one of the things I intended to speak about this afternoon. Now whether ten hon. gentlemen stand or not, I am going on.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, why do you not leave the chair and have the rules of the House properly enforced?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Why not every law in the country be properly enforced. The crowd in charge of af-

fairs to-day are too cowardly and they have not enough manhood in them to enforce the laws of the country. They are not fit to fill their jobs. Now I want to say a few words to the Attorney General and this is why I moved the adjournment of the House. Can you tell me anything about a man called Emanuel Pike of Port aux Basques and has anything unusual happened over there lately?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I know very little about it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Well let us have that little.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—When I get the telegram I got, which is the only information I have about the matter, I will present it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I am going to hold this floor until I get that telegram, because I want to know about the collection of duties on that flour.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I told you I would get it. But if you threaten, I will not be in a hurry about getting it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You are no more fit to carry out the law in this country than a 14 year old boy.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I have sent for the telegram.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Neither His Excellency the Governor nor His Excellency Mr. Coaker nor Detective O'Neill will scare me the slightest bit this afternoon. I want to know the story of what happened Pike's flour which came to Port aux Basques and on which he refused to pay the Sales Tax and I want to know from the Minister of Justice how law and order was maintained in Port aux Basques in connection with that flour.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I don't know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—The law was hopelessly broken and the people took charge, and still 12 or 14 unfortunates from Hr. Grace are held up by

Detective O'Neill. Talk about Bolshevism. Why I cannot understand how the people stand for it so long. A Detective is sent out to Holyrood to turn 12 or 14 men back to Hr. Grace; but Emanuel Pike defies the Customs law, brings his flour in, sells it to his dealers and there is nothing at all about it.

Then we are seriously asked here about law and order. What happened at Port aux Basques is this. Pike brings in a certain amount of flour. He pays his duty of 25% surtax and he says I will pay no more. The people are starving and he delivers them the flour. Pike is summoned to appear before Magistrate Squarey at Channel and his trial was within a few hours of taking place when a message was sent from St. John's postponing it for fourteen days and until this House closed. Yet I am told here that law and order must be maintained and that Detective O'Neill is sent to interfere with 14 men coming from Hr. Grace to try and get work to feed their families. Why law and order is a joke. The country shortly will not have any law and order. They will take charge of you and I, Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation, and I do not blame them. Why should I stand in my place in this House and appeal to people to keep law and order when a business man defies the Customs law and is allowed to go free; but a poor unfortunate creature who cannot pay her rent is evicted and put on the street with bag and baggage. If this poor class of people cannot find anyone to lead them out of the wilderness I will do it, I care not what comes. That is what I have come to now. I never wanted that job, but two laws will no longer suit me. And Mr. Coaker smiles at me. Well might you smile when you can drive in your motor car. There was a time when you travelled in a second class rail-

way car. That was when you were coddling the fishermen of this country and when you said you would not get in a first class car because you were an underdog. The Speaker too, took a fancy trip to Norway last year, paid for by the taxpayers of this Colony, and his own brother was sent fish inspector on the Labrador last year and was paid two thousand dollars for it.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—I hope to have the chance to reply to you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You can reply as soon as you like. Get Mr. Coaker to take the chair and I will sit down while you are replying.

HON. THE SPEAKER.—I had a dollar when you did not have a cent.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I earned mine when you were asleep. There again is shown the dignity of our Speaker. He has not got sense enough to hold his tongue. It has just come to my mind now that long ago I was accused for selling spars at \$2,250. A couple of years ago Mr. Coaker came out of Mr. H. D. Reid's house with me the story how Hon. R. A. Squires got the \$5,000 for nothing. That was when Mr. Coaker called his present leader the black rascal. I said he was worse than I was, because he got \$5,000 from the Reids for nothing and I got \$2,250 for two spars. Mr. Coaker said to me: "Are you ever going to forge that?" I said "No." Of course Mr. Coaker conveniently forgets about that now.

This country to-day is hopelessly ruined and can never come back on account of the greatest crowd of incapables ever the country saw being in charge. Day after day they sit in their seats with statutory faces. They look so serious that one would imagine that they were sat alongside Judge Morris deciding a case. Now I want to know the true story of the Pike transaction and why he is allowed to go free and why the law was not en-

forced in his case like it was in other places.

This House will not be closed in fourteen days, not at all. I am going to suggest to the Prime Minister to have a tent at the Regatta and invite the Opposition down and have one day of peace anyhow, and charge it to Mr. Warren's Department. Are you going to do anything about Emmanuel Pike Mr. Warren? You have nothing to say.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Least said soonest mended. Some people talk too much.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I have not said enough this session. I realise that I have failed in my job in the Opposition. Now as long as you are going to have a few words I will sit down and listen to them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—With regard to Emmanuel Pike this matter did not come before me at all. The matter came before the Deputy Minister of Justice and I only discovered it by ringing up just now and asking Mr. Summers. The only thing I know about it is that I got a telegram from Pike, asking me for advice, and I replied to him that I would have to advise the Government and that he had better consult his own lawyer. Since you have brought the matter up I have found that he refused to pay the sales tax on some flour, and this was reported to the Finance Department. Mr. Summers was communicated with and action was taken against him. What the actual charge was I don't know. Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. Summers concluded that as the sales tax had not passed the House it would be better to postpone the case until it had.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Warren, but it is the same old story again. Nobody knows anything except the Deputies. Now I had to bring up the

story about Pike and Mr. Warren had to find out about it over the phone from Mr. Summers what happened. That is where the trouble is. We are good friends Mr. Warren, but I am here as a representative of the people and I have to forget my personal feelings, and I think it is a frightful thing that the Attorney General admits that he knew nothing of this matter until he asked his Deputy. I would like to ask the Prime Minister this afternoon did he send a message about anything at all to Mr. Pike.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You did not send him a message within the past two months.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There may have been dozens of messages within the past two months but I sent him no message recently.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he ask his Secretary to look up a message sent to Emmanuel Pike of about one hundred and seventy-five words, which he read to about one hundred men at Port aux Basques or Channel. Do you know what it was about. I know you sent him this message. Why not give us some particulars about it, instead of having us put it on the Order Paper in the form of a question. How can Mr. Warren or anyone else tell me why Dr. Barnes went tearing to Conception Bay this morning in a motor car.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Ask Dr. Barnes.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—It would be just as well for me to send a telephone message to the moon to know whether we will have fine weather to-morrow as to ask Dr. Barnes. Do you know Mr. Prime Minister? Would you mind telling him to go to Port de Grave and give the people there the same amount he gave to the men at Spaniard's Bay. Mr. Warren I hope that you are not

gone past the stage of redemption. I hope there is a chance to save you. The rest over there are hopelessly lost. Is there not something better than the petty dollars. Is there not some higher motive for a man's life than dollars and cents, something bigger than his country demands of him. Are you going to allow this kind of thing to continue and see the old sod disgraced. You are the young man that has to save your country. There are things going on over your head every hour and you know nothing of them. What is going to be done with Mr. Pike?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The case will proceed against him.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Do you know what will happen that lawyer who goes out there to prosecute him. I am satisfied that unless he is a decent and sensible fellow when he gets there and sees the way the land lies he will come back and have nothing to do with it. I am prepared to state that the Government is afraid to prosecute Mr. Pike.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is not so as far as I know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—That is the position and the people will not allow him to be prosecuted. I know they will not allow it and I take off my hat to them because this discrimination is frightful. The man over there who is starving demands flour. Pike tosses it out to him, and the Government dare not prosecute him. Twelve men leave Hr. Grace to come here and they want to be paid the same as the men in Spaniard's Bay were paid, and Detective O'Neill is sent out to order them back, and Dr. Barnes goes up in a motor car, and I am satisfied that those men got what they wanted, because Dr. Barnes would promise them the motor car that he was sitting in if it were necessary, and then we have law and order. Why I want to know

about this thing is that if it goes on, I will begin to be the leader of a crowd that nobody ever saw here before, and Mr. Coaker will go to Port Union and will not come back any more.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You will be wanting me for a second hand.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You were alright when you were looking out for the underdog until you got too large for yourself, but now you are lost in a wilderness. I have lost all faith in the Government. My patience is exhausted, and I will not stand it any longer. I don't know whether Archibald invited the crowd to come from Hr. Grace or not, but if I were he I would get them all to come over. Mr. Scammell take a note of that now.

You are in the position now that the longshoremen who made arrangement with the mercantile men of the city to have their wages reduced if prices went down, and owing to the surtax put on by the Prime Minister, you have them on strike to-day, and it is not the fault of the merchants, it is the fault of the Government and only the Government who brought the tax on a barrel of flour from 27½c. to 90½c. and then the men of St. Johns' are taxed to pay Geo. Bury for his report on the railroad, which is the means of handing Reid Nfld. Co. another million and a half dollars. A million and a half thrown away each year to operate the railroad. I was once accused in this House of giving my constituents a special grant, but never was there a special grant given equal to that which you are prepared to give the Reid Nfld. Co., now. What is the motive aback of this. There is some motive. Ruin Newfoundland to the last inch, drive her to the rocks at any cost. It is easy to see what is the motive. A man with half an eye can see it. When I deal with the rail-

road I will tell the motive and the story behind it, because the Government has connected the story for me. They intend driving the place of my birth to Canada. I am going to have a fine evening here waiting for Mr. Pike's telegram.

There is an article here, Mr. Speaker which has mystified me somewhat which has been sent out to special districts by the Prime Minister. He said as follows:—

Do you remember this Mr. Prime Minister?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No I don't remember it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—You don't remember it and you wrote it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No I didn't.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Oh, yes you did my son, look at it. Now then who owns Newfoundland now. The Imperial God had nothing to say about it, the Queen gave it up and I want to know who owns it now. I know who is trying to sacrifice it. Do you know, Mr. Warren? Your Excellency, Mr. Coaker do you know anything of this Imperial God. Is it true that Reid

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I guess so.

SIR J. CROSBIE.—Is not that a terrible admission. Mr. Coaker says that Reid has got him at last. I knew he had but I didn't think Mr. Coaker would make an open confession of it. The man who was so much abused in this House last year, Mr. R. G. Reid, has even covered the Prime Minister with his brilliance and extracted from the country another million and a half dollars. And then the Prime Minister said to the electors of the country in the last election: Save us from the Reids, and the only way to do so is to vote for us and throw out Cashin, and we will make Reid fill the bill. He is filling the bill like a little man.

Has that message come up yet Mr. Warren?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Would you let me have a copy of it please? Mr. Warren was not going to let me have it first because he said I threatened him but I suppose he thought it would be better to let me have it than to keep me here all night talking.

'Emmanuel Pike got the flour and the schooner is gone and nothing will be done for fourteen days. But the Finance Minister is in Topsail.'

MR. BENNETT—The Prime Minister is acting Finance Minister.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, but he is only acting it is a joke. I have lost faith even in the Finance Minister. Did you hear this Mr. Higgins? as follows:—

(Reads)

Mr. Coaker do not go to sleep. You told us he was a Black Rascal. I am not bad you know. You are beginning to sin yourself. I do not believe Mr. Warren or Mr. Foote would give him a case to-morrow. But Mr. Cave would not betray my old district. Young, clean and energetic. He gets up earlier in the morning than Mr. Foote does, but he is selling our country and he does not care what the cost is. What a great doctrine and very few of you have read it. But after getting in where there is filthy lucre, it is unfortunate to see how you act. You have got to come back Mr. Cave to the fold and repent for the terrible sins committed against Mr. Archibald. It is awful hard to save some people some times. But is it not really too bad to see Newfoundland sacrificed by a crowd like you together Sir W. D. Reid and H. D. Reid. You have no intention of doing anything for the betterment of this country. We are not going to sacrifice the country if we can prevent it Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak half so long except for the fact that your Honour required ten honourable

gentlemen to rise. I regret for having detained you so long Sir, I regret Sir, if I have been offensive because in my opinion the dignity of the House must be upheld, but unfortunately you hit me on the wrong side and the little bit of scotch in me would not stand for that. I want the same treatment as every one else gets. Mr. Coaker I would not allow the ink bottle to get the better of me like it did you. When you were over here you were honest as I am now, but when you got over there you got crooked. My old friend you have fallen. You know all I have been saying is quite true and that is what upsets me. I know you are honest in your intentions, but you are gone, and you will be lost if you do not look out. But I think a few words to a back slider will always bring him back. Will you not come? You have got to come. Come over Mr. Coaker and save your country. Excuse me Mr. Warren is that another message from Emmanuel Pike? Mr. Speaker have you any idea when this House is going to close? Have you any idea Mr. Foote? May I suggest to Mr. Foote that you have a tent at the Regatta and invite us all down.

MR. FOOTE—I will stay here as long as you will.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You will stay here long enough for the people to kick you out.

MR. FOOTE—Have you ever heard of the Barber's Cat?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Never heard or thought of it, until I saw and heard you. I now suggest that you send over your photo and have it marked the original Barber's Cat. One would not have to look twice to see whether you are the Barber's cat or not. Look out now perhaps a mouse may jump across. Now do not wink at me like that. I never saw a Barber's cat wink though. Mr. Coaker I never knew you had a Barber's cat in the Executive. Of course a Barber's cat is always able to look after itself except when it is

out late at night. This is the silent man. I am delighted now to say that you ought at once send a telegram to the district of Burin that their Barber's cat was talking from the other side of the House. I must see Mr. Warren if there are any messages in this paper from Port aux Basques. Well I must take off my hat to Emmanuel Pike. He is a man after my own type. Here is a special to the Evening Telegram. (reads). Who in the name of goodness can blame Mr. Pike for taking the flour. Can you Mr. Minister of Justice?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You are right Sir. (reads) Do you hear this Mr. Coaker? Emmanuel Pike takes the flour and yet the Attorney General can not take action. Where are we drifting? You force the people to pay the sales tax so that you can pay the Reids to run the railroad. How long will human nature stand for this? And when one does his best to save his country he is told he is a Barber's cat. We are told this by the silent member who is the Barber's cat. If you like I will tell more of what the public think of you. I would not sell you for a box of biscuits. I would label and express for nowhere. If Kielly at the Nickel advertised about the Barber's cat he would sure get a full house. Here is the choice Barber's cat. Are you enjoying the show Mr. Foote? But I guess you enjoyed sending your old uncle to the wall.

MR. FOOTE—You are an exhibition of stupidity and ignorance.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You are either hopelessly ignorant or no good and my choice is that you are no good. You are a choice joke. Stop winking at me. Get up and have a few shots at me.

MR. FOOTE—It is not worth while.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You would if you could. Are you not going to tell us something more you know? I like

to refer to you. I suppose you are not something which cannot be touched? Gentlemen we have an Imperial God in our midst. Mr. Speaker I regret having detained the House, but I will have more to say to Mr. Foote when the railway problem comes up for discussion. What do you mean Mr. Foote? Do you think I cannot address you as a public official of the executive? I am not talking to you personally. I am dealing with a hopeless politician as the greatest misfit the country has ever seen.

MR. FOOTE—I will be here longer than you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I will be here when you are locked up. You will never get in again. I will put up a side bet and give me the opportunity of my life to test it by having the both of us resign our seats, and I bet you will not come back. Will you get the Prime Minister to nominate the 15th of October next if you like for the election.

THE HON. MR. FOOTE—My district is a respectable one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am prepared to contest the respectability of your district and mine. I have heard of cats being particular. You are too particular. It is really a pity about you. It is wonderful that the Minister of the Executive is so thoughtful about these things. I wish he had thought more about the fishermen of the West Coast whom he has betrayed.

HON. MR. FOOTE—More wind.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—This is the wind you do not like. It is a northeaster. The honorable member for Burin is no good as a public man. Show your manhood.

HON. MR. FOOTE—You never had any to show.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You will not go to the poles again. You are a one session man. So is the Attorney General. This is a characteristic of the Government. I would not swop my

brains for yours. You have neither wind nor brains.

HON. MR. FOOTE—What an exhibition?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would be very glad to put a halter on you and bring you to an exhibition some day. I want you to get up and create a little wind. I did not know there was not a quorum present as the wind was off. Mr. Speaker, I have travelled over a greater area than I intended. The honorable minister of the Executive Government, the member for Burin, rapped a little bit too hard by personal comment, but when I retaliated he got a little ruffled. Anyway it strikes me there is one law for the rich and one for the poor. You send out a detective, and send back the poor men who were coming into town looking for work. I have to strongly object to this indiscriminating treatment towards Emmanuel Pike, and yet when a poor wretch is caught smuggling in a keg of rum he is fined a hundred dollars or given three months in the pen. And again I do not care who it is those defaulters in not paying up on their outstanding bonds ought to be sued right away because they are just as bad as those who smuggle or steal from the government and as Mr. Higgins said it is not right to have those bonds continuously renewed. I do not favour this law of favoritism, and as Mr. Higgins said yesterday the long coat aristocracy passes away in 1894, and the time has come when every one has to get his equal rights. And the man will be found sooner or later who can handle the job of dispensing fair and square law to all whether poor or rich. We all expect to get what Britain stand for equal rights for all, and if we do not get that I am going to make an ugly attempt to see that we get them, and if the wind and gas gets going the honorable member for Burin will get the fright of his life. That is what will happen. Look Mr. Speaker, lost, stolen or strayed, there is not

one member of the executive government in his chair. Mr. Coaker has gone. Mr. Halfyard is gone. Mr. Squires is gone and Mr. Barnes is out in an automobile in company with Detective O'Neill. It is sure proof that the country is wrecked and bankrupt. They are deserters. Mr. Cave how long is it going to last?

THE MIN. OF SHIPPING—I was just considering this.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Come brother come. Come brother Cave and give us a solo. I have no notion of sitting down for a long time yet. I have a good mind to read the manifesto of the Prime Minister because I know you did not read it. See the conquering heroes come. Mr. Cave do you know the intention of the government? His Honour the Speaker does not know. The whole idea is to hand over poor Newfoundland to Canada. That is all. I want the law to be administered to the rich and the poor in the same way. Until we get that there is going to be trouble. Port aux Basques is the first part of the country you strike after leaving the Kyle, and if Bolshevism starts there it will come right down thru the country as sure as the chickens come home to roost. I know Conception Bay as well as any one and once they get a leader and agitator, then I pity the crowd in charge. I want to tell you in the absence of the Prime Minister that the quicker you change from the road you are now travelling the better it will be for the peace of Newfoundland. That is my warning and no detective O'Neill will go into my district and tamper with my people I will be their leader if necessary to get them over here.

Sir Michael Cashin gave Notice of Question.

At a quarter past five 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 the Governor, in the Council Chamber.

And Mr. Speaker and the House being at the Bar of the Council Chamber, His Excellency, the Governor, was pleased to assent to the following Bills

"An Act to amend the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920."

"An Act to amend consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Court of Enquiry'".

"An Act to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act 1920."

"An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act 1918."

"An Act Respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

"An Act Respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom."

"An Act Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for Special Purposes."

"An Act to Amend the Profiteering Act—1920."

"An Act to amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled 'Of Lotteries'".

"An Act Further Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber."

"An Act to amend the Law Society Act."

"An Act for the confirmation of an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company Ltd."

"An Act Respecting the Exportation of Codfish."

"An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'".

"An Act for the Prevention of Venereal Diseases."

"An Act Respecting the appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's."

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister if it is correct that the Government intends to appoint a number of inspectors to supervise the enforcement of the Sales Tax, and if so will he take steps to see that the claims of returned soldiers and sailors are not overlooked in making these appointments?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The matter of appointment of Inspectors in connection with the Sales Tax has not been considered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister if it is correct that the temporary commission administering the affairs of the town of St. John's is no longer in existence, and if so what steps he proposes to take in regard to the matter; also if Messrs. Gosling and Ayre have resigned their seats on said commission and if it is intended to appoint Messrs. E. Collishaw and A. H. Salter to succeed them, and if so, what special qualifications does either possess for such appointments?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no intention whatever to ask these two gentlemen to accept appointments.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Minister of Education how many school teachers are withdrawing from the profession as at the end of June 1921, specifying the different denominations and what steps, if any, he is taking to correct this, and is it correct that the principal reason for the withdrawal of these teachers is dissatisfaction at the failure of the Government to make good any of its promises towards the teachers and the betterment of education generally; also when, if ever, his annual report is likely to be laid on the Table of the House?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I ask that this question and also No. 10 be deferred.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister (a) if any report has yet been received from Dr. Rendell in reference to the work of the Tuberculosis De-

partment of the past year and if so to lay copy of the same on the Table of the House; and (b) if any steps have yet been taken to fill up with deserving cases the unoccupied accommodation in the Sanitorium?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have asked the Deputy Colonial Secretary to turn up the report and will have it tomorrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that the United States Congress is considering a new tariff measure which imposes heavy duties on fishery products from all countries including Newfoundland, imported into the United States; if so to lay on the Table of the House such information as he possesses in regard to the same; also to say what, if any, steps the government is taking to secure the exemption of Newfoundland from these tariff revisions; also what is the value in the light of this information of the claim of Messrs. Collishaw and Devine that when they visited Washington some months ago they secured such concessions for Newfoundland; also if the report of Messrs Collishaw and Devine has yet been received, and if so to lay a copy on the Table of the House and if not when is it expected to be received and what has the mission of Messrs. Collishaw and Devine cost the Colony?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply. I will have copies typed for the benefit of the members.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence between the Government and St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. for years 1920 and 1921.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Questions 6 and 7 are same one, repeated by a printers error. I will get the answer as soon as possible.

MR. LEWIS asked the Chairman of the Railroad Commission to lay on the Table of the House a report of the negotiations entered into between the

Railroad Commissioners and the St. George's Coal Fields, Limited.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has decided to undertake the construction of a series of roads including the following: One between Botwood via Bishop's Falls and Grand Falls; one from the railroad to Springdale Notre Dame Bay; one from the railroad to Bonne Bay; and others in other Northern Districts, and if so to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the proposed roads, their mileage, their estimated cost, the number of men likely to be employed upon them, and the period for which they will be employed, and from what source he proposes to obtain the money necessary to construct them?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am having a statement prepared and will table it as soon as received from the Agriculture and Mines Dept.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total collections of Customs Revenue, at all ports of entry around the coast from Cape Race to Bay of Islands inclusive, for such period of the fiscal year now expiring as details are available and for the same periods in 1919-20 and in 1918-19, so that the country may have an opportunity of seeing the disastrous consequences to the Revenue which have followed upon the ill-advised policy of the Fishery Regulations enforced by the present government since taking office up to the abandonment of the policy a few weeks ago.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The answer is in course of preparation. It will take a lot of clerical work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Colonial Secretary or Hon. Minister of Justice or Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to table all correspon-

dence between Mr. Devine, Mr. Outerbridge of New York, Sir Edgar Bowring or any other persons or source in the U. S. in the alteration in the U. S. A. tariff against Newfoundland.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table copies of the telegrams and correspondence between myself, Mr. Devine and others, the President of the Board of Trade, Sir Jos. Outerbridge and the wireless to Sir E. R. Bowring. I have no message from the latter, but he is on a ship due at Halifax on Thursday and we will pick him up from Cape Race.

MR. WALSH asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as chairman of the Railway Commission to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) The names of all persons, clergy excluded who were given free passes over the railway and coastal system since the Commission took control to date; (b) The approximate cost of these passes to the Commission; (c) The cost of all special trains employed by the members of the persons who were given free trains for Railway Commission or any other the same period.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—(a). This has already been answered; no person but those already on the list got passes from the Commission. (b). The approximate cost is not known as no data is kept. (c) Will get it later.

MR WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs is it the intention of the Government to provide a sufficient amount of money to be voted at the present session to provide the Old Age Pension for those old fishermen whose applications are on file at the office of Mr. Woods the clerk in charge of this Department.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The vote is the same as last year. There is no additional vote.

MR. MacDONNELL asked the Minister of Shipping to inform this House

if the S.S. Seal has been chartered to carry on the Labrador service this season, what is the speed of the said ship and how much per day was paid and if she has suitable passenger accommodation, also to state how many trips she has made to date and if it is the intention of the Government to keep her on this service; (2) To inform this House if it is correct that the S.S. Diana has been chartered for the Labrador service for this season, to state what amount is being paid for her per day, what is her speed and if he is satisfied that her passenger accommodation is satisfactory to the travelling public?

HON. MIN. OF SHIPPING—I beg to say that the Seal was engaged to make one trip from Conception Bay to Labrador which she has now completed. She is now lying up on the Southside. The Diana was under the same charter. She took some men down and as others were anxious to go she made a second trip. They paid \$325 a day for the Ranger and Diana and \$375 for the Seal. The Diana was not engaged for the summer, but for an occasional trip.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—How much are the Government responsible for beyond the \$325. Did you pay for the coals etc.

HON MINISTER OF SHIPPING—No

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—There is a clamour in Conception Bay for a second ship for the summer, and I suggest the Watchful.

HON. MIN. OF SHIPPING—She is hardly fitted for the Labrador service. Arrangements are now being made whereby the Sebastopol will be used. They will have the second boat alright. She will go on as soon as the Diana returns.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE—To ask the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information; if Mr. Moses Young, of Spaniard's Bay has been appointed to advance certain relief to the people of Spaniard's Bay

and vicinity and what amount of advance or relief to each person?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have asked Mr. Stirling to get the information.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I asked before for the original bills of Mr. Bastow and Mr. Irvine Parsons.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will get them.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Resolution for the Confirmation of An Agreement between the Government and The Pulp and Paper Corporation of America" was referred to a Select Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following as the Select Committee—Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Samson, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Sullivan.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 210 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Warehouse Receipts and other Securities in the Possession of Banks'" was read a second time.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker. It strikes me as strange that the banks should advance money in this way at all. In Canada it is done as far as the wheat crop is concerned, but as regards the fish that are still swimming in the sea, it is entirely different matter. I think these two points should be well considered.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I agree with Mr. Bennett in the point that he makes to the effect that if it is possible to get a loan from the banks on the fish that are still swimming in the water it may be that they would give the fishermen a fit-out on the same basis. I also agree with Sir John Crosbie that this Bill should go to a Select Committee to be threshed out thoroughly. We met the bank managers some time ago on this matter and they stated that they had been advancing money all along on fish still

in the sea. I might say personally that I have been in business a good many years now, and I never heard of the practice before. It is probable, however, that large firms doing as much as \$2,000,000 supplying business must have got advances on some such understanding.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE—My only point is that the idea of advancing money on fish swimming in the sea is not good enough. I like Mr. Coaker, could never get the money on that security. This is a Bill brought in by the banks themselves and we should consider it well before deciding on anything definite. If money is to be advanced on the fish still in the water it enables the merchant to give out supplies, but when they have no security and the position is practically the same.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that all except the last paragraph of this Bill is the law to-day and the whole change is embodied in the last three lines of that paragraph. What Sir John Crosbie has been referring to is being done under the Law to-day and this Act does not give the Banks the power to do the things that it has been said they can do. What I mean is this: a man who has fifty dealers goes to the bank and gets money for which he buys goods or provisions. Ordinarily the bank would take these goods as security, but it cannot do so in this case because they are given out to dealers on credit and therefore the process is for the dealers to turn in the fish to the supplier, which fish is hypothecated to the bank. The bank does not actually take a warehouse receipt for the amount advanced, but merely the promise of the customer. The banks inform me that this has heretofore been regarded as the legal practice and no one has ever refused to give the promise, nor have they refused to give the necessary power of attorney. I agree with previous speak-

ers that this Bill should go to a Select Committee.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, here is the weak side of this Bill. The Bank advances the money on fish that is still in the water and the man to whom he advances it buys provisions and gives them out to his dealers, but it must be remembered that every bank has a limit for its creditors, and it may be that the particular man gets only \$30,000 which is not enough and then he goes to Bowrings or some other firm and gets the balance. The point is however that these people have no security.

It was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House to consist of: Hon. the Minister of Justice Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Shipping, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in confirmation of An Agreement with the Reid Newfoundland Company for the Operation of the Railway System of the Colony for the period of one year.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, July 6th, 1921.

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

MR. MacDONNELL—I would like to call the Prime Minister's attention to a question on the Order Paper of July 2nd with reference to the matter of the U. S. tariff re fish importations. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how this measure by the United States is going to effect the

herring fishery of Bonne Bay and Bay of Islands.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, just a word in reply to the honourable member for St. George's. So far as herring is concerned it means that there will be a duty of \$5.00 a barrel on herring going into the United States. They have not listened at all to the proposition put forward by the American interests. Scotch cured herring will come under the same restrictions. My opinion is that the American government will pass that tariff as reported, and they will use it as a weapon to make a treaty with us. What they want is the free exportation of pulp wood. They will probably say to us if you will come along with something to offer us we may have something to offer you. My last information is from Dr. Grenfell who has met several of the Ways and Means Committee. The tax on boneless fish will not interfere with us. We have a good market in Great Britain, and they will take all we can supply.

ter that in the course of the next few days I was hoping with the Prime Minister that the House would close, and then we could send a strong deputation. There is absolutely no reason why we should not be on friendly terms with America. I go further and say that I discussed this matter with the Colonial Office, when I was in England. The destiny of Newfoundland lies in that direction. If they will put in a clause that will enable us to make a reciprocal treaty we will be able to fix things up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me if I say a few words on this matter. It is a serious situation, and I doubt if it is at all possible to do anything about it. A desperate effort must be made, and it must be made right away. It looks to me as if Sir Edgar Bowring is not inclined to go. Let us suppose he is not

going. What we should do is to pick out some executive man, and he should be sent immediately to see what can be done. I am appealing to the Prime Minister and to the Government in a big way to let us start someone out immediately. This serious situation must be saved if possible. You have no idea of how serious a matter it is. You may not succeed, but it is worth trying.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker, Sir John takes his usual reasonable attitude in this matter. The position is a certain bill has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee. It will come before the House in the course of about six weeks. The proceeding is just the same as here. If this House were closed within a reasonable time suitable representation could be sent. Supply has been postponed from day to day on the request of the honourable Leader of the Opposition. With the exception of the railroad Resolutions there is nothing but the Ways and Means and Supply on the Order Paper. The Legislative Council has cleaned up its business to date, and there is no reason why, if the business of the House were taken up in a business-like manner, the House would not be closed in eight or ten days.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, is not this the natural outcome of the policy of discrimination that we practiced last year against the Americans. Last year American gold was sent down here, and because of the gross ignorance and incompetence of those in charge the gold was sent back, and the Americans were not permitted to do business here. It is unfortunate that a competent, patriotic committee of Newfoundlanders such as Dr. Grenfell, Dr. Campbell and Mr. Collishaw did not go to Washington to represent Newfoundland. Where are the Keans and the Lewis's?

I am always misrepresented in the papers. I did not say that we should take the United States by the throat.

The man who has fallen down on his job comes in now and pleads for mercy. On his way back from Europe having wrecked our fisheries, it was his bounden duty when he arrived in New York to consult with his pet commissioner and then proceed to Washington if not get out. It is my duty to speak in this way. And it is nauseating to be told that Grenfell and Collishaw are looking into the matter. I have no doubt these men are all right in their own sphere, but Collishaw has no interest in Newfoundland, he merely is after money. And now you invite When Smith and Shipman were down Sir E. Bowring when it is too late. Here you played Mr. Minister of Marine and Fisheries with fire. They were not fools so they went back to New York and told the whole story to their principals. They told the story how they were dragged through the Supreme Court, and fortunately won, but then you availed of the War Measures Act to still have your own way, be it right or wrong. There are millions of people in the United States wanting our fish and cannot get it. We will never get back to our pre-war dry salt fish markets. I do not hold the Prime Minister altogether responsible because he is at the mercy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but I remember the day when he held forth that he was the man who controlled and would control the price of fish. Where is he now? He now officially tells us he is about to retire from the position. If this is correct and in the light of what has happened I sympathise with him for the hopeless mess he has made of our most important department. It is not good enough to tell the fishermen that it is no longer profitable to catch fish. It is not good enough towards the people who has sent him here and after the promises he has made to them. When he saw he was falling down on his job, and he was failing badly in his job, and he

should have stopped dragging the country down. I would have taken off my hat to him if he had said I see I am on the wrong road, I must go in some other direction. I regret to have to speak in this strain and before he retires I wish to strongly advise him that he ought to try and leave behind him something official that will in some little way offset the calamity he has caused. As to this American tariff, if you think you or some other man on the other side cannot deal with this matter and proceed to Washington, then let you select some competent man and take the matter up right away. Never mind Collishaw. Get the man who has a stake here. No one in this House would have any hesitation in equipping him properly for the job. What Devine does not know about fish would fill a very large volume. What I say I mean tho' not in a personal way. This is no joke for me and the hundreds of others who have to remain in this country. I did not intend to have anything to say, but after seeing this rag misrepresenting me, I then had a different mind. I will not criticise any paper which criticises me fairly, but when it is unfair and narrow I will then defend myself. This rag never put me here. Two thousand free and independent electors placed me here, and I am prepared to stand for all the pledges and promises I made to them. I will uphold East, North, South and West. They form the whole country, and I have an interest in the whole as distinct from any particular section. The defeat of the government at the present time would be the best thing for the country. And that defeat is sure to come whether it is this session or at the next. You cannot go on squandering money like you are, you cannot go on building roads, you cannot go on handling the railroad and prior to your getting the reins of government, the Reids would have to bear any deficit resulting from its operation. If somebody else than you were

in power the Reids would be put in their place. The Reids whom you once vilified were paid last year by you \$1,500,000 to run the road. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that in the future Resolutions would be tabled to deal with the railroad. I assure you that not one vote will be passed in the Estimates until I am convinced that you have a serious earnest attempt to have the railroad run more favourably than it has, and that you will get the American authorities to rescind this terribly destructive tariff on our fish. I know there are other men on the other side who will bear me out, but they have not yet had the opportunity to do so. Captain Jones and the private members are just as responsible as the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and certainly as much as Dr. Grenfell and Mr. Collishaw and others.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I think this American tariff is a very serious matter for Newfoundland. And from what the leader of the Opposition has read, it can be easily seen that the first move was made because of the activity of some Americans. Mr. Coaker got up and I will ask him a question when he is finished talking. Since this has come before the Government, I know you have been taking the thing seriously as you have tried to get Sir Edgar Bowring to handle the matter for us but I understood the Prime Minister to say that we should have a good man to go there, but he added that if the Opposition would allow the House to close then he would get some member of the government to go up there to represent us. Now it seems quite plain from the report of Sir Edgar Bowring that he does not intend to go there. Did I not understand the Prime Minister to say Mr. Coaker that if the House were allowed to close something would be done?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Yes.

MR. ARCHIBALD—The point I am getting after is this. Have we stopped to think that this one dollar and seventy-five cents is against the fishermen. Is this a threat against the Opposition that if they will not allow the House to close the fishermen will be penalised? Why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the champion of the fishermen, and I assume he is at the present time, and now his Government says that if you allow us to close the House we will send some one there, and if you will not we will penalise the fishermen one dollar and seventy-five cents. I want to tell that man in the gallery who is interrupting me that if he is a serious thinking Newfoundland, he will listen to the fact that one dollar and seventy-five cents is about to be placed on our fishermen. I am trying to have this prevented so please do not interrupt and be quiet. You are not getting square with the Opposition in this way as none of them are concerned personally. There are a good many voting machines on your side of the House, and let you try and have this stopped, even at the risk of defeat. I will read a part of this correspondence dealing with Collishaw. (Reads). That is the only place where he is mentioned. All the rest of it is I., I., I., I presume that Collishaw got paid for taking the trip only. Apparently all that was done was done by Devine. Collishaw followed me over to Spaniard's Bay to break up the meeting I held over there and he broke the wheel of his car in trying to do that, so that the smallest child knows that he has some deep interest in the country. I want also to state that he said Archibald had more heart than brains and if I did not have more heart than brain he would not have got back as easily as he did.

Let the fishermen take notice of that. As regards what is said in the paper I will say nothing as it is too trivial. The Hon. Minister of Educa-

tion has now returned but is not in the House. He went to the town of Hr. Grace with Detective O'Neill to attend to the men who were looking for work; we have come to something when that is the case. (Quotes paper.)

The Hon. Prime Minister does not have to worry about Hr. Grace as I will see they are treated right there. There is nothing further in the paper to interest me but surely some of you will see that the proper thing is done.

MR. MOORE.—I object to the Hon. Minister of Marine consulting with Dr. Grenfell as to the tariff being put on our fisheries and I ask you to leave Grenfell and the bird of passage, Collishaw, out of it.

CAPT. LEWIS.—I think this is a most serious question that has been introduced by Mr. Archibald. You should have moved months ago to have this tariff rescinded. But you are following the policy of drift—you came into power on the tidal wave as a fisherman's government but what have you done. Not one of you has ever risen to advocate anything for the fishermen. The members for St. John's are representing the laborers, coopers, etc., but the others here were sent by the fishermen and why don't you ask your leader to rise and do something. It was said a few days ago by the Hon. Minister of Marine that the fishermen can ship their oil in steel casks which is a joke. He has an interest in Newfoundland and if he will not do something a lot of these fishermen will have to go to the United States. Sir Ambrose Shea appealed for confederation in 1869 but failed, but the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Marine can do it now and be knighted. If you do not do it you are a failure and it is up to you who represent the F.P.U. to ask them to remove these duties. Can you expect the Gorton Pew Co. to carry on as in years past. Collishaw is the

guide, philosopher and friend of the Hon. Mr. Coaker and went to Montreal with him but what has he done. His kind has been denounced before by the Hon. Minister of Marine, but what is his interest in Newfoundland. The story will be told in the near future. Once more I appeal to the Hon. Prime Minister to lose no time in getting the United States to rescind the law and block Senator Lodge who has been legislating against it for years. I believe that if you have the interest of the country and the fishermen at heart you will do the best possible to make arrangements and see if the States will not take off the duty in full to do so in part. I believe that Hon. Mr. Foote and his men are suffering harder by this than by any other law. The Hon. Mr. Warren's men, who are of the best class in Newfoundland and fish on the Banks, when they come in in October they will not be able to send it to Gloucester as is the custom and if the policy of drift is allowed to go on it will mean that 20,000 qtls. more of fish will have to go into competition with the rest in Oporto. We now have 46,000 qtls. in Oporto though the American market is next door to us. As I explained before the Hon. Minister of Marine put up the first barrier against us. This had been forcefully explained by Mr. Walsh, it was started for personal reasons or to assist his friends. He did not fill the bill as Minister of Marine and Fisheries as he was too partisan. If he will contribute two millions to the railway why not ask us to contribute to Messrs. Harris and Penney. He supported the Bill for the one and a half millions for the railway—he did not do as was expected of him. He said that his department is the most important one and I agree with him but he does not fill the post. The country has suffered through his mismanagement and is now suffering

through his failure to take up this matter with the States. I fear it has now gone too far to be remedied. Both of these gentlemen may have something in their heads that we know nothing about but they would not carry on with this if confederation were not in sight. We are first of all, Newfoundlanders and I say it is too bad that these representatives of the North will not say a word in the interests of the fishermen. It is alright for them to stand up for the Government but it is their duty to stand for the rights of those who sent them here.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House copies of all telegrams to the amount of six hundred and twenty-one pounds sterling shown in the statement of expenses of Mr. S. Smith, Trade Commissioner for Portugal, as having been sent to Newfoundland from the period September 7, 1920 to June 18, 1921. Also to state the annual salary paid Mr. Smith as Trade Commissioner.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The answer is being prepared.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House—

- (a) Copy of the suggestions which Sir Geo. Bury states in his report he has placed before the Reid Nfld. Co., to assist them to operate the railway this year.
- (b) Is the sum of \$1,500,000, suggested by Sir Geo. Bury to be furnished by the Colony to the Reid Nfld. Co., for operation of the railway to be distinct and apart from expenditure if any, on capital account?
- (c) What class of outlays are intended by Sir Geo. Bury in the paragraph of his report where he says that "expenditure on capital ac-

- count be made only upon the written sanction of the Government and that these works be paid for when completed upon certificate from the Government Engineer?
- (d) Will such expenditure be an absolute loss to the Colony or would they be in the category of the expenditures on locomotives, etc., for the past year to be charged against any claims made by the Reids at the end of their 50-year operating period?
- (e) If such expenditures are to be charged against the Reid Company what steps has the Government taken or will take to ensure that this liability of the Reid Company on account of such payments is clear and undisputed.
- (f) Will he table a statement showing the wage increases made to the different classes of employees mentioned in Sir Geo. Bury's report and the amount paid by the Reid Co., for such services in 1919-20 and by the Railway Commission for such services in 1921?
- (g) Has Sir Geo. Bury supplied any figures on which to base his estimate that the loss on operating the railroad this year will be less than \$2,000,000 and if so, will the same be tabled, and if not what ground is there for supposing that the estimate of this gentleman, who was only in St. John's three or four days, is more likely to be correct than that of the traffic officers of the railway?
- (h) Why is no provision made that the Reid Co. should contribute some amount towards the loss on operating the railroad this year, even if the amount is under a million and a half dollars, seeing that the Company was required to contribute \$100,000 last year?
- (i) When was expenditure proposed for the placing of heavier rails on the line and what will be the cost of the same?
- (j) What will be the cost of making the alterations to the existing rails suggested by Sir Geo. Bury and the cost of angle bars for 100 miles of track, and is the cost of these angle bars to be included in the cost of operation or to be a separate item and if the latter, will it be charged against the Reid claims at the end of fifty years?
- (k) Will the cost of constructing snow sheds and erecting a coal-handling plant at Argentia be included in operation or will it be separate (and in such case will it be charged against the Reid claims at the end of fifty years)?
- (l) What steps is it proposed to take to oblige the Reid Co. to operate the railway with economy, seeing that it is a matter of indifference to the Reid Co., how the line is operated so long as the expenditure is kept below \$1,500,000?
- (m) Why is a capable General Manager necessary? Has the Reid Co. at any time recommended such an appointment, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copy of such recommendation?
- (n) What is the object of appointing a Commission to deal with public utilities and what other public utilities are there in the country that will require the attention of this commission simply be the creation of more offices and the appointment of more high-salaried officials.
- (o) What guarantee has the Colony that if the operation of the railway during this year exceeds a million and a half dollars the Reid Co. will be able to meet the excess seeing that within the past fortnight it has mortgaged all the

assets of its four subsidiary companies to the Royal Trust Company for the sum of \$4,800,000?

(p) Is it proposed to retain the services of Mr. Victory E. Pill as railway auditor this year, and is he to be paid the same salary as last year?

(q) How much has been paid or is to be paid Sir Geo. Bury for his report and his advice. And will this amount include an allowance for his expenses, and if not what extra sum will be paid him therefor?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

(a) I will lay this on the Table as soon as it is received. (b) The million and a half is for loss on capital account not on operating. I have asked for a statement as to wages for 1920-21. Sir George Bury came to Sydney and stopped at Port aux Basques and Argentina and then went to Brigus. He made the estimates of his own knowledge. The original estimate was \$1,900,000 after figuring by the Reids and one and a half millions by Sir George Bury.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Prime Minister if a commission to deal with profiteering has been appointed; if so who are the Commissioners? If no Commission has been appointed why not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I shall be glad to hear from Mr. Walsh if he can recommend the men for the Commission. I have not found the suitable men. The Bill was assented to yesterday and any appointment will be valid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—At the request of the Opposition, the motions for Supply and Ways and Means are being deferred until the railway programme was first announced. For the information of the hon. member for Hr. Grace, I might say that we have been ready with practically all of the matters on the Order Paper and

just as soon as the railway programme is found to be satisfactory to the Opposition we will proceed, to-morrow I presume.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Well then the sooner the better.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—We are not going to deal with Supply until the Prime Minister tables the fullest information concerning the Railway Resolutions and other financial undertakings. Further, the Prime Minister promised to table this information.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I take it that the Prime Minister will furnish the information to-morrow and that we will have no further delay.

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 Election Act, 1913."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Chairman. As there are certain amendments to be made to at least three sections of the Act, and as I would like to have an opportunity of considering them before they are drafted, I would suggest that the Committee rise and report progress and sit again to-morrow.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection to moving that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, but I would be glad to have it understood by the honorable gentlemen opposite that the discussion of the Bill in Committee stage is to take place at the next day of the sitting.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

Second Reading of Bill "An Act respecting fishery supplies for the current season."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker. This morning I met a deputation of the Board of Trade who have asked for certain Amendments to this Bill and which amendments are now in the course of being printed. Consequently, I would ask that the Bill be given Second Reading and that discussion on it be deferred until we go into Committee.

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.

THURSDAY, July 7.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in confirmation of an agreement with the Reid Nfld. Co., for the operation of the Railway System of the Colony for the period of one year.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Scammell took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs

to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total Customs Revenue for the fiscal year which ended on Thursday last, and the two previous fiscal years.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid by members of this House supporting the Government party in respect of guarantees for the prosecution of the fishery this year, for the two individuals or firms in their districts, and what steps have been taken in each case to protect the Government in the matter of securing a return of these payments.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a statement showing all amounts in the way of

(a) Salary;

(b) Of expenses paid to John M. Devine, Trade Commissioner at New York, from the time of his appointment up to date, and also whether it is intended to continue Mr. Devine in his appointment, and if so for how long, and on what grounds. The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the railway resolutions and draft agreement annexed thereto, which I now desire to submit for the consideration of the House, constitutes one of the most important items of the session's business. The railway situation is, in fact, the most important problem which Newfoundland has to face. No agreement has been made between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company with respect to railway operations for the coming year. The railway situation is of such magnitude that I felt the proper course to follow was to submit the matter to the Legislature,

so that the Legislature itself, as the representative body of the country, might have an opportunity of freely debating the problem and authorising the Executive Administration to enter into an agreement as suggested in the draft before the House, or such other agreement as the House itself after full consideration and debate might determine to be in the best interests of the Island. The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Submitted to, Committee of the whole House for the operation of the Newfoundland Railway.

WHEREAS it is necessary to provide for the present operation of the Newfoundland Railway.

Be it Resolved:

(1) The Governor in Council is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into the agreement with the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, set out in the Schedule hereto and the said agreement when executed shall be binding upon the parties thereto.

(2) A Bill shall be introduced to give effect to these resolutions.

AGREEMENT made the Thirtieth day of June, A. D., 1921 BETWEEN His Excellency Sir Charles Alexander Harris, K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., Governor of Newfoundland and Its Dependencies, in Council, (hereinafter called "the Government") of the one part, AND Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited (hereinafter called "the Company") of the other part;

WHEREAS it is desirable to provide for the operation of the Newfoundland Railway for the ensuing twelve months;

NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH as follows:—

1. The Company shall during the term of this Agreement operate the Railway at the minimum

cost consistent with safety and giving a reasonable service with the passenger and mixed service laid down in the Schedule hereto as the minimum.

2. The Company shall secure the services of a competent person, from Canada, or the United States of America, to be General Manager in full charge of the operation of the Railway, and the appointment of such General Manager shall be subject to the approval of the Government.
3. Expenditures on capital account in connection with the Railway shall during the term of this Agreement be made only on the written sanction of the Government, and such works shall be paid for by the Government when completed, and upon the certificate of the Government Engineer. Any amounts so paid shall be charged to the Company with interest at six per cent. per annum from date of payment, and shall be set off against any claim or claims which the Company may have against the Government under Section 13 of the Newfoundland Railway (Amendment) Act, 1901.
4. The Government shall pay the actual loss of operating the Railway during the term of this Agreement, provided that should such loss exceed the sum of One and one-half million dollars such excess shall be borne by the Company. The payments by the Government as aforesaid shall be made in such manner as may be agreed upon between the parties hereto. In computing the actual loss of operating the Railway no charge for interest or depreciation shall be included.
5. The Government shall have the

right to appoint one or more auditors of the revenue and expenditure on Railway operation, and such auditor or auditors shall have access to all the books and records of the Company relating to the operation of the Railway under this Agreement, and shall have the right to make copies thereof or take extracts therefrom, and to examine any official of the Company in relation thereto.

6. The term of this Agreement shall be from the first day of July, A.D., 1921, to the Thirtieth day of June, A.D., 1922, both inclusive.
7. Except as herein expressly provided with regard to the operation of the Railway during the term aforesaid this Agreement and anything done under this Agreement shall be absolutely without prejudice to the rights and liabilities of either party hereto under existing contracts or agreements.

THE SCHEDULE WITHIN REFERRED TO.

BONAVIDA BRANCH: 88 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday.

To be: Tri-weekly (up one day, down following day).

HEART'S CONTENT BRANCH: 42 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday.

To be: Tri-weekly (up and down same day).

ST. JOHN'S TO CARBONEAR: 80 miles.

Present Time Table: Two trains daily except Sunday (up and down.)

To be: One train daily except Sundays (each way).

BAY DE VERDE BRANCH: 52 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday (up and down).

To be: Tri-weekly.

ST. JOHN'S TO TREPASSEY: 105 miles.

Last year's Time Table: Daily.

Now: Tri-weekly (up one day, down following day).

To be: No change except during severe winter months.

ST. JOHN'S TO PORT AUX BASQUES: 546 miles.

Present Time Table: Three times a week.

To be: Semi-weekly (unless passenger traffic picks up sufficiently to warrant tri-weekly trains during month of August).

PORTIONS OF RAILWAY TO BE CLOSED DURING FIRST QUARTER, 1922:

HUMBERMOUTH TO MILLERTOWN JUNCTION: 94 miles.

SHOAL HARBOR TO BONAVIDA: 88 miles.

CARBNEAR TO BAY DE VERDE AND GRATE'S COVE: 52 miles.

WATERFORD BRIDGE TO TREPASSEY: 105 miles.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF His Excellency in Council has caused the Great Seal of the Island of Newfoundland to be set hereto and has signed these presents, and the Company has caused these presents to be executed in accordance with its regulations the day and year first above written.

By His Excellency's Command,

Colonial Secretary.

PRESIDENT. The COMMON SEAL of Reid Nfld. Co. was hereunto affixed in presence of:

SECRETARY.

The draft agreement is as follows: Agreement made the thirtieth day of June, A.D., 1921 BETWEEN His Excellency Sir Charles Alexander Harris, K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., Governor of Newfoundland and its Dependen-

cles in Council (hereinafter called "the Government") of the one part, AND Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited (hereinafter called "the Company") of the other part.

WHEREAS it is desirable to provide for the operation of the Newfoundland Railway for the ensuing twelve months;

NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH as follows:—

1. The Company shall during the term of this Agreement operate the Railway at the minimum cost consistent with safety and giving a reasonable service with the passenger and mixed service laid down in the Schedule hereto as the minimum.

2. The Company shall secure the services of a competent person, from Canada, or the United States of America, to be General Manager in full charge of the operation of the Railway, and the appointment of such General Manager shall be subject to the approval of the Government.

3. Expenditures on capital account in connection with the Railway shall during the term of this Agreement be made only on the written sanction of the Government, and such works shall be paid for by the Government when completed, and upon the Certificate of the Government Engineer. Any amounts so paid shall be charged to the Company with interest at six per cent. per annum from date of payment, and shall be set off against any claim or claims which the Company may have against the Government under Section 13 of the Newfoundland Railway (Amendment) Act, 1901.

4. The Government shall pay the actual loss of operating the Railway during the term of this Agreement, provided that should such loss exceed the sum of One and One-half million dollars such excess shall be borne by the Company. The payments by the Government as aforesaid shall be

made in such manner as may be agreed upon between the parties hereto. In computing the actual loss of operating the Railway no charge for interest of depreciation shall be included.

5. The Government shall have the right to appoint one or more auditors of the revenue and expenditure on Railway operation, and such Auditor or Auditors shall have access to all the books and records of the Company relating to the operation of the Railway under this Agreement, and shall have the right to make copies thereof or take extracts therefrom, and to examine any official of the Company in relation thereto.

6. The term of this Agreement shall be from the first day of July, A.D., 1921, to the Thirtieth day of June, A.D., 1922, both inclusive.

7. Except as herein expressly provided with regard to the operation of the Railway during the term aforesaid this Agreement and anything done under this Agreement shall be absolutely without prejudice to the rights and liabilities of either party hereto under existing Contracts or Agreements.

8. No salary or fee shall be paid to any Director of the Company for services in connection with the operation of the Railroad except with the approval of the Governor-in-Council. THE SCHEDULE WITHIN REFERRED TO.

BONAVISTA BRANCH: 88 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday.

To be: Tri-weekly (up one day, down following day.)

HEART'S CONTENT BRANCH: 42 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday.

To be: Tri-weekly (up and down same day.

ST. JOHN'S TO CARBONEAR: 80 miles.

Present Time Table: Two trains daily except Sunday (up and down.)

To be: One train daily except Sunday, (each way.)

ST. JOHN'S TO PLACENTIA AND ARGENTIA: 86 miles.

Present Time Table: One train daily to Placentia, except Sunday, each way.

To be: One train daily to Placentia and Argentia, except Sunday, each way.

BAY DE VERDE BRANCH: 52 miles.

Present Time Table: Daily except Sunday (up and down).

To be: Tri-weekly.

ST. JOHN'S TO TREPASSEY: 105 miles.

Last year's Time Table: Daily.

Now: Tri-weekly (up one day, down following day.)

To be: No change except during severe winter months.

ST. JOHN'S TO PORT AUX BASQUES: 546 miles.

Present Time Table: Three times a week.

To be: Semi-weekly (unless passenger traffic picks up sufficiently to warrant tri-weekly trains during month of August).

PORTIONS OF RAILWAY TO BE CLOSED DURING FIRST QUARTER, 1922:

Deer Lake to Millertown Junction: 67 miles.

Shoal Harbour to Bonavista: 88 miles.

Carbonear to Bay de Verde and Grate's Cove: 52 miles.

Waterford Bridge to Trepassey: 105 miles.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF His Excellency the Governor-in-Council has caused the Great Seal of the Island of Newfoundland to be set hereto and has signed these presents, and the Company has caused these presents to be executed in accordance with its

regulations the day and year first above written.

By His Excellency's Command,

Colonial Secretary.

President

The Common Seal of Reid Newfoundland Company was hereunto affixed in presence of:

Secretary.

The draft agreement is based upon the report of Sir George Bury, who at my request visited Newfoundland for the purposes of studying the situation and advising in connection therewith. Sir George Bury's report is as follows:

St. John's, Nfld.,

29th June, 1921.

Dear Sir,—I have made a study of the railway situation in Newfoundland, as desired by you, and my suggestions are:

That a contract be entered into for one year, from the 30th June 1921, with the Reid Newfoundland Company to operate your railway, without prejudice to former agreements.

That the Reid Newfoundland Company be required to operate the railway with the utmost economy, consistent with safety and reasonable service.

That a capable general manager be appointed by the Reid Newfoundland Company to operate the railway and that the appointment be subject to your approval.

That a commission of three be formed with the powers of the Canadian Railway Commission, except where such powers would conflict with any agreement existing between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company. This commission to deal with all public utilities in addition to the railway.

That expenditures on capital account be made only upon the written

sanction of the Government and that these works be paid for when completed upon a certificate from the Government engineer.

The railway since 1904 to date has cost to operate, five and three-quarter million dollars more than the railway earned. Of this amount, one million six hundred and fifty thousand dollars was lost during the past year when the railway was operated by the Commission appointed by the Government and one million, three hundred and thirty-five thousand, one hundred and seven dollars and fifty-five cents the year previous.

During the year ending with this month wages of employees were increased, rolling stock shop force, maintenance men and porters on the 30th June last; engineers and firemen at the end of September and the station staff and trainmen at the end of the year.

The officers of the railway estimated that the loss on the coming year's operations will be over two millions of dollars.

The earnings are falling and the railway's traffic officers place the decrease to be expected at almost half the present receipts. I believe their estimate is too pessimistic and have made my calculations on a more hopeful outlook.

To operate the railway at the minimum cost, consistent with safety and reasonable service, certain changes in operations must follow, which have been placed before the Reid Newfoundland Company in the form of suggestions.

That the Government agree to pay the actual loss from operating the railway during the coming year but that should the loss exceed one and a half million dollars that such excess should be borne by the Reid Newfoundland Company.

The very large expenditure that was

proposed, to place heavier rails on the line, should be deferred. The rails on the Fortune Bay branch (never operated) should be taken up and used for replacing worn rails.

For a number of years to come the rails at present on your railway will answer by anchoring them either by substituting angle bars for the fish plates now in use, by rail anchors or by slotting the rails at the ends to hold the joint on the tie. I recommend that the rails be slotted, which can be done cheaply as they lay and that only sufficient angle bars for one hundred miles of track be purchased to substitute fish plates on swamps and such places where the most difficulty is experienced in preventing the rails running.

A series of light snow sheds, through and side hill, to the extent of about a mile should be constructed west of Avondale. Much delay to traffic avoided and economy will result.

So soon as money is available, a coal handling plant should be erected at Argentina. One suitable to the present and prospective tonnage to be transferred.

If you are unable to enter into a contract with the Reid Newfoundland Company, or believe it undesirable to do so, there is only operation by the Government left. In view of the unfortunate results which have come from Government operation of railways in Canada, the United States, Great Britain and elsewhere, I imagine you would prefer to go some lengths before embarking upon such an undertaking.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) GEORGE BURY.

Hon. Sir Richard A. Cquires, K.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister,

St. John's, Newfoundland.

Many of the hon. members opposite are, because of their long associations

with public life in Newfoundland intimately acquainted with the history of railway development. There are those sitting on the Opposition benches who are identified with all railroad contracts which have been entered into since the days of the late revered Sir William Vallance Whiteway, who was the father of railway development in this country. I shall not at this moment occupy the time of the House in discussing the resolutions or the draft agreement, but would point out that there are but three possibilities: (1) to close down the railway. That is not a proposition which I could recommend. The railway is an essential public utility the continuance of which must be secured. (2) The taking over of the railway and operating it during the coming year as a Government undertaking. That is not a proposal which at the present moment I could recommend. The Government has no such information before it to justify it taking any such step. Apart from the visit of Sir George Bury and the advice which he offered, the Newfoundland Government has no railway advisers, nor has it immediately at hand any capable person to put as General Manager of the railroad if it were taken over. If at this time the Government took over the operation of the railroad, they would be depending entirely upon the Reid Newfoundland Company and their management for its operation. This House well knows my opinion of the Reid Newfoundland Company as railway operators. I consider them incompetent. To take over the railroad and ask the Reid Newfoundland Company to operate it at Government expense for the coming year would, in my opinion, be an enormously expensive undertaking, demoralizing to the service and exceedingly unsatisfactory.

3. The entering into some tempor-

ary arrangement for operation during the year along the lines of the report of Sir George Bury, whose standing as an expert in railroad management is, I am sure, above dispute.

I fully appreciate the fact that this is a temporary program, but I feel that if an efficient manager is secured, some substantial progress may be made towards putting railway operations in Newfoundland upon the basis of good management and business sense. I consequently submit these resolutions, with suggested draft contract, to the House, and to each individual member of the House for careful consideration at leisure, in the hope that the hon. members opposite, out of the abundance of their past experience with railroad contracts and railway legislation, may throw some further light upon the situation and some satisfactory program may be jointly evolved. I frankly admit that the proposal which I have suggested, namely, that of accepting the report of Sir George Bury as a temporary arrangement for operation during the coming year, is to avoid the immediate closing down of railway operations on the one hand and to avoid judging blindly in the matter of railway operations by the Newfoundland Government without an opportunity of careful study of the whole situation and the assistance of an expert railroad man who would have at least some practical knowledge of railway conditions as they exist. I presume that the entire House will agree with me in my view that the closing down of the railroad is not to be thought of. As an alternative, some of my friends opposite may suggest that the railway be taken over by the Government. That may be a solution, but at the present moment, without careful examination into the whole situation, without expert advice, and without having a competent railroad manager to take

charge of the situation, the Government would find itself entirely in the hands of the Reid Newfoundland Company in the matter of operation. That would be a hopeless situation, and disastrous to the best interests of the Colony. So that the hon. members opposite may have a full opportunity of considering these resolutions and suggested draft agreement, it might be well that the debate upon this matter be set for Monday next, and that other business before the House be now proceeded with.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I think we ought to adjourn until Monday.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My suggestion was that the debate upon these resolutions be adjourned until Monday. We might now proceed with the debate on supply.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—May I ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if there is no other explanation that he has to give us on this important matter? I expected a great speech this afternoon. I was hoping that the Prime Minister would excel himself.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It is entirely in accordance with my wish that the debate upon these resolutions be set for Monday.

MR. BENNETT.—Is this the only explanation that we can expect on this matter. It is a great disappointment to this House, and I am sure it will be a disappointment to the country. In introducing resolutions it is usual to give a full explanation of the resolutions. This is a matter that is going to have a serious effect upon the financial status of the country, and the attitude that has been taken by the Prime Minister is neither right, proper nor appropriate. It is the one thing that the business of this House has been held up for. There is much information that should be forthcoming. I think, Sir, that before we go into committee on Monday the Prime

Minister should deal at length with this matter and explain it fully.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I am surprised this afternoon as are the other gentlemen of the House. I have been waiting for the time to come when we would get an explanation of this railroad policy. I came here purposely this afternoon to hear the Prime Minister tell us fully about the railroad, and he comes in here and reads the resolutions. A school boy could beat his effort this afternoon. He has acted like one ashamed to read what he has before him. May I ask the Prime Minister if this is a party matter? Are the gentlemen on the other side prepared to sit down and vote for this matter? Most of them have not even received a copy of the resolutions. There is a lot of information that should be forthcoming. Where are you going to get that 1½ million dollars from? Will you tell the House that? I can tell you now that you will never get the revenue that you have estimated, and you know that. If I were to say anything else I would be doing an injustice to your intelligence. The week before last you dropped 70,000 according to information given here in the House.

I don't know who is wrong, but either you are cracked or I am getting cracked. You are voting away millions of dollars and you don't know where you can get a cent. What is the report of the revenue boat, the Daisy, that came in here this morning? There is no fish on the West Coast except what is brought in by bankers. The people of Fortune Bay are starving, and you are here voting 1½ million dollars to be thrown away on the railroad. Why go on to the end? Surely some one will come forward and save the country. What do you care? What stake have you in this country except a few law books? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had

a stake here one time, but now he doesn't know where he is. He made a mess of the country's markets last year, and now he has made a mess of the railroad.

Are you going to sell us out? Either I am a fool or you are, I do not know the way out. I do not see how you are going to manage it. How in the name of common sense can you work on the basis of an estimate of ten million dollars when you know you are not going to get them. The trains are moving empty, there is nothing doing, and on top of that you are forcing the sales tax and sur tax on the merchants and consequently on the people. The Profiteering Act was passed but still the old game is going on. We are the discredited members of this House I take it. We were termed that, when we handed over the Government to you, but when we did there were four millions of dollars in the chest. Then in your manifesto you told the people you were going to retrench. If you had carried out your manifesto there would be a different tale for Newfoundland to-day. You were elected on that cry and we handed over the chest to you but you quickly forgot your promises to the people. You have spent twelve and one half millions plus supplemental supply and even then, after that extravagance, there is nothing left of the surplus which we handed over. You had four millions and you got six millions more, and to begin with you spent one and a half millions on the railway. Surely you are not going to ask us to vote for a proposition of this kind? No independent member of this House will if he has the interest of those who sent him here at heart. If the road is to be run the country will drop another similar amount and I say shut it down. Let us go back to the days when eight hundred schooners would bring supplies back and

forth. Why should we vote another million and a half for this purpose? Surely you have some explanation to offer. You said we would get it when we go into committee. We will not get it there. Now tell the whole story. I see you are in an awkward position. You are the one who denounced the Reids. Yet last year you voted one and a half million dollars to them. Is this consistent on your part? You cannot blame us for keeping you here. You have not passed one vote yet, you have brought down the Ways and Means. Until such time as you show us how you are going to get this money and not until then, will one vote pass this House if the Opposition can prevent it. You say you are looking after the interests of Newfoundland. You have deserted her in all quarters. I spent two hours yesterday showing the House how you had deserted her in a more important matter than this one. I mean the fish policy and not a helping hand was extended to Newfoundland. That is a lovely position to be in. What are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about that tariff? Five dollars on a barrel of herring and the price of a barrel here in Newfoundland is only four dollars. You did not move until we got at you and even up to the present you have only sent a few messages to Mr. Outerbridge and Sir Edgar Bowring. Now you say suspend the rules and close the House. You are not going to close this House until you show us how you are going to raise the money to meet our obligations. Not until then will any legislation be passed except a few minor bills of little or no importance. We had a sample of your conduct last year, when we closed the House and trusted you. You then betrayed Newfoundland. This is hard talk to a young Newfoundlander but you are an unscrupulous Newfoundlander.

You promised a lot of things and you went back on them for a mess of potage. This is a lovely position to be in and you know it. Everything you touched failed and everything you will touch will fail. You are up to your ears and now is the time to get up and give us an explanation, otherwise you go down as the incapable Prime Minister of this Colony. It is your bounden duty to get up and tell us what is your railroad policy from beginning to end and what you intend to do in the future after the report handed you by Sir George Bury. I challenged you yesterday about the American fish tariff and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as well and not one of you got up, but sat like a lot of dummies. This is hard talk but it is true. We are not going to vote for this million and a half dollars and I hope there will be men on the other side who will back us but if you try to pass it you will be written down as traitors to your country forever. Our present debt is fifty millions. Nobody on the other side seems to be alive to the issue. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries one time was a very active man but now he is inactive. As for the Minister of Justice, why great things were expected of him, and I am sorry he did not measure up to the job and the confidence placed in him. He had the chance of his life and he let it go by. He is indifferent and prepared to stay in the old rut. The Prime Minister is apparently trying to do something to get the House closed. As for this million and a half to run the railroad, when and where can you borrow it? You went outside last year and on a false statement of date 1919-1920, which showed a surplus of one and a quarter millions, borrowed money on a statement signed by the Auditor General and handed by us to you in November 1919. You borrowed on that and when challenged to

furnish the financial statement of Newfoundland you refused to do so because you used our statement. You got that six millions of dollars under false pretences. If you want four million for next year what financial statement are you going to show? Your deficit last year was three millions but that was not the statement you handed the financier when you wanted to borrow to pay the Reids. The Reids lost year after year on the running of the road and you were aware of it. You lost two millions last year and you know it cannot go on. I serve notice that it is not to go on and that these Resolutions are not going through this House until such time as you convince us that the revenue of this country will be sufficient to meet its bills at the end of the fiscal year 1922.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I expect to have the answer for tabling during the afternoon.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 11th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 11th.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a reply to question 4 of July 5th. It is the report of Dr. Rendell, Medical Officer.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, Sir, I rise on the question of Privilege, and would like to call your attention to the issue of the Daily Star of Friday last. One article refers to the outlining of the railroad resolutions by the Prime Min-

ister, and the subsequent debates thereon. This says that the resolutions were fully explained and outlined. Now that is just what was not done, and that was what the House objected to. When the members address the House on important national questions the ought to be fairly reported, and when we are slanderously referred to and incorrectly reported then we have only one remedy, and that is to come back to this House, and see that our correct stand is placed before the country.

I might say now Mr. Speaker, that I did not recommend the closing down of the railroad, and when I am reported as saying so I am deliberately and premeditatedly reported incorrectly. It is a deliberate attempt to misrepresent me before the country, and I must protest against this maliciously false article. Closing down the railroad is not my idea of the solution of the railroad problem. The railroad must be operated. It is just as necessary as the lighthouse along the coast.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I might say that I listened very attentively to the speeches of the hon. members opposite on Friday last and I know that Mr. Bennett did not commit himself to any policy. He made general comment, but did not state his personal program.

At half past three of the clock a deputation of ex-Naval Reservists, appeared at the Bar of the House, and through their spokesman, R.M.R. Doherty, presented a petition praying for the share of Prize Money, which was claimed to be due.

MR. HIGGINS.—Has the Government made any decision as to this prize money?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Prize Money has not been received. When it is it goes to the credit of what has been advanced or there

will have to be a vote of \$100,000 by this legislature. Some time ago Mr. Rogers handed us a memorandum and asked that the reply be in writing. I wrote him on July 2nd, which letter I understand was published. I stated in my reply that the matter would be laid before the House in Ways and Means so that there would be an opportunity to debate the whole thing. There was no meeting of the Executive Council since that interview at which the matter could be discussed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What does it all amount to.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am informed it will be \$100,000. It has not been received but when it is it goes to the credit of the Militia account and if the Legislature decides that an additional \$100,000 be paid, it will have to be voted by the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I must first sympathize with the Naval men, knowing they have come to the Bar of this House to demand their rights. I am so used to listening to debates in the House and the splitting of hairs that I want to talk plainly for a few minutes. I am not so familiar with the subject as Mr. Bennett but I remember being one of the Government party who met the men at a banquet in the Prince's Rink in 1917 and at that time a promise was made that they would be put on the same basis as the Canadian sailors and soldiers or the sailors and soldiers from any part of the Empire. It was pronounced on by all the Executive members of the Government at the time. Speaking this afternoon from the point of one not so familiar with the matter but from what the Acting Minister of Militia said, I think that if there is a dollar left they should be paid in full. If they have only received a certain sum and were not informed the amount they are looking for to-day was not included, when we made the pro-

mise we did so to put them all on a level. This is Prize Money pure and simple and has nothing to do with the matter. I am prepared to vote that \$100,000 for the sailors and soldiers. There is too much of this misrepresentation altogether. We are not honest enough to one another. We do not mean what we sa to one another. We conducted the war from 1914 to 1919 and during all that period did our best to carry it on to a successful issue. I think we did so. No one can find fault with the Morris or Lloyd governments in that time. We raised different loans and did everything possible to keep up our men on the other side of the water. Here is the offer you handed out, on page 24 of your Manifesto. (Quotes.)

Was that correct. I throw it back in the face of the gentlemen opposite. That was carried out by the late Government. We put the sailor and soldier on the same basis 18 months before the present Government came into power. (Quotes manifesto.)

There's your promise. I do not wish to make politics out of this but I ask you to take it up and I pledge you the support of all on this side to vote them the full amount. If it were \$200,000 or no matter how much, we should vote it. They sacrificed their health for us and it is not right to turn them down. Mr. Bennett is here and is familiar with the whole transaction and I ask him to rise and explain the matter and let us settle it once and for all.

MR. BENNETT.—In common with Sir M. P. Cashin, I sympathize with the men of the Naval Reserve who are compelled to come here to the Bar of this House to exact their rights from the Legislature of the Colony. I would like to recall for the benefit of the members of the House and particularly for the Hon. Prime Minister, that in the early days of the war there

was an invidious distinction in the pay of the two classes of fighting men. When the great struggle broke out the first call came to the Navy boys; some £00 responded, rallied around the Flag and eventually went overseas. It was not then contemplated we would have an army at all. At a meeting in the C. L. B. Armoury, convened by me the then Colonial Secretary, at the instance of His Excellency Governor Davidson, it was decided to take our part on the land as well as on the sea. The story as to what transpired is familiar to all. In the Morris government, not the National one, as the Hon. Prime Minister said, it was realized the cause was a common one on land and sea and we believed the men in the Army were only too willing to see the men on the ship receive the same pay as themselves. That feeling we had in mind—and I remember it as if it occurred this morning as Sir E. P. Morris was in London and I was acting Prime Minister—I called a meeting of the Executive Council, put the question before them and asked if they were prepared to back up that movement. Every one, I think the present Hon. Prime Minister was the Minister of Justice, agreed, and I said I would send the proposition to the Hon Prime Minister. Look up the records and see his reply endorsing everything. A Minute of Council was made and submitted to the Government. I well remember the concern it gave him. Without any breach of confidence I may say, he said to me coming out of St. Thomas's Church, "Bennett, this means Confederation as it means the outlay of a million," and I replied, "if we got to keep out of Confederation at the cost of our fighting men, then let her go; I am prepared to do so." Next day we sent down the Minute-of-Council, signed. Then the trouble was to get in touch with the men who were on the ships

in the four quarters of the globe and let them know of the arrangement. These were anxious moments particularly to the people at home who were much concerned as prices of everything were going up. The sailors were getting a quarter a day. We thought to let them know at once and we asked the Home Government to send the notice to all in the Navy telling them of the bringing up of the pay. It will be a surprise to all in the country to know that I had to wait six months for a reply. It is one of the dark things of the war and it may not be known but I say it now. Their excuse was that it would take a lot of work. I replied to get all the clerical help necessary and charge it to us. This woke them up to the fact of our determination. That was in 1917. When I went to London I went to the War Office. Up to then we had no reply. They asked for more men for the trawlers, mine sweepers, etc., and I said, "how can you expect Newfoundland to do anything more for the Navy after the way you have shamefully treated us as to putting the notice through the ships concerning the pay." It was only then the men at the top heard that we had made the request to raise the pay. There is a book issued at certain periods giving instructions to all in the Navy and the notice was published in it. Not alone did we have to do that but we had to arrange how a man could get in touch with his people if he were, say in China. We put a notice in the paper saying to send the application signed by a witness. The amounts were then growing to \$600 and \$700. The notes came back signed and the dependents got the money. Some said to keep it till they returned and it was duly guarded for them. The Canadians were then returning and we made arrangements for our men to get the same pay. The matter of

gratuity and post discharge pay came up and we gave ours the same as the others with a little better clothing allowance. When I took up the duties of Minister of Militia I had continuous interviews with the sailors and soldiers as to post discharge pay, etc. I sympathized with them as we had promised to see they would get a square deal. I remember one large delegation waited on me; I planned a conference and all was arranged. That was in 1919 and Sir M. P. Cashin was the Premier. They were given the same treatment as the others and were satisfied that the best possible was being done for them. I have said I had experience with affairs and also many heart burns. I say it right here now that there was no man more devoted to his duties than I as Minister of Militia and I defy any man that ever came to me to say that I treated him with anything but respect. As to the case of the men in 1918, the return of the Blue Puttees, the vilification I was subjected to was unbearable and improper. I will tell the story now. I was accused of shirking my duty in England. I went there as I was asked repeatedly to do so. There were some 5,000 of our men there and no one to look after them but their officers. In the War Office I found stacks of their correspondence waiting settlement and no one to attend to it but the man in charge. I was there every day and I was kept busy too. There was a movement put on foot as soon as I reached the Narrows to call me back. I would not join the Lloyd Executive because they refused to pass the Conscription Bill. I said, until I get the assurance that you will keep the Regiment up to full strength I will not go in with you. I was over there and just to give point to what I said of the Hon. Minister of Marine not going to Washington himself, I will tell you this. While

on the other side I met Lt.-Col. Bernard, one of the finest soldiers who ever stepped in shoe leather—and my friend Mr. LeGrow knows it—and he told me of the men being crowded in their camps and of his not being able to get an interview with the Adjutant General about it. I said, "I will get the interview." I went with Lt.-Col. Bernard to the proper office and I got the interview right off. I only mention this to show what a man in an official position can do.

That is why I say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have had more influence in Washington than a dozen Collishaws or Devines. When I went over to the other side on the occasion to which I have already referred. I got leave of absence for the Blue Puttees, a concession which was granted to no other troops in the British Army. When they came back here I gave my word to the Adjutant General that they would return but when, in accordance with that promise, I was making arrangements to have the men return after their leave had expired, I was vilified for sending them back in spite of the fact that if they did not want to go they need not do so. When the matter was under discussion His Excellency the Governor asked me what I thought best to do under the circumstances. I said I should like that the men could remain at home but that I thought duty came first and it was their duty to go. It was decided that they should return but in the meantime influenza broke out in the barracks and before the men could be sent back the war was over.

So far as the Naval Reservists are concerned I say that in the time of the Morris Government, the Lloyd Government and the Cashin Government they always had my full support and sympathy and whenever they came to me about anything I al-

ways did my very best to help them. What the circumstances surrounding the present situation are I do not know.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This money has been advanced to the Reservists by the Militia on the understanding that it would be refunded to that Department by the Imperial Government and the amount being in the Militia account, the accounts have been closed on that basis. This was done when Mr. Hickman was Minister of Militia and the understanding was that gratuity and prize money were to be paid into the Militia Department. If we pay the amount now, a vote will have to be taken for it.

MR. BENNETT.—That is absolutely incorrect. The arrangement was that when the Government placed the Reservists on the same basis as the soldiers the amount which the war service gratuity and post discharge pay fell short of the soldiers allowance was to be made up by our Government. When a refund of these moneys to the Government was spoken of there was no mention of prize money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My hon. friend was not in the Government at that time.

MR. BENNETT.—I was Colonial Secretary at the time, and to my recollection there was no mention made of prize money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The arrangement as made by Mr. Hickman who was then Minister of Militia.

MR. BENNETT.—If Mr. Hickman made that he did it off his own bat. There was no question of prize money so far as the Executive was concerned and there is evidently a mistake somewhere. The money these men are looking for is Imperial money and the Newfoundland Government has nothing whatever to do with it. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish again to

express my sympathy with the reservists and to congratulate them on the manner in which they have approached this matter and I hope that in dealing with it the Government will at least do justice to those who fought for us.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that these men should have to come here to the Bar of the House and demand what is, without question, their rights and it is all the more so because a little diplomacy on the part of the Government would have averted all this trouble and delay. It was decided that the Newfoundland soldiers and sailors should be treated the same as the Canadian Government treated their men who served overseas. That, Sir, has not been done, not even with regard to the returned men of the Regiment who asked to be placed on the same basis as the Canadians so far as their pensions and war service gratuity were concerned. A Select Committee was appointed to take up that matter, their report was tabled in this House but since then no further action has been taken by the Government.

Now Sir, when these men were wanted to take their place in the ranks there was nothing too flattering for us to say about them; they were lauded to the skies and all kinds of promises were made but when they came back the promises that were so lavishly made were forgotten and the little the returned men did get was only secured by continual agitation.

These men are at the Bar of the House to-day demanding their prize money which justly belongs to them. They are not asking any favor from this Government or any other Government, but they are asking for what is rightfully their own. I think we all understood long ago that Newfoundland was prepared to pay the soldier and sailor the same gratuities, the

same pensions and the same allowances when they were demobilized as Canada did. Neither this Government or any preceding Government could take the credit for giving the Reservists their prize money because this is a matter left entirely in the hands of the British Government. There was an impression abroad that the prize money had been received, but we are glad to get the assurance from the Prime Minister if, when that money, not yet been received up to this moment. Now I would like to ask the Prime Minister if, when that money, contributed by the British authorities, comes, is he prepared to hand it over to the Navy men or not? If you are, I feel quite confident, if I know the Navy men, that that assurance will satisfy them and there will be no further trouble. We are somewhat confounded with the explanation of the Prime Minister and it would appear to us that the money had been received and put to the credit of the Militia Department. It is useless to talk that way because no prize money was ever paid out of the Militia Department; the only money paid out to the Navy men was gratuity money. But if the Militia Department has to be reimbursed let us vote the required amount in the House this evening and when the money comes from the other side hand it over to the Navy men. If that does not satisfy the Navy men, let us cut \$150,000 out of the \$1,500,000 that is to be voted to the Reids. If million dollar propositions with plausible stories to them are brought up here they are put through; and if the Navy men were asking this evening for two million dollars it would be voted for them right away, but because the amount they are asking for is a paltry \$100,000 the Government quibbles about it. Now if we are in a position to devote \$1,500,000 to carry on the railway, surely we are in a

position to give that prize money when it is received.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to say a word or two in connection with this matter and along the lines of the previous speaker. As Mr. Sullivan said, it seems to me also that the deputation who waited on the Government and who called upon the House this afternoon were treated more to a discourse on who constituted the Governments within the past few years and who didn't and who wrote letters and who didn't, than anything else. I think the Prime Minister must have thought he was addressing the House of Assembly instead of a simple plain crowd of men who came here for an honest and definite answer to an honest and definite question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think I made my answer very clear. I said I would submit their position and my reply to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MR. HIGGINS.—I must say I got befogged myself after hearing the answer of the Prime Minister to the petitioners. Now the petition amounts to this. The men say that they are entitled to a certain amount of money which is called prize money and that money is admittedly an allowance that comes to them, apart altogether from what this country gives them for war services rendered; and they say to the Government that if you have any money belonging to us will you please give it to us and if you have not yet received it will you please pay it to us when you do receive it. It only means yes or no for an answer. Simply that and no more. Now the Government can take whichever horn of the dilemma they like. The men came with a direct request and all they want is a direct and definite answer. So as we may know where we are, if the House will permit you Mr. Speaker to sus-

pend the rules so that we can pass it unanimously, I will move the following Resolution:

"Resolved that in the opinion of 'this' House the Government of the 'country should pay the Royal Naval Reserve men the money due 'them by the Imperial authorities 'or otherwise."

If we get that done definitely, that will be the first step of a concrete nature towards getting the money for these men, because I take it that all honourable members on both sides of the House will vote for this Resolution and because then if we vote for it unanimously the Government will not be able to say there is any party politics in it, as all will be equally responsible for what happens. It must be remembered that these men forgot all about frills and formalities when they were fighting in the North Sea for us and there is no good reason why this House or any member of this House should treat them to frills and formalities this afternoon. It is a matter of total unconcern whether Higgins, Cashin or Bennett gets the credit for doing this thing right, because all the Navy men are worrying about and want to know is whether or not the Government will hand them over their prize money. Now let this House say yes or no and waste no more time about it. I think that the principle of saying that the Reservists have been paid as well as the soldiers is merely dodging the main issue and it is a very cheap position to take. In Canada and in the other British Dominions the Navy men had already received their prize money, and why did they not receive it in Newfoundland. Now if we are fair, in view of the statements made by the Prime Minister before the Election and in common with all the rest of the eulogistic talk that we have heard about the boys in blue

throughout the Country, it is just as well for us to recognize that we got to carry out these promises. I respectfully present this motion with the full knowledge that it requires the unanimous consent of the House. I have asked no one to second it. It simply originates from my own desk now. It is only done to give a straight and honest answer to these men and accordingly I move the Resolution, and, in doing so, appeal to hon. members opposite not to stand on technicalities.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that proposition. The men who are at the Bar of the House this afternoon represent a class of men whom we can never fittingly repay for what they have done for us and I am perfectly in accord with everything that has been said on their behalf here this afternoon. We can never hope to fittingly repay them, well then, at all events, let us do what we can for them. When they were paid their gratuities they did not know that they were signing away their prize money, and, I go further and say that I do not think that these men could have signed away their prize money, under any circumstances, because first of all the present Government did not know the amount of the prize money and do not know to-day and secondly we have the statements from the leading men of previous Governments. It was never contemplated that these men should forfeit their prize money which after the war was to come to them. Even supposing the position is sound that this prize money was signed away, I think that this country should take a big stand on the matter and say here men is your money. I am sick listening to flamboyant talk about the debt of gratitude we owe to our sailors. Now let us prove by results, and results alone count, that we are sincere in such utterances. We have had

enough of hot air talk about the magnificent services these men have given to Newfoundland. Let us do something in return for these services. Therefore, I suggest that this House concur unanimously with this Resolution so that these men can be informed before they leave the Bar of the House whether or not it is the intention of the Government to pass along to them their prize money after it is received from the British Government.

The following Resolution moved by Mr. Higgins, and seconded by Mr. Fox, was thereupon submitted:

RESOLVED—That in the opinion of this House, the Government should pay over to the members of the Royal Naval Reserve, any Prize Money received by the Government of Newfoundland, from the Imperial Authorities or otherwise.

It was moved in amendment by Hon. the Prime Minister, and seconded by Hon. the Minister of Justice.

RESOLVED: That all the words after "Resolved That", be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor.

"The Petition be referred to a Committee of five Members of the House to meet a Committee of the Royal Naval Reservists, the Chief Staff Officer President of the Great War Veterans Association, to consider the subject matter of the petition and report to the House.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has indicated already by this amendment that he has no intention of meeting this issue fairly and squarely, nor of dealing with the request of these men in the only manner in which it should be dealt with. The worst of it is, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice gets up and seconds an amendment which is no amendment at all. I want to place on record as an opinion—and surely God we want some opinion; it is hopeless to expect it from the other side—that this like

everything else that has come before the House will be treated as a party measure or a matter for a strictly party vote, but it must be remembered that this is a petition to the House of Assembly and not to the Government; it is a petition asking this House to put the necessary machinery in the hands of the Government to enable them to carry out the wishes or demands of these men if it is found by the House that such demands are just and right. If they ought not to get it then why not get up and say so. Personally, I think they should and I have too much respect for the petitioners to vote for this amendment. I am not unmindful of the fact that if this demand is acceded to, similar demands might come from the soldiers, but that is no reason why this should be turned down. The Government should not fall down on their duty because they think they see the devil in the distance. The country is where it is to-day because of this very policy of waiting and seeing. These men are here to-day because the Government refuses to take a straightforward course; they say there was no understanding that they should forfeit their prize money, and even if there was such an understanding surely no government or no country that is worth sending these men to fight for should think of asking them now to relinquish what is manifestly their right. You talk of their having signed this paper or that. Why God bless my soul, if I had a wife and two or three children in want I would sign anything to get them food. We talk about cheese pairing, and we say to the Naval Reservists "look at your contract," but what of all the other contracts that have been ignored and forgotten. This matter should not be relegated to a select committee. Taking everything you say for granted, what can a select committee do? If we think it right and proper that Canada can pay her men according to the promises made to them and that we

should fall down on our promise to those who went out from this country, let us go vote for the amendment, but if on the other hand, we find that they should get this money, then I would point out to the gentlemen on the other side that to this House of Assembly and not to the Government belongs the responsibility, and that in this matter they are not bound by party affiliations. I go further now, and I say that if this amendment be carried by a party vote as it is, you will never hear of the petition again. That is my prediction, gentlemen. I oppose the amendment on the ground that the matter ought to be dealt with by this Assembly to-night. You have no right morally or legally to withhold this money and if the paying of it means an added trouble to the already long list before you, it is but the penalty of government, but if the Prime Minister wishes to merit the respect of the whole country he will give these men what they ask. The Prime Minister evidently wants to do one of two things; he either wishes to side-track the thing altogether or he does not want to fall in line with a suggestion coming from this side of the House. I can hardly conceive of his wanting to side-track it, and I would like to point out to him that no matter what side the motion comes the thing is right and this is not a matter I see amongst those outside the Bar of politics. Indeed many of the faces to-night will perhaps never vote for me. This is not a time to talk like professors; a number of men come in here and demand their rights and amongst them are many blunt, honest Baymen and you honest Baymen on the other side, if you want to retain the respect and confidence of those who sent you here and to whom you will have to return and give an account of your stewardship, I say if you want to merit the respect of your fellow countrymen, you will act the part of men and vote against this amend-

ment. Now you F. P. U. members, friends of the underdogs and the down-trodden what are you going to do about it? We can vote \$1,500,000 for a railroad and we cannot vote \$100,000 to pay these men. Some of my friends opposite say that the soldiers should be considered. Yes, consider them all. It is only putting on the deck-load before we go into Confederation, although the Prime Minister told me he was an anti-Confederate.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, I am an Anti-Confederate.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I wonder does my friend Mr. Coaker say he is an Anti-Confederate.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, I am one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—No you are not, because the railroad means Confederation I make this statement to-night, and you know Mr. Coaker I became a prophet on the fish regulations—that just as sure as chickens come home to roost that the whole intention of this railway muddle means Confederation. Cannot you members on the Government side do the right thing for these men who did so much for us. This amendment on the part of the Government is only camouflage. It is like the ships were painted with when the war was on, and meant to deceive somebody. Now these men at the Bar of the House are waiting for an answer from us. I say the member who votes for the amendment and keeps that \$100,000 from these men was never a friend of the sailor who kept us here. But for them and their noble service we would not be here to-night. Instead Kaiser William would be here telling us our jobs. I appeal to the Prime Minister and the rest of the Government members here to-night not to turn down the request of these heroic men. Never-mind party politics. It is not a vote of want of confidence in the Government as far as the Opposition is concerned. We must also remember that the democratic age has

come round when capital and labour must work hand in hand. If capital and labour wants to get on they both must work hand in hand, otherwise the beginning of the end is come. Now if the Government is going to vote down this Resolution of Mr. Higgins to-night they will go down in history as the greatest crowd of incapables that ever sat in this House.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I well remember that the question of Prize Money and Gratuities was before the various late administrations. In the Morris Administration during which I was Colonial Secretary the position was arrived at when the members of the Naval Reserve in Newfoundland would be placed on the same basis as the soldier. I well remember the matter as in connection therewith there was a case where a brother was serving in the authorities, while another brother serving in the Newfoundland Reserve was being paid one dollar and ten per day. The man in the Royal Navy was being paid much less and then the dependents of these brothers claimed they were not getting as much from the Imperial authorities as they were from the Newfoundland Government. The Newfoundland Government had no jurisdiction over a Newfoundland serving in the Royal Navy just as it had no jurisdiction over a Newfoundland serving in a British Regiment. The Newfoundland Government decided however, that the two men should so far as humanely possible be placed in the same position, and I remember there were applications made to the Imperial authorities for accounts etc., and they replied that it would be very difficult to get accurate figures, and that they would not differentiate in any respect. The Newfoundland Government levelled up the pay. That was if I remember rightly in the autumn of 1917. That was the time when the matter was definitely decided upon. I was Colonial Secretary

with the Morris Administration. Sir Edward Morris was in England and Sir Wm. Lloyd was the Acting Premier. Mr. Bennett, Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie were members of the executive the time. It had been previously discussed, but at that time it was decided upon. The Government then changed hands, and I retired from the position of Colonial Secretary, and I severed my connection with the Lloyd Administration. Mr. Halfyard then became Colonial Secretary and Mr. Hickman became Minister of Militia. While he was Minister of Militia the whole question of War Service Gratuity and Prize Money was brought before a committee of council. Mr. Bennett was not then a member of the Council. Dr. Lloyd became Prime Minister. That was after Mr. Bennett retired from the department of Militia. I presume that 1919. The question arose as to war service gratuity paid to the Great War Veterans and the members of the Royal Naval Reserve, and it was pointed out to the government of the day that a member in the Army was receiving War Service Gratuity, and that his brother in arms in the Navy was not receiving it. Mr. Hickman brought the matter before the committee of council and he wrote a letter to the Great War Veterans saying that the Government would put the naval man on the same basis as the soldier. The Government would take the War Service Gratuity which amounted to about one hundred dollars and the Prize Money amounting to about forty dollars, and add on out of the public fund the amount that would be necessary to bring the total payment to the members of the Royal Naval Reserve to the same as was being paid the members of the Newfoundland Regiment. That was made clear at the time and this is the form which was prepared by Mr Hickman and which was submitted for signature. (reads). Thus at the time when this Gratuity was advanced at

the time the policy of the Government of that day was the same as that of the previous administration and the decision was that the members of the Royal Naval Reserve should be put on the same basis as the soldier and what ever was short in the Imperial pay would be made up by the Newfoundland Government. The total amount made up by the Newfoundland Government was \$1,775,000. In other words the Newfoundland Government provided \$1,775,000 out of the public funds so that the status of the Naval man should be the same as the soldier. The arrangement made by Mr. Hickman clear and explicit. The Government made an advance of the amount short and received the Prize Money and the War Service Gratuity when it came along for the advance the department of Militia made. The Prize money has not yet been received and the money advanced has not been refunded and the accounts are overdrawn at the present time. Prize money was not altogether as has been explained, as Mr. Fox and Higgins well know. Under the present arrangement Prize Money was not exactly connected with the capture of a prize. It is merely a lump sum for qualified service. Any one who contributed to the capture either by his presence or his actual assistance received it. The whole sum is divided up among all irrespective of the particular captures and the maximum amount paid twelve pounds ten. Now so far as the payment of the Prize Money is concerned that is the entire situation. I was handed the memo I just read, and it is signed at the time the advance was made to the particular person. When the Gratuity was paid at the department or forwarded this was submitted for signature.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker. I think the government are cute enough to see the handwriting on the wall and after having spent their thousands in campaigning during the last election con-

test, they are now hastening to get it back with good interest. It might be all very well for men like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or Dr. Barnes who when he was on this side of the House on a previous occasion did not have the opportunity of getting five thousand dollars a year, it is all very well I say for these men and the others in the Executive who are drawing fat salaries to keep silent, but it is not so with the private members of the party who when they appealed to the people promised all sorts of things and said that when elected they would get big jobs and from that time on their constituents would want for nothing. They know the story and now they should at least show their independence. It is not as has been said, a matter for the Government but for the House of Assembly and therefore you will not be responsible for giving these men the money they ask for, and which is rightly theirs. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of Mr. Higgins, and I intend to vote for it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I think that if you are honest and fair men you will withdraw that amendment to the resolution before the chair, withdraw it and in the next two minutes answer the request of the men at the Bar of the House and let them go home. We have had enough of this hair-splitting business. I ask you to vote this amount to the Naval Reservists unanimously and withdraw the amendment. We have had enough of debate on this question.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—With respect to the question before the House I move that the Committee be appointed to look into the facts, the particular facts which the men at the Bar have spoken of, principally the signing of the memo which they allege they knew nothing about. There is another point raised by my friends at the Bar and one of much greater magnitude than Prize Money, and that

is that the Naval Reservists claim they should receive the same gratuity from the Newfoundland Government as the soldiers received apart from payment by the Imperial authorities. I am not quite sure whether my friends meant it in that sense or not. That involves a greater sum than Prize Money. The arrangement as originally made was that the soldier was on the same basis as the sailor and the sailor on the same basis as the soldier. If you get the Imperial War Service Gratuity as well as the same payment by the Newfoundland Government as made to the soldier, that is all together different from what the Government understood. If the Government is compelled to give an answer to-night the answer must be "No." To avoid that and to provide an opportunity of considering the matter, I move for the appointment of this select committee to go, into the facts which the gentlemen at the Bar allege. You allege you did not comprehend the substance of the memo you all signed and that you understood you were entitled to Prize Money from the Imperial authorities over and above the amount you received from the Newfoundland Government to put you on the same basis as the soldier. I therefore move that this committee be appointed to better handle the situation. But if the answer is forced to-night then the answer is in the negative. I am not in any way ignoring their request. They say they were called upon to sign a complicated paper, and I take their word for it. I may have seen a copy of it, but I have not seen any of the original papers short of the memo, which was tabled this afternoon. And that is copy of the memo which was signed by all those receiving payment. It is a reasonable position for my friends to take when they sincerely tell us they did not understand that Prize Money was included in the scope of the memo they signed. It is the intention of the Government to refer the matter to a

Select Committee consisting of three members of the Government, and two from the Opposition, and that committee will to-morrow look into the matter and make a report to the House. That goes to the point of securing to the men at the Bar perhaps a more favourable answer than if we have to go to the vote now. Usually the House acts upon the report of such committees. It is the usual procedure that three of the committee be Government members and two from the Opposition, and it is only under rare circumstances that the report is not recognised.

MR. HIGGINS—Why not reverse the procedure now and appoint three from the Opposition, and two from the Government?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am quite satisfied.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—With regard to the signing of this memo. for payment by the Government here I had no idea as to this misunderstanding as to Prize Money. Now if you misunderstood about the conditions of the arrangement in the letter of Mr. Hickman, this ought to be investigated and find out all about it and I for one will not deprive you of your Prize Money if you misunderstood all about the signing of that paper. I will do my best to see you get fair play and the same treatment as any other person. Some time ago when I was on the other side of the House I did my best to secure your interests and merely because I pleaded from the Opposition side of the House they said it would be better to let it slide until later on but we have not lost our interest in the Naval Reservists and if you feel you signed that paper not knowing what it meant and it did not appear to you that you were giving your right to Prize Money away then I will do my best to see that you get it. So that is the reason my friends

that a select committee will deal with the matter and if it is shown that you were not clear about this paper and you were not treated fairly then your Prize Money will be all right. From my point if the facts are correct that you did not understand this paper you signed, then so far as I am concerned you will get your Prize Money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Great War Veterans appointed a committee of Great War Veterans and Royal Naval Reservists and met the Government in 1918. That committee waited upon the Government and had interviews with the then Minister of Militia, Mr. Hickman, and the matter came before the executive Government and then there were some subsequent interviews with Mr. Hickman who wrote this letter and made it clear what was meant. This was drawn up in the presence of the committee and now the position arises that a complicated memo. was signed and if there was any such memo. it is down at the Militia department. I can lay a copy of it on the table of the House.

MR. HIGGINS.—I address those at the Bar as my friends and I address them in that personal sense because the idea is that the expression of their views comes from this side of the House and upon us devolves the task of explaining to the House the difficulty of those at the Bar. The question they ask is should the Royal Naval Reservists have been asked to sign this gratuity paper and if the Prime Minister will tax his memory he will remember the identical paper. I have written hundreds of them and that is a fact away from which you cannot yet. You have heard their views this afternoon and I go further and say and even if they questioned what they signed why should we not vote for this amount? This is no time for sharp practice and we are aware

of the bonafides of these men. We on this side are not particular how the committee is constituted but the report of that committee is always adopted by the House. That is the first statement of the Prime Minister. He also said that it is the usual practice of the House to appoint three members from the Government and two from the Opposition and then followed on with a third statement in answer to my question that three may be appointed from the Opposition and two from the Government and now I say vote for the original motion now because the Opposition is going to vote for it. That is only logical and common sense. The three from this side are going to vote for this Prize Money without any hesitation. Why protract the agony. Get up and be straight, fair and manly and tell the men they will get their Prize Money. Now if you are honest you will accept the decision of the committee and act on it but I can tell you unless you hypnotise the three members to be appointed from this side the three will rule being a majority and the Prize Money will be theirs. If you like now appoint Sir Michael Cashin, Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett and Mr. Scammell and Mr. Samson and I think the whole five will say give them their Prize Money. It is very seldom I ask a favour. Just give me this favour. I brought in the motion and do not get uneasy because the leader of the House did not do so but let us get this thing settled right away and let the men go back to their homes knowing that their Prize Money will be paid them. I am going to take the liberty to tell you that the members of the Opposition are going to vote that these men get their Prize Money so that being the case and three of the five of the committee coming from this

side of the House we can hand in the report now and accept it and let us close this whole matter. We have heard enough about one flag and one fleet now let us have one common idea and let those men have their Prize Money and let you haul back that amendment and we will withdraw the motion.

MR. FOX.—I ask the Prime Minister to accede to the request.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If the decision has to be given to-night the answer is in the negative. If the select committee is appointed there will be a full enquiry and report into the matter.

MR. FOX.—You will defer the report for weeks.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It will be in very soon.

MR. FOX.—There is no necessity to have an investigation and you are not treating these men in the manner they should be. The decision ought to be now.

On the motion "that the words left out stand part of the question," there appeared in its favor: Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Dr. Jones, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Macdonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald (14).

And against it, Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Posts, Minister of Education, Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (17).

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the amendment was put, and there appeared in its favor: Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Min-

ister of Posts, Minister of Education, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (17).

And against it, Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Dr. Jones, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald (14).

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question. And it being past midnight,

TUESDAY, July 12th.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee to consider the petition of the ex-Royal Naval Reservists:

Mr. Cave, Mr. Jones, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Sullivan.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 14th.

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

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what steps, if any, are being taken by the Government with a view to securing greater facilities in the way of wireless telegraphy than at present exist in this Colony and is

it the intention of the Government to complete a contract entered last year with the Marconi Company and if not, why not.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has yet taken any steps to appoint a Municipal Commission for St. John's and if so, who have been appointed, and if not what is the cause of the delay.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if in a list of Fish Inspectors recently furnished the House, in which the name of Jas. Carroll appears, this person is really Jas. Carroll or is he Earnest Jas. Carroll, of Bonavista, an employee of the F. P. U. Trading Company, and if in the latter case was the said Earnest Jas. Carroll employed to inspect fish of the Trading Co., and if so what quantity of fish did he inspect, in what cargoes was this fish included for shipment and is it considered proper that an employee of the Trading Co. should have been inspecting fish belonging to that organization.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. D. Jas. Davies, who was sent to Canada to represent this Colony on a Fishery Conference, has yet made any report, and if so to lay a copy of the same on the Table of the House. If not, when will he report and what is the cause of the delay. Also if Mr. Davies, while in Canada took up with the Canadian authorities the question of the proposed abandonment of certain lighthouses and signal stations at present maintained by the Canadian authorities on Newfoundland coast, if not has the Department taken any steps on its own account, and if so, will he lay on the Table of the House copy of the same.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if it is correct that recently a

Surveyor was sent from St. John's to St. George's to measure a few thousand cords of pulp wood at Port'au Port while there were duly appointed surveyors of lumber on the section, one of whom is a returned soldier; if this returned soldier applied for this work, and if so why it was not given him; and under the circumstances, what value is to be placed on the Premier's statement of his intention to protect the interests of the returned men.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works if Mr. W. H. Rennie is employed in the General Hospital in any capacity, and if so what salary is he being paid, and what provision is being made for its payment.

DR. JONES asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary, if any appointment has been made to the position of Port Physician or Quarantine Physician for St. John's, and if not, who is now performing the duties of same, and at what salary and when will a permanent appointment be made.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the Operation of the Nfld. Railway.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, the predicament in which the country finds itself at the present time in regard to the Railway is certainly a deplorable one, but it is only what might have been expected from a Government which, like this one, had shown itself to be utterly incapable of dealing with any question that has come before it.

Just a year ago, on July 9th, the

Premier brought this Railway question before the House in a speech which I propose to review somewhat exhaustively. It is published with large headlines in his personal organ and its tone is best illustrated by the headline which decorated the speech and which was as follows:

"PREMIER SQUIRES, HAMMERS
"REID COMPANY UNMERCIFUL-
"LY FOR PRESENT WRETCHED
"CONDITION OF THE RAILWAY."

The next headline said:

"IN MOVING THAT THE HOUSE
"GRANT THE COMPANY A LOAN
"OF ONE MILLION DOLLARS, HE
"SHOWS THE CORPORATION IS IN
"SUCH CONDITION THAT IT CAN-
"NOT RAISE THE FUNDS NECES-
"SARY FOR RAILROAD IMPROVE-
"MENT ABROAD AND VOICES
"THE GOVERNMENT'S DISSATIS-
"FACTION WITH THE PRESENT
"MANAGEMENT OF THE COM-
"PANY."

Then another headline declared that:

"THE COMPANY COULD BE
"PUSHED TO THE WALL BUT
"THIS WOULD BRING NO BENE-
"FIT TO THE PUBLIC."

And yet another described the purposes of the money as follows:

"THIS MILLION DOLLARS IS
"TO BE SPENT ON STRENGTH-
"ENING OF THE RAILS AND ON
"THE PURCHASE OF NEW EN-
"GINES, BOX CARS, AND
"FREIGHT CARS, WITH PROVIS-
"ION ALSO MADE FOR BIGGER
"AND BETTER FREIGHT FACILI-
"TIES AT PORT AUX BASQUES
"AND AT ST. JOHN'S."

Yet another headline showed how this money was to be spent as follows:

"A COMMISSION OF SEVEN,
"MAJORITY MEMBERSHIP OF
"WHICH WOULD BE NOMINATED
"BY THE GOVERNMENT, WILL

"WATCH THE EXPENDITURE OF
 "THE MILLION DOLLARS.—GOV-
 "ERNMENT TO IMPORT CAPABLE
 "RAILWAY ENGINEER TO SUP-
 "PLANT WORK OF REPAIRS.—
 "REIDS TO REPAY THE MIL-
 "LION WHEN THE TERMS OF
 "THEIR PRESENT CONTRACT
 "HAS EXPIRED.—THE AMOUNT
 "TO BE DEDUCTED FROM THE
 "MONEY OWED THE REID COM-
 "PANY UNDER THE CONTRACT.—
 "THE REIDS MUST PAY THE
 "COUNTRY INTEREST FOR THE
 "WHOLE PERIOD DURING WHICH
 "THE MILLION IS UNPAID."

These are the headlines which introduced a speech from which I propose to take a few extracts. The Premier opened his remarks by announcing that "he was moving these Resolutions with great reluctance, not only because the Company under their contract with the Government were bound to maintain the Railway in operation, but because of its partisan record in this country and especially during the recent general and bye-elections, which clearly demonstrated that the class of men at the head of the Corporation were unworthy of any special consideration from this country." His next declaration was "that the Reid Newfoundland Company have confessed their inability efficiently to operate the road. They are not in a financial position to make the necessary improvements to carry on the operation of the road this summer and prepare for the operation of it the approaching winter. He had a memorandum which he would read, from the Reid Newfoundland Company, or rather that portion of that Company which is under the management of H. L. Reid, the Bank of Montreal, and the Royal Trust Company, who represent the majority of the shareholders of the Corporation. He would not guarantee the accuracy of it nor of any portion of it as he could

not rely on any statement emanating from the management of the Reid Company at present."

Then he proceeded to read a memorandum dated June 30th, 1920, in which the Directorate of the Reid Company explained its position, showed its losses, indicated how these losses had been met, and quoted masses of figures in relation to the matter.

After he had read this memorandum the Premier went on as follows: "He emphatically asserted that he did not agree with a great part of it. He had reason to believe that much of it was not correct and that it was questionable if the financial statements in it could be verified. It was patent that it had been prepared by the Company's solicitor and constructed to make a good case for the Company."

Then we find this gem; I would ask you, sir, and the House to read it carefully: "He said, taking up his Manifesto, most of which the Leader of the Opposition had already done him the honor to read to the House and have embodied in the Hansard, with which he (the Premier) had no complaint, he read the section which dealt with the railway and outlined the policy of his party thereant. He confirmed every observation which he had made in that Manifesto and saw nothing during the past six or eight months to change his opinion."

I will now proceed, Mr. Speaker, to read again the Premier's statement of his railway policy as embodied in his Manifesto, which I think will be of interest to this House and the country, and will afford them food for thought to an extent that the Premier did not realize when he made this utterance a year ago. It would be amusing for the country but for the seriousness of what underlies it, namely, the fact that every man, woman, and child in Newfoundland is being bled white and taxed to the bone to pay the bill for

the Premier's blundering and incapacity.

Here is a declaration by the Premier that his policy, in effect, is to make the Reids carry out their contract. That was his policy in his Manifesto and a year ago, eight months after he took office, he declared it was still his policy and still the policy of the Government. He said, to put it in a few words, that the Reids were defaulting on their obligations, that they were failing to carry out their contract as they might carry it out, and that he and his supporters proposed to force them to do so.

Now, then, we will proceed with a review of the Premier's speech. He next turned to the condition of the road during the winter of 1919-20. He said: "Last winter the road utterly collapsed. As a result of that collapse the trade and industries of the country suffered to an incalculable extent, the loss to business firms and small traders throughout the country was very heavy, but what cared the Reid Company or those upon whom the duty of operating the road rested? Throughout the whole of the winter not one of the Reids, whose duty it was to direct the affairs of the Company in the operation of the road, was in the country, and there was no capable and experienced official to assume the responsibility and see that the country and its people received in some measure the service for which they paid very handsomely. The responsible officials of the Company, the Reid brothers, were globe trotting and enjoying themselves in Southern climes, and not allowing their round of pleasure to be disturbed by even telegraphic reports of their broken down railway system in frosty Newfoundland. If they cared ought for the interests of the Corporation or desired to render this country a fair and just return for all it had given

them, one at least of the Reids would have foregone the winter's sojourn in a warm climate and remained at their post."

I propose here, Mr. Speaker, to give a little attention to this paragraph, because every line in it, almost every word in it, is an indictment of the Premier and his colleagues. Let us go back and analyse it. He says that last winter, 1919-20, the road utterly collapsed. Well, I believe the truth is that the chief cause of the collapse of the road that winter was the inability of the Reids to obtain coals from the Sydney mines, because of the shortage of this article there owing to strikes and other causes. But if the road collapsed last winter under Reid management, did it not equally collapse the past winter under Commission management, because that is really what it meant. Were there not weeks the past winter when no trains ran, and did we not have a report tabled here a few days ago by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Coaker, and the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, testifying that it cost the Colony \$153,000 for snow fighting the past winter to keep the road open, and really was it not kept open merely because Mr. Collishaw, the man who owns the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, wanted to get a few carloads of pulp wood from St. George's to Grand Falls, and the whole of this enormous amount of money was spent to enable the trains to go through to haul his logs. Then we have the charge that the previous winter not one of the Reids was in the country to direct the operation of the road, and moreover that during that winter "there was no capable and experienced official to assume the responsibility and see that the country and its people received in some measure the service for which they paid very handsomely." Well, what was the position the past winter? The rail-

road was under Commission management and the Chairman of the Commission was the Hon. Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or "that man Coaker" as I described him before only to meet rebuke at your hands, Mr. Speaker. Where was Mr. Coaker last winter? He was enjoying himself on the Continent of Europe. He left here at New Year and did not return until after this House met in April, and who was his companion during much of the time he was in Europe? Who, but Mr. H. D. Reid, the President of the Reid Company, a fellow Commissioner, and the man against whom the Premier's bitterest jibes were directed a year ago. Mr. Reid was again globe trotting the past winter, globe trotting with Mr. Coaker, and the Premier made no protest against their doing so, certainly no protest that the House or the country is aware of. But, I ask, why should not these gentlemen be globe trotting during January, February, March and April, when the Premier himself was globe trotting during August, September, October, November, and December, and only returned in time to shake hands with Mr. Coaker—if they did shake hands—before Mr. Coaker left to have his little picnic. It is certainly amusing now, in the light of this speech of the Premier's denouncing globe trotters, to think of his own record in that respect last year, when, during the months that our fish catch was being harvested and made ready for sale, he was absent from this Colony and allowing Mr. Coaker to put in force Regulations which destroyed the whole commercial machinery of the Island. Talk about the losses, talk about the collapse of trade and industry, the losses to business firms through the non-operation of the railroad by the Reids the previous winter. Bad as that was, what was it compared to the loss and destruction brought upon the same peo-

ple a few months later by the Coaker fishery policy enforced in its extremest form, with the Premier out of the country and nobody to offer a word of protest against the crazy and outrageous Regulations enforced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

So much for the globe trotters. Mr. Coaker was globe trotting, Mr. H. D. Reid was globe trotting, Mr. R. G. Reid was also globe trotting, and who was running the railway? The same people were running it as ran it the year before, with the exception of Mr. T. A. Hall, the Government Engineer, as one of the Commissioners, and all I have to say is that if Mr. Hall ran the railroad the last winter any better than it was run the winter before, then the proper thing for the country to do is to take the railroad away from the Reids and put it in charge of Mr. Hall, but if that is not the position, then in Heaven's name I ask what is the position. How was the railroad run any better last winter than the winter before, except that it was operated for a somewhat longer period, but \$150,000 of our money was taken in order to operate it, and it was operated wholly and solely to enable Mr. Collishaw to get his logs across the Topsails during the winter. I challenge truthful contradiction of this statement, and I support it with the charge that Mr. Collishaw's authority and control of the railroad and public matters here the past winter was so great that when he went across country to look after his business affairs at St. George's, the Kyle was diverted from her regular route, between St. John's and North Sydney, to take him aboard at Port aux Basques to bring him across to Sydney.

So much, then, for this brutal attack on the Reids. I say nothing as to whether it was justified or not, as to whether the Reids deserved this. I merely make the argument that the man who denounced the Reids for leav-

ing the country in winter and for failing to operate the railroad efficiently, should himself have taken some measures to see that there was efficient, capable, and economical administration of the Railway the year that he was in charge. I leave it to the House and the country to say whether the operation of the railroad the past winter was any better than it was the year before, and whether the country got any more returns for the \$1,550,000 which Mr. Hall estimates the Colony will have to pay for operating the railroad the past twelve months, than it got for the \$1,400,000 which the Reids lost on operating it the previous year. I turn now to another statement in this single paragraph in which the Premier describes the railway service as being one "for which the Reids were paid very handsomely." This sounds like a ghastly joke to-day, this statement that the Reids were paid very handsomely for operating the railroad, when we know that the Reids claim they have lost \$6,000,000 of their own money, and are in debt to the Bank of Montreal one and a quarter millions more in operating the railroad the past nineteen years, and that such business and legal wizards as the Premier and Mr. Coaker, who were going to make right all the wrongs the Reids to run the railway, have to confess did, and going to show the Reids how now that the result of their own operation of the road for the past 12 years was to sink a million and a half dollars of the country's money in it, although the whole burden of their song was that the Reids were incapable and that as soon as they, Messrs. Squires, Coaker and Co., got control of the road, they would show them a very different condition of affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we go on to the next paragraph in the Premier's speech, which is equally instructive. The Premier said "the question to consider was whether the road should continue to be operated or not." Ac-

ording to the written statement of the Reid Company which he had just read, the Company have reached the limit of their resources and almost their inability to discharge their obligations to this country. They have confessed their utter failure to make good. It is indeed a pitiable admission of failure in big undertakings. The job is evidently too big for the men directing it. It is useless for us to waste valuable time haggling with these men; the country's transportation interests and requirements are too vital just now to jeopardize in any manner, and we must ignore the cause of the collapse of the railway system and address ourselves to its remedy as far as lies within the power of the Dominion to remedy it.

I now invite you to give a little study to this paragraph. Here is another bitter brutal attack on the Reid Company, and it is supplemented by the paragraph which follows in which the Premier expresses the opinion that: "We ought to make about fifty per cent. deduction from the statement of expenses which the Reid Company has supplied us by allowing for padding and amounts which in all probability should be charged to other enterprises entirely foreign to the maintenance and operation of the Railway system."

According to this the Reid Company which claimed that the previous year it lost \$716,000 and which for the year ending on June 30th we now know it claims to have lost \$1,400,000, really only lost about half these amounts, and dishonestly and fraudulently presented statements which included a lot of money lost on other ventures. If this were true, what is the position to-day, and how does the Premier's own machinery show up as compared with the Reids. The statement of the Government Engineer and Mr. Coaker tabled here a few days ago, estimates the loss on operating the railway system

for the twelve months that ended last week, at \$1,550,000, and we must conclude that every cent of this was spent on operating the system, because the Government had their own auditor in the head office in the West End, and we may be sure that he refused to include in the statement of expenses any sums which should not have been properly placed there, and the Premier, whose own administration is responsible for this enormous loss of a million and a half dollars the past year, is the very man who told us twelve months ago that the Reids were not big enough for the job, when they lost, according to him, only about half that amount, and when he invited this House and this country to put himself and Mr. Coaker and the rest of the wonderful geniuses across the floor in charge of the railroad, so that they could show how much better than the Reids they were able to run the railway. He told us then that the intention of the Government was to take measures to remedy the condition of the railway, that it was useless for us to waste valuable time haggling with the Reids, but he was prepared to haggle with them to the extent of allowing them minority representation on a Commission to expend for certain specific purposes the million dollars that he asked this House to vote as a Loan just a year ago. His plan was that there was to be a Commission of seven as told in the headlines, and again in the speech, the Government to have four men including the Chairman, and the Reids to have only three. But it didn't work out that way. The Reids refused to have anything to do with a Commission unless they had equal representation on it, and the Commission as actually arranged for provided for three Members on each side. We were told then that it was tremendously important for the Government to have absolute control of this Commission, because in another paragraph in his speech which I will

now read, the Premier expressed the greatest contempt for the Reid administration of the railroad. Here are his words: "The Premier said the management of the Reid Company could not surely expect to be taken seriously. At present the principal men in the directorate were a geologist, a food controller, and a solicitor. Their knowledge of railway operation was such as may be acquired from text books and short courses in railway management. He had no confidence in their ability to manage a railway system, and their record has not been such as to inspire anyone with confidence in their direction of the road in future, but they were in charge and we must take them as we find them. The government, however, does not propose to entrust to their handling the amount of money asked for in these Resolutions, the Government were going to retain control of it in a manner which would make it impossible for it to be diverted from the purpose for which it is being given. He had no confidence in these men and would take the necessary precautions in the interests of the Dominion."

Let us look at this. The men who were in charge of the Railroad were, according to the Premier, incapable. He had no confidence in them and he did not believe anybody else had confidence in them. As Premier he was not prepared to trust them with good money, and accordingly he was going to take precautions to make sure that everything was rightly and properly expended. A million dollars was to be raised by loan to be applied to certain improvements in the railroad, and he was so careful of the country's interests that he was going to take extreme measures to prevent any mismanagement by the Reids.

Now, then, we will follow his speech a little further and ask what were the precautions he was going to take. Here are his own words. "This control would consist of a Commission,

Three appointed by the Government and three by the Reid Company. The Government could also appoint a Chairman. He will probably be a capable and experienced railway man from outside the Colony, who will be brought here by the Government for the direction of this work. He will be a man who will know his job and who will devote his whole time to the work. On the Board the Government will have an auditor and accountant who will have access to the books of the Reid Company. It is possible that the Government Engineer will be on the Board. It is the intention of the Government to lift the operation of this system from inefficiency to efficiency in so far as it can be done.

Now let us look at that declaration. There were to be seven men, including the Chairman, who was to be an experienced railway official from abroad. He was to be a man who knew his job and who would devote his whole time to the work. Where is he? Was any such person appointed? On the contrary we know that the man who was appointed Chairman was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Coaker, who knew about as much of running a railway as the Prime Minister knows about law, and that I am told is very little, and who instead of devoting his whole time to the work, was unable, from the day he took it until the end of June last to give more than a casual attention to it, and who was out of the Colony for the four worst months of the year in regard to the operation of the railway, namely, January, February, March, and April. That is the sort of way in which the Premier made good his promise to lift the Railway from inefficiency to efficiency and to give us economy, good service, and everything we were led to expect from this great scheme of Commission control. The Premier also told us that the Government would have on the Board an auditor and accountant. Well they had not. They have an auditor

attached to the Commission and they must take the responsibility for him. I do not know anything about him, for or against, except that a man who was willing to leave his job, whatever it was somewhere in the United States, and come down here on the chance of a twelve months employment cannot amount to very much. The Premier also talked of having an engineer appointed to study the whole railroad question, and of bringing out an English lawyer, well versed in Company law, to unravel all the tangles of the Reid contracts, but he did neither the one nor the other until a few days ago when, on the verge of the collapse of the railroad, he brought Sir George Bury here from Canada to look into the situation.

But this is not all that the Premier told us last year about his plans for creating the Commission and ensuring Government control. In a most offensive paragraph he attacked the Reid Company and those connected with it. That paragraph is as follows:

The Dominion is faced with this situation, unless he was misinformed, that the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Trust Company are really the Reid Newfoundland Company. In other words, if these institutions were to say that Jim Jones, an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum, shall be President of the Reid Newfoundland Company, Jim Jones becomes President. The Government desires to deal with the Reid Newfoundland Company not the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Trust Company. But we must now recognize that there are two sections or factions in the Reid Company. One of these is at Montreal conducting a law suit against the other, the ultimate outcome of which we cannot forecast. The other is here in Newfoundland devoting its time to politics and directing political operations through its highest officials against the Government as they did in the general el-

election last November and in the by-election in the West End, and later in Bay de Verde. Unfortunately we have to deal with a corporation or with the factions of the corporation bearing such important relations to this Dominion. Under these circumstances the Government have stipulated that of the three Commissioners which the Reid Company may appoint, one shall be a nominee of the minority shareholders which contest control of the Company with the present management."

I make no comment on the needlessly offensive character of this paragraph. Everybody knows it was dictated by the bitter personal hostility of the Premier to the President of the Reid Newfoundland Company, Mr. H. D. Reid, and by the fact that the Premier is an advocate of the former President, Sir William Reid, who is understood to have subsidized the Premier extensively in his campaign fund for the last general election, on a promise that if the Squires party got in he was to be restored to control here. I believe I can truthfully assert that the Premier, after the House closed, when the question of appointing Government members on this commission came before the Executive Council, nominated Sir William Reid as one of these Commissioners and could not get a seconder for the motion amongst the whole of his colleagues, and I think I can leave the matter at that. The point that I want to call the attention of the House to is that the Premier laid down the principle here that one of the three Reid Commissioners was to represent the minority, in other words, to be either Sir William Reid or a nominee of Sir William Reid, but here again the Reid Company refused to be brow-beaten by the Government and got their way. They appointed as their three men, Mr. H. D. Reid, Mr. R. G. Reid and Mr. John Powell, the latter a man who Sir William Reid dismissed from his position during the

last brief period that he was in control of the Railroad, a step which did much to bring about his own overthrow. Now let us see what works out from all this tangle. The Premier talked of a Commission of seven, but the Reids refused to have anything to do with a Commission of more than six, and the Reids beat him on that point. The Premier talked of insisting that one of the three Reid Commissioners should represent the minority, but the Reid majority refused to agree to this and they beat him again. The Premier talked of getting an expert railroad man for Chairman. But his colleague, Mr. Coaker, who was then all powerful in the Government, wanted the job himself and he beat the Premier out in the Executive Council and took the position for himself. The Premier wanted a clear majority for the Government. Mr. Coaker thought that he himself was as good as a majority, and he so managed things that nobody was appointed by the Government besides himself, only Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, and the result was that Mr. Coaker was absolute boss of the whole thing and Mr. Hall was merely his adviser, who prevented him from making too big a fool of himself when he attempted to deal with matters that he did not understand. This was the organization that resulted from the Government's scheme to remedy all the blunderings of the Reid Company to substitute efficiency for inefficiency, as the Premier puts it. But now I come to the most preposterous statement in the whole speech in the light of what has happened since. The Premier closed this section of his address by stating that "the Government hopes that by thus improving and making the road safe the Company may be rehabilitated financially without any loss to the country."

Think of that, Mr. Speaker. The Premier hoped a year ago, or at any rate said he hoped, that as a result of

this wonderful scheme the road was going to be made safe and satisfactory, and the Reid Company was going to be put on its feet again—all without any loss to the Colony. Instead of that we find that the Reid Company is still in the same position that it was a year ago, except that it has got a million dollars of our money to provide locomotives, freight cars, and so forth, and that so far from the Commission's scheme working to prevent the country from loss, the real truth is that the country has had to put up a million and a half dollars the past twelve months to keep the railroad going while the Reids have escaped with the contribution towards this enormous loss of \$100,000, but as against that have an offset for nearly the whole of the amount in a bill for electric light, power, and other things furnished to the Government during the time. This I think you will agree Mr. Speaker and the country as well, represents a monument of incapacity bigger and more disgraceful than any that was ever erected by an incompetent Government in the past history of the country, and this in the space of twelve short months. The country was then prosperous, had a Surplus and everything promised well. To-day it is on the verge of bankruptcy and the Government are as incapable of dealing with the question as a pack of school children. The Reids, so the Premier told us a year ago, were incapable, were a pack of know nothings. He and his party were going to teach them how to put things right and were going to do it without any cost to the Colony. To-day we see the reality, which is that Messrs. Squires, Coaker and Co. have made a worse mess of the Railroad and everything connected with it than ever the Reids did, and have spent a tremendous amount of public money without any authority from the House or the country and are to-day only in the same position they were a year ago, namely,

that the Reid Company cannot operate the road, and that it must be shut down unless the Government are prepared to tax the people of Newfoundland to an extent never before attempted, in order to get the money to run the railroad.

Just a year ago, as I have repeatedly pointed out, the Premier came in here with a Loan Bill for a million and half dollars—a million dollars for the Reid railway and \$500,000 for coal boring. I would ask the House first to attend very carefully to the Premier's description of the purposes for which this money was to be spent, because I shall have to make some very pointed comments on it a little later. He said: "Of the million dollars proposed to be devoted to the railway \$300,000 will be used for strengthening the rails by heavier fish plates, which has become necessary owing to the heavier engines recently placed on the road. The Government Engineer advises that for the safety of traffic this must be done. I am advised by the Attorney-General that under their contract the Company is not responsible for this improvement, because the requirements of the increased traffic call for engines much heavier than those specified in the original contract of the amended contract."

Here then we find a statement that the Colony has to furnish \$300,000 to put heavier fish plates on the road. It will be observed from the Premier's statement that he deliberately asserted that the Government Engineer advised that for the safety of the traffic these fish plates must be provided. Recently I tabled here some thirty questions based upon the report furnished by Messrs. Coaker and Hall as Railway Commissioners, and asked what had become of the \$300,000 earmarked specially for new fish plates. I received a reply here last week, and I will read it. It is an answer to my question number 14, and is as follows:

"It is not clear that a sum of \$300,-

£00 was earmarked specially for new fish plates. Financial conditions do not warrant the spending of this money, which would all go abroad. The track has been improved by additional ballast and ties for which the money was spent locally."

I say there never was a more dishonest or lying statement presented to this House than what is contained in that assertion. One the one hand we have the Premier stating that this \$300,000 was for the purpose of providing fish plates and giving the Government Engineer as authority for this being necessary. Now, a year after, when the money has been taken and diverted to other purposes the Government Engineer comes in for the answers to my questions, like the report itself, is the work of the government Engineer—and first denies that the money was earmarked, and second tries to plead that the track has been improved by additional ballast and ties and that these fish plates are not now necessary. Everybody within sound of my voice knows that for months and months last year this talk about new fish plates was directed at us and that the House and the country were led to believe that if new fish plates were provided, much would be done to safeguard the Railway. Now the lying statement is put forward that the fish plates were not necessary because ballasting and new ties had been done. The ballasting and putting in of new ties was part of the settled policy of the Reid Company during the days when we held office. They imported new steam shovels, put them to work, and began a systematic ballasting and improving of the main line from Port aux Basques to St. John's. The proof of that is found in the original report of Messrs. Hall and Coaker when it shows that nearly 68,000 yards of ballasting was done three years ago, 91,000 yards the next year, and 100,000 yards the past twelve months, during which the road was

under Commission control. The fact of the matter, Sir, is, and it cannot be truthfully challenged, that the policy of providing new fish plates had to be abandoned because the money was needed for the operation of the road, and it was dishonestly diverted from the purpose for which it was provided by the Legislature in order to be so applied. The same thing is true with regard to the terminals at St. John's and Port aux Basques, which were the next item in the Premier's explanation here a year ago. He said: "the sum of \$250,000 will be devoted to improvement of terminals at Port aux Basques and St. John's. At Port aux Basques it is well known that the handling of traffic and passengers for many years has been not only unsatisfactory, but a reflection on the country and a disgrace to the Railway Company. The Company never made any earnest effort to improve conditions there. They have allowed matters to go from what was bad at the beginning to a condition which is a positive disgrace now and which renders the expeditious and safe handling of traffic impossible."

That is what is said with regard to Port aux Basques and it is no doubt true to a certain extent. Work on the Port aux Basques terminal was started promptly, rumor says, because Mr. Collishaw, the man who owns the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had a lot of lumber at his mill at St. George's which he wanted to sell to the Commission, and which was used in making the improvements there. Anyway, something was done at Port aux Basques, no doubt, because work was started immediately after the Commission took office, and before it was realized how much was going to be lost on operation, and certain improvements were made there at a cost of \$50,000. But now we turn to the Premier's remarks on the St. John's terminal: "St. John's terminal is in ur-

gent need of improvement and extended facilities; the gravity of the situation there is well known to the trade and every shipper or receiver of freight by the Reid trains and steamers. The first step towards the improvement of conditions there will be the erection of a freight shed located where it will best serve the trade. Such freight accommodation will cost about \$200,000 to erect. In connection with this, the question arises whether the Company or the Government should underake the cost of the freight shed at the expiry of the contract thirty years hence. There will probably be claims for improvements when the road reverts to the Dominion. I do not know that there will be such claims, but if so then the country would owe the Company large sums. The Government, however, to facilitate trade and serve the vital interests of the Dominion, have decided to defray the cost of improving the terminals at Port aux Basques and St. John's, but these amounts will be charged to the Company and accrued interest in the final adjustment with the Dominion."

According to this it will be seen that there was urgent need for this work to be done in order to satisfy the business community, and to give a really satisfactory freight service by the Railroad, but what do I find in the answer to question 13 which I put here a few days ago. It is another lying, deceptive answer, intended only to escape from a situation discreditable to the Commissioners and the Government. It is as follows: "The work of building the terminal at St. John's was not started in 1920, because the plans were not ready, and the special men required for piling, etc., were engaged at Argentia; also the lumber was not available. The sum of \$200,000 does not appear to be earmarked in the Act for this particular work."

The Commission actually took office early in last August. This work was represented to be of a most pressing

character. No steps appear to have been taken to prepare plans for this freight shed and I make the assertion now that no plans have been prepared up to the present moment. This thing was like the new steel span for the Long Bridge. It was promised in the Estimates a year ago, but when a demand was made five or six weeks ago for the work to be started, in order to give employment, it was then discovered that no step had been taken to get out the plans for the steel structure, and it will probably be years before anything is done with it. Then the Premier's speech says the special men required for piling were engaged at Argentia, but it is idiotic, Mr. Speaker, to put such an excuse before this House. Every member of this House knows there are scores, hundreds of men to be got in St. John's capable of doing piling work; there are men connected with every mercantile premises along the water front who are doing it constantly. Again we are told that lumber was not available. This is, I think, the only true answer in the lot. Mr. Collishaw hadn't the lumber sawed or could not furnish it, and the work was not proceeded with until Mr Collishaw was good and ready to undertake to supply the material. As for the statement that the sum of \$200,000 was not earmarked for this particular work, my answer is the quotation from the Premier's speech that I have already made. The \$200,000 for this terminal was taken, like the \$300,000 for the fish plates, and put into operation of the Railroad because there was no other money available and the road would have had to shut down otherwise.

Now we go on to the question of the locomotives and rolling stock. Here is what the Premier said on this point "There will be applied to the acquisition of new rolling stock and motive power the sum of \$450,000. Everyone knows how the engines and rolling

stock of the road have depreciated. If it were not for the fact that last winter, when the Railway was tied up, the Company got a chance to effect some repairs because they had nothing else to do, the operation of the road across country having been abandoned, there would be no engines fit to take out the trains this summer, as they would be falling to pieces on the road. The Reids attribute this condition of dilapidation to excessive strain on their equipment owing to war conditions, but in reality the chief cause of the breakdown was to be found in inefficiency on the part of the management. If the road is to be put in operation this Fall and next Winter, the Colony must provide engines and rolling stock. The Government Engineer says six engines, fifty box cars, and 50 flat cars will be required. This equipment should be provided by the Company and not by the Government, but the Company are utterly unable to do so. They are in a financial condition which makes it impossible and they cannot get credit. The Dominion must therefore come to their assistance because the trade and industries of the Colony demand it, and because of this and not for the interests of the Reid Company, the Government are taking the matter up. The amount shall be chargeable to the Company with interest and will not be any loss to this Colony to be recovered when the period of the Reid contract is expired."

Now let us deal with this statement and the facts. The Government Engineer advised that six locomotives would be necessary and he indicated that they would cost about \$200,000. Figures supplied to a question put by me earlier in the session show that they actually cost \$274,000. They are no doubt a great improvement, at any rate in the sense that they give the road more motive power, but whether they are what are claimed for them is another matter. In the report of

Messrs. Coaker and Hall very large claims are made for them by the Government Engineer, who states that they were of a design suggested by him and superior to anything previously put on the road, but I am told by employees of the Reid Company that they are nothing like as satisfactory as the Government Engineer claims. However, we cannot settle that point here, and I readily admit that they are valuable, but I would point out that they have cost this Colony \$274,000, and it is glibly explained to us that the Reids will have to pay this money at the end of fifty years with accrued interest. I have seen nothing yet of a documentary kind to show that the Reids have agreed to this condition, or can be forced to admit it. I have already put a question on the paper asking for the documentary evidence, if any, but I have not been able to get any reply, and I personally do not believe this principle can be maintained in any way. Now let us consider the matter of freight cars. According to the Premier's speech the Government Engineer recommended fifty freight cars and fifty box cars, and the Premier's estimate of the cost of these as \$250,000. According to question 12 of those I put here last week, ten ballast cars have been turned out and forty-four flat cars, but not a box car at all, and the cars and material provided have already cost the Colony nearly \$250,000 without a single box car being included therein. Apparently the Commission took over a few ballast cars which the Reids had under construction and then undertook to build more flat cars, and here we see the fine Italian hand of Mr. Collishaw once more. Most of the freight, except lumber and very heavy material, like kerosene oil in casks, or in steel barrels, has to be carried in box cars to avoid getting damaged. For instance, if the Railroad Company is to haul paper for the Harmsworth

mills, all that paper must be carried in box cars. All the goods liable to be damaged by rain or snow or exposure to the weather must be carried in box cars and the principal traffic of the railroad as to flat cars is lumber, pulp wood, and such like. It is an open secret around the Reid works that the flat cars were provided for the convenience of Mr. Collishaw in hauling his lumber and pit props across the country, and that the general trade of the country was sacrificed on his behalf. Otherwise the sensible thing to have done would have been to have built half of each, and thus give the Company an available reserve stock of both kinds of car, but now all the money available for this purpose has been used up on building flat cars for Mr. Collishaw's convenience, and there is no money which can be applied to building the box cars. I think it will be agreed after this exposure that Mr. Collishaw's friendship for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a pretty costly item for this country and the people who live in it, and that sooner we can get rid of Mr. Collishaw the better for this Newfoundland of ours. From Mr. Collishaw may I divert for a moment to Mr. Pill. Mr. Pill is the gentleman who was put up at the Reid station as an auditor, and it will be news to the House and the country to find that he is drawing a salary of \$400 a month, or roughly \$5,000 a year. In reply to a question amongst those which I put last week I get this answer to question three: "Mr. Pill is a thoroughly qualified railway auditor who gained his experience with the Southern Railroad of the United States, a railway of 6,982 miles with an annual revenue of \$90,000,000. He was assistant chief clerk in the accounting department. The salary he was receiving is a purely personal matter on which it is not proposed to question him. He is being paid a sal-

ary of \$400 per month. His services will be retained until the accounts of the Commission are closed."

I know of no reason why we should not know what salary Mr. Pill was receiving and what his credentials are. When the present Government Engineer came here to succeed Mr. Burchell, Sir Robert Bond laid on the table of this House, his record, his credentials, the other offers he was considering, I think from South Africa or Australia, and the salary he was receiving on the Irish Railway with which he was connected, and the country is entitled, I submit, to know whether Mr. Pill is what he is represented to be or whether he is a man who was being crowded out, as I am informed he was, under the retrenchment scheme in effect on the American railway and saw in this offer down here a Heaven-sent opportunity to get a soft job at a fabulous salary. I notice that it is said his services will be retained until the accounts of the Commission are closed, but I make the prediction that it will be many a long day before we see the last of Mr. Pill in this country.

The above, Mr. Speaker, constitutes a record for incompetence that I think it would be hard to beat in this country. Let us look again at the Premier's statements and the reality. In large headlines it was proclaimed that he had "unmercifully hammered the Reid Company" for the wretched condition of the Railway twelve months ago, but is the railroad any better to-day than it was then. The Reid Company in the statement which they submitted to the Premier and which he read, then showed what they had done before the war, during the war, and after the war, what improvements they had made, what they had lost, and all the difficulties they had to encounter, but the Premier "unmercifully hammered them for their incompetence," boasted of their

bankruptcy, and proclaimed it to the world, and gave an exhibition of vindictiveness never approached in this House. Then he went on to tell how the Government was stepping into the breach and was going to put up a million dollars for new fish plates which haven't been got, for new engines which have been got at a very heavy price, for new flat cars which have been provided at a big figure, for new box cars which haven't been provided at all, for better freight facilities at Port aux Basques, where something has been done and for big freight sheds at St. John's where there has not been a stroke struck at all, and this is the man who denounced the Reids a year ago for their incompetence. As a matter of fact, out of the million dollars that was appropriated last year for Railway betterments, all that has been spent is \$275,000 for locomotives, say \$225,000 for flat cars and \$50,000 for Port aux Basques, or \$550,000 altogether, and the other \$450,000 has been taken and been used in helping to operate the railroad for the past twelve months, for which we will never get a cent back, that money having been thrown into the sink hole of the railway losses. Therefore, even if the Reid Company have agreed to pay back any money at the end of fifty years, all they are responsible for is \$550,000 and not a million dollars as the Premier claimed last year, and again I say this is the man who denounced the Reids twelve months ago for their inefficiency and mismanagement, and boasted of how the Government was going to improve things. But bad as this is it is not the worst. It is when you come to consider the other \$500,000 which was voted here a year ago for coal mining that you strike bottom with regard to incapacity, and utter stupidity.

I will now invite your attention, sir, to another colossal exhibition of

blundering on the part of the Government. I refer to the coal mining experiment at South Branch. After the House closed last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, filled with the idea of his own importance and all he could accomplish, conceived the brilliant idea of mining coal at South Branch, and forthwith the Government newspapers were filled with stories of all the great things that were going to happen. Any amount of coal was to be gotten, and gotten more cheaply than ever before, and all worries and annoyances in this respect were to be brought to an end very quickly, thanks to his foresight and his ability to do things in a proper way. Himself and several other members of the Government, including the Finance Minister, Mr. Shea, and other notable personages, took a special trip to the West Coast to visit this area and, it was during this trip that the other miracle was performed of the train actually going thirty miles an hour, a thing never before heard of in the history of the railroad, and no doubt due to the presence on board the train of Mr. Coaker. He started work at South Branch and continued it during the winter, and in this report there is a good deal of attention devoted to the mine. As with everything else in the report, there is gross misrepresentation where possible, and also an attempt to represent things as very much better than they really are. For instance, there is a table supplied showing that 2,590 tons of coal had been obtained and 2,000 developed, and all of this coal is estimated as being valued at ten dollars a ton. To the unthinking it would of course appear that all this coal had been got to the surface but, being struck by the suspicious looking phraseology of the report, I put a question to the Minister asking what was meant by coal that was obtained

and by coal that was developed, and discovered that coal obtained is that which is brought to the surface and coal developed is that which is left below in the form of pillars to hold up the ground and prevent a collapse. Now, the fact is that although 2,000 tons of coal is estimated to have been developed, the mine has fallen in and been flooded, work is being abandoned, and all the country has to show for an expenditure of nearly \$150,000 up to the end of June is the 2,590 tons brought to the surface. This coal and the coal that was developed are both estimated as being worth ten dollars a ton, and the country is asked to accept as an honest statement of the work done in this area the fact that it was valued for \$20,000 in the 2,000 tons of coal still in the mine and never to be brought above ground. As for the material that has been brought above ground, apparently about half of it only has been used and the other half is said to be stored at the mine awaiting future action. I asked for reports from the engineers of the trains and steamers as to the quality of the coal, but no reports have been obtained. I am informed by people competent to know, that the material is really a little, if any, better than black clay, and we can all form our own conclusions as to what this thing represents when we find, in reply to my further questions, that the work was being abandoned at the end of June, after an expenditure of \$16,000 in addition to the \$120,000 spent up to the end of March, which was the last date we had in the previous report. Here is a case where, without any substantial ground for doing it, the Government went and spent \$150,000 on coal and now has nothing whatever to show for it. A similar boast was made last fall about coal up near Howley, and the Government newspapers were full of boasts that the wonderful Mr. Hatch had dis-

covered a seven-foot seam of coal, and that all the coal that was required for Grand Falls would be obtained by this means. I need hardly say that after the report was made nothing more was heard of it. The whole thing fizzled out and this coal area, like the South Branch one, proved to be of no value whatever. To prove that the Harmsworths take no stock in all this coal talk, I can say that they have recently concluded a ten-year agreement with the Sydney coal mining companies to supply them with all their requirements at Grand Falls, Bishop Falls, Botwood, and the other points where they use it, and if I want still further evidence to show that nothing has been done or is likely to be, it is to be found in the very suggestion of Sir George Bury in his report tabled here a few days ago, where he advises the putting up of a coal handling plant at Argentia, he evidently being satisfied that our coal in the future, as in the past, will have to be obtained from Sydney and brought into this country by ships. The blundering and incompetence exhibited in regard to this coal development is equally evident in regard to the Argentia terminal. Here was another case of flagrant boasting without anything whatever to justify it. We were told that this was to be a wonderful place, that the Harmsworth people were going to do all their shipping from there, and people actually abandoned their homes in other parts of Placentia Bay, and moved to Argentia during the past few months because they were deluded by the Government's pronouncements into the belief that there would be unlimited work there all the year round. Now we find that little or nothing has been done and that the wharf that has been put up is too small for any but local vessels. Answers to my questions show that the Harmsworth people are not committed to anything in relation

to it, and yet I am not exaggerating when I say that all through last fall and winter the country was fooled and deceived into the belief that the selection of Argenta as a winter terminal was going to end all our troubles. This, then, in a word is the result of a year of railroad operation by the Government. As has already been pointed out, for every dollar which it cost the Reid Company to operate the line in 1919-20, it has cost the Government Commission \$1.23 in 1920-21, in spite of all the abuse and vilification heaped upon the Reid Company by the Premier and others for their alleged incompetence. Now, having got an expert down here, the Government brings in his report which is, in a few words, that the Government should abandon the idea of attempting further Government operation of the railroad and hand it back to the Reid Company and bear the expenses of operating the road up to a million and a half dollars for the twelve months. This is one of the triumphs of Liberal Reform. This is the fruit of the Premiers' promise that he would, as stated in his Manifesto, which I will read again. He said that unlike our party, which he charged with being friendly to the Reids, and failing to make them live up to their contracts, he would if elected take the Reids by the throat, oblige them to do all that the contract demanded, and see that the people got every fair play. Instead of that we find that last year he very graciously presented the Reids with \$1,600,000 to help them in operating the road and now proposes to give them another million and a half dollars the present year. I shall next proceed to deal with the proposals of Sir George Bury and the resolutions which the Premier has presented to the House.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with the report of Sir George Bury and with the

obligations which it imposes on the country. This gentleman came here a fortnight ago and spent exactly a week in the country. In that time he made one trip across the railroad from Port aux Basques to St. John's, and I think visited Argenta as well, and he spent three or four days here in touch with the Government and the railroad people and studying statistics of various kinds. Then he joined the Rosalind on Saturday, July the 2nd, and left here to return to Canada, leaving us a report, so called, which covers two and a half sheets of typescript and which will cost us about \$8,000 according to the information given us in this House. The first question I would like to ask is why Sir George Bury didn't go back to Canada by the railroad that he came by, and if I were like the Prime Minister and used the language he did in his Manifesto before the last election, I would say it was because the railroad was not fit to travel on and that Sir George Bury would not risk his life on it a second time. I will not go that far, but I will say that the fact of his not going back over the railway is making a very bad impression throughout the country and that this very argument is being put forward by people who are disturbed over the condition of the road as a reason why they will not travel on it themselves.

For a man of Sir George Bury's standing, I will say further this report is, in my opinion, in no way to his credit. It is the poorest thing that I have seen in my experience and it shows that he gave little or no attention to his subject. As a matter of fact every suggestion he has made, except that for slotting the rails along the line, and for light snow sheds at Avondale is taken from the report of Messrs. Coaker and Hall tabled in the House last month. Although that report is signed by Messrs. Coaker and

Hall, everybody knows it is the work of the Government Engineer because Mr. Coaker, whatever his knowledge in other respects, is not a trained railway man, and knows nothing about this subject, and therefore it is easy to figure out what happened. Sir George Bury came down here, he had very little time for the job and perhaps less inclination. He found the Government Engineer with a scheme already worked out, and he adopted that in toto, adding a suggestion or two himself, pocketed his fee and went away. If we take up Sir George Bury's report as printed in the papers of June the 5th, we will find that the suggestion for a General Manager is taken from the Coaker-Hall report page 27 of the typescript. You will also find that the proposal for a Commission of three to deal with public utilities is taken from the Coaker-Hall report page 8. You will find that the figures regarding the loss of the railroad are taken from the Coaker-Hall report page 27 and from the statements tabled here the past twenty years by the Reid Company every year. You will find that Sir George Bury's statement about losses on operation this year is taken from the Coaker-Hall report, and the suggestion for a coal handling plant at Argentinia is practically the same as that advanced by Messrs. Coaker and Hall heretofore. The proposal that the Government should refrain from further operation of the road is taken from the Coaker Hall report page 28, but whereas Messrs. Coaker and Hall advised casting the road back on the Reid Company's hands, the Bury report suggests that a contract should be made for this year by which the Reids would run the road and we find the money. This policy, of course, is the result of the negotiations that took place in the city a fortnight ago between Sir George Bury, the Govern-

ment, and the Reid Company, and although Sir George Bury assumes responsibility for it, there can be no doubt that it was a scheme which the Government accepted from the Reid Company in desperation because they feared that the Reids would throw up the road, and they would be left with it on the Colony's hands. Sir George Bury's suggestion that the rails on the Fortune Bay Branch should be taken up and used for replacing worn ones is taken from the Coaker-Hall report page 16. The proposal to reduce the services and shut up some of the branches is taken from the Coaker-Hall report page 19.

Now, Sir, I say that is not the object for which Sir George Bury was brought here at all, or certainly it is not the object for which he should have been brought here. The country never supposed that he was to be brought here and paid this large sum of money merely to suggest to us to make an agreement with the Reid Company for one twelve months and then have this whole problem thrust on us again a year from now. The country expected that he was brought here to work out some permanent solution of the railway problem, to advise us how we could make arrangements for the operation of the railroad for a term of years. The position in which we find ourselves to-day is simply that the Government, which adopted one policy last year in desperation, is adopting another policy this year, because they are more desperate than they were then, and a year from now we will find them adopting another policy, because if the country is above water it can hardly be better than waterlogged, and what the Government is going to do then no man can foresee. I repeat, sir, that this was not the idea which the country had of the bringing here of Sir George Bury. A year ago this

House was fooled with the idea that it was only to approve of a loan to provide the Reid Company with locomotives, freight cars, and other items of a permanent character, to be charged to Capital Account and to be recovered from the Reids at the end of their fifty-year term. As soon as the House was closed the Government adopted an entirely different policy, and undertook to operate the road in conjunction with the Reids and to pay all the expenses. In his speech a year ago as I have already quoted, the Premier told us he was going to get experts from the States, an expert engineer to supervise the repairs, and an English expert to go into the contract, but he drifted along for a year doing nothing. It was only when his hand was forced by us, at the last moment, that he got Sir George Bury down here, and now I have no hesitation in saying that the money that was spent on this gentleman might just as well have been thrown over the head of one of the wharves into the waters of the harbor. He has been of no benefit to us whatever. We surely didn't need to get a man down from Canada and pay him \$7,50 to tell us to make a contract with the Reids to run the railway for twelve months, we to pay the bills and the Reids to do the operating. We did not need a man to come from Canada to make the suggestions in his report because they had already been made to us by the Government Engineer. When this House opened on the 30th of March, the Speech from the Throne contained a statement regarding the railroad, which indicated that the Government was going to deal with the matter this session in a temporary fashion and work out a permanent scheme for next year. Nearly a month ago the Premier came into this House with a motion for a suspension of the Rules, and a proposal to adjourn on June

21st, his object, of course, being to get the House shut before this railway problem was tackled, so that he and his associates would have full liberty to do as they liked, without any criticism from us or from the country. I was accused by the Government papers on Friday last of demanding that the railroad be shut down. I blame the Prime Minister for this, because these statements bore on their face the lack of truth and honesty which always mark him in connection with these matters. I did not say that the railroad should be shut down. I said the railroad would have to be shut down unless the Government was able to show the House and the country where it was going to get a million and a half dollars a year to operate the railroad, and I repeat that statement to-day. This policy only means bankruptcy for the country. We can no more get a million and a half dollars a year to run this railroad indefinitely than we can fly. The country is on the rocks already. The balance of the Loan, which the Premier has available, will no more than suffice to meet the shortage in Revenue he is going to face in this twelve months, and there will be nothing whatever left to run the railway. Indeed, I very much question if it will be possible to keep the country going after the end of December, because by that time I believe every available dollar that he has or can lay hands on will have been used up, and then there will be nothing for it but Confederation or Crown Colony.

I turn to the Premier's Manifesto again and I read what he said eighteen months ago about the railway and what he intended to do. Well, now, what has he done? Instead of compelling the Reids to live up to their contract he has been the best friend the Reids ever had in this

country. He is furnishing them with unlimited Government money to operate the railway, and he is casting no obligation whatever upon them. Let us look at these very Resolutions we are asked to adopt to-day and what do they reveal? Here is how it reads: "The Governor-in-Council is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into the agreement with the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, set out in the schedule hereto, and the said agreement when executed shall be binding upon the parties thereto."

The first point I want to make is to call the attention of the House to the fact that this agreement is not being made, as past agreements were made with the Reid Newfoundland Company, with which this country entered into an contract in 1901 for the operation of the railroad, but with the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, a different corporation altogether, brought into being as the result of a bill which the Government conveniently introduced here last year and smuggled through the Legislature, amending the existing Companies Act so as to enable the Reid Company to convert itself into a limited liability corporation. It is, then, with the new Company that the Government makes the agreement, and the Prime Minister would like to have this Bill smuggled through the House in the same way, because this brings me back to the question of the election Manifesto again, and the whole country can now see that the man, who proclaimed before the election that he was going to make Reids toe the mark, is the very man who at the first opportunity afterwards enacted legislation to facilitate the Reid Company in disposing of its properties to three or four subsidiary companies, and turning itself into a limited liability corporation. Evidently the five thousand dollars in Bank of Montreal notes, which the

hon. gentleman is accused of having got from the Reid Company a few years ago is now no doubt explained. Then the agreement states further that it was made on the 30th day of June, 1921, but it is not signed, for what reason I do not know, except that I suppose both sides have refrained from signing it until it has been through Committee in this House, and amended more or less according to the feeling of the House regarding it. Then the agreement goes on to set out six or seven clauses which I propose to deal with at some little length. The first is that "the Company shall, during the term of this agreement operate the railway at the minimum cost consistent with safety, and giving a reasonable service with the passenger and mixed service laid down in the schedule hereto as the minimum." This section requires the Company to operate the railway at the minimum cost, and in the schedule it provides a minimum service, but who is to decide whether the Reid Company is operating the railroad at the minimum cost. So far as the country is concerned this agreement is not as satisfactory for it as last year's agreement, which provided for Commission operation, because we had, at any rate, on the Commission which ran the railway, one competent person, the Government Engineer, who could say whether or not our money was being judiciously expended. To-day there is nobody to check the Reid Company, and so long as they can see their way clear to keeping within the figure of a million and a half dollars for operating they can do as they like. It may be argued that the Government Engineer must certify amounts on Capital Account, but that is a different matter entirely. The Government Engineer, or the Government, or anybody else has no control over the Reid Com-

pany in the expenditure of money in connection with the operation of the railway for the next twelve months, so long as the Reids are able to keep the total expenditure within a million and a half dollars. It is true, too, that provision is made for auditors, but they have no control over any expenditure. They merely have the right of access to the books of the Company, and they cannot exercise any control or direction over the way the money is to be spent at all. The second clause provides "that the Company shall secure the services of a competent person from Canada or the United States to be General Manager in full charge of the operation of the railway and his appointment shall be subject to approval by the Government." This section merely creates another official to be paid for by the Colony, without giving him the independence of control which might be desirable under some conditions. I want to ask whether he is to be subject to the directorate of the Reid Newfoundland Company or not. I maintain that he is to be subject to it, because the Reid Company is to have the operation of the Railroad and the general control of the policy of operation, and the General Manager can only operate the Railroad subject to the orders of his principals. I say, therefore, that to bring a man in here from abroad to operate the Railroad under such conditions is to throw away our money, because Mr. John Powell, who has been acting as manager of the railroad for the Reid Company, and who has had thirty years' experience in railroad building and operating in the country, is certainly much superior to any man who can be brought in from abroad. If you were going to bring in a man like Sir George Bury, and put him in full charge of the railroad, independent of the Reid Company, and subject to no control whatever, a man who could initiate new lines of work and new policies of himself, it would be different; but this man who will be

brought in will be unable to do anything of which the Reid Company's directors do not approve, and therefore I repeat the money that will be spent for him will be absolutely wasted.

Now, the third clause in the agreement provides that "expenditures on Capital Account shall be made only on the written sanction of the Government and be paid for by the Government when completed upon the certificate of the Government Engineer, and to be charged against the Company at the end of the operating period." This section provides for expenditures on Capital Account, and under it the Reid Company can get any sort of thing done that they can persuade the Government is necessary, and that money can be found to pay for it. Under this section the Government can go down to the Bank of Montreal to-morrow, and borrow a million dollars in the way of a temporary loan and give it to the Reids to make permanent improvements to the Railway and nobody can stop it, and I will go so far as to say that I believe there are men in the Government who would be quite prepared to do this as soon as this House is closed, and they no longer fear the criticism of the Opposition and the public, just as last year they violated every pledge they made regarding the railroad and started in to operate it and spend millions of our money without any authority whatever. According to the Coaker-Hall report there are a lot of improvements of a permanent character necessary to the railroad, and in the interests of improving what is public property, it might be desirable to effect some of them, but this is a bad year, there is little or no money, the traffic is going to be down, according to Messrs. Coaker and Hall to only half what it was last year, and I say it is no time to spend a dollar more than is absolutely necessary. Therefore I object to this section because I think no capital expenditure at all ought to be under-

taken. Members of the Government claim that the railroad is in better condition than it has been for years. If that is so it will serve our needs for the coming Fall and Winter. If the trains can run over it as they have been running lately, why should we need to spend money to put angle bars on the rails or to make the other alterations that Sir George Bury suggests. They can be done a year or two from now when more money is available. Why, again, should we build snow sheds near the Avondale section, when it is proposed to shut down so much of the road next winter, and when we shall be running only two trains or possibly one train a week after the snow comes. Why, again, should we spend a lot of money, as I am told it is proposed to do, to widen some rock cuts because the snow blocks them up. Surely if that could be avoided in past years when the Reids had plenty of money, why should the country be asked to make such expenditures this year, the worst year in the history of the Colony.

Section No. 4 of the schedule provides that "the Government shall pay the actual loss of operating the railway during the year up to a million and a half dollars, any excess of that to be borne by the Company." The first argument I have to make with regard to this is that, as I stated before, there is no control imposed on the Reid Co. and they can do anything they like in regard to the railway, spend any money they like, in any way they like, so long as they do not exceed a million and a half dollars. The Government cannot interfere with them in any way the Government has no veto power, has no check on them, and they can come in every month and ask for \$100,000 or \$125,000, whatever they may need, and the Government is powerless to refuse it to them. If the Government did that the Reids would say the Government had broken this contract, would throw it up and leave the

country in the position they did on the 30th of June, when they said they would not operate the road any longer and the Government took them at their word and made this agreement. Under the commission control which we had last year, it was possible for the country to get some protection because the Government members of the Commission would have a say in the expenditures, but now nobody can interfere with the Reids in any way. An other objection I see in regard to this section is that it provides that the payments by the Government shall be made in such manner as may be agreed upon between the parties. This seems to me to open the way for any amount of disputes and troubles in the future. It leaves the Government absolutely at the mercy of the Reids, because the Government cannot dare refuse them the money when they ask for it, because in that case they could and probably would shut down the service and leave us helpless.

The next section (No. 5) provides that the Government shall have the right to appoint auditors who shall have access to the books, and shall have the right to make copies or extracts and to examine any officials of the Company. This is the merest padding, and can have no effect, and can accomplish nothing. Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall brought down a man named Pill from the United States a few months ago, and put him in the Reid office at a salary of \$400 a month, and what benefit has the country gained by it? I do not dispute that it is desirable to have an auditor, when we are paying the bills, but I say that a man, or men, suitable for the purpose could have easily been got in this country. Of course we have been stuffed with the idea that Mr. Pill is the eighth wonder of the world, a man designed by nature for this job, but my answer to that is that if Mr. Pill was any good he would not be giving

up his job with the Southern Railway Company of America to come down here on the chance of what he could pick up, and I think that the common sense of that will appeal to everybody.

The sixth section, providing that the term of the agreement shall be from the first of this month (July) to the 30th of June next, merely fixes the time of the agreement and in my opinion makes the worthlessness of this agreement apparent to everybody, because it proves that a year from now we shall have to face the same sort of trouble, and consider making another agreement with the Reids or somebody else for another twelve months, if the country is solvent at that time, which I do not believe for a moment. The next section (No. 7) provides that, except as expressly provided in this agreement, anything done under it shall be without prejudice to the rights and liabilities of either party. That means that the legal position of the Reids and the Government is supposed not to be altered by this contract, but I maintain that we cannot keep on from year to year making these agreements without decidedly altering the relation between the Colony and the Reids. For instance, any number of matters may arise under this contract about which disputes may take place and new legal complications be brought about. The Reids, if they were so disposed, can make endless trouble for the Government, or any other contractors, in the position of the Reids, could do so. For instance, the Reids may want to have certain things done, which they say shall be paid for out of Capital Account, and the Government may say that it is part of the operating expenses, and who is to decide that? Another and more serious difficulty, in my opinion, is that by making the agreement of

last year, and of this year, and giving all this money to the Reids to operate the railroad, we have made it impossible for us to go into Court in future or go before an Arbitration Tribunal in future, and claim that the Reids have been wasteful or inefficient in their operation of the railroad in the past. When they found the Reids had spent \$1,400,000 in operation the previous year, our Government created this Commission scheme with the idea of proving that Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall, and somebody else whom they never got, could operate the railway more cheaply, and if they had done so we would have had a strong case for arguing that the Reids had been extravagant, and in any legal or arbitration proceedings this would have weighed with the Judges or arbitrators, but instead of that we tried to operate the road ourselves and the country found to its utter disgust that Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall could not run it as cheaply as the Reid Company, but actually spent a quarter of a million dollars more than the Reids did. Therefore we cannot put up the argument we might otherwise have put up, that Reid's extravagance was to blame for the whole of this trouble, for the mess the railway had been got into and now we are that much worse off, because we have proved, ourselves, by our own agents, Messrs. Coaker and Hall, that the Reids were not extravagant, or incompetent, or indifferent, and that all the vilification and abuse of the Reids and their management in which the Premier indulged last year had no justification whatever.

Another point that arises out of this question of Capital Account and operation account is the proposal of Sir George Bury for a coal discharging plant at Argentinia. I have taken the trouble to find out what such a plant would cost, and I find, that to put up

a plant to discharge a hundred tons an hour, or say 2,000 tons in 24 hours, which is the least that would be necessary if big steamers were to be handled, would mean an outlay of about \$150,000, and I ask this House and the country, will any sane man suggest that we should go into such an expenditure as that at Argentia, without any evidence being given us as to why this plant should be built, and what advantage it would be to discharge coal at Argentia. For the eastern section of the railroad, for the coastal boats and Bay steamers, and for the Reid ships that would have to come here at times when other places would be blocked, there is admittedly no place as good as St. John's for a coal discharging plant. Clarendville and Lewisporte can serve the other sections of the railroad on this side of the Topsails much more conveniently than Argentia can, and the West Coast, of course, is served from Port aux Basques and Bay of Islands. To my mind it would be madness to put up a coal discharging plant at Argentia, because the only steamers that would be served by it would be the Placentia Bay boat, the South Coast boat (the Giencoe), and possibly the Kyle in the winter months, if she called there, but most times in winter the Kyle brings a large stock of coal in her hold to avoid being caught short when running through ice. To my mind, therefore, this proposal for a plant at Argentia is only another way of wasting money, but if the Reids demand it, and have Sir George Bury's endorsement, how can the country very well avoid putting it up. Then we turn to the schedule which provides for a much reduced train service on the main line and the branches. I can understand that with the expected reduction of business for the Reid Company and the railroad, the reduced services may be quite suffi-

cient, but I want to know why we should have to consider the idea of paying a million and a half dollars during this year for a service that will be only half what it was last year, seeing that the operation of the entire railroad last year cost only \$1,650,000 on the existing schedule of services. The price of coal has gone down, a cut is being made in wages, the costs of operation ought to be reduced in consequence, and it seems to me that there is no justification whatever for providing for anything like a million and a half dollars for railway purposes this year.

Take it every way you will, Mr. Chairman, this railroad proposal is a ruinous one for the country. It is one that in no manner or fashion can be carried out, because the country will be rendered bankrupt by it. With an increased expenditure on the one side, a reduced Revenue on the other side, a million and a half dollars for the railway, for which no provision is being made, the building of roads through the country, just decided upon by the Government, and all the extravagances into which the Government is plunging, I have no hesitation in saying that every dollar available from the Loan raised recently will be used up by the 31st of December, and that the country will be bankrupt and unable to meet its interest on the first of January. I invite the Premier to say how and where he expects to get a million and a half dollars to run the railway next year. There is no provision made for it in the Budget nor in the Estimates. According to his Estimates, he figures to about square his accounts at the end of next June, if he gets all the Revenue he calculates to get, but I don't believe anybody is foolish enough to suppose he can get anything like the Revenue he is looking for, but in his calculations of Revenue he made no

provision for this railroad operation at all. In fact he told us that the country was going to wash its hands of the Reids, and force the Reid Company into a receivership if the Reids did not operate the road themselves. Mr. Coaker, in his railroad report from which I have been quoting, took the same stand. On page 28 they say: "The coming year is likely to be a more trying one than that through which we have passed, and it is thought that the traffic receipts will be a half of what they have been this year. Consequently great retrenchments in expenditure, involving reduction of forces, pay, train service, and avoidance of new construction must be made. The onus of any losses arising must fall directly upon the parties most interested, namely, the Railway contractors. Only in this way will they be careful of expenditure."

Here you find the only two men connected with the Government who are in a position to speak with authority in regard to the railway. Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall, advising that the railroad should be thrown back on the contractors' hands and that the onus of the expenditure should be put on the contractors, because otherwise they would not be careful of expenditure, but would spend money as they liked. That is sound advice at any time and under any circumstances. Unless a man has to pay for things out of his own pocket, he will exercise no economy, but in the face of that recommendation made on the 15th of June, or less than a month ago, the Government has now come in with a measure to allow the Reids to operate the railroad and the Colony to bear the whole burden, and Mr. Coaker, the man who signed his name to this recommendation to throw the burden on the Reids, will, I have no doubt, get up here and vote for the

very contrary policy to-day because it suits him to do so.

The proper policy to pursue in regard to the expenditure on the railway under a scheme like that submitted to us, would be for the Government to make an arrangement with the Reid Company by which each party would contribute a certain proportion of the total loss. If the Reids had the money, it should be on the basis of half and half, or if their financial position did not admit of this, we might pay two-thirds and they one-third, or we three-fourths and they one-fourth, but certainly they should be obliged to put up a proportion of the cost. Only by this means can the Colony be satisfied that proper economy is being practised in the operation of the road and that the Reids are taking every justifiable means to keep down expenditure. As it is now, though it is a matter of indifference to the Reids what they spend, or how they spend it, so long as they keep within a million and a half dollars. According to answers supplied to me on Tuesday last in response to certain questions which I put last Saturday, the Reids are apparently prepared to finance a certain overdraft. Here's what the Premier says in the answer supplied to me: "The Reid Company are liable to pay losses, which they estimate at between \$400,000 and \$500,000 over and above the million and a half maximum guarantee by the Government." This statement is supplemented by another which is as follows: "The Reid Company assure the Government that they will be in a position, through their bankers, to handle any deficit over a million and a half dollars." Now I maintain that if the Reids estimate they will have to find half a million dollars, and assure the Government that they will be able to get this money through their bankers, then I claim

that they should be obliged to pay a third or a fourth of the loss on operating the railroad from the first of this month. If they were having to spend some of their own money they would be cautious, but under this plan of the Governments' they will escape having to put up a single dollar until the country has spent a million and a half. This is not a sensible arrangement; no business man would make it in his private affairs. Not a man on the other side of the House would, if a proposition like this was put up to him to-morrow, say to the other party to the agreement, you go ahead and carry on the work and I will find all the money. Instead of that he would say: "You put up as much as you are able to afford, and I will find the balance, and by this means I will have some guarantee that you are carrying on the work as economically as possible."

Now, Sir, I propose to end on practically the same note as I begun. A year ago the Premier's declaration was that the scheme which he was then putting before the House would ensure that the operation of the road would cost the country nothing. Instead of that we find that it cost the country a million and a half dollars. He told us then that between the close of that session and the opening of this one the Government would take up the railway problem and be prepared with a proposition this year for dealing with the question in a thorough and satisfactory fashion. When the House opened nearly four months ago, nothing had been done, and while the Speech from the Throne could contain lengthy paragraphs about the Labrador Boundary and the Imperial Conference, all the space that could be devoted to this vital question of the future of the railway was a bald paragraph that "the subject of inland and coastal transportation will come be-

fore you." All through the session efforts to gather any information as to a sane policy were fruitless, and an attempt was actually made to get the House closed, without submitting this question to us at all. It was only when we refused to be parties to such a scheme, and declined to pass any money votes until a railway policy was brought down, that any real attempt was made to devise anything, and the result is the monstrosity we have now before us, a scheme whereby the Reids are to run the railway, and we are to find the money to enable them to do so, without any supervision, direction, control, or authority whatever.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman. As Sir Michael Cashin, the leader of the Opposition, has been unavoidably called away for a short while, I intend to make a few remarks on the Resolutions now before the Chair. I fully realize Sir, that anything I may say will not have probably the slightest effect on the Government or in any way cause them to amend the Resolutions which are now before this Committee. Undoubtedly this Government takes the stand that they were elected to this House by a majority of the people of Newfoundland, and I presume they take it they have a mandate from the electorate to impose those resolutions on a confiding people, and I am safe in leaving the present Government to the verdict of the people who sent them here in the event of their putting through these iniquitous Resolutions, as they now stand. While, Sir, I do not anticipate that anything I may say will alter these resolutions, still I would be recreant in my duty to the people who sent me here, if I stood by and gave silent consent to imposing a further burden on the people of Newfoundland of a million and a half dollars. One of the greatest statesmen of the age gives the meaning of the word parliament as "speaking one's mind

your constituents money, before you vote away \$30.00 from every family throughout the length and breadth of Newfoundland. Now Sir, I might say that I was very much disappointed in the report that was brought in here by Sir George Bury in connection with our whole railway policy. There was certainly nothing in it, Mr. Chairman, which many men in this country could not have told the Government. There was nothing in it, that had not already been told in this House, nothing; and there was certainly nothing in it to warrant the outlay of \$7,500 which we paid Sir George Bury for his three days visit to this country. Besides, that, I understand there was another small sum, four or five hundred dollars for expenses. I do not think, that money was well spent. As you know without fear or favour." Well I am here this evening and am prepared to call a spade a spade. I am prepared in so far as lies in my power to show the Government wherein I think they are wrong, wherein I think it would be a gross injustice for this House to vote a million and a half dollars to meet a deficit on the operating account of the Reid Newfoundland Company from July 1st 1921 to June 30th 1922. I am not speaking here to embarrass the Government in any way, because I am quite positive there are men on that side of the House who are just as anxious to get the best possible terms as I am, and I am sure they will realize that the expression of opinion I am making here to-night, and the criticisms, that I may make, will be made with the best intentions, and as far as in my power I am prepared to use what ability I have to help out and assist the Government in carrying out some policy to operate the Railway in this country. I am not up here criticizing those resolutions because I am unfriendly to the Reids or the Reid interests. I have always found them most obliging in anything I had to do with them, but, Sir, we owe our allegiance

to our country this evening, and not to a Company, and whether the Reids do or do not take my remarks as friendly or otherwise is immaterial. But, after the information we have dragged from the government in connection with the operation of the railway for the past twelve months and the further information that it is absolutely necessary to have tabled in this House before a proper discussion of these Resolutions can be undertaken, I say, even after reading and diagnosing the figures which we have received. I am quite convinced that it is absolutely unnecessary for this House to vote the million and a half dollars asked for under those resolutions, and Mr. Chairman, before I have finished my remarks, and I would like the men opposite, particularly the laymen of the party to follow my remarks. If the analysis which I have made does not coincide with their analysis, then I would like them to ask me any question which strikes them and see after I have discussed the matter with them if they will not agree with me. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman to try and browbeat or bully any man in this House, on one side or the other, to vote for or against those Resolutions; but, Sir, I want every man to realize that a very large number of people of the different Districts sent those men here to safeguard the Treasury of this country and to see that they got proper returns for the money that is going to be expended. I want every member of this House, on both sides, to bear in mind the fact that after we have debated this question to the best of our ability, to realize that if the Government votes to give this \$1,500,000 to the Reid Newfoundland Company, they are placing a further burden of \$30.00 on every family throughout the length and breadth of Newfoundland, placing a heavy burden upon them, that will take some explaining. Look what that means. Look what that \$30.00 will come to in thirty

years from now. Figure it out with interest and compound interest, and then I would ask you in all sincerity to pause and think well. Unless this is absolutely a party measure, I ask you men to pause before you decide to vote away a million and a half dollars of there have been men in this country who profess to know the whole thing about the railway business, what should be done and what should not be done at the last session of this House things were absolutely necessary to be done at the last session of this House. One of the things that had to be done right off, we were assured was the re-ralling of the railway, and from this same seat in this House at last session I made a statement that this was absolutely unnecessary, and I am glad to be able to say that Sir George Bury, the man was paid \$7,500 to tell you this, corroborated this statement which I made. My friend over there the Minister of Justice told me, not in this House, he told me I did not know anything about Railway work. Well, I did a little Railway work with the Reid New Zealand Company, and he said it was a fake. My decision about re-ralling, I am glad to be able to state that Sir George Bury told me as he also told you, that the re-ralling of the Railway at the present time is not necessary. So much for Sir George Bury's report.

There are a lot of reports, to be dealt with in this discussion here. We will take, the Resolutions which were introduced by the Prime Minister. These I regret to say, do not throw much further light on the subject. We have been led to expect that some policy would be outlined and we had been led to expect some explanation of how that policy was going to be carried out, and furthermore we had reason to suppose that we would be given some explanation why the financial assistance to the enormous amount required was to be given. We expected, Sir, that some estimate, some plausible

reason, some plausible excuse would be given as to why the Treasury of this country should be asked to hand out a further sum of a million and a half dollars to meet the deficit in the operating expenses of a Railway Company that had already contracted for the next thirty years to operate our Railway system. But, we waited in vain, and after the Prime Minister had introduced and tabled his Resolutions, we were as much in the dark as before they had been brought in. During the few remarks which he made, some questions were asked of him informally across this House, for certain information, and I will be honest enough to admit that the Prime Minister was only too pleased to get this information, but sir, he introduced those Resolutions and he should have been prepared. This is no small measure, this vote of a million and a half dollars, nothing two-penny-half-penny about it. The Prime Minister would have saved considerable time if he had come in here fortified with all the information that was essential for the favorable reception of those Resolutions by the members of the Opposition. It is all very well, Mr. Chairman, for the members on the Government side of the House. They are aware of all that is going on, they have their party meetings and the Prime Minister, no doubt, takes them into his confidence and gives them all the statistics that are required to give them the necessary assurance that the measure he is introducing is the only measure that can be introduced, and that it is in the best interests of the Country that those Resolutions should be carried by the Government. But I am sure you will realize that we men on this side of the House, who have not had the same opportunity of knowing the real facts in connection with the railway must insist on getting all the information we can before we decide to give our support to a measure of this kind. Now, Sir, what are the statements the Prime

Minister should have brought into this House when he tabled these Resolutions. Well, in the first place, he told us he wanted a million and a half dollars to meet the losses on the Railway in 1921-1922. I, for one, am not prepared to accept this as a gospel fact. I contend, Sir, and I think rightly, that the Prime Minister should have told us why there is going to be that deficit. The Prime Minister should have told us what the estimated revenue would be under the new schedule for operating the Road from July 1, 1921 to June 30, 1922. He should have told us or he should have had somebody work out for him, what the estimated earning power of that road would be for 1922. When the Resolutions were introduced in an informal way at the last sitting of this House, I asked the Prime Minister if he had any idea of what the estimated revenue and the estimated expenditure would be for the year 1921-22. He told me he had not the figures with him, but he had them in his possession. Well, Sir, I think it high time these figures were tabled here, because before we can give the necessary amount of time to intelligently discuss and debate this matter, we should have every possible figure that is available, we should know everything the Government knows, and by doing that the Government would be shortening the debate and not prolonging it as they are likely to do. The Prime Minister in introducing those Resolutions, should have gone a little more into detail. He should have explained things much better than he did, and I say again that the explanation of those Resolutions which he did give was a disappointment. He should have informed this House if any part of the \$1,500,000 is to be used in connection with any deficit which may be made in the operating of their steamers run in connection with the Railway System. He has told us practically nothing but simply asked us to vote carte blanche \$1,500,000 to meet the

deficit which he has been told is likely to occur. Now, I have no doubt, I am quite positive there are many on that side of the House who are just as antagonistic as I am to handing out a million and a half dollars to meet a deficit on the operation of the road. Yes, from the Prime Minister down, there are men on that side of the House who do not want to vote this money provided they can see a better way out. When introducing those Resolutions the Prime Minister intimated that they need not necessarily go thru' as they were, so Sir, it is up to us to see what we can do. Men on that side of the House have asked us have we any Resolutions, do we see any way out. Well there is a way out, and I think Sir, before we vote this sum of a million and a half dollars, we should analyze them carefully, use our brains, use our common sense, use what little ability we have—and I suppose we have a little—to solve this problem; and then, Sir, and then only if there is no other way out after doing that, let us safeguard that million and a half dollars, safeguard it, tie it up so that not one cent of the money can be used or spent in any way except on actual operation of our Road.

The first question, Sir, that I am sure strikes the members of this House, is, have we had sufficient information to lead us to suppose that there is going to be a deficit of a million and a half dollars. It seems an immense sum of money. Let us think for a moment. What happened last year under Government control, Government control is the worst thing that could happen—so it is said—lavish expenditure all round. Now what did we find under Government control last year? Last year when all prices were at their zenith, when coal was worth its weight in gold, when labour was at top notch, when all the materials used in connection with the operation of the road were at top notch price, what did we find?

A deficit of \$1,600,000. That deficit can be explained considerably, and that is the reason, Sir, why I for one am not going to vote a million and a half dollars to meet an anticipated deficit next year, unless the Reid Nfld. Company are prepared to share their proportion of that loss. We must bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that last year we ran a tri-weekly service. We must bear in mind again, that the price of everything was at its height including labour. We must remember that last year we ran a tri-weekly service across Newfoundland; we must bear in mind that we ran four trains daily from St. John's to Carbonear. We must bear in mind that we ran daily trains on the other branch lines, and then, Sir, we must take this fact into consideration, that this year those resolutions only call for a semi-weekly service across country, unless the passenger and freight service demand it. We must realise that the branch lines, instead of a daily service, are giving us a tri-weekly service. We must also bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as the snow comes the branch lines will be shut down. We must bear in mind that the line from Humbermouth to Millertown Junction across the Topsails will be closed down. We must recognize the fact, that the cost of everything is dropping. I must ask you, Sir, if it is not right that the members on both sides of the House should realize the fact that there is bound to be a reduction of at least twenty-five per cent. on the cost of operating next year. I am sure that the men on the other side of the House, after weighing those facts carefully, and if they are as much interested in Newfoundland as I am, will not feel justified in voting a million and a half dollars this year when the deficit last year as I stated, was only \$1,600,000. There is bound to be, and there will be, a big decrease in the cost of operating on the cur-

tailment of trains alone. Now, if the contractors at the present time cannot see their way clear to operate this road, and they have no other solution to offer, the best thing for them to do is to tell the Government to take the railway, and they will pay you their forfeit of \$250,000, and let the matter be decided one way or the other for the future. What's the use of putting off the evil day. It was a mistake, last year, a grave mistake, over the Railway Commission to take over that railway, it was something that was not authorized by this House. Look at the result. We were asked in this House last year to vote a million dollars for a specific purpose. There was no mention of a Commission, there was no mention of taking over the railway, we voted that million dollars for railway purposes and notwithstanding the remarks that have been made from the other side of the House that the money was not earmarked for specific purposes in the Bill, but I remember distinctly, when the resolutions were brought down, and when we were told just how that money was going to be spent, we were told that there would be \$50,000 for a terminal at Port aux Basques. I think that has been done. We were told that there would be \$300,000 for fish plates; that has not been done, and I am very glad. We were told that \$150,000 would be spent on terminal improvements in St. John's West, that has not been done. If it had been done it would have given employment when it was badly needed. We were also told that a certain amount would be for box cars and flat cars. Some money has been spent upon this, and Sir Michael Cashin, Leader of the Opposition, in his remarks here this evening gave a very good explanation of the way this money has been spent. That money, Sir, has not been spent to the satisfaction of the Government themselves. As to the expenditure made,

by the Commission in relation to box cars and flat cars being satisfactory I am not in a position to say, but if the statements which were made here this evening by the Leader of the Opposition are correct, then, Sir, the Railway Commission has no reason to be proud of the way that matter has been handled.

Now, I am not yet convinced, and I have very good reason to feel that the members on both sides of the House are not convinced, and are not satisfied that the resolutions as they now stand are the proper solution of this railway problem. If the Reid Nfld. Company is not in a position financially to carry out their contract, what are they prepared to give us for financial assistance? Their own interests we have been repeatedly informed, have all been mortgaged to the Royal Trust Company, and in the event of there being a deficit of more than a million and a half dollars, where do we come in? Last year you know what happened, as and coal boring operations a million well as I do. We voted for railway and a half dollars. When we met again this year what had we to do? We were not asked to find the million and a half which we voted last year, but we had to put another million and a half on top of it. Now do we want to be placed in the same position next year. If we do not, then it is up to this House to take the necessary steps to see that proper precautions are taken, so that when we meet again a year hence, as I hope we may, we won't be asked to vote three million instead of the one and a half we are now asked to vote. I ask again Sir, in the event of there being a deficit, what may we expect from the present Reid Nfld. Company? I have before me a copy of a question which was asked by Sir Michael Cashin on July 6th, about the Reid Nfld. Company as to their liability to pay losses; and I shall read the

answer to the question tabled by the Government. It is, and I want you men on both sides of the House to digest this. "The Reid Nfld. Company assure the Government that they will be in a position, through their bankers, to handle any deficit over a million and a half dollars." Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is correct, and we have every reason to suppose it is correct, why should not this House ask the Reid Nfld. Company to share a proportion of the losses on operating if they are prepared to put up \$500,000, should the deficit be over a million and a half dollars. Would it not, Sir, be showing a proper spirit if they came in here and said to the Government: "Yes, we are prepared to accept a share of the losses." I do not care what the amount is—10%, 20% or 50%. But after seeing this statement that they will have available at least \$500,000 I think it is only right that the Reid Nfld. Company should be prepared at least to share twenty-five per cent. of any loss on operating. It is only in this way, Sir, that we can have economical operation. It is only by giving the people who are responsible, an interest in the road that we will have economical operation. Once again, I want to say, it seems to me that the amount of a million and a half dollars asked for is out of all proportion to the services that will be attempted to be rendered, and we must ask ourselves again, and we must keep asking ourselves until the very last moment, before we decide to vote for or against those resolutions, are we justified in pledging a million and a half dollars out of the Treasury of this country; are we justified in giving this to contractors, who should be legally responsible for the operating of the railway under their contract? Are we justified in placing that burden of \$30.00 on every family throughout this country? If we are, if we decide, to grant this million and a half dollars, how can

we reconcile it with the fact that the country is in a bad state financially? How can we reconcile it with the fact that we are cutting the civil servants salaries? How can we reconcile it with the fact that we are unable to give increased pensions to returned disabled soldiers? Those are matters Sir, that should be weighed carefully, and then, if we decide we are able to do it, then we should also allow the civil servants a living wage, and we should not dismiss men from the civil service. I know of a case of a man who has given sixteen years to the civil service, and who I hear is to be dismissed because the Government is going to retrench. Besides giving 16 years of his life in the civil service, this man gave his son to fight for us in France. Would not that son be proud if he could see to-day the treatment that is being meted out to his father? Surely Sir, once this matter is brought to the attention of the Government it will be ratified at once. I might say this man belongs to my district.

Now, we have been asked here to vote a million and a half dollars. It is only by repetition of this big sum that I hope to be able to rub it in. We have been asked to vote this enormous amount to make good the losses on operating, surely then we are entitled to some further information. Is it unreasonable to ask Mr. Chairman, that we should be informed of how this money is going to be spent? Is it unreasonable to ask that we should have a statement here showing the distribution of the overhead expenses? We should also be informed of what the actual operating expenses would be. And the overhead charges in connection with the actual operating of the Railway. The overhead expenses of salaried men in connection with the actual operation of the Road should be segregated from the other interests of the Reid Newfoundland Company. We are entitled to know, Sir, what the salaries or what proportion of the sal-

aries shall be charged up to the actual operation of the railway, and what proportion of the other interests. We should know what proportion of the purchasing Department expenses is charged to the operating of the railway, what proportion of the overhead charges of the electric light plant will be charged up to actual operation of the Railway. We should know what overhead charges in connection with the Dock and Machine shop will be charged to Railway operation. I am not so much interested in what happened last year as I am in what is going to happen this year. What is past is past. But, I see great possibilities for big overcharging this year in connection with the operating of the Railway, and I submit, it is necessary to know just where we are before we tie ourselves down to some hard and fast policy. Every department should be credited and debited with everything that relates to that department. If men are to go out from the machine shops to Bay of Islands, then they should go out on railway tickets—on passes if you will, but the passes should not be charged up to operating expenses. The passes should be charged back to the machine shop or to whichever department the man is travelling from. This is only a very small instance, but what applies to one thing may apply to another. With the Reid Newfoundland Company sub-divided as it is now, with five or six subsidiary Companies, it would be very easy Sir, without strict control, without strict supervision, very easy indeed to lose a million and a half dollars. In stating just now why I thought this million and a half dollars of a deficit excessive for the coming year. I forgot to mention a very important matter. I forgot to mention the cost of maintenance. We all know, and I will quote figures to prove it before I finish here this evening, the Railway Commission spent very large sums on improvements and charged it to operating expenses. I am not talk-

ing about ballast, I am talking about the shafts and boilers they put in steamers, repairs to steamers, and everything else. The rolling stock and the road now, if we are to believe what we are told, the rolling stock and road is in very good condition and on this next year they should save three hundred thousand dollars. I will give those figures later on when I come to them. But if eventually, after fully debating those Railway Resolutions and trying to do the best we can with them we should decide to give this million and a half dollars to meet this deficit, then surely, Sir, it will be up to the Government to treat that matter as a Government railway, and it will be up to them to see that the salaried men, the salaried men of the Reid Newfoundland Company, are put on the same scale as to reduction in wages as the Civil Servants of this country. I think that would be only right, only fair, only just and reasonable, because if we are paying the civil servants directly, we are paying the salaried officials of the Reid Nfld. Co. indirectly.

Now, sir, the Railway system of this country is not big enough to warrant very heavy overhead expenses. Hence it is, that it is very necessary that each of the Reid Newfoundland Company Interests should be debited with their proportion of overhead expenses. There is where the great leakage can occur. The auditor does not know such an awful lot about it after all, because the auditor has to take the figures which are given him by the management, and unless there is a general Manager there who has the implicit confidence of the Government, I would not give much for any figures that may be handed in by any auditor to this Government, even if he is employed by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the actual operation of the railway should not require a very heavy salaried list, and, as I said

before, if it is the intention to reduce the Civil Service, then it will be up to the Government to see that the salaried officials are treated in a similar manner. No reference, Mr. Chairman, is made in the Resolutions with regard to freight and passenger rates. There is no mention at all in the Resolutions about Placentia. I wonder if when those resolutions were being framed, you forgot that Placentia was over there, also forgot Argentia, the new terminal. Every other Branch line in the country is mentioned, and before those Resolutions go through I am going to ask that the schedule for the Placentia Branch be attended to. With reference to the freight and passenger rates, there is no provision made in connection with his matter, and the increase or reduction of freight and passenger rates should only be undertaken after consulting and with the approval of the Government. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman after going into the figures that have been submitted to us, that with judicious management and proper control we should lose a million and a half dollars this year on the operation of the railway; I very much doubt it indeed. As the Resolutions now stand, there is no incentive whatever for economy. How could there be any incentive for economy where there is a cheque for a million and a half guaranteed if you lose it. How can we provide an incentive for economy. I am throwing out a suggestion, not that I expect the Government to consider it, still I am throwing it out. If it is definitely decided that we have to guarantee the Reid Nfld. Company against loss up to a million and a half dollars, or any other amount. I would make it conditional sir, that a fair proportion of the salary of the Management should come out of the savings. I would suggest that a bonus be given the management and the officials of the Reid Newfound-

land Company, including the conductors, drivers, brakeman and section men. They should be paid a bonus out of the amount of money saved under the million and a half dollars. In this way, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will readily see that every employee of the Reid Newfoundland Company would have an incentive for economy; and mind, I think it is not impossible to save at least half a million dollars; if a percentage of what they save was handed out to the employees and the officials, and I would recommend a good percentage on a pro rata basis be offered to the men who have to make that undertaking a success, it would be a great inducement to them to economize and give the best that is in them. I merely throw out this suggestion for what it is worth.

We have been told, Sir, from time to time—about the condition of the railway and the improvements that are required. Last year, as I told you, it was stated that the rails needed re-railing. At the time I stated this was unnecessary, and as I said before, that statement has been corroborated by Sir John Bury. We were told that it was necessary to do a certain amount in connection with putting on heavier fish plates, and \$300,000 was earmarked last year for that work. Nothing has yet been done. I doubt if anything will be done now. Probably, though, if the re-railing of the road had been undertaken there would have been a nice little profit in it for somebody, whoever gets the rake-off. I would like to be the Agent for those rails, what a nice little commission there would be. We will hear nothing more about re-railing this road until we go into Confederation, and I hope and trust that is a long way off. Other improvements, Mr. Chairman, have been suggested, such as widening the dumps, widening the rock cuts, putting up snow fences, strengthening some bridges and lengthening

others. All very good, perhaps, and very necessary, but not absolutely necessary, not important enough to make us spend that money this year, any more than there is great necessity to make us put in those fish plates, and slot the ends of the rails for 100 miles, as Sir George Bury recommended, not necessary at a time like this when money is so tight, and I do not think sir, that the Government would be justified in authorizing expenditure on works of this nature.

As the Resolutions stand now the Reid Newfoundland Company, with the consent of the Government, could and may spend very large amounts of money on capital expenditure. It's all very well to say it will be charged up against the Reid Newfoundland Company with interest and that when it came to a day of reckoning thirty years hence it would be all right. Well Sir, we might have a great deal of difficulty in getting that money, and I do not think that we are justified in placing any further burdens on the people of this country at the present time. I ask now, are we justified in attending to this 100 miles of line which Sir George Bury suggested. I think we have very good reason for not doing it this year because we must realize that last year a tremendous amount of ballast was put out and a tremendous lot of ties were held over this section. And both the Reid Nfld. Co., and the Government contend that there will be little traffic this year. Well, if their predictions are right, why should we go to work and spend a lot of money in fixing up a 100 miles of road. These fish plates have done very well for twenty odd years, and surely, until we can get out of the hole we are in now, it would not be advisable to spend a lot of money on this kind of work. These cries for improvements may be all false alarms just as were the emphatic statements that it was absolutely

necessary last year to rerail the Road, and that it was absolutely necessary to have that Terminal in St. John's West.

Now I have here an extract from the Government Railway Commission's Report, signed by the Hon. Mr. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the Railway Commission, and Mr. T. A. Hall, Secretary. Those Gentlemen say, and I want you to digest this:—

"On one point your Commission are thoroughly in accord, and that is that dual Control must cease. There is a diversity of interest and where these exist, satisfactory results can not be obtained.

"The coming year is likely to be a more trying one than that through which we have passed, and it is thought that the traffic receipts will only be a moiety of what they have been this year. Consequently, great retrenchments in expenditure, involving reductions in forces, pay, train services and avoidance of new construction must be made. The onus of any losses arising must fall directly upon the parties most interested namely,—the railway Contractor; only in this way will they be careful of expenditure.

"The raising of rates and fares and the provision of large subsidies should be made to reduce the losses, and there the Government's liability should cease.

"(Signed) W. F. COAKER,
T. A. HALL."

Your own Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the man who was there in charge of that railway for the last twelve months, tells us that the onus of any losses arising must fall directly upon the parties interested, namely the Railway Contractors, and he says that only in this way will they be careful of expenditure, which means that they will be economical in running the road. That is the reason that I threw out the suggestion just now of how

there should be an incentive given to the employees and the management to save money, to run it economically; and I think this would be better brought about if the Reid Company were made to bear, as they should, at least twenty-five per cent. of the loss.

I do not think that the Chairman meant that we should vote a million and a half dollars as a subsidy, did you, Mr. Minister? Did you anticipate when you made that recommendation that this House would be called upon to vote a million and a half dollars? I want you to give me an answer: Yes or No?

HON. MR. COAKER—Do you want an answer?

MR SULLIVAN—Yes. If you please.

HON. MR. COAKER—We certainly did not.

MR. SULLIVAN—When this matter was being introduced here on Tuesday evening I made a few remarks across the House in an impromptu manner, and the Prime Minister was good enough to take them up and get the answers. One of the remarks I made at the time was in connection with the Directors' Fees, but it did not relate, Sir, to the Directors' fees under the Railway Commission. It related to them under this year's contract, 1921-22. I have been informed that no salary or Directors' fees of any kind had been paid to Mr. H. D. Reid or Mr. R. G. Reid last year and I believe that is quite correct, but I want to know what proportion of Directors' Fees and salaries of the Management this year will be charged up to the railway operation account, or will the operating account be saddled with all the Directors' fees, present management salaries and then a general Manager brought in at a very heavy salary also? I do not think Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Government, that this is the right year to bring in a General Manager and impose that heavy burden on the

country. While I recognize we should have a General Manager over that Reid Newfoundland Company, a man in whom the Government could have implicit confidence, I do not think it is necessary for the Government to go outside this country to get a General Manager. I have every respect for Mr. Powell; but whether it would be advisable, if the Reid Nfld. Co. continue to operate the road to put Mr. Powell there as the representative of the Government or not, I do not say, but if I was the owner of that Railway and wanted a General Manager, John Powell would be good enough for me. But I am afraid that a General Manager appointed by the Reid Nfld. Co., with the approval of the Government, will be no good, and you mark what I am telling you now.

There is another matter, Sir, I would like to get some light on, perhaps the chairman of the Commission would give me the information. If not he may tell us to-morrow or next day. It would be most interesting information, perhaps the members on the Government side know already, I do not, nor the men on this side. We would like to know how the \$100,000, the proportionate loss which the Reid Newfoundland Company agreed to pay on last year's operating Contract, was paid. Was it paid in actual Cash, or if it was put up as a set off to stores, or if it was a credit on account of Officials' Salaries. I do not know whether the late Chairman of the Commission would be able to answer that question or not. If he could I would be very glad to have the information.

HON. MR. COAKER—It has been deducted under contra account, we owe them certain sums for stores.

MR. SULLIVAN—Well! We intend Sir, to find out presently what these contra accounts were. Before the debate on these resolutions finishes there is a lot of other information I would like to get, and I am going to ask some questions here this even-

ing, when the House adjourns, in the usual way, about the amount paid for light, heat and power, and several things. But I was most anxious to know how that \$100,000 was paid. Now I am going to make some charges I contend that the deficit brought about by mis-management and by the mis-spending of money's. Money was spent that should not have been spent, too many trains were run to handle the traffic, trains were held up continually through bad management, through bad crossing orders, and it was only quite recently, when your expert was brought down here, you held up an express two hours to give him a crossing. Considerable time was lost that way, too many special trains were run; too many by far. All those things added up and eventually they ran into thousands and thousands of dollars. Not only were private special trains run, but all other luxuries, necessary for a pleasant and enjoyable outing, were put on those trains, and the tax payer paid for it. In not one instance did a person, having a private car, pay one cent for it, and furthermore, as I stated, the luxuries that were put on that train, what were they charged up against the Operating Expenses, they were charged up against the Dining Car account, and this is still going on. If we give this million and a half dollars this year, the line will be run as it was last year, and are we prepared to allow this sort of thing to go on? No wonder the losses are fabulous. This country is passing through a very trying period financially, and if we go ahead pledging immense sums without knowing where the money is going to come from—we are making matters much worse. What did you do last year? You did not try to hold the trade, you turned it away from your doors, you put up the prices on passenger tickets and made it possible for only the rich man to travel. You put up your prices on freight. The consequence

was that steamers got it all. Now it is up to the management to cut freight and passenger rates. A certain number of trains will have to be run, get busy and get back the passenger service of nearly a million dollars that you had in the good days if you hope to ever get this thing on a working basis again.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions before the House to-night in connection with the Railroad of the country, are, in my judgment, and possibly in the judgment of all hon. members of this House, among the most serious problems that Newfoundland has had to grapple with for years. I pitied the Prime Minister last Tuesday when he was forced to introduce Resolutions in this House which he absolutely disbelieved in. He brought in here a report from the Government Engineer, which was most uninteresting, as were other figures laid before us, and to my mind are absolute camouflage. These figures, so far as I can see, are given with only one intention, to cover up the whole case, and in dealing with those Railway Resolutions to-night I also want to deal with the Prime Minister's Budget and the financial position of Newfoundland in the future. I don't want to stand up to-night and lay a lot of blame on the Government, which I could very easily and truthfully do. The management of affairs by them for the past twenty months has been simply awful. Never in the history of this country was mismanagement so pronounced as at the present moment, under this Government. If any of you hon. gentlemen give this matter serious attention you will be as dumbfounded as I am, absolutely dumbfounded. It has been said in this House recently that high revenues were the result of inflated prices. One time I was more or less inclined to believe that, but I don't believe it

now. It helped a little no doubt, but the real cause was that the earning power of our people was so great that they were able to import more stuff and consume a greater amount of stuff, and this helped to increase the Revenue much more than what we call inflated war prices. Now I would like to read this statement to the hon. gentlemen in this House just to show them what has taken place in our country for the past nineteen years. These figures are perhaps not interesting in debate, but they are facts that we can't get away from. I would like my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, who wants to vote a million and a half dollars away to the Railroad, to listen to me to-night. I want his attention very seriously, because I am going to show him to-night where he is going to get off. In 1900 this Colony was called upon to collect a Revenue of \$2,111,638, and her total trade that year was approximately sixteen millions, imports \$7,497,147 and exports \$8,627,576. Now it took, to get a Revenue of \$2,111,638, practically a trade of sixteen millions of dollars in imports and exports. In 1901 we find a Revenue of \$2,060,581; imports and exports together were just \$15,800,000; imports \$7,476,503, exports \$8,359,978.

COMPARATIVE REVENUE STATEMENT.

Year.	Revenue.	Imports.	Exports.
1900	\$2,111,638	\$7,497,147	\$8,627,576
1901	2,060,581	7,476,503	8,359,978
1902	2,193,526	7,836,685	9,552,524
1903	2,328,044	8,479,944	9,976,504
1904	2,513,633	9,448,664	10,381,897
1905	2,574,069	10,279,293	10,669,342
1906	2,560,805	10,414,274	12,086,276
1907	2,750,691	10,426,040	12,101,161
1908	2,829,019	11,516,111	11,815,769
1909	2,947,869	11,402,337	10,848,913
1910	3,447,989	12,799,696	11,824,997
1911	3,527,126	13,383,910	11,975,747
1912	3,736,456	14,733,490	13,874,809
1913	3,919,040	16,012,365	14,672,889

1914	3,618,329	15,193,726	15,134,543
1915	3,252,631	12,350,786	13,136,880
1916	4,600,272	16,427,336	18,969,493
1917	5,206,648	21,318,310	22,381,762
1918	3,540,083	26,892,946	30,153,217
1919	9,535,725	33,297,184	36,784,616

All of that was due, no doubt, to the big trade. In 1920 our Revenue, if I am not wrong, Mr. Prime Minister, was somewhere about \$10,500,000, and our total trade then, according to the Prime Minister's Budget, was approximately \$76,000,000. But where are we now? Have we any idea of what we are really facing? Are we going to walk blindfolded into a pit? Before dealing any further with these Railway Resolutions, I want to say that, if I were the Reid Company, I doubt very much if I would take the \$1,500,000 offered by the Government, unless they gave

me a cheque in the morning; I would not leave it any longer. I know it is no use my talking to the Executive Government any longer, but I want the laymen of the party to listen to me, I want them to listen to the figures I am going to read now, and then perhaps they can tell me where we are going to get a million and a half dollars to give to the Reid Newfoundland Company. If they can tell me that, I am ready to listen to them. But I defy any man who stands on two feet in this House to tell me how it is going to be done. These are startling figures, they make one think. Our imports were jumping all the time for these years, simply because money was going around here, people didn't know the value of it, everybody was buying and that drove values away up.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF IMPORTATIONS.

	1914-15	1918-19	1919-20
Cabinet Wares	\$35,861	\$162,543	\$170,640
China and Earthenware	17,630	76,771	115,082
Clocks and Watches	11,501	40,637	38,206
Confectionery	55,829	311,453	429,430
Cordage	18,591	56,913	134,182
Cottons	231,206	778,757	987,835
Dry Goods	287,877	989,763	1,369,698
Fancy Wares	27,162	75,722	91,953
Flour, (brls.)	380,000	255,913	443,854
Glassware	40,000	114,000	121,297
Groceries	139,000	388,584	509,596
Gasoline, etc. (gals.)	270,142	1,251,325	1,234,804
Kerosene, (gals.)	1,463,314	2,382,882	2,020,726
Milk	30,448	166,991	258,384
Medicine	87,837	279,660	333,382
Meats, Canned, (oz.)	1,708,795	4,487,658	10,738,958
Meats, Fresh, (lbs.)	876,370	1,150,761	2,301,643
Meats, Polutry, etc., (lbs.)	111,300	94,233	151,399
Meats, Sausages, (lbs.)	33,876	76,939	85,648
Meats, Smoked Hams, etc., (lbs.)	87,640	80,625	101,490
Meats, Hams and Dried Salted, (lbs.)	347,249	686,351	699,154
Meats, Dried Salted Beef, (lbs.)	69,907	63,609	64,570
Meats, Beef, Salted, (brls.)	26,081	23,066	37,579
Meats, Pig Jowls, etc., (brls.)	3,615	5,447	3,944
Meats, Pork, (brls.)	21,363	31,570	27,523
Machines and Machinery	340,866	1,751,381	1,505,136

Molasses. (gals.)	668,777	1,189,778	1,036,165
Musical Instruments	11,824	66,012	83,662
Hardware, 35 per cent.	145,443	493,839	662,494
Indian Rubber Goods	144,590	522,339	646,994
Leatherware	132,188	522,994	592,454
Automobiles	16,487	232,774	278,076
Oatmeal, etc., (lbs.)	1,061,421	6,786,104	799,315
Paints	92,314	264,465	374,771
Paper Hangings	20,491	115,599	57,199
Perfumery	6,976	33,467	45,285
Readymades	207,296	874,515	1,236,390
Small Wares	183,000	432,850	583,220
Soap	50,000	162,714	223,999
Spirits, (gals.)	57,229	9,973	13,825
Stoves	9,654	35,256	70,820
Sugar (lbs.)	8,258,765	12,529,689	13,972,232
Tea, (lbs.)	981,000	1,212,117	1,440,671
Tinware	16,633	110,477	119,710
Tobacco, (lbs.)	119,417	163,048	199,758
Cigars	5,825	11,624	9,130
Cigarettes	2,125	5,941	3,714
Tweeds, etc.	85,513	404,818	609,068
Wines, (gals.)	7,757	1,664	9,089
Women's Dress Goods	59,596	284,886	352,573

These are not my figures; these are the official figures of the Newfoundland Government taken out of the wreckage. Now let us look at the year that is before us and see our trade. Take Mr. Coaker's own figures and his own ideas, and the Prime Minister's that he has in the back of his head. I ask you, Mr. Coaker, do you think that for the coming year our voyage of fish will be anything over \$1,500,000 quintals. That will be a big voyage if we get it. What do you estimate will be the price per quintal for that?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That's a difficult question to answer.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—No it is not. Let me tell you that if we get eight dollars a quintal for an average catch it will be a marvellous price.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I agree with you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—We agree

upon that, it will be a marvellous price, and it will mean twelve millions of dollars, and if we get from other sources three or four millions it is going to be a big amount. Suppose, for argument sake, we say our trade is sixteen millions and our exports another sixteen millions, mind you I am giving big figures because if that will not happen, will that really give us \$3,618,000? I want to try and get you to see that you are on the breakers, or that you will be on the breakers if something is not done. I say we are on the breakers now definitely, no more looking to get on them. We are there, and you will agree with me if you are intelligent enough to see it. Then suppose I get good-natured and say, take your three millions plus your surtax, plus your sales tax, and allow a million and a half on it; this is a big allowance, but I want to be on the safe side. Take that and add it together and it brings

you up to five or six millions of dollars of revenue. I am allowing you to add a million and a half for your sales tax and surtax. The Hon. Prime Minister in his Budget estimates the revenue of the colony will be \$8,404,000, and your expenditure \$8,307,000, leaving a balance of \$96,704.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That includes the anticipated Civil Service reduction.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Yes, I understand that, but my argument is that you estimate this revenue, but you can't do enough trade and you can't tax the people enough to go within three millions of dollars of it. It is not a case of my just getting up and making this charge; I have the facts to prove conclusively that it cannot be done. There is no use in us fooling ourselves any longer. Big mistakes have been made in the past and we should not undertake any new expenditures that we cannot bear. That's the position we are in to-day. Now, let me ask you, where do you propose, Sir, to get that million and a half dollars to give the Reid Nfld. Company to run the railroad the coming year? Where do you think you can find it to operate the colony? That's what you are facing now, and you can't get away from it. The Hon. the Prime Minister told us here on Tuesday, that he has this particular \$1,500,000 reserved as I take it, earmarked out of the loan for the operation of the railroad the present year. Well, what are we going to do about all the other money we owe? Where are we going to get the money to build that road to Badger? Where are we going to get money to pay for pit props. I hope you get some returns from them. Where are we going to get the money for all this relief that is given out, that nobody can tell yet what it cost the colony? Where are you going to get the money to pay in

the very near future for the fishery supplies? As sure as you live, as I do, you are in hope of getting it back, but not one man in this House believes that we will get the half back of what we sent out. I want some man to tell me where this money is going to be found; I don't think it can be found and I don't know anyone who can prove the contrary. Yes, I am a pessimist if you like, and a pity for the country that there are not some other pessimists besides me. I say this colony could not produce a revenue last year of eleven million dollars, and the man who brought in that Budget was a man in a dream, absolutely in a trance; and the men who lavishly squandered that money were in a trance with him. I ask you, Mr. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, would you, if you could have foreseen the future as we see it to-day, have allowed what has gone on to take place? I know you would not, I believe you would not have done it, but you are going to do the same thing again this year if you are not watched. Do you, Sir, who come from the North, with your hon. members standing by you in this House, can you tell us clearly and conscientiously that you know there will be enough revenue produced to carry this colony on this year? Now, Mr. Coaker, it is down to man and man with you and I to-night. Do you believe for one minute it is possible to produce a revenue of \$8,400,000 in this colony the coming year? Do you believe it, Sir?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—It is a difficult matter to answer.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—No, it is not a difficult matter. Manhood asserts itself in even you and I once in a while. You know in your innermost soul we cannot produce that revenue, and what's the use of your fooling the

country? We can't produce this revenue, it is utterly impossible. You cannot get away from the fact that the revenue for this colony the past years was the money earned by the toiler, and earned by the soldier who spent his money in St. John's.

The more I look at this railroad policy, the more I am convinced that there is a nigger in the wood pile somewhere in this job. I really believe there is a little black fellow somewhere. Take it from me now, there must have been some ulterior motive for money being thrown about right and left without any hesitation whatever. Is it because of that old chap they thought so much about here, who we always heard about in an election campaign? Have they really put his silk hat on at last? Has he arrived here? I think he has. His name is Confederation. You may smile about it, Mr. Prime Minister, but my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows as well as I do that is what we are coming to. You may talk, if you like, about annexing us to America. We don't want to be annexed to the United States. We don't want Confederation with Canada. We want to live as we have always lived, we want to live in our own home, our own birthright. Are you going to continue this mad expenditure over to Canada? We are on the rocks for ever and ever, so far as Newfoundland is concerned financially, and I defy any man to contradict me. This is not Crosbie's dream or imagination. These are the official figures of the Government which cannot and will not be denied.

Now the Prime Minister wants to hand over this million and a half to the Reids. Some chap from Canada comes down here, by the name of Sir George Bury. He arrives at Sydney, crosses over to Port aux Basques, is met by Mr. T. A. Hall, Government Engineer, with all official documents, we are told, of the

railroad to study on the way across and study the track. He arrives in St. John's, then he goes down to Argentia and looks at it; he then takes the extreme end and goes down to Grate's Cove. Then he comes back to St. John's. I heard somebody say to-night, I don't know whether it is correct or not, that he got \$7,500 for the job. Was that what he was paid?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think it was \$7,500.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well, the Lord deliver us. We sit here for weeks and weeks and serve our country for a paltry thousand dollars, and Sir George Bury can butt in, take \$7,500 and go away and laugh at us. A 14-year old boy could write that report of Sir George Bury's. He travels over the railroad and in half a dozen words he gives us a report that anybody could have given us. And this is the report that cost us \$7,500. We don't know the value of money at all. We are gone mad, we are money mad. We are squander maniacs of the worst class. When a man like Sir Geo. Bury can be invited down for a week and get \$7,500, well it is enough to make any man's blood boil. We send our own men to the woods and to the roads and tell them \$2.50 per day is enough for them. I am going to read this railway report of Sir George Bury's I can't help reading this \$7,500 report. May I ask what is meant. Mr. Prime Minister, by "all public utilities."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Well, I really don't know, but I would conclude that he meant such public utilities as the railroad, the steamers, the public telegraphs, and such matters.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Oh you think he means all these? Is he an authority on steamers, telegraph service and all that kind of thing?"

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I don't know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—What impu-

dence had he to put it in here then? Does this report mean, Mr. Coaker, that we are going to spend any more money? Does Bury advise us spending any more money on the railroad outside of the \$1,500,000 to operate it. Is it your intention to go on spending and squandering money? If it is I thing it ought to be stopped. Who were the officials on the railroad who estimated the loss at two millions? Who were the officials who told Bury that? Where did they come from? Do you know anything about them Mr. Coaker?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Reid's men.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Oh, Reid's men. Ahem. This man tells us everything is gone. He tells us that the railroad to-day will not carry about half of what it carried last year. I estimate that you won't carry within 60% of what you carried last year. Isn't that right? There you are, that's the trouble. What does Bury know about Newfoundland and a hopeful outlook? What does Sir George Bury know about a hopeful outlook in Newfoundland? He got \$7,500 out of it, that's what is amusing me. Well if Reids can't operate the railroad now can they take any part of the loss? If they have any money after the million and a half, why should they not bear a proportion of this million and a half? Why should we lie down and let them take it and do as they like with it? Sure, anybody could tell us to do that. Anybody at all, could tell us that we ought to take up the rails on the Fortune Bay Branch. We know it is not operating and that it is no good there. We know that, but Sir George Bury must come down and tell us about it. I would like him to tell us when the money is going to be available. I would have paid him myself for that information. I don't know it, neither does he nor anybody else. Seventy-five hundred dollars for this Report, thank you. Now, Mr. Coa-

ker, have you for one sane moment thought about those railway resolutions? Have you seen them at all? Are these resolutions Sir George Bury's idea? Why, my dear man, it is an insult to you and those associated with you. What is it? Here it is in a nutshell. You operated that railroad last year at full speed. You had trains going everywhere. You had special trains, you had your own train, you put on a daily express to Bonavista with a sleeper on. You went around everywhere and you had a full staff of men on, and you managed to lose \$1,625,000. I presume that was operating the steamers also wasn't it?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Oh, the steamers weren't in it? Do you mean to say that the \$1,625,000 did not include the steamers?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Well, the steamers made a separate loss.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No, I don't think they have lost very much.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—But were they for the Government Commission or what?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The Commission operated them.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—So you really operated the steamers last year in conjunction with the railroad. Well, you know, we had steamers going everywhere. There was a steamer from Port Union down to White Bay, there was the Earl of Devon from Lewisporte to White Bay, there was another one running down the North and South side of Green Bay, Susu running, steamers running from the West—all of that was going on and you operating the railroad last year full swing, and you dropped under your management \$1,625,000. You did all of this

and yet you come into this House now with these resolutions and tell us you want a million and a half. The Government wants this House to vote a million and a half to operate that railroad, but we are going to cut practically half the service out. You operated it all last year, but you only lost \$1,625,000. They are going to cut everything out that they possibly can, and yet they ask us boldly for a million and a half to operate a railroad. We are a joke. I shall never vote for that million and a half to go to the Reid Newfoundland Company. I will absolutely oppose it, because I think the thing is indecent. This year the steamers are not going to be in the contract. We will give them a million and a half dollars to operate the railroad, cut down half the service, pay men off, turn men off, and they can lay it up for three months and we are going to pay them a million and a half. I don't believe you are seriously contemplating that, not seriously contemplating giving the Reid Newfoundland Company a million and a half of the Colony's money to operate a half service, as you state in your resolutions. Why we are a dream. Are you going to be a party to that, Mr. Coaker? No, you are not. I have been deceived in you once or twice, but don't do it any more. You are surely not going to vote that million and a half, when certain operations are going to be cut off. Take our friend over there who spent money lavishly, who travelled everywhere, who had special trains going. I don't object to that, I don't care whether he goes to Catalina in a private car or freight train. It doesn't bother me that way, but with everything operating and everything going at full speed, all you could lose on the steamers and trains was \$1,625,000, and now you want to cut the railway in two and ask us for a million and a half. I can't understand it. Frightful stuff, and then we are asked to go to work and deliver over \$1,500,-

600 to the Reid Newfoundland Company. I don't care whether it is to the Reids, it makes no difference to me as far as I am concerned personally. All I can say is that when I was Minister of Shipping, H. D. Reid and R. G. Reid did all they could to assist me, and I know that at that time it cost them money. I know the Government I was associated with gave them so much money to complete contracts that were not adjusted. I always felt that they were entitled to a certain amount and that they should be considered, but you are going to the fair altogether with it, absolutely gone mad. We can't do this Mr. Coaker. Are we going to deliberately sell the country out? Are we sitting here to-night with the full intention of passing it over? I made a charge in this House and I repeat this charge now, that there is a Confederate in the Executive Government who will tell you he is an "anti." but his actions prove him a Confederate. Do you know that gentleman, Mr. Coaker? You know yourself that you see nothing before this Colony now only Confederation, and you know she has got to go into Confederation, and you think the crowd on this side of the House want to get hold of her when she does go there to get the plums out of it when she does go in. That assertion has been made by you, sir, and I say that you are the gentleman who is sitting up all night to send Newfoundland to Confederation. But, thank God for one thing. Neither you, nor your Executive, nor the Prime Minister associated with you, can put her in because the voice of the people must speak first. The voice of the people will have to be heard. Canada will not take you in no matter how far down you may get. You will not have the power to put her in till you go back to the people whom you betrayed hopelessly by over expenditure and extravagance of the worst type. You will have to go back to them and they will have the final say, and I can see

that time ahead now, when every man who thinks his seat in this House is secure, will have to bundle and go. What a pity you have been led astray. What a pity, sir, that you have betrayed the men of the North who stood by you and whom you betrayed, perhaps unknowingly, but it is too late. Yes, Mr. Halfyard, I would hide right behind that curtain if I were you. Hide yourself away now because I can see the day when you will run away.

HON. MR. HALFYARD—I would like to do it now.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I believe you would.

HON. MR. HALFYARD—You are too noisy.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It's a pity you are so quiet. It's a pity you have a vote to throw the money of this colony away. I can understand why Mr. Halfyard and possibly Dr. Barnes will stick to his government when they know that government is in jeopardy. I can understand their position exactly. No man can tell me that we are not on the brink of a precipice. You can produce no man to tell us the Colony can be saved from the state she now finds herself in, and the final touch is the railway resolutions. Dr. Barnes you are on a high pedestal with some people in this country who have a certain regard for you and I believe that you know right from wrong, and when something wrong is being done they trust you to take a stand for your country.

I want to ask you now to-night do you think you are playing the part of a man when you propose to sacrifice a million and a half dollars to the Reids. It was only a few years ago you denounced the Reids. Have you changed your opinion of the railroad policy? I ask you that question now, have you really, Sir, changed your opinion of the operation of the railroad to-day any more than you did a few years ago? No you haven't changed a bit, silence gives consent. I won-

der what is the price you are being paid for sacrificing your country. I wonder if somebody is not paying somebody else to allow her to go over. That's how it looks now. Last year Mr. Coaker said we are going to run this road economically. You Mr. Targett, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Jones and all the rest of you, no passes for you, none whatever, you can never have a railroad pass. Mr. Coaker was not entitled to give you a pass, neither was he entitled to stop it. That pass was never any compliment from the Reid Nfld. Co., you got your pass because you were a member, but the hon. member for Bonavista wouldn't give you a pass, but he gives \$7,500 to Sir George Bury to come down and say "how do you do; good evening." Anything that comes in here with any kind of a hat on it, or a long coat or a good looking mackintosh, always can get more than the man who is living here in his own country. They always come here empty but they always go away with something from the Government or somebody else. And this is the last touch. We want money for everything but we give Sir George Bury \$7,500 for coming down here, and mind you, he was so pleased with the railroad, so pleased with his reception here, that he said, "I prefer, now, sailing on the Rosalind; I won't go over the line any more." and I have no doubt the Government bought his ticket for him, and he went by the Rosalind, not by the train. He didn't want to see that any more or hear of it.

I say the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries has only one intention in his mind, no matter what he says on the other side of the House, I assert that he has become a Confederate and this is a part of a scheme to put this Colony into Confederation. Now I make that assertion and I defy contradiction of it, because the hon. member talked it over with me on the Adriatic coming

out and told me there was no hope only Confederation.

HON. MR. COAKER—I didn't say so.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Why don't you try and save her from going into it? You are to-night putting her into it, then you must be a Confederate and I brand you now as a Confederate.

HON. MR. COAKER—You said a dozen times to-night that she is going there.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, and I say you are doing your best to put her there as fast as you can. I say it emphatically, that you and the Executive Government are out shoving her along as fast as you can, afraid she is not going fast enough to suit you. Instead of a twelve-knot boat not to convey her you would like to have a thirty-knot boat.

HON. MR. COAKER—She is not going as fast as that.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Isn't she going as fast as that. Nobody knows better than you how fast she is going."

HON. MR. COAKER.—It won't be with my help.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Sure you're at it overtime. You don't take the ordinary 12-hour day at it, you are going the 22-hour. Aren't these Resolutions a sample? Didn't you admit to me to-night that you couldn't get a revenue beyond five or six millions and your expenditure is going into nine. What is that but driving her to the wall. What are you going to do about it. Get out and get a constructive policy, get out into the centre of this House and I will tell you something that you can do; how to run the railroad. I am at the stage now when I think it is time something should be done.

HON. MR. COAKER—If we went with you could you run her for less?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well, with your experience attached to me I might possibly do it. I would not like to go there at all without you. I would not like to attempt it without you."

HON. MR. COAKER—If I thought you could run it on a policy of half a million I would join you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Half million dollars? Easy. Now are you ready to come over? No, you daren't come over because they have you. You daren't come over. You are running the railroad like you ran the F.P.U. You ran the railroad on an unbusiness like basis and you are running the F.P.U. and anything else you took hold of, like the Fishery Regulations, in the same way, and that's why I am talking to-night. You don't deny any of that.

HON. MR. COAKER—I have my own opinion.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well, that's what I am using I don't have to use my opinion at all. Facts are facts and you can't get clear of them. There is no need to use my opinion, you know yourself what is happening, you know what is going on. I make that statement; shall I repeat it?

HON. MR. COAKER—That doesn't prove it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I say that everything you have touched in connection with fish, in connection with the Railroad, in connection with other matters, has not been done in a business like way and has not been financially and properly run. I know it. Surely Heavens, I can't help knowing what's going on, what everybody is talking about, and that's the reason I say to you to-night that you ought reconsider this Railway problem and not run the country on the rocks like you are doing. Mr. Higgins rightly says that you ought to be intelligent enough to know that. He says that you can run her at a loss of possibly half a million. You ran her last year with full speed on and you only lost \$1,625,000.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—She lost \$200,000 in April. At that rate where is she going?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—What do you mean by that loss of \$200,000?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—You would want to be mighty smart to cut it down to \$50,000 a month.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You know, Mr. Coaker, that the months of April and May are not 110 months to be taken seriously into consideration?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Well we haven't done that.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, but you know, Mr. Reid, with all due respect to him, has been entirely too brilliant for the bunch of you, especially the Prime Minister, who thought H. D. Reid was slow. I never thought it at any time. He tied the Prime Minister into a knot and he took charge of the Railroad and now he is going to take charge of the million and a half, after twenty months. Now, let me read you a part of Mr. Squires' Manifesto.

Did you ever read this Mr. Barnes? But I suppose each man had a Manifesto of his own. Little did the present Prime Minister imagine it was about himself he was telling the story. Reid has got him in the mess and instead of treating him like the landlord treats the tenant, making him keep the house in repair, well Mr. Reid says to the landlord, get up you landlord, get up you Prime Minister, get up you Attorney-General, get up all you gentlemen in the Executive including Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; get up all of you, I want this house put in repair, I am only the tenant, you get up and put her in repair. What Mr. Squires says was Mr. Reid's duty, to-day Mr. Reid is making the Hon. the Prime Minister and his Government do. Is that correct, Mr. Coaker? That's the answer. Now let us come to another question. The other day I picked up a report and in that report the first thing I saw was the transfer of \$4,800,000 worth of property to the Royal Trust Company

under a chattel mortgage from the Electric Light and Power Company the Reid Ltd. Products Co. (I think), the Dock Company, and some other company connected with mines and forests, whatever it was. How did the Reids get the right to do that. Who gave him that right, Mr. Attorney General? Wasn't there an amendment to the Companies Act brought in here last year? Didn't it give him this right?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Excuse me, I will produce the goods. They could not transfer anything until you changed the Act and in changing the Act it simply made it, instead of two-thirds being necessary, you made it the majority of shareholders, and that's what you allowed Mr. H. D. Reid to do. You can't deny that. According to you we have no authority over the Reids any more? Who gave it away?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I don't know.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Do you mean to tell us to-night that we have no more rights over that Railroad, that Reid can do as he likes with it? If he can I am gone.

Well, where do we stand now? Mr. Reid has taken these Companies, they are gone from us, they are registered now with the Royal Trust Co., the Bank of Montreal. We have nothing in the world only the Railroad across the country. Is that where we stand to-day? From the little I do know, I know they could not do this under the old Act, you had to have two-thirds and under the new Act you must only have a majority. Do you mean to tell me to-night that we have no right over the Dock Company? Is that gone? Surely the dock can't be mortgaged to us if it is a chattel mortgage to the Royal Trust Company? Would you mind seeing if that can be taken from us? Don't let that

go over-night. It seems to me that we don't own any part of Newfoundland at all. It is all gone. I don't understand where we are. When I was in Sir William Lloyd's Government he was very strong against letting any Act come into this House that would enable them to do so, and I remember well Sir Michael Cashin discussed that Act and would not let it go through.

Now to-night I understand that the steamers are not going to be operated in conjunction with the Railroad, that the money is for the Railroad absolutely. We have nothing for the steamers. That is what I understand from Mr. Coaker. In some of the figures furnished me by the Prime Minister. I understand that on June 30th, 1904, the Reid Newfoundland Co's loss by their statement to you was \$91,000, statement No. 4 I think. Well the loss that year, according to the official statement given to this House of Assembly, was \$111,136. Then you take the next year, 1905 and it shows \$109,000 when it was \$119,000. Who is right or wrong. Here is the official statement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The figures that I have given do not include Bank Interest, charges or Depreciation charges. The point is this, in Railway accounting it is not customary with many lines to charge Depreciation, and it's also a question whether Current Interest charges or overdrafts on Current Account may be charged. Now that makes the difference in the figures I have quoted. Depreciation charges are not quoted and Interest charges on Current Account are not included.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well, I would like to pass this over and you examine it. Now, with regard to the expenditure of a million and a half dollars, here's the right thing to do. You come into this House of Assembly here, and you have a manifesto signed by the Hon. the Prime Minister

which goes out to the country. The people knew nothing whatever about this railroad policy when they were voting for you. The right and proper course for the Government to do was to go to the country on that expenditure and get a mandate from the people to come in here and vote that money. If they wanted it get a mandate from them, go out, and let them know all about it, and if you can possibly find the money you are not to be blamed, but you are embarking on a policy to-day such as they never dreamed of, they never heard of it until now, and I think the proper thing to do, if you are decent about it, is to prorogue this House and go to the country and ask them to decide immediately whether you ought to give that million and a half dollars to the railroad. That's the right and proper course for you to take, before the people are betrayed. As this thing is going to continue in Committee for some time, I don't intend to say very much more to-night, but as the debate continues I will show my reasons for so strongly objecting not because of the Reids, that doesn't bother me in the slightest. If they were anybody else but the Reids I would oppose them also. I strongly oppose this railway resolution and I am going to do all I possibly can to stop it. I would do anything in reason to help the Reids out, but when it comes down to deliberately taking \$1,500,000 from the people of this country, who are taxed to-day to their limit, I stop. The railway resolution proposes giving the Reid Nfld. Company, including subsidies, of between \$400,000 and \$500,000, or about \$5,540 every day, and the service to be cut in half in the winter. Now, is it right for us to deliberately throw away this money without the people who sent us here knowing something about it. I don't believe anybody in this House believes it is the right thing to do. I believe the Prime Minister is against

it. He doesn't want to do it but he is driven into a hole.

I would now ask the hon. Chairman of the Railway Commission, Mr. Coaker, if he would tell me if the General Manager for the railway is in the country yet? Do you know a man named Kerr? Is it proposed that he shall be the General Manager?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, it is not.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Are you quite sure about that?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes, no fear of that. He is not a railway man.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You assure me that gentleman is not going there.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Thank you. Are you going to deliberately vote this million and a half dollars? I don't think you will. The man who votes for that money to operate the railroad for the coming year, who passes over the million and a half to Reid, passes his birthright away. He may think what he likes and may dream as he likes, but I say that the day he registers his vote for that million and a half to be given the Reid Company as suggested by these resolutions, in the condition the country is to-day, he gives away his birthright. There ought to be some other way out. If any man takes a contract with you to do a certain thing and he can't do it, you don't go down and pay him because he says he can't do it. That's what we are doing to-night, exactly, and I want to say now that I strongly protest against it, absolutely protest against this money being made over to the Reid Nfld. Company. Not on account of the Reids—I don't care about them—but to anybody. They have no right to take this money from the taxpayers of this country to-day without the Government putting it up to the people and getting a mandate from them, because the Hon. the

Prime Minister's manifesto was absolutely opposed to the Reids and he was going to force them to carry out their contract. If we must give this money away, then I say let the people have a chance to give their opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I absolutely oppose these resolutions. I don't intend to vote for them. I intend to oppose them because they are utterly impossible—cutting a service in two, taking practically everything from us, and then asking us to pay the piper. Some other arrangement could be made. We know we must run the railroad, but we feel that there must be some other way of doing it. It really makes one feel bad to think of the poor old colony, after struggling along like she did, under many a gale and stress, to be sacrificed now in the last stage of the game. One man in this House long ago said what was right. He is gone now, but if I remember rightly, he foresaw what we were going to come to. That was the late Mr. Goodridge, when he said this country didn't want a railroad at all. He said the railroad it wanted was steamers running in and out the Narrows and down the coast, but we have the railroad and we must run it. I know what he said was absolutely right. It would have been far better for us if we had never had a railroad, but we must run it now that we have it, but surely gracious we haven't got to begin by dumping a million and a half into this thing. I appeal to the Prime Minister to find some other way out of it and see if there is not some other policy possible than handing out a million and a half dollars which we practically have no control over.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received

and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Annual Report of the Nfld. Patriotic Fund for year ended December 31, 1920.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 11 Geo. V, Cap. 40 entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads,'" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the following Report of the Select Committee on "An Act Respecting Fisheries Supplies" for the current season

July 14th, 1921.

The Select Committee to which was referred the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" beg to report that in their opinion the present Bill should be withdrawn and another Bill introduced, based on resolutions containing only the last four sections of the Bill before the House.

(Signed)

W. R. WARREN,
W. F. COAKER,
J. R. BENNETT,
W. J. HIGGINS,
W. H. CAVE,
J. H. SCAMMELL.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

On motion the Bill "Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

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

the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of Fishery Supplies for the Current Season.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 15th, 1921.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister if it is correct that Sir Edgar Bowring has wired that he will be unable to complete his work at Washington within the week which he allowed himself and has notified the Government that it will be necessary to get somebody to take his place, and if it is correct that Mr. Collishaw is to be sent to Washington for this purpose, and if so, what qualifications does Mr. Collishaw possess to represent this country in regard to fishery matters.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Sir Edgar Bowring telegraphed, though not to me personally, saying that he would not be able to stay any longer than a week to work at Washington, and that if satisfactory progress was not forthcoming as a result of his efforts he intimated that it would be necessary to send somebody else in his place; I might say that there is no intention whatever to send Mr. Collishaw to Washington.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he requested Dr. Grenfell to proceed to Washington to interest himself with in

fluent members of the Government there, and others to present Newfoundland's claim for remission of the increased taxation now being proposed by the American tariff on fishery products, and if this request was in writing and if so to lay a copy on the table of the House; also if Dr. Grenfell went to Washington at his own expense to put our case before these authorities and if he subsequently made a report to the Minister in writing and if so to lay a copy of it on the table of the House.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement certified by the Auditor-General, showing the disposition of the recent loan of six million dollars obtained by the Prime Minister showing—

“The amount by which the total sum is reduced through the discount on the sale, expense, etc., specifying each: (b) to state amount which has come into the possession of the Colony and is available for public purposes; (c) the amount paid or to be paid on behalf of operation of the Railway during the past fiscal year; (d) the amount paid or to be paid on behalf of Capital expenditure on the Railway the past year; (e) the amount paid or to be paid on account of Public work; and other services; (f) the amount paid or to be paid on behalf of St. John's Municipal Council; (g) the amount put to the credit of the Surplus Trust Fund and what obligations, if any, are likely to be chargeable against the same; (h) the amount of the loan on deposit at the Bank of Montreal at the present time and how it is proposed to pay the amounts likely to be required on account of the completion of the Railroad to Argentina and the arbitrations in connection therewith; (i) the amount of guarantees for pit-preps (j) the amount for guarantees for fishery supplies; and

the amount of any other obligations which will have to be met out of the balance to the credit of Surplus Trust Fund or the balance to the credit of Loan Account.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have called the attention of the Auditor General to that question and he is kindly preparing the answer.

MR SULLIVAN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman of Railway Commission, to inform this House what amount was paid by the Government Railway Commission to the Reid Nfld. Co. or any of its subsidiary Co's, for light, heat and power from July 1st 1920 to June 30th, 1921, and to lay on the table of the House a copy of the General Storage from July 1st, 1920 to June 30th, 1921; and to lay on the table of the House detailed statement of the General Expense account which amounts to \$140,000 from July 1st, 1920 to June 30th, 1921.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That information is being prepared.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the operation of the Nfld. Railway.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Before the Committee rose this evening, I was about to discuss an article written in the “Advocate” against me and I regret to see that Mr. Coaker is absent. I hope he is coming to-night, and I hope my criticisms will not make a physical wrack of him. The editor of this paper says in his article: (Reads) The statement which I produced last night proves conclusively that the revenue for the next year will be three million dollars short of the expenditure. You can take that statement to the greatest expert in this country on

such matters and, after careful analysis, he will be equally convinced as I am that the revenue for the coming year will be three millions behind what is estimated. It is utterly impossible for it to be anything else. You came here last year and you estimated your revenue over eleven million dollars. Where did you get off? If it had not been for the three million and odd dollars left by the Cashin administration, you would be hopelessly on the rocks ere this. Still we were told here last year by the Finance Minister that we were going to have a surplus over and above our expenditure. The worst part of it is that you are over five millions short this year and then some man who knows what he is talking about is told by the "Advocate" that such a statement is a libel on Newfoundland. When the people of Newfoundland had an industry that provided plenty of work they could earn a revenue. But what has happened? And what has been going on ever since this House opened? Every industry is almost at a standstill and almost day after day we have had people at the Bar of the House asking for employment. To help out the unemployment problem the Government has had to send 1000 men to Badger to build a road at \$2.50 a day and to find themselves. When was this country in such a position before I ask? And what is the cause of it? The answer is that it was brought about through lavish expenditure, utter incompetency and lack of judgment on the part of the Executive Government, and thru the want of knowing how to handle the people's money. Why you do not want any better example of your indifference and carelessness than the very railroad policy we are discussing to-day. The man who took this railroad to operate last year, what did he do? He lost to this Colony \$1,625,000 on operation and spent \$2,000,000 on construction or upkeep and then we are told to take the Executive seriously. There

was nothing too bad for the Prime Minister to say about the Reids either in his Manifesto or in this House last year. About this time last year he left this country and was not seen here any more for five months. When he came back everything was in a topsy-turvy state. He looks in all directions for somebody to blame and then the best he can find is to laud Mr. Coaker, who had charge of the whole railway outfit, and say that Mr. Coaker had become a physical wreck as a result of his railway work. The Prime Minister might have added that Newfoundland was a financial wreck as a result of Mr. Coaker's control. Ever since this Government was elected the people have been deceived. Their chief stock in trade is deception. According to the Prime Minister's Manifesto, this is the country he was going to make fit for people to live in. Well, if what we have been experiencing the past six months is any criterion of what the Prime Minister meant, we do not want to see any more of it. I am sorry for the people, and I am sure Dr. Barnes is too. I wonder if Dr. Barnes is going to stand much longer for what he has been doing the past two weeks. While trying to get employment for the people he has been giving out \$50 to some folks to buy supplies or in other words taking away the peoples' independence. Then in the face of all that this Colony has got to pay Sir George Bury for writing a report about the railway to the Government, a report that any fourteen year old schoolboy could write, \$7,500 and expenses. Now is Dr. Barnes going to stand for that in his Government? The people to-day in this country are absolutely overburdened with taxation and still the Government have no hesitation in adding more taxation on them in the way of Surtax and Sales Tax. The Prime Minister said in his Manifesto "I will re-adjust the tariff." You did not carry out that promise. You

couldn't do it because you have not the ability to re-adjust the tariff.

Now what are we doing for the Reids to-night? Resolutions are before the House to vote them a million and a half dollars. You never attempted to develop a railroad policy until a few days before the 30th of June when it is impossible to do anything. We got the service, and the service got you. The Reids, says the Prime Minister, dominated past Governments. Will the honourable Mr. Winsor tell us whether the Reids are dominating the present Government? I don't know where we are. The Reids have bluffed the Prime Minister to a standstill. They want a million and a half dollars, and you are going to give it to them, and the only thing we can get from the Executive Government is that they can do not better. The Reids got you and I know they got you. I am told that I lose sleep over it. Well if that is true of me it is not true of the members on the Government side of the House. I am told by the Attorney General that the Reids have a claim against us.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—I did not say that. I said this amount would be put against any claim they may have against us.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—What is the use of doing that. What is the use of charging it up against a company that can't pay? You have said that Sir Michael and I want to close the railroad. I want to tell you now that I do not want to close the railroad. The railroad is there and it must be run, but what we object to is passing one and a half million dollars over to the Reids to be taken from the tax-payers of this Colony. Just imagine letting this whole thing go for a year, and then at the last minute when we have forced you to do something you bring in this absurd policy. Then the Advocate expects us to come in here and pass this policy without a protest. I do not be-

lieve you have read the Prime Minister's manifesto yet Dr. Barnes. This is what he sent all over the country. He believed that no members on the other side would be bribed or bullied by the Reids, and the Reids have handled every one of you to a standstill.

What is the meaning of this man who is coming here? He is supposed to be in Montreal. Sir George Bury has told the Prime Minister that he has a man and the Prime Minister says he doesn't know who he is. The chances are it will mean another \$25,000 a year. This contract with the Reids is only for one year, and yet we are told that they are going to enter into a contract with this man for five years. There seems to be a nigger somewhere. We are unable to get any information, and the best the members on the other side can do is to read a paper and look wise. Somebody has been bullied and bribed and just as sure as the members on the other side of the House vote for these resolutions you will be responsible for this whole program and the condition of the country at the close of the war was the most prosperous of its type in the world, and if she had been taken hold of by capable statesmen she would be in good financial condition to-day. Do you mean to tell me that if a man found that he was losing every year on his private business he would be here to-night discussing this million and a half dollar proposition. Not you. It is a squandermania that has taken hold of you, and now the country is on the rocks. The Government comes in here and asks the Opposition to enquire into the condition of the railroad. But you did not ask us last year. What right have we to assume this responsibility? We are here as an Opposition, and you are responsible for the wrongs of your administration. I wish the honourable Min. of Marine and Fisheries was here, and I would tell him what has happened during the last 12 or 14

days regarding the railroad policy. Does any member on the other side believe that there is not a nigger in the woodpile somewhere. We are told that the Reids are unable to run the road; then we are told that millions are going to be charged up to them, and then on top of all that we read in the papers that the Reids have bought a mine in Cape Breton. Can Mr. Collishaw tell us what is going on? I move for the appointment of a Select Committee, Mr. Chairman, to have Mr. Collishaw brought in to tell us what is going on.

Money has been like scraps of paper. They have squandered it everywhere. You might smile, but you will not smile long. You have an indignant public to contend with. We are living in an age that some of you do not seem to understand, and until public opinion manifests itself you will not understand what is happening. You hand over a million and a half dollars to the Reids besides four or five hundred thousand for subsidies. If it was a Crosbie or some other native he would be told to close up shop and get out, and this is the man the Prime Minister calls the most incapable man in Newfoundland. But the Prime Minister has been caught napping. The Reids have absolutely put the lasso over the colony. They have proved their cleverness. They have made you bring in resolutions that will give them practically two million dollars. Twenty years ago that was the total revenue of the Colony, and you dump it out to Reid to-night without giving it a thought. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has returned I want to read something to him. It's a tit bit. Listen to what the Prime Minister says in his manifesto: "I know I will not permit myself. . . Now what do you think of the Prime Minister? You remember what your paper use to call him, but he has captured you. But now Mr. Coaker are you going to al-

low this country to be driven into this mad policy of voting away millions of dollars without any chance of getting it back out of the revenue. Are you still going to continue this bungle? Can you not rise to the occasion and say I will be a whole man, I will be loyal to the people who sent me here? Can I not appeal to you to-night in memory of the days when you were really worth while. I pity you Mr. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-night. You are all balled up in this railroad matter and you don't know how to get out of it. There has been nothing left for me to do, but to take the stand that I have taken to-night. When I can see where the money is coming from I may be ready to let these resolutions go through. All you are told in your party meeting is that it is the best that can be done. They put you off in that way. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I will have more to say as the debate goes on, but I want to say to the Prime Minister now that I hope he will be able to give us some information; that he will be able to tell what other suggestions were put up to the government, and how he expects to get the money to finance this proposition.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the debate I desire to say a few words regarding the railroad Resolutions. It may come as the irony of fate that one who has been accused of being lined up with the Reid interests is obliged to vote against these resolutions.

There are two well-known sayings that have bearing on the situation that confronts us to-night. One is that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones," and then there is the corollary to that "one should not holler until he is out of the woods." The Hon. the Prime Minister in introducing the Resolutions stated that the Resolutions should not be regarded as a partizan measure. He

took the position that as far as the House was concerned we might regard them in an absolutely non-partizan spirit because in our little country while we have a railroad that is not exactly the kind of one we would like, it is the only one we have and we have to do the best we can with it. Many travellers have been willing to forgive us when they realize that it is the only railroad we have. It has always been the stormy petrel of politics in this country. There have been the two great bugaboos—the Reids and Confederation. What will happen when they are both realized I don't know, but from the conduct of the Government they both seem likely to take place in the near future.

The thoughts that I have on this question are absolutely non-partizan, but they are thoughts that have come to me because of the unfortunate manner in which the Government has approached the railroad problem. We leave the onus of responsibility for these resolutions in the Government. If they undertake to say that they will go through then it is theirs, and we have discharged our duty when we have shown our opposition to them and have given our reasons for our position.

Railroad operations in this country are summarized in three distinct periods. There is the famous '98 period. The year 1898 started the beginning of the Reid political talk. In 1901 a party was returned for the specific purpose of cancelling that contract, and in 1910 a party was returned that had for its platform the Branch Railroad policy. It was the distinct platform of the Morris party. Someone said justly the other day in one of the daily papers that we are paying just now for our branch railroad policy.

The situation so far as the expenditure which arose in the 1910 period is concerned, was surrounded by condi-

tions of prosperity which are lacking to-day. But considering the price that has had to be paid it would have been far better if we had never embarked upon that policy. The crux of the position as far as the branch railways are concerned is as I said a few days ago, that the country's population is mostly situate around the sea board and the kind of transportation that will improve matters is better water service. The branch railways are a joke except in one or two cases but there are stretches of coast where it would be much cheaper and better to have that class of service than the idea of branch railway policy. At that time of the year when the best travelling facilities are required the road is out of commission. The motion here that we can afford to carry on and keep open branch lines is an absurd one and I may say with reference to Sir George Bury's report that any thought of seriously operating the stretches of branches finished and unfinished means a task beyond the powers of the country physically and financially. The next cycle is the position where we have a second stage of what happened last year and I think the members will remember that in this House we were faced with the extraordinary situation that contrary to the pre-election promises, contrary to all the ideals the members opposite stood for, contrary to all the ideals advocated for on the platform and contrary to the policy under which they were elected, the Government of the day came and proceeded to tackle the railway problem. I say contrary to what has been said and done because in 1919 the present Government, the leading members of the Government, the Minister of Finance and Customs who is unavoidably absent to-night, gave as their only justification, as their only reason for going into public life was that they would be associated with a Gov-

ernment that would put the Reids in their places. The Prime Minister's manifesto has been read. You will remember the complimentary way in which he referred to the fact that those in power then and myself included as the Reid's solicitor, were the class of men that had to be put right out of power because we were dangerous to the welfare of the country to allow us to remain, as then the Reids got what they liked. And that the only chance of making the Reids live up to their contractual obligations was to return the present Government to power and the people to-day have got to accept their own decision and they swallowed it, like sugar when it came from the gifted hand and flowery tongue of the leader of the Government but the bitterness after the sugar coating has melted, is now being tasted and I bet you when you start to take a pill if the sugar melts away before you swallow it you will not swallow it at all and here is a pill the people of the country are not going to swallow too easily. But they must have been half doped when the sugar was passed around but they will wake up and realise that it is the old story over again and that that kind of fancy utterance of the leader of the House was the same old story told in different words merely to get into office. Now I have no purpose to digress in the short time I intend to utilise, because of this tempting opportunity to talk of the pill that was manufactured at that time and of the unfortunate bitterness resultant from the dose contained in that famous manifesto. We will have an opportunity of saying something in that regard during Ways and Means but I say to the hon. members opposite that before voting for the resolutions after turning them over in your minds, you can vote as you please as I would not for a minute think that as far as I am personally concerned, that I would influ-

ence you in the voting, but having seen them under the circumstances as shown you by the preceding speakers, and in the absence of any authority from the electorate, you men should not violate the principle without reason, and that is voting contrary to the mandate of the people who returned you here. The hon. members who have supported the Government have got to bear that in their minds. Up to the present you can have no justification for voting for them and the administration of the day cannot justify the Government voting for these resolutions until and unless they have given more reason than they have up to the present and the hon. members opposite cannot get clear of that position. The members of the Government cannot shirk this duty in this very important matter next in importance to our fishing industry, because of the financial expenditure. I say that the mixing up of the state with the financial obligations connected with the railway is the biggest item of expenditure we are called upon to consider and it is such a matter that we should see to it that it is given the best thought we have, so that we may be justified in the action we take. The hon. members will understand that in this country to-day the relations with regard to the railway system are not the relations ordinarily passing in matters which come before this House in matters of financial assistance from the Government to institutions but the relations between the Government and the Reids are contractual obligations, obligations and relations the result of a solemn contract entered into between the county on the one hand and the Reid Company on the other and before these obligations can be waived by the other side of this House to do which they have no right, you have to be shown a reason why, and I regret that I am not able to vote for them not alone because the Govern-

ment has not shown the reason why I should but because they have not attempted to show me why I should I have no desire whatever to hamper the operation of the railway nor have I any desire to hamper those connected with the railway. I have had connection with the system myself, I worked there for years and have had many very pleasant relations. I have had the luck to go through all the departments. And therefore I would like to approve of the resolutions for the sake of those there but I have to recognize that after all when it comes to dealing with a matter of public importance involving a broad general principle that if anything has to be done and can be done by the Assembly it can only be accomplished when the Assembly is thoroughly satisfied that no better course is available. What position do we find ourselves in to-night?

You are asking this House to vote for these resolutions which not alone will affect the contract but the country instead of being in the position of dictator to-day we find the humorous position that the situation is just the same as if a man met you on the street to-morrow and said, give me five hundred dollars to set me up in business on the cab stand and if I lose you lose all and if I make anything out of it you get nothing. Now that is the position so far as the country is concerned. The country is asked to accept the liability of at least one million and a half dollars and still further the country may find itself in the position of having to pay any amount on capital account. What is the justification for that? In the first place last year the Government of the day came in here and the leader of it following out his policy outlined in his manifesto, got up here and through the official debates told us that the whole situation was hopelessly bad and that the relations between the

contractors and the Government were unreliable and untrustworthy and that no credence could be put in the statements of the Company and he said that personally as Prime Minister he did not believe the story of the losses, in other words the hon. members will remember that he practically told the House that the operators of the railroad were a crowd of shifty men setting out with the purpose of jewing the Government. The Prime Minister said he would not trust the Reids with the expenditure of any moneys so you decided to appoint a commission to look after the expenditure of the money in three directions but when the House closed we find that you illegally and improperly, contrary to the power you had and contrary to all idea of legislative Government, the Executive Council while they were supposed to appoint four from the Government and three from the Reid Company they only appointed one and the Reids had three, so there was three to one and that was the beginning of the end of the 1901 contract and it was just what the contractors were looking for. The Reids were delighted to have the Government, being only six months in power, to come and save them.

I do not either deny or affirm that the Reids were losing or making money on the Railroad but the Government committed its first fraud upon this country when it embarked upon this matter, a matter which it was never authorized to do. This was a gross fraud. We were told that the commission would make a careful study of the railway system, look into its management and see where the country stood and make a report later on and advise what would be best to do. But the commission of four from the country never materialized. It was three to one in favour of the Reids. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is honest enough to say he

did not know very much about the various figures and money expenditures as these matters were looked after by Mr. Hall and if an accident occurred on Bell Island Mr. Hall had to go there and many other duties had to be attended to by him and in his spare time he looked after the expenditure of this million dollars, and still we are told by the leader of the Government that this commission was expressly appointed for the express purpose of undertaking the expenditure of this sum of money and the operation of the railroad. The Government never had the right legally or morally, to make the agreement it did. It had no right to spend one dollar of this money which was earmarked on purposes for which it was not intended to be expended on. The country agreed to pay all the loss of the operation of the road with the exception of one hundred thousand dollars and of course the Reids said thank you your kindness is unforgivable. In their wildest dreams they never thought of getting a gift like that. If Reid's solicitor and the Cashin-Crosbie bunch were all rolled up into one ball they could not possibly serve the Reids so nicely as you did. Why if the entire Reid Company staff sat on the opposite side of the House it could not achieve so much as you have for the Reids. I do not say you did it deliberately but it may be the result of the unfortunate position that like everything else you did not know what you were doing.

The Government, Mr. Chairman, was in this position—the Hon Minister of Marine, the central figure, had so many irons in the fire that the idea struck him this would be a good thing to do. He did it according to his lights as he did with the Fish Regulations. But the unfortunate part is that the country has to pay and we have to try and excuse him on the grounds that he did not know any better. You are too lazy

to learn and too hide-bound to ask for advice. You sat around the council board and looked wise and you are here because your chosen people put you here and you think they will not mind what you do. The people were the goats once again. You are there, a collection of five of you, looking wise typifying calm indifference, at peace with yourselves, a mutual admiration society, saying there are none like our selves. In their smug countenances and in their way of looking wise and self-satisfied, I congratulate the ordinary members in having them. Capt. Jones in his make-up and style and smile at the things going on here, cannot be outdone even by the Hon. Minister of Marine himself. It is improper for the Government to commit us to an expenditure of practically three millions—a sum which those who are looking on so calmly, stole by their indifference—and in a sense commit us to an expenditure that they have no right whatever to commit us to. We were told the House could not be kept open because the honorable members should not be kept from their work, but we have been here now till July 15th, and will stay here till December 15th if necessary. The House was not closed, the messengers etc., had no time to draw their pay or the Sergeant at-Arms to lock up his mace, before you entered into an abnegation of the contract. The Government knew when they came in this session what they would do, but they were afraid to bring it before the House. If you are honest in your proposition, why not lay all your cards on the table. Negotiations were on and the Government knew the position of the Reids and why did they not come forward and say "something will have to be done." You were afraid to have it laid on the table, and we would not have these resolutions here to-night except that the Government is burst and hasn't the same surpluses to bear and haul on

as they did last year. It does not matter much what powers we give as fortunately we are not there to be thrown out. We have these resolutions and what are they. After 12 months of control by the Commission on which the country is represented by the Hon. Minister of Marine, this Commission put in a report in which they do not make any such recommendations as we have here and give no undertaking that the country will commit itself to be responsible for the loss of one and a half millions on operation. They say on one point. (Quotes report.)

The delightful part of that sentence is its resemblance to the invitation of the spider to the fly—will you walk into my parlour. That report was signed by the Hon. Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall and they have decided that dual control must cease. I agree with that decision, but the lovely part of it is that though it must cease and the report is tabled, the next step is we are told nothing else can be done, and the House must be responsible for the one and a half million loss. We often hear of the nigger in the woodpile, but there is one between the railway ties in this respect. No recommendation such as this was made, but we are asked to be responsible for one and a half million. I'll try and fill the story in. On June 27th, knowing the railroad would close on the 30th, the Hon. Prime Minister in reply to a question and admitting the Government have nothing to do with it, said, we are going to bring down a man from Canada to tell us what to do. And this man was to be brought down 24 hours before the closing of the road, to assimilate all the rights, contracts, position of the company, the matters of assets and control and the penalty clauses in the contracts etc.—and he was to do it in 24 hours. He did do it—he did it in style. He rode the horse like any broncho steerer rides the foolish colt.

The truism, whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad, was never better exemplified than in his report. We have heard the Hon. Min. of Marine called the Mad Mullah, but he is now staid and retired. He came into prominence in connection with fishery matters, and I know he would appreciate it if he were on this side and were asked to vote for this thing. I'd like to see him asked to do so in the days when he was fit and going strong. Talk of throwing ink bottles—why the desk and all would go across the floor. I will pay him this much credit, that if he were here in my position, you Mr. Chairman, would not have such an easy time as you now have in me addressing you. I can just imagine him listening to this report. Sir George Bury arrived on the 27th and had a few days here—he may be a good railway man alright, but he is only a man, he has only one pair of eyes, one pair of legs to walk on, and one brain though it may be a very bright one—and he comes here and this is what he says. (Quotes report.)

Picture him making a study of the railroad in 24 hours. He could pick up a folder belonging to the Co. and get someone to point out for him the terminals, mileage, etc., A study indeed; there are different kinds of study and I would not like to compare my study of the Bible with that of a law book from which I was going to make a \$10 bill. As far as Sir George Bury is concerned, when he says "I made a study of it and suggest this, etc.," he first figured out we were too green to burn, and the greenest of all is the Government who employed him. But I hope there is enough of the fir bough left about us to be tough in burning and that we will not take the suggestions of a man who says he made a study of the railroad in 24 hours. If I did not know the man I would say he were a fool, but I do know him as a

man. He had a few days off to spare, he came in here one way and went out the other and took his \$10,000 for it. It's a wonder you did not erect an arch for him for if you had not this you would have nothing as there is no suggestion in the report. But you say, "Oh, Sir George tells us to do it, and we are going to do it." I hope you will not do it all. We might do some things but I hope we will not do all till we get an answer to the Americanism "We want to know." Despite his qualifications, I would not compare his report to that of one of our roadmasters, any more than I would compare myself to one of the great big lawyers on a point of constitutional law. If Graham Cobb, Keefe, some of the well tried conductors or engineers, or Powell, Taylor or Joyce said something, I would listen, as they know what they are talking about. But not to a man who does not know if the sign on the station at Port aux Basques is spelt in the singular or the plural. Here's what he says—(Quotes report.)

This expression 'without prejudice,' is one that is used by lawyers when they do not know exactly where they stand. Was there not enough legal talent in your ranks to find out after 12 months the true position. What is going to happen if you do not find out now—will you only keep on drawing up agreements "without prejudice." Why not say something plain as to where we are under the contract. I respect the position occupied by those representing justice in the Government but in 12 months surely some digest of opinions should have been arrived at as to where we stood. Some authorities say it can be found under the penalty clause of a million dollars, others say there is a daily penalty, and we ought to have it as part of these resolutions. It is good enough to say blindly after 12 months that this is the best that can be done? It is nothing to Sir

George Bury to say "enter into a contract for 12 months." I care not how honest of purpose he may be, he does not have to live here. There is an awful difference between him in his position and if he were responsible to the people for his seat in the House. We ought not lightly accept his ideas and I want to get the opinions of those who have to bear the burden. What kind of position would it be if I were called to Canada under similar circumstances and simply said "cut that or this out for a year or two." It would be alright for me personally; I could smoke my cigar, draw my \$10,000 and say "what odds, it does not matter to me." But that is not good enough. I'd rather one of the Government would say that, despite their laziness, and I would say that, and I would pay more attention to it than coming from Bury, because the speaker then would be one interested. There is absence of interest here as there is not one man in the Government with grit enough to get up and say this is the best thing we can do. The Opposition therefore finds itself in this position, that there is no effort made to see if any other arrangement can be made than this. So then I say, it is not good enough for the Hon. Prime Minister to come in here and say, "here are the resolutions, and if you can do better go and do it." It is your job, and if you cannot do better after 12 months, it is a poor thing to fire this on the Table and ask us to find an opinion—not if you gave each of us \$10,000. I have faith enough in the men of our side to think they would justify their actions and say so, if it were the best they could do. But there is not a word to say if the Government touched on the project, with anyone else. Give the Reids the preference if there is nobody else to do better, but I object to you asking us to vote blindly when you will not show

us you have made efforts elsewhere. I am not pro-Reid or anti-Reid, but treat all on the square. It is not good enough to simply say you must vote for this without showing that you have tried to do better. It is decidedly unfair to expect the Opposition to endorse this. There is no reason why we should try to embarrass the Government, but then you ought to come down and lay before the House the proposals that have been made. Have you not had other proposals from the Reids than those of which the House has knowledge, and if you have such proposals, why do you not bring them down; what is the use of trying to stave off the inevitable? The Government in this matter is like Mr. Micawber, they are waiting for something to turn up, but it must be remembered that these things do not come knocking at your door. You have done nothing; you are worrying about nothing but your own petty interests.

The second thing which this wonderful movie star tells us is that the road should be operated with all reasonable economy and again he tells us that we should have a competent general manager. He was told to say this because it is no more his opinion than it is mine; it is merely an attempt to camouflage the true position which is that certain people here say that we must have a man down from Canada to run the railway and the proof of this is that the Prime Minister tells us that he has just the man we want in Montreal, and not alone is he ready to come here but he has a five years' contract. The life of the Government is short, you see and realizing this the Prime Minister is taking no chances. And, in that connection I will go further and say that not alone has this man a contract for five years, but he will be paid at the rate of at least \$25,000 a year because Mr. Coaker has said that no man worth his

salt would come down here for less as he would be worth more up there. I say as a Newfoundlander that no Sir George Bury, nor anyone else needs to pick a man in Canada for this job, because there are as competent men in this country as there are to be found outside of it. You may strike a man in Canada or elsewhere who is worn out, turned out or beaten out in some other job, but there are so many things that need to be watched that I would rather take a local man than to import a man whom it will take five years to learn the language and assimilate himself to our peculiar methods of approach; why it would take him twelve months to learn the different dialects that are used in the different parts of the country. Sir George Bury himself was so impressed with the railway that he did not use his ticket to go back, but instead took passage by the *Rosalind* and then he says I will pick the proper man to run the road. I think we have men good enough here for the job because after all the whole system is only a good yard for a decent railway. Capt. Lewis is timely in his suggestion that this is but the case of "another George." First we had George Hawes, and now it is George Bury, but personally, I would rather pin my faith to a local George, and right here I will say that our own George Cobb is a man than whom no better could be imported. The whole report of Sir George Bury is an insult and a joke. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the heart of the present resolutions. Sir George Bury tells us that the Railway cost \$1,650,000 to operate last year, and that the operators are too, pessimistic as to the outlook for the coming year and that the country ought to become responsible for another million and a half dollars and I cannot vote for the resolutions on that account. I do not say that the Reids are liars as the Leader of the

House suggests but no matter how honest they may be, I refuse to accept the dictation of people with whom I am going to make a contract. It is not right, for the country's sake that you should do so, and that is why I say that you should have more than Sir George Bury's report before introducing these resolutions. The Government party as a party are no wiser to-day with regard to the Resolutions before the Chair than we are and we on this side are not opposing the Resolutions because we want to create an awkward situation for the Government but merely because we have not got the information that we should have to enable us to deal with them intelligently or that would warrant us voting for them, and it is the same with you gentlemen on the other side. We have talked of being here till after the races, but it would be better for us to stay here till Christmas or to adjourn the House and come in afterwards with something business-like and definite than to let this go thru under the present circumstances. I would like to see the Resolutions go through, but the Minister who has introduced them has not given us a word to show that any attempt has been made to do any better than we are now doing.

As Sir Michael Cashin has said, if the Reid Nfld. Co. are financially tied up, I do not know that there is any special desire on the part of the Opposition to make their task more unpleasant, because there would be no object in that position at all, as we want to have the system kept going and kept going at the greatest capacity possible. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that under the Resolutions you are getting after the employees and hitting them hard, and that is another reason why I cannot vote for the Resolutions? Do you know that you are going to cut your train services

by over one-third thereby curtailing the railroad employees? Have you thought out that the first result of the passing of these Resolutions will mean the clipping off of over one-third of your engineers, brakemen, conductors and railroadmen generally, because if you are going to cut down the train services you got to cut down your staff proportionately? It must be remembered that train crews are only required as under the present schedule, but reduce your schedule, cut out your branch lines along with the closing down of most of the main line during the winter time, and it means the dismissal of nearly half of the employees of the Company. It may be necessary to do that, but before you do it, ought you not be certain and sure that such a course is necessary, and ought you not be satisfied as to what might happen. I go further and say that you cannot afford any how to pay one and a half million dollars to run a railway. This country cannot stand keeping on paying one and a half million dollars for operating the railroad. I cannot subscribe to the idea of voting all this money and at the same cut the service in two, and throw a thousand or more men out of employment. I have to be absolutely convinced that this course is essential before I will subscribe to such a principle. The Government party as a party are no better informed on this matter than the Opposition party. Show us that this is the best you can do by bringing down the history of the whole thing and we will be prepared to give you some consideration. Now why put it off and await the evil day. Let us have the true story now. In any event it got to be threshed out in twelve months time, if this country survives. There has got to be some other arrangement, I think. Has the Government considered anything about that I wonder? Not a sound, not an idea, not a thought.

Honorable members of the Government, with regard to the present Resolutions, appear to have subscribed to a settled simple and blunt policy. Seemingly the crowd in the Government content themselves with the position, that, after all, they did many bad things and made many mistakes, that they regret that what they did was bad for the country and that one other thing, more or less, will not matter. But this one thing is the worst of all and the most fatal blunder they have yet made, because I want to say that of all the bad things that you have done and of all the frightful mistakes you have made, none of them spells as much for either great or ill as the railway policy of the Government. There is nothing in our industrial life or our hope for the future that means so much as the attitude we are going to take in connection with the railway. It is not good enough for any member of the Government to get up and say to the Opposition 'What do you suggest?' I want some member opposite to get up and show me why I should vote for the Resolutions. The burden is on you. You set up the case. There was a fifty years contract, but you came in and stopped it. In other words you got your contract. Your duty is to show me that it is impossible to have that contract carried out, and that being so you are trying to do the best thing now. You took the advice of Sir George Bury, who said that you should have heavier rails, although your own Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, recommended the use of heavier rails. You decided to accept Bury's passing opinion in preference to Hall's, despite the fact that the latter has been watching the movements of the trains and has been watching the traffic generally for years. Why did you do that? Now I do not say for a moment that report of Hall's was right, but is it not an extraordinary thing that the

railway policy for this whole country has got to depend upon the opinion of this wonderful man Bury. We must remember that it is not because this gentleman was employed abroad by different countries to look into railroad matters that he is of necessity such an expert that his advice alone is the one we got to take. How many Government Fish experts and School experts have we got abroad and who were sent abroad by the present Government and whose opinion on any big public question abroad would be taken as final simply because they were Newfoundland Government experts? It seems that the whole case has rested upon the report of Sir Geo. Bury. Not a Minister of the Government has said anything to substantiate his report, nor has there been a thought expressed by the Railway Commissioners. We talk idly about voting away millions of dollars. The voting away of twenty, thirty, forty or fifty millions matters nothing to big countries, but we in Newfoundland cannot afford to do that. Why fifteen millions in Canada would be only considered an incidental in Canada, because it is a big country and because there are more people there to shoulder the burden; but surely there must come a day when our public service will have to stop if this kind of expenditure is continued here. We have only a limited number of people and we got to be contented with a reasonable and a limited amount to run our public utilities and we got to be contented with making up our minds that we cannot have the luxuries of more populous countries. We would all like to have them, no doubt, and no one would object to-day to voting ten millions for the railroad if we could afford it. It is not a question of principle with us, it must be remembered, but it is a question of paying the money. Now can we afford it? It mat-

ters no more to me Mr. Chairman than it does to you. But the point is can we afford to commit ourselves to this and can we manage to get anything cheaper? And not alone that, but under these Resolutions a cheaper schedule is contemplated for the operation of the railway, and I cannot accept the statement that a service reduced by more than one-third is going to cost as much this year as it did last year. It stands to reason and common sense will dictate that the operation expenses this year cannot be as great as they were last year. Why accept responsibility at all? Why not turn around to-morrow and advance the Reid Company the money straight and accept their mortgage like other Trust Companies did? But I say now that as a Legislature we have no right whatever to come in and haphazardly vote this amount without being satisfied that no other arrangements were attempted to be made. I am thoroughly satisfied that this is not the only proposition that can be put up.

The concluding paragraph in the report of this expert that you brought down suggests the inadvisibility of Government ownership. We agree with him. But what light is there thrown on the situation. What have we got to-day before us to indicate that the Government has made the slightest attempt to make it sure that even that course would not be necessary. No one wants to have Government ownership of the railroad in this country, I am sure I don't. The million and a half squandered last year by the Commission is enough experience for us; but on the other hand I say that this House cannot be expected to pass these Resolutions in their present form. There are two paragraphs embodied in Sir George Bury's report and which I have already commented upon and which are highly objectionable, and were put in for the purpose of taking

the position that because the country is going to be responsible for a loss of one and a half million dollars that you are going to have it appear that the new General Manager of the road will not be under the influence of the Reids. I resent that for many reasons, Sir George Bury was told to suggest that he wanted a new General Manager, and he was told that the Prime Minister wanted a new General Manager. One of the reasons why I resent this is because a local man will be a better man than any one that Sir George Bury can pick, and that he and his assistants who are used to the operation of our road and who grew up with the road will give a much better service than an outside man; secondly the class of man you will bring down will not be as good at all as a local man, because if he has any great knowledge on railway matters he would not be allowed to come down here to work; thirdly because I have sufficient faith in any local man, I care not whom, to be satisfied that he will do his work just as honestly, as fearlessly and as efficiently as any man you will import. In any event, if you bring down a man to act as General Manager for this road with the contractors in control, the first man that the Manager will want to please with his work is either one of the contractors. I know that the Prime Minister has already secured a man in Montreal to act in that capacity, and that his job is alright for five years, under a contract and for no less than \$25,000 for that period, so that he will be under no obligation, at least, for that time whether he suits or not. He will be paid by the contractors primarily and if there is any favour to be shown by him it will first be shown to the contractors. Furthermore this man from Canada is not going to worry a great deal whether he saves any money for this country in the operation of the

railway or not. It would be better to adopt the system of giving a bonus. Get a local Manager, instead of the hand-picked one of Sir George Bury, and tell him and his associates that for all the amounts under a certain figure saved to this country in the operation of the road that you will give a certain bonus. It is the same old story. "No man can be a prophet in his own country." According to this hopeless crowd that are in office now, all the wise acres come from abroad. If you are abroad you are worth a lot more than you are worth in your own country. My advice to the whole Government is to go abroad and travel. The great trouble here is that when we get in close touch with one another we see our defects; but we should remember that "Cows far off wear long horns." We know nothing of the capabilities or the disposition of a man coming here from the United States or Canada, but we do know these qualities in a local man just as my friend, Mr. Jennings, and I know the extremists on either side of the Temperance question.

I propose to vote against the Resolutions and I regret that I am obliged to do so. Why I am going to vote against them is because of the conduct of the Government, and because of the absence of any justification being made for the Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Timber" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be re-

ferred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.



MONDAY, July 18th.

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

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of Fishery Supplies for the Current Season.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fisheries Supplies for the Current Season" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of all expenses incurred by Mr. J. M. Devine, Trade Commissioner at New York, from the date of his appointment up to June 30th last. Also to ask if the Colony is under any obligation to pay him for his services after that date, and if so, what amount has been paid him, also whether he is entitled to have his expenses back to

this country paid, and if so what amount is being allowed him therefor.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the receipts:

- (a) For the Post Office Department.
- (b) Of the Postal Telegraph Department, from the 1st of January to the 30th of June of this year, and the amount received for the first six months of last year; and also a statement of the expenditure of each Department during the same periods.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total receipts of the Department of Agriculture and Mines from the 1st of January to the 30th of June of this year and the amount received for the first six months of last year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what is the reason that Mr. J. M. Devine, Trade Commissioner at New York, made no reference, according to the report of his evidence at Washington, in the American official publication tabled in this House recently to our exports of iron ore, manufactured pulp and manufactured paper, which apart from our fishery products are some of our most valuable exports, and what is the use of having a man occupying the position of Trade Commissioner in New York and purporting to represent us at Washington, who knows so little about the Trade and Commerce of this country that in a statement of this kind he omits these very important items.

MR. WALSH asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing:

- (a) The amount of stores, material and any other property, landed

from the steamers purchased in the U. S. by Mr. J. B. Patten for the Government.

- (b) Where is said stores or material now.
- (c) If any of said goods have been sold, who was purchaser and what was price paid.
- (d) Table a statement in detail in reference to material landed from S.S. Watchful, S.S. Daisy and S. S. Lobelia, said statement to give same particulars as asked for in reference to steamers purchased in the United States.

MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how many new schools were opened since his appointment as Head of this Department, giving location of said new schools. Also a statement showing the number of children of school age, deprived of an opportunity of receiving an education because of no school in their localities, also the number of schools which are only open for six months of the year, because of insufficient funds at the disposal of the School Boards, giving locations of said schools.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if it is correct that the firm of P. H. Cowan & Co., of this City, which went into liquidation a few days ago, owes the Customs Department nearly \$15,000 in the form of bonds for duties which, under the law would form a first claim on the assets of this estate; also, if it is true that Mr. Collishaw has a mortgage on the House of Mr. Cowan, one of the assets of the estate, for an equivalent amount, and if it is correct that Mr. Collishaw has arranged with the Government that his mortgage is to be satisfied before the Colony's claim under the Custom bonds, and if so, what is the legal

justification for this step and why is Mr. Collishaw being permitted the advantage over the Colony or other creditors.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the total amount of duty paid on the imports of intoxicating liquors, wines, beers, etc., from the 1st of January to the 30th of June, of this year and the amounts paid for the same for the first six months of last year.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the operation of the Nfld. Railway.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, in rising to address the House on this question before the Chair, I appreciate very deeply the importance of this matter, as it is one of the most important measures that has come before this House since this session opened. It had the effect of putting aside a great deal of important legislation that otherwise would have been put through the House long before this, and in expressing my appreciation of its importance I trust that any remarks I may make will be accepted by the House in the spirit in which I make them, as my only object is to speak in the interest of the people of the country. Conditions are such in the country that the greatest minds in the country are needed and this matter is of such a serious nature that it will effect the economic future of the country. The question we are asked to decide is whether this Legislature in its wisdom is satisfied to vote a million and a half dollars for the coming year, to make up the anticipated deficit on the operation of

the railway system. A million and a half dollars a few years ago would cover our entire colonial expenditure, and in the days gone by when we had small revenues, when Newfoundland was a happy and a prosperous country with a small National Debt. A great deal has been said with regard to the operation of the Railroad of this country carrying as it does enormous obligations and now we have come to the parting of the ways when we have to decide as to whether we can continue this expenditure. The railway to-day Sir, is just as necessary to the life of the country as any other of our public utilities, our Post Offices, Lighthouses, Fog Alarms, etc., and therefore we cannot seriously consider the abandonment of the operation of the railroad. Economic management of the road is another question, as to whether it can be made to pay its own way. On that question I am not in a position to give an opinion, but we should conserve the public funds to the last dollar in expenditure on this account. Hon. members on this side of the House have endeavoured to point out.

I condemn the Government for not having given the fullest information regarding the policy for the future operation of the railroad. The whole country is disappointed, and the members on this side of the House are disappointed. When the Prime Minister brought in the Resolutions the other day he tabled a large amount of statistics; very illuminating in their way, but not at all what we required. In my opinion there is a lot of other information—such as correspondence, suggestions, and interviews that we know nothing of, and I do not believe that the members on the other side of the House knew anything of it. We are asked to vote away a million and a half dollars without any reason whatever being given. It goes

to prove that the whole operation of the railroad by the Government is rotten to the core. How the work of repairs to the railroad was carried out is a matter of history. The transaction that has damned the Government was the appointment of a commission without the authority of this House. When the Commission was appointed it was lop-sided, there were only two government representatives and there were three representatives of the Reids. Now I say that neither Mr. Coaker nor Mr. Hall should have been on that commission. Mr. Coaker may have a fair idea of matters in connection with the fish business, but he knows nothing whatever of the railroad business. Mr. Hall is a good man in his way, but he knew nothing of the details of a railroad business, and beside he had enough other work to do if it were properly attended to. He is practically taken out of his office, and sent up to the Reid Newfoundland Company. Outside of the laying of bridges and such work he knows nothing of the railroad business. He knows nothing of the details in connection with the employment of a large number of men, and the various work that they are detailed to do. It is no wonder under those conditions that they made a mess of the whole thing as shown by the report that has been tabled. The commission was appointed to find out where leakages were, and instead of coming back to this House after having discovered the leakages and saving money for the Colony they come back with the biggest deficit in the history of the railroad. I quite appreciate the fact that the commission did their work voluntarily. Mr. Coaker did not take any pay. Mr. Hall got \$2,000. Mr. Coaker could give practically no time to the work. His duties are numerous and scattered. When it is realized that he was Prime Minister during

four of the busiest months of the year, that he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that in addition to these duties he had to attend to his private work as president of several big corporations, it is small wonder that he could give very little time to his work as a member of the railroad commission. But the point is he should not have been on the commission at all. The very best he could do was to take several trips to Port Union in his private car. It would be far better to give the man at the head of the commission representing the Government, \$25,000 a year and have him stay on the job. After a year in office they should have been in a position to go to the Government and recommend what course should be followed. I do not blame the Prime Minister so much, because he does not know the facts. But I blame the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because he should be in possession of the facts, and should be able to supply them to this House. If this vote is made to the Reid Nfld. Company then Newfoundland will be a sorry place to live in. Some set policy should be laid down by the Government of the day; some policy that will show a more economical operation of the railroad. I believe that there have been other suggestions, that there have been other recommendations. I believe the Government has information that would assist the members on this side of the House to make suggestions, but the members on this side are groping in the dark. It is impossible to get any information from the Government, and that is where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is failing ignominiously in his duty as chairman of that commission.

The history of the railroad is one that paralyzes when one thinks of the enormous expenses of the past year compared with that of previous years.

It has not been explained to this House why the operation of certain sections of the road has gone up 100 per cent. I have a copy of the Commissioners Report, signed by the two Government members. Last year the steamers were under the commissioners, but this year they are not. That has not been explained to this House. If they are a paying proposition that explains it, but if they are not who is going to pay the deficit? Paragraph 5 of the report refers to Mr. Pill. Mr. Pill may be a good man. He left Newfoundland 20 or 25 years ago. and now he is planning to return. I understand he is to get \$400 a month. Now there are many men in public life in Newfoundland who have given the best years of their life to the country. who could do the job just as well. There are two men under him, a Mr. Crummy and Mr. Bert Dicks. Mr. Dicks is a man that we have the utmost respect for. When the time came he put down his tools and went to fight for his country. If he was good enough to go and fight for his country he was good enough to audit accounts. Mr. Dicks was well trained in railroad affairs, and if the position had been given to him he could have done the job with another man with him because he is an industrious, hard-working man. The work of auditing accounts is merely clerical.

One of the saddest experiences of the railroad commission was their experience in coal boring. They blindly took on themselves the expenditure of a large sum of money. Now we have to face the fact that after spending \$155,000 they got 2,000 tons of coal. In other words it has cost the country \$75.00 a ton. We have a statement here that 2,500 tons were obtained and 2,000 tons developed. Now what they call developed is that the coal is along by the walls, and it will never be obtained because the place is flooded

with water. Was it not the duty of the commission to economize in the expenditure of public moneys? But instead we have the worst example of extravagance that has ever come before this House. The idea first was to build a railroad to the mines, but that would have cost twice as much as building the Argentinia branch. Instead of doing that they went to work and ordered a number of five ton trucks. The trucks have sunk in the mud, and will never be seen down here again.

No wonder why we have a deficit. No wonder why the railroad cost \$1,600,000. If this is how you spent the money and controlled its expenditure then no wonder a big deficit is facing us to-day. It was all spent through bungling and incapacity. For this there was no authority whatever. Then he goes on to say that a curtailment of free passes (reads). All the employees of the parent and subsidiary companies have them, I have no fault to find if there was no unfair discrimination for we find the Inspector General and others getting them. The honourable members on the opposite side belonging to the Outports find it very costly to visit their homes and there is no reason why they when here attending to their legislative duties should not get their free passes home. We all know they have no untold wealth and they deserve the consideration of the Government in that direction more so than the Inspector General and others. Mr. Macdonnell, the hon. member for St. George's has to go the full end of the line and has to pay his full fare all the time. His Honour the Speaker also has to do the same. I claim all those expenses incurred here like that ought to be refunded them before the House closes. The same applies to Mr. Archibald who has to make many trips to his district to at-

tend to the wants of his constituents. I hope the Government will realize their duty in this respect. (Reads.) Now I join issue with the Government on that point as I do not believe they would have saved one dollar as the railway is at the present time suffering from the high cost of travelling. The run from here to Sydney on a boat only costs half of the fare as it does on the railway. It is absolutely essential to have a cheaper rate of travelling and it is only false economy to run like it is being run. It was pointed out by Sir John Crosbie re the consumption of food stuffs, that the earning power of the people had dropped and I say it is dropping all the time and the cheaper things get the more will they purchase and the same applies to the travelling on the road.

The same applies to the freights. By railroad the freight on a barrel of flour from Sydney to here is \$1.52 and by ship it is only \$1.00. You have got to cut down the rates to get business. Then he goes on to talk about the operation of the road. (Reads.) That was true and it is a point well taken. The trouble about the railroad is that there are many stretches along our line where not a single soul is to be found. It is impossible to operate the road without any loss and some remedy ought to be found for this big factor. The trains are only half filled with freight most of the time. Why has not the commission found a remedy to some degree at any rate? The Canadian Government operated the roads there last year and lost \$7,000,000 and everyone knows whatever Government took over the operation of a railroad lost. But they were under Government control. The United States Government lost billions of dollars. In the old country they were a failure as well when operated by the Government while they paid well

when run otherwise. If proper regard had been taken by the Commission I say an immense amount of money would have been saved. The memo. handed me in relation to this matters reads as follows. (Reads.) Now there is a point that may be lost sight of. When Sir John Crosbie was head of the Shipping Department during the year 1916 and onward the Government took over the management and operation of the road as there was a tremendous scarcity of ships and the submarines were quite active. Every ship available was handed over to the Russian Government to keep the White Sea open and we sacrificed our ships to help the cause and with the exception of a couple of ships we had none at all. Therefore the railroad had to carry more than it was ever intended to transport and that burden was a continuous one and very little time was given to the repair of the road. But that road suffered terribly during that period and the Reid Company were never reimbursed, and I contend they are entitled to the same consideration given by other Governments. Bonds should have been raised and the operation of the road properly managed. The Reids did their part very well and they did their best to keep the transportation open and in working order.

These extra duties brought about the condition of the road last year. We voted \$1,000,000 to fix up the road caused because of the extra wear and tear but that has nothing to do with this question. (Reads.) The Government last year when they came in here for \$1,000,000 should have asked for \$2,000,000 and they would have it. The Reids deserved it. I say this legislature should give back the road as they found it before the war period. Then came another unnecessary and ill advised action of the Government

and that was the building of the branch line to Argentinia. I have no fault to find with that but I contend that the country could not afford it and that temporary repairs should have been effected. You had no legislative authority to build it. You then came in here and passed a Bill of Indemnity to legalise your actions and it is due to the retribution towards the poor people out there that the Opposition voted for it. The whole thing was wrong. This terminal is going to cost the sum of four hundred thousand dollars and for this sum much better use could be found as the country is in dire want of money at the present time. Raising it by means of bonds is only shirking your duty and responsibility. Not because you are spending it on capital account you should so do. That debt will go on for ever and then tax, surtax and sales tax is the result. Still you allow this to go on. In the Resolutions before me there is a proviso that money shall only be spent on capital account. Outside the expenditure of the \$1,500,000 the excess will be charged up against the Reid Company on settling day. Is there any hidden meaning attached to that section? You must find the money to spend on capital account. Perhaps 8% will be charged up to public and burden after burden is coming on their shoulders until finally they will give way under strain. This is all due to the indifference to the public welfare. You got six engines from seventy-five to eighty tons and what for? I understand they cost about \$500,000. Is that so Mr. Coaker?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Cost three hundred and fifty thousand.

Why was it necessary to purchase these expensive locomotives? They were not built to carry their weight. Why did you not only get fifty-ton

engines and then less than six? A man running a business to-day will not so increase and elaborate his equipment. Are not fifty-ton engines sufficient to suit our road? You have not considered the safety of the public in this matter. Economy—why it is the other way about. This action of yours with regard to our tramway, as that is all it is, is ill advised and lacking wisdom. We only paid fifteen thousand dollars per mile and we got what we paid for. It cannot be any good. In the Old Country they have paid as much as £45,000 per mile. Then you talk of getting eighty-ton engines for this road of ours. Then Hall gives us a long recitation about railway matters such as fire boxes, etc., which does not concern us.

They bought the box cars, etc. and every kind of gear when they should have been conserving. They say here. (Quotes report.)

The condition here are different to-day; the freight sheds have been half empty for 12 months; the real trouble is the money voted for building sheds was spent in another direction. (Quotes report.)

Now just imagine this in a country on the verge of bankruptcy. We know the passenger accommodations are not ideal, but to seriously consider new style cars to be decided on by the man from Canada when we are bankrupt, is madness. It is only fooling the people. (Quotes report.)

Everyone knows that next to our Cathedrals the railway station is the biggest building in St. John's; it is not half used, and yet they suggest increased space for the office hands. It is outrageous. From the men who composed the Commission—I do not think the Hon. Minister of Marine has read this—and Mr. Hall is only a visionary but a big man in the States when he has millions to spend—the presumption of extension is ridicul-

ous. To come in here and ask for enlargement is putting the trappings of an elephant on a cat; the expenses are too great and have to be considered and cut down. They could not find the money to build a freight shed but they ask for and recommend the extension of the railway offices. Here is a clause. (Quotes report). Surely they didn't realize this when they put it in the report. This is an extraordinary statement from the Commission considering the need of cutting expenses. They realize it is a foolish statement. Nobody wanted the Commission to do anything improper or to leave undone anything that should be done and this statement damns the whole report as it shows they have not enough backbone to do what they are called on to do. Evidently the Commission sent in this report as to the steamers with a view to escaping adverse criticism as they wish to do in connection with the railway. (Quotes report.)

The question of coals I think is a serious one for the Reids. They had no money; they had to get the coal here before the 1st of January, the Dominion Co. would give them none without the money and the Government had to come to the rescue. This year they ought to do with 40,000 tons at \$2 a ton less which ought to mean practically half a million with the reduced use of it. I believe the Government have to provide it to keep the road running as they can't import it in the winter but must get it in before the end of December. Last year it cost \$980,000 but this year it ought to cost about \$800,000. There are reasons assigned for running the road and one of these is cheaper coal. They hope to have higher passenger rates and cheaper wages. You are confronted to-day with conditions that make it wrong to reduce wages while the Government is piling on taxes.

You spent last year \$470,000 in snow-fighting. This year you expect a less volume of freight and less passengers moving owing to the condition of the country. The earning power from Grand Falls is gone and they realize they have greater competition than ever from water traffic. It is no trouble to get steamers to compete with the Reid Nfld. Co. in bringing freight in and out of the country. These are all reasons why you should conserve and see that no money is wasted so that justification for this legislation would be your experience when you come back here another year. The report says some of this may be left out. Why I ask. Isn't it of importance to the public—that is why we complain, because it is left out. That is the trouble—they are not fair to the public. Why cloak it from the public. What would be thought of the directors at a meeting of any shareholders if they said they would not make the details of the business public. No wonder there is lack of trust and confidence and the people are fed up with the Government. Very few of you have even read the report. (Quotes report.)

Where is the necessity for all the experts? Why send to Canada for managers when you have better men right here on the spot. You had to bring in one who perhaps is pre-eminent in his class but Mr. Hall met him at Port aux Basques with his report. He arrived, stayed three days and wrote a letter, the same as we have here. He told us what we all knew before, said long ago that he would recommend that we spend half a million. Why pay him \$2,500 a day for what we all knew already. We heard from the Hon. Prime Minister a few days ago that we would have to get a manager. We have freight men, section men, and audit men and the whole business to them is like A B C.

and I know half a dozen men can run it successfully. But still we got to send for experts. Do you think the men here are imbeciles? Why did not the Prospero and Portia need experts to run them? Mr. Foley, a hand in Bowring's office could run them successfully but they are now under Government control and we got to have a Minister and assistant and various others to do the same work or try to do it. There are too many frills and we get no returns. It is absolutely unjustifiable and still we are asked to subscribe to such nonsense. We have experts as to the cars, etc., and nobody knows how many more we will have before we are much older. That report will be discussed perhaps later by those more efficient than myself and things I do not see will be extracted from it, but it shows lack of appreciation of the situation of the country as will be pointed out when we come to consider the money bills which will show the country is on the verge of bankruptcy. The money is spent with no regard to economy. I would like to quote some figures to show the growth of expenditure on the railway. The Hon. Prime Minister does not consider them or give them out. I would like to refer to few tables of them.

In 1919-20, that is the last year the Reid Nfld. Co. ran the railway, the expenses were \$2,676,890 while the earnings were \$1,341,000, making a deficit of \$1,335,107. Last year, 1920-21 the expenses of running the road were \$1,350,000, the earnings were \$700,000, making a deficit of \$1,650,000. In other words, the loss on the operation of the Railway was \$91,630, in 1904 and in 1921 it is \$1,650,000. The operating expenses in 1904 were \$520,600, in 1905 \$523,961, in 1917 \$1,232,976. Now in 1920 the expenses of operation were \$2,767,890 and in 1921 they were \$3,148,000, showing an in-

crease of \$400,000 over the previous year. In other words, while the operating expenses in 1904 were \$522,600 in 1921 they are \$3,148,000, or an increase of \$2,592,000 in that period, showing that the cost of running the railway has been gradually increasing from year to year. Now, let us compare the earnings. In 1904 the earnings were \$490,469 and in 1921 \$1,433,783 or \$1,700,000 less than the cost of operation. Now, Mr. Chairman, I merely quote these figures for the purpose of bringing home to the House the serious problem that confronts this country, a problem that no other government in Newfoundland ever had to tackle and a problem, moreover, that will not be solved for years to come, and with a request now for another million and a half dollars or more besides all the other demands that must be met, is it any wonder one should ask, in the words so well known "where are we and whither tending?" In the brief speech made by the Prime Minister in introducing the Budget, he said that in 1911 our Revenue was \$2,527,126.43 and our expenditure was \$3,406,278.22. I said at the time that it was not long ago since our Revenue was under a million dollars. The Revenue in 1914 was \$3,950,000 while the Expenditure was \$4,008,000 and in 1920 the Revenue was \$10,951,000 and the Expenditure was \$9,247,000 or an increase of 6½ and 5 millions. Now it must be remembered that this revenue was due to war conditions. The value of our fisheries jumped from 20 million dollars to over 40 millions and other things increased accordingly, but we put some by for a rainy day, and let me say here that the people who saved something in these days of plenty are better off now as a result. The question is however, how can people pay as big a revenue now as they did in 1914? There are at least 1,500 men engaged on work that is not necessary

simply because work must be found to keep them from starving and this is another of the many blunders of the Government. They are spending \$120,000 every month on the Hall's Bay Road and in addition to that, other roads are being built to give employment. The whole thing is only a case of simple proportion. You are putting this country deeper in the mire every day. You are overtaxing the people who are unable to pay it because the prices of the goods are so far as they are concerned, prohibitive. These Resolutions are so serious that one is diffident about expressing an opinion on them and I hope that before the debate closes the Government will see fit to withdraw them. It is unthinkable that we should hand out a million and a half dollars in this way, and the worst of it is that I do not believe the Reids want it. If you must give it, however, give it in such a way that it will be spent properly and with due regard to all the economy that is possible under the circumstances.

MR. FOX—Just one or two words, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of these resolutions. I am glad to know that the Government has at last decided to ask this House for legislation on the railway question. This however, has not been done of their own volition; like everything else that the Government has yet done, it has been brought about by the assistance of the Opposition. Three weeks ago an attempt was made to close this House and if this had been permitted, we would have the same sorry spectacle as we had last year when the Executive Council saw fit to throw over the contract that existed between this country and the Reids and in the process lost something like \$1,650,000 along with, I suppose, another million dollars on captial expenditure, and Mr. Chairman, when I discuss that I ask is it not, after the experience of the past, futile for the Opposition to

simply speak at all. When one thinks of the scandals that have been brought home to the Government the past thirteen months, the prostitution of public services, the wanton waste of public moneys and the total disregard of every sense of decency and when one thinks that although all this has been shown up to the public and the public has made no sign, I ask myself if it is worth while discussing these matters.

When the contract of 1898 was made, the hue and cry was raised that the country had been sold to the Reids but when the amended contract of 1901 was brought in Newfoundland felt satisfied that her interests would be protected. Last year, however, when the present Government undertook their infamous railway policy, Newfoundland was sacrificed as she never was before. Two million and a half dollars were lost then and another million and a half will be lost this year besides still further expenditures on capital account, yet not a dissenting voice is heard from the other side. Now, it is a truism that a government is but a reflex of the people. If a Government is bad the people have only themselves to blame. Every country must be prepared to have itself judged, not by individual actions, but by the actions of its government and I say now that this Government is the worst that ever sat in this House of Assembly. We might even say worse than that when we realize all the moneys that have been squandered, how the Treasury has time after time been raided and every principle of decent government trampled upon. We might call their deeds by stronger names, and if those members who have been guilty of such deeds occupied places in civil life, they would find themselves in a far different position from that in which they are

this evening. But, we will forget that for the nonce and content ourselves with saying to them that you are the most incapable crowd that ever sat on the floors of this Assembly, for, after all, the people are to blame and as the quotation is "the wages of sin are death." It is regrettably true that public opinion in this country is dead, at least there is an apathy that shows that the people are no longer interested in either civil or national affairs.

One of the consequences is that the Government is allowed to continue making confusion worse confounded and day by day sinking Newfoundland to a depth from which she will never be rescued. In the introduction of these Railway Resolutions we have another instance of Governmental indifference, incapacity and inability to handle the most serious problem that has confronted this country for the past quarter of a century. Although the Prime Minister intimated here that these Resolutions originated in the report of Sir George Bury, his remarks a few days later contradicted what he then said, because it will be remembered that recently when it came down to a question as to where we were going to find the money for railroad purposes the Prime Minister said that he had earmarked $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars out of the six million dollar loan that was floated. Now I do not question the credentials of Sir George Bury nor do I question his ability, but once again we have to judge by results. The two and a half pages of foolscap, constituting his report to the people of Newfoundland, must of necessity give us a very poor opinion of the study he made of railway conditions in this country, and when we come to consider that poor impoverished and bankrupt Newfoundland has once more to go to her Treasury and take out \$10,000 to pay

Sir George Bury for that report, can we but realize that there must be something wrong with the man carrying out such a policy of extravagance. Only a few short weeks ago we had the spectacle of the destitute people of the city and of this country generally coming to the Bar of this House practically crying for bread in addition to the stories coming in from all parts of the country pointing out the destitution people are finding themselves in, still this Liberal-Reform Government that the people of this country are saddled with to-day begets the bright idea of getting the Vice-President of the C. P. R. to study in three days the Newfoundland Railway and he compiles his report and puts in his bill for \$7,500 or \$2,500 a day, exclusive of expenses. There are men in the civil service only getting a fifth of that amount for a year's work. There are men working in every department of the Government to-day getting \$500 a year. These men of course are receiving by way of recognition for their services a notification from the Government that they are going to have their present salaries cut ten per cent. The Government does not regard their services sufficiently valuable to continue paying them the paltry stipend of \$500 a year, but they regard the services of the eminent Bury of such value that they are prepared to pay him \$2,500 a day for a report that the present Manager of the railway, Mr. John Powell, could compile with far better results to the people of Newfoundland than the one from this expert from Canada. The general purport of the report is that "without prejudice to past agreements" this country has to dig down once again to its pocket and find $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars to run a railway that to-day is composed of two streaks of rust across the country, the rails be-

ing worn out and useless. Sir George Bury says, in his report as follows: (Reads). I think the public will realize that no man no matter how qualified he may be could be capable in three days of making an exhaustive study of the railway conditions of this country, and perhaps he knew as little of the effect of those words as he knew about the railway. Under their contract and in consideration of their own best interests the Reid Newfoundland Company might have well be given the credit of saying that they were going to operate that railway with the strictest economy and any injunction coming from Sir George Bury could not affect it. Then there is a paragraph in the report that deals a direct blow at a man whose competency has been proven by years of faithful service to the railway interests of this country. On all sides, excepting perhaps one or two members of the Executive Council of the Government, Mr. John Powell's qualifications are beyond question. He is a man who grew up with the road and who knows it from A to Z. He has proven himself to be capable and fitted for the position of General Manager and if that railway has not paid during the past two years it is not his fault. Perhaps, if the full story of the railway were disclosed the people of Newfoundland would realize what they never dreamt of before. Looking at the figures contained in the report of the Railway Commissioners, we find that six millions of dollars were lost on the operation of the railroad since 1904. It is hard to credit that any institution in this country can go on incurring such tremendous losses as this railway system. Personally I do not believe it. I have a strong suspicion that the railway is the milch cow for every subsidiary service operated by the Reid Newfoundland Company. If there are losses in oth-

er directions I would not be surprised if they were saddled on the railway and any profits derived from the other services would not be put to the credit of the railway. Hence it is quite possible that any losses met with by the other Companies might have been added to whatever losses that might have been incurred during any one year of the operation of the railroad. Let us analyse the figures brought in here in answer to certain questions that were laid before the Government. The incidental expenses under one or two general headings are positively appalling. In 1919 under the head of general expenses there is an item for \$197,682; in 1920 when the railway was operated by the commission the general expenses came to \$347,374, practically \$150,000 added to the general expenses. I want to know why this increase of \$150,000? This item is here, a cold bald statement, but there is no information explaining it. In 1919 there is an item for incidental expenses of \$31,763; for 1920 under that general heading it is \$116,069 or a difference of roughly \$80,000. This is also unexplained. How is all that money made up and how can this House intelligently discuss these Resolutions requesting an expenditure of 1½ million dollars, without having proper information as to the actual earnings and losses and without having the fullest possible information given to the House by way of guarantee and accuracy of the figures tabled. Every question of importance that came from the Opposition received the retort that there was no correspondence. Sir Michael Cashin asked for information a few days ago about the six million dollar loan that was recently floated by the Government and he was told that there was nothing in writing. The Government expects the people to believe that and expects them to be-

lieve that there is no correspondence in connection with this important matter, although the correspondence is actually in the archives of one of the departments. The Government fears to table any correspondence regarding the loan and how it was raised because they know what an extremely interesting story it would make. As soon as it was asked by this side of the House on what year's statement the loan was raised the answer comes that there has been nothing in writing. The same principle applied to the railroad. Sir Michael Cashin asked for the information and the correspondence that passed between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company within the past year and is again told that there is none and that there is nothing in writing. Has the Government such unbounded confidence in the contractors that they will merely take their word and do nothing in writing? I do not think that this is so, because we have only to refer to the Prime Minister's speech of last year when he exhausted the whole of the vocabulary in denouncing the Reids and when there was nothing too bad for him to say about the present President of the Company and when he dragged in and defamed the name of the man who could not defend himself and for which, if he said it in a public place, he would have to face a libel suit for it. He dubbed the Reid Newfoundland Company as a gang of incompetents and incapable, untrustworthy and altogether unsuitable. Sir George Bury goes on to say in his report that this Commission he suggested should have the powers given to a Canadian Commission; also that he advocated the spending of $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars on the actual operation of the railway for the next twelve months. Sir George talked in millions when he should have talked in

hundreds. He came here and made a cursory glance of the railway conditions of the country it is true. He left Canada and the precincts of the C. P. J. Railway, but, evidently, he had the atmosphere of that big country in his mind all the while he was here. The idea of spending $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars on a railroad in Canada is only a trifling sum. In Newfoundland it represents almost the major portion of our total revenue. Perhaps, Sir George Bury's fortune approximates $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars for what I know. At all events from his business transactions abroad it is almost an every day occurrence for him to put through deals aggregating $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and, therefore, he does not question or stop to think whether Newfoundland financially is capable of bearing such a heavy burden such as indicated in his recommendation for this country in connection with railroad operation. There is another paragraph in the report that is intended to convey the impression that the interests of the Government will be guarded because a commission of three will be appointed and who will take care that Newfoundland is not sacrificed. The same statement was made last year, according to the written correspondence tabled in this House a few months ago. When that railroad was taken over by a Government commission last year one of the main principles was that Newfoundland was to have a majority on that commission, namely, the Reid Newfoundland Company 3, and the Government 4. Now we all know what happened. The result was that the Reid Newfoundland Company had three representatives on it and Newfoundland one and that one was Mr. Coaker, who was the sole lord and master of our destinies. He represented four commissioners that he should have had on that commission and it is no wonder

that Newfoundland to-night has to dig down in its pockets and hand out \$1,650,000 and look pleasant. The Reid Company's interests were protected, but were Newfoundland's? Once again results speak, and from the results that Newfoundland has to pay 2½ millions for the delightful experiment undertaken last year, we can very well form an opinion whether her interests were as fully protected as they should have been. If we want to find out why \$1,650,000 was spent we need not go further than one paragraph in the report of the Commission. That paragraph is very illuminating, and, I think, is the key-note to the whole situation. On page 21 will be found that literary gem. (Reads). They said in effect that they spent money unwarrantedly to avoid adverse criticism. Now that self-condemnation has written themselves down as men who were derelict in their duties to this country when in order to avoid adverse criticism from the Reids or anyone else they spent money liberally and without any regard for the country's welfare. They were liberal with money that did not belong to them and far more liberal than what was required of them. When we realize that Newfoundland is a fishing country with poverty and destitution on every hand at the present time and when we do not know where we are going to find to-morrow morning's meal and when perhaps next winter will be the worst in the history of every man who is alive to-day and when the conditions that we have gone through will be nothing compared with the conditions we have to face and when every single cent should be husbanded to prepare for such a contingency and then for these men, who are owned body and soul by the Reids, to go down to the public Treasury and take and spend money in a manner that neither their duties

nor their work could justify is I say nothing short of an outrageous scandal. No wonder we had a loss of \$1,650,000 on the railroad last year. Why it is only through the mercy of Providence that the country is not bankrupted outright. That is the type of men that Newfoundland had entrusted to control its affairs. Next to the fish regulations this railroad commission was the most expensive experiment ever brought into existence in this country. The commission may be inclined to look upon page 21 of their report as a frank expression of opinion, but I look upon it as the utterances of men who were weak enough to be controlled by influence which should have had no effect on them. They had not got the tact to cover up their tracks or to keep their breach of faith to themselves, because they know that they broke faith with the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose at six thirty I was referring to paragraph one page twenty-one, and on looking it over one could not find anywhere a more serious charge against those gentlemen who last year were supposed to guard the Crown Lands' interests, than they have levelled against themselves in this paragraph.

I suppose the public will one day realise the significance of remarks of this sort. Those members of the Government who are not tied to the party chariot wheels, those who have a sense of their obligations and responsibilities, those men who want to see things done properly, and the interests of the country carefully safeguarded, I ask them to-night what do they think of a commission of that sort, who last year undertook a work, which the public had not called upon them to perform, but which having undertaken it, it was their bounden duty to see that every cent was ex-

pended for the furtherance of the public interests. We might attempt to palliate some of their actions, and we might be prepared to take with a grain of salt certain criticism coming from certain quarters with regard to their work, but here in this report we have their own statement that they spent moneys of which they were only the trustees far more largely than the volume of traffic warranted. I do not know whether they realise the import of their remarks, or whether when that paragraph was being printed that these men knew they were writing an indictment for themselves. You private members of the Government who are not tied to the party machine does it not strike you after reading this paragraph, that much more of the criticism levelled at these people is perfectly justified. How long, oh, Lord, how long? The country to-night is as poor as Lazarus. There is not a cent in the Treasury which is not earmarked to pay a debt. We are going along raising loans of five or six million dollars to pay off other loans, and in the truest possible sense of the word, Newfoundland is living upon the interest of what she owes, and still we have people under obligation to safeguard her interests, and control her expenditures. We have these people coming in and in defiance of every law governing expenditure of moneys, taking money they are not entitled to, throwing it away with an abandon which has already brought Newfoundland to the brink of ruin, and is settling her in a position from which she will never recover. The position in Newfoundland to-day is analogous to the position in France some centuries ago, the Government blind to the interest of the country robbing money from a depressed people, spending money extravagantly, grinding down the people to get money to further every private in-

terest and personal desire of a crazed monarchy until at last they drove the people beyond the bounds of discretion, and they paid for their misdeeds with their blood, and Newfoundland is in the same position. She is governed by an Administration that came into power on the wave of a prejudice, created deliberately to stir up the worst passions of an easily beguiled electorate vilifying men who had done good service to Newfoundland. You sympathized with the people because of the taxes they were paying and you told them that the public expenditure were far in excess of what they should be, and you told them that the high cost of living was brought about by the Government then in office, and that when you got in you would see that expenditures were cut as low as possible to give efficient service to the country, and that the high cost of living would be reduced. Then what happened.

You were hardly in office when you put over two and a half million dollars on to the public expenditure. You brought in a profiteering bill but because perhaps it would have to be directed against some of your best friends it was left in abeyance last year, a dead letter never carried out, and the people of Newfoundland last year paid as they never before paid, and as they never should be asked to pay for the necessities of life. Once you had used them like an old glove they were thrown aside. The people were no longer serviceable to you. They had served your purpose and for the time being you had no further interest in them. In addition to the two and a half million dollars you added to the public expenditure you put five hundred per cent. on to your own salaries. You could not help the people but you took good care to help yourselves. But I think in one respect we can all congratulate you be-

cause you never had the impudence to justify your action and then with respect to this year Newfoundland passed through a year the worst in her history in 1920 was perhaps the darkest shadow that ever settled on the banks of Newfoundland, and then we come in this year and pile tax upon tax until now the man who earns a dollar pays seventy-five cents of it to the Government, and then you smilingly talk about carrying out your promises and performing the pledges you made to the electorate a short eighteen months ago.

You found yourselves in the hole this year, and money was necessary. How did you get out of it? The future will tell, but there is a suspicion that you got it in fictitious statement. You got your six million, and as soon as you found that it was not all immediately necessary you used it to pay passed bills. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of the public's money has been thrown to the wind. The only creative ability you have displayed is to expend extravagantly the money of other people. You seem to be geniuses in creating avenues of expenditure. You flooded the country with school inspectors without advancing the cause of education the least bit. Fish inspectors were sent broadcast to throw away the money of the people who are struggling to maintain large families. At one time the Minister of Marine & Fisheries made the price of fish what he liked, but this year his limit of ambition is six or seven dollars. Why does he not make the price big this year. Never before was it more needed. I only hope it will be six or seven dollars, but there are grave doubts amongst fish buyers.

To-day Newfoundland is in the position that she has not a cent of her own. She has to go to charitable financiers and get assistance. In the railroad matter the Government seems to forget that there is any such thing

as a Government contract. They closed the door of this House, refused to answer any questions regarding a railroad proposition, and getting the backs of the people's representatives turned they went down behind closed doors and disregarded completely the people's rights and inheritance. Now this year they seem also to forget that there is a contract, and that the contract must be carried out without favor or affection. The honourable, the Leader of the Government, said in 1919 that the Reid Nfld. Company would no longer be a liability on the people of Newfoundland. Every member on the Government side joined hands with the Reids last year and took two and a half million dollars from the public treasury to pay bills that only the Reids themselves were responsible for. This year we have a repetition, only this year you bring it down under the cloak of an expert's report. Now I hold no brief for the Reids. They must have had tremendous odds against them, especially during the last few years. The road did wonderful work during the war period. They kept the road in operation during the winter months, and that could not be done by any railroad men in the world except in Newfoundland. The railroad has dropped, according to the statements filed here, six million dollars. There must be something wrong somewhere. They never would have carried on the operation of the railroad if they were losing a half million a year. It may be what the Prime Minister said last year it was. At least, it is food for thought, and I commend it to the Prime Minister's following.

But look at the way the interests of the people were conserved last year. Two and a half million dollars were taken from the pockets of the people to feed the company. As was said this afternoon it is only when driven to desperation that a traveller goes over the line, and when you are forced to

do you don't know what minute you are lost. But in spite of this fact the Government went to work and imported 60 and 70 ton engines last year, and by so doing took away the sporting chance of getting over the line without losing your life. Now look at this report for last year. Most of that \$140,000 for snow shovelling was spent on the section from St. George's to Grand Falls to enable the notorious Mr. Collishaw to get his logs through to Grand Falls. People had to suffer the indignity of having their cars held up on the sidings at the bidding of Mr. Collishaw. No wonder Mr. Coaker says that rather than risk an unfavourable report from the Reid Newfoundland Company he spent money more liberally than called for. The Government representatives would not dare make a proposal to the representatives of the Company. Is not this a wretched state of affairs. Would this happen 20 years ago? Would the representatives of the people sit down and allow this to go on? No wonder it has to dole out flour and molasses to keep its people alive. From every single section of the country come the most heart rendering appeals for aid, but you allowed them to suffer, and it appears you are willing to let them suffer. Take the West Coast. I am glad its representative is here to-night. The West Coast is not in the same happy position it was one and a half years ago. You know it is not. Let that Government go to every section of the Island and ask the people for its opinion and their answer will be what? You know only too well. The same conditions operate over the whole Island. Everywhere there is indication of the direst want all brought about by a helpless administration, by men who had no genius for Government, who miscalculated everything they undertook, who are sufficiently shortsighted never to realise that Newfoundland was going to be faced with conditions which are fastly overtaking us. If this

Government deliberately set to make Newfoundland bankrupt then it could not do better than it has done. Shame on you for having done this to Newfoundland, this country with all its potential wealth. There is no place on God's earth more pleasant to live than here. She only wants what she is not getting and that is a square deal. You seem to have a mania in this direction. Take that matter which we have been discussing namely the famous Bury report. There are many people crying for bread and Mr. Small knows it, and they have not a crust to put inside their lips, and still the Government is prepared to sit idly by and see them starve. Still you can send to Canada and bring down a market to present this country with a report consisting of two and a half pages of foolscap for which this country has to pay \$7,500 plus expenses. I do not expect you have the temerity to expect forgiveness at the hands of the people whom you are outraging today. Just look at this report. It is nothing. It merely commits this country to the another expenditure of one million and a half dollars. There is not the slightest hope that there will be any result. (Reads). It has all the features of a comic opera. This man never knew the conditions of this country. With cursory knowledge of the financial conditions of this country, he advocates glibly the expenditure of one million and one half dollars from the Treasury to the Reid Newfoundland Company. Beyond that suggestion I cannot see anything original in that report. That did not require such great ability such as Sir George Bury's. Take the most inexperienced of the track masters in the employ of the Company and send him over the line and he will come back with suggestions equal in every respect to those contained in this report. Does it require any great genius to report that an angle bar has to be altered, or that a certain fish plate is

twisted, or something else? Has anybody the effrontery to suggest that Mr. John Powell has not the qualifications to study the Company's system and outline a policy equal to one contained in this report? (Reads). For all this the country has got to pay that sum of money and for the benefit of this report the sum of \$7,500 plus expenses to be paid to a man who came down here, more in the sense of a tourist than a man who came to earn his money. During the past few weeks the Government press has flooded the country with the reports commenting upon the tactics of the Opposition. They say the Opposition criticised the Resolutions, but they did not advance any practical suggestions. Now it has become a matter of history that every thing you did was not of your own volition, there was nothing done under the personal initiative of yourselves. Nothing that was done was the outcome of your own creative genius. But all that you did was done because the Opposition forced you to do it. You have practically from the beginning to the end picked the brains of the Opposition. You have acted on all the suggestions coming from this side. Now you want the Opposition to help you in a very serious problem, but it is not the position of the Opposition to come in here and outline some practical policy re the railroad, but in the manifesto of your leader the people were promised a railway policy that would suit the requirements of the country. Let him live up to his promise if he can. When you ask for any suggestions and co-operation from the Opposition you should supply those whom you want to make your allies with certain information and data so that they will be able to consider the matter intelligently. You have had negotiations with the Reid Company although when asked you denied it. You were discussing a different proposition than this with them. You refused to supply any information to this House.

Why you did not attempt with regard to the Resolutions, to make any explanations as to the expenditures. They are compiled in such a way that no one can tell how in the name of the world the loss is made up. There are items in this statement which I believe you will never be able to explain yourselves. Take the items under the heading General Expenses. Four hundred thousand dollars are tied up. That cannot be explained. The Prime Minister said that he made up that amount because there were five thousand tons of coal more last year at \$14 per ton, but that would be only \$70,000, where is the balance? These figures give us the impression that there has been an effort to cloak expenditures for which there are no justification whatever. One cannot but help doubting the accuracy of these figures. Do you think then we are going to accept them at face value? When you brought down the railway policy as it has turned out you should have said we have very many serious problems to work out, but of them all the railway one seems the most feasible and for the following reasons and then enumerate them. But this is the lazy man's way of getting over the difficulty and according to the Prime Minister's own words he said the government could not do it, so that it had to import a man and pay him for work which the government undertook to do. You said you had no policy to offer and Sir George Bury has This is no way to attack the problem, and if this report had anything to commend it the Opposition may consider it. But it means nothing but additional expenditure of \$1,500,000, and then your presumption that the Opposition will accept, but it is beyond my comprehension why you dare presume that. Now as I said a moment ago, I have not a lot of sympathy for the contractors under this contract. You have to treat them as you would treat any one else, no privileges, no undue favour, nothing that will conflict with

the best interests of Newfoundland. Twenty years ago they entered into a solemn contract with the Government for the performance of a certain work. They have the railway still. The Reids contracted to operate it for fifty years with certain concessions which the Government gave them, and the country expects them to carry out their contract. It provides that in case of the contractors defaulting certain consequences shall follow. There were also certain penalties to be enforced if the contractors broke their contract. If any thing was undone which should be otherwise they should be treated like any other individual on Water St. Take the case of two private individuals. In case of breach, what would happen? Is it a question at all? The consequences would those which the parties had in mind when they entered into the contract. But now you ask the tax payers of the country to finance the Reids to do a certain work which they contracted to perform. Has any attempt been made to find out the effect of the railway contract? Has the Government endeavoured to ascertain its exact position under the contract? Has it found out to what extent its exact position is under the contract? Has it found out to what extent they can force the contractors to perform their contract? If there has been any attempt how was it made? After twenty years work the Reids come along and say they are unable to continue. There is then a clear breach of contract. Do the Reids expect to get all the advantages under the contract and none of the disadvantages? Would that be tolerated in any other country? The Prime Minister said no undue consideration would be shown the Reids. Yet you take from the Treasury \$1,500,000 to help them to perform their contract. They should be required to perform it according to law. If this is to be done this year how long will it continue? Is it to be done till the expiry of the contract in 1950? I suggest that

immediate steps be taken to institute legal proceedings against the contractors for breach of contract. When one party to a contract makes a breach of his obligations that brings about a certain set of circumstances.

Is it not the right thing to do if we know there is a breach of contract to set the machinery in motion and see if Newfoundland cannot be compensated for the breach. How are you going to do this thing and expect the people to think we are consistent, if you wink this breach out of sight. But now you are going to enter into a new agreement for a new year and give them one and a half millions. How can you do anything else as logical legislators, but insist that the contract be carried out. Last year unconstitutionally and scandalously, you tore the contract up and flung it in the faces of the people who sent you to this House and forced them to pay two and a half millions, and now you expect this year to add insult to injury and the people to stand for your shirking an issue which confronts you and which the people have said you got to handle. Are you going to deliberately defy the provisions of the contract and add another one and a half millions to the debt of the Colony. If nothing else the people expect you to carry out your manifesto, to now fulfill your pledge. It faces you squarely. Take up the problem and make the contractors fulfill their agreement to the country or suffer the consequences of their failure. Instead of winking it out of sight do what the law says, you must do, and tell them if they do not carry out the contract they got to take the consequences. You are bound by it as by any other law on the Statute books. Bring in an act rescinding it if you do not intend to enforce it, but while you are there you are bound by it. You are bound body and soul and the Reids exert an influence over you greater than over any other government and they have worsted you

every time in all their transactions. Every trick has been played by them to win and they have won. You cannot face the public with any other statement than carry out the law. The law says, carry out the contract and it is up to you to see that it is enforced properly. You cannot avoid the situation that confronts you; you dare not avoid it, to do so would be to violate one of the acts of the Legislature. There is something as solemn as anything on the Statute books; it is part and parcel of the laws of the country; it binds both Newfoundland and the Reids, and yet you have the temerity to come in here and ask us to do something diametrically opposed to it. No matter how much we may sympathise with them in their position, we are bound by the Act while it is on the books; we cannot do anything but obey its mandates and you are derelict in your duty to the people when you refuse to insist on the performance of the contract. I do not see how we can do anything but vote against these resolutions. If we are to pay any respect to the laws of the land we live in, or to look with respect on what is passed by the Legislature, there is nothing to do, but enforce them. Nothing to do but insist on their performance or in case of failure, insist on the penalties. This is the only position we can take. It is not competent for us to consider this to-night; we either got to throw it in the discard or consider it in full. If the old contract has failed, even from an every day business point is it not only logical to say we will make a new one instead of going on and adding one and a half millions yearly to the debt of the Colony. You say it is to be charged to them and in the next breath you say they are insolvent. Everything spent now on capital account is spent on the dead; there is no legal justification for it. I do not feel like touching such an important matter as this, but think it should be submitted to the people. The Railway problem is the

most serious matter before the country and the consideration of all the people ought to be brought to bear on it. It should not be solved except by the people; you ought to appeal to them on it. I would not consider voting on it because I do not consider we are competent to do so without a mandate from the people. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against these resolutions and feel that when the House comes to seriously consider them they must see the situation facing them in the measure before the Chair. It is a defiance of the law of the land and the House has no justification for throwing aside the contract entered into by the leader of the government who promised the people to see it carried out, to enforce the penalties or enter into a new contract for the performance of the service. In any case the people ought to be consulted before you burden them with this enormous outlay.

MR. WALSH.—As a first duty, Mr. Chairman, which I consider I owe the constituents who sent me here to this House, I am resolved not to allow these resolutions to pass without going on record for or against them. The history of railroads has been so well outlined by previous speakers that there is no need for me to go into the details concerning them. But I intend to deal with the action of the Reids and I say it is not good enough when we have to consider if we will give them 1½ million dollars after they have fallen down hopelessly on their job. When they were contractors under the government of the then Sir Edward Morris—a man who was vilified in the party press as the direct servant of the company—they had to bear their losses but in the late campaign your winning card was your promise to make them toe the line and live up to their obligations. This Government was going to prevent the trains being turned upside down daily

and to remedy all the evils which were pointed out by the men now in the Executive and who said the road was unsafe to travel over. Was it all a well conceived plot? We heard a lot about graft in 1919 but where is there anything greater than the giving of $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions to the people whom you vilified from every political platform. We have often heard of the nigger in the woodpile but it is no joke this time. When we consider that last year the Commission made a hopeless mess of the road, headed by the Hon. Minister of Marine who was trotting around Europe instead of being at home attending to his work, it is nothing to his credit. Nor is it to the credit of the Hon. Prime Minister after denouncing the Reids here in his speech of a year ago, to allow the Hon. Minister of Marine and his secret agents, Collishaw and company, to manipulate the funds of the country to the tune of $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions. It is no laughing matter, Sir, and the hon. member for Fortune would not smile if he knew you were a party to it. I do not profess to be an orator or to be able to put up such strong arguments as those who preceded me, and it may be alright for the Hon. Minister of Justice who has a fat salary and those who have their cosy mansions with no need to worry about the necessities for their families, but what about the underdogs who sent you here—it is no smiling matter for them. I do not expect you to vote against our salaries and that is what is keeping most of you in your places. If it were not for the salary, some of you would be the first to denounce the giving of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions. It is said that America was discovered by the Italians, financed by the Jews and run by the Irish. The same cannot be said of Newfoundland though an Italian did discover it. But it can be said that Newfoundland is owned and

run by the Reids and their hired men. Take the papers supporting the present Government in the 1919 campaign and also the Manifesto of the Hon. Prime Minister and see what they had to say of the Reids and their railway system and then come into this House and listen to the debates.

Note the silence of the men who a little more than a year ago were going to put the Reids in their place. One would think that we were a lot of Rip Van Winkles who had only just woken up. The Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, and others of his associates on this side of the House who are supposed to be the great Reid advocates would not dare to bring in these Resolutions. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries when a year ago he created himself the President of the Railway Company, and I believe he was sincere in what he undertook at the time, said that he was going to put seven men on the Commission, but instead of getting a good local man for the position, he appointed as secretary of that Commission, Hall, a brilliant importation and a man who was already drawing a salary of \$4,000. You had lots of men in this country fitted for the job, men who had returned from France and Flanders and who appealed to you to do something for them in return for the sacrifices they had made but you gave them the cold shoulder for Mr. Hall who is put on every commission of enquiry and every other commission that happens to be appointed. Then again you deprive men like Capt. Jones over there of their passes, a privilege that was their's by right but you place a palace car at the disposal of Hall and yourself, you saw that it was provided with a fat larder and stewards to tend on you and you used this car to take you to Port Union to confer with Geo. Barr and others of his ilk who have

put this country on the bum. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is sufficient manhood on the other side, at least in the rank and file, to assert itself before these Resolutions go through. I will say this, that the man who votes for them will not be allowed to come inside the park after another election, much less into this House.

Since the House opened the session has extended over three seasons. It began in the winter season, the spring has come and gone, the summer is now here and the possibilities are that we shall go into the autumn. This is most extraordinary but if there were not good and sufficient reason for keeping the House open, there are men on this side who would have been glad to close it after two weeks, but what has been said to-night is, I think, sufficient justification for any delay that might be attributed to the action of the Opposition. Three weeks ago the Leader of the Government tried to suspend the rules so that Mr. Coaker would be again able to manipulate with the Reids and, after all, I cannot blame you for wanting to get out of here as quickly as possible because if Sir Michael Cashin had been guilty of one hundredth part of what you have done, not alone would the House have been cleaned out but it would not be here at all. When any Newfoundlander who intends to live his life in this country and who is trying to make it a fit place to live in, when such a man I say comes to ponder on all that is being done and to walk the road over which we are travelling, it should be enough to wake him up. When appeals are made for necessary improvements we cannot find the money to effect them as for example, when a few days ago the Government was asked to provide more beds in the Sanatorium. This appeal fell on deaf

ears and Dr. Rendell was told that there were no funds. We cannot find \$10,000 to increase the Old Age Pensions although we take good care that on the eve of an election we do not forget to make all sorts of promises and then the old man if he is not able to walk is taken in a carriage and brought to the booth room to vote. I have no doubt that Mr. Jackman, whom I see down there in the corner, made the same promises in this regard as I did when he went through the District, but its fulfilment is a very different matter. I asked the question early in the session how many applications were on file for the Old Age Pension and I was informed that there were over three hundred but I was also informed by the Leader of the House that there was no increase in the vote. In other words, only sufficient money can be found to keep the men whom Sir M. P. Cashin put on the list, and those to whom I and others promised the pension must wait till their next-door neighbour dies to take his place.

But in his manifesto, the Prime Minister, not satisfied with adding a few more aged and worn out fishermen to the list of those receiving the pension, must express his intention of increasing the amount of it from \$50 to \$100 and not only that, but he was going to give it to the women as well as the men. Ah! but when H. D. Reid waved the magic wand and Mr. Collishaw stepped in the old fishermen could go die for all the Prime Minister cared. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you as an honest man, to say whether you think it is fair to come in here and ask for a million and a half dollars, the expenditure of which nobody knows anything. I do not care whether it is to the Reids or any one else you are going to give it. When I was identified with the Morris Government I had on more than one occasion to fight the Reids to get proper treatment for my constitu-

ents and you will find on file in the Colonial Secretary's office correspondence signed by W. J. Walsh denouncing the Reids for their failure to do what was right. I cared not then for either Morris nor Reid, and these are my principles to-day. On the other hand, if I see a contractor making an honest effort to carry out his contract I am ready and willing to give him due credit. Every election that has been fought in this country since '98 has been fought around the Reids and they always came out on top, but never have they been placed on such a pedestal as they have been now. Sir M. P. Cashin said in the course of his remarks, I think his exact words were these: "As far as I am concerned, I care not what happens; my family and myself will not be in want, but it is for my fellow countryman that I am sorry." Now, Mr. Chairman, these are noble sentiments and I wish I too could give expression to them. With the first part of them I cannot join because I am not financially secure like Sir M. P. Cashin. I am the father of a large family, and by this vote to the Reids you tax me to the extent that you take from these little Newfoundlanders the only protection I am able to give them; namely life insurance and the same applies to the greater number of fathers amongst the 250,000 people in the country. If you put on masks and went down and raided the Treasury and then sold the country to the first bidder, the fortunate forty or fifty thousand people who are in good financial circumstances could emigrate but it is not so with the great majority who would have to remain and take the consequences. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the man whom I hold largely, if not wholly responsible for the condition this country finds itself in to-day, should be prepared for the criticisms that must now be levelled against him, and to do him justice I think that he is. It is not so long ago when it took but very lit-

tle to bring him to his feet, but that is all changed now. These were the days when he was satisfied with out-port life and all that pertained thereto, before the web was woven that has since entangled him. Some of us had expected great things from him if he ever got control in this country, and perhaps if the government to-day were differently constituted, things would be somewhat different from what they are. By this vote, the country will have given to the Reids the sum of \$4,500,000 and as was instanced last year without any attempt being made to protect the funds of the Colony in any way. Last year the Commission spent \$1,565,000 and we had steamers running everywhere, trains running on schedule every day and you were paying men the very highest wages. Now you are cutting the service down to one-third, reducing the wages of the employees and still you are asking for the same amount. Surely this is preposterous. The Trepassey train, at any rate should be allowed to continue on the old schedule. The very men who went to the country and promised the people new roads and new branches are now prepared to take the services they had away from them. The Bay de Verde service is to be curtailed and cut out altogether, yet the representatives of that important district make no protest, but they are prepared to hand over \$1,500,000. I want to endorse what has been said by some hon. gentleman on this side of the House, altho' I did not have the pleasure of hearing most of the speakers, but especially do I want to emphatically endorse what was said by my hon. friend, Mr. Higgins with regard to the Reid Newfoundland Company. If you as a government, Mr. Chairman, when this House closed about a year ago and you finally decided to run the railroad by a commission, had any fore sight which you should have had and if you had been the true representatives of the people, who sent you here, that

you should have been, and when you saw it was inevitable that Government ment control was to take existence, your first duty should have been to look around and advertise for other contractors, if the Reid Newfoundland Company were bankrupt as we have been told, and you should have looked to Canada or the United States, or any other country for contractors. It was your duty as representatives of the people to look around and see if you could find suitable men to make an offer to take over the road. Now I do not know much about the '98 or '01 contracts, but there are gentlemen on this side of the House who do know and I am quite prepared to take their opinions with regard to these contracts, and I think that if you as a business like Government had sent a competent man to Canada—and you had lots to send there such as you had to send to other parts of the world on other missions—to consult with competent men there, and to bring with them a copy of the contract under which the Reids were carrying on the service and had brought a Solicitor with them who would intelligently be able to put the proposition before prospective contractors and then if you failed after having made an honest attempt to do something and came in here this session and placed your cards on the table to that effect, perhaps a great deal of the lengthy debate that we have had on these Resolutions might have been avoided; but you did not do so. You made absolutely no attempt, but, as has been said before, twenty-four hours before your agreement expired you telegraphed to Canada and brought down one Sir George Bury. What his qualifications are with regard to Canadian or American railroading I do not know. I dare say he is looked upon as a competent man because he went over to Russia during the war period and untangled a serious problem there with regard to transportation; but conditions with regard

to war transportation in Russia and conditions as to railroading in Canada or the United States are far different to the conditions that exist in this country and nobody knows that better than the Ex-Minister of Railroads. Sir George Bury arrived at Port aux Basques and met Mr. T. A. Hall, the Government Engineer, and, no doubt, was conducted to the best accommodation that this road can provide, perhaps, to the same paraffin car that Mr. Coaker used to use on his trips to Port Union. Sir George Bury made a five-day visit across country and to the Placentia and Bay de Verde branches, and in five days he handed in this famous document, which I do not propose to read to the House as it has already been read, published and studied by a great many of the people who will be called upon to contribute the \$7,500 and expenses, or \$8,000, that Sir George Bury took from this country for five days work. As Mr. Hignett said in his speech the other day you could go up to Reids and find an ordinary labouring man even a section man with pick and shovel, who could make you a similar report as that which Sir George Bury charged you \$8,000 for. It is no trouble for the Government to find \$8,000 for Sir George Bury for a useless report; but we are told in this House that one thousand dollars cannot be provided for a cot in the Sanitorium for some poor unfortunate boy or girl, who may be slightly afflicted with lung trouble. Sufficient money cannot be found to put an extra cot in the Sanitorium to give the poor afflicted ones a fighting chance for their lives; a paltry \$50 cannot be provided per year to give some poor worn out fishermen; but there is no trouble on the part of the Government to find \$8,000 for Sir George Bury. Now these are matters that I have no doubt do not appeal to the members of the Executive Government, but they are matters that must appeal to the ordinary members of this House—members of this House

who are not voting for the giving of this one and a half million dollars to the Reids, members who are not voting for the giving of this \$8,000 to Bury and the members who are not subscribing to the saddling of this country with millions of dollars of debt. Now I do not mean any of the men who are occupying Executive seats and Departmental offices, and who do not hold seats in this, the people's House, and never will and who are drawing down as high as \$30,000 a year. Take Dr. Campbell, who was never elected in this country, and who, I have no doubt, never will. I have no hesitation in stating to-night that he is drawing down not a cent less than \$30,000. Although not elected by the people, he is Minister of Agriculture and Mines; he was pitchforked into the House of Lords, which one time used to be styled the dumping chamber by the men who dumped Campbell there. He is allowed to indiscriminately rake in thousands of dollars from other sources that the members of the Government know well about, but have not the courage to get up and denounce such practice. I remember reading a report of a famous Convention held in a certain part of this country only a year ago. At that Convention a crowd of men assembled, and, I have no doubt in all honesty, passed Resolutions that any man holding a departmental office should hold a seat also in the popular branch of the Legislature. The Resolutions were put and unanimously passed, and there the matter ended. There are other men as well as Dr. Campbell who could be criticized in this connection and it may seem strange on my part to get up and attack a man who is not in a position to defend himself here. I regret to have to do it. There is one thing that can be truthfully said about me, that I am unafraid of criticising any man in his public capacity, I care not who he may be, and I want to have him in his place in this House and any-

thing that I do say is not meant for him as a private individual. Any man who is handling the money belonging to the thousands of fishermen of this country, his actions are open to criticism. Now there are other men in this country who have had an opportunity to spend and rake in large amounts of money besides the Reid Newfoundland Company, and there are other men who have been worthy of consideration and who have been totally ignored. My colleague, Mr. Sullivan, while speaking here the other evening, referred to a man, belonging to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, who had held a position in the public service for the past sixteen years and who has been dismissed by the present Government. This man gave one of his sons in defence of the Empire—though! I do not think that gives him any claim, at least it is not recognised as such by the members of the Government. This man, who to-day is mourning and must mourn for the balance of his years the loss of that noble son, you had no hesitation, Mr. Chairman, in firing out of his job because he was drawing down six or eight hundred dollars a year. As Mr. Coaker said on many occasions, how long, O Lord, how long is this sort of thing going to continue. I think it is utterly useless and a waste of time for the members on this side of the House to labor hour after hour, and pleading on behalf of the common people who send us here. It seems to be the set policy of the government to sit tight. They have their programme mapped out, their plans are made and when the Opposition are tired talking they will put through the Resolutions as they have sufficient followers—some of them only half fools and do not think that they are committing political suicide—to put them through. I venture to predict to-night that there is not a solitary member of the Executive Government who is seriously anticipating ever going before the electorate again. If they

are it is not for a Newfoundland constituency they intend running. There may be men in the present Executive who do intend to remain in public life, but if they do it is not in this country. They may have in their minds eye a seat in Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, or some other portion of the great Dominion of Canada into which they are trying to dump this country. But I contend that they will be foiled in that little game no matter how hard they try, notwithstanding the utterances of Mr. Coaker, to Sir John Crosbie on the contrary. A few evening's ago while Mr. Coaker was in his seat Sir John Crosbie charged him with having told him on the ship that he came from Europe on that there was no hope for Newfoundland and that she was going into Confederation. I did not yet hear the Hon. member contradict Sir John, nor have I seen a contradiction of that statement in his press. Now that in my opinion is a serious charge to remain unrefuted. But I want to tell the Hon. member that as sure as many of our noblest and best gave their blood on the battle fields of France, Flanders, and Gallipoli sufficient men will be found, who, perhaps, were unable to fight in a foreign country, but who will be prepared to spill a drop of blood right on the soil of their own country before they see it sold to Canada. If we never heard such a charge from Sir John Crosbie against Mr. Coaker, what better proof does any man want than the woeful extravagance that has been carried on by the Government since elected to office. Now I do not say it was deliberately planned, but I do not think I could be blamed if I got up and charged the Government with having secretly mapped out the Confederation plot in 1919, in view of the way they ruined the fish markets first and compelled Newfoundlanders to draw out over twenty millions of dollars from the Banks, money that they had put aside when more business like governments were

in power. We had a statement here a few evenings ago that last year five millions of dollars of the people's earnings were taken out of the Banks. This money was put in the Banks by men since the famous Bank Crash, and was not taken out to put in their stockings. No, but it was taken out to buy food to put in their stomachs. If that is the spectacle since 1919 what can we expect for the year to come? It has been said in this House by more competent men to give an expression of opinion than I am, that the price of fish the coming fall would be about \$6 a quintal. That statement was made by Mr. Coaker who should be, if he is not, the best authority that we have in this country on the price of fish. Goodness knows it cost this country enough of money to make him the best authority we have on the price of fish. If I had only the interest on the income to qualify me for any particular line immense amount of money spent on him of business then I would be able to handle that business with the best expert in this country. It has cost this country millions of dollars to qualify Mr. Coaker to be able to say what he thinks is going to be the likely price of fish. Well then if that statement of \$6 a quintal is correct and in consideration of the immense columns of figures that were read out to this House in the early part of this debate by Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie and in consideration of the fact that it took 70 millions of exports and imports to be able to produce a revenue of ten millions—and in these days it must be remembered that we were getting as high as \$16 a qtl. for fish, and when we consider that last year the total value of our exports of codfish alone was something like 20 millions of dollars; then figure out an average catch this year of 1,500,000 quintals at \$2 a quintal, Talqual, valued at 9 million dollars, that will not be sufficient money to be able to meet your Estimates in this House as well as pay the

civil servants their salaries. Still members of the government are here all smiles and not a frown on the countenances of the responsible men of the Government, and still we are here voting away one and a half million dollars to the Reid Nfld. Co., and when we happen to ask where the money is going to come from we have to be satisfied with the statement from the Prime Minister that sufficient money is earmarked out of the 6 million loan that was recently floated to be able to hand it over to the Reid Nfld. Co. If these Resolutions pass the House tonight, what a lovely position any Newfoundland, who has the slightest bit of interest in the country, will find himself in. I am glad to have had an opportunity of at least giving a few of the reasons why I think it my bounden duty not to give a silent vote on this very important matter. We are told in the report of Sir George Bury that a competent General Manager is to be found abroad to see that this one and a half million dollars is properly spent. We heard that story oft times before. That is the same old story that was dished up last year. We are told that the Government is already in communication with a competent man and that that man is being located in Montreal. I wonder if that is the famous old railroad man who spent years in Newfoundland at a similar job, and I wonder if he is in any way implicated in that Confederation scheme in Montreal? The only thing now is the salary; it would not surprise me one bit if I discovered that this man was hired early in the autumn of 1919 before the general election because it was common property that a certain gentleman who was very much identified with railroading was a large contributor to the fund of the present government. I have no means of finding out whether this is true or not, but I do know that the gentlemen to whom I referred was not antagonistic to the present government, and then

we are told that he is going to be a competent man because we are going to pay him twenty-five thousand dollars a year. I know lots of men who are drawing big salaries and some of them on the other side of the House, but the fact that they are drawing large salaries is no proof of their ability or qualifications, it may be a proof that they have some political pull. I think that it is about time that the members on both sides of this House woke up to the fact that they have a duty to perform. I have no reason to object to any honorable gentleman coming to make this country his home. I like to see a certain class of man come in here. All our grandfathers and great-grandfathers were not born in Newfoundland. Mine came from good old Ireland, and you gentlemen on the other side of the House, some of your grandfathers came from good old England, or good old Ireland or Scotland, or good old somewhere, I don't care where, but it is time we objected and strongly objected to having every Tom Dick and Harry, because he was Sir Geo somebody, or recommended by Sir someone else to be a qualified man to come in here and take twenty-five thousand dollars a year from the poor people of this country, because whether Reid pays him directly or indirectly, it is the working people of the country who will have to pay in the long run the expert you bring down here. We are getting feed up, I am, I know, and the country is also with the class of expert that has been brought down here year after year. We have men here who have forgotten more about railroading than this class of man will ever know. You may perhaps get some fellow who has worked in the office as a flunkey to some railroad man. Why the class of man who would be considered in Canada as a railroad expert would not come down here at all. What Mr. Bennett said was correct. Every rail and all the branch lines you have here would not be equivalent to a rail-

road yard in Canada, and how can you expect a railroad expert to come down from Canada for twenty-five thousand dollars a year. That is only as much as some of the members of the Executive Government are making. When Mr. Warren has finished with the Labrador Boundary you will likely find on the books of the Finance Department the same old story. It was told in the past. A certain gentleman who at one time occupied a seat in this House died, and after his death there was a claim against the Colony for legal work in connection with the Labrador Boundary. I hope Mr. Warren will not die soon, but I hope he will not be too long at the Labrador boundary. I want him to die politically, because I think it would be the best thing for the country, and I say this without any personal animosity, because I have a respect for him as Mr. Warren, but for his public service, I have nothing but the bitterest condemnation. I don't know what he has done with regard to his own district. He may be building railroads, bridges and breakwaters and wharves up there, but if he is he is doing just the opposite for the district which I have the honor to represent. I hold individually and collectively the Executive responsible for the past actions of the present administration. I don't wish to blame the private members of the Government, but now we have a measure before the House that will be a test. The attitude of every man in this House with regard to this measure will be watched carefully by the people. I don't care what the members on the other side may think, they may think they have a sufficient amount of pull to offset the damage they are doing, but I don't think they have. To get back to the possible financial position of the country when this House is called together again next year, if it is ever called together again, and right here I want to subscribe to the warning given by Mr. Bennett a month and a half ago to the

effect that this House should not be allowed to prorogue. It is alright to adjourn the House, but it should be able to be called together again at a day's notice. Serious things may happen. I don't know the exact financial standing of the country. We were given to understand that this loan of six million dollars was procured on a financial statement compiled since the present Government came into office. That was challenged by the Leader of the Opposition, and he made a charge that the money was procured under false pretences. Sir Michael Cashin stated that it was on a statement left when his Government vacated office that you received the loan, and he also stated that if you wanted fifty thousand dollars tomorrow (I don't say that he stated fifty thousand, but I am stating that amount) you would not be able to get it in any of the money markets on a statement that you would compile yourselves if it were a true one, if you were to tell these financiers that you spent four million dollars left as a nest egg by the late Government of 1919, you have borrowed six million dollars and you had a revenue of nearly ten million dollars and you have spent twenty million dollars in less than two years. Do you think if you admitted this, any financier would be prepared to lend you one dollar, he may give it out of charity, but he would not lend it as a business proposition. If that is correct what position are we going to be in a year's time if we allow this bill to go through and the one and a half million dollars left out of the six million dollar loan is handed over to the Reid Nfld. Co., when that contract expires which is only for a year, you will be in the same position as you are to-night. You will have to come back here and ask this House to vote another million and a half or two and a half and there is no reason why we

should not if the country is prepared to swallow this pill. Mr. Higgins spoke eloquently the other day about swallowing pills, but most of those he referred to were coated but the coating has been well worn off this pill by the various speakers, and if the public are prepared to subscribe to the handing over of this money to the Reid Nfld. Co., in addition to the million and a half last year, in addition to the million for Rolling Stock and the five hundred thousand for Coal Exploration, and the money that was voted for a Terminus in St. John's West and spent as you thought fit in your own interest and that of your friends, I would not blame men who are in the position of Sir Michael Cashin who made the statement I referred to with regard to himself and his family, and any other members I would not blame them if immediately this bill becomes law they took their papers from their desks in this House and went down and bought a ticket on some steamship line and cleared out of the country. We may get up and talk here for hours, and it is not done in any spirit of hang her down. I think that the amount of a million and a half dollars is sufficient to justify a man in getting up and speaking for twenty-four hours if he has the lungs and the ability. In the '98 contract there was only the same amount involved and public meetings were convened all over the island, Priest and Parson spoke from the same platform and every public spirited man in the country protested against the giving away of the people's money. It is not only this million and a half but this amount on top of the three million dollars already given to the Reid Nfld. Co., and coming on top of all the other actions of the Government that involve millions to the country coupled with the fact that by your blind headstrong policy you have closed up practically

all the industries of the country. Bell Island which in other years gave employment to thousands of people is, now in the position that there are only sufficient men kept on there to keep the water pumped out. We have a bill before the House three months now and thousands of men are starving for want of employment all over the island and the bill has never come up for discussion. It is fresh in the minds of most of us, Mr. Chairman that a certain gentleman who occupies an important seat on that side of the House appointed that one dollar a ton tax should be put upon Ore. as an export tax. Previous to that the Government collected 7½ cents a ton. That is a large increase and if the hon. gentleman and his associates could see that they were justified they have my unqualified support. I want to collect every dollar possible for the revenue, but I don't want to be a party to trying to legislate out of existence any of our important industries. We had sufficient experience in this direction during the term of the Fish Regulations. We have Grand Falls tied up though I don't blame the Government for that, but I would like to know what the Government has done in this matter. Have they made any offer to this Company to assist them in starting up this work which means so much to the men in the Northern districts during the winter. Even if the mill started up now, owing to the fact that there was so much wood cut last year and not used owing to the hang up, there will not be so much needed this winter, and there will be a lot of people out of employment the coming winter in the lumber woods. One cannot be blamed if one is suspicious that the whole thing is a plan to bankrupt the country and drive us to Confederation or worse. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries threatened the Home Office with annexation if they did not pay more at-

tention to us. Now I wonder would there be anything doing with regard to the United States. I suppose Collishaw, Grenville and Devine who has by now made himself very officious around New York after meeting so many big men at that confereyce he attended at Washington. I wonder would there be a nigger in the woodpile in that direction.

In winding up my few remarks I wish to say that all I have said came from the bottom of my heart. I meant every word I said and I don't intend ever to take anything back that I have said. I don't expect I want to repeat any man who occupies a seat in the present Executive to vote against this measure, but I do expect and hope that I will be justified in expecting other men on the other side of the House who have the inclination to remain in public life, who have helped to keep you in office by contributing their votes, and to draw your eight, ten and fifteen thousand dollars a year and expenses, while they who have done as much work or more in their districts have got nothing. These men I believe or most of them, have no desire to cater to the Reid Nfld. Co., or to you and your friends; I believe they came here with an honest desire to do justice to the people who sent them here and I believe that these men after listening to the debate, after listening to the speeches of some of the members on this side and after listening to the speeches that will be made by other gentlemen on this side, I don't say that I have said anything worthy of convincing you, but I believe that finally they are men whose honesty of purpose is just as clear as mine, men who when they vote, whether they vote for or against these Resolutions, will be voting not for their own pockets or their friends' pockets but in the interest of the general public. To these men I look for the safeguarding of the rights of the

people that are about to be bartered away. It is disgusting to stand up here and see a man who a few years ago said he was safeguarding the rights of the people and he was loud in denouncing the Reid Nfld. Co., and now he has no hesitation in handing over to the Reid Nfld. Co. this million and a half dollars. Any man who aspires to a high seat in this House or any other House is not worthy of the public trust when he is prepared to trifle with a matter of such importance as this.

For these reasons and others which I may have an opportunity to explain later on, I intend to vote against the Resolutions.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here while this discussion has been going on by the Opposition speakers, I cannot say by the Government members because I have not heard one of them open his mouth. I think it is time for me to have a few words to say on this matter as I don't intend to take a silent vote on it. I am sorry that the other men of this party are not here tonight. I have here, Sir, the Manifesto of the Prime Minister, and I think I owe it to myself as a Newfoundlander to deal with his references to the railroad in that Manifesto, as it is one of the chief reasons why I moved out here. I first moved out here as I stated the first night, looking for a policy to put this country on its feet, and I offered to back the first man who would come forward with a policy. Now, Sir, when I read this to the House I think every man in the House, possibly excluding Government members, will agree with me that the stand I took was justified. There has been a lot of talk about a nigger in the woodpile. I have been accused of being in league with Sir John Crosbie and everyone else but before I get through I will show the nigger in the woodpile. I will connect the story up

so that it will be quite plain for anyone to read.

Mr. Chairman, it does not need an explanation from me. The system has been correctly described as a rotten outfit, too indifferent to learn, and this Government comes in here and hands out two million dollars to an outfit of that kind.

I do not know what has happened, Mr. Chairman, but I do know that the present Government, that the Prime Minister is leading is going to give them a million and a half dollars that is going to destroy this country. Why do you not get up in your seats and explain where this money is coming from? No, you have never thought about that, but now I am going to state what I think is the nigger in the woodpile. I am ashamed of the members of the Government who have come in here to vote away this million and a half dollars without any explanation. Why have not the Prime Minister or the Government attempted to make these people carry out their agreement? I would not be surprised if the Prime Minister is by the collar as well as the others in this deal. Mr. Chairman, would I be justified in sitting in a Government seat after having promised the people that I would make the Reids carry out their contract, but Sir George Bury came down here to make a report for the purpose of covering over the Government's action in this matter. Are the Reids dominating the Government of to-day? I venture to say that the Reids are dominating the Government to-day more than ever before. That is one of the reasons why I moved out in the centre of the House. No man who took the Prime Minister's Manifesto as his platform is justified in keeping his seat in the Government. He ought to put it at the disposal of the people.

Now we come to Sir George Bury's report. I think it is sad that we pos-

sess a Government to-day that is willing to vote away a million and a half dollars in spite of the fact that the country hasn't got a cent. If every Newfoundlander was of my mind tonight you would not be here with a calm look on your faces. I stated in this House a few days ago that the estimated revenue that the Prime Minister is looking for is 8 million dollars. I pointed out at that time that the codfishery is our only industry. I put the catch at 1,500,000, and suppose the price will be \$7.00 a quintal that will give us a total buying power of \$10,500,000. Now suppose the average duty would be 40% that would give us a revenue of \$4,000,000, and you are looking for \$8,000,000. Now that is the only industry that is going. Bell Island is shut down, and you have had a bill on the order paper for almost three months. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Grand Falls is closed down. There is absolutely nothing to look to but the codfishery. Now where are you going to get this million and a half dollars? You can't tax the people any more. They won't stand for it. The first thing we have got to consider is the financial condition of the country.

After spending 1½ millions, the Government come in here and intend to pay the rest and then a man is looked on as a fool for standing here and fighting as a Newfoundlander. It is a pity enough of the others did not come over and get us out of this position. I did my duty. (Quotes report.)

The snow shed near Avondale is likely to be destroyed by a forest fire as there are no spark arresters on these engines. (Quotes report.)

That is only a joke—everyone knows you are going to finance the Reids; you are going to give them 1½ millions. That brings me back to the point where I was before. This Reid Deal is going through I contend,

as far as some people are concerned, even if the country goes under water I am here to-night with the information on my possession and if you have any imagination at all you will soon smell him out—the one I refer to. You will soon find it out for yourselves. I hold here a chart of Newfoundland from the Crown Lands office and the places marked by x's is the property owned by the Reid Nfld. Co. and which is leased to Collishaw. I wonder what did he pay for it. Here's the letter and you can all have it if you doubt it. Some in the Government know of it. This property here belongs to Collishaw and last year the operation of the railroad between St George's and Grand Falls was carried on for his benefit. The Hon. Prime Minister a few days ago in explaining the operations, paused at Grand Falls as at that point he struck these x's. This man drifted in here and is making the big money. He followed me to Spaniard's Bay, broke the wheel of his car and jumped on the train but was too late for my meeting—fortunaetly for himself. If he had got there he would not have returned taller though he might be fatter, because I was asked at the meeting by the people what they would do with him. I said to let him alone as he was a friend of mine. But he said I had more heart than brains but I have enough to come back at him with the outfit who are trying to destroy the country. This is private correspondence but I will read it here as I am a Newfoundlander and I don't want any wirepuller to come here and kill us. (Reads correspondence.)

Collishaw got these properties here and what is making them valuable is the fact that the railway runs through them. If that stops, the areas will not be so valuable and consequently he wants it running.

Before I sit down I may show he is a friend of others besides the Reids

and three of a kind makes a good hand. (Reads.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, Collishaw has a contract with the A. N. D. Co. for 5,000 cords of pulp wood at \$17 a cord. I will show that this wood cost him \$6 loaded on the cars. If the railroad was not running through his property he would not be able to make \$17 a cord. This letter is dated Feb. 4th, 1921. Unless the road was running to Grand Falls he would not be able to make the contracts and that explains his interest in the railway. I am not a polished speaker but when I get it all together, all hands will be able to see the connections. (Reads letter.)

Now this is making up a sale. The 5,000 cords at \$17 a cord means about \$87,000 and still we have some people simple enough to wonder why he is trying to get the railroad going.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Isn't it giving employment.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Wait a minute—I'll make the connection before I am finished. I do not object to Collishaw giving employment but I object to him worming himself in to make contracts. (Reads letter.)

Now here is another letter (Reads letter.)

The block here is marked Foote & Henderson.

HON. MR. FOOTE.—I got it under the late government.

CAPT LEWIS.—And you'll vote for this to help him export his timber.

HON. MR. FOOTE.—That is nonsense.

CAPT. LEWIS.—Mr. Morine got out of the Executive for less than that.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Collishaw is a friend of the Reids. I am informed on good authority and the statement I make is in the interest of Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland and I am sorry to have to make it as it will touch friends of mine, but I put Newfoundland ahead of all personal friendship and I say that Collishaw is

on the F. P. U. Co.'s paper for over \$100,000.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Why bring in personal matters—stick to your subject and be logical.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I take it as a fact unless the Hon. Minister of Marine contradicts it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You have no right to ask me that.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Collishaw is backing the Union Trading Co's paper for over \$100,000 and if he lifts it—if it is lifted off any company to-day—that company will find it hard to get that money. I am not making this statement in a vindictive spirit but to show that it is dangerous to have such a man about. Let him lift that money and up goes the company.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—And yet you are so nice and would not hurt the feelings of anybody.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I am bringing in a public man and one who controls 11 seats in this House.

CAPT. LEWIS.—And who is prepared to sell Newfoundland for his own aggrandisement.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—If \$100,000 is lifted from any company to-day that company will not be able to get it. Knowing Collishaw as I do, he is in no way lenient in trying to get his deal through.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—What has that to do with the railroad.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—He is making \$10.50 profit on each cord and he could not do it if the road were not running. I believe this thing will be voted because it will swing to the Union. You are simple minded if you cannot make the connection. And I will say more if I am put to it. Collishaw holds the first mortgage on all of it. I speak as a Newfoundlander. He has a preferred mortgage and the

fishermen will not get one cent till he is satisfied.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Do you think everyone can be bribed and bullied.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I am satisfied to go down in history as a fool even, but I do not like to see one man with his hand on the throat of the man who controls eleven seats here.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—What has all this to do with the railway?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—This much—the Hon. Minister of Marine has built up a business at the north and by it secured political power. Everything is alright while the business lasts but if it fails the people will be ready to horsewhip him. I tell him straight now that this man holds a chattel mortgage on him. It is too much power for one man to have over another and if Collishaw lifts it, up she goes.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—What has that to do with the railway?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Coaker is swinging eleven seats in this House and when a man holds his paper for \$100,000 there is only one thing possible. I say this much, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that Mr. Collishaw is forcing more than he should force in this House. That, too, I suppose is the result of blood pressure. I ask any common sense man to-night does he think it is a safe position for his country to be in to have a man like Collishaw backing to the extent of \$100,000 the one who holds control in this House, especially when it is only a question whether Collishaw wishes to close up the Union Trading Company or to let it continue. The second day after I moved my seat out here, Collishaw picked me up in his car with the remark that he did not mind carrying his enemies along. I asked him how he could assume that I was an enemy of his and he replied that I would now vote with the Opposition,

and then you will tell us here that Mr. Collishaw is not interested in the Government. He said to me, "the talk going around is that you have been bought by Crosbie."

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—If Collishaw said that, he lied. I never purchased Mr. Archibald nor anyone else, and there is a place at the Bar of this House where such a charge may be proved or disproved. I'll stand none of Mr. Collishaw's nonsense and I demand now that he be brought before the Bar of the House and made to answer for the slander of which he has been guilty.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I thank Sir John Crosbie for his emphatic denial of such a charge against me. I was going to ask him if he knew anything of a bribe in connection with my taking an independent seat in this House. I told Mr. Collishaw that I cared no more for Sir John Crosbie than I did for the Government but he said "the proof is that the first time you vote you are going to vote with the Opposition." That was some proof, was it not?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I care not for Mr. Collishaw nor anyone else but I want to say again that Collishaw is running this country. The thing is as plain as day. He is a bosom friend of the Reids; he is backing the Union Trading Company and he has big timber interests in this country that he wants to sell. I told this country tonight for the first time that he holds a chattel mortgage on the Union Trading Co. for \$100,000. Talk of bribery, Mr. Chairman. Why, since I left that side of the House I was followed to Hr. Grace by men who made me offers to go back. I do not know whom these men came from but one of them asked me if he could come back and report to the Prime Minister that I was a friend of his. I told him I was always a friend of the Prime

Ministers. Now Sir, there must be a reason for the Government to give Reids a million and a half dollars and whatever the reason might be there is not a man on the other side prepared to get up and say where the money is to come from. I wish I was in a position to state what a man said to me recently. I would send a shock through Newfoundland from one end to the other. This whole thing is nothing but a scheme to put the country into Confederation and from what I have been told of Collishaw's connection with the Reids, the Union Trading Company and his interests in this country, I leave it to intelligent people to draw their own conclusions as to whether or not he is not closely identified with the scheme. I have a hazy recollection of having heard some thing about Mr. Collishaw having taken Mr. Coaker around Canada on a certain memorable occasion. I think that statement was made and I do not know but it was sworn to by one of the Reids.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we come another matter of interest to the public of Newfoundland. The Prime Minister has said that the fishery is nearly defunct and that it is up to us to develop our inland resources and Mr. Coaker brings forward his Humber proposition. But, what does this Humber proposition mean? The original plan was for this country to find bonds for the sum of \$25,000,000 to ensure the carrying out of the project and 95% of the timber areas along the Humber which would be worked are owned by the Reids while different other blocks belong to Mr. Collishaw. The whole thing was only going to be a promoting scheme to be worked out in London and the people of this country stood to lose \$25,000,000 if the proposition did not succeed, while no matter how it went, the own-

ers of the timber areas would be sure of having them taken up.

Now Sir, I do not intend to vote for these Resolutions. I am not fool enough to think that the railway must not be run but I am not going to vote to give this million and a half to Reids unless I can get some clearer explanation than we have had so far and I think that some such explanation is due, both to this House and to the country.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight

←→
TUESDAY, July 19th.

On a question of privilege arising, Mr. Speaker took the chair.

Whereupon Sir J. C. Crosbie proposed and Mr. Higgins seconded the following.—

"I move for the appointment of a Committee of Privilege from the House to consider and report upon the charge made in the speech of hon. member for Harbor Grace, Mr. Archibald, in Committee of the Whole House, on Railway Resolutions, on July 19th, 1921, that one, E. Collishaw, stated that I had bribed the said member for Harbor Grace to withdraw from the Government ranks."

The said motion being adopted, Mr. Speaker appointed the Committee as follows: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Cave, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs resumed the Chair of Committee.

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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

←→

TUESDAY, July 19th.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

MR. LEWIS asked Hon. the Chairman of the Railway Commission if Capt. Leo Murphy has been appointed Government Railroad Inspector and it itemed that he has been drawing a salary since April.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Capt. Murphy has not been so appointed nor has he been drawing a salary.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if his attention has been called to an article in this morning's Daily News which deals with a leaflet issued by the Christian World at the instance of some Mr. Howard, presumably an American, in which an appalling description is given of the condition of our fishermen along the South and West Coast, and if the Premier can say to what extent these statements are correct and what action, if any, is the Government taking in regard to the matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the total receipts for the Customs Department in St. Johns' last week and the receipts for the corresponding week in 1920 and also in 1919.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am getting that information prepared

but I can at present time give you digest of it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—No preparation is necessary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Tabled digest.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I asked for a statement of the total amount for the first two weeks of July. There is always a comparative statement handed out by Mr. LeMessurier. There is not any trouble at all.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No trouble at all. I got that for my own personal information.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—We are \$94,000 short for the first two weeks of July, 1920.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—When Sir John looks through this digest he will see the whole matter in a satisfactory light. The year 1921-22 is better than any previous year excepting the high priced years.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—We have up to this July dropped \$200,000. If we keep dropping I know what will happen. I also wish to say that when Mr. Walsh was speaking some one said I intimated that fish would be eight dollars per quintal. I wish to deny that.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to my question four, Order Paper July 15th.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I tabled it.

MR. MOORE.—I beg to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a question of mine of July 18th.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—I beg to table the reply to Mr. Walsh's question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Moore the reply has not come down but I will telephone for it during a leisure moment.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—With your permission Sir, I will read a letter I re-

ceived from W. W. Bradley of Grand Falls. He asked me to lay it before the House. It is dated July 16th, 1921. (Reads.) I remember the gentleman. He was a tide waiter at Grand Falls. He gave every satisfaction but if this letter is correct, which I assume it is, I take it is an outrage to cut the salary of this man. Now he finds himself with a wife and family and \$48.00 is taken from his salary. If the civil servants are to be treated like that, how can we look forward to efficiency. You are thereby opening the door to smuggling and you will drive them elsewhere by your bad treatment. I hope the Minister of Marine or the Minister of Public Works will give us an explanation. When I was in the Custom House I tried my best to keep the salaries of men up to the degree to meet their accounts. I always received the men with sympathy and promptitude. How long is this going to continue?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I might say that I and my colleagues are looking after the affairs of our district just as well as the hon. member did. As far as the transfer of Mr. Bradley is concerned, I take the full responsibility for his transfer at the request of the people of Lewisporte. Somehow or other this official made himself objectionable to the people of Lewisporte. I had a lot of correspondence about the matter. Ultimately he got a petition started asking that he remain, there were but only eight signatures responded and that is sufficient proof. His family is now grown up and married. He made himself very objectionable in the fall of 1919 and he was in the end transferred to Grand Falls. If anything was deducted from his salary I had nothing to do with it. The only information I had of it was that I received a letter from him and I might say that he was so offensive towards

me that in the last part of the letter he apologized for his conduct.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Jennings will appreciate that the very reasons he put forward to support his argument are the means of the best proof against him. This incident occurred because of certain relations between Mr. Bradley and particular men over here. I am very sorry indeed to find that a member of this House and a Minister of the Crown has to be guided by a principle like this with regard to the civil servants. It was bad enough for us to think of the weak things we do as politicians but for the member of Twillingate to get up here and lay down the principle that as representative of the district he accepts the position that a civil servant is to be removed at the dictates of the whims of the people he works for, is the most frightful and malicious principle yet heard of. Did we conceive the day would arrive when a man of intelligence such as the hon. member would make such an indiscreet utterance as he has made? It strikes right at the foundation of the whole of the civil service. It was bad enough to have felt that this Government and all other Governments may be accused of making the charge that a long tailed family was bellowing against the Government but in this case a civil servant who has rendered faithful and efficient service is simply removed because the majority of the people do not like him. Is it not a frightful guiding principle? Then when he comes to the people with a petition asking that he be retained because he only succeeds in getting eight signatures from all the men who run the settlement, a Minister of the Crown forgetful of his duty as such and thinking more of a particular organization transfers him.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—No. You misunderstand.

MR. HIGGINS.—I do not misunderstand things all the time. I want to make this case clear. I had consulted the Minister last year and I was surprised at that time but I do not misunderstand and don't you forget it. Netieher can I misunderstand it now. There might be some law if it was according to F. P. U. law but when he is removed because he is distasteful to the people then it is mob law. It is lynch law.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That is an insult.

MR. HIGGINS.—Because you find yourself cornered and having violated a principle which should not be so treated, you say what you do not mean. I say it is mob law recognized by the Minister of Public Works when a man is dealt with according to the opinion of the people without a trial. It is called lynch law in the United States and I fear if the hon. member advocates it further it will bear the name of Jennings' law when a man is not kept in his job because he is not popular with the people.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—He said there was a petition signed by eight persons. I would like to examine the houses of those who signed that petition. I bet they are smugglers. If I were in the Custom House I would instruct the detective to examine their houses. Whoever heard tell of a man doing his duty and being popular. Did you ever hear tell of Kelly Morrissey—he's gone now, God rest his soul—who would ever sign a petition to keep him. Who would sign a petition to keep Detectives Byrne or Tobin in a place. The fact is that the whole coast is open from Cape Race west and smuggling is rampant; it is going on to-day. Now you are going to take half the salary from this man who has been doing his duty faithfully for 25 years. You're cracked.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—It's an imaginary statement.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Here it is, I'll read it again. He says it is the Hon. Minister of Marines' answer. I'd increase his salary if I were in the Customs Department and I'd be doing my duty to the Colony. I ask the Hon. Prime Minister to look it up and see how much duties he has collected to date. You cannot now expect him to do his duty conscientiously if he is thrown out because he did not vote for you. And then you put your relative in his place.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That's a lie, and a big one.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Here's his statement. (Reads letter.)

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—They are all F. P. U. men.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—They can't be because I signed the petition to keep him there. Now as long as I got you to speak at last, I ask you is it right to do this thing.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He was not in my department.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—You are partly responsible.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—If I had my way he would be dismissed.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—We are too easy with him. If you were there you would have fired him.

MR. BENNETT.—Was there any fault in the performance of his duties.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I think he was obnoxious in doing it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That is not right. You are a political hypocrite as I called you before.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I take that as a compliment as I do not deserve it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—If we were outside the House I would give you

your right title but it would not be parliamentary to do so here.

MR. FOX.—This is a matter of personal interest to me. I know Mr. Bradley well and I am in a position to put in a word for him as to his competency in the position he held. I have had experience with him and I know you cannot get a more capable man and when the Minister of Works suggests that he is not capable it is a direct falsehood. I had an experience of Mr. Bradley that I intend to tell you of this afternoon. He is a man of the highest character, a man of splendid intelligence and better able to perform his duties than the majority of such officials throughout the Island. The service is lucky in having such a man. You are shortsighted in dismissing him and from the point of morality for you to say you dismissed him because he was not popular, shows you have no idea of how to fill your office. You are absolutely incapable of judging how to run it. We want no one to be a harsher judge of you than yourself, sir. When you have broken the silence, a few times during the session, you have put your foot in it. And you had the impertinence to tell Sir M. P. Cashin you knew how to run your district. You ought to go with your hat in hand to him for a few tips on it. As a Newfoundlander I have a right to say this. We all do not love ourselves as you do, and you jump to your feet whenever there is a suspicion of throwing the least shade of doubt on you, but you must remember you are more or less on sufferance here. Keep your mouth closed and your ears open and learn something. One of the things you ought to learn is that you cannot handle St. John's as you do your district. The other night we had the spectacle of you in talking of the men at the Bar of the House, saying you would have

to go and get a posse of the police here. They were decent citizens and own more of the town than you do and I had trouble in restraining myself from getting up and telling you where you'll get off. We are come to a pretty pass when you come in here and tell them such a thing, and that you cannot get out of the Chamber without ruffling the lapels of your Tuxedo coat without a posse of police on guard, the next thing you will want is an arch of boughs or palms or an avenue of crossed swords for you to stalk out under. Now getting down to brass tacks, I will not allow you to insult those whom I represent and I will not take it from you. The people I have the honour to represent have shown restraint I fear I would not show, because you could not get out of the Chamber you said you ordered up the police.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—
That is a lie.

MR. FOX.—Your memory must be failing you—you said it yourself. Do you deny what you said to Mr. Higgins and to me. The idea—this town is come to a pretty pass when citizens cannot come to the Bar of this House for assistance—men who came here and told the Hon. Speaker they wanted to come observing all the amenities and the dignity that surround a visit to the House—without you sending an order to the Constabulary to send a posse here to keep the peace. Their forefathers built this town and they own more of it than you. This evening we have another instance of the oblique way in which you look at things in your dismissing a man who would not vote for you in the fall of 1919. You say he made himself most objectionable. But you must remember that you might have bought his services but not his mind. The Creator gave him a will and because he does not kow-tow to you, you come

here like the Big Pooh-Bah and say you take full responsibility for his dismissal. The only thing you are entitled to take is a castigation from the decent-minded citizens. The Civil Service has lost a most competent man in Mr. Bradley; I know him and his abilities. Four years ago when you were spreading the hymn of hate and inciting your people to take property that did not belong to them, he was protecting it from the marauders.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—
That is a lie.

MR. FOX.—Everything is a lie that is contrary to your wishes. No wonder you dismissed him; he could not stable with you; he would not back you in the election of 1919 but you gratify your own petty spleen and spite and to satisfy someone who is weak-kneed enough to accept it, you cashier him. You ought to be proud of yourself. You are a credit to the district which sent you here and to the Department which you are so inefficiently managing. You might have had the decency to keep quiet and allow the people to recognize these things and not add insult to injury. For you to preach the vicious principle which Mr. Higgins referred to, that a man may not be kept in office only when he serves the interests of the powers that be, is truly a lovely proposition. You forgot that any man in the position of Mr. Bradley cannot be popular with the crowd. The proof that he is efficient is that he is unpopular. You will find as Sir M. P. Cashin said, if you investigate, that the 8 who supported him were likely backing him for what they could get out of him. You say you got all the correspondence—will you table it? And then you say he was incompetent. Will you swear to that after his 25 years in the service. For you to cast such a stigma on him is no more than

vagance has been can now be seen. This year the Government comes in with a proposition to give the Reids the same amount as was voted last session although I know for a fact that last year cars were hauled over the line empty, section gangs were doubled and repairs were made that should have been made when Reids were in charge. To-day there is no indication of what has become of the contracts of 1898 and 1901, nor do we know whether or not the Reids are any longer responsible for the running of the railway. In these Resolutions apparently every effort has been made to conserve the rights of the Reids but there is nothing about the Colony's rights at all. I notice also that any expenditures on capital account must be paid on application to the Government. In other words, another million dollars besides the million and a half we are now asked to vote, might be spent. Mr. Halfyard yesterday objected to the bringing in of the F. P. U. into this discussion but it is useless to make any objection of the kind because the F. P. U. has only itself to blame; such a corporation has no right whatever to have a party in this House and if a connection can be traced between the F. P. U. and the Reids, we are quite within our rights in bringing the former into this debate.

It says here in these Resolutions: "The company shall during the term of this Agreement operate the Railway at the minimum cost consistent with safety." In other words, if the Reids were running the road at their own expense it is assumed that it would be run more economically than it will be under the present arrangement. At any rate we are paying the Reids a million and a half dollars to operate the road this year which means that we are paying a bonus for extravagance and they will give one-third the service we had last year, and at an extra cost.

With regard to the General Manager that is to be brought in here, it has been said that no man worth his salt would come to this country in such a capacity, but the Prime Minister now tells us that he has signed a contract with a man for five years which simply proves that this is only a stop-gap for one year, and that the same situation will have to be faced when the House meets again. As far as I can understand it, the thing has been let run until the Reids got the Prime Minister in a corner, and then got what they wanted. In desperation he sent for Sir George Bury to help him out of the hole, and the Resolutions before us are the result. The opposition has I think made it clear that they will have nothing whatever to do with it. The position has not been made sufficiently clear as to what has happened the previous contracts, to enable this House to deal with it intelligently, and I condemn the Resolutions on the ground that they are only getting us in more deeply, and that the real meaning of them is that there is no longer such a thing as a Reid contract. If the Government votes these resolutions through the people must inevitably denounce them for their action. I intend, Mr. Chairman, to vote against the Resolutions.

MR. VINICOMBE—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of saying a few words with regard to the Resolutions now before the Chair. As I look opposite, I can see the men who branded the Cashinites grafters and Reids' satellites, and these are the people who are to-day bringing in these Resolutions to give the same Reids a million and a half dollars. Surely the Government must have been slumbering these past twenty months, if they could not realize that it was not Cashin, but they themselves who must give Reids the money they needed to run the railway, and still Mr. Chairman, they were going to put Sir Michael Cashin in jail as a grafter. I am not going to vote

for these Resolutions because I know they are wrong. Propositions have been made to the Government that were unknown, not only to the Opposition, but to the rank and file of the Government itself, but nevertheless, they are asked to vote for the Resolutions, and no doubt they will fall in line and do as they are told. I say, Mr. Chairman, that as Newfoundlanders and as men who are expected to have a sense of their responsibilities and of their duty to their constituents and the country, they should insist on knowing what these propositions are before they vote for the Resolutions that are now before them. We have no detailed account of how that one million, six hundred thousand dollars was lost when Mr. Coaker tried his little experiment of railway running, nor do we know how the million and a half which we are now asked to vote is going to be spent. I say again that it is due to every man in this House that he should get all the information that there is to get before he is asked to vote away this money because after all it is Newfoundland who owns the money, that you are going to give to the Reids and when you do vote it, see to it at least that the men who are working on the Railway do not have their wages cut, as it is now, I understand, the intention to do. Private members on this side of the House know that there were propositions put up to the Government by the Reid Newfoundland Company. Why do you not go and ask Mr. Coaker what the propositions were. No sensible man on the other side of the House will tell me that this is the only proposition, put up to you. I know Mr. Targett is a sympathetic man, and understands me, and he will tell us what the propositions were. I may take a different view of the resolutions. If the Prime Minister will tell us what the propositions were, I will vote for the resolutions. We know that propositions were handed out to the Government, but we are in the

dark. If we knew what the propositions were we may all vote for the resolutions. I know that W. D. Reid was going to be chairman of the Commission. He was nominated by the Prime Minister and seconded by Mr. Cave. Mr. Cave was the only man who would stand by the Prime Minister. It finally turned out that they had five members on the commission instead of seven. Mr. Coaker and Mr. Hall represented the Government. It is said yesterday how much he was going to that some Government member asked get to vote for the resolutions. We have heard the cry "put the grafters out," but now it is time to put the grafters somewhere. I know Mr. Jennings is an innocent man.

MR. TARGETT—Why is it that most of the countries in the world are in a worse state than Newfoundland?

MR. VINICOMBE—Mr. Coaker knew when he put the regulations on that practically all the countries of the world were in a bad shape, but he has continued his bungling. Who closed down Bell Island? Now don't you mind Mr. Abbott, honest John Abbott. I mentioned Bell Island because it is in my district. Mr. Coaker, at an F.P.U. meeting said he was going to make the tax on ore a dollar a ton, but he hasn't done anything yet. He is continuing to throw dust in the eyes of the F. P. U. men in the northern districts. There must be some graft in connection with this matter too.

Now, Sir, regarding these resolutions, as I said before, surely goodness, Mr. Warren, you as a Newfoundlander and a good sportsman, are not going to have these resolutions go thru without giving us some information as to what other propositions were put up to the Government by the Reid Newfoundland Company. You know that there is more than this report of Sir George Bury. Don't forsake your country. Don't forsake Fortune Bay that sent you to this House. I say again,

Mr. Warren, you who lived in St. John's East, played all the games and played the game of a man, now, sir, live up to your reputation and play the game to-night.

I am not interested in the Reids, but I am interested in Mr. Targett, Mr. Abbott and these men because they are Newfoundlanders. Regarding Mr. Collishaw all I got to say is that if Mr. Coaker is associated so much with him as it seems he is every morning, he ought to say the Lord's prayer "Lead us not into temptation," and he will get rid of Collishaw. You tried to help the country Sir, and you put your foot in it, but the Prime Minister did nothing, he did no reconstruction as he promised the people he would do. I sympathize with Mr. Targett and Mr. Abbott, because the Prime Minister and Mr. Coaker has been keeping certain information from them that they ought to have. This is no joke. There are private members on this side who know the propositions but it is kept from you men. It is not because Mr. Coaker is going to vote for these resolutions that you have to vote for them, If you vote for them you will go down in history unwept, unhonoured and unsung. The people of the north will turn you down Mr. Coaker, and the Prime Minister will have no more use for you. Be true to the people who sent you here, and they will send you back to the House again to represent them. During my remarks this evening I did not realise how the time flew until the Chairman rose the committee until eight o'clock to-night. I am filled up with a feeling "My country 'tis of thee." That is the feeling beating within my heart to-night, and I think every honourable member on the other side has enough British blood in him to have the same feeling with regard to these Resolutions. They may be good for Newfoundland. As I stated before they may be the best thing for the country, but as the rank and file of the Government are not acquainted

with the proposition put up to the Government I think that these resolutions brought in here to-night should be adjourned until every member on the other side is well acquainted with every particular leading up to the Resolutions. Mr. Samson, Mr. Targett and Mr. Guppy do not know anything about the proposition put up to the Government. Then why should they vote for the Resolutions? Why should not Jack be as well as his master? I have a better regard for those men than to think they are going to vote for those Resolutions without having first deliberated upon them seriously. I will be surprised if they will vote for them to-night. Only this report of Sir George Bury we have before us to-night. It is like a dictation given to a school child about who killed cock robin. Because a man comes down from Canada and says give the Reids as Newfoundlanders ought to forget party politics, and forget we are on \$1,500,000 you give it to them. Now wa the Government side or on the Opposition side, but think in common along the line that we have but one aim and object in view and that is the betterment of the country. We are getting feeble, but our children will remain. I for one, do not want to see Newfoundland go into Confederation. There was a time when we could have gone to Canada, and stated our own terms, but now we can only go on our knees. I do not speak as one who has not a stake in this country. I reared up seven children, and I do not want them to be burdened with taxation. The Boers, the South Africans and the Irish fought for their freedom, and they got home rule, and here are we trying to throw away our independence. We are going right down in the mire. We were asked if we had any amendments to offer. These resolutions are your own doings. You come in here and tell us that Bury's report says give the Reids \$1,500,000. The men on the Gov-

ernment side cannot be very conscientious. You take his word for this. Some of the members on the opposite side do not know but he is some tramp just like myself who thought he was. I never heard anything of him. You did not get John Powell to make a report. With reference to Mr. LeGrow and Mr. Small I said this afternoon that these honourable men fought for King and country. But now they are called upon to do more than that, that is to vote for the welfare of the country they fought for, and let us hope they did not fight in vain. I do hope they will weigh the facts before they will vote. If they vote according to the dictates of their conscience I am satisfied. I did not intend to hold up the House, but as the Prime Minister has left the House I will hold up the House until eleven o'clock. He is the man who brought those resolutions forward and my remarks are intended for him. In five minutes time the band in the Park will play, and that will tune me up so that I may keep it going until the Prime Minister comes in. Do you think we are foolish enough to pay \$1,500,000 upon the basis of two sheets of foolscap. Mr. Targett you ought to keep a copy of this report as a souvenir.

MR. TARGETT—With your permission I may ask what was the proposition Sir Michael Cashin would have brought forward had he been returned to power as spoken of by you?

MR. VINICOMBE—You misunderstood me.

MR. TARGETT—Was it true that Sir M. P. Cashin intended to float a loan of 10 millions for the purpose?

MR. VINICOMBE—No, that was the Squire's report. He said he would put their nose to the grinding stone, but now he is going to give them 1 1-2 millions. He got into power on false pretences. I do not accuse you men of it but the Hon. Prime Minister and his followers. I am as honest in my re-

marks as Honest John Abbott. Now, Minister of Public Works, I hope you have gone over these resolutions; you haven't a seat in the Executive, but I hope they do not keep you out of their secrets, and as the proposition has been put up to the Hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. Minister of Marine and the Hon. Minister of Justice, and they won't show the decency to tell us, I hope you will rise and explain just what the proposals are. Some of you ought to have some Newfoundland pluck in you, and if the leaders will not do it, let you rise and tell us. Don't keep us in the dark—though I know some of you are in the dark yourselves. Mr. Targett smiles, but in the same way as the Hon. Prime Minister, he has not the same bad opinion of us. The Hon. Prime Minister says in his paper, the Star that the Opposition are a crowd of clowns. Now I ask any honorable member on that side of the House, have we acted in any way wrong or improper since taking our seats here. Since I came into this House I have tried to do my duty by my district, and to act the gentleman in every way to everyone. And then the Hon. Prime Minister goes out of his way to say we are clowns. I will wait for him to come back, as I have something to tell him, and it will not spoil by keeping. If you have decided to vote for these resolutions to give the Reids this 1 1-2 millions, I as a Newfoundlander with a family to rear in this country, tell you that you are doing wrong. I suppose the Hon. Minister of Marine will see that there is some agreement drawn up as to how the money is to be spent. I will suggest something to you so that you will not forget it,—some people, you know, when they get into power, do forget the underdogs. If you are going to spend this 1 1-2 millions of the country's money, and do not intend to run the trains daily, but three times weekly this year and to close down the

branch lines in winter, the Reids will be better off than ever they were. I appeal to the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries, and the Hon. Minister of Justice, to see that if this 1 1-2 millions is voted to the Reids, there will not be a reduction in a month's time in the wages along the line, and in the machine shops. You know that you are putting on a tax that will make it beyond the power of the people to live. When the war was on prices were high enough, but when they started to come down you put on the surtax, and the other taxes and kept them up. The Hon. Prime Minister is different from Sir M. P. Cashin and Sir John Crosbie as they kept their titles to themselves, but he put it on all by the name of "Sir" tax. The working classes find it as hard to live now as they did a year ago, and if you are going to vote away this 1 1-2 millions which is wrung out of Newfundland I hope and trust you will see that the workers get a standard rate of pay and that there will be no cutting for at least 12 months. I would like to have your promise on that, Hon. Minister of Marine. You know that if the Reids get this present, the workers will be contributing it as it belongs to them. It is pretty hard for them to have to give it and then be dictated to by the Reids, as to what they will get back. I ask you in all sincerity to see that there is no reduction of the poor man's pay. The condition of the country at present is such that it is not worth living in and if you cut him you are crucifying him again. Now, Sir, there is another thing that I want to say. Why I am so interested in the Hon. Prime Minister being in the House, is because he says in his remarks to-night that the clergymen and leading citizens are invited to the House to see how it is held up day by day by the Opposition. Isn't that very kind of him. I do not know if I will get it off my chest till he comes in. How is it he is so friendly now with the clergymen.

A time there was when he put the detectives on their trail, and only two weeks ago when it was in the papers that the members of the Methodist Conference were coming to this House in connection with Prohibition he bluffed them by adjourning the House. He did not invite them while the Conference was on. I am tired of reading in the papers what we on this side are. There is no bluff about me—rich and poor, all are alike to me. The idea of him inviting the clergy now; he was not sincere before and closed the House so as not to give them the chance to come here, I was in the liquor business once, and the revenue then was about \$350,000 and the people had all the liquor they liked. But now the Hon. Prime Minister in his Estimates for the coming year reckons on \$480,000. Isn't that grand in a Prohibition town. Is that the reason he kept the clergy out. I do not know if it is so, but I do know the clergy would trust me more than him. I had to pass these remarks, but I would rather have done so when he was in the chair. I do not accuse Dr. Mosdell of writing this stuff, it was the Hon. Prime Minister, I know his writing. As I said this afternoon, if you representatives of the F.P.U. took an oath to stand by the Union it may be alright at times to do so. But it is not alright when the country is at stake like now. That's why I appeal to you now. And I ask the Hon. Minister of Justice who has always played a man's part up to now to do so to-night. I hold no brief for the Reids, but the road has to be run; I find no fault with giving them the 1 1-2 millions, but what I do find fault with is that these resolutions should be thrown at us with the only explanation that Sir George Bury says the Reids should get the money. Does the Hon. Prime Minister think we are really wooden heads as we have been termed to take it seriously. There are better men right

here in the country who can run the road with the 1 1-2 millions, and make a million out of it. I have read the articles in the Telegram by Mr. Butler I do not know him personally, but any one reading what he has written knows that he is intelligent. Was he ever tried as to the running of the road. You who represent the outports from one of which Mr. Butler writes, should be ashamed to have this man brought in here to give us this report. To give him \$7,500 for it is a downright disgrace. There are men in the outports who can do anything and why should you turn them down. In the Reid Nfld. Co. to-day there is a Carbonar man—the Hon. Mr. Speaker knows him—Mr. Powell, who can show Bury all about the railroad or anything connected with it. The Hon. Minister of Marine spent \$1,600,000 on the road and Sir Gerge Bury thought so much of it that he took good care not to go back over it, but cleared out by the Rosalind. That is where the money goes. If I were an outport man I would not mind what the Hon. Minister of Marine says; he is only tied up with the Reids for his own benefit. He started to do good for you, and I trust he will, but after all he is not an outport man, he was born on the Southside. Nevertheless that's why I say he should not have gone to Canada to bring down a man for this business. When he was building the premises at Port Union he gave great praise to the Newfoundlanders and Capt. Jones came in for his share. The Newfoundlanders can do anything and we should not have got this man from Canada down here. I know a lot of the party meetings, and I would like to know how much the Hon. Prime Minister was interested in the resolutions. He leaves the House when anyone on this side gets up. He vilified Mr. Higgins in the last campaign, but left the Chamber, when that gentleman took the floor. The Minister of Justice ought to ask him to come in and take his seat

This is the place to hear what we have to say and this is a matter of 1 1-2 million dollars. I think in justice to the House he ought to be brought in here. I am one of those who in passing remarks do so openly, and I would like to see him in his chair. I do not want anyone to tell him what I said, I will tell him myself. I do not know if there is any rule that while I hold the floor I have to say a word, and I will now hold it till he comes in.

MR. MacDONNELL—I think the House should rise till he comes in, and I put the suggestion to your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VINICOMBE—Mr. Chairman, as the Prime Minister has come back after his smoke, while this question of a million and a half dollars is pending, I will continue my remarks. We on this side of the House are called clowns. Well, all I can say is that we are fools as well and the people must be fools. You say in your article to-night that we are clowns, but you are the only one who has looked upon us in that light. When some time ago Mr. MacDonnell put the question on the Order Paper about the Lobella you replied by calling us wooden heads. We took that for what it was worth, but I do not want my children to take up the paper and see in it their father called a clown. Now, Sir, while you were out another article came up for discussion, that referring to clergymen being invited to the House. I want to say that clergymen are always welcome here, and what is more you will always find them here enjoying the debates, except on one occasion and that was while the Methodist Conference was on, and then you took good care that they should not be here. You were cute enough to haul it over them there. When they came in the House was adjourned on one occasion. I happened to be sitting at my desk here writing a letter when two or three of these gentlemen approached me and

asked when the House would be open. I replied that it would be open tomorrow. Now Sir, I don't mind being called a wooden head, or a bald head, but when it gets down to clowns, I must protest and do so very thoroughly.

As to these Resolutions, I do not believe that the Prime Minister is the father of them at all, but be that as it may. I would like to see a clause put in them providing that there shall be no cut in the wages of employees for twelve months. Is that too much to ask? I see men here from the West End who, I am sure are not here to see how the money is going to be voted, but to see whether or not their wages are going to be cut. The position with them is that if John Jones is getting \$24 a week, and he is told that he must take \$18 a week now, it is his own money that is being paid him and it is therefore his own money that is being taken from him if he is cut. I ask, therefore, is it right and fitting that these men should have their pay reduced. Now Mr. Coaker, will you guarantee that this will not be done? The Prime Minister will say nothing in reply to my appeal on behalf of these men, altho they are his own constituents. Mr. Coaker does not answer either. Look at them! Two silent monks. My God, have you not got the interests of the poor at heart? Must it be always Self with you?

The Reids will make money this year if they never made it before. You don't seem to realize the position. If a man works for Knowlings, Knowlings pay his salary, but if a man works for Reids, the Newfoundland Government pays his salary. Now Mr. Warren, before I take my seat I want to say this to you. You and I grew up together and played together and you were always one who played the game. You have won medals and trophies that you perhaps value very highly, but if you vote against these Resolutions you will win a greater trophy

than any you have ever won, namely, the honor of Newfoundland. The Resolutions may be all right, but we on this side of the House are in the dark as to the true position, and the rank and file of the Government are in the dark. Sir George Bury says that Reids must be given a million and a half dollars, and on the strength of that we are asked to hand it out to them and ask no questions. My appeal to the Government to-night, humble as it may be, is "Do the best you can for the people." You never asked anyone else if they could run the railway, you never got the opinion of anyone. Was the opinion of this Mr. Butler who is writing in the Telegram asked? No, but one Collishaw who drifts in here from Nova Scotia was asked to advise us not only on the railway, but on the Fishery as well in spite of the fact that he did not know what a fish was till he struck this country. He was not alone consulted, but he was the leading man on the Fishery Board when one was appointed last year. Now if you are going to vote on this matter do not do so in the dark, but ask for the correspondence between Reids and the Executive. Mr. Sampson says that he knows nothing of any proposition, but that he will vote this million and a half because Sir George Bury says so. And now Mr. Jennings, I ask you again "what does it profit a man to gain the whole world if he lose his immortal soul?" Are you going to let a paltry \$5,000 keep you from voting against these Resolutions when you know them to be wrong. The people were up in arms Reids gave us a million for the railway but now the position is changed and we are going to give them a million and a half to run it for us. What would those men who, when the '98 contract was made had bootrooms all over the country to receive the protests of the people, what would they do if they could get out of their graves now? I know that an agree-

ment exists between the Reids and the Government but I do not know what it is. However the private members of the Government should know it before this vote is taken. I regret, Mr. Chairman, having detained the House so long, but I want to inform the Prime Minister before taking my seat that should he attempt to force the issue as he has threatened to do, I can talk for a week.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to rise again, but I want to assure the House that there is no desire whatever on my part to obstruct or delay the proceedings in any way. I hold in my hand a copy of the Advocate of to-day's issue and on the front page of that paper is an attack upon me with a heading in large type which reads, "CONTEMPTIBLE CONDUCT OF ARCHIBALD, ETC." The article goes on to say: (Reads article.)

Now Sir, I want to say that in my remarks last night I had not the slightest intention of hurting the Union Trading Company, nor have I to-day. I don't know who wrote that article but I do not think it was Mr. Coaker because he knows better. I have helped the Union Trading Company as much as any man in the country and perhaps even better than Mr. Collishaw. I want to say that through efforts of mine and after I had put in eight or nine weeks of hard work the Trading Co. was able to pay a dividend one year. This charge which the Advocate makes against me is not correct but I want to prove it to the satisfaction of the Union members. The first year after the Armistice was signed everyone knows what happened. The bottom went out of the market and fish that was bought here at 15 and 16 dollars a quintal could not be disposed of. I met the famous Mr. Collishaw and he had 1600 casks of Union fish on his

hands that he did not know what to do with. I sold that 1600 casks of fish for \$99.00 per cask and before that fish was shipped every man who had contracted for fish tried to cancel. I went to Boston and New York and interviewed Bleakhouse with the result that the deal was put through successfully although I had been told by experienced men before I left here that I should be only wasting my time and money. After eight weeks of hard work I got these credits through at 100% which meant \$144,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, everyone knows what happened in the case of the Escasoni and when she went out of here the only fish on board her that was sold and paid for was what I had sold for the Union Trading Co. when I visited the States. The balance of her cargo was paid for in Roumanian bonds which might be realized on some day but which are still unpaid. If I had not got that sale through and got cold cash for the fish, I ask what position the Union Trading Co. would have been in. If they had held these Roumanian bonds they would certainly have been up against it. I received as commission on that sale \$1,400.

I would not expect anyone to do \$144,000 worth of business for me and pay such a small sum. And that's not the worst of it. I went to the States, spent \$250 in telegrams, sold the fish, applied to Sir John Crosbie to get it on the Escasoni—he will tell you the same—got the credits, had the fish put on board, and a quarter of an hour after it went over her side the F. P. U. agent went to the Bank and got his \$144,000 in cold coin but the rest of the shippers are looking at their contracts yet. After spending weeks and my own money to get the contract through I came back here and I now ask the Hon. Minister of

Marine did I ever ask him to pay, any bill for me.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Did I ever talk to you of expenses?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—The reason I did not send in a bill is because I was and am friendly to the Union and I have fought for it all through from the days of its inception. I am democratic and in favour of anything that will help to uplift the poor man. That deal cost me a lot of money and I got not a cent. You got \$144,000 and but for me you would now be holding Roumanian bonds and be in a far worse position than you are. I did it on a friendly basis pure and simple. And then this paper states I am out to hurt the F. P. U. And this whole article, I can hit it as hard as I like through the reporter's box but that is not my intention at all. I knew as a matter of absolute fact that Collishaw was backing paper for the F.P. U. and I was sorry for it because we all know that charity begins at home and I feel as a Newfoundlander tonight that any man backing paper for any company holding political power as the F. P. U. does in this country, makes it to say the best, very unsafe. I leave it to Newfoundlanders to say if it is not so. When money is hard to get as it is at the present time, and Collishaw is backing paper, I am afraid of it. I do not want to accuse the Hon. Minister of Marine of any wrong but I am certain that he would rather be clear of that Collishaw connection than anything in the country. I never accused the Hon. Minister of Marine or any man of doing something that is not right but what I did say is that with Collishaw backing paper for \$100,000 or more, I as a Newfoundlander consider it unsafe

and he holds too much power. No matter how honest a man may be—and I take off my hat to the Hon. Minister of Marine for his wonderful work in Port Union—if a man holds \$100,000 over any company which holds political power, he might squeeze them if he were unscrupulous enough. And if it were my case I would probably be inclined to give in rather than sacrifice my life work and the people I had worked for. Mr. Collishaw has been in many deals. He said in the first, the fish deal, the best way to do it was to charge the small dealers \$5,000 each and force them out. It would then become like the big oil business and be run by only 4 or 5 men who would make a lot of money. He said that the Hon. Minister of Marine was the only one to bring that about. Mr. Collishaw has been following the Hon. Minister very close, and it has been said in a foreign city that Mr. Coaker is a clever man, but we will land him, and I think that is the tactics of that agent we have been speaking about. I could make a vindictive speech if I wished, but I will not do it; still I cannot let this newspaper statement go unchallenged. I cannot allow that. I stated that Collishaw was on paper for the F.P.U. for \$100,000 and that is absolutely correct. I have not stated it to hurt the Union, but because I like to see the Hon. Minister of Marine out of the mess, and he got to get the money somewhere. The one I am talking of is this fellow blowing in here and making money off the Newfoundlanders, and then forcing a man into a hard position. I know his type. When I moved out of the Government I met him, and he thought the Government was broken up. He said to me, "when you and Crosbie get far enough, come up to me and I will do something with the rest of them." Why did he speak to me like that? He did not help you for love, and I guarantee that he secured himself. He didn't follow

me to Spaniards Bay for nothing. I have no intention to hurt the F.P.U. I have been more help than hurt to them, but I guarantee the people all over the country have two eyes on Collishaw and are watching him. His flowery smile will not fool them as in the past.

(Reads article)

I am quite sure of this, and I am not the kind of fool to talk without knowing what I am talking about; the article itself shows it is true. I stated he is on the paper for the F.P.U. and the Union is swinging the country and I am afraid of it. Certainly I am afraid of it.

(Reads article.)

I do not know what they mean by referring to Archibald's business. I am able to swing my business, and I state right here, that I want help from no man. The one who penned this is trying to put over some idea, but I thank God I do not need anyone to help me one cent even though I am a young man, and that is the reason I can stand up here and talk to them. If I did need help I would choose better company than Collishaw. Sometimes however, people have not the choosing of their company.

(Reads article.)

I am not twisting this for political purposes. It is very little interest I have in it though I got something to tell of what was in the Advocate after I came back from my district. I got over 1,000 signatures on paper of the men who backed me up. I am not so often absent from my seat now, as when I was in the Government. Do you know the reason?—because I am not here on a party vote, but by the command of the people. And I financed my own campaign. I was backed up by the people. I do not care what became of my business and I will stay here till Doomsday because what I have got is as good a recommendation as any man can get from the people.

(Reads article.)

Is anyone silly enough to think those men are not taking securities on a preferred basis. I will not discuss this as I do not want things to get in the press or create a panic among the people interested. But I will come here and spit it out when I know a man is holding power such as Collishaw does.

(Reads article.)

There is a laboured effort all through the article to try and show it is alright. It were better you did not refer to it at all as it only backs me up. I will not refer to it in full as I would only be making trouble which I do not desire to do.

(Reads article.)

I have explained it in the interests of Newfoundland as I do not think it right for a man to be backing paper for one who holds political power. You can make as light of it as possible, but money talks, and I leave it to the Newfoundlanders whether I am right or not.

(Reads article.)

Every Bank wants gilt edge security and this thing is only a camouflage. They will take care if anything happens that they will be alright. Bondholders always seek a preferential claim and nobody is green enough to believe otherwise.

(Reads article.)

I think I sent enough to the 6,000 shareholders of the Union, enough to show that in getting them \$144,000, I was doing them a good turn. If I hadn't done that they would be in a worse position than they are now. The only thing stopping me from treating this in such a way as to stampede the people is because I have no desire to injure them.

MR. LEWIS—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on the Resolutions now before the Chair. I consider that this public question is so important to Newfound-

land that I feel that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents who sent me here or to this Dominion as a Newfoundlander, if I did not express my views thereon. Of course it will be recognized that there has been as much said in condemnation of these Resolutions by the able speakers who preceded me that there is but little ground left for me to cover; it is also a well recognized theory, I understand by the Government members that anything said by members on this side of the House is said merely because we are in Opposition and because it is our desire to prolong the business of the House. Now I want to make it quite clear that it is not my intention to speak because I am in Opposition, and want to delay the time of the House, but I am speaking as a Newfoundlander in the interest of Newfoundland, also because I hold no brief for the Reid Newfoundland Company. This is a matter on which each and every individual member should throw off all party feelings, and let all affiliations go to the wind, and he should stand up here in his place as a Newfoundlander for Newfoundland. We one and all are Newfoundlanders and are here for a common purpose and it is up to each and every one of us to express our opinions, and vote according to the dictates of our consciences on any question of importance such as the one now under discussion. The hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Archibald, dealt with the Prime Minister's Manifesto of 1919 and from it he read some very important extracts to prove, I hope, to the satisfaction of the average member of this House that the Prime Minister's views in 1919 and his views to-night are very inconsistent indeed. His Manifesto in no uncertain sound condemned the Reids, and the management of the whole railway system. He certainly put some very strong pleas before the electorate and asked the people from many different angles, not necessary for me to enu-

merate now, that before they would vote for the candidates of Cashin and the associates of A. B. Morine and W. I. Higgins to consider the matter carefully. This was the appeal of the man, who, a few years ago, was painted as the "black rascal" by his close friend who now sits behind him in the Government. I am going to read to the House now a few extracts from what is known as "The Trail of the Serpent." This is a little pamphlet that was issued and circulated with the Squires Manifesto in 1919. I am sure it will be listened to with great interest, and I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Justice sees fit to leave the House now while I am talking. This is very important in fact to the people of the country when they know that they got to be penalized to-night on account of the way they were hoodwinked and deceived by the present administration. In this document A. B. Morine is painted as the serpent that put the Railway Deal through in 1898 and the betrayer of Newfoundland (Reads article.)

Now what happened after the election? Cashin did not come back with the biggest following in this House to spend millions on the Reids, but the present Prime Minister did, and he has already given millions to the Reids without the consent of the people of the country. But not satisfied with that here is another paragraph (reads) referring to Mr. Higgins, as Reid's Solicitor, although at the time that was written Mr. Higgins was not a Solicitor for the Reid Newfoundland Company. I understand that that paragraph has already been affectively disposed of to the satisfaction of this House and to the country at large. Then this pamphlet goes on to tell of Morine, Cavell etc. (Reads). Well if it is right to please this country in preference to Morine, I say it is doubly and trebly right to please this country in preference to pleasing Collishaw; and if it is true what Mr. Ar-

chibald said to-night, I appeal to the young man of Newfoundland to see that Collishaw and Coaker do not put anything over on Newfoundland, and who will be more to the detriment of Newfoundland than Morine was in '98.

Here is another extract. (Reads) Well after the past 20 months' experience of the rule (or rather the misrule) of the present Government we should be all convinced by this time that we have certainly a Liberal Reform Government with a vengeance. They were liberal to themselves, and now they are going to be more liberal to the Reid Newfoundland Company. Last year this House closed, and there were members here who did not know what was going to happen to the Reid deal. Of course Legislation was passed to have a certain amount of money voted for a certain purpose, but it was not conceived that Mr. Coaker, after the departure of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, was going to undertake the running of the railroad as he did. However, he did as he wished himself and today we are paying the piper for his blunder. He said he was going to undertake the running of the railroad and was going to show to this country that he knew something about railroading. He ran it so well that he involved this country to the amount of \$1,650,000 and not satisfied with that the Prime Minister comes in here and introduces Resolutions asking this House to give to the Reid Nfld. Co. another 1 1-2 million dollars. Why should we give them that amount now, after the Prime Minister going to the country in 1919 and denouncing the Reid Nfld. Co. in all its moods and tempers? Even his Finance Minister—and I am sorry he is not in his place in the House to-night—denounced the Reid Nfld. Co. both in the General election and Bye-election in St. John's West and told the people there that whatever else happened that one thing was certain and that was

that he would have nothing to do with the Reid Nfld. Co. or with anything that they had anything to do with. How have those promises been kept? Now I am not expected, as an outport representative of the fishermen, to stand here and make a flowery speech like other members, but my language will have to be taken with the best intentions as what I say comes from the heart and with the very best intentions, and I fail to see what mandate the Prime Minister got from the people of this country to indemnify the Reid Nfld. Co. for what was done last year after this House closed. I think the Prime Minister is deceiving the people in worse fashion than Morine did in '98. I was a party to what came about in 1900 and did all possible to undo what Morine had done. If I disagreed with Morine then, I have more reason and more cause tonight to declare that the present Prime Minister is doing ten times worse because he introduced these infamous Resolutions yet this same young man, because Morine is a Nova Scotian by birth, paints him black to the country, and in cold print tells the people that he is going to bring the Reids to their senses. I say to-night that the Prime Minister is the greatest deceiver that ever occupied the Prime Minister's chair in Newfoundland. At the time that the Reids and Morine made the deal and drove it through this House, there was a stronger public sentiment in evidence than they are to-day, and the people were not so demoralized as they are to-day. At the time I refer to indignation meetings were held all over the country, and the people by their determination drove that crowd out of power. They went down to political oblivion for all time, and so will the crowd that are advocating the voting away of this 1 1-2 million dollars because by so doing they will put a mill stone around the necks of Newfoundlanders yet unborn as well as the present generation. The voting of this

1 1-2 million dollars to the Reid Newfoundland Company now means forty five millions for the next thirty years, because once that law is on the statute book then Mr. Coaker with his following of eleven sworn men to guard their own interest and the interest of the F.P.U. Trading Company, not Newfoundland in general, are prepared to vote 1 1-2 million dollars for the next thirty years. That is one of the great things that Premier Squires intends to do for Newfoundland. Why not take a little time, as Mr. Higgins said? About this time last year the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice went to the Old Country on a trip. It was known that the Minister of Justice went on important business regarding the Labrador Boundary, and in the interest of this country, but I say as a Newfoundlander that it would have paid the country better if he had remained in Newfoundland and took an interest in this railroad contract and spent his season here, even if he took the same leisure moments that he took in London. He would then be in a position to come in here with something of a business like nature in the interest of the whole country. If the Reid Newfoundland Co. are insolvent, as was stated here, why abrogate the amended contract of 1901 to sustain the Reids to carry on this railroad. I admit that it is impossible for this country to go on without this service now, but I also contend that we are not doing justice to the people outside this House without having a mandate from them to vote away this 1 1-2 million dollars this year. You are taxing the people \$30 per head for the Reids, and it means that you are going to take \$40 from every fisherman who is catching fish in Newfoundland to-day. Every fisherman has got to give six quintals of his voyage to pay this tax on the 1 1-2 million dollars, and while on this point I appeal to the representatives of the fishermen on the Government side of the House,

as I believe that very few of their constituents who are on the Labrador and fishing all round the coast to-night are prepared to throw down the value of five or six quintals of fish to pay the Reid Nfld. Co. to operate the railroad. I say it is the greatest piece of injustice ever perpetrated on a free people. I know, and I am positively certain that Mr. Guppy never told the people of Trinity that he was going to be a party to voting away forty dollars of their money this year, because if he did they would not have voted for him as largely as they did. The boot was on the other foot Mr. Guppy told the people of Trinity district and his colleagues told them too that they were going to reduce taxation and that they were going to make the Reids live up to their contract. This tax on the fishermen is as indirect as a man going to you to-morrow Mr. Guppy, and taxing your boots and traps. There is no more difference to it. The only difference is in the whole transaction is that the people of Trinity Bay were deceived like you deceived the people all over the other sections of the country, and the present leader of the Government will go down to posterity and his name will be emblazoned by the future historian of Newfoundland as the greatest deceiver that ever went before the electorate of this country.

We have heard a lot of talk here about niggers in woodpiles, and I think, according to Mr. Archibald's statements here, in referring to the happy associations between Mr. Collishaw, Mr. Coaker, the Trading Company and the Reid Newfoundland Co., that Mr. Collishaw is the white nigger in the woodpile and I believe that Collishaw is a very important man in the Resolutions before the House to-night.

With reference to the work on the road at Badger, I may say that there are at least a thousand men in Conception Bay waiting for employment at Bell Island to start operations again. We have men, women and children in

our own district actually starving for want of labour. Men are waiting for some avenue of employment to open up, and they are not permitted to leave the country, because every man must have \$250 on his person, or else he will not be allowed to land at Sydney. Well any man who has that amount can afford to stay home, but it is the poor man who cannot get enough money together to pay his passage money that wants to go to Sydney. I remember asking the Government, and the Prime Minister over a month ago, to suspend the rules of this House, and to pass this ore Bill when first it was brought up here, but nothing, apparently, has been done yet. Mr. Walsh to-night took us back to what happened at Catalina a few years ago, and he told us what contributed greater than anything else to the closing down of the Bell Island companies. At that time Mr. Coaker, who was flushed with victory and filled up with his own ambitions, contended that as he had attained political power that everything all over the country should fall before his wand. He there and then declared that the Dominion and Nova Scotia Companies were amassing immense wealth from the ore at Bell Island and he said that he was going to introduce a Bill compelling the companies to pay \$1 a ton upon all the ore exported from Bell Island.

From the day that statement was made public those companies began to pull in and they pulled in their business until a few days ago when they discharged two or three hundred men. That is the result of those pronouncements without consideration. That is the result of the underdogs, it is the men who are catching fish to-night who are going to suffer, and the men who have gone in to Badger. These are the men who are going to feel the pressure of this income tax. There are probably hundreds of families who do not know what they are going to have for breakfast to-morrow.

Then there is that Bell Island agreement. That Bill has been before this House for the past two months, and the Companies are held up. The onus is on the Government. If that bill had been passed the country would be in a position to know whether it was the Government or the companies that were holding up the work on Bell Island. But to return to the railroad Resolutions, and read what the Plain-dealers says:

(Reads.)

The last is well worth perusal. We are here as the representatives of the people. If you on the other side pass these resolutions the burden will be on your shoulders. It is up to you gentlemen. We have here Sir George Bury's report. This is the crux of the situation when Sir George Bury was telegraphed for to come to Newfoundland to advise the voting of one and a half million dollars to the Reid Nfld. Co. There are men in this country who know more about the conditions in this country than he does. What did we get out of the commission last year? We are charged with \$1,612,000; that is the price we had to pay for Government control. One would think we were in a great city in the United States or on the other side. Although we are asked to vote 1-2 million dollars for it it is only a one-horse matter. The Prime Minister said in this House last year that he did not agree with all auditors. I agree with that. But the Prime Minister accepts the statement that we have handed to us as a result of Government operation of the railroad last year, and he accepts the report of Sir George Bury.

MR. MACDONELL.—Mr. Speaker, on the motion for adjournment I would like to say a word or two on a matter of great importance. I think we should not adjourn till this is cleared up. The matter has been brought to me in its full context to-night. Certain blocks of land on the

West Coast on the three mile limit, were leased to Foote and Henderson—and I think, illegally—and afterwards to Collishaw. When the news reached St. George's of it being on the three-mile limit, I wrote the Government at the instance of the people who had held meetings to protest against the cutting of timber there as it was one of the few remaining places where they can get coopers' stock. All these people make herring barrels. I was invited to the meeting and protested and asked the Government to cancel the grants as in Conception Bay to Dr. Smith and Mr. Perez. There was a great flourish in the papers when that was done. I was curious then and did not understand why they did not do the same in St. George's as in the other case. The story has been unfolded by Mr. Archibald and I thank him and I will take the opportunity when the House closes to tell the people of St. George's. I am not sure if Collishaw was on the Commission but at Nardini's they loaded cars on the siding to more than they could hold and when the people applied for cars to carry freight they could not get one. Some more were on the siding at St. George's, not 100 yards from the Government wharf, but they could not get one and the engine took them back to load for Collishaw. The time is gone for hearing stories about the Reids—when they want anything done they get the man, and by a curious turn of the wheel, he is not in the House at all. I will tell a story later that will shock the House. When I go into it, the deal on the West Coast, it will buttress all that Mr. Archibald has said. To the credit of the Hon. Minister of Marine, I think he was not in the country when these things were done. It bears out what we all have said, that it is not the Commission is running the railway but

the Reids. Collishaw is the finished article and the Reids who are generally wise in their selections, got him. It is a scandal. That some of you here have not seen him is the proof that he does not deal with the small man—he goes to the top of the ladder to get his man. I have preached some of the Squires' manifesto myself; I believed something about the grafters and thought some of them would be in jail by this time, and I got about a hundred weight of the menace literature in St. George's yet as the people would not read it. The Reids got control of the country through this marvellous man who was expected to put it over the people at Washington as he did here. It would have been a good story and a benefit to the people of Newfoundland. I do not like to see him get privileges over others. I worked for the same equality for contractors and towards that end got a show from the Reids. I have found the Government were not the people to deal with but the Reids—and then to come in here with this proposition from the Hon. Prime Minister, who, if he played fair would be apologizing to the people. That's what you are trying to foist on the people and it is in keeping with everything else you have done in the House here. We are prepared to stay here for hours, weeks or months.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I'll be glad to withdraw the motion to adjourn if you like.

MR. MACDONNELL.—And withdraw the resolutions too as you may have to yet. You bragged here to-night of your mind running in a logical vein.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not brag—that comes from the other side.

MR. MACDONNELL.—You did; look at these men here—they are the fellows you were going to put in jail. What has he, Sir M. P. Cashin, ever

done that would show he is under the thumb of the Reids like you are. They have two mates ahead of you—they would not even pay you the compliment of putting you first but got two others ahead who could hold you. One thing you cannot do is stop us from talking. I have not spoken yet for two hours altogether though the House has been open three months. You tried to fool us by a cute trick—but I want to inform the Hon. Speaker and the House that I am not speaking of the railway now but on certain remarks that came up here to-night. There are strong grounds for Mr. Archibald's remarks. Did it ever strike you it would be worth Collishaw's while to have the railway run.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—Everyone thinks it would be worth while to have it run.

MR. MACDONNELL.—It's worth while for the Reids to have it run—that's the story. But it is not right to have the House pass a Bill at the direction of a man who is not in the House. I told you he was the finished diplomat. If he had been so successful in Washington we would not have this story in the papers to-day that we are worse off than the Armenians were under the control of the Turks during the war. It is written by a reputable man and I'll read it this afternoon. He thinks that Newfoundland can be saved by the selling of fish through social service clubs. Talk of the message of P. T. McGrath. The people will never forgive this Government for having such a story written about them. I will tell it before the member for Burin and move that the article be withdrawn. It is not my intention to delay the House but I hope you will give serious thought to the linking up of the chain that has been shown here to-night. I would be glad to see Collishaw here and I know Mr. Targett would be

glad. I hope he will make a speech in the House and I think he would excel even Mr. Archibald himself.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair. And it being past midnight.



WEDNESDAY, July-20th.

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. Bennett, on behalf of the Select Committee, appointed to consider Municipal Bill, present the following Report:

The Select Committee, appointed to consider the Bill sent down from the Legislative Council, entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's," beg to report that they have considered the Bill to them referred, and recommend its adoption with the following amendments.

(Signed)

J. R. BENNETT.

W. J. HIGGINS.

W. W. HALFYARD.

CYRIL JAS. FOX.

N. J. VINNICOMBE.

House of Assembly, July 20th, 1921.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.



WEDNESDAY, July 20th.

The House met at three of the clock

in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if the House is to infer from his statement of yesterday, that John M. Devine is still being retained as Trade Commissioner in New York and if so with what object, seeing that the other Trade Commissioners have been recalled and that in the present condition of the country's finances the payment of public money for this purpose seems an absolute waste, and if he is being retained for what period is he being retained.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if in view of the present reduced receipts in the Custom House indicating a probable decline of two and a half million dollars for the fiscal year ending June next, instead of an increase of two million dollars as estimated in his Budget Speech of May 25th, he proposes to take any step to deal with the situation thus created and how he expects to avert bankruptcy and default in payment of our Interest due on the 31st December next, which is inevitable unless some alteration takes place in these conditions.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education for the tenth time when, if ever, his report will be ready for submission to this House and if it is not to be presented this year will he make an oral statement embodying the substance of its contents.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education,

- (a) If he or his Department has been for sometime past engaged in the framing of a scheme whereby the country is to be divided into inspection districts for educational purposes, each district to be un-

der the jurisdiction of one or more of the inspectors now being trained abroad for this work;

- (b) If the scheme contemplates that these inspectors are to inspect all schools within these districts, not alone the schools of the denominations to which the inspectors themselves belong, but of every other denomination as well;
- (c) If this is not a breach of the principle of denominational education as recognized in this Colony;
- (d) If protests against this proposed procedure have been received by himself, his department, or any officials thereof, from representatives of certain denominations, and if so to lay on the Table of the House copies of the said protests;
- (e) To lay on the Table also a written statement of the policy of the Government in this regard and how it is proposed to employ the different inspectors.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission, if it is correct that last winter application was made from the South Branch coal mine for 100 pairs of snow shoes for the miners, and if these were supplied and at what cost and what has become of them.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend the Act 11 Geo. V. Cap. 40 entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads,'" were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly concurred in the said amendments without amendment; it being understood that the aforesaid amendments were in no

way intended to interfere with the prerogative of the House of Assembly respecting Money Bills.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions Respecting the Operation of the Nfld. Railway.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, last night I had intended to make some remarks on these resolutions, but I was prevented from doing so by an article in the Daily Star by an abominable pencil, by an unfortunate interruption by a diseased mind of someone in this country. I hope the air is clear now.

Regarding, Sir, the resolutions themselves, I take them as a further evidence of certain members of the Government, the absolute inability of the Executive Government. I have heard it stated in this House, and we have not heard it denied, that when the late Government went out of office there were about four million dollars in the Treasury. When the House opened we on this side of the House were of the opinion that all that money was spent. I am glad my hon. friends, Capt. Jones and Mr. Scammell are in the House, because they were the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. It is significant that their speeches appeared in the Advocate on the 1st of April, All Fools Day. The hon. members of the House are treated to a further ejaculation. We are asking this country to vote a revenue of \$8,700,000, and there is not a member on this side of the House who is not sure that we cannot get \$5,000,000. The hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out that it would inevitably put us further in the mire, and there can be no doubt that he is

right. In times when things are not going smoothly not men but slaves are made. Keep that in mind; I will prove that this afternoon before I am through. A half million dollars were taken from the treasury of the country to prop up the price of fish, and then we hear it said that the price was not small compared with other years. "The fishery regulations," they say, "were profitable to the fishermen." That makes one think. The man who put these regulations on said he would stand or fall with these regulations. The leader of the Government thought they were right, and this House by a unanimous vote recalled them. Do they want this country to believe that this House turned down what they thought was good. The Regulations were good but you took them off. It is almost in keeping with the record of your Government, because what was good you destroyed. It almost makes one think that there was something good about them, because you destroyed them.

Now I come to the subject before the chair, "Inland transportation." I would like, Sir, to take your mind back to the day when the railroad resolutions were first introduced into the House. We were then favored by a speech from the present Prime Minister, the introducer. We then heard a speech that for vilification was never equalled in this House. It was said that the Reids faked reports. There was a reason for that speech, and I have an idea as to what that reason was. But since then, after a year of operation by the Government, we have a greater loss than during any two years under the operation of the Reid Newfoundland Company. And now to-day we have that man who said that the Reids were giving us faked reports coming in here and asking for one and a half million dollars which he proposes to turn over to the

Reid Newfoundland Company. I believe there is too much intelligence on this side of the House and on the other side of the House to vote a million and a half dollars to people who faked their reports. In spite of all the prophecies we made last year they have come to pass. "Look forward," he says. I wish the people of the country had enough imagination to look forward to better things, to peace and plenty, but there will be no peace and plenty six months from now. In spite of the advice of the older men of experience and ability you follow the old policy of drift and look forward to times of peace and plenty. There is no peace and plenty to-day. I believe the hon. member who proposed that speech was sincere, I believe he is sincere to-day. I believe he is too big a man to say that everything has gone as it should have gone. Six months from now we will be 100% further in the mire than we are to-day. That is a hard thing to say, and a foolish one for one who is only young in this Assembly, but it appears too obvious.

I will read some extracts from the speech of the member for St. Barbe. The first one I will refer to is that relating to the Fish Regulations. (Reads.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is correct and incorrect. He will have in agreement with him some thousands of fishermen from some parts of the country but in disagreement he will have thousands of others in all parts, because to some is it given and to some it is refused. Many are called, according to the speech of the hon. member for St. Barbe, but few are chosen. And it is unfortunate for him that the few came all from the same section, a section not two thousand miles from the region controlled, and in which the men are moved like pawns upon a chess board,

by the Hon. Minister of Marine. All of these will be thankful for the Fish Regulations, but they are all from the one section. There are very few around Fortune Bay that are thankful; there is not one in St. George's and as to how many there are in Burlin, let the tale be told by the Harris petition. In Conception Bay, Capt. Gosse was thankful—so much so that he kept it dark, he hid his light under a bushel and would not let the world know but went his way rejoicing. Oh, yes, the fishermen of Newfoundland are thankful alright. It is the same story as told by Capt. Jones. If it be taken for granted, then why were the Regulations withdrawn by a unanimous vote. We all have to depend on the fisheries and if the fishermen are thankful, how dare we withdraw the regulations. We did it because those responsible knew the temper of the people and were forced to do it as they saw the time was coming when the people would not stand for it. Now we come to the matter of finance on which I am as ignorant as the Hon. Minister of Finance himself. (Reads.)

Round the corner safely, eh? How? By floating a loan on a statement 12 months old, furnished by one in such a manner that he dare not face the people. You simply fooled the financiers in the floating of this loan. Then my friend the hon. member for St. Barbe said, "We are going to round the corner by the end of the fiscal year 1921." (Reads.) He said we should adjust our expenditure to our income; \$8,700,000 is your estimated revenue but only \$5,000,000 at the most can be collected. The member for St. Barbe is anxious that we should adjust our expenditure to our income. Yet he comes in here and takes on \$1,500,000 to our national debt. The Prime Minister told us that the Budget was all his own and he received no suggestions at all. He simply told

us that he sought no suggestions from his colleagues. Then the member for St. Barbe is not blamable because according to the Prime Minister he got no chance to know that anxiety. I wonder if he is anxious enough to know that \$2,000,000 will be short in the estimated revenue? Does his anxiety go that far or is he very short sighted? I am not an economist or a financier but I can clearly see we are in a hopeless position, so hopeless that you come in here day after day and instead of having only twenty pounds around our neck to-day we have two hundred. Reference is made in the speech from the Throne to the German indemnity. (Reads.) There is no such legislation here to-day and I would suggest that we are better off than the British legislature. The German people were vanquished. They can only pay when they regain their former markets. Still the British House of Commons passed a dumping act against German goods. How in the name of God can they pay? I attribute the want of such legislation here to the intelligence of the Prime Minister who saw that this ridiculous clause in the English legislation was only putting away the day of settlement.

It is just as well to look forward to the day when someone will be born who will make gold out of iron. The ridiculous statement appeared in the press the other day that the sum of \$300,000,000 was the Canadian share of the German indemnity. I hope it will be paid. I hope it will be paid when your grandson will sit in that chair. All this is due to the short sightedness of the Imperial politicians. (Reads.) We are not overlooked by the Imperial authorities. Although we are small and insignificant, we should not be overlooked at the conference. Yet although we are not represented there still it goes on. They did not forget

Newfoundland. Perhaps though they did not care if such a thing as Newfoundland existed, and I think the Prime Minister knew that and if he thought we were of any consequence he would have gone over. If he thought he should have gone well this country will know how to deal with a man of this type. I believe he was right in not going. In reference to the Speech from the Throne and the address in reply thereto I want to point out that the Government was inaccurate in not knowing what was coming. (Reads.) It can be easily seen the hon. member was astray in his reckoning. With regard to that Bill dealing with delinquent children; it went through the hands of a select committee and it was chopped up, sections were obliterated and ten of them amended so that it was not the same bill at all in the end. The bill after which it was originally fashioned, was an English one and one which agitated the English people to an extreme degree and the partial politicians here when pressure was brought to bear upon them by people outside this House it was introduced but thanks it was so amended. It again shows the false prophecy of the hon. member. (Reads.) The hon. member for St. Barbe did not believe the conditions were as represented. Well I hope he will move the adjournment of the debate to pass a vote of censure upon the person who wrote this. He said then that the country has reached rock bottom. But since your Government gained power the country has gone below rock bottom. Now here is the gospel of one William W. Howard. I guess his principles are well known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—They are not.

MR. MACDONNELL.—(Reads.) I do not believe this report. As one be-

ing closely akin to this district, I would suggest that we pass a vote of censure on this article and author. (Reads.) All this distress here is due to the fact that the fishermen cannot sell their fish. The hon. member for St. Barbe knows that there are thousands not in favour of the regulations.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I do not.

MR. MACDONNELL.—In all your rambles you did not ramble into Bonne Bay and when you go back to that place you will not come back. Then we come on to the most significant sentence in the whole thing when the author says that although he does not know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries he knows someone who knows him. He says, "I will not take any time explaining why the fish cannot be sold." It is not unlikely that a man who goes to Washington on his own authority would say why the fish could not be sold. The author says, "I will not go into the discussion of the causes as that will not feed the people." Sometimes the people may be prejudiced and sometimes that prejudice may swing around one hundred and eighty degrees at one shot. Perhaps that prejudice may guide the thought of the people and in that event it may be wise that there be a discussion of the causes as it may guide those in the future. But here is the thing I object to. (Reads.) Why the Turks would not come under the sectarian cry at all. They merely bow down during the middle part of the day. This author says, "In Albania after the Great War and in Cuba after the Spanish American War I saw hunger in its worst type." (Reads.) There is the story. There is the story of a man who puts in a worse position than the Turks. There is a story which paints a picture worse than the inroads of the Russians into the Balkans. There is a

story which reflects on us worse than the conduct of the blood fiends in Cuba after the Spanish American War. He tells us the pitiful story that we will have a tremendous trouble in marketing our fish although when this House opened we had reached rock bottom conditions. This is the way the country is going round the corner. One would think after reading this article that it is necessary for someone like the Syrian of the old to come down and release us from the yoke of tyranny. Here we are instead of being the land of peace and plenty. (Reads.)

It is the story of the West Coast—a story which I hope will be contradicted by the hon. member for Burgeo and LaPoile and following that contradiction I will move a vote of censure on the man who gave Newfoundland that reputation abroad. But if we are in that position, is that how we have turned the corner safely; are these the days of peace and plenty for the land we live in. This article goes on to tell how numbers of families are starving in Newfoundland. (Reads article.)

Imagine that—you got a market for the Newfoundland fish in this manner because the regulations were so good, because thousands believed they were so good someone has to get out and say I will market it at so much a pound to keep you from starving—and those who are saved are highly pleased. I have heard of people dying of extreme joy and I expect many will be stricken with apoplexy when they read this and compare it with the regulations, when we are labelled before the United States as depending on charity. Where can you find better men than those of the South West coast of Newfoundland, men who fish all through the winter—and, if you please, they got to live on the charity

of one who asks the world to buy the fish to save them from starving.

MR. SAMSON.—Do you believe the story?

MR. MACDONNELL.—Yes, until it is denied by the hon. member for the district which was particularly referred to. If it is not true I will second a vote of censure on the man who wrote it. This writer goes on to suggest the buying of 100 lb. boxes of fish by social clubs, etc. (Reads article.)

That is the story, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Samson may now have it to read. Now, Sir, to my mind this is not away from our subject and that is why I dealt with it. For when we come to consider this debt of 1½ millions you are going to saddle on Newfoundland and look into the position of the people and the share of the interest each will have to pay, therefore this is not irrelevant. As I understand it—whatever the cause—this country was never in a better standing financially than when the present Government took power. Someone said here yesterday that the money ran in like water into a boat. You have all heard the story of the man bailing out the boat by taking the plug out, of the bottom. That is the case with you. The country was never in such a miserable state as it is to-day—in 2 short years you have swung it from one extreme to the other. There must be a reason. It seems to me that you are in the position of those whose last days are extremely worse than the first, and still in your dying moments, in your moments of agony when the most hardened sinner is said to repent, you come in here with the most criminal act of all, and ask for 1 1-2 millions for Reids to spend as they damn well please. That is what you are doing. Take it from me the expenditure will not be over 1 1-2 millions—the Reids will see to that. To think of a measure like that being put to the

House, and we to be told it is not a party measure, it is only a matter of 1 1-2 millions. I wonder which of the honourable members on the Government side will go to his constituents and tell that story. I wonder? As far as I am personally concerned I think you are in a hopeless muddle and the reason. Should it be suggested that 1 1-2 millions is to come from us because you do not know—that is the reason you are not telling where the side with anyone who wants to close down the railroad, I will tell you what would happen in St. George's. If they figured there on the road closing they would take the trains and keep them—they would never cross the Topsails again—and they would take the fancy coal that you dug up at South Branch too. Is that all you have to offer to give Reids 1 1-2 millions or to close up the road. You are the same Government whose Prime Minister was to tackle the Reids, and who came here with promises to take over the railroad and operate it. You came in this year with the same idea and but for Sir M. F. Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Bennett and the older politicians on this side you would pass a vote perhaps for 2 1-2 millions. That is what you did last year after the House had closed. There was never anything like it in the history of the country. Against the Reids personally I have nothing to say, they are friends of mine, and I hope will continue to be. But because a man comes here—and he is not like a bird of passage, because that alights some time, but like lightning for he was here only 3 days—and says give Reids 1 1-2 millions, you are going to do it. What about the report of the man who was brought here by the Reids themselves, an engineer who spent weeks going over the road? It's not here on the Table, because it tells a true story. That's why we have not got it. And I will tell you more; that while the Reids themselves had that man down

here, they also pulled the wires to get Bury from the C.P.R. who would be a scapegoat against the people and a camouflage for the transaction. It was the same people brought both men, and I challenge denial by any man in the House. Do you mean to tell me the Government would bank their salvation on bringing a man here for 3 days to look at a bridge or two. Mr. Rodree was here, and gave a special report. Why is it not here.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The Reids were opposed to Bury.

MR. MacDONNELL—Yes, and they put Mr. Thomson or the Commission for the C. P. R. I am certain Reids would give the report of this capable man, but when Bury comes he gets Mr. Hall's report, and then looks at the other and says what it is in the interest of himself to say, give the Reids 1 1-2 millions. And he gets \$7,500 for it. I am sorry to hear of anyone voting the money on this flimsy excuse. How much will there be in salaries for the Reids? There is not a word. What about the discrepancy in the estimated and the actual cost of the coal—\$4 difference. Not a word. Where did it go—into a sinking fund to bring down Bury to mesmerize the Government. Once again, why was not Mr. Rodree's report given here.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It was confidential.

MR. MacDONNELL.—Have the railroad employee been given notice of a cut in pay with your cognizance.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I believe the Reids have notified them of it since they took charge. The Commission has not been operating the road since July 1st.

MR. MacDONNELL—And so the Reid's have been running it for 19 days. I thought they were not able to run it at all. Have they power to reduce the men's wages when we are putting up the money?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes.

MR. MacDONNELL—I want to say Mr. Chairman, I believe this problem should have been tackled when you first took office—you know the railway had to be run and why all this dickering in the dark. Why was the Companies' Act amended in this House allowing the Reids to put their other industries into subsidiary companies? Was there a reason? Are we to think that this came to pass without a reason? There was a reason—and as soon as the session closed you took over the railroad, and list 2½ millions on it, although you have stated the Reids did not lose, but faked their reports. And the same Government comes in again this year and says, give them 1 1-2 millions. I will not talk much longer, Mr. Chairman, it is useless. I will vote against these resolutions, but to my honorable friends I say, do not come into this House enthusiastic. I refer them before the vote is taken at 8 o'clock, to read a text from the Scripture which is applicable to the Government; they will find it in St. Luke, Chap. 19, 41 to 47th verses. Read this and as it was prophetic for the city of Jerusalem, so it will be for the Government. (Reads quotation).

MR. SMALL—I would like to say Mr. Chairman, to the honorable member for St. George's that in a day or two I hope to have more information as to this article and will go into it myself.

MR. SAMSON—Before the vote is taken, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the subject. I have been watching the debate all through and while the speakers have been interesting, we are Newfoundlanders the same as themselves, and intend to do the best for the country. People sometimes allow politics to lead them too far. I am one of the members on this side and when we held a party meeting on these resolutions, I stated I could not see through the deal before us, but would vote for it if it was the

best thing for the country, and nothing better came in sight. I had every faith in the Executive, but said that if the Opposition amended and improved the proposition I would support it. The Hon. Prime Minister in the early stages of the discussion, offered them a chance of a committee to deal with the problem of running the railway, but they turned it down. That showed we did not want to take the whole responsibility, but to do the best for the country. The Executive brought in the resolutions which have been criticized fully by the Opposition, but only Mr. Sullivan suggested any amendment that was worth while. Now when, as I am one of those connected with this party, and as much a New-rounder as even Mr. Archibald himself, where am I to stand. If the Government has done this with the best intentions and honestly, and the Opposition has brought in no amendments of any value, what am I to do but support it.

MR. BENNETT—We complained of lack of information; we could not make suggestions when the Government would not tell us what we wanted to know.

MR. SAMSON—The Hon. Prime Minister said that anything available you could have—there is no excuse on that score. Therefore I will vote for the resolutions because I want to do the best for the country.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like a word or two, Mr. Chairman, before the matter is put to the vote. I agree with Mr. Samson that he is sincere in regard to the interests of the country, and is no doubt voting according to his lights. But there is one thing that is not clear to me. I have asked repeatedly for information, but did not get it. I am still asking, and it is of the utmost importance—where we are going to get the money to pay the bill. The Hon. Prime Minister says \$1,500,000 of the loans we borrowed. Would it not be better for us as men to face

the situation squarely now. The financial condition of the country is a matter that will have to be faced, and we cannot afford to vote a million and a half unless the tangle is straightened out. I have not heard from the Prime Minister where the money is to come from, and we are only shirking a serious position for a few days. We may have said hard things to each other in the heat of debate, but when we come down to facts we all know that we are merely shirking the evil day. It is not up to the Opposition to find a policy for you, but this thing has now come to an issue and you are going to vote for these Resolutions. That is what you are here for, of course; that is your job but we are not doing our duty, by shirking a position that must be faced sooner or later. The first issue to be considered is our financial position, and in this I know the Prime Minister will agree with me. He knows that this thing cannot go on for long. We are now going to vote a million and a half dollars and in a few months time the House will be meeting to deal with the disaster that is inevitable. That is the stone wall we are up against and most of us are wondering how soon we will have to face Confederation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the million and a half dollars for which we are now asking a vote, I have already stated that the money is to be provided out of the loan of six millions that was recently raised. I may say also that when the accounts were closed on the 30th June we found that we were \$50,000 better off than was estimated in the Budget. I do not take any credit for that; I merely took the figures from the Finance Department and the estimate made happened to be that much under what it really turned out to be. The Budget is a straight business proposition and when we go into Committee on Ways

and Means we will have an opportunity of going into that matter more fully. All the accounts are not yet closed.

With respect to the general condition of the Colony, Newfoundland has been passing through an unusual period of trade depression. She has been engulfed in the ways that is sweeping over the whole world and no one knows better than the gentlemen opposite what the seriousness of these war conditions have been. During the war we were called upon to pay the price in blood; now we have to pay in treasure and all countries alike are helping to pay for the millions and billions of dollars that during those years of war went off in smoke, and Newfoundland has to pay her part. The total Revenue for the first 15 or 16 days of July has been better than I expected and there is no reason to believe that this condition of things will not continue. I agree that the Committee arise now and report progress.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE.—The whole position is that we are not as well off as other countries. We have not the natural wealth nor the power of taxation, nor have we any internal industries. We are depending on one thing alone and that is the fishery: This country cannot produce six millions of Revenue this year and in this statement I am borne out by the fact that the Revenue up to July showed a deficit of \$180,000 as against the same period last year. Now, we have to find \$3,000,000 for interest, \$1,500,000 for civil service and \$1,000,000 for Education, amounting in all to \$5,500,000, of your Revenue and these are only some of the amounts we have to find, so I ask where are we going to get off? I do not know. I do not wish to embarrass the Government and I have merely done my duty by pointing out the true position as I see it.

The Prime Minister said we were fifty thousand dollars better off than last year —

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said that I had found we would be fifty thousand dollars better off than I had calculated we would be.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—There are amounts outstanding that if they were paid, would leave us \$200,000 less than was stated. I have asked for information with regard to the position of the Dept. of Militia, but that information has never been laid on the table of this House. Party politics are all right in their place, but we have reached the point now where party politics must cease. We must all act as men. It is not my duty to go over and tell you what to do. The Prime Minister and the Attorney General know as much about the contracts of '98 and '01 as I do, but I want to go on record as affirming that Newfoundland cannot bear the burden you are placing upon her, and you will come in here in a few months after having met d'saster.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, it is a very unusual position we find ourselves in to-night. A great many of us are very forgetful, but only two short years ago these men appealed to the electors of this country and told them that the gentlemen then in power were dishonest and that they were not looking after the people's interests. They made a strong appeal to the passions of the people and were elected, not as a party but as two sections, and they were handed over control of a government or a corporation if you like with a great big bank account. They told the people of Newfoundland we were robbing the country and allowing it to go to the dogs.

MR. SAMSON—I did not have to say that.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Here is the story in this Manifesto of your leader.

MR. SAMSON—We did not have that Manifesto.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Now, listen to this. We handed over to these people the Government and a purse of four millions of dollars and here is the promise which the Prime Minister handed out with regard to taxation.

(Reads manifesto.)

That fell from the lips of the Prime Minister and you are here to-night whining for us to save you from suicide. Now, what have you done to carry out that policy? Take it home with you to-night and think it out for yourselves. Here you are to-night, sitting on the other side and not one of you has pluck or intelligence enough to lift a hand to prevent the ruin that you must know is being brought upon this country. You made an attempt to carry out your manifesto, and if it has been carried out there would be a different tale for Newfoundland to-day. The best proof of your failure is your own action. You said nine millions was too great a taxation and in you came to the same House of Assembly and in your Budget you increase it two millions more instead of your trying to remedy it. That will make the tax per capita forty-six instead of thirty-six dollars. Then you talk about railway matters. What did you promise? The trouble with the whole lot of the Government is that you are too forgetful. Some months ago you denounced every man on this side of the House in all moods and tenses and you chased us with auditors you got down here whom you are ashamed to defend. Then to think of the impudence of those on the other side asking us to help them being treated by them so dastardly. Think of it, Mr. Samson asks for a suggestion from this side of the House. He promised to do everything good for the people and instead he and his Government have done everything that was bad. Now the Prime Minister said this about the Reid system. (reads). I have heard this time

and again in this House uttered by unscrupulous politicians. He handed this out to the electors in 1919, and he promised to cure all this. He has well vilified Cashin, Morine and others. (reads). He did all this contemptible work to get the people's votes. Having got them he increased taxation instead. He spent the four millions of dollars which we left for the rainy day. He took without authority last year to spend \$1,500,000 on the Reids system. He did not appoint a commission while this House was in session to look after the expenditure of this money. The man who keeps you in your position took it upon himself to look after this money and he said he would look after the management of the railway and make it pay. What has happened is what we have before us here to-night. He took the money and appointed the commission and the story is threadbare now. We received no information of how that money was spent.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—He appointed himself chairman and ran the road. That money was voted to be loaned to the company but that was not done. When the House opened we find that instead of one million, three million were spent and then we find you on the revenue tack which you promised to reduce. After one year in harness the surplus is gone and on railway account three million more. You come back here then and asked for a loan of six millions and when you found you were on the wrong side of the books you concocted a statement to place before the New York financiers. It was the statement we handed you in 1920. The statement belonged to the Government preceding you. When you were asked you said you furnished no statement. I ridiculed you because I knew you were playing false. Your surplus was gone and to square your deficit then you borrowed six million upon a

false statement. You knew if you furnished the proper statement you would be turned down. You betrayed those who placed their trust in you. On the back of that you get into trouble with the Royal Bank of Canada and you had to borrow to straighten that out. Then this innocent politician says why do you not give us some suggestions. When this surplus was there we were barred out. Then your great commercial man took five hundred thousand dollars and placed it to his credit in the Bank of Nova Scotia. I am making it so hot for some of you that you have to go out to cool off but you will have to come in again and listen and take your medicine. Now Sir, here is the position. This man says tells us something to do. Why not tell the people that you have betrayed them. That is my answer to Mr. Samson and the Prime Minister. You are crying today for help. Where are you going to end up in six months time? Where are you going to get the money to pay your interest? Your Budget is so long in that we will want another Budget. The people of this country do not know what you are doing because you have adopted your usual policy of deception. The Ways and Means is another lie. You are going to find yourself in such a position next year that you will require another loan. With your twenty-five per cent. sales tax and all the other taxes it is now up to seventy-five per cent. and even with all that for the two weeks ending last Saturday you lost \$1000,000. You then politely tell Sir John Crosbie that you have found another \$50,000 but you did not tell us you forgot to find the \$300,000 in the Customs which you will never find and then one of your innocent members asks me to tell him something better. It is a pity to see a young man like you become nothing but an un-

scrupulous lawyer as you have. You are unscrupulous because of your statements and actions. When you got in you increased all taxes. The sky was the limit. When we got the large revenue in 1919-1920 the purchasing power of the Colony was very high as fish was selling at \$17.00 per quintal and total exports of fish amounted to \$25,000,000. Where are you going to get your revenue from? Put down \$1,500,000 quintals at \$6.00 per quintal and that will be \$9,000,000 and take fifty per cent. from that for taxation, then how can you take the statement of the Prime Minister that he is going to collect \$9,000,000? He has omitted provision for expenditure which will surely materialize and he has made no provision for supplemental supply. He asks us to swallow that and the members on the other side say that is the best he can do. The Prime Minister said two years ago that the then Government was destroying Newfoundland. He said he would cut taxation down. As soon as he got in the saddle he spent money right and left like a drunken sailor. He has been afraid to put all the items in the budget hoping something will turn up. When we handed over the Government we had no railway liability and every bill was paid. No one on the other side has got up to justify this vote of \$1,50,000. The Prime Minister read a lot of statistics and that was all. When the people are finished digesting the manifesto of the Prime Minister you are gone. There is no one on the other side able to get up and deny one statement I made. Talking about Revenue, you are going to be two or three millions short. Three millions for the coming year. You are going to spend one million on roads that will make four.

Where will you be on the relief throughout the country? You will be 5 or 6 millions on the wrong side of the

books by the 30th of June—you don't even know where you will get the interest for the end of December. All this has to stop some day. You are like men giving credit—you go on, go on, but the reckoning will come some day. That is your position to-day. I know it as I was Minister of Finance for 12 years. This afternoon you found a mistake of \$50,000 on my part and you would think it was a great thing. But take the different departments where the money is going to waste. Take the Customs House—it is deserted, but half a dozen motor cars were brought in last year by one man and the duty is not paid on them yet. Some \$260,000 in bonds have not been paid up yet and still we are told that we should not ask the names of those who owe it. They were supporters of you people but they were cute and took it up in the Customs House. Take the Post Office where the money is being dropped every day. Tell us about the Telegraph deal. The hon. Minister goes out of the House now because he knows I might come back to the subject which a few weeks after opening I drew attention to, but we have heard nothing further of it yet. It is the same with regard to the Bell Island matters. Now I will get back to the point—last year you spent 2½ millions and now you come in here and ask to spend 1½ millions again. Now we are here and if the Reids will not run the railway is it not your duty to formulate a policy and bring it to us. But you only say you must have 1½ millions and are going to give it to the Reids. You are not able to tell us how you are going to get the interest. You are only hoping for something to turn up but you can't hope for the big revenues again and where will you get the money to finance the road. You styled us black-legs and spent \$10,000 in trying to prove it, but you will not get up and

fight this question—you are not even sporty. There is nothing to justify this thing but the brute force of those who are going to put it through for a certain sum. It is time to take away the government from Newfoundland altogether—one-third of you are not fit to vote, let alone sit on that hall. A man who is sworn to a corporation comes in here and takes an oath to his King and Country but jumps when the individual in charge jerks his thumb. That's the position. Will you ask yourselves if my story is correct. You, Minister of Public Works; Minister of Shipping and you, Capt. Jones, go and analyze it and take evidence if you like. Surely you will not vote this 1½ millions blindly and without some explanation. Did not the Minister of Railways in his report say the revenue of the railroad next year would not be 50% of last. Last year you lost 2½ millions and now he says in the report signed by his Secretary, Mr. Hall, that you will not get half the revenue. How much then will you lose next year? We cannot get him up on his feet to explain, even with dynamite. The time was when he threatened to throw around the ink bottles and raised a terrible uproar in this House. It is indeed a lovely position when a junior member has to get up and ask someone to advise him. Not one of you can justify your proposition. I believe it is correct that the revenue from the railroad will not be half of last year's—and what are you going to do? Will you formulate some policy for next year? These are all questions, fair and above board, but there is no answer and now you want advise from us. You couldn't hear your ears last year with the tirade about the fishery policy by the same man who has wrecked the railroad but you hear nothing of it now. We got to get back to the law of supply and demand, and that is the

right place to be in my opinion. I would now like to ask about these 1500 men who are working on a road in a certain part of the country at \$2.50 or \$3 a day. Have you the money to pay them? The same thing is happening with this road money as with the fish money—the needy men of the north are being bundled to work on a road running from nowhere to nowhere. You must be getting the money from this loan. And what will the road accomplish after it is finished. It is no good to the country—why not spend the money on the railway. You have 1500 men working in the wilderness and you will soon have 2,000 and you are paying them from \$4,000 to \$5,000 a day. The expenses will increase as the men go on but there is not a word of explanation. The gentlemen on the other side will send their friends to work there but those from the other parts of the Island know nothing about it. I would like the Hon. Prime Minister to tell us about this road, how long it is to go on and where he is going to get the money. I know the men are back from Bell Island, Grand Falls, etc., but still there is no word of explanation. Take the question of Bell Island tax; it is on the Order Paper for weeks past but yet there is no answer. The Hon. Minister of Marine said at the northward that he was going to put \$1 a ton tax on the ore, and he denounced Sir E. P. Morris about it but to-day there is nothing on it. To-day the owners of Bell Island are tied up and I prophesy there will not be 400 men there shortly, because what we are holding back is keeping the companies from making contracts. They do not know but they will be taxed out of existence. They only got the word of the Hon. Minister of Marine that he will put a tax of \$1 a ton. They have over a million tons in the bins there now and the men are laid

off. Mr. Archibald referred to this a few days ago but nothing has been done and yet you want the House closed. What is the House for if not to attend to business like that. The companies have amalgamated and I understand are going to send an enormous lot of ore to Europe. The President and other officials were here last year and interviewed the Hon. Prime Minister, and the matter has been on the Order Paper since we first opened but so far it has not been considered. How long is this to go on? You cannot fool a corporation and the people like this without their resenting it. You don't care so long as you live in luxury; but there will be a rude awakening for you and your government. Some of you recognise it all right but you have not strength enough to act. Then there is the pit prop scandal. The ice will soon be in at the northward in some of the bays, preventing the handling of the cut and you will have to pay the loss. But what does the Hon. Dr. Campbell care—the only answer we can get from him is that there has been nothing done. In the Postal Telegraphs there is \$100,000 or \$200,000 going astray. I drew attention to this the first week in April but nothing has been done, still the Hon. Minister told me of his finding a \$50,000 mistake. You would think that was a gold mine but it will only pay Bury and the detectives whom you brought down to put Cashin and Crosbie and the rest of us in jail. Aren't you in a lovely mess to be appealing to the men you denounced to assist you. This is the best you can do after 2 years and after calling the Reids everything vile; here you are and you don't know where you are going to get off. You can only hand out the Reids the 1½ millions and let them spend the last dollar. What are you playing for anyway—you are a young lawyer—is

it for a high fee or for Confederation. If you would betray us in one direction you would do so in another, and the hard part of it is, neither you nor the Hon. Minister of Justice will get up and defend your action. You are mesmerised and you will soon be pauperized. Now to get back to this road money—are eth other gentlemen of the opposite side content because their people are getting it? It should be given out on a per capita basis. In my section there are men idle and they should get their share. No financial bill will go through this House till we get satisfaction and are told where you are to get the money and what will be the benefit of it when it is spent. The quicker that is done the quicker you will be out of the House. In the day of Whiteway and Bond the Government would dare spend even \$50,000 or \$60,000 without laying the whole proposition for doing so on the Table of the House. I challenge you to look up the records and you will see there are no expenditures without the sanction of the representatives of the people. But here you are, spending money right and left on the railway, fish, coal, etc., without the least authority, and we are asked now to give the Reids the other 1½ millions and let them loose. You were going to reform everything and turn the grafters out. Still you sit down contented and look wise—I would look longer at the figures in the wax works. Now before the Committee rises, I would ask you again about this work, where you are getting the money, what is the road for and if it is 40 or 50 miles long. If it is a waste of money, why not stop it and use it to take the kinks out of the railroad. Surely you are not building this road to have the grass grow over it again in a few years. In the olden days there was a proposition up for such a road as it would serve the herring

fisheries, but that industry too is gone. To-day you have to pay \$5 duty on the herring going into the States. The fish business to the States is over. The whole thing is a disgrace. There was nothing done by the Government till it was prompted by this side to make representation to Washington. The Hon. Minister of Marine was in New York, next door to it, and did not know enough to go there himself. He sent Mr. Devine who talked of our industries as berries and fish, but he forgot the mines, pulp wood, etc., and you also sent a tender because he was a pal and wanted to get his expenses out of the Government, but we made it so hot for him here that he has sent in no bill yet. When we pushed you up against the ropes you got in touch with Sir Edgar Bowring and asked him to go, after the harm was done. And now this young man Samson asks me to help you—to help you—to Hell with you.

Mr. Chairman, surely this democratic House of Assembly is not going to take seriously the actions of the present administration and vote away 1½ million dollars without a single member of the Executive Government having a word to say in justification of such a huge expenditure, and here I want to compliment Mr. Samson for at least having sufficient courage and sufficient interest in this country to get up in his place here this evening and justify the action that he is going to take when the time comes to vote. Mr. Samson said in his opening remarks that he came into this House with an open mind on this subject. Well I am not going to take issue with him with regard to that statement, but if he came here with an open mind and after hearing the able and magnificent addresses and the sound, forceful and logical arguments of the men who spoke on this side of the House I fail to see how Mr. Samson could

take the position of voting for these Resolutions. Mr. Samson also intimated in his speech that he understood that the Government did not want to take the whole responsibility for this important measure and that they were depending upon the co-operation of the Opposition. Well, surely, Mr. Chairman, you would not expect that any sane man on this side of the House would be prepared to take the responsibilities of conditions that are confronting the country to-day and conditions that were brought about by the actions of the present administration. When the Cashin Government were in office two years ago the affairs of this country were in a flourishing condition. Nobody can deny that fact. We learn from the ex-Minister of Railroads here this evening that the Reid Newfoundland Company were now assuming full responsibility for the operations of the road since July 1st. Well if that story is correct I fail to see how the Reid Company could be bankrupted in June, as told by the Prime Minister. How did they operate for a month without any financial assistance from the Government? Surely you have not, in anticipation of being able to pass this measure in the House, handed over any financial assistance to the Reid Newfoundland Company, without the consent of this House. Another instance why the Company were financially sound is the fact that they were in a position to purchase a coal mine a few days ago in Nova Scotia and pay a quarter of a million dollars for it. And it is expected, according to an article in a Nova Scotian paper, that the mine will yield sufficient coal for the operation of the railroad. Still the people's money is being thrown away for the purpose of digging up dirt at South Branch. The Government of Sir Michael Cashin undertook to find out if coal was at South Branch in

paying quantities and the services of Mr. Scott, the Manager at Grand Falls, were availed of. Mr. Scott had a treble interest in the proposition, first because of his desire to be able to do something for Newfoundland; secondly because he was Managing Director of that important Company at Grand Falls and thirdly he himself is a native of the country and that gentleman made a thorough investigation and reported back to the Government that in his opinion and in the opinion of qualified men whose services he availed of that coal was not at South Branch in paying quantities. Still this Government that are now holding office and the railway commission went blindly into the extravagant expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and they even went to the extent of sending out motor trucks to truck coal that was not there; and in the dead of winter ordered that a hundred pairs of snow rackets be sent there. It has been demonstrated beyond question that the St. George's Coal Fields have coal in paying quantities and I understand that the Company were made an offer by outside capitalists who were prepared to buy out the mine so as to be able to develop the coal. What happened? Mr. Coaker had not been in office any longer than a month when his official organ the "Advocate" made a public statement that part of the coal areas of the St. George's Coal Fields Syndicate was on the property owned by the Reid Newfoundland Company. Conditions since have become such that it is questionable that that property of the St. George's Coal Fields Company will be disposed of for some time to come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with regard to these Resolutions, I do not intend to offer any amendment but I notice in the schedule that the Placentia and Argentia branches, two of the most

important shipping points of the whole island are left out altogether. I dare say it is by error, but I want to be sure before the Resolutions pass the House that provision will be made for these two mentioned places. If not, I shall have to offer a suggestion as follows: (Reads). I hope that the Prime Minister will see fit to have that suggestion embodied in the Bill.

Now I would also like to have a word or two to say in relation to the road building that is being carried on North. I want to remind the House that in the early days of this present session a largely signed petition was presented by Mr. Sinnott, one of my colleagues, and was supported by Mr. Sullivan, another of my colleagues, and by myself, asking that the old road leading from Colinet to Placentia be re-opened. I might say that that road was the only means of transportation in the olden days before the line was cleared down to Placentia, and now that the terminal has been removed from Placentia to Argentia it is most important that that road be again opened up. If this is done, not alone will it be a great benefit to the people in that immediate vicinity, but it will be a great benefit to the people of the entire country as well as being a source of additional revenue to the Colony. Even the man down in White Bay will derive benefit from it. Only a few days ago a number of gentlemen came here from the United States on the S.S. Rosalind, on a vacation. I happened to know three or four of them and in the course of the conversation we had I interested them in taking a trip as far as Placentia line. They hired a motor car in St. John's, but before reaching their destination had to engage dilapidated traps. Despite that, however, and although the trip cost them \$400, when they returned they said that they would not miss it for

\$5,000. There are large numbers of people coming here on round trips who would gladly avail of the opportunity to drive over that road for the purpose of engaging in salmon and trout fishing in that neighborhood. I take it then that immediate attention should be paid to that road, because I think the amount of money spent to open it will be paid back a thousand fold. Apart from the tourist aspect of the situation, there are at least between four and five hundred men of St. Mary's and Placentia Bays who have made a failure at the fishery and who badly need work on the roads to provide for their families for the coming winter. Now it behoves this House to see, if they can give 1½ million dollars to the greatest corporation we ever had in this country, that a suggestion to provide work for these unfortunate people will not be opposed. As I have said before, my colleagues and myself have offered our co-operation and assistance to any man, representing any part of the island in this House, who at any time have to get up and make a similar appeal and we are prepared now to offer that same assistance and support. I spoke some few nights ago about what I consider to be an unnecessary expenditure, namely, the transportation of a lot of men from Conception Bay or any of the Southern Bays to the northward to engage at road building at Badger Brook and Hall's Bay. I pointed out that the efficient transportation of 1,000 men would cost in the vicinity of thirty or forty thousand dollars. I say that that money could be saved instead of giving it to Reids. I understand that the men have to pay their own passages, well I do not see any reason why the Government should not provide it. The people in Conception Bay, many of whom are badly off, have not been looked after as they should have been,

because if they were their transportation expenses would be saved by employing them on the Colinet Rd. and by which arrangement they could leave their homes in the morning and in the course of a couple of hours reach the scene of their labour, returning home every night, thus saving any transportation expenses. I think it is very essential that the road from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay should be attended to promptly also. I have gone over that section of the country and know the great necessity of this important road and I hope that the Minister of Public Works will give this matter his most earnest consideration. If conditions were normal and there were other avenues of employment available I would not be as anxious to press the point. Now if this House can seriously consider the voting away of 1½ million dollars to the Reid Newfoundland Company, surely we should have no hesitation in acceding to the request that I am making on behalf of the working classes of the country. With regard to the building of this Colinet road, I may say that this is not going to be a dead loss to the Government later on. If I were a wealthy man, I would have no hesitation in putting up \$150,000 to build that road and build tourist hotels along that road and I believe that I would be making a good investment. I take this opportunity while speaking on this tourist traffic business to point out to this Committee that the time has come in Newfoundland when we must look facts square in the face; and if you as a Government are prepared to depend on the Controller's Department for a large amount of the current revenue to pay civil servants their salaries, then, in my opinion, the proper course for you to take is to grant a plebiscite along the lines asked for by the moderate gentlemen in this town, who are not temperance

fanatics and not hypocrites. The result I know would be an overwhelming majority for the non-hypocrites and then if hotels were given a license all over the country millions of people would come here from the United States and Canada every year and people who, no doubt, would not mind spending their millions.

That is the suggestion I offer. That is how I feel about the matter, and I am prepared to back up what I say. Never mind dickering with the various prohibition committees because that will get you nowhere. From the bone-drys to the wets and the advocates of the open saloon, all will get the support of some members of the government. Throw all that aside if you are asking for revenue from booze, because that is what you are doing and as Mr. Vinnicombe has pointed out, the estimated revenue from this source for the coming year is greater than it was in the days of the saloon. It is a well-known fact that liquor is flowing like water and that you can get all and every kind you want if you have the money. Now, that is the act of hypocrites. For the consistent man, be he prohibitionist or anti-prohibitionist, I have the greatest respect, but there is no consistency in this. I do not suggest going back to the days of the saloon, but get some system that will do away with all the hypocrisy and discrimination. My leader is not affected one way or the other because he does not drink and as for myself, I can take a glass of liquor or two if I think I need them, and I do not go behind the door to do it. Now, I say again that in consideration of the circumstances as painted by men who are good artists where the drawing of such pictures is concerned, there is no hope for this country except in confederation, and as I have said before, confederation will never be got except by the vote of the people. It

will never be brought about by intrigue as long as I occupy a seat in this House, and the men who attempt anything of the kind will not die on feather beds if I can do it. So help me God, I mean it. If you cannot see any other reasonable way out of this predicament, do as I have suggested. You may say that I have drifted away from the subject, but I have not. The question under discussion is the expenditure of a million and a half dollars of somebody's money and therefore any suggestion of ways and means is one that should be considered. In conclusion I would say that I trust the Hon. Prime Minister will have inserted in the Schedule a daily service for Placentia and Argentina.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable and I think most discourteous that we have been on this debate since Thursday last, and not one member of the Executive has got up to accede to the requests from this side of the House for information. In my speech on these Resolutions I stated that the House was entitled to certain information if the matter was to be given intelligent consideration but the request fell on deaf ears because up to the present no action has been taken to comply with that request and no explanation has been attempted. I said that as the House was asked to vote a million and a half dollars, surely it was entitled to know how the money was going to be spent, but this we have not been told. We are entitled to know what salaries are to be paid out of the amount in question, but we can get no answer to that either. I asked what share of the directors fees were to be paid out of it, and that is information we as representatives of the people should have because why should we pay fat salaries to these people out of the funds of the Colony. If you pass these Resolutions the responsibility is

yours. We have done our best to awaken you to a sense of your duty and yet you are going into this thing with your eyes closed. Do you think you are the honest stewards the people thought you were when they sent you here? That money should be especially ear-marked for operating only, and if you are not going to pay salaries out of it, have it fixed in the Resolutions or in the Bill. We asked how the money was spent last year, and we were handed in here a statement under general expenses. I did not want to keep on putting questions on the Order Paper and, moreover, I thought it would be in the best interests of the Government for them to give us the desired information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the causes that led up to the expense of operating the system last year, I might point out that the one great cause was the machine shops. The superintendence of motive power and repairs was the weak spot in the R. N. Co. system for, to judge by the equipment they have in their machine shops, they think they are still hack in the days of construction. The shops at Whitbourne were more up to date than those here now and those were only put there to look after construction. That machinery was put there thirty years ago, and is the same that we now have here while the machinery purchased in 1901 from Jas. Angel and Co. must be at least fifty years old, and still you expect to handle work economically. That is where the great leakage came in last year, lack of up-to-date machinery and lack of proper supervision. What competent man did you have there to superintend the work on behalf of the Commission?

HON. MIN. OF FISHERIES—Mr. Fulmore.

MR. SULLIVAN—No, he was Reid's man.

HON. MIN. OF FISHERIES—There was no Commission superintendent.

MR. SULLIVAN—What about Mr. Crummy?

HON. MIN. OF FISHERIES—He only made up the costs.

MR. SULLIVAN—What did he know about the work; how could he make up costs if he was not a practical man who understood his business thoroughly?

HON. MIN. OF FISHERIES—He made them up from the Bills.

MR. SULLIVAN—That was the trouble; you should have had a competent machinist who knew whether or not the bills were correct. The Reid Nfld. Co. made more money last year than they did any year since the Telegraph Award when they got one million dollars, and they made it on Commission work. Another mistake that was made was the purchase of these new engines. They are not suitable for the Road and they are going to tear it to pieces. The 40 class passenger type of engines would be better. The engines you purchased are not made to a large extent because so few narrow gage roads are now operating, and they are only in the experimental stage. I will not say that these are the first of the type to be used, but I know that not many of them have been built and tried out. Now, if there is no other way, why not loan this million and a half to the Reids and charge it up to them to be paid back at the final settling up or take their lands as security for it. We gave them five thousand acres per mile to operate the road and now if they want financial assistance let them give us back this land or otherwise let the Reids stand a portion of the loss. It is understood that the Prime Minister is going to take this million and a half out of what he has left of the loan, but I heard a rumor from a reliable source, from an officer of a Canadian railroad in fact, that the money was to be provided in another way. It was said that the whole

thing was fixed before Sir George Burey came down here, and that he gave the assurance that the money would be provided by the C. P. R. thru the efforts of Lord Shaughnessy. Sir Geo. Burey is a close friend of Lord Shaughnessy, and also of Mr. Beatty, and the Reids are large shareholders in the C.P.R. Now, if this million and a half is voted and a loss results, the Government will have to stand it, and does any one doubt for a moment that there will be a loss? I understand next year the railway will be put up at tender and if this is to be done next year, why not do it now? Like Mr. Walsh, I was going to point out that there is no mention in the schedule of the Flacencia and Argentina line.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We shall include that.

MR. SULLIVAN—Thank you. Now there are some other points I would like to touch on, and one of these is that in connection with a general manager. In the first place it is my opinion that the man you should have as superintendent of motive power and repairs is Mr. Fred Angel, because I think you will find it difficult to get a better man for the position anywhere. Another matter is the appointment of auditors. We are not told who will have to pay for them, whether it will be Reids or the Government. The Government has embarked upon another big policy, the building of a carriage road from Badger to Springdale. If you build the road you intend, there won't be a cent of the \$500,000 allotted left after the last of October. At a conservative estimate these operations will cost at least \$100,000 a month and the whole thing will be taken up by the Badger Road. Where then are you going to get the money to continue the road on to Bonne Bay? What about the road from Colinet to Flacencia and on to Branch; what assurance have we that you will un

dertake the work? When the Motor Association Bill was before the House last year we were promised an allocation for this road, and I trust now the promise will not be ignored. There are telegrams coming in from our district daily asking for work and I would like to know definitely when the Colinet road will be started. Now I would say again that if this million and a half dollars must be voted, I trust that it will be so safeguarded that there will be no big rake-offs possible.

MR. ARCHIBALD—Mr. Chairman. This matter of the Bell Island mines is one of the utmost importance to many sections of the country, just now, and no time should be lost in coming to some agreement with them. The mines have been practically closed down for some time, and the two companies now want to form a combine and get that place going again, but they cannot fix up the combine until the government tells them what they are going to charge as tax on the export of ore.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—They made their combine in Halifax and are now amalgamated.

MR. ARCHIBALD—You said that the Government were prepared to give the Companies free export for one year, and they refused to accept it. But you must get this in your mind that a Bell Island ore company is not the same as a bullseye shop. It turns out millions of tons of stuff and it might be necessary for that company to make some terms with some other big country—a contract lasting ten or twelve years. They would not be interested in being one year ahead on your free offer.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—They have sold three or four cargoes already to England; it is Sydney that is hampering them.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I understand that the Companies would be able to do more business if that Bill was dis-

posed of. It is not fair and I am sure that the Attorney General will admit that it is not to have this Bill on the Order Paper for months. How do we know what those people have in their minds? Now I do not say that we should accede to all the requests and concessions asked for by the Companies, but we should do something so that they can start operations as soon as possible to provide employment for our people.

HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE.—The Companies told me that financially they were not in a position to do it.

MR. ARCHIBALD—This delay in connection with the discussion on this ore tax matter is not business-like and there must be a reason for it, although I don't know the reason. The Attorney General also said in his remarks in regard to the railroad that he believed the Reid figures to be true.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—I have no reason for saying the Reid Company were faking or lying.

MR. ARCHIBALD—No more have I, but I have to tell you that if you never disagreed with your Leader before you do now, because the Prime Minister said that we should have never taken notice of the figures supplied by the Reid Newfoundland Co. Now the Attorney General practically said here to-night that the Prime Minister did not know what he was talking about, and the Prime Minister said the same in effect regarding the Attorney General.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—That is a different opinion from the one I have.

MR. ARCHIBALD—But he is the Leader of the Government, Sir. We are taking a million and a half of the people's money and voting it away to the Reid Company. I asked the Prime Minister the other night if these figures were sworn to, and he

replied in the negative. Now I have no reason to distrust the Reid Company, but what made me ask the question was that the Prime Minister stated here that we could not depend upon their figures, as they were not reliable. Now we got the statement from the Minister of Justice that the figures are alright while the Prime Minister says they are all wrong. Most of what I said was based on what fell from the lips of the Prime Minister—the Prime Minister, mark me, not Mr. Guppy, or any other member of the party.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I do not think the Prime Minister said that. He said that he would not guarantee the accuracy of the figures.

MR. ARCHIBALD—That is only quibbling. What is the difference between a thing not being accurate and being incorrect?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—He did not make a positive statement.

MR. HIGGINS—Last year the Prime Minister in submitting figures said he would not guarantee their accuracy because they came from the Reid Newfoundland Company. There was quite a conflict then as well as now, because the Attorney General said last year also that he was quite prepared to accept them because they were from the Reid Newfoundland Company.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I have to thank Mr Higgins, Mr Chairman, for coming to my assistance; he has proved what I said. For the first time there is no getting away from the fact. Members of this House who are not on the Government side are dubbed by a certain section of the press as wooden heads and clowns, etc. I wonder what would that press call the dummy members of this House, and members who have not uttered a single word since the session opened. However, the public are the best judges of that. The Minister of Justice, in his speech, stated that the

reason he voted for the Railway Resolutions was that he did not see any other way out. Well that brings me back to the point, that I had taken when first I moved my seat in the centre of this House. We have come now to a point where the Prime Minister said that the figures submitted by the Reid Newfoundland Company were not only inaccurate, but that they were padded.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I never heard him make such a statement. When did he say that.

MR. ARCHIBALD—I do not know the time, but I think that was what he said. With a conflict of opinion between the Prime Minister and the Attorney General as to the figures submitted by the Reids and with having offered no justification for their attitude, except that the Attorney General said that he did not see any other way out, these two gentlemen, the highest officials in the Government, are going to vote for the Resolutions which are going to be brutally forced through this Chamber; what about the members on the Opposition side of the House and are they not representatives of the people as well as the Government, only that they are not in the majority in this House.

It appears that each and every individual member of the Government has made up his mind to vote for the Resolutions although he has not gone up in this House, and told the reason why he is doing it. Now, I say that this is a crucial period in the history of Newfoundland, and it by no means a time for party politics. Time there was when the present Government brought two detectives here from Canada to put Cashin and Crosbie, who were called rogues, robbers, crooks, etc., in jail mind you. Under the administration of these two men there was no poor relief evident and the country was going along successfully and still that was the

class of man Mr. Chairman you attempted to put in jail. What did you find? The two auditors you brought down here gave them a first class certificate of character. They never found one single thing against these men. If I am informed correctly, the auditors sent for Sir John Cresbie while they were here, as they had found \$130,000 to the credit of the Colony in the Department of Shipping and which they said Sir John could have kept if he liked, because they did not know where that money came from. Imagine trying to put that class of man in jail. And then Mr. Samson appeals to the Opposition for a suggestion, while the party division is still kept busily active. Can any sane man expect Sir Michael Cashin or Sir John Cresbie to do anything to help this Government out of the hole they are in. I believe that the Minister of Justice is sincere, but he did not go far enough in stating that he could not see any other way out. He should not have the presumption to think that because the Government could not see a way out and that therefore nobody else knew anything. There is where I think he made a mistake. If he had to do the right thing when he saw no other way out, and if he was a true Newfoundlander the proper place for him was an independent seat with me in the centre of the floors. Then, perhaps we would be in a position of giving the Opposition of helping the country out of the difficulty. As I said on previous occasions, that was the principle and the grounds why I moved out of the Government some weeks ago. I moved out of the government to do my best to help bring about a condition of affairs to destroy party politics, and I never found a man in the government to take the thing seriously enough to move with me.

The position of the Government seems to be that they are not able to

find any other way out in relation to this railroad problem and they are not prepared to give anybody else a chance and the reason of this is the party politics division line, still you members of the Government are simple enough and foolish enough to think that the Opposition are going to take a share of the responsibility for this railroad blunder. If the Government of to-day were comprised of any statesmen they would seek the assistance of the Opposition, get them to accept part of the responsibility, cut out party politics and try to get this country out of the hole she is in. If any man in the Government to-night can prove to me that party politics should be kept up while starvation stalks throughout the length and breadth of the land and while men, women and children are hungry, then I am prepared to take my seat with him.

You cannot prove it and you wont attempt to because you know you are fighting on a wrong principle, and I want to appeal again to Newfoundlanders to be on the alert against such arguments as these. When we find ourselves up against a crisis like that which confronts us to-day, we have sectarianism trotted out. Let me tell this country that the man who takes any notice of sectarianism while his family is starving is neither doing justice to his family nor himself. So far as I am concerned, never while I am in this House will one get an advantage over another because of his religion. "To every man his own," is the motto of the Advocate, but according to the manner in which that is carried out by those who have adopted it, it means only every man of a certain section of the country. If you are going to work along denominational lines, give each church what is its just right and treat all alike. When I moved my seat out here I did it on

the soundest principle possible, namely because I did not consider that I was doing my duty to my constituents by remaining in the Government after I had become convinced that they were not doing the best in their power under the circumstances. Then this man Collishaw who drifts in here from God knows where has the cheek to suggest that I was bought by the Opposition.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I would like to ask the hon. member if it is true that his brother sold a thousand quintals of fish to Sir John Crosbie a week before or after he took an independent seat in this House.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I will answer that question and if I am not stating what is the absolute truth, Sir John Crosbie can put me in my place. Neither myself, my brother nor any of my family, nor yet anybody connected with me ever sold a fish to Sir John Crosbie at any time either before nor after I took my seat in the middle of the House.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, I will answer Mr. Scammell's question to what I think will prove to be his entire satisfaction. My answer to you is this. You have a diseased mind and it is both rude and impudent for you to have the audacity to suggest that because this hon. member took an independent seat in the House, he must have been actuated by some personal motive of gain, in other words that he was bribed to take the stand that he took, a stand that you have not the independence nor the courage to take yourself. Never in my life did I buy a fish from an Archibald but I will say this, that if Archibald had taken advantage of his position in the Government as Capt. Gosse did, he could have sold his fish without any difficulty and got paid for it out of Government money. You must have the mind of a gull to make such

an insinuation. The charge has already been made that one Collishaw said I had bought Archibald—

MR. SCAMMELL.—I do not know Collishaw.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—If you did you would move your seat out from the Government too.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Sir John is under a wrong impression. I asked about Mr. Archibald's brother and not about himself.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—And I said I knew nothing about Mr. Archibald's brother's fish. It is like the Government fish so far as I am concerned, I do not know where it is.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I'll bet that Archibald's fish is sold.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Archibald's fish was shipped to a man named Shipman with fish belonging to Bairds and others. And now, I will tell you that you can have neither brains nor manhood to make the suggestion that because a man moves out to an independent seat in this House he must have been bought.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I have as much brains as you, Crosbie, and the stock I came from is sufficient to prove that I have as much manhood.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Don't talk to me about stock. The idea, Mr. Chairman, of this man insinuating that I had bought Mr. Archibald's fish as an inducement for him to leave the Government. I may say that I never either coaxed nor asked Mr. Archibald to leave the Government. I did not care whether he came or stayed. That is a matter entirely for a man's own conscience.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to deal with Mr. Scammell on a question of that class, I must first of all thank Sir John Crosbie for the manner in which he has substantiated my denial of the dirty charge that, if not directly made, was

at least insinuated by the member for St. Barbe. I want to repeat through you, Sir, that I never sold a fish to Sir John Crosbie in my lifetime, neither did my brother nor anyone connected with me or my family. Now, I want to deal with Mr. Scammell in a gentlemanly manner if it is possible. When the question was asked, a question which connected me with another member of this House, I sat down and gave that other member a chance to make a liar of me if what I had stated was not the truth. I presume your question was sincere, anyway, I will not accuse you of any ulterior motive in asking it and if you will accept my answer I will let the matter drop.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I will not impeach the honor of any hon. member so I must accept your answer.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Do you accept my answer?

MR. SCAMMELL.—Yes.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Very well, I will accept your question in the same good faith that you do my answer. Now, that disposes of that matter, and I am sorry Sir, for having taken up so much of the time of the House, but I felt that I owed it to myself to have that fully cleared up. Mr. Scammell has said that I did not have the manhood to go right across the House. I have stated that what I did I did on a firm principle. I came here to join the first man who would make a move to save this country from the destruction towards which she is heading, and I put it to any fairminded man if my position in this House to-night is not based on a firmer principle than that of either the Government or the Opposition. I moved out here because I was satisfied, from a conscientious standpoint, that I was not serving my country rightly by sitting with a Government that had not the policy we want to help the poor men of this country feed

their families. I moved out looking for a leader who was strong enough to formulate such a policy, and when such a man comes forward he will find me the first man to join forces with him.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of this opportunity to have a word to say in reference to the question that has been before this House for the last twelve weeks, that is, the Bell Island ore tax. The Attorney General has to-night made certain statements regarding that tax, and I have been aware of certain propaganda that has been circulated on Bell Island regarding putting that bill through. That propaganda has been to the effect of throwing on the shoulders of the Opposition the responsibility for holding up the bill. I am not prepared to state the cause or origin of that propaganda, but I am prepared to state that we are not responsible for the delays in making that contract. We have endeavored to make the very best contract for the country. We realize that the companies over there are in a very serious condition. It was our utmost desire to make a contract that would be acceptable to the companies, and for the best possible interest of Newfoundland. It must be borne in mind that this contract goes over a period of twenty years. Conditions that exist now may not exist in years to come.

Now, Sir, I am prepared to give them free exportation for 40 years if they are prepared to guarantee a certain expenditure and employment. The tax is only a drop in the bucket, it is the labor that is the most important matter. The Companies are anxious that the contract go through as it stood; then I say we should put it through. It has not in any way been held up by the Opposition members of that committee, and if it were sub-

mitted to this House I believe it would pass unanimously.

Sir Michael spoke briefly regarding the railroad resolutions. I say again it is deplorable, it is unfair, unjust to this House that the Government should treat this subject in the way it is treated. It is a piece of legislation from which will radiate our whole financial position during the present year.

The operation of the railway is absolutely essential and no reason can be given for closing it. As I intimated when the Hon. Prime Minister laid the resolutions on the Table—he is the man who is custodian of the people's interests—that all the cards should be laid on the table and the story be told, but that was not done. Therefore this side cannot accept these resolutions as proposed because a principle has been violated that any independent legislature must not forego. The House is entitled by its composition when here in session convened as the directors of the affairs of Newfoundland, to a full and complete statement of these affairs. And when there is ground for suspicion that the whole story is not forthcoming, the people will hold you responsible for the lack of interest in their welfare. You went to the country as Prime Minister on a manifesto which the people accepted in good faith; you went, saying have confidence in me to carry out the contract which I make with you, and they trusted you and sent you back with a big majority to carry it out, but now the whole policy is reversed and an entire change of front takes place. The members on this side are not trying to embarrass the Government or the Reid Nfld. Co. on this subject. We all know what they did in the war; that prior to that they lost considerable sums in operating the road and anyone who had visions of making it pay had a belief

that few in the country shared in. Last year when we voted a million to partially repair the damage of the years of war, it was considered by some of us as a small return in view of the fact that other countries were paying their roads much more for the same period. I say it to the favour of the Reid Co. that they never exacted anything for the work which they were not called on to do under their contract. They were imbued with the same spirit of patriotism as others in Newfoundland in doing their best in that trying time. As I said the other night we had divested ourselves of shipping and the road was taxed to the utmost in getting in the necessities or our whole industrial life would be shut off and we would be left starving. To their credit be it said—and Sir John Crosbie knows—they ran the road to death to meet the emergency and to tide us over a period when we might be starved if the means were not found to convey the necessities of life to the people. In 1919 we had a general election, certain parties going to the country, each with a platform, a policy, promising if returned to carry out certain obligations. It must be borne in mind that prior to that the Cashin, Lloyd and Coalition governments had to use every means and were often at their wits' end to keep the commercial life breathing and the trade of the country in operation. When the leader of the present administration went to the country he issued this manifesto. This is the first time I have referred to it, and I may tell the House that I never read it yet because I would rather take my own observations of conditions and of how they are fulfilling the promises so flippantly made by those who raised themselves to power at the expense of an unthinking people. In this manifesto the Hon. Prime Minister says. (Quotes manifesto.)

I might say in that connection that the timber areas of the Reids are not concessions by the Government but part and parcel of their contract. When they built the road for \$15,000 a mile they were given certain blocks of timber as part of the contract. (Quotes manifesto.)

Prophetic indeed. The first part of the paragraph unfortunately is not true which says the revenue is good. It goes on to say. (Quotes manifesto.)

The proposal now is to close the branch lines and in one instance to take up the rails. (Quotes.)

For some years past the Reids have dominated the Government—the Hon. Prime Minister was a part of it and writes himself down as under the domination of the Reids. (Quotes.)

Mr. Chairman, comment is unnecessary. The Hon. Prime Minister was returned on that manifesto, the mandate of the people sent him here, and that is in conjunction with the promises to do the people's will. We who did not see eye to eye with him knew that it was absolute bunkum and intended to trap the people. The Reids stood by us in the time of war and I would be the last to say a word against any man who stood up for us in our darkest hour. But I am not prepared to stand for him turning a somersault. He said last year he did not believe the figures of the Reids as to the earnings and expenses of operating the road. He had to swallow a bitter pill when he had to bring in these resolutions that the Hon. Minister of Finance refused to bring. The Hon. Minister of Finance is not here and I will not say anything as to his action but it is an open secret that he went into political life to put the Reids in their proper place. But the Opposition is just as responsible as the Government to see the interests of the country conserved and to see that a square deal is given to all; and I

may claim this privilege that I took the same position when the Bowrings on the coastal contract wanted to pull it over us on a contract for 20 years and an increase in subsidies for their steamers and on passenger and freight rates 100%. They wanted the Government to sign it for 50 years and I pointed out in the interests of the people we should not sign it for more than 5 years, because with the price of everything up in connection with the operation of a contract of that kind it would be a mistake to enter into such a contract as the prices might tumble lower than before the war. Now, sir, we having tried in every possible way to extract light on the proposition before us, if they would lay their cards on the table and tell us the inside story of the transaction, I believe there would be little to complain of but I think they have not played the game with the Reids and we are driven in the interests of the country to oppose. As I said before, withdraw the resolutions and hand us the full story. And then to ask us to accept something with no foundation to it but a three-page letter from Bury who was practically in the custody of the Government and the Government engineer while here and went away after 3 days after, putting in a report that anyone at all might give. It would be as well to ask the captain of a dreadnought to give particulars of a Labrador fishing boat as to ask the Vice-President of the C.P.R. to give an opinion on the Reid Nfld. Co.'s railway. Bury could not size up the situation—there was no situation to size up. There are men in the Reid Co who are more practical and by reason of their common sense, better able to give an opinion than Bury with all his eminence and knowledge. And the next thing we heard you got to get a manager, probably with 5

times the salary of any man in the company. What would he know about it—it is a downright insult to the country. The management of the road to a man who is trained to it is as easy as the management of a shoe factory or any other industry. It is no matter if there is one or five trains a day, or how many are employed. It is no more than any ordinary business conducted in St. John's and still we hear of nothing but experts coming where there are better men already to fill the duties. I realize that no matter what we say the Government will vote for these resolutions and they will be put through. I realize that we have fulfilled our public duty but we regret that this matter has not been handled with consideration of detail and the necessity to get the information so vital to Newfoundland. If there is nothing else behind this, are we to drift along in the same way forever and next year pass another vote of millions. It is all totally wrong and the Government is devoid of any policy as to the railroad. I say it is a shame that the House should be asked to pass such resolutions as those laid before us and with these ideas I rise to second the proposition of the leader of the Opposition. At such a critical period you got to watch your step, be careful of the credit of Newfoundland and remember that the financiers of the world realize that the people govern and it is only on their wishes that a Government can govern.

If you are sincere in your purpose and are satisfied that that is the best you can do and if you are satisfied that the country is behind you and if you are satisfied that you have fulfilled the promises you made to the country and that, under the circumstances, this is the best you can do, well then go back to the people who sent you here—the people are the

shareholders of Newfoundland and we are their trustees—and if they are prepared to let you make this expenditure on their account and if they endorse your attitude you will have fulfilled the people's will, but until such time as you do that you are going back on the promises that you made them and you will find that the day is not far distant when you will go down to perdition as a Government who have lived on the practice of deception in the administration of the affairs of the country and who remained in office contrary to the will and the wishes of the people.

I, therefore, beg to second the amendment made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, namely, to have this matter referred to the people for their endorsement or otherwise and I trust that the Government will see the wisdom of this course. In the meantime provision will have to be made for the operation of the railroad and moneys will have to be allocated by the Legislature for this purpose, as I believe that as far as this Opposition is concerned they want to have the railway in proper running order.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight.



THURSDAY, July 21.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the Report, Sir M. P. Cashin moved, and Mr. Bennett seconded the following amendment:

“That all the words following the preamble in the Resolutions be stricken out and the following inserted in place thereof:—

And Whereas, the Liberal Reform Party in the General Election of 1919, through their manifesto and in their public utterances, went to the electorate on behalf of a policy against any concessions whatever being given to the Reid Nfld. Co., and on the policy that the Reid Nfld. Co. should be made carry out to the letter, their obligations to the people of this country as contained in the Contract of 1901.

And Whereas, the people at the polls endorsed that policy,

And Whereas, the contract in the schedule hereto is in direct opposition to the policy as endorsed at the polls.

Be it Resolved, that in the opinion of this House this contract should not pass until the country has again pronounced on the same at the polls at a general election to be held as soon as possible."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment:— Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald, (14).

And against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (18).

So it passed in the negative.

On the motion that the Report be adopted there appeared in its favor: Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Actg. Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr.

Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (18).

And against it Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald (14).

So it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles," as follows:

The Select Committee, appointed to consider the Quieting of Titles Bill, beg to report that they recommend the passing of the Act.

(Signed)

W. R. WARREN.
A. TARGETT,
CYRIL JAS. FOX.

St. John's, July 2th, 1920.

On motion this report was adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.



THURSDAY, July 21, 1921.

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

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I heard to-day that the government had

sold the pit props cut last winter at twelve dollars per cord. Might I ask the hon. Prime Minister if that is correct?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—But for one or two details, the sale is practically concluded. The purchaser is some American concern represented by House and Company. The price is f.o.b., I merely know that the name House was mentioned.

MR. SULLIVAN—Might I also ask the Prime Minister about that memo, re the fee chargeable by the Hospital?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will attend to that as soon as possible.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Might I ask the Minister of Education about his report?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF EDUCATION—I hope to table it next week.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Might I ask the Prime Minister if the total amount of the loan has been paid over to the Bank of Montreal?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The entire amount.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—You took it all from New York and did not consider the rate of exchange. You may have two or three points.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I asked the Finance Minister to table a statement of the amount of interest paid New York up to the 30th of June this year.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have the information here.

MR. MOORE—I wish to ask the Minister of Marine if he enquired about that one hundred pairs of snow shoes?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE—No requisition has been sent out.

MR. MOORE—Then the Government is not responsible for them?

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE—No. They were not ordered.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I would like the Finance Minister to table the information as to how he arrived at those figures in this statement? I did

not ask for this. If you want to see my question look up the Order Papers. This statement deals with interest for next year. This is a false statement made by a fool or a baby. I asked the amount paid the London financiers to the 30th., of June and you answered that. Then I asked what interest you paid New York on \$20,000,000, and then said nothing paid. When the estimates comes up you will find you are one hundred thousand dollars short, and I will prove that. This is not signed by any body. I will put a question on the Order Paper asking to have this signed by Mr. Keating.

SIR M P. CASHIN—Do I understand that the Hon. Minister of Finance took all the money down from New York at 11 per cent. exchange, and is sending it back at 14. He was glad enough to get it at first, and is now sending it back to pay our debts. When are you going to put someone in charge of the Customs House—there is nobody there now, and it is going to the dogs. I asked a question months ago as to the duty on motor cars, and it is not paid yet. One individual, who was a supporter of the Government, got in six and though they have been sold and are now wearing out, there is no duty paid on them yet. We also asked a lot about the men with the overdue bonds, but were told it was not judicious to tell the names as it would be injurious to the trade of the Colony. Here is the question:

(reads question.)

And then the Hon. Minister comes along with a manufactured answer. How can you say the exchange will be the same as last year. It was then down to \$3.76, and you say it makes up \$166,000, but I say it will not be \$56,000. I ask now for an answer certified by Mr. Keating or someone responsible.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—A bad break has been made by the colony, and I want a full statement of the loss on exchange before we go into Ways and

Means. Exchange is a great thing to make money on if you understand it, but the trouble is you got nobody competent to look after it. Hundreds of thousands have been stolen by the bankers through your stupidity. It would be cheap at \$100,000 to have a man there who understands it. You got the money from New York at 11 per cent. and got to send it back at 14 p.c. Look at the amount in the difference. I want the whole figures laid before the House and I will be glad to give any information if I can, but let a stop be put to this questioning.

MR. MOORE—On July 18th I asked the Hon. Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Min. of Finance as to the duties on liquor from January to June and for the corresponding six months of last year. What about the answer?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will give it as soon as I get it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Posts as to the offers by the Commercial and Anglo companies.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—There is nothing further to report.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the value of the passenger and freight services of the various steamers operated by his department for each of the first six months of 1920, and for the same period the present year, said statement to specify the earnings of each steamer for passengers, and also for freight traffic during each month in each year, and if any steamers are being operated during these months in this year that were not operated the other year, to show their earnings for each month of the present year in each class of traffic.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—In reply I beg to say it will take a little time to get the information, but I hope to have it in a day or two.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I would like to

draw attention to the fact that we have not got a full answer from the Minister since the House opened. It is a wonder he is here to answer it all when he knew the question was on the Order Paper. I knew what I would get and you thought I would forget the matter, but I am going to get after you and ask you now to get your officials to get it.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—I gave even more than asked for at times.

MR. WALSH—I wish to remind the Minister of Shipping that I put an important question on the Order Paper on the 18th., but have received no reply. The impression is abroad that valuable furnishings of the ships which came out here have disappeared at St. John's, and that some have found their way into places where it would not pay the Colony, and I assure him we will not close till I get a satisfactory answer to my question.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—I brought the matter to the attention of Mr. Foley this morning and he assured me he would let me know this afternoon. I have received anonymous letters to the same effect as Mr. Walsh's statement, and made enquiries, but found them unfounded. The word of Mr. McGettigan cannot be questioned, and he investigated and found nothing. The things on the boats were listed and it is only a matter of getting the lists written.

MR. WALSH—I make no charge against any man, and if no goods have been sold let you give the reply in writing.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—When the boats arrived here the goods were landed and stored at the Southside. From the Watchful they were landed at Relds and put back on board when she was ready for sea. Some goods were put on the Prospero and Portia. I will have the reply not later than tomorrow.

MR. MOORE—You are a nice innocent man alright, but if some of the

rumours are true, there is a nice story to be told. There are no goods at Bowring's now. Why was the reply delayed.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—There are only 3 men in the office, and one has been sick some weeks. The others are very busy, one boat sailing only yesterday, so we could not get the reply before.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I have no doubt the Minister got an inventory when the goods were landed, and what has been removed can be easily checked up. This is not part of Mr. McGettigan's job—he has to look after the hulls etc.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—I have done it since I have been in office.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I found Mr. McGettigan perfectly satisfactory. Like the Minister I got anonymous letters, but put them in the waste basket. I appreciate your taking no notice of them—the writer of them is no man.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, or the Minister of Shipping, what ships, if any, are operated by his Department during the present fiscal year, what services are they engaged upon, and what are they costing per day, and is it the intention to operate any other steamers in connection with his Department the present year. Also if any of the ships obtained on behalf of the Government last year are now employed, and if so to state what vessels are unemployed and what is the cost of their maintenance while so unemployed.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—No steamers are attached to that department at the present time.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he has received any information from Sir Edgar Bowring with respect to his visit to Washington, as it appears from the public press that he was at Halifax yesterday on his way back to the Colony, and if so to lay on the table of the House

copy of any message which should pass between Sir Edgar Bowring and himself in relation to the former's mission to Washington.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Sir Edgar Bowring says that Fordney intended to put through the Tariff Bill, but there is also a clause which provides for reciprocal arrangements. I will give you a copy of it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission for last year, if the steamboat services of the Reid Nfld. Company were operated in conjunction with those of the Railroad during the past fiscal year, and if so was any proportion of the cost borne by the Colony and paid for out of the funds at the disposal of the Railroad Commission; and if so to state how much of the loss which the Colony has to make up on account of last year was sustained on account of operating the Railroad steamers, and how much on account of operating the Railroad service itself.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee of the House which recently sat and recommended certain additional provision for returned soldiers, especially for those suffering from wounds or illness, and if so to state the nature of the steps which the Government proposes to take.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The report has been referred to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means and will come up in a day or two.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that Albert H. Salter has been appointed to undertake the distribution of all supplies for lighthouses during the current year, and if so what amount is he to receive for such service; if so will it be in addition to the

services he performs in the Public Works Department at present, and if so what amount, if any, will be paid for such services.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—I beg to table the reply.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and by unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council with a message acquainting that Body that the House of Assembly had passed the Bill sent down with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, that the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway" be read a second time, the House divided and there appeared in its favour—

Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, Mr. Abbott—(13)

and against it

Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald—(14).

So it passed in the affirmative, 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An

Act Respecting the Exportation of Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently:

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister and by unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Timber" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled 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.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.



FRIDAY, July 22nd.

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

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is the intention of the Government, after the House closes to send Mr. E. Collishaw to Ottawa to negotiate terms of Confederation, and if so to state what qualification Mr. Collishaw has for this work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if

any extension of the telegraph lines is being carried out this year; if so where, to what extent and what will be the cost of the same.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education when the Inspectors, now being trained abroad, will take up their duties and when the construction of the proposed Normal School is to be started.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice what is the present position with regard to the Labrador Boundary Question; are any legal men at work in this Colony in connection with it at the present time or likely to be in the near future; if so to state the names of said parties; the nature of the work they are engaged in, and the amount that will likely be paid them for their services.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I beg to say that I propose to give a detailed statement of the present position of this matter when the vote for it come up in Supply. In the meantime, Newfoundland's case is being prepared, has been printed and has to be gone over. I have received proposals from Messrs. Bern & Beridge about getting together evidence, but we cannot do anything in that till the vote for payment has been put thru. The Prime Minister and myself are the only legal men in this country engaged in connection with the matter so far.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is it the intention of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice to go to London this year in connection with the matter?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am not sure yet whether or not it will be necessary for me to go to London during the autumn in connection with the preparation of evidence for our case.

MR. BENNETT asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if the usual monthly cheques to members of the Civil Service, has been issued for the present month, and if not, why not.

Reply tabled.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Chairman of the Railway Commission of last year, when he proposes to table the reply to No. 10 of my questions of June 23rd, relating to the subsidies for railroads and steamers drawn by the Reid Company and the increased rates which the Commission proposed, and also the answer to my question No. 20 relating to the cost of the new shaft for the Glencoe, new boiler for the Argyle, renewal of the electric light on several other steamers of the Reid fleet, cost of the four months' special survey on several of these steamers and the thorough overhaul given them.

Reply will be tabled to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" 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 provision.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles," 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the

Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill goes through, I again want to enter my protest against the Reids getting a million and a half dollars from the taxpayers of this Coony.

Another matter I wish to refer to is the work being done at Badger where I understand there are fifteen hundred men employed. Now, the District of which I have the honor to be one of the representatives, has a large number of men who are in very poor circumstances owing to the failure of the fishery and the bad management of the present Government. These men are in immediate need of employment and we must get money to finish the road from Cappahayden to Trepassey while I would also support the completion of the road from Holyrood to Witless Bay along which there is land equally as good as any in the Island for Agricultural purposes, and I feel sure that in this I have the fullest support of the members for Hr. Main. Why you have put men to work building a road through the woods from Badger to Springdale, when there are other roads going to wreck and ruin, is more than I can understand. The bridges on the road from Trepassey to Cape Race have fallen down and before this Bill goes through I would like to hear the opinion of Messrs. Walsh and Sullivan on this matter. I object emphatically to money being indiscriminately spent at Badger when the District of Ferryland cannot get its per capita share.

DR. JONES.—Mr. Chairman, allow me to say a word or two with regard to the matter just referred to by the hon. member for Ferryland. We have in our District four or five hundred men who are out of work. The pro-

mise was made them that they would be sent out to work on the new roads that are being built, but I want to point out how much better it would be if these men were put to work on the roads in their own district. The road from Seal Cove to Holyrood, poetically known as the Cow Path, needs to be widened, as you well know, as at present it is almost impassible especially for motor cars. I think, moreover, that many members will agree with me on the great advantage of giving men work of this kind right at home. The money they could thus earn would mean a great deal more to them than if they were sent out of their own districts, and I am sure that all will agree that now is the opportunity of getting work like that which I have mentioned done.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of saying anything at this stage as the House will remember that the whole principle of this measure has been fully debated. The point of my rising is this: the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice who undertook to speak for the Government, said that these Resolutions now epitomized in the form of a Bill, were the best they could do at present, but it is because the Government were so lackadaisical in their duty that this is so. The correspondence before us shows that not a thing was done to make the situation better than it is and with all the defects that may arise out of the Resolutions, all the missing of better chances, all the losses that may accrue the Government will stand charged and without any cause whatever except its own laziness. The reason we now let this Bill go through without any further tie-up is the same that makes a man, held up at the point of a gun, act contrary to his own ideas. I commit this Bill which the Resolutions have brought forth to the

custody of the incapable Government that brought them about, with a full realization and an absolute belief that poor indeed is the hope of anything in the way of a railway policy while this Administration is in charge. I expect nothing better twelve months hence than we have now and I am not much concerned with the passing of this Bill for the reason that the railway must be run and as the contractors cannot do it without financial assistance, it is better that we have this arrangement than that it be left in the hands of this incompetent bunch we see masquerading as a Government. It were better to donate a million and a half dollars to Reids even though there is not a figure shown to warrant it. It is because of the experience I have had of the Government up to now that I can give it no better recommendation and the Prime Minister and his pliable crew can have this consolation, that no lack of ability on their part, no laziness they may show and no lack of appreciation of their responsibilities will be any surprise to me.

If five minutes of time is given to anything demanding particular attention, it must come from Tommy Hall on the one hand or Mr. Pill on the other and, therefore, to Hall and Pill do I commit the interests of my children and my constituents, in taxation as in other things, till we meet again. I can only say now as I said before that the Government's attitude in this matter is a complete abandonment to the dictates of the Contractors. They are not passing what is in keeping with the ideas of the people; they are not passing the policy of the Government but the policy dictated by the contractors who realize that they have an easy Government to deal with. They have been asleep at the switch. June the 30th came and found them asleep on the job and the watchman awake,

threw up his hands and asked for terms, and these, Mr. Chairman, are the terms.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Chairman, though I think I have already done my duty by my country and the district of Placentia which I have the honour to represent, I don't think I should allow this opportunity to pass without once more entering my protest against the final act of what I consider to be the most serious drama, I should have said tragedy, that has ever taken place in this House. I don't intend to delay the House long this afternoon but I don't want to allow this opportunity to pass without giving my reason for voting against these Resolutions.

The Manifesto of the Prime Minister has had considerable prominence during the debate upon these Resolutions, but I crave the indulgence of the House while I refer to one paragraph of it which refers to the railroad. This is an extract from a letter sent by H. D. Reid to W. D. Reid when they were both friendly in the operation of the railroad. That letter was written two or three years ago. Well I think it will be agreed to by any sane, reasonable person in this Island who has had an opportunity of viewing the conditions of the railroad, and with regard to the general condition of the Colony financially that Messrs. Reids nor any other person looking for concessions that could only come when we were on the verge of bankruptcy that that time has arrived. Now I was not present a couple of evenings ago when the Prime Minister gave his justification for passing these Resolutions, it is true I was here for a short period while the Prime Minister was speaking, but whether it is that my hearing has got much worse than it was during the year or whether the Prime Minister gave the same address that I had

the pleasure of hearing a year ago I don't know, but it strikes me after reading some comment and hearing from my colleagues of it that it is an absolute reversal of the policy and intention of Mr. Squires at that time. I did hear Mr. Samson make some attempt to justify his vote and I did hear Mr. Warren who I am sorry is not here now. I was struck with the only reason he attempted to give the House and I took it down. I am glad to see that Mr. Warren has returned as he will be able to correct me if I am wrong. As follows:—

Might I ask Mr. Warren if he remembers whether these words were his.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Words to that effect.

MR. WALSH.—Now if that was so or is so now and I agree with him it is so that Government control of public utilities has never been successful in any country not alone Canada and the United States, but might I remind him that the history of Canada and the United States in connection with the railroad was before this House last year. Despite that this House, not this House but the Government after this House closed last year, took over control of the railway. I say Sir, that this was the time for Mr. Warren to have given vent to his opinion, and acted upon the statement he made here the other night. Again during the whole time that the Government was in control of the railroad, this was the time to get in consultation with inside or outside contractors, in case the Reid Nfld. Co. would not be able to take it over again when the Government term had expired, and even if you were not successful you would be able to say well, we asked for tenders and were turned down, we communicated with reputable railroad men outside the country but after they had investigated the matter

they would not have anything to do with it. If you had done this there would be some excuse but no, the Government made no such attempt. From correspondence tabled a day or two ago since the debate closed we find that in the speech made by Mr. Reid before a Committee of Council, it states that Reid on behalf of himself or his Company, nor the Prime Minister on behalf of the Government made no attempt. Sir Michael Cashin in the early days of this debate said that until such time as the Government were prepared to come in and show the House and the country where we propose to get the million and a half dollars to assist the Reids, until it can be shown that the Colony can afford it

These men were transported to Badger and the vast amount of money spent on this could have been better spent on work in their own district. Dr. Jones pleaded on behalf of his constituents who are not fishing and are being deprived of this employment. The Nova Scotia Steel Company on Bell Island has closed down and that means a pretty blue look up for those men who have only a ten dollar bill in their homes at the present time. Most of us here are well able to provide for the wants of those depending upon us but there are thousands outside this House who are at a loss to know how they are going to provide the wherewithal to have them from destruction. I am prepared to take the statements of Sir Michael Cashin who has been the head of the Finance Department for many years and no one, even his political opponents, will question the fact that judiciously handled the financial affairs of this country extremely well. And if his statements are correct this country will not be able to give an open order to R. H. O'Dwyer when the snow falls. What if the country will de-

fault on the 31st December; what about the thousands of men, women and children who are being deprived of the necessaries of life. While the sun shines they can bask in it and it takes very little to sustain them and very little fuel and clothing is required. But what when the cold, dreary hungry winter comes? Every man on the other side must realise that what I am saying is correct. I am greatly surprised to find all you men over there prepared to sit down for four months and not even attempt to get to your feet. All you do is chew chewing gum. I expect very little from those who are well paid but I am at a loss to understand why some of the honest men on the other side are prepared to sit down and listen to men appeal on behalf of those men from which they and myself sprung. The appeals have fallen on deaf ears. When it comes to a matter of voting away \$1,500,000 to the Reids you are lax in your responsibilities.

When it comes to giving away \$10,000 to some fellow who drifts in here to that kind of fellow who says when he gets outside the Narrows that "We are too green to burn" you seem to be all alive to his interest and forget the desires and wishes of your constituents. There are men on the other side who are not too green to burn. There are men on the other side who will reap their reward when this Bill passes. I know that is an insinuation. This man Collishaw who has figured so often if often mentioned here, and then those on the other side smile, but his tracks have been well covered. But our suspicions were well founded and we have discovered the nigger in the wood pile. Since he came amongst us he has developed into a rich man. Previous to his coming here he had been selling oil, butter and soap in his native town. He had still the impudence to tell Mr. Martin that he would not export any pit props as he controlled

the railroad. If he had made that statement to me there would have been very little of Collishaw left. We have had enough of interference by such an intriguer. It is a curious fact that at all hours of the night one can see Collishaw emerging from the houses of those closely identified with the movements of the Government. It does not take a lot of brains to make the connection as Mr. Archibald put it. He has a lot of interest in the whole outfit. He was appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to represent poor old Newfoundland at Washington. The Government was afraid to table the amount of his expenses. When the House closes Collishaw will be quick enough to run to the Treasury to get his quota of the people's money. I want to say right now, that I do not think that the Prime Minister with all his faults would have been a party to all these transactions, had it not been for the fact that he depends upon his remaining in this House upon the friends of Collishaw. It would be much better for the country if the Prime Minister was independent enough to tell such individuals as the Collishaw type to get about their business. With regard to this very important commission on which this mysterious Collishaw was we find that Sir Edgar Bowring who has returned has been interviewed by the reporter of the Evening Telegram. This has bearing upon the Bill before the House. (reads). I think this House is the proper place to discuss such important matters as this and if you cannot listen or stay in here let you get home and go fishing and farming as the case may be. I feel like reading this article again for the benefit of those who were not present. (reads). I am glad that the suggestions of the honourable members on this side of the House have been borne out by the last paragraph of Sir Edgar Bowring's report. The members on this side pointed out that such men as Devine, Collishaw and Grenfell were

not qualified for such an undertaking. But I am not prejudiced against Devine and I can say both he and his colleagues cannot accuse me of hitting below the belt. I have great respect for Devine. But he was not the proper man to discuss this tariff bill at Washington. The honourable Minister of Marine was the proper man. He is responsible for ruining the European markets, and this was an opportunity to undo what he had done. But he was cute enough to be able to discern that any attempt by him would meet with the same failure as any by Devine and Collishaw. The men of New England and Alaska were interested in this protective tariff bill, and the Minister knew all the men attending the conference were big men, and read the papers containing attacks upon him. They knew that owing to his mad and insane policy and by the government submitting to it, that the fishery of Newfoundland had been destroyed. Therefore he knew that he would be looked upon as a joke.

I would like to see it and no doubt we will have the report and a further chance to deal with this important piece of legislation. I regret to say that as I see it Newfoundland is staggering under a load which it is impossible for a country with a population of a quarter million to pay off. They cannot pay the enormous amount of taxes that are piling up, and by this Bill you are putting on extra burdens, and it will be, as said by the gentlemen on this side, the last straw which will break the camels back. The Hon. Prime Minister had lots to say about taxation in his Manifesto. Let us see for a moment how his promises in this document agree with his performances, and those of his Government since they took office. And remember Mr. Chairman, I only resurrect this important item of Education to try and point out to this Committee the absolutely hopeless position the father of

that document must feel in when he submits to the vicious legislation we are considering this afternoon. On page 14 the document refers to taxation

(reads manifesto)

In other words every man, woman and child has a capital tax of \$30 a year.

(reads again.)

Now there is a very attractive sentence and I have no doubt, but the father of the document was sincere when he wrote the statement and expected a response from the people not controlled by the F.P.U. that would enable him to put his theory in practice. I am fair enough to concede that for him. I do not believe he manufactured this with the express purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the people in order to ride to power. But the facts of the last 20 months have proven to all, even his colleagues who were open to conviction, that the practice is directly opposite to what he put before the people. Taxation is a subject which covers all departments of the country and is the means whereby everything is derived to run the ship of State. In 1919 it cost \$36 per head for education and families were paying from \$300 to \$400 taxation. Now look at the expenditures and extravagances since the unfortunate Nov. 15th when the present Government took power. In consideration of any lady or gentleman who was not in this Chamber, I will repeat for their benefit that when Sir M. P. Cashin went out he left 4 millions of a nest egg for the rainy day and any man that had the slightest vision must have seen that that day was inevitable. Like all other countries we were about to be faced with the period of reconstruction. Sir M. I. Cashin and his Government were wise enough and Newfoundlanders enough to put by for the rainy day. The Government now in control took office on Nov. 15th. They were just back after being supported enthusiastically. They

came back and in their big-heartedness tried to pay back some of the leading people to whom they owed their success and to fling out right and left the money to those who had brought grit to the political mill. Now after they have been in office 20 months we find ourselves bankrupt—absolutely bankrupt. When the House was convened 3 or 4 months ago, they undertook to raise a loan and though they did raise it, as charged by the ex-Premier, it was done under false pretences. If these questions go on the Order Paper day after day, you will find that this country will not be an attractive proposition as a borrower. We now find that this 6 millions has all been spent. Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw attention to the document passed me by Mr. Sullivan. If the signature is alright, I will say no more on this subject.

MR. SULLIVAN—It is correct.

MR. WALSH—I now have the absolute assurance of the answer to my request.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to see the memorandum to which the member refers.

MR. WALSH—Here it is.

Colinet Road,

That matter will be alright.

(Sgd.) W. F. COAKER.

July 22nd, 1921.

Witness—R. Hibbs.

MR. WALSH—I hope the Hon. Prime Minister will not go back on what the Hon. Minister of Marine concedes. I will now take my seat and am glad to register my vote against the Bill brought in as the result of the resolutions. I voted against them the other day, and I still hope some men will be found to dig up what I have missed and that some on the other side will be so interested in Newfoundland as to register themselves against the measure.

MR VINNICOMBE—Before this goes through Mr. Chairman, I would like to

have a few words on it. I know it is not pleasant for the Hon. Prime Minister to have to sit and listen to the remarks of Mr. Higgins who was dubbed Reids' Solicitor, but has proved himself a true Newfoundlander at heart. He was vilified as Reids' Solicitor and when he spoke here the Hon. Prime Minister left the House, but today he happened to be in his seat, and I know he felt uncomfortable when Mr. Higgins made his address. The other day I asked if the members knew of any proposition and they said no. They were voting on Bury's report. Later it was said by the Hon. Prime Minister some proposition would be put up, and then they realized they were kept in the dark. I know you do not like to vote for this Bill, and I am sorry Mr. Walsh has taken his seat, but now we have the opportunity to keep the House open till the 1st of August. All of you should say something on this Bill.

MR. SAMSON—You are not anxious about the Regatta.

MR. VINNICOMBE—No, but we are anxious about the money for the Railway. The Reid Nfid. Co. are now running it. Who is going to pay for this month's work? I'd like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine, if this Bill is rejected—and some of you have Newfoundland blood as I know—who will pay for the railway.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—The company was ordered by the Government to operate it.

MR. VINNICOMBE—You understood beforehand that the Bill would be passed.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—If they were not told to run it the road would be stopped.

MR. VINNICOMBE—Mr. Samson said that if something better were brought forward he would vote for it, but how could he do so when you had given your word to the Reids that the Bill would pass. I do not think we should pay for this month's operations

in connection with this Bill the other night I asked as to the reduction of wages. In this Bill here we have no control of what they can do with the workers and they are figuring out the advantages for next year, they will increase the freight rates etc.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—It is here—the passenger rates and reduction of wages. The people will not be able to buy even fuel this winter, and I am interested in the people. "The saving due to reduction of wages"—if we have money to give the railway we should have a say as to how it is to be spent. The man in the machine shops are under dogs as you would call them and they should be looked after, and not be cut. You know that as a result of the 'Longshoremen's' strike the merchants realized that prices were not going down. They would be, but for the taxes which are being kept up. I do not think it fair for you to say that this was going through as Mr. Samson wanted to see the proposals. I think that was a big undertaking for the Hon. Prime Minister or the Hon. Minister of Marine to tell them that.

MR. SAMSON—It would be a bigger proposition to close down the road.

MR. VINNICOMBE—I do not want to see it closed either. You said you would keep their nose to the grinding stone. You have vilified every man on this side.

MR. SAMSON—We vilified no man.

MR. TARGETT—That belongs to your side of the House, not ours.

MR. VINNICOMBE—You are part and parcel of the government though you are F.P.U. men and didn't the Advocate vilify us.

MR. SAMSON—I am not responsible for the Advocate.

MR. VINNICOMBE—You are under the leadership of Sir R. A. Squires and you all know how we were vilified in Hr. Main. Now Mr. Targett said if M. P. Cashin was going to give the Reids 10 millions but he was sincere and knew

the Reids wanted it. But the Hon. Prime Minister knew the same, but wanted to bring grist to their mill, and said he would put the Reids out of business. The Hon. Minister of Finance went into politics for nothing else, but to put the Reids down and out, but the Hon. Prime Minister introduced the Bill to give them the money. I am not against giving it, but to give it on the report of Bury, a thing of only three lines from a man who was here only 3 days, is not good enough. I do not see how any Newfoundlanders can cast his vote for it. The honorable member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh, has asked the Minister of Works about the work at Badger. The Hon. Prime Minister has said that some men from St. John's East have gone out there. I would like to ask how many.

MINISTER OF WORKS—I do not know.

MR. VINICOMBE—Mr. Walsh said the members on the other side know where their constituents will get off, and I know where mine will get off—they will get off with starvation staring them in the face. There is no fish at Torbay, Flatrock and other points and now it is the 22nd of July.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks this afternoon I spoke of what Mr. Walsh said of himself and other members as to where their constituents are going to get off. I know where our constituents are going to get off. There is no fish at Torbay or Outer Cove and here it is, the 22nd of July, and we have a crowd of able-bodied men looking to us for employment to keep themselves and their families from starving. These men cannot be employed on Municipal works because they reside outside the city limits and do not pay taxes. Mr. Bennett has spoken of the work on the West End roads, and here I must say, in justice to the Prime Minister that he is doing fine work on Thorburne Road. At Bell Island the Dominion Iron Steel Co. have three

ships a week taking cargoes and the six or seven hundred men employed by the companies get only three half days work a week. This of course is very little good to them or their families, and we have men over from the Island looking for money to start work there, but we have no money to give them. The Prime Minister tells us that some men from St. John's East have been sent to Badger, but why send men from St. John's East or anywhere else to Badger, when there is plenty of work needing to be done in their own districts. I appeal now for a share of that money for St. John's East, not merely because it is being given out, but because the people need work. Bowring Bros. gave out a little supplies to start the fishery at Flatrock and vicinity, but as that has turned out a failure, they will not give any more and anyone who knows St. John's East knows that it is an unusual sight to see so many fishermen looking for work at this time of year. We are here giving a million and a half dollars to the Reids to run the railroad, but why not spend it to connect up the country with good carriage roads. I know the Chairman approves of that idea because he is a highwayman. I do not mean now that he is a highwayman in the common acceptance of the term, but he is a man who has knowledge and interest in the subject of roads. With regard to the Resolutions, I told the Prime Minister that this Agreement should start from August 1st and extend to the end of June, and then pay the Reids \$1,375,000 instead of \$1,500,000. In this way we would save \$125,000, but now I find that they are getting paid for this month. I also appealed to the Executive to see that the Reid Nfld. Co. did not reduce the wages of their employees, but I find that they have made a reduction of 20 per cent. This is an outrage and should not be tolerated. The Opposition has been looked upon as hanging up this House,

but I think it is lucky for the country that the Opposition has such long-winded men because we are seeing new developments every day that we would know nothing about if the Government had been allowed to rush matters thru as they wanted to. Mr. Walsh has succeeded in getting some work for his constituents, and has got a guarantee from the Minister of Fisheries.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It was guaranteed by the Prime Minister.

MR VINICOMBE—Oh, you are Prime Minister then. I congratulate you. I always thought that you were the real Prime Minister. The agreement was read out here this afternoon, and it read something like this "I guarantee the work will be done" signed W. F. Coaker, witness: R. Hibbs.

They sent for Sir George Bury, but didn't the Prime Minister send to Sir W. D. Reid to send down Sir George Bury. Now Mr. Coaker, aren't you trying to haul it over the Prime Minister? You can be sure of it that the Prime Minister is trying to haul it over you. Now, Sir, I think we should give some guarantee to the men who are working on the line. It is only fair that those two or three thousand men should be given a guarantee. Then you call yourselves the Reform Government; a reformatory should be built for every one of you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to take my seat, but I have no mind to take my seat because you have not answered a civil question for me tonight. I am looking to Dr. Barnes to do a man. Never mind what the others say to you. If it is a job you are looking for, I will see that you get a job. Mr. Coaker gave Mr. Walsh this afternoon a guarantee of a \$75,000 road, witnessed by Mr. Hibbs. He said the Prime Minister gave it, then he must be Prime Minister. I was going to talk ten minutes when I got up, but your conduct is enough to drive a man

off his head. As long as they will not tell me how much money they have spent on the road, I am going to appeal to you, Mr. Jennings, to see that there is no discrimination. To-day there were eight men who wanted to get work in St. John's East. They wanted me to give them work on the Council, but I had to tell them that no Outport men could get work on the Council. You can't give a poor man a day's work, but you can give a million and a half to the Reids.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, just before this sorry chapter of a sorry story goes through I would like to have a word to say, whether in the way of malediction or benediction it is for those who are in charge to say. When the present Government went to the country in 1919, when nothing was too bad to say about the Reids and their associates, when the main cries against the late administration was their association with the Reids, when you realize there was a pledge to make the Reids live up to their contract and the fact that the Prime Minister was a personal enemy of the Reids, then we have big grounds for supposing that there must be some big reason for the sudden change of the present Government and their present generosity for that company. When a government is elected on a manifesto, then the government elected has a direct mandate from the people to follow that course and no other.

We have to come to the conclusion now that it is almost certain that every Department under the control of the Government is in debt. Take the information that strayed along a few weeks ago with regard to the Militia Department. You might search the Budget from beginning to end and you would not find any reference to the Militia Department or to any deficit that might occur in the books, but it suddenly appears the other night that the Department is overdrawn at

least one hundred thousand dollars. Is there any reason therefore why the people of the country should not ask themselves if strict accounting were taken to-morrow in every branch of the Civil Service, would we not find that the accounts have been cooked and that the condition of the country financially is even bluer than the bitterest antagonist of the Government thinks. We have had statements made here to the effect that the loan raised six weeks ago was obtained upon a fictitious financial statement and those statements have been made repeatedly and gone unchallenged. There has been no official contradiction of the fact and the people are justified in thinking that not alone has this Administration been guilty of heinous offences against public decency in defiance of the wishes of the people but that they have been guilty of fraud that if they were acting in a private capacity they would be in the penitentiary for now. There is no doubt in the world that you never would have obtained that loan had the true position of the country been disclosed to the prospective investors. I don't believe that you would find anybody sufficiently gullible to advance this country that fabulous sum of money if they knew that our finances were at such a low ebb as they unfortunately are to-day and then we all remember the hue and cry raised coincidentally with the raising of this loan a statement was communicated to one of the New York papers and the Government flew into a passion, they suggested immediately that the hidden hand was again at work and they sent the statement to the New York Tribune with malicious intent to discredit the country, but there was one significant fact in this connection and that was that no attempt was made to dispute the facts set out in that statement. The Government took the

position that the disclosure of these facts was sufficient to destroy any hope of floating a loan. Now they did not deny the statement but they said it would be sufficient to prevent these New York investors from investing their money in the bonds of this country. What was that but a tantamount admission of this statement that if the true position of the country were known we would not get the credit we were after. We need go no further than the action of the Government in connection with that article to come to the conclusion that they knew that the only way to obtain that loan was to rig a statement of this country's finances. They were guilty of fraud. They took these New York investors in and they had no right to do it. They committed a grossly immoral act because neither a Government nor an individual is entitled in a position of that sort to deceive the people from whom he is attempting to get concessions, and the people in charge of that loan are morally guilty to-day of fraud, and they cannot attempt in any way to wriggle out of that position because they were not acting in a private capacity but as a Government. Therefore when we remember these things we are not surprised to find in the passing of this bill evidence of what heretofore has been merely a well founded suspicion that the promises made to the electorate in 1919 were merely made to deceive the people, and in making them you had neither the prospect nor the intention of carrying them out, and having gained power by the practice of such deception you paid no further attention to these pledges or to your obligations to the people who sent you here, but having the power you proceeded immediately to cater to your own selfish and personal desires and cared not the snap of your finger what became of the country that bore

you. We need no apology nor excuse nor have we to make one for talking on this subject, because I believe that time will show that the proposition which is about to pass in this House to-night, the measure that by a party vote is about to bind the people of the country irrevocably for a certain period is not alone one of the most nefarious transactions ever undertaken by this or any other Government in the history of the country, but is one that is almost sure to work harm and hardship to the already overburdened people of the Dominion.

You cannot find one tittle of justification for your action to-night. You have on the Statute Book an Act known as the Railway Act. Under that Act the railway service of the country is operated by contractors. The country is pledged to do its part towards those contractors, and they towards the country, and without even taking the trouble to consider the full effect of that contract, without making any attempt to find out the true position of Newfoundland under that contract you proceed with this course of action, and you defy the people and tell them that although they want one thing that you will do the other, and you go to the already over taxed treasury of the country and take out another million and a half dollars and hand it to the Reid Nfld. Co., and you say to these contractors we recognize that you have obligations under this contract you entered into twenty years ago. You have broken your pledges and it is up to the Government to institute proceedings against you, but for some reason which we don't intend to disclose to you we are going to pay no attention to that contract to regard it as null and void and take up some other plan for the performance of a service that in all truth these people have been well paid for. Now the railway con-

tract of the country either exists or it does not exist. While it is there on the Statute Book I think it is reasonable to say this country is bound by it, and while it is there it is a corollary of that principle that the contractors are bound by it. If it is the position and the fact that that contract is no longer of any further service to the country is it not the proper thing to do to come down here and be frank with the people and say yes, we realize that there is a contract in existence but circumstances have shown that the contractors cannot keep to that contract, we will have to frame up some other workable scheme for the continuance of that service. But you don't do that you allow that contract to remain in effect, and you go behind the people and you enter into a fresh agreement with the Reids. Now there is no dissenting voice to the proposition that the railway in Newfoundland should be a workable service, but I don't think on serious consideration of the whole situation that anyone will question this fact, that if we cannot get the railway contract performed by the Reid Nfld. Co. under present conditions we should rescind it and start afresh. The making of contracts like the one now before the House is merely piling up disadvantages upon Newfoundland, rendering almost certain this fact that you are complicating and further complicating the situation, that it is your duty to clarify and clear up at once.

I was surprised the other night when the Minister of Justice in his attempt to justify the action of the Government, took the position that he was opposed to Government control of the railway, because he said the experience of the world has shown that a loss is certain, and my mind went back to August the fifth last year, when that very same gentleman was

the one who drafted the Minute of Council, under which the Government took control of the railway situation of the country, and I said where is your consistency now, because the experience of the world in regard to Government control of public utilities was perhaps more evident last summer than it is to-day, and therefore that evidence was before the Minister, and he must have known when he was drafting that agreement under which the Government in defiance of the wishes of the people took charge of the railway, he must have known that he was landing Newfoundland in a position where a tremendous loss would have to be shouldered by her, and I was surprised because if I credited anyone with bona fides it was the Minister of Justice, and I don't believe to-night as I speak to you Sir, that the Minister of Justice believed what he was saying the other night, I don't think he believes in this contract, I believe that he realises it is placing Newfoundland in a terrible position, which is bound to work to her disadvantage, and I am sorry that he has not the courage of his convictions, to come in here and say, "No this Bill will not pass." I think his words were: "I am opposed to Government control of railways." It is a pity Sir, you did not have a similar opinion last year. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman has been driven into this position. We all remember the comment made in the early part of this session when contrary to all methods of procedure in such cases, when information with regard to the railway policy of the Government as Sir Michael Cashin said was drawn from the Government like you draw a tooth, and that Minute of Council was laid upon the table of the House, all over its face was spread the fact that this agreement was drawn by the Attorney General. The public asked why

should the fact that the Attorney General drew up that document be agitated and we were uncharitable enough to say that his kindly and well-intentioned colleagues were taking good care that the sin which was bound to attach to the Administration that committed such a heinous wrong against the public trust would have to be shouldered by him as well, they were taking good care that he would not have a loophole to escape, and join his views with the Opposition with regard to Government control of the railroad. They knew he was of the same opinion then as he is now and they did not want to let him have a single pretext in this year of grace 1921 to say, yes, I am opposed to the Government controlling this railroad, and I don't intend to vote for this measure, I had no hand, act or word in what took place last year, and with a clear conscience I can go before my people and say I don't intend to support this administration because they are doing something contrary to the wishes of the people, and to-day that gentleman is in the unfortunate position that he is opposing the very principle that last year he advocated and took part in. I listened to him the other night and I realized that he was only half hearted in his apology for this proposition. He realises that it is a wrong, a deliberate wrong upon the people of Newfoundland, but his shortsightedness last year prevents him from taking the independent stand he otherwise would have taken in regard to this matter, this unjustifiable trafficking of the rights of the people. As a lawyer he should and must know the exact position of Newfoundland under these various contracts with the Reid Nfld. Co. It is part of his duty as a responsible Minister controlling the administration of the laws of the country, and the protection of its interests, to see that the obligations

due to her by third parties are carried out to the letter and he to-night should be in the position to say

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I rise to a point of order. There is no quorum here. Is it the intention to abandon it, if it is you should put up a notice to that effect.

MR. FOX.—Is there any use in asking you to get a quorum. Haven't you a bell you could ring? Don't you think you should appoint a special committee to see if the people outside are dead. Certainly it is in keeping with the way affairs are conducted that when Legislation of a serious nature like this is being discussed, members of the Government should leave the House. You ask a stranger who is visiting the House for the first time what impression he carries away with him, and he will tell you it is a recognition of the indifference of the Government. In numerous instances that fact has been given out to me in conversation with people who have visited this House for the first time. You have no idea how you are writing your own epitaph as indifferent incompetent men. You sit there day after day and not one of you has the courage or public spirit to get up and express an opinion. I almost feel inclined to go down to the bookstore and buy a copybook with the deaf and dumb alphabet to see whether with the aid of that knowledge it would be possible to expect an expression of opinion from you. Ordinary language fails in this respect. Every attempt made so far has been a dismal failure. I wonder whether you know our language at all. You heard some years ago of the terrible scourge that swept over the Southern and Eastern countries, it was called the Sleeping Sickness. I am wondering to-night whether Newfoundland has not had a visitation of that pestilence, although I am devoutly thankful that the Bascillus

has taken care to work its ravages on the left of the Speaker.

This was the Bill on consideration of which we might well expect an individual expression of opinion. When the controlling factor in the Government sat on this side of the House we heard nothing but abuse of the Reids. We had the Minister of Works and other holy men rise up here like the Phoenix from the ashes and almost lift the roof with their fulminations against the all devouring octopus, the Reid Nfld. Co. You said we will put them in their places when we get into power and see that once and for all the yoke is lifted from the necks of the people of Newfoundland. Last year you raised no protest against the scheme with the Reids but arranged it behind closed doors last August after the House closed. It is not written that a single one of the Government rose and gave forth the views that he had given utterance to the year before. No, because the leader of the mannikins on the stage pulled the string and you bobbed up and he pulled it again and you sat down. It was not worth your while, you risked too much; politically your career was not worth a snap of my fingers if you attempted to step over the traces because he would say, "go no further." It is a pretty way you take notice of the desire to further the interests of Newfoundland. It is a sorry way indeed—you had your ears open last year but it is not recorded that you had your mouths though you heard the Opposition ask what you were going to do about the railway. They were concentrating on it to straighten out the tangle and to see that all information was brought here to this House and given to the people who sent you here on the policy of putting the Reids in their place. You allowed your leaders to close the House and in secret chamber to formulate a policy and

draw up a plan that was nothing less than the outraging of the best interests of the people. Last year the country was sold body and soul and you are as guilty to-night as if yourselves went down to the Treasury and took the 2½ millions, and this year because the party whip cracks you sit there and allow your leaders to put through the other contract that means a denial to the people of Newfoundland of the rights that are theirs and once more the people of the Colony have to dip in the box and feed what you one time termed the octopus which was strangling the life blood out of the people of Newfoundland. You are doing what is contrary to the wishes of the people and the promises given. They do not want you to monkey with this thing; they sent you here on a definite policy, as a leader pledged to put the Reids in their places and if the contract was unworkable to clear up the dirty mess which you were so glad to disclose to the eyes of the public through the press and platform when you were seeking votes, to start afresh and show the people when you got in power that all would be changed. You are not alone attempting this to-night, to put through this nefarious scheme but you have not common decency to get off your couches in the Speaker's room and come here and take your seats and at least by your presence continue the bluff that you have a duty to perform and are doing it. If you had a particle of shame or self respect you never would have stood for 4 months the laceration that almost daily you have suffered. You have not the courage of a tom-tit. Do you mean to say that any full blooded men would allow their shame to be exposed to the public as it has been done the last 4 months and take it lying down. You well merit the condemnation of the public for the way

in which you have outraged their interests and further you merit their contempt and there is nothing worse in this wide world than to have to realize you are held in contempt. If a question is asked as to whether or not the criticism levelled at you for your inaction and indifference to the public needs is right, and a justification is sought, there is no clearer evidence to be gained than the act of one of your own members who driven mad by the flagrant violation of the interests of the people who sent you here, no longer would sit with you but took his seat in the centre of the Chamber. You can never recover from the blow; that was the worst blow you could possibly receive—the action of Mr. Archibald a few weeks ago in shaking off the contamination you were spreading even to him. The manner in which he exposed your acts of omission and commission was greater than all the utterances of your antagonists since you took office because he was one of yourselves and said you were incompetent, indifferent and incapable. He attended your party meetings and had a knowledge of what you had done, was the best informed man to be asked for an opinion of you and he gave expression to that opinion, and not alone has he expressed himself disgusted with you but ridiculed you and held you up to the contempt of the people whom you outraged. As I listened to him hold you up, I asked myself what you were made of. He made you cut a sorry spectacle. Not even your own self-conceit can blind you to the fact that you are not only held in silent but in outspoken contempt. And now we are attending in a sense the last rites of the poor corpse known as the Treasury of Newfoundland; performing the last rites over her dead body, putting the finishing touch to the work of the past year. Last year you

lost no chance to squander the people's money, you fattened off them yourself and no wonder you sit and put up with what we have given you for 4 months; no wonder you soothe yourselves with the \$1,000 balm you gave yourselves last year, your ears were soothed by the sound of the dollars and the people can starve but you will see that yourselves do not. You can hear the cries of the suffering in every quarter but there is not a whimper from you and you may well close your ears as you have well protected yourselves. When the day of reckoning comes the people will remember, and I hope the dark days will be short—but the public memory is long and when you go back to them you will be asked to harken back to 1921 when you left the people to starve because your own stomach were filled. Therefore adieu to all hope for the country because to-night you are tying the millstone around her neck that will sink her. It not only means 1½ millions—bad though it be—but you give scope to spend perhaps 2 millions more on capital account. That contract will not be bought for 1½ millions—it will more likely be three. There is no hope of Newfoundland recuperating the loss she is going to suffer. I wonder how the other members can stand it. Sorry though your plight is, terrible though the spectacle is, the apathy displayed touches one to the quick—Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey

Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

I wonder where our manhood is gone and it must be decaying because what is happening now would not happen 25 years ago. Then if you had a Government indifferent to the people you would have a people who would see that if you did not look to their interests they would look to them

themselves. And in the days of our forefathers you could never steal 1½ millions as now. I do not know which is the worse, the insanity and incompetency of you or the apathy of the people whom you are daily outraging more and more. Now before I sit down I wish to refer to the matter of that road and it is well that it should be discussed in connection with the railway as it is merely a corollary because it is evidence you do not consult the House on anything you take up. We all know how you raided and pilfered the Treasury of this country last year; like thieves in the dark you went and took what you liked. And further you would do it again. A few days ago without the consent of this House you entered upon a constructive programme in the woods which will cost us some \$400,000 or \$500,000. You are spending \$5,000 a day on a road which starts nowhere and goes nowhere. You have 1500 or 2,000 men engaged on the road from Badger to Springdale and the only work they do is keeping the mosquitoes from biting them to death. It is no good to the country but is being put there because it is part and parcel of your political indifference. Now that gentleman—the late lamented in the words of the obituary—the Minister of Works, arose in his seat here recently and stated you had taken \$500,000 out of the public Treasury and devoted it to the purposes of the big body to the North against the interests of Newfoundland, but that one cent of it did not go within the walls of his district. And he was proud because he could state that fact. Where does he stand to-night when this \$400,000 is being carried out in his district. But there are men in my district who are without their breakfast. I have had them into my own office begging to give them something for God's sake. Their wives and lit-

tle ones are starving and the Government is doing nothing. There is work here to be done—necessary public work—and you need go no further than the Battery to see it. The road there is in such a condition that it is risking life and limb to pass over it in the dark. I know of doctors refusing to go over the Upper or Lower Battery roads in answer to sick calls at night owing to the danger of breaking a limb or losing their lives. And do you think the Government would spend even 100 cents to put a decent retaining wall there. No—they would not; because this is St. John's East and the people there did not lie down and let you put the yoke on them in 1918.

And, therefore, St. John's East tonight has to pay the price. While I occupy a seat in this House I intend to speak as I speak to-night, without fear, favor or affectation, and I upbraid the Government before the eyes of my people for the utter neglect manifested by them of the interests of those who sent them here as their representatives. How many of our people have been sent to Badger? Does his silent highness know? Would he vouchsafe a reply to the people of St. John's East or must we approach him in sackcloth and ashes and with bowed heads ask him in all humility to give us the information we desire? Will he grant me a reply to that question now? Mr. Chairman, I ask you to ask him and I pause for a reply.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Put your question on the Order Paper.

MR. FOX.—Now, mark you this, here we have the Minister of Public Works, the man in charge of the work, and when he is asked a simple question dealing with his department he says "put it on the Order Paper," but he did not stick so strictly to the rules and formalities when he en-

tered upon this work without the sanction of this Chamber. He commits this country, without question or hesitation, to the expenditure of half a million dollars but when he is asked how many men are employed from one district or another he wants the rules carried out before he will deign to answer. I shall put that question on the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman, and then I shall have a few more words to say to him on the subject. There is no justification whatever for that road, particularly when we realize the necessity that exists for the performance of public works in the City where, too, poverty is rampant. Walk down our streets and there you will see sights that would chill the blood in your veins; you will hear the piteous cries of starving adults and helpless children asking for bread.

The Government cannot help them but they can spend three or four hundred thousand dollars building a road thru the woods, and the Minister of Public Works assents to it not because it is necessary but because it is in Twillingate district and because his constituents will reap the benefit by it. It is but another instance of the North benefitting at the cost of the South. Last year the \$500,000 taken from the Treasury for the purchase of fish went North, the contracts for the cutting of railway ties went North and when the Standardization Act was put in force it was strictly carried out everywhere, but in the North. The East, West and South were pilloried, but not so the North and now we have one other instance of hundreds of thousands of dollars gone North. The soldiers had a saying, when a man passed from this earthly sphere to the world beyond, that he was "gone west", but our experience is that everything worth while has gone North. The thing is an outrage and even were you to take men from St. John's East to send them to Badger or anywhere else,

I should object to it because there is work to be done right here. These men should not be deported like criminals; they should not be torn from the bosoms of their families, and then you try to palliate your action by saying to us "men from your district have gone there." How dare you deny to them what is theirs by right when all you had to do was open your eyes which are blinded by prejudice and see the necessary work that you could have given these men in their own district. I shall have more to say on this subject on another occasion; at present I can only express my disapproval of the government's action in this matter and once more publicly voice my opposition to these Resolutions whose passing will render the more certain the ruin you have brought upon this once prosperous and smiling land.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I think I am nearly the last to address the House on this Bill before it is put to a vote. Yesterday morning the debate on the Resolutions closed and the vote on them was taken but just before the debate finished, we succeeded in bringing the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice to their feet. Altho' the discussion had lasted for forty-eight hours, no reply to the questions asked by us could be got till 3 o'clock yesterday morning. The Minister of Justice after a lot of pressure had been brought to bear, got up and mumbled a few words and then the Prime Minister got up and apologized in a low voice for bringing these Resolutions before the House. An apology was the right thing under the circumstances. They have seen fit to pass this in spite of the protests of the Opposition and of their better intelligence. These resolutions which are before us now in the form of a Bill will become law in a few minutes and then the railway will go on in the same old way after costing the Colony three or four million dollars. We

were asked by them for a way out and we gave it to them. The way in was by the voice of the people and when they asked us for a way out we told them to go back to the people as the quickest and most effective means of getting out of their difficulties, but blacklegs as they are, they continue to rob the people and sell their own birth-right for a mess of pottage. All this the Prime Minister is doing for place and pay and the Minister of Justice from whom better things were expected is in the same boat. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the strong man of the party, denounced the Reids on every possible occasion but now he is here as their saviour with his twelve shipped men or rather his twelve blacklegs. Now, the curtain will drop in a few moments and these men will vote for the Resolutions from the Prime Minister down because they are ordered to do so. You are here tonight as the betrayers of your country and here is the proof:

(reads Advocate)

That is the man who framed the Resolutions and whose duty it is to maintain law and order, a man who was looked up to as having something in him, but now we find that he was overestimated. The Prime Minister has told the House that he wired Sir Geo. Bury asking him if he could come to Newfoundland, but the truth is that he wrote or wired or sent to Sir W. D. Reid and consulted him as to whom he would send down here.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is not true.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Did he not give you a report covering two sheets of fools' cap and leave after four or five days taking a fee of \$8,000? Is that true?

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No, that is not true either.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Now, this is what the Advocate says about you.

(reads Advocate.)

Now, before we get away from this sub

ject, why did you interfere with the Reids at all; why after twenty years of their contract had run out did you touch it; why did you not tell them that if they could not run the railway to throw it up, and then come down here with a Railway Policy? Instead of that you take the Reids to your bosom and give them a million and a half of the people's money to spend for their own advantage and if you did not do it, the man who sits behind you (Mr. Coaker) did, the man who has put Newfoundland financially on the rocks and we are here to-night to ratify that and to give you this million and a half dollars, and the reason of it all is that the country is still asleep.

How long do you want? You are no further to-night to bring down any proposals than you were twenty months ago when you were elected to office, and twelve months from now the Colony will be in a worse mess, owing to your wild cat schemes and extravagant expenditures. The idea of men, supposed to have red blood in them, standing up to vote for this Bill. The thing the Prime Minister has in the back of his head is Canada. But what does he care about the future of Newfoundland. Apart from the few law books that he has, he has no stake in this country. You stated that long ago. Your ambition was to have a position in Canada, and nothing less than the Prime Ministership, Mr. Chairman.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Never.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—You pulled the wires with W. D. Reid and then Sir George Bury was sent down here to advise you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is not so.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—It is so. If it is not so, why don't you bring down the correspondence that went on between yourself and Sir George Bury or between somebody in Montreal and Sir George Bury? You must

have some correspondence so bring it down and prove that I am wrong.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There was nobody in Montreal corresponding with Sir George Bury about railroad matters in Newfoundland.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—W. D. Reid is blamed for it, and he is known to be a close friend of Sir George Bury's. The story is well known to almost everybody. Now this is all another mares' nest and you are calling it off for a reason and that reason will come within the next eighteen months. How are you going to carry on the finances of the Colony? You have not told this House how you are going to get the interest to be paid to the share-holders of the country and to the debenture holders up to the 30th of December next. You have not given particulars as to what you have done with that six million dollar loan. If the revenue is going to continue falling behind, where do you expect to land? You are looking for a revenue of over 8 millions for next year and you are not going to collect more than 4. Neither you or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have made any attempt to explain and what surprises me is that the country is standing for it. The crime is still worse for Mr. Coaker, who paralyzed the trade and commerce of the country, than it is for you. Forty eight hours ago the Prime Minister came in and tried to excuse Mr. Coaker, the man who destroyed the fisheries of this country last year, and the only thing he said on his behalf was to have pity on him as he was physically broken down. These are not my words, they are the words of the Prime Minister. But before he broke down, he broke the country down financially and to-night he has not a word in his cheek. Mr. Coaker destroyed the country; destroyed Penny of Ramea; destroyed Harris of

Grand Bank; destroyed Moulton of Burgeo and he destroyed everything and everybody he could lay his hands on; but he took good care to sell his own fish under false pretences. Now these are frightful statement to make and you know Mr. Chairman that I would not be allowed to make them, nor would I attempt to make them, if they were not true. Look at the plight the country is in tonight, and mes coming here and voting with their mouths closed at the crack of a whip. I would rather beg my bread from door to door before I would do such a thing.

What a lovely exhibition we were treated to this afternoon when Mr. Walsh, the member for Placentia, appealed on behalf of his district for road work for some four or five hundred fishermen. He could not get any definite answer from the Prime Minister. Mr. Walsh continued speaking and threatened to hold up the House. What happened? Mr. Coaker wanted to close off the debate to enable him to go to Port Union, and he went outside this Chamber in an ante-room, wrote a note, got it witnessed by Mr. Hibbs and sent it in to Mr. Walsh saying in effect that he would give him the money if he would stop talking. Well then we call this a House of Assembly, the people's House, and we call the leader of this House, Prime Minister. It was the Prime Minister's duty there and then to dismiss Mr. Coaker, if he had the pluck to do it. How dare he tell a man that he would square him, if he would stop speaking, and how dare he attempt to close off debate? I wonder will the Prime Minister get up in his place tonight and justify such conduct. The story told by Mr. Archibald to this House of the actions of the present government is the best illustration of what is going on. We are asking question day after day, endeavouring to get information that is necessary for the country to

know. All we get from the Prime Minister are quibbling replies. Take the "President Coaker's" cargo of fish, now rotten somewhere in the Mediterranean. It was purchased by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on his own account, but when he found that he could not make money on it he put it over on the government. Then again take the cargo of salt that was brought here by the merchants among whom was Mr. Coaker. When he found that that was going wrong also he put that over on the Government and told the Deputy Minister of Finance to make out a cheque for the amount with the result that the Colony is losing to-day three or four dollars a hoghead on it. I asked for an enquiry and Mr. Coaker wrote you Mr. Prime Minister to appoint a commission of enquiry, but you did not do it yet because you were afraid of the disclosures that were going to be made. If I had the time to-night I would tell the story of the Woodford Affidavit scandal, which is now ancient history, that you took a prominent part in, and I am sorry to say that if His Excellency the Governor knew his business he would dismiss you and you would not be occupying the Prime Minister's chair in this House to-night. I say that about the Governor, it is hard to say, but too true. If it was Governor Murray or any other Governor that lived at Government House you would get your walking ticket pretty quick. How did yourself and another in the Upper House crucify Mr. Woodford? And when the enquiry was over the commission gave you a Scottish verdict and you stood for it all. During your twenty months of office scandal has succeeded scandal and disgrace succeeded disgrace. Take the telegraph scandal, for instance, in which Newfoundland is being robbed of a quarter million dollars. Then again look at the amount you have lost on pit

props for the purpose of giving poor relief and last but by no means least the taking of the five hundred thousand dollars from the public Treasury of this colony to buy codfish. This latter scandal was committed by Mr. Coaker during the absence from this country of the Prime Minister. This money was used by Mr. Coaker to purchase fish from his friends in the North and the men who did not vote for him he refused to buy fish from. As Mr. Archibald said in his speech, the men in the western districts have their fish on hand yet, and then they call that Responsible Government. Another scandal on similar principle is being perpetrated in the North to-night. To keep fifteen hundred men who apparently had no supplies for the fishery, from howling, the government saw they were surrounded, and they took another million dollars from the Treasury and packed the men in the woods to work for \$2.50 a day at roads to be eaten by flies? Are you going to stand for that Mr. Small? I heard the story in this House the other day as to what was happening in your district Mr. Small.

MR. SMALL—That is wrong, and I hope to contradict it in a day or two.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—It may be in part, but it came through Dr. Grenfell, the man who one of your chiefs sent to Washington to represent Newfoundland, and he gave that story to the American people.

MR. SMALL—I hope to contradict that story.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Its all contradictions we hear from you as to what you are going to do, but can you point out a single instance where we have failed to prove any statements that the Opposition made? prove how the money was taken from the Banks to purchase fish that is now rotten on the other side of the water.

We are down here now with our last act, and we will close the doors of

this House within a few days. An attempt was made here by the Prime Minister two months ago to close this House, and we were told that we had to submit to suspended rules weeks ago. This railway deal was not looked upon as an important matter at all then. The government were looking forward to handle the railway problem by Minute of Council, and give 1½ million dollars to the Reid Newfoundland Company when this House would be closed; also to allow the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister to go to England on a jaunt. As a matter of fact the Minister practically told us that he was going across on the Labrador Boundary question again. Now I am not troubling about the Labrador Boundary; what is puzzling me is what is going to happen to Newfoundland. The reason we were asked to suspend the rules of this House two months ago is because men were coming here from the city and the outports destitute because they had no supplies for the fishery. The Prime Minister wanted to be clear of such annoyance and he wanted to get away to the States or England. We, the Opposition, insisted that this House would not and did not close until we are satisfied. Here we are to-night with not a cent in the chest, and, despite the fact that the Surtax, Super Tax and Sales Tax are enforced, the Custom House dropped \$100,000 within the past two weeks. Now where are you going to get off on the Profits and Income taxes. Last year you got a quarter of a million dollars on the Profits Tax. This year you were afraid to handle those who are making profits. A Profits Tax Act was on the Statute Book and last year you were afraid to get after the men who made excessive profits. You have not stirred hand or foot to collect that money.

Take the Prohibition Bill—another joke. Why you can go down in the landwash any other morning and find

a keg of rum floating ashore. But and last year you were afraid to get those who are naming profits. A Pro- the limit has been reached in this country as far as smuggling is concerned. There were six motor cars imported into this country recently by a friend of the present government. No duty was paid on them, although they were sold as if duty was paid on them. That money is still owed the Government and on the back of that there is between \$250,000 and \$300,000 duty owed. That amount is in a scrap of paper which was handed to the Manager of the Bank of Montreal and is placed to the credit of current exchequer account. It is all unpaid, and it is money due to the taxpayers of this colony. You may get a proportionate part of it, but I doubt that you will get any more than \$50,000 of it. Now the men who owe this money are not the class of men who smuggle rum, tobacco and cigarettes. These are the men who supported the present Prime Minister and who walk Water Street with walking sticks and fancy eye glasses. Apart from the falling off of the revenue for the past twelve months, the gentlemen on the other side of the House spent ten millions of dollars with nothing to show for it. Here we are to-night with a public debt of 51 millions of dollars for a population of 250,000 and we are asked to vote away another million and a half. Newfoundland to-night is on the verge of bankruptcy and there is not a man on the other side of the House to offer up a prayer for her. I think the crowd in the government is what termed them a week ago—a crowd of political hypocrites of the worst kind—and there is no human being I have more contempt for than for a hypocrite, and Mr. Jennings, the Minister of Public Works, is one of them. He is the man who gave out the eight thousand dollars for snow shovelling in Hr. Main during the Bye-election.

He did everything that was required to be done at the beck and call of the Prime Minister. This is the man who would commit suicide rather than give a man booze. Still he spent eight thousand dollars belonging to the people of this country. Don't squirm; the kinks are getting in you know. By the time the Bill is before the House and the people have time to realise what you have done, it will be a very easy matter to straighten you out. You were the one to hold up your hands in holy horror, because some district got \$500 from special grant or another; yet tonight you are not prepared to get up and give an answer for the thousands that you are spending in your district, an answer that your position requires of you.

It is only a matter of time before you go to the wall. You have to go there and you can see it as well as I can. Before sitting down I would like to ask the Prime Minister to-night before we go into Supply and Ways and Means to explain the road policy to us. You have not told us yet why the Government undertook this work, and where we are to get the money for this work. It is not out of the general revenue. It must be out of the Loan. You have not told us how many people you are going to relieve nor how long the work is going to go on. Mr. Jennings has told us it will cost five thousand dollars a day and the number of unemployed will be greater each day. As you know, Bell Island has closed down. Tell us how much money you are going to spend on labour in this Colony. The American Fishery is gone. A year and a half ago Herring was worth five dollars a barrel, to-day it is worth one dollar and seventy-five cents. Haddock that was a year and a half ago worth ten dollars a quintal is now going to farms in the country for one dollar a cartload. What have you to say to that Mr.

Coaker? You allowed that American market to go. I told you it was gone and then you sent a message to Sir Edgar Bowring that you should have sent four months ago. Where are we going to get our revenue. You have not told us still you come in here and sit down and say that you are going to pass this Bill. You are going to reduce the machinist's pay on that road, and curtail the amount of the employees. What are you going to do with them. They cannot go to Sydney or the United States. All these things have to be answered. I promised not to be long, but the temptation is so great I cannot resist it. All I have said was in earnestness. It is our position as I see it to-night, and you men are going to vote one and a half million dollars which will have to come out of the pockets of the working people of this country to reduce their earning power and increase their taxes forty per cent.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I am only here a short time and would ask you to tell me please on what section are we speaking.

MR. HIGGINS.—No. 7.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Thank you. I wish to move an amendment which will take the form of a new section that a Committee of five be appointed to supervise the expenditure of that money in the operation of the railway that no money be paid except subject to the approval of that committee. My reason for that amendment is this that it means too much that this idea of voting a million and a half dollars when I say voting I mean that we guarantee to pay all the expenses up to a million and a half, and the Reid Nfld. Co. will take good care to see that they will not go above that, consequently sir, as we are to pay this money I think that the least we should do in the interest of the people is to appoint a Committee of this House of five members who shall say

whether the bills presented by the Company are reasonable or not, and who will refuse to pay them if they are not reasonable. That is not a big think to ask but it is something which I am sure members on both sides of the House will agree to and something that will give the people of the country reason to believe that we are working in their interest. Why should we hand the Reid Nfld. Co. this money to run the railroad. We have no detail estimated expenditure before us to know what we may expect as the cost of coal, wages, etc., we don't even know the mileage they intend to operate. We should have the protection to see that the Reids use that money in a legitimate manner. As this Bill stands before us to-day it means only this that we in the House vote one and a half million dollars which the Reids can spend in any way they please. They can spend it in six months and then close down the road and the people have no redress. I submit in all sincerity that this is not good enough. I am not suggesting that the Government should operate the railway or that we should unduly interfere with the Reids in their operation of it, but I am suggesting that a check be put upon the expenditure, so that no member on either side will be able to come in here and say, the records of the Reid Co. are fakes, let us know the truth about the operation of the railway. I don't think that is unreasonable, I think it is the least that the people of the country deserve, when we come here with no mandate from the people last year we were foolish enough as a Government to run this road, this year we make the best of our mistake, and we will show our sincerity in appointing this Committee. With regard to the Bill itself we know from the vote on the Resolutions what the intention of the Government is and we know it is going

through but I am sure that many of the Government members will agree with me that this amendment is reasonable. In moving this Amendment I don't move it for any purpose of obstruction, I move it as the only thing I can think of as an improvement to the bill now before the House. I don't think that the adding of another section, No. 8 to this Bill will be objectionable to the contractors operating the railway, I don't think it is too much to ask the House, and I don't intend at this stage to speak at any length. My opinion of the Resolutions I gave here a couple of days ago. I said then I did not believe that the Government did their duty when they knew twelve months ago that this proposition was to be put up to them. I am of the same opinion yet, and while I don't intend to delay the passage of this bill at the present stage, I wish to move that a Committee of five be appointed to supervise the expenditure of moneys in the operation of the railroad, no bills to be paid except approved of by that Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, the Amendment moved by Mr. MacDonnell is one that pleases me very much. It was the intention of the Administration to make an effort on the same lines as suggested by that hon. member. It will be remembered that early in the session I gave notice of a motion for the appointment of a Committee to consider the railroad position my idea being that the matter might be considered in a broader sense than perhaps it could be by the Government because of my own personal antagonism to the Reid Nfld. Co., which is so well known. Consequently if Mr. MacDonnell would submit the wording of the Amendment in writing, (being a lawyer, I am naturally careful in that respect, and he as a prospective one will ap-

prelate that position) I would be prepared to second the Amendment, and I think that the Committee should have not alone right to supervise the expenditure of money but that they should have power to examine into past records, and see the situation as it has been developing the past few years. I think this would be of benefit to the people of the country. As it will take some little time to work out the wording of the Amendment I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past Midnight

Saturday, July 23rd, 1921

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Hon. the Minister of Justice on behalf of the Select Committee presented the following reports—

The Select Committee on the Bill for the Ratification of the Contract with PJulp and Paper Corporation of America, beg to report that they recommend the passage of the Bill with the following amendments:—

That the following be added as Section 7 of the Schedule A:—

7. The Government shall not be liable for any loss or damage which may be claimed or sustained by reason of any defect in title to the areas herein referred to:

That section 7 of the Schedule A be stricken out.

That the following be added to Schedule A as Section 8:—

8. The Government shall give to the Company a free grant of all minerals with the exception of oil, petroleum and other oleiferous products in and upon any part or parts of the area leased to the Company's provided however.

(1) That application (with proper surveys) for such minerals shall have been made within five years from the first day of January 1922 and

(2) That the total of such mineral area or areas so granted shall not exceed one hundred square miles in extent.

That the remaining Sections of Schedule A be renumbered.

(Sgd.) W. R. WARREN,
W. F. COAKER,
M. S. SULLIVAN.
S. SAMSON.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of a Contract with Pulp and Paper Corporation of America" be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon, next the 25th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.



MONDAY, July 25th, 1921.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Speaker. With your permission, Sir, may I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has been in receipt of a petition from King's Cove, signed by Mr. William Costello, Chairman, and Mr. Eli Curtis, Secretary, on behalf

of some hundreds of people of that place asking for relief from the Government for those who are out of employment?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I received a petition to-day.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I would like to know if you are going to present it to this House? I might say that I am in receipt of a copy of the petition and so that I will have carried out my end of the contract I will now read it to the House.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at a Public meeting held at King's Cove last night, July 18th, 1921.

To the Honourable the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened. May it please your Honourable House.

WHEREAS the unemployed of King's Cove, confronted by the most serious circumstances ever known in the history of the settlement, viz:— that of being unable to engage in actual remunerative employment, either at home or abroad; or of being able to hope for sufficient maintenance for ourselves and families from the present fishery;

AND WHEREAS the only work of a public or Government nature that we have shared in this season has been in the form of some repairs to the Coastal Wharf, an expenditure of \$1500.00;

AND WHEREAS we have found this expenditure to be so inadequate as to scarcely maintain us during the period employed;

AND WHEREAS we have now reached the stage where it behoves us to make public representation of our position, and to request that due recognition of our condition be taken:—

BE IT RESOLVED that we ask your Honourable House:—

1. To immediately and seriously consider our case.
2. That we be given at home in the

way of Public Works, on a Road connecting us with the Railway, a necessity of the most vital importance, not alone to the settlement of King's Cove, but to the surrounding places as well as a necessity that has become so apparent since the inception of the branch railway, as to merit the support and promise of fulfilment by both contesting political parties, prior to the last General Election.

3. That failing anything of a public expenditure along these lines, we be registered as unemployed, and that in the event of work, already started or starting elsewhere, that we be notified of such work and fares advanced through the Relieving Officer of this section to such place of employment.
4. That in making this representation, we are backed by four hundred unemployed, embracing that section of the District from Western Plate Cove to Black Head Bay and justify ourselves because of,
 - (a) Our present destitution.
 - (b) Other Settlements similarly situated have to our personal knowledge been considered and their unemployed placed at work.
 - (c) We have delayed public action until now, when we have realized that our only hope of being able to make provision for the coming Fall and Winter—the shore fishery—is destined to be a failure.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of these resolutions be forwarded the Prime Minister, Sir R. A. Squires; The Hon. W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and the Hon. the leader of the Opposition, Sir M. P. Cashin, for presentation to your Honourable House.

Signed for and on behalf of the unemployed of King's Cove.

WILLIAM COSTELLO, Chairman
 ELI CURTIS, Secretary,
 J. SCULLY, P.P.,
 S. A. DAWSON, Incumbent.
 E. C. BROWN,
 M. G. MULLOWNEY,
 JOHN G. HART,
 WILSON BROWN,
 R. LAWTON, Customs Officer.

Now I would like to know from the Prime Minister and in particular from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who represents that constituency, what is being done in this matter? Have they taken any notice of the petition or taken any steps towards securing employment for those men? Are they to be sent to the place we hear so much about here—"Badger" or is it the intention to find some other source of employment for these men? The principal season for trap fishing has passed so far as King's Cove or any other part of Bonavista Bay are concerned, and I take it that the reason those people are petitioning this House in the last week of July is that they are looking forward to the approaching winter for which they want to make provision, and, consequently, are now asking for Government work so as to be able to provide sufficient food for their families. I would like to know what steps, if any, are being taken to relieve those men?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker. In regard to the petition presented by the Hon. leader of the Opposition. I may say that a copy of it came to me at noon today and that was the first I heard of the matter. There will be a number of these men sent to Badger and other places up the country road building and a batch of men will go out this week. The fishery is not over in Bonavista Bay yet, and will not be for another month. I do not like the idea of taking men away from the

fishery. The men who are not engaged fishing at present will be sent to work on the roads now and when the fishermen finish the voyage in September they will be put to work.

MR. SULLIVAN—I would like to ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is correct that a number of men, train hands, have been called to town to report for their dismissal; also if it is correct that a number of train men were dismissed on Saturday last?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have heard nothing about it.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have no connection with the railway now.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Colonial Secretary if it is the intention of the Government to have the decennial census taken this year, and if so why has no provision been made for this in the estimates, and why have the enumerators to be appointed.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The preliminary work for the taking of the Census this Autumn has commenced and on page 15 of the Estimates will be found a vote for \$10,000 to cover same. With regard to the enumerating work, I may say that this is a matter that is always handled by the Deputy Colonial Secretary.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what progress, if any, has been made up to date in the disposal of the balance of the stock of 40,000 quintals of cod fish purchased during last November on account of the Government, and if any sales have been made to table a statement giving the quantity, the price, and what the net financial return to the Colony will be from the same. Also, if no sales have been made, when he expects to dispose of the fish and at what figure.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—The answer to that question is being prepared and I will probab-

ly have the information during the afternoon.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I take it that there is nothing on record in your office to enable you to give any kind of a complete answer in writing. Would you be able this afternoon to answer my question verbally.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I am quite willing to give the reply verbally, but I am also prepared to give it in writing. Out of the thirty-four thousand and odd quintals purchased there are about eleven thousand at Barr's premises, and that amount will be shipped to Greece the latter part of August, as it will not be required in Greece before the 15th of September. It will not go as new fish, but as last year's fish. At present this fish is in splendid condition. Over eight thousand quintals of that 34,000 went in the "June" and is now being discharged in Malaga. About two thousand qtls. of the "President Coaker's" cargo is now in cold storage in Genoa. The "Wakely" load has been disposed of and we made a small shipment to Liverpool yielding a remittance of something like \$50,000. I have a statement in my office to show you in detail how much per quintal all that fish realized. Roughly, these are the particulars. The eleven thousand quintals that will leave here next month will go by steamer.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government proposes to take any steps during the current year to carry out the promises in his Manifesto that the Government would erect working men's houses in the city of St. John's, and if so to what extent will this work be undertaken and when will it be proceeded with.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There is no vote in the Estimates for this purpose.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education if it was an

unconscious oversight or a deliberate evasion on his part, that in replying to my question regarding educational inspection, he stated yesterday that "no protests had been received by his Department from the representatives of certain denominations" whereas any question was "if protests had been received by himself, his department, or any officials thereof; "and if he will give a full answer to the question to-morrow.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—There has been no intention on my part to evade the question. There has been no protests received by myself nor by any officials of the department. There has been one letter received by an official of the department, but I am not at liberty to place that letter on the table of the House, as I understand that the letter was shown to me in confidence. The gentleman who showed it to me is now out of town. On his return I will discuss the matter with him if I have his permission I will table it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Can you tell us the substance of it?

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—No to do so, would be a breach of confidence.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Who has the letter?

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION—One of the Superintendents.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of the House.

1. The original stevedores' bills for the discharging of the salt cargo of the S.S. "Henrik Lund."

2. The original bill for the shedding and trimming of the same cargo; and

3. what storage charge is being paid the Furness Withy Co. Ltd. for same.

MIN. OF SHIPPING—I beg to table the information.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Min. of Marine and Fisheries, in his capa-

city of Chairman of the Railway Commission of last year, if Mr. Bert Hayward, brother-in-law of Mr. Collishaw sold three trucks to the Commission for work at the coal mining at South Branch, if these trucks were admitted duty free or did they pay duty, if they were admitted duty free, is the Minister satisfied that the price paid for them was fair and reasonable, was the procuring of these trucks put to tender, and if so, who were invited to tender and what were their offers, and if not why were no tenders asked; if the sale of these trucks was negotiated between the Minister and Mr. Collishaw, and if not by whom, what was the amount paid Mr. Hayward for the said trucks and for any other expense in connection with them and if Mr. Collishaw received any commission on the sale of these trucks; and to table the bills and other documents respecting the said trucks.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table that information.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to appoint the unemployed Trade Commissioners to be members of the Municipal Council, as it is reported that nobody else can be induced to accept seats thereon, and if Mr. John M. Devine is to be appointed Chairman.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The answer is in the negative. I may say with regard to the last part of your question that the Executive Council has no power to appoint a Chairman, under the Act. The Commission has to appoint their own Chairman.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the returns for the building the Mackinson Bridge for which the amount of \$500 00 was allocated last fall and built by the Board of the Goulds.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—On enquiry I find that the returns are not in. The law for the sending in of returns is to the effect that returns must come in within twelve months, so I suppose that folks are taking advantage of this wide scope. However, I have instructed the officials of the department to write for them, and as soon as they are received I will table them.

MR. J. R. MacDONNELL asked the Min. of Marine and Fisheries why Albert Morgan, Inspector of Pickled Fish and Fish Oils, and Supervisor of Wardens and Lobster Propagation; was discharged from office; how long has he been in the employ of the government; did he hold office under commission; if so to lay on the table of the House a copy of commissions; under whose authority was he dismissed and when; was it under order in Council, if so to lay on the table of the House a copy of the minute in Council relative there to, together with all correspondence and other memoranda dealing with this matter.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

MR. FOX asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House statement showing.

(1) total number of men employed on road construction work between Badger and Springdale;

(2) Under what authority was the work undertaken,

(3) When was it started; how long will it take to complete?

(4) What rate of wages per day per man is paid on the said work; what is the daily expenditure on that account; and what is the total expenditure to date?

(5) Have there been any men sent on that work from St. John's East; if so how many; from what place in the said district showing the number of men from each place.

(6) Was any allowance made these men on account (a) travelling expen-

ses (b) board; and if so in what amount.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I may say that some of this information is difficult to get, but I will table all I can get as soon as I receive it. With regard to that part of the question dealing with the number of men from St. John's East. That information would be in possession of Major Butler who is registering the men. However, I will have whatever information that is available for to-morrow.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Under what authority was the work undertaken?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The Governor-in-Council.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Will you table a copy of the Minutes?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

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 "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the Report, the House divided when there appeared in its favour,

Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(18).

end against it;

Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosble, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Archibald—(14).

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of the Contract with the Pulp and Paper Corporations of America."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion of the Minister of Justice, and by unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of the Contract with Pulp and Paper Corporations of America" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Importation and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and recommended that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows—Hon. Mr. Coaker, Mr. Cave, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins.

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 Election Act—1913."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—During the second reading of this Bill (A Bill respecting the Election Act) I explained that it was a measure bordering along the lines of the English Act with regard to women of twenty-five years of age and over having the right to vote at the next general election. The Bill as originally printed did not contain the provision as this Bill would go into effect at the next general election. This Bill should have had that provision but it appears that the re-print copy does not contain it either.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I take it that this Bill is a party measure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No it is not. I did not anticipate that party lines would be drawn. I think there are members on both sides of the House who will vote for and vote against it.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—In all sincerity I think this House ought not to have any hesitation about giving the right to vote to women. I do not agree with regard to the difference in age. Even in England all things they do are not quite correct. The women

at twenty-one years of age are just as intelligent as the men at the same age. We could not even get the Prohibition measure carried unless the women helped. In many other cases their help is indispensable and these are the people who are asking for the right to vote. Why should they not have the right of representation in this House? They can only say when they are in here I will or will not vote. It is an insult to turn this matter. It is only a minute ago I saw a photo of a man and a woman going to Washington arm in arm. Why not have that here? I am going to vote for this and I want the age twenty-one years. The W.P.A. and War Memorial and many other charitable works have been successfully carried on by the good ladies and it is only just and honorable that they be given the vote. Mr. Target your wife and mine will vote the same way. Pardon me Mr. Foote and Dr. Barnes I was just going to mention your names but I assume you are not interested. But I am sure Mr. Warren, the Attorney General and Mr. Halfyard are going to vote for it. Surely we are so big that we cannot be like Canada and the United States. Now I would like to see any hon. member on the other side get up and say why we should not vote for this Bill. And even further they should have the right of representation here. It is an insult to any man who has a daughter or a wife to turn down this matter. Mr. Attorney General are you going to vote for this?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I did not say that I would vote for this Bill at this session.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You have a bad memory. You may vote against the Prime Minister.

MR. SAMSON.—There is something wrong.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I agree. I congratulate you Mr. Prime Minister.

This is the first time you and I will vote unanimously.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—You and I are married men.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I really think this ought to be a Government measure. This would be an unhappy place if the women were not here. I am afraid the members on the both sides of the House are taking this matter as a joke. I do believe that the women would be an asset to this House. Mr. Cave is another cut lad. If I were a widower I would vote for it.

MR. TARGETT.—There is one thing about this which is rather serious and that is the fact that the outport districts have not had much to say about this. I am told that the ladies out there do not want a vote but very few of them have told me that. I am not so sure whether they do or do not. However I am going to have the courage of my convictions and I am going to vote for the ladies. But for them we would not be here. Nothing is done but we must have the help of the good ladies. The ladies took a part when the other morning we did not go home until after four.

With regard to the Outport women that is the only obstacle. Petitions were sent out but the majority of the ladies did not know anything about them. The ladies worked hard during the War and in some cases suffered mentally much more than the men.

MR. HIGGINS.—Following the lines suggested that this is not a party measure I would like to make the position clear. In the first place the Prime Minister said this is not a party measure. That being the case the members shall have to vote each for himself. So far as I am concerned I propose voting for the Bill. I have been consistent all along. I have dealt with it along the lines that the real question was why we should vote against the Bill.

However, a second position has been raised by Mr. Targett—the desires of the districts. It is confined largely to St. John's and it might be accused of coming to a decision on the grounds of representation. Why I state my own position is because I do not like the way the Bill is being treated—we are now in the dog days and nobody seems to be much interested. This ought not be handled in a haphazard way, and I appreciate the position the hon. members find themselves in—but I think this Bill should be given mature consideration before being dealt with. Set it for to-morrow, to-day the House is not half constituted; Mr. Fox, a strong exponent of the measure is not here and I do not think it fair to go on. I have no reason to know the views of other members, but I do not think it would be just in view of the large number of signatures to the petition. The point I make is as to the voting on the measure and I think we should have a fully constituted House to do that—we owe it as a courtesy to the ladies if for no other reason. To-day we got two surprises—we had no idea of these two Bills being on the Order Paper and I do not think any hon. members would like to be absent on this vote and create the impression that he was shirking. I thought it would be a party measure—and if so it would go through—but we find now that it is not and that is why you ought to give due notice of it. In justice to the ladies I suggest that to the consideration of the Hon. Prime Minister.

MR. BENNETT.—I join, Mr. Chairman, with Mr. Higgins in the idea of giving time for the consideration of this Bill. I do not think the Hon. Prime Minister or his Ministers have kept faith in the matter. You promised to bring in a Government measure when the members would be called to vote on it. We are here to-day

as on every other afternoon of the session with the members of the Executive keeping their mouths shut on one of the most important matters before the House. This is a big constitutional question—not flapdoodle. It will affect the whole destiny of Newfoundland. I believe the ladies are sincere in taking this up and are trying to do something that will rebound to their credit and to that of Newfoundland, and it is the duty of all here to express their opinions manfully and properly. I never voted for any measure fearfully but used my intelligence and never feared to rise and express my views. We come in here now and I know whereof we affirm—the Hon. Prime Minister promise to bring in a party measure in the first instance, and I think the Minister of Works was present at the time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Government is supporting the measure but party lines are not drawn.

MR. BENNETT.—If that be so it is useless for us to argue.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We want to get your opinions.

MR. BENNETT.—Will that effect you—if so it will be the first time this session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We made amendments for you this evening on another bill.

MR. BENNETT.—That was only a technical point—this is whether the constituents who sent us here will be satisfied for us to take such steps as will materially alter the franchise of the country. It is useless for us to take this up without giving consideration to its important merits. Though it has been on the Order Paper it has been passed over this month, but the point I want to make is this—it does not behove the Opposition to pronounce on this any more than on any other measure. By introducing it the Hon. Prime Minister gives it his im-

primatur and why do not the Hon. Minister of Education or the Hon. Mr. Foote or others pronounce themselves for or against it. To put the onus on the Opposition is not fair or just. The main principles of the Bill I am in favor of, but it does not go far enough. We hear a lot of heroics about what the women have done in the war, etc., but on one hand we offer them something and on the other we take it back. If a woman has the right to vote at all she has the right to vote for a woman. What right have we to insult here and tell her she can do so and so but has no right to be a representative. I am sincere on this point and believe that half measures are no good. I only speak for St. John's—the other districts are not so pronounced for their members to feel so enthusiastic over the subject as I do, and unfortunately the women all over the country have not the opportunity to give their opinions as they have here. In remote parts of the Island it is difficult to get up a campaign where the women can voice their opinions, where you have to go from door to door, and in these far flung places it takes time and money as the outport members know, because when they enter upon their canvass every four years it takes them weeks and weeks to see their constituents. Whether the House in its wisdom will decide to give the vote I do not know, but I want to amend the Bill so as to have them not only vote but be represented here. I believe they should have the whole franchise. I agree with making the age 25 years—perhaps the safeguard would be desirable—but many at 21 are as smart as at 25 as we all know from their work in the offices and elsewhere and are well able to distinguish right from wrong in going to the polls to give their views on any matters. On general principle I do not object to the

age being 25 years as in some places it is 30, but if they ask for the vote they should get it and if sufficient representation has not been made to the members on the matter, they have had time enough since it has been on the Order Paper over a month, to have got in touch with the main centres of their districts and to have found out if they are to vote for it or not. It is a measure that will change the constitution of this House considerably; it may change the religious representation and other things also as the voting power will be increased 75 to 80 per cent. by this Bill. The machinery in connection with elections will have to be increased enormously and the work of the candidates also. I say it advisedly, we should have time to give this full consideration and decide if we will go the whole hog now or otherwise, and if the women do come in here—well, they will do badly if they are not better than some who are here now. I join with Mr. Higgins in asking that a day or two be given so that this measure may be well considered.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I understand it is not a Government measure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I anticipate many of the Opposition will be supporting the Bill and others be against it.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—You are only talking nonsense and shirking your promises to the ladies.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—I would like Mr. Chairman, to make one or two observations on the Bill before the House and to express myself on this important measure. Whenever I have been in conversation with anyone on this matter I have given it my unqualified support and whether it is a party measure or not I am in favor of it. I cannot see why it should be deferred as I think the House is well represented now and

you have only to ring the bells and the members will come in. What it should be deferred for I do not know and surely all have made up their minds as to how they will vote.

MR. BENNETT.—Will you vote for the women to have representation?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—I will vote for the Bill as it is. I do not like to see it sidetracked in any way and it is an insult to all to delay it. The ladies are just as qualified as the men, generally speaking, to vote for representatives, and I think it is only right to adopt the principle and put it to a vote to-day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am prepared to take the vote but as my hon. friend Mr. Higgins has referred to the absence of Mr. Fox, a strong supporter of the measure, I am agreeable to deferring it for a day or two.

MR. HIGGINS.—I would like the Hon. Minister of Posts to understand that we have no desire to delay the handling of the Bill; but the best proof that the whole thing has not been considered is found in the suggestions made just now, such as the question of representation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am not supporting the matter of members or otherwise, but the Bill as it is now.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I will introduce an amendment to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—All right and I now move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On 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 on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.



TUESDAY, July 26th.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that Mr. John M. Devine, at that time Trade Commissioner in New York, sent letters to business men and others here setting out that he was engaged in endeavouring to promote the import of cod tongues from this Colony to the United States and claimed that he ought to be retained in his position because of this, and if the Government does not consider this an addition to various "cods" that have already been perpetrated on this Colony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am not aware that Mr. Devine had sent letters to people stating that he was so engaged nor have I heard of any being sent.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his attention has been called to statements made in the public newspapers last week that haddock is now unsaleable as an article of food and is being disposed of for fertilizing purposes at \$1.00 a load, and if he or his Department is going to take any steps to remedy this condition and also to ask him if, in face of his claim in the past that the price of fish is what Coaker makes it, he will initiate measures to put the price of haddock up to \$10.00 a quintal as it was two years ago, and if not, why not.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the reply.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the Customs receipts at St. John's for the week ending Saturday last and for the corresponding weeks in 1920, and 1919; and also a statement of the total Customs Revenue for St. John's from July 1st up to Saturday last in this year, and for the corresponding period in the past two years.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table the reply to that question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is correct that a Minute of Council has been adopted by the Government to the effect that Dr. Rendell is not to take into the Sanitarium on Topsail Road, more than 70 or some such number of patients, and that there is a large waiting list of patients who cannot be accommodated until patients either die or are discharged so as to reduce the number below this figure; and if so to lay on the Table of the House copy of the said Order-in-Council.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Mr. Speaker,

with reference to that second question of Sir Michael Cashin I would like to know if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are aware that there is an enormous amount of saleable fish that could be used for fish next winter being carted away from the Cold Storage Plant to be used as a fertilizer on the farms around the city.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Coaker's reply to my question states as follows: (Reads reply.)

Is that your position to-day Sir? I pointed out to the House the other day that Haddock which we sold last year for ten dollars a quintal is now being sold for one dollar and used as a fertilizer on the farms, and no attempt is being made to handle the situation. I happened to be out in the country yesterday after the House closed, and at Petty Hr. Station there were three cartloads of fish that was in as good condition up to the time it left the Cold Storage Plant yesterday as it was last year, quite a palatable article of food, and it was a pitiful thing yesterday to see that fish going to the farms. Something should be done in this matter. There are a million and a half or two million pounds of fish being destroyed. Will it not be a visitation from God if we are faced with starvation when the like of this is allowed to go on. I know of two cases where frozen fish was taken from the Cold Storage a year ago and dumped upon farms and the people there after the frost went took the fish split and salted it and sold it for ten dollars a quintal in the city. Not alone that, but Haddock to-day is being caught in unusual quantities around the South and West Coast particularly. The people there claim that fifty per cent. of the catch is Haddock and it is no good to them because it would not pay them to cure it, and I

understand from Mr. Coaker that nothing is going to be done about it.

MR. BENNETT.—In this connection I would like to say a word. It is certainly a display of negligence on the part of the Government that is absolutely inexcusable. We have to-day first class food being destroyed and done away with. I was in the country the other day and saw cartloads of perfectly good fish being dumped upon the farms as a fertilizer, and the only explanation I was given was that it does not pay to cure it. They cannot afford to use the salt on it at the price they have to pay for it, because that fish can only demand the price of West Indies Fish. There are a quarter of a million people in the country and those people should be induced to eat some of this fish. There are between thirty and forty thousand people in St. John's and I say that this winter this fish could be sold at an almost prohibitive price. People will have to go out of their homes to the grocery store and pay twenty cents a pound for this fish that to-day is being dumped upon the farms. I suggest that the Government through the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries purchase all the Haddock available cured at five dollars a quintal and if they cannot market it abroad keep it here and sell it as cheaply as possible next winter through certain depots around the fishing districts. It is a simple proposition and it will not involve much expenditure. Next fall we will have the spectacle of buying Smoked Haddock from Nova Scotia at from twenty to thirty cents a pound while here the best possible kind of the same fish is being given to the farmers, and nothing is being done to stop it. The fishermen to-day are handicapped in their operations because of this Haddock getting into their nets. I submit to Mr. Coaker now that he take im-

mediate steps in this direction, and next winter we will be able to furnish the poor people of the country with it who will not be able to buy it, or other articles of food that cost less money. As Sir Michael Cashin said it looks like a visitation from God that we are faced with starvation, to test our sincerity of purpose, in dealing with this matter.

MR. WALSH.—In my opinion this latest development is in keeping with the carnival of destruction that has been going on since the country has been under the present regime. This statement of Sir Michael Cashin that fresh codfish is being carted from the Cold Storage Plant and being dumped on the farms as a fertilizer is one that should make every hon. member in this House hang his head in shame. We are going to be faced next winter with worse conditions than we are now, and I may be classed as a Blue Ruinist for saying this, but one cannot close his eyes to facts, and judging from the trend of affairs conditions must be worse by the time the snow falls in a month or two. Why does not the Government reserve sufficient fish in the Cold Storage Plant to be able to distribute to the poor people in the fishing districts next winter who will hardly be able to purchase the necessaries of life. I want to endorse the suggestion made by Mr. Bennett and in doing so, I would in all seriousness suggest to the Government that they reserve a certain amount even if they have to pay a handsome price for it to the Reid Nfld. Co., or whoever owns that Cold Storage Plant and put it by for the use of the poor people during the coming winter. I know that lots of people in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's have not up to the present time been able to get enough fish for their own consumption, not to talk of putting anything by to purchase supplies for the

coming winter. I think that the Government would do well if they would take both those suggestions into consideration, and attend to the matter as quickly as possible.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have asked Mr. Mews about that matter and he will send me up a memorandum.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What is the explanation re question No. 4? Does not the Government know that there are forty vacant beds in that Sanatorium and that there are people clamouring to get in. That institution was built by the late Government to accommodate one hundred and fifty patients. We have to-day that Sanatorium equipped, machinery is there, the Doctor is there, and we are told that they cannot take in any more patients. Surely there is some explanation. We come in here day after day talking about trivial matters comparatively and here we are with a matter of life and death, people suffering from Tuberculosis are deprived of the proper treatment, and we are so callous and cold that no explanation is given them. Surely the Government will have some sense of manhood and tell us the reason. There must be a reason. It is going on from day to day and not one of the responsible Ministers on the other side has a word to say on the matter. There are people to-day down in boarding houses awaiting admission and their expenses are being paid out of the public funds. I know of two such cases.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My hon. friend's memory must be very short. This same question was brought before the House a few weeks ago, and I called his attention to the fact that it would be necessary for this Legislature to vote a certain sum over and above the regular allocation to open to its capacity this institution. It would be necessary to

vote an additional sum of forty thousand dollars. If this House is prepared to do this we can go into Committee at once on the public Charities Vote and adjust the matter.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I can hardly swallow that explanation of the Prime Minister's. You, Sir, are one of the people who are paying five thousand dollars a day for work on roads, and you had not the decency to get authority from this House for that expenditure, but now you say you have to wait for a vote in the Estimates before you can attend to this more important matter. You took a half million dollars last year for fish and more for salt and other things. Why not open up that Institute? Dr. Rendell can handle one hundred and fifty patients as well as seventy. Why send these people, who are waiting admission, down to boarding houses in this hot weather and pay for them out of the public funds? Are you waiting until the House closes to turn them back to their districts? Is that the explanation? Of course that is the answer and the intention of the Government, and not the explanation you have given this afternoon. You know perfectly well that this House will not refuse one hundred or two hundred thousand dollars for this purpose in the relief of humanity.

MR. JENNINGS.—It is impossible to take any more patients in there as only yesterday Dr. Rendell was complaining that there is a shortage of water. Until the water supply is completed nothing further in this way can be done.

THE PRIME MINISTER.—It has been claimed that if the Lunatic Asylum can be attended to that the Sanatorium can also. In that connection I may say that the completion of the two new wings in the Lunatic Asylum was not an enormous expense. The reduction in the cost of supplies fuel and food and clothing would be

very nearly sufficient to cover the cost of the wings without any increased vote over last year. It just means that there will be no substantial reduction in last year's vote for this purpose as there was in other cases. Now the Sanatorium is different. It would necessitate an increased vote if the Legislature should decide to open up the Sanatorium to the full capacity. In the meantime the number of the patients there already is the maximum that can be treated with safety because of the shortage of water. Until the water supply is finished nothing can be done. The question as to whether it can be occupied in full is left to this Legislature, but even if the Legislature should decide to vote the necessary money it could not be run in its capacity at present.

MR. SULLIVAN—Might I ask Mr. Jennings when the Water Supply will be finished.

MR. JENNINGS—I cannot tell you exactly. They have met with some difficulty in rock cutting. We had hoped it would be finished in the spring but owing to this delay I don't think it will be completed until August.

MR. SULLIVAN—How long have they been working at it?

MR. JENNINGS—Since last August

MR. SULLIVAN—Will you have sufficient money to finance this in view of the delay. It should have been done months ago.

MR. JENNINGS.—The work is being handled by the best contractors in the city.

MR. SULLIVAN—Then it is a contract job.

MR. JENNINGS—Yes. It is.

MR. BENNETT—With your permission I would like to make a few remarks on this matter. The answer given by Mr. Jennings is fair, and I think is acceptable to the Opposition, but the reason given by the Prime Minister is absurd. We know that the

Lunatic Asylum is able to accommodate 100 patients more now and the expense in this connection has to be provided for by vote in the Estimates also. There is no reason why the Sanatorium is any different. It is not different. What applies to the Lunatic Asylum also applies to the Sanatorium. It was stated in this House that the Government did not intend to open it up because of the lack of funds, and the members on this side of the House protested and rightly because if we are going to economize at the expense of the Tubercular patients I am sorry for the country. We had a lesson the other day in this connection with regard to our soldiers and sailors, and every member felt indignant to think that we should economize at their expense, and we should feel it more with regard to Tubercular patients. We went to the expense of building that Sanatorium, and many of the patients are returned soldiers, and after putting up the building and equipping it in first class condition, we are told that we cannot afford to open it up to its full capacity, and I say that it is camouflage on the part of the Prime Minister to condone that neglect, and the only reasonable excuse was given by Mr. Jennings, in saying that it is because of the shortage of water. The water supply should have been ready before this, and the contractors have been very dilatory in that regard. I know where they are and they are not half way yet to where they are going to get the water supply, and if it is opened at all this winter it will not be before the end of December, if that is the reason why it is closed. In the meantime we are paying for those people in boarding houses down town, when they should be in that Institution. Why was not the water supply attended to at the completion of the building. You don't see a person building a private house and then

looking around to see where he will get his water.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—That is not our fault it was built by the late Government.

MR. BENNETT.—You have been in office eighteen months and you have done nothing. The late Government thought there was a sufficient water supply. I don't believe that that is the reason at all, I feel sure that there is sufficient water to supply that Institution.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works if a special grant has been made to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries or to that gentleman and his colleagues, of \$5,000, or any other sum for the repair of a road at or near Bonavista, and if so to state the amount. Also if it is correct that this work is being done by men who are ordinarily employed in connection with the F.P.U. at Port Union; if a motor truck owned by the F.P.U. is being employed for this work and is being paid twenty-five dollars a day and if not at what figure; if it is correct that people in the vicinity where this road is being made, who are in great need, cannot obtain employment on it, all employment being reserved for men recommended by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries; also if recently repairs were made to the road near Elliston, and if so from what grant and what was the cost of the said repairs; was the F. P.U. truck employed thereon and if so at what figure per day; are these works being carried out by the Chairmen of the elective road boards for these vicinities or by or through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his colleagues.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS tabled a reply.

On the motion that the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway" be

read the third time, the House divided and there appeared in its favor:—Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(18) and against it: Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Archibald, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Fox—(14), so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway," was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. FOX.—While we are on this vote, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word on the matter of the salary of Miss Sullivan of the Department of Public Works. I happen to know Miss Sullivan and I know she is one of the most efficient members of the Civil Service. She has to support a family, and her father was the late Inspector General Sullivan whose services in connection with the affairs of this country need no extolling by me or anyone else. I think it is not fair to have her salary less than that of a

clerk in a temporary position. On the admission of the Minister of Works himself the temporary clerk was engaged at \$720 a year, which is in excess of the salary of the permanent one, and I recommend to the Government that Miss Sullivan's stipend be raised so as to at least be equal to that of the young lady engaged last year. It is not fair to say it will not be raised because she has not asked for it. Did you ask for your raise or refuse to accept it because you had not asked for it. You took the sessional pay of \$4,000 as head of the department while your predecessor had only \$2,400. Did you object because you had not asked and do you think we will accept your statement that because she did not ask for it, you are not going to give it to her. Is not her salary to be gauged by her capabilities—and you ought to be able to state in this House that because of her capabilities you yourself assessed her salary. The other came to you from the Militia Department, and you gave her \$20 more than the permanent clerk though you did not know her qualifications. You ought to know the commendation of Miss Sullivan from this side is correct. She is one of the most efficient of her class and won a foremost place in every competition here and abroad—a few years ago she won the Sloan-Duployan Shield against the world. She is a girl of 20 or 21 years, the main support of a family, the daughter of a man who gave the best years of his life to the services of Newfoundland and to have her salary cut and made lower than that of the one you took in to clean up excess correspondence in your department is grossly unjust. I ask you to take this up and put her on a level with the clerk you are now dispensing with. We are not asking a favor for her, but for recognition of her services and efficiency and because she

is the daughter of a man who for 49 or 45 years gave himself to the onerous duties of Head Constable of the country.

MR. MOORE.—I would like, Mr. Chairman, to subscribe a few words to what has been said by the members for St. John's East. I know Miss Sullivan and her capabilities; I saw her work at the Works Department, and if the lady who is now with the Minister get \$720, she also is worth it. I hope the Hon. Minister of Marine will use his influence in this matter but the Minister of Works has sulked and slapped the Estimates on the desk. But that is not the way you are going to get them through. We will stay here till next Regatta if necessary to have things done properly. How about A. H. Salter being paid \$1400—that is not on the Estimates.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—He is paid out of different votes from the institutions.

MR. MOORE.—It should not go through as he is not worth it. Surely the Hon. Minister of Marine will not let it go while there are people in my district starving. He is getting a double salary—one from the Royal Stores and a rake off of \$1400.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—He is getting no rake-off. You are measuring him by your own bushel.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Does the hon. member make the charge that Mr. Salter is getting a rake-off.

MR. MOORE.—I won't make the charge but he is a stool pigeon and it is common property around town. Will the Hon. Minister of Marine stand for it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Will you make the charge that he is getting graft?

MR. MOORE.—I will not do that but I will make the charge that he is getting a rake-off on the orders of the

Royal Stores. He is getting \$1400 but the people in King's Cove are starving and have threatened to tear down the stores.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Salter is saving five times \$1400.

MR. MOORE.—The Deputy Minister, Mr. Harris, is well able to do the work and is disgusted. We will not allow this to go through till the Hon. Minister of Marine who is the only one to give an order here, sees that it is cut out. He is the only one to see that Miss Sullivan is treated fairly. This kind of thing, this case of Salter, is causing all the rupture all over the country.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I regret that my hon. friend threw across the floor whether we would be allowed to do this or that; we may not let him out of the House at all yet. When he throws down the cudgel to me, the Scotch in me rises and I say, No. You say that Salter is saving five times what he is getting, but do you think there is no other one to do it. He was absolutely stuffed there because of what he did in politics. I will tell the story to show the disgrace of it while the people are walking the streets idle. He is getting a salary at the Royal Stores and it is indecent to chuck him out this \$13,800. Will you stand for it Hon. Minister of Marine—will you let it be done. Do you think it is a square deal Mr. Minister of Shipping? Men who went overseas and fought for us are chucked about while Salter is getting a salary from the Royal Stores and also \$1400. I object to it. I have made up my mind as to where I am and will stay here till we get word that Salter will not get the job from the Government but that you will give it to a returned man who is as good as ever Salter was. No votes will go through till I am told this. I want word from the Government as to what will be done about it or the

votes will not go through. What are you going to do Hon. Prime Minister?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Whatever consideration I will give it as a matter of business I will not consider it as put.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE.—Your master gave Mr. Walsh a road and will probably give a promise of this if you do not. I do not put this as a threat but as an appeal for a returned man who is beating about idle. They were hail GALLEY—722

fellows when they left and you promised them many things in your Manifesto but do not carry them out. The Minister of Works does not want Salter but he is foisted on him by you. The Hon. Minister of Marine knows he has no right there and if he has any manhood he will get up and say so. What will you do, sir? I do not want to embarrass you but I am looking out for a returned soldier. I will give you his name privately but do not want to give it here as it would not be fair. Let this be considered tomorrow.

MR. FOX.—I ask that we take up Miss Sullivan's salary. Will you reconsider it, Mr. Minister of Works.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Yes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—As I announced a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, the vote for the Justice Department, as far as the Estimates go, shows no changes in them except the reduction, but I would like to avail of this opportunity to say a few words as to the Labrador Boundary. I propose to ask for a vote in Supplemental Supply for it. The subject for many years has been the cause of much caustic and witty comment but the time has now arrived when it is coming to a head. I stated it last year and perhaps if the hon. members will bear with me, I will give a short history of it up to the present stage. In

1903 the Dickie people had a mill at Hamilton Inlet and while cutting timber, Canada stepped in and demanded what they claimed was due the Canadian Government. The Dickie Co. refused and appealed to the Newfoundland Government. The latter stood behind them and said they should not pay whereon the Quebec authorities took an action against the Dickie people in the Quebec Courts and Newfoundland undertook to defend them. Then the Courts realized that the Dickie question would not settle the matter of jurisdiction because Newfoundland had power over the rivers from the watershed to the ocean but it might not decide the power over other areas. It was a bigger question than that of Dickie's title and it was decided to refer it to higher tribunals.

But there has been a considerable amount of correspondence with regard to the terms of submission. The Newfoundland Government retained very many counsels but the burden of the case fell upon the late Mr. Martin Furlong, K.C., who devoted a considerable amount of time, care and attention to the case and especially to the actual draft of the submission so that the case for Newfoundland would not be prejudiced. He always recognized that Canada was a very big influential country and Newfoundland was merely a province. He always contended even to the day of his death that when the submission was submitted to the Privy Council it should be such so that there would be no influence used to boost the case for the Canadian Government. When the negotiations started the Canadian Government wanted the Privy Council to lay down a boundary line between the two countries. If the Privy Council were to lay down such a line Newfoundland would go to the wall under the battalions of Canada. So Mr.

Furlong contended the question to submit to the Privy Council was what is the boundary line according to the proclamations and laws of the present time and it was some time before Canada would accept that. Then from the correspondence it was gleaned that little or nothing was done up to 1914 and during the war nothing was done. When the war was over in 1918 the then Attorney General for Newfoundland, Mr. Morine, was approached by the Department of Justice at Ottawa and the Governor here who had received despatches asking that the matter be brought to a head so that the potential development of Labrador would not be retarded. So he took it up and he could be nothing else but impressed by the stand taken by the late Mr. Furlong. That was reduced into writing the correspondence changed hands as Mr. Morine went out of office and I went in after the election. Then the Department of Justice at Ottawa were pressing for the signing of the agreement and for the hearing of the case. It was then deemed necessary to engage a good counsel for the Government and the standing counsel for the Government, Messrs. Burn and Burridge, engaged Sir John Simon an ex-attorney general of England. Every member of the House who belongs to the legal fraternity knows that he is an outstanding figure of the English Bar. Barrington Ward who took the silk eighteen months ago and whom I met was also retained. According to the English practice every man who is a K. C. must have a junior and W. C. Moncton was engaged. Then the question of getting the evidence together came up. I want to assure the members of the House that that entails quite a bit of work. I do not think Mr. Furlong left any brief of any evidence but he left a large library on the matter. There was another source of evidence

and that was the Colonial Record Office in London and consisted of despatches from 1683. This had to be gone into and since I have been Attorney General I have gone through all the records and I made a brief of all the evidence that could be gathered from the Colonial evidence. The copies made by Miss D'Alberti who was here some years ago provided interesting history. Then it was agreed between the Department of Justice at Ottawa and the Department of Justice here that each would be at liberty to examine the records of the other. All our evidence was collected by myself here and Mr. Moncton, Captain Victor Gordon and myself over in London. Finally it was all put forth in the shape of a case which was printed and sent out. I submitted a copy of it to Mr. Higgins and I am sorry he did not return it as I wanted it for the House. It easily contained one hundred pages and that would not include the appendage of documents.

Then after I left London a lot of work had to be done in various libraries. Mr. Smith told me there was some strong evidence at the Rhode Island Library. When I left London the case was being proceeded with by Messrs. Ward, Gordon and Moncton and the prepared case reached me in February or March last. And it is absolutely necessary to make further searches. I would like to point out what Canada is doing. In London she has seven men engaged making searches for evidence and on Labrador also. When Mr. Smith came down here some time ago he found a lot of information and according to the agreement he had to furnish me with a copy of what he found whether in Canada's favour or ours. And after he had left I received a parcel of documents nine inches thick. I strongly urge upon the House the de-

sirability of not letting this matter drop. We cannot afford to lose any opportunity of putting our case in the best light possible. Then I received an advice from Mr. Moncton as to further investigation and I will read this part of it. (Reads) We then employed Mr. Wm. Hardy a man of considerable experience and knowledge as to where to look for this kind of document. He sent me a memo which is too long to read to the House. (Reads). So you see it is not going to be a very cheap arrangement. The work of our case to be done in the United States ought to take about two months so says Mr. Smith and he promised to give all the assistance he could. (Reads). So that is the position of the matter at the present time I have had some letters from Sir Edgar Bowring our High Commissioner as to the employment of Mr. Hardy and I could not do anything definite until I know sufficient funds are available and I propose asking for a vote of ten thousand dollars in order to carry out this work. Under the terms of the reference it was agreed that when Canada and Newfoundland had prepared the cases one would exchange its own case for the case of the other and as soon as that was done there would be a counter case to be exchanged within a fixed time. These times have not been fixed and in connection therewith I have been in communication with the Minister of Justice for Canada, Mr. Doherty. When I signed the agreement in London no further steps had been made but since then I have been busy. I wrote him asking when would it be possible to fix a date and I suggested nine months for the preparation of the case and three months for the exchange of reply so that the case ought to come on about July next and Mr. Doherty replied as the Canadian House was open then he could not decide definitely about the

period but he thought the nine months would be all right. I propose to write him again soon asking him when it would be possible to name a date so that we may know when the case will go before the Privy Council. I hope I have not wearied the House in tracing the history of this case and I hope the proposed vote will be favourably considered, I think the vote a very small one considering the amount of work to be done. I therefore beg to submit the first vote.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—We have heard this case alluded to time after time and I would like to understand from the Minister of Justice when will be the time when both sides will be satisfied as to the state of their case for submission to the tribunal before which it will come. But I do object to having this a mainstay for many lawyers both here and on the other side. It grates on my nerves to have so many lawyers treating our case. I am prepared to vote the essential amount provided it will benefit our case but we have in the past been coming in here voting money to different persons. I agree with the Minister of Justice that we should see this matter through. We ought to hang on to all that we can but when can we finalise this matter? Putting it off has been our practice. The legal lights of both sides of the House ought to get together and settle this thing.

Mr. Furlong, as the Minister of Justice said, handled the case very thoroughly and I agree that he succeeded in getting more information than anyone else. When Mr. Smith was here he told me there was some very valuable information here in the Colonial Secretary's Office.

I had one or two conversations with Mr. Smith when he was here and I was surprised that he had so much valuable information for this Colony in this case and which he left at the

Colonial Secretary's Office. Now I am quite in accord with voting any reasonable amount to carry on this case and disposing of it once and for all, but I do object to coming in here year after year and passing this thing on to posterity. Take the whole case out and finish it, because while it remains in abeyance there is a lot of valuable land held up on the Labrador on that boundary line. This case has been going on for at least ten or twelve years to my knowledge. I remember we had Governor MacGregor who went down there and did a lot of work in that direction, but I do not know whether or not his evidence was handed over to the Justice Department. Now the quicker this case is settled the better for the Government, for the Dominion of Canada and for Newfoundland. I think that the Minister of Justice should bring down an estimate of what he thinks it is going to cost this Colony to finalize this case. I want the Minister of Justice to come down with a business-like proposition as to how much money is wanted to bring the case to a finish, as I fail to see why a half dozen lawyers, either here or abroad, should be eating up the money we vote; some of the lawyers, perhaps, will get fat fees, without even having dotted an I or crossed a T. I wish to say again that I am prepared to vote a sufficient amount to complete this case once and for all and not have it handed down to our children's children, as I believe this Labrador Boundary case has in the past, at any rate, been a case of milking the cow so far as the legal fraternity was concerned.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, however much lawyers disagree on other things I think this is an occasion—I refer now to the graceful compliment paid by the Hon. Minister of Justice this evening to the late lamented Mr. Furlong—where some of us must

agree. As one who had the great pleasure of his close acquaintance, I listened with deep interest to the kindly words of appreciation that fell from the lips of the Minister. It brought me back to the enthusiastic interest displayed by the late Mr. Furlong in that Labrador Boundary matter and it is sad to feel that the knowledge that attended that great mind should have been lost. He was not alone the greatest lawyer in the country and not alone in a class to himself as a lawyer; but particularly pathetic was it that he should have been called away when his mind was so richly stored in relation to this particular question and a question that only an extraordinary mind could encompass. I had the great privilege of being associated in business with him and of realizing that not only did he take an interest on this matter but I can testify to the voluminous amount of research work that he did in connection with it and the great mass of material that he collected. There were thousands of dollars worth of literary matter in his office that he was never compensated for. Apart of any law fees, he was never compensated to a fraction of a degree for the amount of time and study that he gave to this Labrador matter. In his library to-day there is a collection of a class of literature that the ordinary lawyer would marvel at. It is extraordinary the mass of material he had really gone into. He had everything appertaining not alone to Labrador but had books on all kinds of expeditions on either side of the Atlantic of long ago and he had read and studied them. Unfortunately, the pity is he was the class of man that left no record behind him. The records of all the data collected by his giant intellect were not made by him and the great bulk of his knowledge passed away with him. It was because of the

great work that he had done, as stated by the Minister of Justice, and because I regard this matter as a matter of urgency, it not being a party question, prompted me to rise and speak.

It is a source of satisfaction to know that despite all the strategic positions advanced by illustrious Counsels and great minds in Canada and in the Old Country that the line of thought laid down on this important question by the home product—the late Mr. Furlong—was ultimately forced to be accepted by the Privy Council. People there were who could not properly understand or appreciate the difference between the point of view taken by Mr. Furlong and the others. As the Hon. Minister of Justice has intimated, there was a material difference between having the conditions defined by a Committee of the Privy Council and having the boundary line fixed and decided upon, and having them to undertake and decide to fix a boundary where we said there was a boundary. That was due to the foresight and dogged determination of Mr. Furlong. It is now only a question of what evidence can be produced to back up the statement as to what that boundary is. As a tribute to his memory and in grateful recognition of what he has done for me, I would like to see the best possible done and to see this Labrador Boundary question given a trial, out of respect for him. I care not on what side of the water men were on, it will be difficult to find a man his superior or who took such a great responsibility or such a keen interest in this matter as the late Mr. Furlong. Therefore, in the words of Sir Michael Cashin, I would like to see this thing brought to a speedy termination, and I propose to give my very strongest support to anything to be brought down here for that purpose. Some people blame the lawyers

for the delay, but, unfortunately, a matter like this is not one that can be brought through as quickly as the ordinary layman can imagine. I think that whatever amount is necessary for this thing we ought to vote it. Unfortunately, for this country we are not able to cope with Canada in the matter of finance, as I understand they have now seven or eight men on the Labrador on an expedition. Unfortunately, we are not able to do that; but we have Sir John Simon looking after our interests on the other side of the water and in him we have a man in whom I have not alone implicit faith with regard to his trustworthiness, but his ability as a lawyer is beyond question or discussion.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support a vote for the expediting of a decision on this important matter.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the remarks of some previous speakers. In fact I told the Minister of Justice that I would gladly support the vote when it came up on the ground that I do not want to give up one inch of Newfoundland, and, like Sir Michael Cashin, I would like to see this question settled once and for all time. I heard about this thing the first time I came into public life and still it is in existence. I am prepared to vote whatever amount the Minister of Justice thinks it is necessary to finalize the case. The land is in dispute and the quicker it is settled the better for all concerned. I know what it means to a man who has to go around seeking information on this question and I sympathize with the Attorney General.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the debate on the Labrador Boundary Question and for my own information I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what progress has been made towards submitting our

case before the Privy Council and what is really the position in relation to the dispute. I am informed that the Canadian and Newfoundland Governments have come to an understanding and I presume that the whole thing will be finalized this year. Has all the evidence possible been collected with regard to Newfoundland?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am trying to get the case up for argument before the Privy Council in June 1922 and with that end in view I am communicating with Mr. Doherty, the Attorney General of Canada.

MR. BENNETT.—For nearly twenty years past I have been hearing about this dispute and it is not settled. I know that the late Mr. Martin W. Furlong had the case well in hand, and the terms of the argument were decided upon before Mr. Furlong died. Mr. Furlong is dead several years now. What progress has been made since he died? Is this thing to go on for the next ten years? Surely it is to be finalized some time in the near future. Why has not all the information been collected for Newfoundland yet? I am sorry I was not here to hear the first part of the debate on this important matter this afternoon. I am quite in accord with what has been said by some gentlemen on this side of the House. From what I know about the matter the probabilities are that the Attorney General will be a long period in his office before the case is settled. As Sir Michael Cashin said, it is a case of the milch cow getting tossed into the hands of the lawyers. We have a Bill before the House now that is involved in this matter. The place in dispute on the Labrador is part of the land that the Labrador Pulp and Paper Corporation of America have been paying for yearly to the Newfoundland Government. Well if we are taking rentals unjustly we will have to return them.

Personally I believe our case will be successful for Newfoundland, but it appears to me that we are just as far from a solution of this question now as we were ten years ago. It is quite true there was a lot of lawyers engaged and it is quite true that Sir John Simon is an eminent lawyer. He was engaged after the case was handed from one lawyer to another and one Government to another for years and years. Still it has not got us any further advanced in the case.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
We are further now.

MR. BENNETT.—I hope your prognostications will turn to be correct. Last year when we wished you bon voyage we expected that on your return that the thing would be settled or that you would have something definite to tell us. Now you tell us that the matter will not be ready for argument before June 192. Now it is no use us anticipating something that is not going to happen. Probably the solution of the Labrador Boundary question will be found in the Estimates we are considering to-day and the Budget that we will have to consider before this House closes. It is going to be a matter that I am afraid that Newfoundland is going to be left in the lurch in. The Labrador Boundary question is on a par with what was known as the French Shore question, which was another great football for lawyers and politicians. I do not want to delay the House, but I congratulate the Minister of Justice on the endorsement that he has received from this side of the House and I want to assure him that as far as I am concerned that I hope he will be successful in every possible way, though I am afraid that with all his energy and all his ability and all his good intentions that there will not be a settlement of the Labrador Boundary next year or

for many years to come and that Newfoundland will have to pay the piper.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the following Report:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Ltd., beg to report that the Committee has had several conferences with the representatives of the Company and has thoroughly discussed the agreement. The Committee is of opinion that the Bill should be passed in its present form.

(Sgd.) W. R. WARREN.
W. F. COAKER.
W. J. HIGGINS.
J. R. BENNETT.
R. A. SQUIRES.

July 26th, 1921.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron & Steel Co. and the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd." be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment was read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time presently.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister and with unanimous consent the said amendment was read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council that the House of Assembly had concurred in the said amendment without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 25th.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Hon. Minister of Posts gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave Notice of Question.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of vessels cleared for the Labrador fishery this year, last year and the previous year, if these details are kept in his Department; and if not, to procure them from whatever Department keeps such records and submit them here.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if his attention has been called to an article in the past issue of the "Western Star" which asserts that illegal salmon fishing is general on the West Coast, and that at one point a party of five tourists from abroad were so disgusted with conditions that they left for home earlier than they intend-

ed; and if the Government, as it has abandoned the system of fishery wardens, will take any steps to prosecute the parties guilty of these offences.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if it is the case that officials in his Department are destroying all newspapers addressed to points in the Northern Bays, except the Advocate and the Star; if this is done with his approval and that of his Department; and if any written instructions to that effect have been given, to lay copy of the same on the Table.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education if it is his intention to appoint a Private Secretary after the closing of this House, and if so to state who he proposes for this position and what is the need for such an appointment.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if a claim on behalf of the F.P.U. for payment of several hundred dollars for clothes supplied to the crew of the motor boat "F.P.U." is or has been before his Department and if the facts are that this motor boat was lost on the North coast a year ago, the crew escaping; if the crew claimed that they lost their belongings and secured new outfits from the F.P.U. store in the vicinity; if the bills for these outfits were sent to the Poor Commissioner and by him to the Relieving Officer in the vicinity; if the Relieving Officer refuses to certify the bills on the ground that the men saved all their clothes and suffered no loss whatever, if the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Hon. Prime Minister have both written urging that the bills be signed, and if so why, and to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence in relation to this matter.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, before this clause (Clause 6) goes through I would like to say that I think this water power is in dispute at the present time. Probably the Minister of Justice could inform us regarding that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Chairman, I may say that there was no license granted, but only a minute of Council, and that has been cancelled for more than a year and nothing has been heard from the parties. There is no absolute grant made by this Act; that would have to be done after.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word with respect to this bill before it goes through. Hon. members will remember that notice of this bill was given early in the session. It has been on the order paper, and copies have been in the hands of hon. members, for a long time. It was referred to a Select Committee, and it comes back from the Select Committee without any alteration whatever. The Committee would like to have certain changes made because of certain involved expressions, and also with a view to getting better terms for the Colony, but we find ourselves confronted with the fact that the companies come back with the proposition that this contract was entered into away back in September, that conditions have changed since that time, and that if they had to make a contract to-day it would not be as favorable as this to

one. We will all recognize that the real value of this contract is not in the duty but in the employment that it will afford. The companies will not now be able to give this as an excuse for tying up the work on the Island, and if business is still tied up it is a financial tie-up and not due to this contract.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Government members on that Committee I may say that they associate themselves with what the hon. member for St. John's East has said. Mr. Higgins has correctly stated the position. Not only have conditions changed for the companies but they have changed for the country. With conditions as they are, and the companies willing to avail of any excuse to stop work, we thought this was the only course. As Mr. Higgins pointed out, the main thing now is to get employment.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I merely want to subscribe to the ideas expressed by the hon. member for St. John's East and the Minister of Justice. The Opposition members, at least of that Committee, were anxious to make the best possible agreement in the interests of the Colony. It is unfortunate that at a juncture like this we should be called upon to make a contract. We are in a position that we cannot very well turn down anything that will give employment. Under the old contract the companies paid 7½ cents per ton for ore exported, or \$75,000 on a million tons. Under this new contract they are to pay 25 cents per ton for ore exported to Nova Scotia, or \$250,000 on a million tons.

The idea behind that was this: The companies made a large extension of their operations and under present conditions it is very difficult to raise money and they want the proposition to be as practicable as possible so

that they may be able to raise the money. They are going to build a large smelting works in Great Britain and a big furnace will be required on account of the peculiarity of the Bell Island ore and that is going to cost a large sum of money. We have no reason to believe that there will be any curtailment and the difference in duty will more than off set what goes to foreign markets. The strongest objection I have is the twenty year period over which the agreement extends. And I pointed out that it was unfair to ask the Country under such present abnormal conditions to enter into an agreement for such a long time. If matters were normal perhaps the contract would not have been entered into at all. However less than that would not be acceptable to the Companies. They said they could not get finance if this period was not obtainable. Another feature is that when the original seven and one half cents per ton was effected the ore could be mined for one dollar per ton but to-day the cost is double and the price of steel is low. Therefore the immediate prospects of the Companies are not bright and they want a contract as attractive as possible. I quite agree with the expression of Mr. Higgins that the whole object is that we get an assurance at least that they will extend their operations on the Island and it is only a matter of time when they will employ double the number they usually engage. That means an increase in the revenue and I want employment for our people. The tax is a mere drop in the bucket. We have to look to the future and this is one of the places where development will take place. I therefore support it.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I am glad that this Government even at this late day has taken this matter up. I am interested in this Bill as it means the

life of Conception Bay and I have no doubt that the Select Committee gave the matter their closest attention. I am also very glad the Companies concerned are hereby helped to go ahead with their contracts. The tax is not worrying me either. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to express my approval of this Bill before it goes through and I wish to point out what is the mystery why this Bill has been held up until this hour of the day. It was introduced on April 8th last and no substantial reason has been given this House for the hold up. We have asked from this side of the House several times why and have received evasive answers and here we are to-day receiving it back from the Committee without any alteration. I like my colleagues am not concerned so much about the export duty on the ore. I would look for an increase in the earning powers of the people in the shipping and the mining of the ore. The export duty on the ore under this Bill gives us a small revenue but when the earning power of the people is increased we receive about fifty per cent. under the new tariff and I think this matter should have been finalised long ago. I take it that while this was in the slings the companies in question have been hampered. I understand on the Island labour has been considerably reduced and matters over there are not looking very bright. To the ordinary lay man this agreement is a Chinese puzzle and most of the clauses cannot be grasped at the first perusal. However it places the companies in a position to make contracts and I think development over there is not going to be very much. At the present time they have a million and a half tons of ore in the pockets over there and therefore labour will be reduced during the autumn and winter

months. While there may be a lot of things that could be found fault with in this matter yet Bell Island is laying the golden egg for Newfoundland as well as Aguathuna and Grand Falls. These are the places upon which we are depending. Therefore we must not quibble over small items in this but I fear it is too late as quite a number of men have been laid off, however, I suppose there was a reason why there was such a long delay. I agree with the finding of the Committee.

MR. WALSH.—As I am the only practical miner in the House I wish to say a word before this bill goes through. A bill of such importance as this one should have come up earlier in the session. I quite agree with the expressions of the preceding speakers in that it is not so much a matter of export duty but it is a question of employment. I agree with Sir Michael Cashin that it is perhaps too late to change matters now. Section 11 deals with the erection of working men's homes. (Reads.) In most industrial centres in Canada and the United States and even here the companies erect homes for the employees. That was done at Little Bay mines. I merely offer the suggestion that the words, "If requested by the Government" be struck out and have it definite. Why not have suitable homes constructed by the Companies and let them charge a small rental for the same. The closing paragraph of section 9 reads as follows. (Reads.) I do not agree with that. If they undertake to supply coal locally there ought not to be any discrimination. Profiteering has been going on long enough and it is time to have a competent man appointed to handle this matter. When I first came into this Chamber seven years ago I advocated the appointment of a competent inspector. There are many men around

suitable for the job. It is an important matter.

Some were killed and discovered only by chance, and yet there is no law on the Statute Books to prevent accidents. A man may work only a week and be given charge of dynamite, but this should not be, as it is not done elsewhere. I speak from experience as a partner of mine is now in Heaven as the result of a dy-part in our country and I have great competency and neglect. There have been many sad occurrences since then and I know from the papers that many are killed in the same way. This is a serious matter and I hope the Hon. Prime Minister will deal with it as such. There is not a man on the other side of the House, perhaps, as well qualified as myself to deal with this matter and I hope Mr. Hall and Mr. Geo. Turner will be appointed to examine a man for the post but will see that there is no party politics in it as all I am interested in is in seeing a good man selected. I am glad the Hon. Minister of Fisheries is looking forward to our mines playing a great part in our country and I have great faith in Notre Dame Bay as a mineral section. The great mine of Little Bay was discovered by accident and it is only the last few years that any intelligent attempt has been made to search for mineral and I think if we abolished the Model Farm and devoted the money towards a search for mineral under competent men, it would be the best money ever spent. You do not need to go a foot below the surface in all parts of the country for mineral and in Little Bay it is found in all the coves, etc. In Sleepy Valley, which we spoke of just now you have solid 12% ore from wall to wall and the same is to be found on the West Coast in different parts. I make these suggestions and look forward to other avenues besides the fish-

eries and commend these remarks to the Hon. Prime Minister, hoping they will have the consideration which they should get from him and the Government.

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 it be read a third time presently.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice and with the unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron & Steel Co., and the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd.," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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

Colonial Secretary's Department, \$66,500.00.

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 Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In discussing the Estimates for the Department of Justice on page 18 you will see an increase for the Chief Clerk and Registrar—given him because the Judges have been increased

and the Judge of the District Court. There is no change in page 19 or 20; on 21 the Magistrate Court contingencies are reduced from \$6,000 to \$5,000; pages 22 and 23 are the same except uniforms and bedding are reduced \$1,200, and there is no change on page 25.

MR. HIGGINS.—I do not propose to delay the time of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, nor to deal in general with the reduction of the civil servants, but I wish to intimate that when we go into Ways and Means I will then take the position as I do now that the cur is wrong in principle and in every other way. It is an unsound position for the State to set up to tax a man beyond ordinarily, then add surtaxes and super-taxes, etc., and also reduce his salary. You cannot justify it as the sum total of the reductions will only be \$200,000 and you are still frittering money away in every direction. It is unwise as you will get inferior men—and to-day you must pay as men cannot feel they are getting any reward for being competent unless they are paid their worth and value to their department. I am particularly reminded of that in the vote under the charge of the Department of the Hon. Minister. I will not go so far as to say that this is exceptional, but some of these votes are striking. On page 17 the messenger gets \$650, but others of the same position get much more. This man, Hy. Raynes, went overseas, won a distinguished conduct medal, is bright, reliable, intelligent, but is put in at \$650. Why? While others who are not half so good get double the pay. There is no basis on which to justify that. On the next page take the position as to what happened the Chief Clerk and Registrar in the Supreme Court. I do not object, and so far as I can say Messrs. Kent and Butler are not receiving pay commensurate with the value they

give. They are like the old policemen—the country has got the benefit of all their services—but if they were in the outside world they would command double their present salary. But how can you justify the fact that in the same department there is no increase for the Registrar of Deeds and Companies. If anything should happen Mr. Adams he would have to be replaced by an expert—he has an extraordinary knowledge of conveyancing, etc. In other departments there are men who went in only a year or two ago but are getting \$3,600 and if Mr. Adams dropped out no lawyer would take the position for \$5,000. You pay him \$2,400—why not increase him? I am not saying this as a criticism of the Hon. Minister but I cannot see how he can justify the increase for one and have another kept back. I do not say he should give all officials increases, but there was to be a great transformation when you got in form. The Salaries Commission is as dead as the Railway Commission—the only difference is that these on the Civil Service brought in a decent report but that of the Railway Commission was a discredit even to a Fourth-Form Government. The difference is further that when the Civil Service Commission laid down a basis which would encourage boys to go in for the Civil Service, it was noticed but with regard to the railway report the Government took good care to swallow their few and costly ideas—and costly they were because they were the same as everything else they have done. Now take the police and firemen; how can you justify applying the reduction of 10, 15 and 20 per cent. to them. How can you expect to get men to fill the force. You exact from them health, youth, intelligence, honesty; you take the pick of the community and pay them a miserable wage all along and

just as they are getting to the half-decent living point you cut them again. How are you going to hold them. The time will come when you will call for them as you did some while ago and you will not get them. None but the old and worn out, who cannot go anywhere else, will remain. The resignations are coming in already. Take the suggestion which I made in good faith a while ago—let us give them the amount in excess of our old-time sessional pay. What you will save means nothing to the country but it is all to them. I now say that it is manifestly unfair that just as the force is getting into shape, you should cripple it as you are doing. The only one who will join now is broken down timber who can manage to smuggle past the doctor. It was just getting to the stage of appealing to the men but now it is all knocked down again. Now here is another case, Mr. McCarthy, the Clerk of the Peace. He is decidedly a deputy and is called upon to exercise not only the powers of a deputy but of a Magistrate. He is a lawyer and I hope it will not be said that because of this I speak for him. You pay him \$1,400 less than the other deputies. As the Hon. Minister of Justice knows he is often called upon to function as Judge when Judge Morris is sick or absent through any cause, and his work is of an administrative and judicial character. He is daily called on to act as Stipendiary Justice though he has not the power but does so by agreement of counsel, and I say that nine-tenths of all the court work is done in the Magistrate's Court. In the Supreme Court they only do a fraction of what they do in the other. The bulk of the litigation is done there and only the big cases go up above. This is something you cannot defend and it is unjustifiable to lay down these Estimates and say you will in-

crease the Clerk and Registrar but not him. My reason for making this plea is this—that I object to any reductions and hope the Government will say they will enquire into cases of hardship—this one, the Hon. Minister's own clerk and also the police and firemen. These should be the last to be cut, it is false economy, saving money the wrong way. If you want efficiency you have to pay for it. Business places are being embezzled and the owners are too mean to pay competent help. I have found that the firms paying the best wages suffer less than others from robbery. This is the result of my years in criminal practice. If you want efficiency you got to pay the man and it is a wrong principle for us to sit down calmly and decide on reductions. I do not say this in a merely critical spirit but I would like to see something done on the lines I have suggested.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I have no fault whatever to find with what the hon. member, Mr. Higgins, has said—it is 100% true and I accept it in the spirit in which it is offered. I know he realizes that a Minister sometimes has to decide to do a thing in some cases but not do it in others and I would be only too glad if I could put all as they are actually worth but think that under the circumstances that is impossible at present. Take the case of Raynes, the messenger in my Department, he came in under the Civil Servants Commission report at \$504.00 and was advanced \$150.00 a year. As far as my Department is concerned, I have tried to apply that report wherever possible. With regard to Mr. Adams, he has been in the Civil Service for twenty years, but not always in the Justice Department, and he is now receiving \$2,400.00 per year. In connection with the case of Mr. McCarthy, he has written me submitting figures

to show that if he were to come in for this reduction, he would be back to the 1914 scale of salary because he did not share in the increases that were given in the meantime, and I shall place his case before the Executive Council for consideration. The police also made representations to me, setting out that they did not share in the last increase that was given and it is the intention to arrange as far as possible that those who did not share in the last increase will not be cut.

MR. BENNETT.—Will that apply throughout the Civil Service.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In all the other Departments the increase was given.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Take the Custom House, there are men there who have been receiving the same salary for years while others during the past year or two have been increased four and five hundred dollars.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—There are particular cases of the kind you mention but the police as a class did not get the increases that were given the other Civil Servants. I shall have much pleasure in bringing these matters before the Executive.

MR. SULLIVAN.—There are three or four salaries in the Justice Department in which increases have been made on Executive responsibility and all are cases where the recipients are not family men. Now these men are not only exempt from this cut but they are also exempt from the Income Tax and I do not think that is good enough.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They are exempt under the Income Tax Act. Under that Act, which was passed by the late Government, anyone who judicially interprets the Act is not affected by its provisions.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Are the Judges exempt from the Income Tax in England?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, they are liable to the Income Tax, but in Canada they increased the judges salaries \$3,000 and made them pay the tax, while here we increased the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court but did not impose the tax.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Why should we follow the example of Canada? This country is only a small town compared with Canada and there is no reason why we should have to pay at the same rate as Canada does.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It is only the Provinces we are going by.

MR. SULLIVAN.—It is not fair to increase these judges and let the salary of the man in Hr. Grace stay where it is. Moreover, these men are exempt from both the tax and the reduction while the other has to pay the tax and also take the reduction.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—You cannot blame this Government.

MR. SULLIVAN.—It is not good enough all the same.

MR. BENNETT.—Have you any idea of the amount of fees collected by the Registrar of the Supreme Court.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I cannot give you the exact figures but the hon. member said the other day that he heard they ran from \$20,000 downwards, and as a result of that statement by him, I had a visit from the Chief Clerk next day and he told me he would gladly give up the fees if he could be relieved of the work. He assured me that they did not amount to more than five or six hundred dollars a year.

MR. BENNETT.—That is why I asked the question. I did make the statement that I had been informed by an officer of the Court that the Registrar's fees ran from \$20,000 down. Of course, I did not believe that this was so, but Dr. Lloyd came to me and after hearing his explanation I want to

set right any impression that might have got abroad with regard to the amount of fees he receives. The position is that owing to the establishment of Trust Companies in this country, the trusteeship of all large estates is handed over to them while Sir William Lloyd gets only the small estates which entail just as much work with very little in the way of fees and he told me that last year he did not receive in this way more than \$500.00 after paying a stenographer himself. The impression is abroad that he gets very heavy fees and I asked the question so that I might have that matter cleared up. With regard to the salaries of the Department of Justice, I support what Mr. Higgins has said. I know Mr. Raynes very well and I know him to be a fine, industrious and trustworthy young man. He was one of the men who went over and fought during the war and he won the Distinguished Conduct Medal which was a very high distinction for a private soldier, and now in return he gets a salary of \$650.00, less than most girls earn, while the messenger in the Agriculture and Mines Department next door gets \$950.00. Now, I do not object to Mr. Kearney, who is also a returned soldier, getting this amount because it is little enough, but there is no reason why Mr. Raynes should not get the same amount.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, the reason why I spoke of the Judges' salaries was because of the evident discrimination that is being practiced. It has been brought to my notice that men in the Department of Marine and Fisheries are being discharged. Mr. Dunphy, a herring inspector was getting \$900,000 a year and now that vote is cut out. He has been in the Civil Service for many years and he has a claim on this country because his son went overseas and was killed but instead of the consideration that is due

him, this is the treatment he receives.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make before this vote goes through. I would like first of all, however, to draw attention to a letter in to-day's Telegram headed "M.H.A.'s Taken to Task" and reading as follows:

Editor Evening Telegram.

Dear Sir,—It is with reluctance that I have to make a statement regarding what took place in the House last evening. I have endeavoured up to the present to take no part, whatever, in any controversy regarding the parliamentary doings of Newfoundland, but on reading this morning's Daily News it is only my duty, as Manager of the Cold Storage, to refute certain statements made in regard to the dumping of the frozen fish from the Cold Storage.

Mr. Bennett appears to be very bombastic in his dictation as to what should have been done with this fish. It would probably be more advisable if the said Mr. Bennett made a few enquiries before making such rash statements, namely: "That the fish were caught last year and because of its being a little old it was dumped in the fields for fertilizer." I may mention now that those fish were caught in 1917, and have been in Cold Storage since; therefore, under ordinary hygienic principles, those fish are unfit for human food. From the information of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Walsh, I may mention that in the Old Country all fish, which have been in Cold Storage over one year are automatically condemned by the Food Inspector. The reference as keeping the fish over until next year, and giving them to the destitute poor, I consider this plan would be committing murder on these poor people, by supplying them with fish which is absolutely unfit for human food. However, if Mr. Bennett disputes my state-

ment he is welcome to come down to the Cold Storage Plant, and I will, with pleasure, supply him with a quantity of the said fish and I hope the eating of some will satisfy his curiosity, and probably be the means of his instituting enquiries before making any rash statements.

The other matters referred to, namely, that Mr. Bennett suggested the Government should buy up all the haddock in the country at \$5.00 per qtl. in order to encourage the people to cure it. Is a matter which I leave to those who have sense enough to study the markets and market values. One more point in which I wish to refer to is the statement which Mr. Bennett makes "that, probably, they would have to pay 20 or 30 cents per pound for smoked haddock during the coming winter." I think it only right to state that since my arrival in the country, at least, our price for smoked haddock has been 10 cents per pound. Therefore, in a summary, I wish the public of Newfoundland to note that not one statement made by Mr. Bennett or Mr. Walsh contains the least particle of truth, and I would suggest for their information that they ought to collect data from which they can make statements with accuracy, instead of blowing off a lot of hot air.

Yours very truly,

W. LAMOND MCINTOSH,
Manager.

July 28, 1921.

Another saviour arrived for the country. How long has he been here, Mr. Minister?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I do not know anything about him.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—He'll soon find you out like all the others. Now, Mr. Chairman, it was not Mr. Bennett but your humble servant who made the statements that the writer of this letter objects to. I happened to be at

Petty Hr. some days ago when several cart loads of frozen fish were being unloaded there to be used as fertilizer. I went down and took a couple of the fish and cut them with an axe and I found that they were the same kind of fish that I had been eating all last winter and I am still alive in spite of what Mr. McIntosh says. Perhaps I am one of those people you cannot poison. Now this McIntosh is a man who drifted in here forty-eight hours ago and if he had been here a little earlier he would have been sent to Washington to represent us there on fishery matters. That is usually what happens in this country whenever an upstart of this kind drifts in here as a half bum. This man may be different, I do not know. I take the responsibility for the statements in question, but Mr. Bennett asked the question why haddock was being sold now as a fertilizer, and I put the question on the Order Paper asking the Minister of Fisheries what steps were being taken with regard to the matter. Mr. Bennett said that we are paying 20c. and 30c. per pound for smoked haddock and he was right. Finnan haddie, which is the same as the haddock that is now being sold here as fertilizer, is sold by grocers wholesale at 20c. per pound. Schools of haddock have struck in on the coast this season such as has not been experienced for years. Take the Battery for example; the fishermen down there are bringing them in in boat loads and selling them to the farmers. Now, was not this fish worth \$10.00 a quintal last year and if \$4.00 could be got for it this year would it not be better than using it as fertilizer? It is nothing short of sorrowful to be here discussing ways and means when we have an article that last year was worth \$10.00 a quintal and is worth nothing now. That is gone, the lobster fishery is gone and the

herring fishery is almost gone and that is an industry whose value is not appreciated. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, if the value of all our industries this year will amount to nine millions, let alone getting nine millions revenue.

We are in a worse position to-night than any country in the world and you know it, and nobody knows it better than the Minister of Marine & Fisheries. You sit down now Mr. Samson you are only a shipped man, and shouldn't have a vote here at all. You have two oaths one to the King and one to the F.P.U. Your term here will be very short. Why didn't you vote for the Resolutions the other day with regard to the Railway Bill. When I challenged you to go back to your people you were afraid to do so. That is the answer to you. Look at the difference now to two years ago. To-night we are beggared. We have two thousand men in the woods getting public relief. Is it necessary for me to repeat what I have said so often. You have no blood in you because if you had you would leave the House when you think of what has happened in the last year and a half. Mr. Coaker took the fish money for his friends in the North. We have the other scandals, and then we have a Salt scandal and one hundred and one requests written by him to the Prime Minister asking for an inquiry, a fake. Where is that inquiry now. He is not prepared to take it now and go before a Royal Commission. What do I care if the people will stand for it? They will suffer for it and you know it. It is hard talk but it is true and you bring it on yourselves when you get up here and talk nonsense. He is trying now to get out of this House as quickly as he can, take all he can, rob all he can out of the Government, for that is the right name for it and then get out. Legalised robbers and state paupers that is what you are. Is

there any worse spectacle than you people to-night. I would not mind if you would take advice when you are told where you can get money, but because it comes from this side of the House you cannot take it. The Commercial Cable Co., and the Anglo Co., matter is a scandal. I did not intend to talk this way this afternoon. I got up quietly and entered my protest against this reduction of the salaries of the Civil Servants and increase of salaries in the Supreme Court. I am not prepared to vote for it. You can find that sum of two hundred thousand dollars in any of the Departments. It is not right to come in here and reduce the salary of a man with seven or eight or ten children twenty per cent., and tax him twenty per cent. more with the other hand. There is no justification for it, and I hope that the Minister of Justice will reconsider this vote and try to improve it in some shape or form. Take the police as outlined by Mr. Higgins to-day.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I said that the salaries of the policemen would not be cut.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I am glad to know that there is still feeling enough on the other side not to reduce their salaries.

MR. WALSH.—I think that it is at least refreshing for members of this House to learn that this Raincoat or Mackintosh or whatever the name is appended to the letter read by Sir Michael Cashin, could hold his patience for three months in this country before he criticised the members of this House. We ought to be thankful for that. It is time to put a stop to this kind of thing. I am prepared to accept Sir Michael Cashin's statement about fish. With regard to what this oracle has to say about what would happen in the Old Country if fish was a year in Cold Storage, I don't pay any attention to it. I am going to ask

leave before this House closes to introduce a Bill that will be a copy of the English Act and if Cold Storage fish one year old is not fit for England it is not fit for Newfoundland, and I hope Mr. Mackintosh will be prepared for the consequences. What Mr. Bennett and Sir Michael Cashin said about haddock I endorse, with regard to frozen fish being carted away from the Cold Storage and a lot of it was paid for with English money, and I am not prepared to accept the statement of Mr. Mackintosh, and I would not accept his oath. This is only another sample of all the good things we have been treated to by Collishaw and all the other imports that came here to find a feeding ground, and found an Eldorado. I endorse the statement made by Mr. Bennett with regard to this man and think he should be made apologize at the Bar of this House.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of entering my protest as a member of this House to the communication read by Sir Michael Cashin this afternoon. This is the second time I have had to defend myself against the misrepresentations, and loose statements of the Press. Now I took up the Telegram and found a letter written by a gentleman in criticism of my remarks on Cold Storage fish. I want to say right here that I never made any reference to Cold Storage fish. I listened to Sir Michael Cashin's remarks, wherein he said it was a crime, and I suppose he knew what he was talking about, but it is no concern of mine what they did with their fish. I saw in my district or certain section of it cartloads of good fish being dumped upon the farms as a fertilizer, and I threw out the suggestion to the House and Mr. Coaker will agree with me that the Government purchase this fish and sell it in the winter at the lowest possible

figure. This is some fellow who dropped in from God knows where and he has the impudence to rail at me through the paper, and misrepresent me before the public. It is time we woke up to the fact that this country belongs to Newfoundlanders. Those people must think we are a lot of aborigines. I want the paper that published that statement of his now to publish my denial. I never made the statement he alleged I made, and what I said I am prepared to stand by. I said that we will have to pay from fifteen to thirty cents a pound for the haddock that is being dumped upon the farms. Now go and see what you have to pay for it. The Cold Storage plant will probably charge ten cents for it but in the past two or three years we have been paying thirty cents a lb. for it, and this impudent fellow comes in here with a carpet bag, and will probably go out after a few years with a Gladstone valise, and he has the impudence to insult members of this Legislature. Unless there is a public apology from that man I will ask the Speaker to have him brought to the Bar of the House. What right has he to hold me or any other man up to ridicule? I would be the last in the world to act discourteously towards a stranger coming in here. I was treated very courteously in England and I want to extend to others the same treatment that I received abroad and as long as they behave decently they will get that treatment from Newfoundlanders. but when a man comes in here and tries to dictate to this Legislature how its business should be run it is time to send him about his business, and I am not going to stand for it, and if the apology I already referred to is not published in the same paper as his accusations I demand that he be brought to the Bar of this House to make that apology.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, just a word with regard to the statement written by Mr. Mackintosh. It strikes me forcibly that if he realized what he was writing he would have hesitated. I know all about this Cold Storage Plant from its start and I have seen men like this Mackintosh come in here, men who knew all about codfish were turned down by them, and men you and I would not give a thousand dollars to were put in their places at five thousand a year, and after six months they were labelled, and packed back to the Old Country. If he were any good he would not be coming in here with this nonsense about haddock in Cold Storage twelve months in England being destroyed. I am the very man who sent over a cargo of fish there and it was two years old when it got there, and they said it was the best fish they got during the war, and the only trouble was that the British Government could not keep on eating our fish because they were catching it themselves, and there was no market for ours. But this fable that it is destroyed after one year is ridiculous. I had a telegram the other day asking if haddock was of any value and I wired back saying the men would likely get four dollars a quintal for it. This man comes in here and tells us all about dried haddock. What does he know about it? If he does not apologise as Mr. Bennett said he should be brought here and taught the lesson that it is a wise man who can mind his own business. Another statement that has to be corrected is that the Cold Storage Plant is selling at ten cents a lb. That is not so, that is only the wholesale price. He would not sell ten pounds of fish, and he says he has been selling haddock for six months at this price. I don't suppose he packed one hundred pounds of haddock since he came here. The Reid Nfld. Co. had a

hard time with this Cold Storage Plant and now that they have sold out to a new company the best one can do is to wish them success, but this man is the first barrier to that success, and if he was any good he would be attending to his own business, not writing fancy articles in the Press, and you will find that he is getting as much salary as any one of our Executive members. He is not busy enough at his own job, but he has to tell us a lot of bosh and nonsense. Now as far as the Estimates with regard to the salaries of the Police are concerned we are told they will not be cut, and the Government is to be congratulated on that decision, and I would like it if it is possible, to cut none of the civil servants, and if there is any way that I can help in this I will be only too glad.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Regulate the Cold Storage of Fish.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act for the Quieting of Titles" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent up in and upon the Bill sent down entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the

Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that with reference to the latter portion of their message received regarding the Legislative Council's amendments to the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads," the action of the Legislative Council was within the scope of their constitutional powers and in no way infringed upon the prerogatives of the House of Assembly with regard to Money Bills, as the Bill in question was not sent up to the Legislative Council as a Money Bill under the Act 8, Geo. V, (Second Series) Cap. 11, Section 1, subsection three.

On motion consideration of the foregoing message was deferred until to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 29th.

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

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled Report of his Department for year ended June 30th, 1921.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Walsh the Bill to regulate the Cold Storage of Fish was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the fishermen of Harbour Grace Island. They have always had a launch-way there where they could haul up their boats in rough weather. During a storm of last winter the launch-way was carried away. There are seventeen names to this petition, the entire fishing settlement of the Island. I wonder if it is possible for the Prime Minister to give me a reply to this so that I could give these fishermen an early answer. It is absolutely necessary that the work be done as soon as possible because when the rough fall weather comes, if the launch-way is not built before that time, they will have to take their boats all the way into Harbour Grace, a distance of about three miles. This would mean that they would not be able to do any fall fishing. I would like for the Prime Minister to give me a reply as soon as possible.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Did not the Minister of Public Works receive instructions from the Executive Government to go ahead with the work on certain roads?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—He was present and took his authority direct from the Executive Government.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, what steps, if any, have been taken to collect the bonds for duty owed to the Custom House on account of the fiscal year 1919-1920, and what has been the result of such action; if any amounts have been paid and if so what is their total and what is the total of the amounts still unpaid on account of that fiscal year, and what is the prospect of securing any payment on account of them, and also to supply similar information with re-

gard to amounts due on account of the fiscal year 1920-21.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The exact particulars re this question I have not yet received but I will have them during the afternoon. Up to the 30th June 1921 the arrears due on bonds were \$62,000 but \$10,000 has been paid in cash and \$20,000 has been put to credit because of refunds due leaving a balance of about \$30,000 which is in the hands of the Government's solicitor for collection.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education if the salaries of school teachers are to be reduced in the same proportion of those of public officials according to the Government's scheme recently submitted to this House, and if so to state what will be the total amount of the same.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—It is not the intention of the Government to make any reduction.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if the duty on six motor cars imported into this country some months ago without payment of duty has since been paid, and if not what is the reason such payment is not being enforced.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Twenty-two hundred dollars have been paid in cash but two cars have been held as there is a lien on them.

MR. FOX asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House statement showing (1) number of men in Winterton, District of Trinity, obtaining poor relief from 1919 to date. (2) Who supplied these men and what amount has been paid the parties supplying this Poor Relief. (3) The number of men receiving old Age Pensions in Winterton aforesaid from 1919 to date. (4) What salary is paid the Poor Commissioner at Winterton and what amount by way

of Commission has been paid him in connection with the distribution of Poor Relief as above.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— This will be tabled to-morrow as much time is required.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if it is correct that milk from the Government's Model Farm in the West End is being sold in the city in competition with milk supplied by ordinary farmers, and if so why is the milk being sold instead of being supplied to public institutions; and if not what becomes of the milk at this stock farm.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— No milk is being sold from the stock farm in competition with local dealers but some local dealers purchase milk from the farm when their own stock is short.

MR. MOORE asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works if the lumber required for building bridges and for other work in connection with the construction of the new roads from Badger to Notre Dame Bay and from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay, is being supplied by or through Mr. E. Collishaw, and if so is this the result of seeking tenders for the same or has the order been given to him without competition, and if so why; and if not from whom is the lumber being obtained.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.— I do not know anything about the purchase of lumber from any person. No bill has been received by the department. I have no knowledge of Mr. Collishaw making any bargain. I presume this road is being built through the wooded country and from there the timber is got. Mr. Graham has full power to get whatever timber he wants.

MR. BENNETT.— I would like to refer to an item that appeared in this

morning's paper about men going to Labrador. I got a telephone message from Mr. Monroe and he said he knew nothing about the matter as he is the representative of the Company in question. He wired the company and got the reply of no, they did not know anything about the matter but if they do employ they will be Newfoundlanders. I thought it well to tell the House.

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

Department of Justice, \$276,870.47.

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 Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Chairman:

The estimates of the Fishery Department will show that the retrenchment knife has been deeply inserted. The needs of the country in my opinion, demand this severe treatment. I urged retrenchment in every department and I show my belief in my attitude by asking for estimates this year which amount to nearly half a million dollars less than my estimates of last year.

1920-21 Estimates voted \$1500.00 for Cod Liver Oil and Herring Clerk. This was not used, but an Assistant Accountant was appoint-

ed (a returned soldier) at a sum of \$1,200.00 per year.

Herring Inspector (Mr. Dunphy). It is the intention of the Government not to retain Mr. Dunphy on a yearly salary. This work only comprises some three to five months, and an inspector could be had for this period if required.

Lobster Propagation and Herring Inspector (Mr. Morgan). It is the intention of the Government not to retain the services of Mr. Morgan, as the work in connection with Lobster Propagation will not be carried on this year, and no lobsters will be paid for by the Department.

That of Herring Inspection can be arranged for when the need arrives. These alterations reduce the vote for this Service by \$2,600.00.

Inspector of Lighthouses.—This position is not considered necessary in view of the fact that the Superintendent of the Lighthouse Service, together with the Accountant, will do all the clerical work attached to this section of the Department.

It is the intention to have two Supervisors, one stationed North and one West. These two men have been in the service of the Department and paid out of the amount voted for the up-keep of the Lighthouse Service, during the past few years.

It is the intention of the Government to appoint these two men as Supervisors, and vote their

salaries in the Estimates in the regular way. They are practical men and can superintend all construction work and repairs; see to the erection and adjustment of Fog Alarms and Acetylene lights over the Coast that they have under supervision; report to the Superintendent all necessary repairs, needs and requirements of each Lighthouse and Fog Alarm. In this way, the needs of the Lighthouse Service will be better looked after than formerly.

The work of the Lighthouse Inspector was practically done from the office from information received from the Lighthouse Keepers, or carpenters who were sent to the various stations, and very naturally carpenters who were depending upon this work for their summer wages would make the worst case possible for the Department and thereby get work for themselves. These men, of course, could not be blamed for this because it was slackness on the Department's part for allowing it, and further, the lack of proper inspection.

By the appointment of these two Supervisors, and the visiting of each and every station, the actual needs and requirements will be ascertained by the Department and thereby save unnecessary expenditure through having work or supplies given when really there was no need for same.

The Supervisors' salaries will be \$1,500 each, but as the two men

have been paid from Upkeep of Service, that Vote will be reduced this amount, and the difference between salaries paid the two supervisors and that saved by dropping the vote of \$2500 for the Inspector will be \$500.

In Aid of Instruction in Drawing for Mechanical Engineers.—The vote of \$300 each year for the past two years has been given in aid of the Commercial School. This vote is considered not necessary by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Cold Storage for Bait.—This sum has been reduced to \$1,000.00 as it is thought the requirements for this service will not need more. This is a saving of \$4,000.00.

Bounty on Ships.—This amount is reduced to \$5,000.00. It is sufficient, as it is not likely that thought that this amount will be many, if any, new vessels will be built this year claiming bounty. Last year \$17,480.45 has been spent under this heading, which is a saving of \$12,480.

Dredging.—As it is the intention of the Government not to put the S. S. Priestman in commission this year, a vote of only \$2,000.00 is asked for, and this is for expenses in connection with the care of the boat while lying up. A saving of \$31,000.00 will be made in this Vote.

Propagation of Lobsters.—The expenditure in relation to the payment of 10c. for every spawn lob-

ster put back into the sea, will be discontinued, and therefore the work in this connection will cease. The fishermen know, or ought to know, by now, the value of putting back into the sea all spawn bearing lobsters; but as it is the law for this to be done without payment by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, this will be carried out. The expenditure for this purpose the year past was \$34,500.00, or \$11,500 in excess of the vote, and there will be a saving this year of the total vote.

Amount In Aid of Game and Fisheries Board.—The vote for this service this year will be \$3,000.00, thereby making a saving of \$17,000.00.

Herring Fishery Board and Cod Liver Oil.—These services will be continued owing to the amount of good derived from them, and the great improvements to these important industries. The Vote for Cod Liver Oil last year was \$6,800, it will be \$5,000, this year; but that of the Herring Fishery will be \$7,000, instead of \$12,000, this affecting a saving of \$6,800 this year, on these Votes.

Export of Fish.—This Service will be discontinued, owing to the repeal of the Act. \$8,000.00 was voted last year. As no Vote will be asked for in the estimates this year 1921-22, this amount of \$8,000.00 will be saved.

Trade Commissioners.—The cost of the Trade Commissioners to June 30th, 1921, will be about \$75,-

000.00, and that of the Standardization of Codfish \$50,000.00, making a total expenditure of say, \$125,000.00. This in reality is not a cost to the Colony, as regards taxes, because the 10c. per qtl. extra on Exportation of Codfish will be about \$135,000.00. It has been decided not to have Trade Commissioners for this year. \$50,000.00 was voted for this service in last year's estimates. This amount will be saved this year.

Standardization.—Will not be put in force this year, as every possible dollar must be saved, consequently the Government has decided to allow the Act to become inoperative this year, or until the the financial situation of the Colony improves.

Marine Works.—Owing to the grant of half a million dollars expended on public works this year the grant of \$15,000 for marine works has been dropped.

Superintendent of Fisheries.—This appointment has not been made and owing to retrenchment this Vote of \$5,000.00 will not be asked for.

Lighthouse Maintenance.—With the economy that must be exercised by the Department, and the careful expenditure of the money voted for the Lighthouse Service last year, many thousands of dollars have been saved. Supplies as in the past will not be allowed, and the Keepers and Assistants will have to do petty repairs to their stations, without being paid

extra for doing same. Paint, brushes, sponges, etc., will not be had for the asking, but only as the real need demands, and in this way thousands of dollars can and must be saved.

The Expenditure for 1919-20 for Maintenance and Supplies was \$177,269. The Expenditure for 1920-21, will be \$102,000, a saving of \$75,000.00, although the cost of supplies last year was 20 per cent higher than the previous year.

The Lighthouse Keepers will have to keep their stations in proper order, clean, and in good repair, for the two Supervisors will inspect each Lighthouse once a year and report to the Department the condition of each and nothing but what is strictly needed will be supplied by the Department.

The Vote for Maintenance for 1919-20 was \$94,946.00. This year 1920-21; \$73,719.00 is asked for, which will mean a saving of nearly \$19,000.

Wardens' Salaries.—This vote is considered unnecessary, it will not be asked for this year in the estimates. This means a saving of \$5,000.00.

Herring Fishery Protection and Enforcement of Bait Laws.—This Vote is unnecessary, as the Customs' Revenue Service practically covers this Service. This reduction means \$8,800 saved.

The cost of Kerosene Oil to the Trade during 1921 was 3c. per gal. in excess of the price

paid in 1920. Thus instead of Kerosene Oil costing 43 cents per gal. it was supplied by the wholesale importers at 28c. This shows a reduction in the quantity of oil purchased and sent out by this Department of 7,770 galls. This reduction is due to the fact that oil is now supplied, as required, to the various stations, in steel drums which prevent leakage, and not sent out as formerly in large quantities at the beginning of the season. Therefore the kerosene oil bill last year was \$11,500 less than the expenditure of the year previous in spite of an increase to the trade of 3c. per gall. in the cost of kero oil.

The expenditure for Lighthouse Maintenance for the Fiscal year 1919-20, was \$205,921.00, and was made up as follows:—

For general repairs, upkeep of lights, and erections of new lights \$ 28,651.32

For General Maintenance and Supplies .. 177,269.68

\$205,921.00

The expenditure for Lighthouse Maintenance for the year 1920-21 will be \$211,240.00, made up as follows:—

For general repairs, upkeep of lights and erection of new lights 108,563.61

For General Maintenance and Supplies ..102,677.78

\$211,240.89

We are asking for \$20,000 the coming year for repairs, installations and erections, as against \$99,604.00 voted last year.

New Acetylene Lights already provided out of 1920-21 vote, are being installed at the following places:—La Scie, Smokey Island, Puffin, Flat Island, B.B., Flat Island, Burgeo, Little Hr., LaPoile, West Rencontre, English Hr., Fortune Bay, Ragg's Island, Fogo, Point Verde.

Long Point, Twillingate: — A new 4" Diaphine Fog Alarm Plant has been installed on Long Point, Twillingate.

The Fog Alarms at Lamaline at St. Lawrence have been completed.

A Fog Alarm has been erected at Green Island, Catalina.

The Cabot Island Station has been fitted with the Fog Alarm taken from Green Island.

A compressor for the manufacture of acetylene gas is now being erected at the King's wharf, the cost of which was provided from last year's votes.

The Bonavista Cape Fog Alarm had been erected in a dangerous place and the heavy seas of 1919 almost destroyed the station. The Fog Alarm had to be removed to a new building adjoining the lighthouse. This was accomplished last year.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT SHOWING GENERAL COST OF
REPAIRS, UP-KEEP, AND ERECTION OF NEW LIGHTS,
FOR THE YEARS 1919-20 AND 1920-21.**

	1919-20	1920-21
Gull Island—General repairs.....		\$ 85.00
Little Bay Islands—Moving store and landing..\$	77.60	
Leading Tickles—New floor.....	52.40	
Fortune Hr.—General repairs.....		19.99
Surgeon's Cove Head—New spar.....		60.00
Black Island—New boom.....	63.50	
Black Island—General repairs and up-keep.....		381.53
Cabbage Hr. Head—Erecting store and landing place.....	377.60	
Lower Sandy Pt.—Enlarging house.....	619.49	
Bacalhao—Repairs to store and landing....	148.40	
Change Is., S.E.—Goods supplied Shipwrecked crew.....	60.00	
Change Is.—General repairs to station.....		68.62
Long Point, N.D.B.—New Alarm Plant, Freight and erecting same.....		13,000.00
Cann Island—General repairs to Station.....	153.00	
Smoker Island—Erecting new Light.....		563.00
White Point—Erecting small light for fishing boats.....		65.00
Puffin Flat Is.—Installing new Light.....		217.00
Musgrave Hr.—New iron work for Buoys.....		57.20
Peckford's Is.—Repairs to wall and landing place.....	29.90	
Wadhams—General repairs to Station.....	574.59	
Cabot Island—General repairs to Station.....	410.30	
Cabot Island—Erecting buildings for new Fog Alarm Plant.....		4,182.00
Puffin Island—General repairs to Station.....	154.19	
Newtown—Installing new Light.....	546.-0	
Squarry Hd.—Installing new Light and iron bridge.....	2,359.46	
Bonavista—Repairs to machinery and general up-keep.....	448.91	
Bonavista—Cost of transporting building and Alarm plant to Cape.....		2,698.14
Green Is.—General Repairs to Station.....	381.78	
Catalina—New spar, etc.....		56.35

Fort Pt. Alarm—Repairs to Engine parts....		45.27
Random—Motor Boat hire....	15.00	
Heart's Content—Repairs to Building....	420.77	
Heart's Content—General repairs to station....		665.76
Jean's Head—General repairs to station.....	137.30	
Old Perlican—Repairs to road....	25.00	
Baccalieu—Repairs to house, iron ladder, and repairs to machinery....	589.93	
Baccalieu—General repairs to Station		692.50
Carbonear—General repairs to Station	528.43	
Harbor Grace Island—Iron work, etc., for land- ing places	126.20	
Harbor Grace Buoys—New mooring tackle, chain and spar		155.09
Bay Roberts—General repairs and up-keep of Station	1,932.73	
Brigus—General repairs and fixing road to house	143.30	
Salmon Cove—General repairs to Station	57.20	
Cape St. Francis—General repairs to Station ...	554.32	
Cape St. Francis—General repairs to Station ...		304.32
Fort Amherst—New light tower and general repairs	1,030.91	
Fort Amherst—Repairs to engine		119.91
Cape Spear—General repairs to Station	675.87	
Cape Spear—Repairs to engine, new cylinder and magneto		221.69
Bay Bulls—Motor hire on account accident to light	20.00	
Bay Bulls—General repairs to light		78.31
Ferryland—Iron casement for tower and gen- eral repairs	4,296.75	
Fermeuse—General repairs to Station		406.29
Powell's Head—Erecting new landing place, and repairs		614.25
Cape Pine—Repairs to Station	70.95	
Cape Pine—Repairs to Station		35.00
Cape St. Mary's—General repairs to Station ...		910.94
Point Verde—New iron tower and general re- pairs....	1,410.18	
Point Verde—Installing new Light and repairs to dwelling....		1,592.92
Marticcott—Glass....		10.15

Long Is., P.B.—General repairs to Station....	55.88	
Long Is., P.B.—New Spar.....		40.00
Dodding Head—Making new Wharf and repairing dwelling.....	630.00	
Dodding Head—General repairs to Station....		98.00
Burin Island—New dory and repairs to Station	205.36	
Burin Island—General repairs to Station....		204.93
St. Lawrence—Erecting new building, etc., destroyed by lightning.....	4,162.37	
St. Lawrence—New alarm plant and cost of erection.....		8,555.35
Lamaline—Air tank and erecting building....	2,125.86	
Lamaline—New Alarm plant and cost of installation.....		9,236.71
Leading Lights—General up-keep.....	62.00	
(Lamaline)—2 new Buoys.....		59.00
Green Is., F.B.—New dome and general repairs	749.00	
Green Is., F.B.—General up-keep and repairs....		364.45
Brunette—Repairs to road.....	100.00	
Brunette—General repairs to Station.....		204.93
Fortune—Repairs to Light damaged by fire....	51.00	
Garnish—Repairs to Breakwater.....	200.40	
Rencontre—New Light stands.....		35.63
Belleoram—Temporary light.....		24.50
St. Jacques.....		13.60
Pass Island—General repairs to Station.....		86.40
Penguin West—Putting iron tank in position...		115.50
Burego, Flat Is.—New Light stands.....		35.63
LaPoile—New Light stands.....		35.63
Rose Blanche—Repairs to Station.....	189.63	
Rose Blanche—Repairs to Station.....		32.05
Channel Head—Repairing damage caused by storm.....	780.28	
Channel Head—New circulating pump and general repairs.....		180.45
Codroy—Erecting new Light.....		145.00
Sandy Point—General repairs.....	28.25	
Cape St. George—Repairs to road.....	15.00	
Black Duck Brook—Erecting Leading Light....	204.98	
Black Duck Brook—Up-keep and repairs....		7.40
Little Port Head—Repairs to winch and general repairs.....		63.80

Frenchan's Head—General repairs.....	95.00	
Noble Island—New light stand.....		110.00
Goose Cove—New light stand.....		60.88
LaScie—New light stand.....		124.20
West Coast Range—New light stand.....		206.30
LaScie Wharf Light—General repairs.....		19.00
St. Jacques' Buoy—General repairs.....		13.20
English Hr. Buoy—General repairs.....		23.00
Hy. Simon's Account.....		4,087.52

N.B.—This amount was due in 1919-20, but was not paid until 1920-21. It was for Grand Bank Light, and also supplied for all Stations of wicks, and glasses, which were sent out as required during the year 1919-20.

STATEMENT SHOWING VOTE FOR 1920-21—1921-22 AND REDUCTION IN VOTES.

	1920-21	1921-22	Saving
Salaries.....	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 3,500.00
LIGHTHOUSES :			
Salaries.....	110,641.14	107,681.14	2,960.00
Maintenance.....	93,847.00	73,719.00	20,128.00
Contingencies.....	2,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	<u>\$206,488.14</u>	<u>\$182,400.14</u>	
For Repairs, Installation and Outfits.....	99,604.00	20,000.00	79,604.00
BLOCK HOUSE :			
Salaries.....	\$ 1,316.25	\$ 1,316.25	
Maintenance.....	950.00	500.00	450.00\$
	<u>\$ 2,266.25</u>		
Salaries, Wardens.....	\$ 5,500.00		\$ 5,500.00
Meteorological Service.....	6,000.00	6,000.00	
Herring Fishery Protection.....	800.00		800.00
Travelling Expenses, Department Fisheries.....	1,650.00	1,650.00	
Incidentals.....	150.00	150.00	
Lobster and Salmon Label Expenses.....	2,100.00	2,100.00	
Public Wharves, repairs, Keepers, rent, light.....	2,500.00	2,500.00	

Harbour Master and Boatman	845.00		
Night Boatman and Sundries....	40.00	885.00	
Instruction to Masters and Mates and Assistant Ex- aminers.....	1,550.00	1,550.00	
Mechanical Engineers.....	300.00		300.00
Cold Storage for Bait.....	5,000.00	1,000.00	4,000.00
Enforcement of Bait Laws	8,000.00		8,000.00
Bounty on Ships Built.....	16,000.00	5,000.00	11,000.00
Marine Works.....	15,000.00		15,000.00
Dredging.....	33,000.00	2,000.00	31,000.00
Propagation Lobsters.....	23,000.00		23,000.00
In Aid of Game and Inland Fisheries Boar.....	20,000.00	3,000.00	17,000.00
Herring Fishery Expenses.....	12,000.00	7,000.00	5,000.00
Cod Liver Oil Expenses.....	6,000.00	5,000.00	1,800.00
Export Fish Board.....	8,000.00		8,000.00
New Steamers (2).....	50,000.00		50,000.00
Trade Commissioners.....	50,000.00		50,000.00
For Harbour Improvements..	100,000.00		100,000.00
Public Wharves, Marine Works	50,000.00		50,000.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$781,186.39	\$286,044.39	\$495,142.00

Any information required by members of the House in connection with these estimates I shall endeavour to answer if in my power.

MR. MOORE.—Might I ask the Hon. Minister of Fisheries if all the Commissioners who were in the various fish markets have been recalled and if none are receiving salaries.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—None are receiving salaries.

MR. MOORE.—Is it the intention to take them on again after the House closes. Some are boasting of going abroad again and I hope this will not be the case. If you do that and come back here again, you will never be allowed to close. I do not know yet if you will close this season. One of them is boasting of going back in August.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND

FISHERIES.—They are not being engaged by me.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to some of the reductions—take the ase of Mr. Dunphy, the Herring Inspector at \$900. I do not understand why you are going to abandon this fishery altogether. Dunphy is one of the best men for the inspection of herring in this country and Mr. Fitzgerald who was also dismissed is one of the best as his experience is universal. He is a son of the late Nicholas Fitzgerald, of Hr. Grace, a famous herring catcher on the Labrador; and next to him is Dunphy. But you took it upon yourself to reform this, one of the principal departments of the

Government. I do not know if you read Sir R. A. Squires' manifesto. He told the people the Department of Fisheries had ever been a 2nd rate, not a first rate one but this must no longer be so. With the programme of to-day where are we to land as a fishing country if you are going to put up the shutters. You say nothing will be done for the lobster fishery and last year you spent \$34,000 on it. If that be so you are going to abandon what we have been protecting for years and what was being brought up to the standard that it ought to be. This means go-as-you-please as far as packing is concerned. It would be better to close up even the lighthouse and fog alarms. Here you are now going to wipe out the lobster fishery—clean it right off the map. You say it cost \$34,000 and are you going to taffe off the revenue boat. If you do, you may save \$50,000 or \$60,000, but I say, on will come free smuggling. If the lobster vote is taken off it will allow the fishermen to do as they like. The fact remains, that there will be nobody to protect the lobsters, no supervisors, etc. and it would be better to take up a public collection for the service. The lobster, like the her-ring, was quite an asset but like the latter it is to be allowed to go by default. Why is Mr. Dunphy laid off—is it because his sons fought and died for us. He had only a pauper's salary but at one time he was a competent member of this House. But the time has arrived now when men can be brought in here and paid to vote their superiors like Dunphy out of a position. It is a lovely spectacle indeed. Now take here in your Estimates an assistant accountant at \$1600. Is that a new vote?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He was made assistant last year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Why do you

want him if you are reducing your department two-thirds. You have not explained it. Why appoint a new official. What have you done with Mr. Goodridge?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He is not being paid by the Government since the Commissioners were paid off at the end of June.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I think you will find he is still under pay of the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Not in my department.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Now to get back to the lobster fishery. I would join with you this afternoon to close every lighthouse at the north rather than do away with the lobster fishery. And this thing of the dredging is also fictitious—you cannot keep her at the wharf and pay the engineers, etc. for less than \$5,000 a year. Isn't she in commission now?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Those who are using her are paying for her. She is employed for the end of the year.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Then you come along with a reduction in cold storage. What have you to show that this will be less this year. There are no two seasons showing the bait alike in Newfoundland. Some seasons there is squid in abundance but in others it is scarce. Take the squid season—if last year you required \$5,000 for the freezing plants it is only guess work on your part to say \$1,000 will do now. I know where they are working without a subsidy from the Government and what I want to impress upon you is that your estimates are simply guesswork. There is no proof that your figures will be sufficient to carry on the work of the Colony. Not one iota uttered by you will balance when you come in next year with your estimates and expenditure and then

you will see that I am correct. You struck me hard when you told me you are going to abandon the lobster fishery. Surely you are not going to do it. You ought to find out what you should do.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The season is gone.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—But it will come again. This \$34,000 was voted last year for the lobster fishery, wasn't it. I want to impress on you that I am not satisfied you are going to abandon it. Others here know more of the matter than I and will not sit idly by and let you do it. The herring fishery was ruined too. The fish were brought to New York and with the Hon. R. K. Bishop, I saw them stacked from one end of the pier to the other, rolled in mud and in leaky barrels. After going through the war we had a chance but not an attempt was made to save that fishery—hundreds of barrels were dumped into the sea.

The codfishery is also gone. You are going to destroy the lobster fishery now because as soon as the people read this out will go the traps and the females will be destroyed as the men will not throw them back into the sea, particularly with codfish at \$3 or \$4 a qtl. On the Trade Commissioners last year you tell us you spent \$74,000 but you give us no figures of the returns to the Colony for it. Why were the fishermen taxed 10 cents a qtl. to pay for it, and on the back of that you had another \$50,000 for standardization but you do not say what it will benefit Newfoundland. Now you ask us to vote money again but give no explanation of the big expenditure for last year. Your department is the most important in the Government but now it is abandoned. I expected a two hours' speech from you, telling of the inspectors and commissioners but you came in here

with a prepared statement, handed it out and sat down but gave no explanation. You are practicing false economy as to the lighthouses; you told us the supplies were reduced by \$75,000 but you have not told us how you accomplished that. It would be interesting to me as I am an old member here. But I know how you reduced it—when a keeper sent a list for supplies to you, you put your pencil through it and said, go out, you will get no more. You had no regard whether he had enough or not. You reduced it alright, but what condition will the lighthouses be in. The man who comes after you will find his work cut out for him as if the houses are neglected for a year or two the whole thing will go to pot. There is no effort to tell us how they will be saved. Now you vote \$20,000 for repairs against \$97,000 last year—how are you going to do that?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—We will not put up any new lighthouses or fog alarms.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I do not agree with you. We are not in a position to vote the money but why continue the lighthouses on the North coast—the fishermen made a better living before without them than they can to-day. You simply cut off the supplies. This is the way all your reform is being done. The dredge was bought at something like \$50,000 to deepen the harbors, etc., but now she is handed over to a company on a loan with no hard and fast agreement for the benefit of the Colony. She has been taken as a loan by some enterprising men who saw her lying idle. She cost \$50,000 or \$60,000 and the same for upkeep which is still going on and now we are asked to vote it again next year. Is the standardization abandoned altogether?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—That is a good thing—you had a gang of men going around insulting the people, and mark this well, there was more bad fish in Newfoundland last year than since Cabot discovered it. You have not told the House of that but you say you will save \$75,000 by cutting out standardization. I told you last year it was an unnecessary expense to be sending these inspectors around as they had nothing whatever to do with the making of the fish. The three best months of the year were very hot as you will remember, we had no rains, the fishermen were up against it to make their fish and there was more West India than ever before—from some of the outports the fish averaged 75% West India. What had the army of inspectors around the Island to do with it. You now got to sit there and take it coldly—you, the great organizer, have to be told that your first attempt has resulted in producing more bad fish than ever. You did not tell us that result or give us an account of the matter. It is all a joke sending around these inspectors isn't it in the interests of the man who has it to make it good, and how can they affect it. The depression now may be a blessing in disguise as it has put a stop to this kind of thing. You spent \$175,000 last year on these men whom you would not employ in many cases if you had to pay them from your own purse. May I again ask the Hon. Minister what he is going to do about Mr. Dunphy. I am especially interested in his case; I was a member of this House with him; he has given special services to the country but is now up against it and without any ceremony he is put on the street. It is not good enough. You got men in your department that ought to go out before Mr. Dunphy. He is asked to live on \$900 after giving his two sons to King and Country.

And still we hear you talking of all you can do for the afflicted.

I am also in possession this afternoon of a memorial from the employees of another department, the Customs, which reads as follows: (Reads memorial.)

They ask in this petition that their salaries not be decreased and I agree with them in every respect in what they set out here. I have pointed out to the House before as I pointed out yesterday that the whole amount is only \$200,000 and you are going to cut this up and while you leave one department as it is you intend to cut others. Is there any reason or method in this? We have told you before and we are prepared to tell you again where you can get this money without employing these means to do so. Again, as the petitioners hint in this memorial, if you want efficient service you must not decrease the civil servants' salaries. You have cut them sufficiently already and you cannot be in earnest about bringing in this Bill now. The proof of this is that you are already giving in to some of the departments. The Minister of Education has said that he is not going to cut the teachers and I agree with him, but why cut any of them if you are going to discriminate? I am prepared to stay here another month if necessary rather than submit to this being done and I serve notice now that before a salary of \$1,200.00 or under is cut I will keep you here another six weeks and every man on this side of the House is of the same mind. Imagine a man with a salary of \$700 having his income reduced already 35% on one end and another reduction now of 25% on the other. It is like a candle burning at both ends. Now I ask you to take this away and come down with the salaries as they were before and you can put your estimates through in twenty-four

hours. The only explanation you have to offer for this outrage is that we have spent too much money during the past year, we are sorry but we will make this grab and the men in the civil service who have no pull will make up the deficiency or part of it out of their salaries. Anyway, this is not an estimate because no man in the House can tell what the estimates for these salaries are. The amounts we are asked to pass now are the same as last year and if we pass them you will come in with a Bill asking for a reduction the amount of which you do not know. You cannot tell us now what money you will want and we are not going to vote on that this evening. I was instrumental in getting the few increases that the civil servants received during the past few years, at least when I say that I was instrumental I mean the Governments with which I was identified, and I was Receiver General, I tried to make it a point to always tack on something instead of taking it off.

The Minister of Posts could very easily save that \$200,000 and I have told him time and again how he can do it but he is too stiff-necked and bull-headed to do what he will have to do ultimately, but before it is done I suppose the Prime Minister will have to go to New York and interview the head of the Anglo Company. He will get four or five thousand dollars for expenses and then come back and announce with a flourish of trumpets that the whole matter is settled when it could be done now by the stroke of a pen. We are not going to take these Estimates and have you turn round and take \$200,000 from a body of men who are in a groove and cannot make a cent any way outside their salaries. One would think that you were on the inside track and that you knew these people have bank ac-

counts but unfortunately for them this is not so. I would therefore move that you rise the Committee and I if you recognize the justice of our contention with regard to this matter, we are with you in getting through the business as expeditiously as possible.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse fully everything that has been said in regard to this matter by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin. I think it will be borne in mind that when the Estimates were tabled, the Prime Minister said he was going to bring in a Bill to reduce the salaries of the civil servants. This side then took a firm stand against anything of the kind being done on the ground that to do so would be to entail great hardship upon these people. Now Sir, I do not desire to delay the business of the House in any way but I cannot keep my seat without entering my protest against this manifest injustice. The civil servants have all they can do now to live between increased taxation and continued high prices, for, whatever reduction there may have been in the price of the necessaries of life has been offset by the increased taxes imposed by the present Government, making things as dear as they were before the end of the war. Therefore, if you increased the salaries during the war on the ground of high prices, what is the logic of cutting them now? Anyway, the civil servants are as a class miserably paid and in this respect we have no parallel in any part of the British Empire. Some, it is true, are getting fairly well paid and the remarkable thing about it is that the Minister of Justice was instructed to increase the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court according to those of the Provincial Judges of the Dominion of Canada. If it was thought advisable to do this why did the Government not

secure copies of the Estimates of the Provinces of Canada and base the whole civil servants' salaries accordingly and so save discrimination.

As I have already pointed out, this will be money saved without economy because you will not have efficiency and you are leaving the door open to dishonesty. How can you expect a revenue officer for example to do his duty night and day in the rounding up of smugglers if you discourage him by cutting his salary? If he is not getting paid enough for his services his sympathies will be with the smugglers rather than with the department he represents. You might say if the salary is not sufficiently large to satisfy him, let them get out, but unfortunately the majority of civil servants are unfitted for anything else and the only door open to them is inefficiency and neglect of duty. Therefore, it is but opening the door for wrong-doing to pursue this policy, and I hope the Prime Minister will reconsider his decision and decline to bring in this Bill. The cutting of \$270,000 off the salaries of our civil servants is a big mistake. The Opposition is as much interested in saving the country as the Government is, but if you must save it by this means, then the sooner it goes into somebody else's hands the better. The Estimates as they stand are entirely satisfactory and I think we should leave them as they are. Mention has been made of the dismissal of men from certain departments, notably Mr. Dunphy of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Now, if there was no work for him there why were other men taken in? Why was Mr. James McGrath given a job on the revenue boat and Mr. Dunphy who has been in the Department for a number of years thrown on the street? The same thing happened last year in the case of Mr. Fitzgerald and I know that he was

considered one of the most efficient men connected with the Department. He was dismissed without any cause whatever and he has been for the past year or year and a half without employment. We all realize that there are occasions when we could do with less help than we employ at other times but who will question the injustice of putting on the street a man who has stuck to you through thick and thin, merely because business happens to be a bit slack for the time being.

There is a day coming, however, when things in this respect will be changed, when employer and employees will go arm in arm and when mutual confidence and respect will exist between them. This is as it should be, for why should one man be allowed to amass all the wealth, why should he pile up gold beyond counting while others are living in semi-starvation? That is what the world is suffering from to-day; it is not socialism nor bolshevism, and the same thing applies to a Government. The people of this country want to give everybody a square deal and I hope that these two cases will be given consideration by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, I am sure, will do what he can to rectify the injustice that has been done. I, therefore, join with Sir Michael Cashin in protesting against this proposed decrease and I assure you that if you abandon the idea now you will be just as well off next year because you will be repaid two-fold.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Chairman, with the exception of one or two cases, I am not prepared to vote for these increases, and there will be a division I hope, because some of those who are getting five or six thousand dollars already were raised so that this decrease would not affect them. I heard that statement made before and I be-

I've the man who made it knew what he was talking about. I am not prepared to vote those increase for the Judges and Dr. Lloyd under the present circumstances. The time may come when I may recommend a two thousand dollar increase for Dr. Lloyd, and I hope it won't be long before it does come but we will have to be in a better financial condition than we are to-day. In conclusion I would say that I hope the Government will act upon the suggestion of Sir Michael Cashin and pass these votes as they are, because we are going to protest against cutting the salary of the ordinary Civil Servant who is only getting enough to keep body and soul together.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House but I wish to endorse the attitude taken by Sir Michael Cashin. I think he made a very fair offer here this afternoon. I am sure that the Prime Minister and the members of the Government have no wish to cut the salaries of the Civil Servants, and they only did it because they thought there was no other way out. After all when we consider that it is only two hundred thousand dollars, and that is not of much importance to the country I am sure that the Prime Minister will give this matter further consideration and will probably be prepared to withdraw the Resolutions. After all there are none of them getting huge amounts and with conditions as they are to-day, I don't see how these people could live on less than they are at present getting. Take a man with a family, he can't live on nothing. In the past he has been paying forty per cent. duty, and now he is paying an extra ten per cent. surtax, and 25 per cent. sales tax. I am sure that the Government will reconsider this matter. Perhaps they have done so. Judging from the words of the Prime Min-

ister just now, I feel that he will not press this matter. It would facilitate matters greatly if the Prime Minister would say that he is prepared to consider this matter. Sir Michael Cashin said that he will let the Estimates go through in twenty-four hours if this is done.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Prime Minister at this stage if it would not be just as well after the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon to raise the Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The passing the Estimates we are now on will have no effect on the Resolutions with regard to reduction of Civil Servants, and I think we can discuss this matter when we go into Committee on ways & Means to-morrow.

MR. MOORE.—That is alright but if you will take these Estimates and put them before a party meeting and bring them down here in concrete form we will vote for them. You heard what Sir Michael Cashin said. We cannot vote for them. We have a petition here from the officials of the Custom House in this connection, and we are asking you to withdraw those Resolutions and if you do that you will have no further trouble. If you don't the black flag is mast high.

With regard to Mr. Dunphy that is a scandal, to dismiss a man who was in this House when I had a seat outside the Bar. He is a fisherman and it comes with poor grace from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to fire him on the street when he was only getting nine hundred a year, especially at this time of the year. We have no desire to be here a moment longer than is necessary and we are here to help you out if you will do what we want, and withdraw these Resolutions, or raise the Committee to see what can be done with them. I think Sir Michael Cashin was very reason-

able this evening when he asked you to raise the Committee and go back and leave that two hundred thousand dollars on, because if we have to go down it is just as well to go with all sails set. You are here to-day voting money you have not got and cannot get. I would ask the Prime Minister to seriously consider that request of mine before we go any further with the debate, and if you come back here Monday with that two hundred thousand dollars on again, the votes will go through and we will all go home.

M^R. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House long, but I wish to say that I thoroughly appreciate and endorse the attitude taken by Sir Michael Cashin in this matter. I think that for a Government with the record you have made for spending money that now at the twenty-third hour, almost at the last minute, it is a pitiable thing that the best you can conceive is to make two hundred thousand dollars off the Civil Servants of Newfoundland. That is regrettable. I think that it is a matter which when you reconsider it you will not push to its conclusion. Take the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I know there is a case of perhaps the most capable man in the Civil Service that I know, Mr. Morgan. I know that since he took charge of the lobster on the West Coast in my district and Mr. Scammell's, there is three times as much lobster as there was ten years ago, and this is due to a large extent to his efficient work. I am sorry that there is no vote for this industry this year, because I believe that the fishermen when there is no protection will be shortsighted enough to ruin the whole fishery by not putting back the spawn. I do believe that this year through the lack of protection there will be more harm done than there has been good in the past five

years, and I really recommend that to Mr. Coaker. We cannot afford to have this lobster fishery go. Take in St. George's up to Port au Port, a man who is at codfishery has to wait until the fall for his money, but with lobster the minute a man gets a case canned he can turn it over for whatever he requires, and that that should go is a pity. We should have a vote here for the encouragement of that fishery, and we should have a proper label, the one we have is no good, it spreads all over the can, and by the time it arrives in the States the label is off the can. You want to encourage putting up lobster in half pound tins. There is a tremendous market for it in this way in New York. Our stuff arrives there with no labels and the cans all rust and the result is that the Japanese product is bought in preference to ours because it is done up attractively. Instead of killing this thing which we are doing by having no protection this year, we should do something for it to make it better.

With regard to the general reduction of the salaries of the Civil Servants, I think it is wrong. I hope it will not be necessary for us to fight that because I am tired of being in this House in this fine weather, and I hope we won't have to stay here any longer, but if this matter is not adjusted and these men who can't defend themselves are going to be cut, when they can just live on what they are getting, as far as I am concerned I endorse the attitude of Sir Michael Cashin in this matter and if it is necessary to prevent the passing of these Estimates I will do as much as I can in that direction.

H^{ON}. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, with respect to the matter now before the House I may say that when we go into Committee on Ways and Means the Government has some amendments to submit.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—We had a promise from the Attorney General that the salaries in his Department would not be cut down, and we had a similar assurance from Dr. Barnes. If the Prime Minister will assure us that the same will apply to all the Civil Servants we will be satisfied. The whole amount of the cut is I think, two hundred and thirty thousand dollars, and when you consider what that means to the country it is very small in comparison with the amount of anxiety and hardship entailed by that reduction, and if you give us the promise we ask for it will make things very easy for you. We received a petition from the Custom House this afternoon pointing out that under the present conditions they cannot live on less than they are getting, and there are some of those officials who did not get an increase last year, and now you are going to apply the axe to them as well as the others. If you reconsider this matter you will have the endorsement of the House and of the country, because as Mr. Moore said if we are going down let us go with all sails set, and the two hundred thousand dollars you would save on the Civil Servants would not be of much help to you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply I might say that the cut does not apply to anyone who did not receive the from twenty to thirty per cent. increase in the Autumn of 1919. There are some who did not get that increase then who got it later and to these the bill applies. I think that when we get into Committee on Ways and Means and have an opportunity of discussing this matter that Sir Michael Cashin will see that this bill deals fairly with all. The school teachers did not receive that increase in 1919 and they did not receive any subsequent increase from the present Government so they do not come under

the Bill. With respect to the Police when that increase was given in 1919 the Inspector General on behalf of the Police waited upon the Government, asking that that increase be applied to them, and the Government at that time took the position and I think they were right that their salaries some time previously had been put upon a scale which had been under consideration by the previous Administration, and that consequently they did not come under this increase. I will be very glad to take up this matter when we go into Committee on Ways and Means. With regard to teachers they are not Civil Servants at all. The only Civil Servants in the Department of Education are the Minister and three or four officials identified with his department and these will be subject to the decrease. I suggest therefore that as this does not affect any votes in Supply, that we leave it until we come to Ways and Means. It was suggested by Sir Michael Cashin when in Committee on this matter some weeks ago that there should be a minimum salary which should not be subject to taxation. I will be very glad to discuss this to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I don't think it is too much to ask the Prime Minister for a promise similar to the one given by the Minister of Justice. When you come to consider that you are decreasing the salaries and increasing taxation you are trying to burn the candle at both ends. I think that the Estimates with very few exceptions should remain as they are. No taxation or reduction should be applied to a Civil Servant who is receiving less than twelve hundred dollars. We have here a petition signed by one of the oldest officials in the Civil Service, Mr. LeMessurier and other members of the Custom House and they are to-day receiving

salaries on which they can barely live. I don't pity the official high up, but the ordinary official with a family who is paying rent, etc., with the increased taxation you are putting on. It is intolerable. If we are going to the wall we should go with that two hundred thousand dollars on. It doesn't amount to a row of beans to the country. If you cannot show and you cannot, how you are going to benefit the country by this reduction, it is better to leave it alone.

Now I would ask the Prime Minister to reconsider the bill before the House. Leave that 10 cents on fish if you will, but don't cut the Civil Servants.

You say the teachers are not Civil Servants. Well, if they are not, they are paid by the Government. When I first came into this House the vote for education was about \$150,000, and this year it is almost \$800,000. It is an absolute waste of money. Now I am not going to be a party to cutting the salaries of Civil Servants, I am not going to cut a man from his living. Civil Servants have to live, and they have to support families. Once you start to reduce your servant's wages you have got to be careful. They are not going to show any interest in their work.

MR. VINNICOMBE.—Mr. Chairman, regarding these resolutions there were no increases last year in the Customs Department except Mr. LeMessurier. He was put on a par with all the other heads. The Police are not going to be reduced, the teachers are not going to be reduced, what, therefore, is the meaning of this bill? It cannot be regarded as anything but discrimination. I think this is a very unpopular measure on the part of the Government, and I would not like to see the Government any more unpopular than they are. Now I would recommend that the Government take

the suggestion of the esteemed leader of the Opposition, and let the Civil Servants salaries stay as they are, and then we could go on with the "Supply" without any trouble.

MR. HIGGINS.—It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to delay the House but I wish to say that in connection with this matter of salaries I commend the stand of the Opposition as to this as they took it from the first. The principle of differentiating is unfair and improper and we are enunciating no new line of thought now as we from the first opposed it. The Government ought not take this position in regard to the Civil Servants. It is alright to suggest economy but if the Government and the members are honest to themselves and their constituents they have no right to expend the money in other directions and curtail the servants of the State. It is not right as in the same breath they tax them to a degree never contemplated. It needs no words of mine to point out that for the man—the out and out civil servants whose salary was his only means of support and who found it impossible to exist on \$1200 or even less—there ought to be no reduction. It is only putting a premium on inefficiency and dishonesty. It simply amounts to an inducement to them to go into a game that the Minister of Works would deplore. It will make the Customs a department of smugglers. If you cut the officials to look after the revenue you will put a premium on their collusion with those who are evading the law and you will be inducing them to wink these evasions out of sight. I hope you will take this into consideration and if you do, I feel the reduction will not come and that you will recognize the principle that you have no right to draw the line, as apparently is to be done, between one official and another in a department. If

you are only levelling up the salaries you have no right to say it should come off only those who got increases. The Hon. Minister of Justice has been good enough to say that he will not apply the reduction to the police and firemen, but I object to the basis on which that is laid down. The excuse is wrong—that they will not be reduced because they got no increases. It is no use trying to sidetrack it. The Hon. Minister of Education says the teachers' salaries are not to be cut, but the Government has nothing to be thanked for as they have no right to cut them. A teacher's pay is a private matter between himself and his Board and he can say, "thank you for nothing." The Government has absolutely no more to do with their salaries than the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Postal Telegraph officials will not be touched and I am glad of it, but it shows the hole you are getting into. They got a contract and later we will find that other people got special little contracts with their members, and they will not be touched. And later it will be found that a certain circle will not be touched but those outside it will be. Surely the private members will see the justice of our position. If you eliminate the postal people, the select ones and those not under your purview because they were not increased, the few left will be so small that the reduction will not come to anything near \$200,000. Why not the Government be honest. In the Budget Speech you made the suggestion of reduction in all departments, and if we accept the idea of reduction at all—that you are doing it because you cannot get on without the \$200,000—it is knocked on the head because you will have to spend two millions on roads, etc., which were not heard of at all before. You have gone to work here and made the admission out of your own mouths

that you will not save the \$200,000 as the reduction will not apply to many departments. Now what will be left. It amounts to this, that when we are in Ways and Means the House will be asked to apply a scheme of reductions that will amount to only \$40,000 or \$50,000—the big scheme will be no good. Now, as I suggested before, why not do it right here in the House—chop off the sessional indemnity, chop off the Ministerial increases and save right there the amount you want to make up. The other plan is only camouflage. As Sir M. P. Cashin says, you got to save the country by cutting salaries, and I say if this be so the pictures painted of blue ruin are true. And then for the Government to turn up their eyes and tell the hewer of wood and drawer of water that he got to be cut to keep them in opulence. No wonder we are ready to sit here till the Races or Christmas. The memorial presented here to-day is from men who have given their lives to the service and I subscribe to the prayer and I say it is arrant hypocrisy for the Government to come in here and say they have an extraordinary interest in economy and got to cut the man whose perhaps is bent double from carrying the mails. He got to be cut 20 or 25 dollars out of his pittance because the economizing Government have to save. If it came from any other bunch but the conglomeration who have set an example never to be outdone in incompetency and extravagant expenditure, there might be some excuse, but it is too much of it to ask us to swallow that medicine from you. By your maladministration you have put a tax on them that will make reductions impossible. If the cost of living had been reduced, there might have been a proportionate reduction of wages but you followed the announcement to cut the cost of living by putting on the

taxes, and I say it is not right for the Government who put that on to come here and say to offset their own expenditure by cutting the civil servants.

Might I ask the Prime Minister if we vote the Estimates as they stand, is it the intention to apply an all-around reduction or is he at liberty to say in just what direction the cut will be applied. We would like him to give us some indication of what the Government's intentions are in this regard.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to my hon. friend I might say that the policy behind the suggestion of reducing the salaries of civil servants is this: During the war Civil Servants' salaries were increased 35% to 105%. All along, these salaries were abnormally low, due to the fact that the country has to support an enormous Civil Service as compared with the population because of the large stretch of territory over which the population is scattered. In other words our Civil Service is abnormally large for the population but small for the extent of the coast line over which they operate. The increases to which I have referred were made, not for the purpose of putting the salaries on a higher basis, but because of the high cost of living as a result of the war, and all the arguments put forward both in and outside this House went to prove that this was so. Now, the laborer to-day has to work for less than he received during the war; the fisherman will receive from \$5 to \$8 for his fish which during the past five or six years brought from \$12 to \$15 per quintal and the same thing applies to all the other producers whether from the sea or from the soil. It was, therefore, thought eminently fair and just that a small reduction, not nearly as great as that which the fish-

erman and the laborer and the mechanic will be forced to accept, should come about and the Government thought that the Civil Servants would realize the justice of this and be prepared, in common with everyone else, to tighten their belts. We realize that in Canada increases were made but they adopted the bonus system, giving those with a salary of \$1,000 an increase of \$360 and making other increases accordingly. In April that bonus was cut out so that Civil Servants who were getting a salary of \$1,650 are now receiving \$1,000 and those formerly getting \$1,060 are now getting \$700. In the case of salaries between two and three thousand dollars the bonus was less but these have also been taken off.

MR. HIGGINS.—That bonus was based solely on the cost of living.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Ours was by word of mouth based on the cost of living. In the Autumn of 1919 a bonus was given of 25% on the salaries paid but many of the Civil Servants did not receive that. My hon. friend was right, however, when he said that that was based on the assumption that all were to get it. When it was found that many did not get that increase it was not thought fair to bring them under the decrease. I do not know just how many there are but I have asked the Auditor General for the figures. It will represent a moderately substantial amount. That, Mr. Chairman, is entirely the position and nature of the resolutions which the House was asked to consider five or six weeks ago. A counter proposition was suggested by my hon. friends of the Opposition for which I have to thank them and that was that instead of having a ten, fifteen and twenty per cent. decrease with certain exemptions the bill should apply to all classes alike but in such a way that no one receiving a salary under

\$1,200 be reduced. That is, the first \$1,200 to be free from decrease but on the first \$500 over that a ten per cent. cut to be imposed, on the second \$500 fifteen per cent. and so on. This proposition shall have the consideration of the Government. Is there any other point which my hon. friends would like to have cleared up?

MR. HIGGINS.—Except that of how much will be saved by these reductions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would rather not enter upon a discussion of that phase of the question just now.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Prime Minister for his promise that before the House goes into Committee on Ways and Means we will have these figures. The point I would like cleared up is how much will be saved after the Government has used its discretion as to who shall be cut and who shall not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We shall be glad to have the Resolutions so drafted by my hon. friend himself as to leave no room for discrimination.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Is it the intention to include the salaries provided for by statute as well as those voted?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Bill will cover both.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Is it the intention to keep on the two Codliver Oil Inspectors this year?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—With the price of codliver oil at 40c. a gallon, do you think there will be sufficient oil manufactured to warrant that?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—There will be quite a number of factories operating and in any case these men will have to go over their territory.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I see you have

cut out the vote for the Superintendent of Fisheries.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes, we were unable to get a suitable man for the position either in Canada or the States so we dropped it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I must congratulate you on that, anyway. Now, who is this Marine Inspector?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Hawco.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What has he to do?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—He superintends marine construction in the Outports.

MR. MOORE.—Who is the Secretary to the Minister?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Clouter.

MR. MOORE.—I see he is down at \$1,200.00.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What is the meaning of this \$7,000 for the Herring Fishery Board?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That is what the inspectors are paid out of.

MR. SULLIVAN.—But there are three voted salaries here for them.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—These are the three supervisors.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight,

Saturday, July 30th.

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.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Timber" with some amendments, in

which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that they be read a second time presently.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister and with the unanimous consent of the whole House the said amendments were read a second time and agreed to and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been concurred in without amendment.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the following Report:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill respecting Warehouse Receipts, beg to report that they are of opinion that the Bill should be passed as it stands with the addition of the following words to Section 1:

"And provided further that security under this section shall be taken without prejudice to any existing rights of sharmen under the present law."

(Sgd.)

W. R. WARREN.
J. R. BENNETT.
J. H. SCAMMELL.
W. H. CAVE.
J. C. CROSBIE.

St. John's, July 29th, 1921.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice and with the unanimous consent of the House, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 210 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Warehouse Receipts and other Securities in the Possession of Banks."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred had passed the Bill with some amendments and ordered that the same be read a third time present.

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

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice and with unanimous consent of the whole House the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 210 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Warehouse Receipts and other Securities in the possession of Banks" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, August 1st, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 1st, 1921.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill to amend Chapter 72 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Illegitimate Children."

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Mr. LeGrow a select committee was appointed to enquire into and report upon the following charge made against him in the course of debate by the Member for St. John's East (Mr.

Fox)—namely: that he had offered some person two bottles of rum to come into the gallery of this House and call the member for Harbor Grace "A slacker."

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee:—Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Cave, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Sullivan.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he has seen the announcement in the "Daily News" Friday morning that parties in North Sydney are seeking 1,000 men to proceed to Labrador to do lumbering work next winter; if the Government of this Colony is a party to this, and if so why; and if not what steps does it propose to take to see that our people get a share of this work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The question was answered on Saturday. There is no truth in the rumor.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount received during the past two years and the amount owed and yet uncollected for the same periods, on account of the fees and licenses to be paid for the operating of timber mills around the Island, and to say what steps, if any, the Government is taking for the collection of the same.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will have the information to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Where are we as to pit props.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The matter is not finalized unless something has transpired since Friday.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the quantity, if any, of pitprops and pulp wood exported from this Colony the past two years and the amount received for the same.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Will have the information to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if any representations have been made to the Government or to himself by representatives of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, as to the injurious effect which the new import taxes will have on the operations of that Company at Grand Falls, and if so what answer the Government had made to the company, and to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence in relation thereto.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Harris was in town the other day and he stated that under the Sales Tax they are called upon to pay duty on machinery parts that wear out frequently and which are really not supplies in the usual sense. The Government consequently in Ways and Means propose to include a change in the working so that this stuff will not come under the Sales or Super Tax.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount of Income and Excess Profits Tax uncollected for the past two years and what steps the Government is taking for the collection of the same.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am getting the information from the Finance and Customs Department. Steps have been taken to put the matter in the hands of a solicitor.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions which were read a first time as follows: Department of Marine and Fisheries, \$286,044.39; Department Accountant of Contingencies, \$74,101.67; Department Accountant of Old Age Pensions, \$92,000; Department Controller of Liquors \$166,864.00; Department Assessor of

Taxes, \$15,068.00; Department Naval and Military Pension Commission, \$509,466.00; Department Public Works \$906,275.27.

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 Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Chairman,—Before taking up the discussion of the Educational estimates in detail I crave the indulgence of the Committee while I refer to a matter which since the last session of the Legislature has occasioned considerable adverse criticism.

It will be remembered, Sir, that in the Education Bill of last year which passed the Assembly without opposition, provision was made for the appointment of eleven Supervisors or Helping-teachers with a view of rendering our young teachers in the field skillful assistance in the difficult educational problems that confront them. No sooner had the Assembly closed than the Opposition papers launched a campaign of hostility against the project, which they have persistently kept up to this very day, presumably for the express purpose of creating a prejudice in the mind of the electorate against any attempt to improve the status of Education in the country. This, of course, is not at all surprising.

The spirit underlying Education is as difficult to quicken as the material structure is easy to provide. It has ever been the case. In the 18th century Pestalozzi of Switzerland, realising that ignorance and vice were the two great obstacles to any lasting improvement in the condition of the people, devoted his life to the task of

improving Education as the most effective means of combatting those evils and ameliorating the condition of his countrymen.

Without adequate remuneration and almost daily confronted with poverty, opposition and even persecution he laboured incessantly to accomplish his purpose. He lived like a beggar in order that he might teach beggars to live like men. In spite of adverse criticism and persistent opposition he not only accomplished his chief educational aim which he stated in the words "Ich will den menschlichen Untereicht Psychologisieren," but had the satisfaction of receiving thousands of people who visited him to learn the secret of his success.

In every Swiss school to-day hangs a picture of Pestalozzi, and in every large city in Switzerland a grateful people have erected a monument in honor of their great benefactor.

During the early part of the 18th century when the people of England had not yet realised that every child is entitled to an education to equip him for citizenship, a number of charity schools sprang up, but even those were not without their doughty opponents—men who were prepared to go to any lengths in their opposition to education for the working man's child. Chief among those, perhaps, was B. de Mandeville, who declared:

"There is no need for any learning at all for the meanest ranks of mankind; their business is to labor, not to think; their duty is to do what they are commanded, to fill the most servile posts and to perform the lowest offices and drudgeries of life for the convenience of their superiors and common nature gives them knowledge enough for this purpose.

"It is manifest that in a free nation, where slaves are

not allowed of, the surest wealth consists in a multitude of laborious poor; for besides that they are the never-failing nursery of fleets and armies, without them there could be no employment, and no product of any country could be valuable. To make society happy and people easy under the meanest circumstances it is required that great numbers of them should be ignorant as well as poor."

Horace Mann, the father of Educational Reform in the State of Massachusetts, in the 19th century effected improvements astonishing both in their extent and value. He established three public Normal Schools, the first of their kind in the country, for the professional training of teachers. Those schools were highly successful from the beginning in providing a corps of teachers properly trained for the work, and had a marked influence in elevating the teaching profession in public esteem.

He doubled the State appropriation for Education in twelve years; he increased the number of High Schools, and established School Libraries and Teachers Institutes, new agencies for increasing the efficiency of teachers.

But, Sir, these reforms were not secured without bitter opposition. Politicians did their utmost in the Legislature to abolish the State Board of Education, of which Mann was the Secretary; they declared him to be an idealist and a visionary.

Many of the Conservative Teachers of Boston took exception to certain statements in Mann's report of 1843, and enlisted under the banner of the reactionaries, but in a little while they were completely silenced. Opposition from sectarian sources were more vague but none the less bitter and Mann was accused of causing the disappearance of religion and the religious spirit from the schools.

Fortunately, Sir, for the cause of Education this appeal to religious prejudice was unsuccessful; but his efforts to combat the combined opposition from those three sources so overtaxed his strength that eventually he was compelled, because of failing health, to abandon the post.

Even in our own country, Mr. Chairman, the opposition to Educational advancement has always been pronounced. It took the Newfoundland Government eight years, that is from 1836 to 1844, to pass an Act for the establishment of a classical academy in this city. When the first school inspector for the country was appointed, the papers of that day declared such an official to be altogether unnecessary, his appointment an unpardonable waste of public money. The appointment of an Inspector was claimed to be an indirect insult to the members of the respective Boards of Education, many of whom were far better qualified to form correct opinions regarding the educational needs of their localities than the Inspector himself.

When a small vote was made by the Assembly many years ago for Manual Training, that also was adversely criticised and condemned on the ground that pupils were to be taught to make chips.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these few instances of determined opposition to educational progress merely to show that persons who know least about Education are generally the first to enter the lists as opponents of progress. Truly, "every man is not a proper champion of truth nor fit to take up the gauntlet in the cause of verity."

It may be asked why we need these Supervisors. My answer is because many of our schools are woefully inefficient and must be so from the very nature of the case. There are at least three causes of this inefficiency. First, the great majority of our teach-

ers have had no professional training, and to-day no less than two hundred and ninety-eight of them have no grade at all. Second, the majority of our teachers hold the lowest grades (371 third grade, 295 second) and have had the least experience. Contemplate what that means—we have to-day 298 teachers without any grade or professional qualifications of any kind attempting to develop the mental powers, mould the character of the children committed to their charge, and fit them for their place in life.

I ask any fair-minded person is that sound? is it economic? is it just? If from the most valuable material you desire to make or manufacture a thing of value and surpassing beauty would you entrust the task to a novice. If, for example, you had a very valuable diamond in the rough that you desired to have cut in a manner to enhance its value and display its brilliancy, would you think of placing it in the hands of any but an expert lapidary?

Our children are unquestionably our greatest asset, our most valuable and sacred possessions; yet we, as a country, have been up to the present content to entrust them during the most impressionable years, the most plastic period of their life, to persons with no qualifications for that most difficult and serious work.

We cannot bring all those teachers to the city at once and give them the training they should have, in order to carry on their work efficiently; but we can send out to them the Supervisors, who are qualified because of their training to render that assistance and council which many of our teachers so sadly need.

The third cause of inefficiency in many of our rural schools is the fact that our present inspection affords no uplift. It is absolutely impossible for the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents to pay even one visit a year to all the schools of their respective denominations. Let me il-

lustrate. Last year there were 425 Church of England Schools operating along a coast line of two thousand miles. The school year consists of 210 days, so that if the Superintendent and his Assistant could visit one school per day the whole year would only be sufficient to permit them to pay one visit to each school, while the year's correspondence would remain in the office unanswered.

What applies to the Church of England Superintendent applies to those of the other denominations. Any person who has any knowledge of the enormous pile of correspondence Superintendents are called upon to handle will readily admit that there is sufficient work in that alone to keep them in their offices for the major part of the year.

The Hon. member for St. George's, who has had considerable experience as an Inspector, will appreciate that all an Inspector can do is to pay one visit a year to each school in a certain section of the country, and even then he can spend only a few hours at any one place. He is thus quite unable to form an accurate idea of the teacher's work or to make himself acquainted with the conditions under which that work is carried on, let alone meet the teachers in conference for discussion of their peculiar difficulties.

The majority of our schools are inefficient, woefully inefficient; but when I say that I mean no reflection on the teachers who are, as a class, doing the very best they know how. The wonder is that they accomplish so much. Their desire and our aim is that it be made possible for them to do better. It is the paramount duty of the country to improve the teachers in the service by every possible means within its power. This duty is recognised where ever progress is sought and there are several ways by which this improvement has been brought about.—Leave of absence, Sabbatical year, Summer

School, Teachers' Institutes and Supervision.

"It is the function of Supervisors to breathe upon a school system the breath of life, to infuse into it a generous purpose and to direct it towards beneficent ends."

This presupposes a rich and varied experience gained in the class-room; it presupposes educational ideals and an expert knowledge of the necessary machinery of schools. It is not enough that a merely intelligent man, supplied only with empirical notions, should undertake the responsible duties of Supervision. Intelligence and executive ability are forceful qualities everywhere; but they do not equip the doctor or lawyer; neither do they equip the educator. To the necessary basis of common sense must be super-added the science of Education. The Supervisor must be professionally trained for the work and must be deeply and fruitfully read in educational literature, and possessed of patience, tolerance and fair-mindedness.

Who Selected Them?

It was stated some time ago in this Chamber by an Hon. gentleman of the Opposition that the Supervisors were chosen because they were my friends. Permit me to say in reply, Sir, that they were not selected by me at all; they were chosen by the Superintendents of Education and recommended to me. Last September they were sent to two of the best Normal Schools on the North American Continent, where they undertook special courses, both theoretical and practical, to afford them professional information essential to their success. They completed their courses with credit to themselves and returned to us at the end of June fired with enthusiasm and eager to advance the cause in our midst.

What Do They Do?

The duties of the Supervisors were specifically laid down in the Education Act of last year. They will visit the

schools not as mere inspectors, spies, judges, or detectives to discover defects, failings, short-comings; but to render real service—to assist teachers in finding better ways of doing things, getting solutions to their peculiar school problems. They will remain in a school long enough at a visit to see the teacher actually at work, to note the strong and weak points in discipline, instruction and method, detect inefficiency or monotonous routine if such exist, and give the teachers sufficient time in conference to discuss in a friendly spirit the weaknesses observed and give suggestions for their removal.

They will give demonstration lessons to illustrate the best methods of teaching the various subjects. Any person who is acquainted with our Rural Schools must admit that this is necessary. To watch some of the younger teachers take a lesson is sufficient to give one the "creeps." Socialize It.

The emphasis of Supervision will be placed on socialization of school work. The school work must be made to touch the community life. The school is not performing to its full activity the function of making citizens by the continuance of a course of study based essentially on text-book work and only slightly related to the life of the community in which it is placed. A purely academic course of study causes the school to become a sort of emigration bureau and either depopulates the community or at least keeps it at a standstill.

Teachers' Meetings.

The Supervisors, too, will conduct Teachers' Meetings, assist in summer schools and direct professional reading circles. The Department, with the assistance of the Superintendents, will assign one or two professional works to be read by the teachers during the

year. The Supervisors will assemble the teachers in a town or settlement at certain periods and discuss essential portions of the books. In this way the teachers will be made acquainted with modern educational thought and practice, keep themselves ahead of the times, and gradually equip themselves for more efficient service.

Under the conditions that too often obtain to-day, the lessons are repulsive to the teachers and the pupils alike. Is it any wonder that under such circumstances the child dislikes school, and prefers to wander in a field or sail a boat? The Supervisors will in some measure remedy this by showing how the work may be made attractive.

Right education can not be brought about until teachers are so broadly trained, so professionally in earnest, so confident of public support and approval that they will be true leaders, making youth ready to meet the new demands of to-morrow, instead of being timid conservatives holding back civilization by loading it down with hordes of incompetents, ill-taught, untrained and to all intents and purposes totally uneducated.

The Canadian provinces have for a long time recognised the value of Supervision and have liberally provided for them. I shall read for the benefit of the Committee the number in the different provinces, together with average salary paid each.

	Population
Br. Columbia	400,000
Alberta	496,525
Saskatchewan	647,835
Manitoba	566,000
Ontario	3,000,000
New Brunswick	360,000
Nova Scotia	500,000
Newfoundland	245,000

While the population of those provinces in every case exceeds ours, it must be remembered that our schools

are scattered along the whole coastline, approximately two thousand miles, with long stretches between schools.

Mr. Sullivan: There are lots of places around the island where there are no schools at all.

Dr. Barnes: Yes; but at present it is impossible to state how many places there are.

Mr. Sullivan: The Superintendents should know.

Dr. Barnes: It is only fair to them to say that one Superintendent cannot do the work of five or six men. I myself had the idea at one time that they could do more work than they did, but more experience has led me to change that opinion, and I think if the Hon. gentleman were to visit the Department and see the correspondence that has to be attended to, and note the interviews that have to be given, he too would change his opinion.

An Expert's Opinion.

As to the value of Supervisors, it is interesting to get the opinion of other people and in this connection I would like to read to the House the opinion of Superintendent Chadsey of Detroit. He says:

"The criticism is sometimes heard that there is a tendency ~~unduly~~ to increase the number of Supervisors in our system. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, money expended for salaries of Supervisors produces far

Supervisors	Av. Salary	T. Ex.
15	2,700	1,000
35	2,400	1,000
48	2,700	Motor Car
29	2,400	780
108	2,500-6,200	600
8	2,000	500
12	2,000	350
11	1,600	600

greater returns in increasing educational efficiency than similar sums expended for class-room teachers.

With the great increase in the size of the system it has become practically impossible for the Superintendents and the Assistant Superintendents to do any genuine supervision. Their work has to be in the form of Inspection rather than of Supervision.

"The Supervisors must be able to remain in a given school long enough to determine the strong and weak points of instruction, and must later give to the individual teacher time through conferences which will enable improvement to be effected."

There in the city of Detroit alone, with a population of 466,000 people, there are no less than 25 supervisors. **Dakota's Experiment.**

Last year an experiment was made at Brown County, S. Dakota, by Dr. M. S. Pittman, State Normal College Ypsilanti, Michigan, to determine the value of Supervision in rural schools, which are equivalent to our outport schools. The experiment took cognizance of two equal of schools and was conducted without the teachers knowing what the object was. The results constitute striking confirmation of the good opinion previously held respecting the value of Supervision. They showed that children in all supervised schools made marked progress in all grades. Children in supervised groups made almost twice as much progress as those in unsupervised. In other words, expressed in percentage, Dr. Pittman found that if the progress in unsupervised schools were represented by 100 per cent. the progress in Supervised schools would be 194 per cent.

Teachers in the Supervised groups did four times as much professional reading as they had done in any one year before. The work of supervision resulted in progress of children's work which showed that the Supervisor's service is approximately worth \$20,000 per year to the taxpayers of this country the returns would more than justify the expenditure. This ex-

periment was made in fields where the teachers were trained for their work, and if it was found that Supervisors are essential where the teachers are professionally trained surely they are doubly necessary in our schools, where the teachers have received no professional training at all!

Teachers' Verdict.

Supervision was given a brief trial in our own country about two years ago, and I shall take the liberty of reading a few extracts from teachers' letters expressing opinions as to its value:

"Your visits to the school were such a source of inspiration and encouragement that I have never seen the children more keen and work so well as they do now."

"I have derived considerable benefit, which will improve my methods of teaching."

"Although in the profession for over a quarter of a century, I still find that there are many things to learn, yes, and many things to unlearn; and it is only by having a ready ear and open mind that one can hope to keep abreast of the times and, consequently be of true service to our dear old country."

"We venture to assert, that if a system of direct supervision of schools by competent and well trained teachers should become in the near future a part of our Educational plan in Newfoundland, our country would benefit greatly thereby."

This is the verdict of a number of our own teachers, Mr. Chairman. I trust I have said enough to remove any doubt from the minds of Hon. members opposite as to the absolute necessity of Supervision if our schools are to do better work, and if we are to get adequate returns for the money voted for educational purposes. **What Propaganda Did.**

Unfortunately, however, there has been such a hue and cry against the appointment of the Supervisors by the

Opposition press, such constant reiteration—though without proof—that the appointment of those helping-teachers would constitute an interference with the denominational system, it has been rendered impossible to secure unanimity among the heads of the various denominations as to assignment of the Supervisors to their proper fields. It is regrettable that such is the case, but it is the case, and I have been reluctantly forced to advise the Government to defer the appointment till the heads of the various denominations reach a mutual agreement on the matter.

The intention was to have a certain field assigned to each Supervisor by mutual agreement of the Superintendents and have him visit, supervise and inspect all the public schools in that field regardless of denomination. When the Bill was introduced last year I made it perfectly clear that it was not the intention to interfere with the present denominational system. The Supervisor would in no way interfere with the powers of the Boards in their administration of schools; his function would be supervisory, inspirational; and would in no case interfere with the work of religious instruction but confine his attention to the secular work in accordance with specific instructions, mutually agreed upon by the Superintendent and the Minister.

The Supervisors.

Mr. Samson: What are you going to do with the Supervisors now?

Dr. Barnes: Considering their qualifications as teachers they will have no difficulty in securing schools. Some of them I have no doubt could secure remunerative positions as teachers in America if they cared to accept them.

Mr. Bennet: For what period of time are the Supervisors appointed, and is there any contract in connection with their appointment?

Dr. Barnes: The Supervisors have not yet been appointed. There was

an agreement signed by the Supervisors last autumn to the effect that they were to pursue a course of study at approved institutions, and on their return to Newfoundland to take what is termed in the Act the Professional Examination. These conditions being met the Act calls for a provisional appointment for two years and, if at the conclusion of that period the work of a Supervisor be satisfactory to the Department, the appointment may be made permanent. We should have no claim upon the Supervisors after two years.

The Estimates.

We turn now, Sir, to the Estimates. There is an increase of 2,150 on page 26. That is occasioned by the increase in the salary of the principal of the Normal School and an increase of \$700 for Printing and Stationery. The grant for Printing and Stationery for the year 1919-1920, before we came into office, was \$1,000 and the printing of the reports of that year cost the Superintendents \$2500. This year we are hoping to be able to keep one bill for Printing and Stationery within the vote, \$2300. Next year there will be far more Stationery and Printing required. The travelling expenses are cut down from \$9,000 to \$3,000. This reduction is made owing to the fact that no Supervisors are to be appointed this year.

We next turn to page 27. At first it was proposed to reduce the grant of the sparsely populated localities, but when it was later found that that would reduce the salaries of the teachers in those places, and since there was no intention on the part of the Government to disturb their salaries, it was decided to allow that grant to stand. There is a change for Inspection; instead of \$36,546 it should read \$19,546. There is also a change in the grant for special purposes. Last year you will notice that the grant for special purposes was \$285.03 and later

there was a slight increase made in Additional Estimates of \$522 to increase the salaries of the Registrar of the Council of Higher Education and his Stenographer. There was a printer's error of \$4.80 and which accounts for the discrepancy. We propose to drop the \$10,000 vote for Night Schools.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the only changes in the Educational Estimates

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks before the vote goes through. The main portion of the discourse given by Dr. Barnes was a justification for laying Supervisors. On that point I do not think that there is anybody in this House can speak with more accuracy than he, because for years he worked in this country as a Supervisor of schools; but he has missed the point so far as the objection of the Opposition to Supervisors is concerned. We do not dispute the necessity of Supervisors; our point was that we could not afford to pay for them. I think a necessity in a time of prosperity becomes a luxury in hard times. The appointment of Supervisors in times like these would be a luxury and I do not think that the country can stand for luxuries now. We cannot afford it. Now that was our position right through. In trying to justify his Department this evening Dr. Barnes made out an excellent case, but I honestly believe that he was not really serious in dealing with present conditions in this country. He justified the stand he had taken with regard to Supervisors but he ignored the point we made, and I have too much respect for his intelligence to say that he did it intentionally. First of all he told us the regrettable fact that the greatest number of teachers are in the lower grades. That is regrettable, everybody knows. But how are you going

to avoid it? Take the localities as you find them and the salaries paid them. You cannot get first grade teachers to accept those salaries. Those ungraded teachers are not paid but you cannot help it. The reason for the appointment of ungraded teachers is because of the small salaries offered. Further, the ungraded teachers suffer additional hardships. They get no allowances from the Augmentation Board. That is a problem that Supervisors cannot solve. I quite agree with Dr. Barnes this evening that the Supervisor will be helpful to the teacher; but I am glad that for the present year at least we will not be called upon to pay those salaries to Supervisors, despite the fact that quite a few of the Supervisors are personal friends of mine.

Many people go around talking about the work done by the Superintendents of Education, and I quite agree with the Hon. Minister in having the Superintendents on the job in the office. The Superintendent is the main spring for his particular denomination. There is nothing that crops up that is not referred to the Superintendents. The actual salaries and in fact the whole thing is hung up until the Superintendents return from their flying visits. Consequently, I think that the Superintendents should be kept on the job in the office all the time, because many important things are neglected here in headquarters in St. John's while they are making those flying visits. Then again it is impossible for any Superintendent to-day to visit the number of schools for each particular denomination at all, especially when one considers the facilities for travelling. Also I think it is unfair that the Superintendents were only allowed a certain amount for travelling purposes. The amount for travelling expenses for Superintendents should

be commensurate with the amount of expenses incurred. Why an ordinary policeman or Customs official or Magistrate in the public service is allowed full expenses; but a distinction is made in the case of the Superintendents of Education. I had an experience of that myself. It takes a man's fortnight salary to travel a week by the time you pay for motor boats, etc., and a man has to pay that expenses out of his own salary. I think that is unfair and that is one of the reasons why a Superintendent is not anxious to travel. I have had to remain home in St. George's a month to recoup myself for a fortnight's travelling that I had done. I think that Dr. Barnes should look after this and see that some provision is made by which those who do travel should be paid the expenses they incur.

I was particularly struck with one thing the Doctor talked about, namely, that when the day's work in the school was over the Supervisor would take the teacher aside and discuss matters. I never had any such opportunity. Dr. Barnes promised wonderful and rosy things, too, in that he said that the Supervisors were going to make the schools attractive for the teachers and pupils alike. Well that will come to the time when children will prefer to go to school rather than do anything else and which is certainly contrary to, at least, the experiences I have ever had of children. Usually there is a road leading to every school, but you will notice that almost every child will go through the field and meadows instead of going by the beaten track, but now, according to Dr. Barnes, the Supervisors are going to have them all travel on the one, straight road. How many of us here are going to walk on the straight roads all our lives and in the one direction. If the Supervisors of Education, when they

are appointed, are able to change human nature and in the early days of childhood at that, then I think our educational system is not in the experimental stage but rather are we thirty degrees below zero on the point of education. However, there is no further necessity of discussing the matter now as the Minister has given the assurance that the Supervisors will not be appointed this year.

With the last point he made I entirely disagree. I do not agree with the reference that the visitation of Supervisors did not interfere with the denominational aspect. So far as the denomination I belong to is concerned the distinction is this. The religious instruction that a child receives is not a subject at all. It is the ground work of our educational system. Why take any chances of having this system interfered with. The vast majority of the people of the country do not want to see it interfered with. Dr. Barnes says he does not think it will be and for that I am thankful.

With regard to the Higher Education Examinations alluded to by Dr. Barnes. The Council of Higher Education stands very highly in the opinion of the outport people of this country. True there are people who are prepared to offer any other test in its place. Now I believe there is a necessity for some sort of an examination and until somebody comes forward with some other system I think it is a pity that we should do anything in this House that would mean the cutting off of the \$1,500 a year allocated for these C. H. E. Examinations and deprive the outport people of what they think an advantage.

I will fight as fairly as I can and hit as hard as I can, but with regard to the principles laid down by the Minister, who with his Deputy, Dr.

Burke, are, perhaps, the best authorities on education in Newfoundland, I do not know enough to state an opinion as to whether he is right or wrong.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Mr. Chairman—Just one word. I am not an authority on this matter like Mr. Mac-Donnell, but the part I am sorry for is that the Minister did not do like Mr. Coaker and come in here and show the country that he has cut a substantial amount of the expenditure of his Department. We are in this position that we are voting away money we haven't got and we will not be able to meet our bills at the end of the year. The amount voted for Education in 1910 was less than three hundred thousand dollars and to-day we are asking for eight hundred thousand dollars. That is a difference of five hundred thousand dollars in ten years. Well now we have not been told where we are going to get the revenue to meet that expenditure. That is the thing I am most concerned with. I am in favour of Education that we can pay for but we can't afford this amount. Take the Revenue for 1914 which we have to get back to. It was three hundred and sixty-nine thousand six hundred dollars. How much are we asking for this year, over eight million dollars. You haven't told us where we are going to get it, you may have told us but we are not satisfied that you are correct. You can't get it with new fish selling in the market to-day at four dollars and two and a half dollars a quintal. It is all very well for the Minister to make a flowery speech about Education in other countries, but beggars cannot be choosers, and we must be prepared to cut our garment according to the cloth. You have to get busy to do it. Now I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to an article in this paper this afternoon. I was wondering when I read it if it is correct. It is headed Mr. Howard

again. Are we not losing our time here discussing this vote if what is contained in this article is true, as follows:—

Well may you hide your head behind that paper Mr. Coaker. It is a reflection upon you Sir to have it said that it is up to this man to look out for the people that you stated you were looking out for a couple of years ago when you took the Government. You have to sit there and listen to me reading this and you cannot utter a word in denial. That is the position we are in here to-day and we sit here discussing a vote for education of eight hundred thousand dollars. The people of Twillingate to-day are working on roads up in the woods although Mr. Jennings says that is not so.

MR. JENNINGS—I don't know that there is a man in my district working on that road.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I know you don't and that is the reason I am telling you. The member for Burgeo was going to take action because of a statement that this Mr. Howard made the other day with regard to his district but he didn't because he found that Mr. Howard was correct. It is foolishness in the face of this kind of thing to be voting eight hundred thousand dollars to-day for education against three hundred and sixty thousand and ten years ago. You can't get it and you know it. If you can show me how we can get back to 1909 or 1914 then I am prepared to listen to this vote but not until then. When you do as Mr. Coaker did and cut off some of your expenditure in your Department then I will be prepared to talk Education. I will ask you Mr. Minister to get up and tell me how you are going to get this money. I see you don't get up. Then you and your education can go to Hong Kong.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I hoped that Dr. Barnes would have acceded to Sir Michael's request. I

cannot congratulate him on the address he made in so far as the present situation of the country's finances are concerned. I would like for the Minister to get up and tell us how he hopes to bring about the conditions he is so anxious should accrue in relation to Education in this country. He complained bitterly about the criticism of the Opposition, as if the criticism of that department of Education were for the purpose of destroying Education. Not one member of the Opposition said one word against the improvement of the educational system of Newfoundland. We all want to see progress made, a better system, and better teachers. We want the best we can only have what we can afford to pay for, and no matter what Dr. Barnes may say or do, he cannot get over that stumbling block. On a previous occasion, when he spoke on Education he referred to the ideal system in Switzerland. I have no knowledge of that system, but I think it is very much akin to that of Germany, because in all the schools they speak German there.

DR. BARNES:—That is German Switzerland only.

MR. BENNETT:—I do not think that these are the countries we should look to for our system of Education. We have seen enough in the late war of what German Culture has done for the world. These high ideals are not always the best. It has been freely admitted that Germany paid more attention to education than any other nation of its size and importance. Newfoundland is in an entirely different position to any of these countries. One would think after hearing Dr. Barnes that no effort has been made to improve the system of education in this country. Sir Michael Cashin pointed out just now that in the past ten years

the educational grants have increased six hundred thousand dollars.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks on this vote before it goes through, and while congratulating the Hon. Minister on the able manner in which he has dealt with the all important question of Education, I cannot but be mindful of how inopportune is the present time, for the introduction of innovations or the trying out of new and expensive ideas

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I do not lay down a policy as it would be impertinent on my part to tell the Hon. Minister what plan to develop, just as I think it would be for him to tell me about fish. As far as the Opposition criticism goes it is not directed to the value of the Supervisors, but as to where the money is to come from. Can we with a population of 250,000 people find the money to carry out the ideas of the Hon. Minister. The more I look over it, the more I think it is impossible. He is doing more, unconsciously perhaps, to cause friction among the teachers than anyone else. When we look at Mr. Solomon Whiteway getting \$3,600 we are bound to find a grievance. I do not question the qualifications of Dr. Burke or Mr. Whiteway but the teacher in the outport has to play the organ and be a lay reader for \$700. It is the vote of over \$800,000 that worries me. If Hon. Dr. Barnes or any other will tell me how we are to raise it I will vote for Education. Nobody can tell me. I notice too what the Hon. Minister has said about the Supervisor going into the teacher. Some are born teachers and others are not and cannot take care of children. I remember one man who would frighten what was in my head out of it and another who would teach me more in 10 minutes than the first could in 6 hours. The education of the States is not the education for

here as there is an entirely different atmosphere. Therefore I do not like this amount of money to be spent on those people here. The Hon. Minister says that even the Chinese are sent to the States but I say you do not get the best education there. In Canada you will get a good grounding but right here you will get the best commercial education under the old systems. My own daughter on going abroad outclassed all competitors. Our ground work has been good. The Hon. Prime Minister himself knows it.

Take the late Prof. Holloway—the Hon. Prime Minister, the Hon. S. J. Foote and even myself were pupils under him. That kind of man got to be born to develop the best in the children. The Hon. Minister says he sent these Supervisors to the States, with the best intentions, but if we can get what was taught here 20 years ago into the boy he can't be beaten. What I want to point out is this—can we expect the children to be educated if they are so short of food and clothes, especially in the winter that their parents cannot send them to school. It would be better to have no system at all. I think we should cut the vote to meet the conditions. You cannot find the money today. I do not think the Hon. Prime Minister will disagree with one word I have said as we now have been here 4 months and don't know how we are going to produce the revenue. He wants a revenue of over 8 millions but cannot get 5, and I say Dr. Barnes, you will not have the money to spend. Go to any mercantile premises any morning and you will see 20 or thirty men sitting down idle—they are not producing a penny today.

You will see men now lying about the wharves playing cards because they can find nothing to do and how are we going to produce a revenue? I am here to learn but nobody has

yet submitted a financial statement that can convince me. Here we have one Mr. Willard Howard making a statement about the destitution of the people in the District of Burgeo and LaPoile but the member for that District has not done a single thing about it. We talked of passing a vote of censure on him but are we going to do it? Dr. Grenfell has denied having anything to do with it and perhaps in this case he did not. One thing I do know that if Mr. Grant sent that message about the condition of the people in the Straits, he sent it in all sincerity. What is said about Twillingate I do not believe but we know that there are sections of Trinity and Bonavista Bays where unemployment is rampant and in spite of the fact that everything possible has been done for them, these people are now only earning sufficient to put them over the summer. Now, if we have an average catch of fish this year which would be a million and a half quintals at \$3.00 a quintal it would give us only \$12,000,000. It was believed by some people outside the House when I made a similar estimate before that I said the price of fish this year would be \$3.00 a quintal but I said nothing of the kind because I do not believe it will reach such figure. The best that is being paid to-day is four dollars for merchantable and Maderia, two dollars for West India and two dollars and a half for haddock. It is all very well to vote this amount, Dr. Barnes, but you won't get it if that's the way mercantile people are looking at things now. I never believed in Labrador Shore made fish myself but I know a man who came in here with 500 qtls. of it and although he tried every firm in town he could not get an offer for it. As I have already said, it is just as well for us to face the situation like men and we all know that we cannot, under the pre-

sent conditions, give \$850,000 for Education. No one in this House is prepared to vote more for Education than I am, but what we have not got we cannot give. I take off my hat to Hon. Dr. Barnes when it comes to a knowledge of Education but he knows nothing about finance and I am coming to the opinion that very few in this House, or at least on that side of it, do know anything about it. If they did they would all be attempting to do what the Minister of Fisheries has done, and that is cut the estimates for their several departments in two. I want you to be perfectly clear that I am as strong on Education as you are but I first want to see where the money is going to come from before I vote it. I know that there is not a man on the other side who has not said to himself, "whatever may be the conditions existing when the House meets again, it is certain that we cannot tax the people any more." The last straw has been placed upon the camel's back. I have no desire to delay the House on the Educational vote, but I do want to go on record as not being conscientiously able to vote for this amount, simply because I cannot see where we can get the money. I would suggest to the Hon. Minister that even now he would take that vote and cut off another few thousands and leave something over till next year when things might look brighter than they do now. I do not ask for the vote to be delayed but I do say that if some of these things are cut off, the children cannot suffer very much for one year, and I appeal to you to see if it is not possible to cut something off this vote. If you can reduce it by another \$100,000 or \$150,000, and I believe you are man enough to do that, you will come back here next year the proudest man in the House, and I say now that I be-

lieve you will consider this matter yet.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, after listening to the remarks of the various speakers who preceded me there is not much left for me to say except to put once more our position before the Government. I must congratulate the Minister on the speech he made. I am sure that he believes thoroughly in his proposition but I am sorry we cannot see eye to eye with him. My principal reason for objecting to this vote is because the country cannot afford it, and from what I imagine is going to happen I think that we will hardly be able to afford this expenditure which he proposes to saddle the country with next year. I now suggest and will make a motion to that effect that this Department be abolished until this country is in a better position. I figure that it is going to cost us next year twenty-three thousand, one hundred and forty dollars for the Department of Education. You have four stenographers down there at seven hundred and twenty dollars a year. Why is that?

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—Would you permit me to explain. We have only one stenographer in our office. The others are for the Superintendents.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Now I am going to say that your Department will cost more than I stated before. What provision have you made for rent, heat, light, etc.? That is the very question I was debating in the Railway Resolutions. Your Department will have to pay part of the rent of the Militia Department. Why have you not come in here and shown it in your estimates? Haven't you any intention of contributing your share?

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—That comes out of the vote for Public Works.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Why isn't your Department charged with it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is the way it should be but it doesn't work out that way. That all comes out of Public Works.

MR. SULLIVAN.—The total amount of money we are asked to pay for salaries for Education is seven hundred and thirty-nine thousand six hundred and thirty-nine dollars, and we are asked to vote eight hundred and eight thousand three hundred and eighty-eight dollars, which leaves sixty-eight thousand seven hundred and forty-nine dollars. Out of that amount we are paying nineteen thousand five hundred and forty-six dollars for inspection. Is that right? In other words the Department of Education and Inspection under that head, without any charges for light, heat, etc., is costing the country forty-two thousand six hundred and eighty-six dollars. Under the heading of Inspection, that nineteen thousand five hundred and forty-six dollars does that include travelling expenses?

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—That comes out of the three thousand dollars.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Will that fill the bill? You don't have to bring in anything in Supplemental Supply.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—No. There will be nothing in Supplemental Supply.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Now Sir, I am glad that you have cut out those Supervisors, because I think it was outrageous to ask the country at a time like this to shoulder the expense of eleven supervisors in addition to six inspectors. In New Brunswick where they have twice our population they have only eight supervisors. I would be only too pleased to do anything I can to advance the cause of Education, but I think it would be better until we can afford it to cut out that

Department altogether, and give the twenty-three thousand one hundred and forty dollars to the sparsely populated settlements where they have no schools to enable them to get one. As Mr. Walsh has stated he knows many places where people have been begging for schools for years, and nothing has been done and they are disgusted. I know several places in and around my district, where there was not enough money to pay for a school and there are twenty or twenty-five children in those little settlements. That is disgraceful, and that is one reason why the Department should be done away with, and money used for additional schools. That is the reason I am opposed to the measure before the House.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Chairman, I think we are too conservative not to see that for every dollar spent for this purpose we get a dollar's worth of returns. The vote for supervision is altogether out of proportion to the amount spent for education. It is another instance of the misappropriation of public funds.

I can hardly expect that anything that will come from this side of the House will check the mad, extravagant policy of the Government. You will go your own way with your eyes wide open, but we have done our duty by the people who sent us here. The public will not be able to say that we have missed any chance to do our very best to preserve public moneys. For over four months we have kept on ceaselessly without any hope of personal advantage. It has been a real sacrifice on our part, but we have spared no effort to fulfil our obligation to the public and to those who sent us here. We have done the best we could, not alone to checkmate the Government but we have tried to unearth the scandals that have come to light during the past three or four

months, and it will be agreed that no such scandals have come to light during the past 25 years. If they had it would have swept the Government out of existence within a month. We have had the burden of unearthing these scandals, and we must now pass the burden on to the public. The public will have to bear the burdens for the scandals that you have committed, and the lack of ability that you have shown to handle the various matters that have come before you.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.
And it being past midnight,

TUESDAY, August 2nd.

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

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Ratification of the Contract with Pulp and Paper Corporation of America," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children," with some amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting

the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season," with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this morning at eleven of the clock.

Hon. the Minister of Education tabled Report of Department of Education, 1919-1920 and Report of Council of Higher Education, 1920.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon pursuant to adjournment.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Sir J. C. Crosbie, the Bill to amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Illegitimate Children," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I beg to call attention to question 2 of July 30th which is still unanswered.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will get the information probably this afternoon.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What is the position as to the sale of pit props.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have had no opportunity of seeing to the matter since yesterday. Arrangements have been made with Mr. House of Port aux Basques but I have heard nothing further since yesterday.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. House writes to me to say nothing has been arranged. If that is correct how can

the Government say there is a contract—where does the contract fit in.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I beg leave Mr. Speaker, to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 72 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Illegitimate Children."

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement signed by the Auditor General showing the position of the Surplus Trust Fund as on Saturday last, July 30th, and of any obligations existing or in prospect which have to be met from the said Fund.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I have sent to get the answers right away.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the work of taking the Census has yet begun, if it is being given to school teachers as in previous years, and if not why not; how many school teachers actually engaged in the work of their profession have been employed in connection with the Census and how many other persons, and to give the names of the latter, the amounts being paid to them for their services as Census officials, and the amount per day or week or per job that is being paid them as travelling expenses; also what is the regular occupation of Fred House, Jr., and Reginald White, who are engaged in taking the Census for Twillingate and in what capacity did they serve the present Government so as to earn for them the description of being "political crooks," applied to them by the Twillingate Sun.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We will employ resident school teachers where possible. The arrangements are in the hands of Mr. Mews as formerly, from whom I will get information as to their occupations.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What is the occupation of White and House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know about them.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education if it is correct that he intends to urge the Government to adjourn the present session until the Autumn so as to give him an opportunity to prepare his report for last year for which the House has been waiting since the early days of the session.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—The answer is in the negative.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any sum was given directly or as a guarantee to the United Trading Company in the way of supplying for the fishery this year, under the terms of the recent agreement, and if so how much, and also who are the officials of the United Trading Company and have they any connection with the F.P.U. or its associated Companies.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know who the company is but understand it is part of the Conception Bay concern.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the Customs Revenue collected at St. John's from May 25th of this year, the day of the presentation of his Budget and the imposition of new taxes, up to Saturday last, July 30th, and for the corresponding periods in 1920 and in 1919, and to say, in view of the failure of his tariff proposals to realize even as much Revenue as last year, not to speak of the forty per cent. increase he estimated, what steps he proposes to take to cope with the condition of things which involves bankruptcy for the Colony in a very few months.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

That will be secured from the Deputy Minister of Finance.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if he is aware that several Canadian survey parties are now at work in Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, in connection with the Labrador Boundary Question, if they are refusing to pay Customs duties and if they are acting as though they owned the territory; if he or the Government have any information in regard to this matter, to table the same together with any telegrams, letters, or any correspondence in relation thereto; and if the Government is not informed will he take steps to inform himself as to the position so that the House may know exactly where it stands before the Session closes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am aware that a surveying party is working on Labrador. I was told a few weeks ago by the Assitant Collector they had refused to pay duties and he insists on their doing so. He gave me some correspondence on the matter but I have heard nothing since.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Council's amendments to the "Delinquent Children Bill" was referred to a Select Committee, as follows: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Higgins.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" was read a second time and agreed to and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had concurred in the said amendments without amendment.

The Chairman from the Committee

of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Department of Education, \$794,895.03; Department of Shipping, \$50,000.00; Department of Public Charities, \$410,295.81.

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 Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned last night we had under consideration the outstanding question in regard to the telegraphs and cables of this country and I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of Sir Michael Cashin, who evidently made a very close study of the situation and from his experience in past Governments he spoke with an authority that no other member of the House could have spoken. I noticed that during the course of his remarks he got under the skin of the Prime Minister with regard to a certain attitude of his in relation to the Anglo Telegraph Company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—He never succeeded in doing that.

MR. BENNETT.—Well if he didn't get under your skin he aroused your ire. You threw out the insinuation, which had no foundation in fact and which you very cleverly tried to the best of your ability to cloak and conceal, that Sir Michael Cashin had another motive in view because he emphasized the proper handling of this cable matter. I know, personally, that Sir Michael Cashin is not identi-

fied in any way with the Anglo Telegraph Company and I know that that concern is of no personal moment, advantage or interest to him.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I had no intention of making any suggestion that it was.

MR. BENNETT.—I have some knowledge and some remembrance of the Prime Minister being one of those who vetoed the contract made by Sir Robert Bond's Executive in 1909 with the Commercial Cable Company. I think that the Prime Minister was a member of the Morris Party that came into power after the spring election of 1909 and which party repudiated the contract made by the Bond administration. The contract was made absolutely without legislative sanction or legislative endorsement. It was another case of acting on Executive responsibility, without the approval or sanction of the representatives of the people. However, it is not my purpose to unduly criticise all that happened at that time.

To-day we have a spectacle in this House that is extraordinary and unprecedented and we have an anticipation of further extraordinary conditions. The Prime Minister thought it well last night to call this House together at 10.30 this morning. It was suggested that he made it 11, which he did and we are here. It will not make any difference about time with the Opposition, we will be here anyhow: but I have to sympathize with certain hon. members on the other side because they have to come here this day of the year and I want to say to them that I would be contemptible and I would not have any self-respect if I came here merely to retard and embarrass the Government. That is not the position I occupy in this House. Mr. Targett smiles cynically and apparently does not believe my statement.

MR. TARGETT.—I don't believe you mean it.

MR. BENNETT.—I want to assist the Government in putting through legislation, even to-day, but I am not prepared to stay here and let this House prorogue. I stated before in this House on a couple of occasions earlier in the session that this House should not prorogue this year. Nor do I think now that it should. You may adjourn for over a month or so, but to say that this House shall prorogue I will oppose it to the bitterest end and in making that statement I am asking it advisedly and in the true interests of the country. Hon. members of this House I know have been seriously inconvenienced and seriously handicapped and I sympathize with them, but they must realize that we on this side are not here for pleasure or for fun. We are not here because we want to be here in these dog days. Most of the gentlemen on both sides have their businesses to attend to and their health to look after and I have yet to learn that this House is a health resort. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to put through the business of the House in 24 hours, but I am not prepared to lock that door and give the present administration a blank cheque to go out and play ducks and drakes with the affairs of this country like they did last year. I am not prepared to put the administration of the affairs of this country in the hands of two or three men, who, after the doors of this House are closed, will probably hie away to some parts where they will not be in reach of the people. I am not prepared to close this House until the Finance Minister's Interest Bill is presented here. I think it is an aspersion on the country that we have at present the position of Finance Minister unfilled, under present circumstances. Half the trouble in the country to-day is due

to the fact that we have nobody in charge of the finances of the country. Mr. Browning should retire, if he is unable to fulfil his duties. The members on this side of the House have said nothing against him all through the session, rather have we sympathized with him in his affliction; but I say it is a deplorable condition of things when one of the chief Ministers of the Crown is absent from his office and when the collection of the revenues of this country are practically left to irresponsible people and people who are not responsible to the great electorate of the country. Still we are asked to close this Legislature and shift the Government of this country down on Water Street to the Court House building where probably one man will take full charge as he did before, and the probabilities are that he will not remain in St. John's very long. What is going to happen after this House closes anybody with half an eye can see. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be going to Port Union; the Minister of Justice will be going to London and the Prime Minister will likely be going to New York and probably from there to England. What a spectacle for a country. Mark the comparison in Canada where every office is filled by an eminent man and a man absolutely capable of fulfilling the duties of his office. Take the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Meighen. He goes to London for a brief period on business. A late English paper to hand quotes Mr. Meighen for saying: "I am not going to stay here any longer because my country needs me." And he is coming back to go to work in his own country and every one of his Cabinet Ministers are there on the job too. But we have the spectacle in this country of an absolute abandonment of almost every departmental head.

Then Mr. Targett smiles and says, "You don't mean that."

MR. TARGETT.—I do not think you do.

MR. BENNETT.—The unfortunate part of it in this country is that we have not enough of intelligent men representing the people. If you, Mr. Targett, had any stake in this country, you would know what I mean. You will not believe anything; but you sit there like a stone statue. The curse of this country is that there is not enough independent and intelligent men in the House of Assembly; and the reason I do not want this House to prorogue is because there is no intelligence in the Government. I am only in Opposition, but I want to tell you Mr. Chairman, the people of this country may thank God that there was an Opposition of which I am a member to try and keep this country from going on the rocks and from foiling the plans and upsetting the plots that are in the minds of the Executive Government to-day. There is a conspiracy being planned in the Executive and of which there are members in the rank and file of the Government know nothing about. There are members of the Executive Government to-day who know where we are drifting and who know what the ultimate end is going to be, and if we close this House now we will never come back here again. There is conspiracy of the deepest character going on. If it is not in the minds of the whole Executive, it is in the minds of some of them.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I happen to be a member of the Executive. I know nothing whatever about any conspiracy.

MR. BENNETT.—You are not in the swim.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I am glad of that.

MR. BENNETT.—I say, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary that this House should prorogue. I took the stand on the opening day that this House should remain in session to consider problems that are arising every other day. This Legislature shall not close for some considerable time yet, despite the fact that the Prime Minister treats us to a morning session and threatens to sit all night and despite the fact that he tried to suspend the rules. Does the Prime Minister imagine for one moment that we are a lot of nincompoops and does he imagine that he represents everybody in this House and that there is nobody else to be considered in this country only those whom he represents? Does he mean to tell me that any man sitting on this side has not got as much responsibility here as he has? Does he mean to tell us that we do not represent the people here as well as he does? Does he mean that in the time of any great crisis in the country that we should remain silent? We warned the Government and we put every possible phase of the country before the Government. Still Mr. Targett gets up and says we do not mean it. It is absolute childishness for any man to lull himself to sleep in a state of false security and think that everything is well and right. It is no use calling out peace when there is no peace. There is no peace in Newfoundland now and there will be none next fall. I met two working men on Water Street yesterday morning and they asked me what we were doing in the House of Assembly. I said we cannot do any more than we are doing, except to try and bring home to the Government their responsibilities and to try and stop them in their mad course of extravagance. One of them said well what is going to happen? I said that I did not know. He said there will be a revolution in New-

foundland shortly. I said that cannot occur. He said we are getting hungry and where are we and our families going to be in the months of January, February and March next. He added that the only thing that could stop a revolution was that the stores were well filled on Water Street. Now that man was not an extremist, but merely a thinking man with good foresight. I quite appreciate the action of the Government in providing employment for those who were out of work, as I do not think there was any other course left open to them, because of the various deputations that we had at the Bar of this House looking for work and for supplies for the fishery. Consequently, the Government had to provide relief works of some kind. However, I say it is a deplorable state of affairs when the Government had to come down in the month of August and start relief works for thousands of men all over the country. Instead of looking into the future and realising where they are drifting, the Government are remaining in the state of false security that they lulled themselves. Does anybody in this House, I mean on the Government side, appreciate the position that this thing cannot go on. Every intelligent man must remember that between now and the first of June next we will have nine or ten months practically of winter. Apart from the men who are engaged on relief works there will have to be looked after the families of the fishermen, who made a medium voyage and who will only get a small price for their catch, in addition to those who got only a small voyage. I do not blame the Government entirely for the low price for fish, because I do not think that they are entirely responsible. But let us take the situation as we find it. What has the Government done or this House done to make pro-

vision to meet that emergency next winter when it arises? Why the House has not yet considered the matter nor has the Government and still we are supposed to be the representatives of the people who pay the taxes in this country. We are supposed to be the custodians of the peoples' interests and the people's money. Yet we are told that the House is to be closed and that the people are to be left to look after themselves. I tell you Mr. Targett that there is a gloomy situation looming on the horizon and it will be poor comfort for the people in the northern districts to come to Mr. Coaker next winter. All he will say is that last year he tried to do something for them and he was severely criticized for it. He will say that he unlawfully took a half million dollars from the Treasury to buy their fish, but that he cannot help them any more as his own business enterprises are in danger now. It will be poor comfort for the people in general to find the Attorney General and Prime Minister in London and no Minister in the Finance Department. It will be poor comfort for the whole Government the Minister of Public Works, for work on the roads when he will say there is no money left. It will be poor comfort to the whole Government when they find that their credit is gone and that the Banks have closed down on them; but it would be some source of comfort to the people if the House was open so that the people's birthright could be prevented from being bartered away. That is why I say that, if the Government are honest with the people who sent them here, even at this eleventh hour, and if they would redeem the broken pledges of 1919, they come back and realize that the country belongs to the people of Newfoundland. The Government of the people are the Government of the people as long as the

people are satisfied; but when the people are not satisfied the Government are no longer the representatives of the people.

That is the reason that I for one resent the latest attempt of the Prime Minister to force the Opposition to a conclusion of our criticisms of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There is no attempt to force, Mr. Bennett.

MR. BENNETT.—We will get ahead with the business of the session when you have given us a certain assurance. This House should not close because conditions at present are too serious. I have the greatest veneration for the land that gave me birth and I have children who were born in this country whom I want to live here and that is why I make this assertion to-day. Is there no modus vivendi in which we can get together and discuss the serious problems confronting us in a proper manner? Is the flippant decision of one man to be regarded as final? Is Newfoundland to be made the tool for the self-advancement of politicians to the downfall of the people? What are conditions as regards our commercial life to-day? Ask Water Street and I venture to say the answer will be sufficiently startling to cause even the Government to wake up to a sense of their responsibilities. What is the condition as regards the Country's finances? Last year we had to take five millions of the people's money to tide us over and this year perhaps ten millions will be needed but in face of all that we had the Minister of Education telling us yesterday how many supervisors they had in British Columbia, Nova Scotia and other places in Canada but he forgot to tell us that the earning power of these people is twice as great as ours and still we are trying to keep pace with

them and are asked to put ourselves on the same par as regards expenditure on Education. It is an unfortunate position that we should be here this day of the year discussing these questions. It is without precedent that the followers of the Government have been so long docile and apparently perfectly satisfied with those who are directing their destinies and those of the people whom they represent in this House. It is, indeed, a splendid demonstration of loyalty and a tribute to those who lead you. No man is any good who does not appreciate his fellow-man, but it is deplorable that people should permit their minds to be so warped by the saying and doings of others as seems to be the case where you gentlemen are concerned. Fakirs there may be, indeed you will find them on every street corner, but there is an inborn instinct in all of us that should be listened to and that instinct is conscience. There is a time in the life of every man when he should assert himself and there is a time when every man in this House should assert himself if he wishes to do his duty. Mr. Archibald has asserted himself and he will never have cause to regret it. Mr. Coaker asserted himself when as a telegrapher and little more than a boy, he saw the need for reform amongst the fishermen and he had the peculiar good fortune to find the soil ready for the seed. He sowed the seed and in reaping the harvest he brought forth one of the most powerful organizations that this country has ever known. Thousands said he was a crazy man but he saw his vision and he went forward and attained its realization and if the principles underlying that had been bad he never could have succeeded. When that organization was in its infancy I sat on the other side of the House and I saw that the principle was right. As re-

gards its political influence, that is another matter. No such organization should ever hold the balance of power in this House and so upset the equilibrium of affairs in the country. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have arrived at a stage in this session when some undertaking should be arrived at. Some have come to the conclusion that all this side of the House wants to do is to embarrass the Government and hinder legislation but that in the first place would be a very unpopular attitude for the Opposition to assume, it would, moreover be wrong and disloyal. I want to serve my country as faithfully as lies in my power but I am not prepared to hand out blank cheques to an irresponsible Government or lose the autonomy of Newfoundland, and I am prepared to put every vote through in twenty-four hours provided this House does not prorogue. I am consistent in that and I am actuated by nothing but honesty of purpose. I do not care who has the Government but I do want to see the different offices properly filled. I do not want to see one man filling four or five offices while another, like Dr. Barnes, for example, is placed in charge of a Department that has nothing to direct and at the same time a department like the Finance and Customs left absolutely without a head. Pass your votes by all means, it is only childish to keep them back but leave the House in operation. I say this as a Newfoundlander who wants to have a safety valve. The Ministers of the Crown have not the decency to stay in their seats after bringing us here this morning but you will have to stay here or we will keep you here all night and all day to-morrow if necessary. The dignity of the House is becoming prostituted and nothing but indignities are showered upon the heads of the men on this side. The Prime Minister brings us here and then he

hasn't the decency to stay here himself. Give us an understanding that the House will not prorogue and you can be out of here by Saturday, otherwise, you will not get out of it before Christmas. Arrogant, ignorant, time-serving politicians that they are, they do not care if the whole thing goes up in smoke to-morrow. What interest has Anderson Squires got in this country?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Would the hon. gentleman indicate the period of time over which he would consider it proper for the House to adjourn.

MR. BENNETT. — Adjournment could be taken over a sufficient time to permit hon. members to get home and pick up the threads of their business. It is perfectly obvious that we are going to be up against serious conditions and it is not sufficient to leave the decision of what is then to be done in the hands of three or four men. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this morning session is going to have any good results. It is not to embarrass the Government that we have so persistently held out against the House closing before this. We have asked for information and that information has been withheld from us.

MR. PENNEY.—Mr. Chairman, as the sitting member for Carbonear and not in my capacity as Speaker of the House, I wish to call your attention to the direct charge made by the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett in that he said that the Executive Government are plotting a conspiracy which will lock the doors of this House so that they will never open again.

MR. BENNETT.—I made no such charge.

MR. PENNEY.—You did unless my ears deceived me.

MR. BENNETT.—In that case your ears must have deceived you.

MR. PENNEY.—My position is that if the hon. member is prepared to substantiate that charge before a Select Committee, I am prepared to take such action as perhaps will place a different complexion on things in this Assembly, than we have now. I do not take exception to the charge as the Sppeaker of the House but I would not be doing my duty as the representative of Carbonear, if I allowed such a charge to go unchallenged, while I was returned with the party now in power and am responsible to the electors for the actions of the Government. If he is prepared to make that charge then I move that a Select Committee be appointed to investigate it and give the hon. gentleman a chance of proving his charge.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, through you I want to tell the Speaker or rather the hon. member for Carbonear, that in criticising the actions of the Government, I have a perfect right and license to make any statements I please on the floors of this Assembly. He accuses me of making a charge which I did not make, that there was a conspiracy afoot. What I said was this: "We have witnessed the spectacle of the Prime Minister six weeks ago trying to close this House on Suspended Rules, an unprecedented spectacle and for that reason I have to say that there is no other conclusion for me to come to than that there is a conspiracy which is known to only a few of the Executive Government. Mr. Halfyard took exception to the statement and I told him he was not one of them, and in my own justification I say this that if this House closes now with the country in the present condition, that you will never open it again.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I

was not in the House when the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, made the remarks to which Mr. Penney called attention, as I was making arrangements with His Excellency the Governor to assent to some necessary bills to-morrow at three fifteen. He has kindly consented to do so. With respect to those remarks of Mr. Bennett I feel sure that he did not wish to make an imputation of improper conduct against the Executive Government, or to make the shadow of a suggestion that the Government intended selling Newfoundland to either the Imperial Government or anyone else. I can assure my hon. friend that if he had full knowledge of the industry with which the Government has been grappling with the problems facing us in the past few months it would dispel all such doubts he might have. I don't think he believes that.

I also wish to congratulate Mr. Bennett upon that portion of his speech which I had the pleasure of hearing. I feel that it made the morning session well worth while. If there is one principle more than another which ought to appeal to every Newfoundlander it is the welfare of the children who are to be the future men and women of the country. With respect to the suggestion that the morning session was an attempt to force things through, there has never been an occasion on which any member has suggested adjournment for an extra day or even more, that the Government has not agreed to it. Last evening a debate developed on the Postal Telegraph vote, and instead of continuing on a few hours longer, I suggested that we meet at ten thirty. Some hon. member opposite suggested eleven and I concurred immediately. It is the desire of the Government that every detail of the Estimates should be fully debated, but that the business of the House be proceeded with as

speedily as possible. With Mr. Bennett I agree that there was nothing in the correspondence tabled by Mr. Hafyard which was necessary to hide, and there was no such attempt made. The fact that it was open and above board is clear from the fact that it was placed in the hands of Sir Michael Cashin. The only knotty point in the contract with the Anglo is that they want a twenty-five year contract and we don't want to give it. I held out from the start that any wireless project which the Imperial Government might undertake would be permissible in the contract. These are the only two contentious points in the matter.

MR. BENNETT.—You ought to put it up to the Anglo Co. that if the Government decides to enter into a contract with another company, that they should have first chance of tendering for it, but that after that they should not stand in the way of another Company coming here on this work.

The Chairman left the Chair of Committee at 1.30 a.m.

The Chairman resumed the Chair of Committee at 3 p.m.

At half past three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber.

And Mr. Speaker and the House being at the Bar of the Council Chamber, His Excellency the Governor was pleased to assent to the following Bills:—

"An Act respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony."

"An Act to amend the Act 11 Geo. V, Cap. 40, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads'."

"An Act respecting the Exportation of Timber."

"An Act for the Ratification of the Contract with Pu!p & Paper Corporation of America."

"An Act for the Quieting of Titles."

"An Act to amend and consolidate the laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had 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 on Supply have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1913."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Targett took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MACDONNELL.—Mr. Chairman, when this was introduced and on the occasion of its second reading I took the stand that we members of this Assembly would be straining our powers as legislators if we pass this amendment to the Election Act 1913 for the reason that it will affect the constitution of Newfoundland and change the electorate. I have not discussed the bill and have not given my opinion as to whether the vote for women is right or wrong, but it is a measure to which we must give earnest consideration and the best that is in us. My point is, that the people are the only ones who can change it and I submit we should put it to a plebiscite. A few days ago we sent the Prohibition Bill to a Select Committee to decide as to submitting it to a plebiscite and you cannot do better

than do the same with this. Send it to a committee who will enquire into all the circumstances and the right and wrongs of the case and then come and report to the House. Having got that we can have all the debate we like on the report. We should tread slowly in matters of such importance and I move that it be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. SAMSON.—I am in accord with that and beg to second the motion.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and recommended that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

On motion this report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the report the House divided when there appeared for the motion: Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Samson, Hon. Mr. Warren, Hon. Mr. Barnes, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Lewis, (11).

And against it:—Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Targett, Mr. Jones, Sir J. C. Crosbie (8), so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows:—Mr. Jennings, Hon. Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Samson, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Sullivan.

Sir M. P. Cashin 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.

WEDNESDAY, August 3.

The House met at three of the clock

In the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

At a quarter past three of the clock there being no quorum present, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, August 4.

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

At a quarter past three of the clock there being no quorum present, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 5th.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, to table a draft of Contract made between Hon. Dr. Robinson on behalf of Newfoundland Government and C. P.R. during his visit to Canada in 1919.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of the House a statement of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture and Mines under the various heads for the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June last showing (a) all payments to parties by way of salaries or wages employed in connection with the said Department, all payments for the purchase of live stock, all payments for the purchase of seed, all payments for the purchase of machinery and all ex-

penditures for any other purpose, stating briefly the various heads of expenditure.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total expenditure authorized by his Department to members of the legal profession for business on behalf of the Government, giving the names of the parties receiving these amounts and the sum paid or to be paid to each.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount of the deficit on the operation of the Postal Telegraphs Department for the past three fiscal years, showing (a) the amount lost on business within the Colony and also on business outside the Colony.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the table of the House a copy of the agreement made with the various parties sent away last year to be trained as educational supervisors, or the letters or other documents of instructions given to them, and also a copy of the letter sent to them or to be sent to them notifying them of the termination of their engagement.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, may I ask is it the intention of the Government to close this House within a short period? If so, I would suggest to the Committee the advisability of adjourning for a month or six weeks and not close or prorogue, under the existing conditions in the country to-day. Conditions in this

Colony to-day are such that we, the representatives of the people of Newfoundland, should take every precaution for the future, and, to use an old expression, "we should be in the watch tower" to watch the way matters would develop. Last year after this House prorogued certain matters that should have come before this House were decided upon by the Executive Government and which caused considerable criticisms since the House opened this year. This afternoon, on behalf of the Opposition, I would suggest that the House adjourn for six weeks or so and if anything should arise in the meantime we will be in a position to come here and deal with it, if anything does not, so much the better for the Government and the country. It will require very little energy to meet here from time to time within the next six months. Conditions call for it. Take the matters in Supply and Ways and Means before this House at present. It is a hopeless task to try and get the money that is expected. Then again the marketing of our codfish within the next four months is going to be a very serious matter for this country. I think the suggestion I am throwing out this afternoon would be the wise and proper course to adopt and there is no reason why it should not be adopted. Everything around us to-day is brimful of trouble. The fishery is very bad in some places and in places where it is supposed to be good there is not sufficient to make an average voyage on account of the anticipated low price for fish this coming fall. Our purchasing power is away below our cost of living. I await the decision of the Government regarding our suggestion. If the suggestion of the Opposition is not accepted we will have to go on in the same old rut and keep the House open.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, the intention of the Government was not to have the House open during the Autumn season, because it would be exceedingly difficult for various members in the Government to be here—members who represent outport constituencies and members who have already made material sacrifices to be here in session within the past month or so; but if a crisis should occur they will be able the duty of the Government to have in the Autumn. It was the intention of the administration to open the legislature about the second week in January next, as by that time all the accounts up to December 31st would be available and every member would be able to see where the country was financially and all of us would know the situation in connection with the fishery. I thought this plan would be best for the country and there would be no advantage that I can see to be derived from having an Autumn session of the Legislature. The desirability of having the House in session again at an early date appeals to me as well as it does to the Opposition, but in my opinion it would be found impracticable, in fact almost utterly impossible, to put back the session from January and I do not think that the best interests of Newfoundland would be conserved thereby.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that I can see eye to eye with the Prime Minister in this matter. He has overlooked the most serious thing that can happen within that period, namely, the marketing of our fish, and the whole thing will be over before the first of January next. The great crisis will be upon us in October or November when if we have on hand a million and a half quintals of fish and find that we cannot sell that fish to the merchants on Water Street and we have no customers to

come in from outside to buy that fish, where is Newfoundland? It is no use talking about opening in January as far as the fishermen of this Colony are concerned. They come here in October and November prepared to market their fish to the merchants. If they find that the merchants are not in a position to buy because the Banks refuse to advance money to the merchants, are not we going to face one of the worst crisis in the history of Newfoundland. We are now advancing in the month of August and a great deal of our fish is in salt bulk and Water Street merchants are only prepared to buy at four dollars a quintal.

It is no use closing up our shutters now and return in January but I think you ought to look ahead and realise what is coming. Some strong hand is required to handle the situation during the next few months judging from present circumstances. You may be called upon to buy a half million quintals of fish and is it not the duty of the Government to have that debated here. There is considerable fish still in the hands of the fishermen from last year. The new fish coming in is only fetching four dollars and is it not our duty to take every precaution to guard the interest of the country. I think every member of the House is prepared to come back here in October and why not prorogue until then if it should be necessary to re-open then. With regard to the three thousand employed on the Badger work the number is increasing daily and on the back of that we have new fish only getting four dollars per quintal and it is up to the Government to get busy. The Government ought to recognize the position it is in. The Minister of Justice knows the state of Fortune Bay and we all know the condition of Placentia and Ferryland districts. Grand

Falls is closed down and so also is Bell Island and nothing else is left to happen. I think the proposition made to the Government by the Opposition is one of sound business. If things look better in October then do not open until a justifiable date.

MR. HIGGINS—I desire to concur in the formal presentation made to the House by the leader of the Opposition I think it is manifest that it is not an unusual thing for the Opposition to be called upon to make this proposal to the government and the desirability of adjourning for a couple of months is obvious and if conditions at that time require no legislative consideration the formal prorogation of the session can take place.

This proposition being now for the first time presented to the Prime Minister he may take it coldly, but I think he will see the logic of it. We shall not have to come back until the occasion arises and then I think we are all prepared to make a little sacrifice. I am sure during the Fall if necessary every member of the House will be able to set aside a few days to come to the city to attend to the matter then requiring consideration. I do not want to disturb the fine way in which the Leader of the Opposition presented the case. It represents the deliberate thought of the Opposition and it is manifest that this side of the House does not wish to protract the Session any longer than necessary. This proposition ought not be met with the retort that this is a reflection on the government. The Prime Minister will see that it is hardly fair to the Opposition and the private members of this House to have the calling of this Assembly together remain in the hand of the Governor-in-Council. If conditions should necessitate the opening of the House I think the idea of the opening ought not to remain in the power of the Governor-in-Council. I think we ought to deal with the question in the honest way

in which it has been presented. There is nothing novel in this. It does not come as some thing suggested for the first time in this House. Adjournments for three and four weeks were periodical some years ago when conditions warranted that. From a view point of principle the same conditions prevail to-day. I think the suggestion will expediate the business of the House if accepted. If a black cheque is to be given the Governor-in-Council I will not support it.

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may be able to say something about this matter of the disposal of fish. I do not agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition all together. I do think that the conditions appertaining are serious. I think they will not be similar to last year. How an adjournment until some months from now will meet the situation I am at a loss to see, but I think if a committee is left to deal with the matter say two from the Government, two from the Opposition, and one from the trade, then the best solution will be effected. Then the matter will be handled in a business-like way, but if it is dealt with by the whole House it will be handled along political lines. I do not think we are going to have as low a price for fish as suggested, but I do say it will be low. To-day five dollars is being given for Labrador and six dollars for Shore, but what the price will be in November we cannot say. We can easily dispose of a half million quintals of fish at the present price. When I was in Europe last year I could have entered into an arrangement at a high price for the disposal of seven hundred thousand quintals of fish. If my suggestion of appointing that committee is accepted that fish can be disposed without the country suffering much. I do not think the catch will exceed one million and a half. There will not be any difficulty of disposing of this fish in Europe. I am glad to

say that I see light through a transaction disposing of all the Labrador fish in the city now. But with regard to the suggestion of the Opposition I do not agree with it and when I addressed the House upon my return from Europe I made an appeal for co-operation.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Since you returned from Europe the country cannot be redeemed. There has been a dropping market ever since.

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE—I as Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the same conditions present themselves this Fall as last I will not do what I did last year.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—If we had been with you we would not have let you.

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE—Perhaps so. I think if anything important crops up then if it demands it the House can open. I pledge myself to that. If you accept my suggestion from a commercial point of view I think the matter will work better. I would also like to say that if I had known the Session would be as long as this I would have resigned from public life and spend my time at Port Union.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am in full accord with the leader of the Opposition that we adjourn until October or such time that it is necessary to open the House again. The remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries convinces me that we should adjourn. As to the shipping of fish the Minister and myself have been shipping it out for the past five years very profitably but recently it has been reversed. Since a group of bright gentlemen here appointed Hawes their agent in Italy it has been impossible to do business. The Italian Fish merchant will fight any one who will dare interfere with his business. The same applies to Greece and Spain. Never in the history of Newfoundland have we seen such conditions exist in Portugal as

we have during the last year or so. I know of fish being caught in April, loaded in June and arrive there in July and the best offer obtainable was fifty shillings and not cash against documents but payment by note. I know a man who was offered a note for \$30,000 for his cargo. If that is not very serious I do not what seriousness can occur to the fish business of this country. There is another matter which speaks for the adjournment of this House and that is the Banks. So far as supplies are concerned the merchant is all right, but when he comes to buying the fish later on he will find the blockade. At the present time there are twenty five thousand quintals of fish in Italy unsold shipped between January and April, and now you will ship as you say another ten thousand so that simply means another bad shot for the Labrador fish. Even then you will not have an outright sale. As for the regulations you admitted they were bad and that proves you did not believe in them.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Is not that so?

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am sorry to hear that. Why did you then lift the regulations?

THE HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There was no other remedy.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—If all those gentlemen on the other side backed the Railway resolutions why did they not back up in the fishery regulations? As to your suggestion for the appointment of a committee I do not agree. This is the right place for anything of a serious nature to be discussed and decided upon. I am not troubled about anybody coming to the Bar of this House. In your suggestion you say and the fifth be appointed from the trade. Why he would be the king of the four and would have the casting vote.

THE HON. THE MIN. OF MARINE—
—I suggested him because we would know how the trade was thinking.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am not going to take off my hat to the trade. This is the people's house and this is the right place for this matter. Then there is the unemployment question. Taking Deer Lake road, Bonne Bay and Badger roads some four thousand men are employed at three dollars per day is \$270,000 per month. You will want to meet here again to devise Ways and Means for this. As Mr. Higgins said it is in the interests of the country to close the House and come back when the times demand it. Again we do not know although we have asked time after time where you are going to get the money to run the country. That is another reason why we should come back here in October. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he will pledge himself to the opening of the House then if it is essential, but we ought to know now if we are going to open or not.

MR. BENNETT—Suppose we leave the total of the Postal and Telegraphs stand over and just pass the details.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is just as well to pass the total and on Monday go into Ways and Means.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—The new appointment in the Postals is Mr. Parsons. Four carriers were moved up.

MR. VINICOMBE—There is a clerk here at 450; may I ask if that is a young or old man.

HON. MIN. OF PROFITS—That is Miss Dunn.

MR. MacDONNELL—I want to ask the Hon. Minister of Posts a few questions before we go any further. If there is an amount for telephone extension I want to get a share of it. We have the poles cut in a few places and all we want is the wire. It is only a distance of 8 or 10 miles to link up places like Codroy to Cape Ray and Cape Ray to Fischell's and I would like to get it. I made some sugges-

tions early in the session as to the Superintendent of Mail Clerks, and I now ask himself to go out occasionally without it being heralded abroad and have a look over the line. He should not stay in St. John's. We were told of his great geographical knowledge and it is a pity to let it rust. Sometimes things go wrong and he should be out travelling. Do you know, Sir, if the lady in charge of the two telephone systems at Abraham's Cove, which is really an exchange, is being paid for it.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—I will enquire.

MR. MacDONNELL—She is doing the work for nothing and it is not fair.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Is this a new appointment at Bell Island Mines? I do not see the need of such when things are on the down grade, and there are not so many people there.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—I will find out who is there.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The appointment was made long ago, but was formerly paid out of contingencies.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—About that 1150 for the Postmaster at Bay Roberts—why is he so much over every one else.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is the same arrangement as last year and when you and I were in the same government.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Motor express service \$1,000—what does that mean?

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—That means the mail truck—~~is~~ is for maintenance.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—How about this \$10,000 off the steamer on the Placentia-Port aux Basques-Sydney route.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE—We are going back to where we were before as we consider wages, coal etc., will be cheaper.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—What has the Superintendent of Telegraphs done to be jumped up \$300 or \$400.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—Last year he did not participate in the increase,

but he was recommended by the Commission on Salaries.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. 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. Vinicombe gave notice of question.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Operation of the Newfoundland Railway", and "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited," without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 8.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 3.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 5.10 p.m.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has yet taken any action with regard to the statements made by an American tourist named Willard Howard, in the "Christian World" of New York respecting conditions on the South Coast of this Island, and notably in the district of Burgeo and LaPoile, and if the hon. member for that District has furnished the Government

with any evidence which would go to prove that these statements were unwarranted or exaggerated and if so to lay the same on the table of the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, if a Sub Collector has been appointed at Avondale at a salary of \$500 and five per cent. on duties, and what is the reason for making such an appointment, if the party given this position is little better than illiterate, is unable to make out the necessary papers and documents and has to get other people to check over the entries, prepare his returns and generally conduct the business, and if so what is the sense of appointing a man notoriously unfit for the position, and why it is necessary to have such an appointment made at all in view of the prevailing depression and the reduction in imports which prevails and is likely to continue for some time.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, if the Government has issued instructions that parties who owe for outstanding Customs Bonds are to be prosecuted and if similar measures are to be taken against those who have not paid their Income and Profit Taxes, and if so to lay on the table of the House copy of the Minute-of-Council or any instructions issued by the Government, and also copies of the circulars that have been sent out.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if certain information for which Messrs. Jones and Samson asked early in this session with regard to certain wrecks near Cape Race has yet been secured, and if it is the intention to lay the same on the table of the House.

MR. VINNICOMBE asked Hon. the

Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House all correspondence between the Government and St. Georges' Coal Co. re coal boring at St. George's Coal Fields; and re disposal of that property to the Government or any other party or parties.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair an hour ago the informal Committee consisting of Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Higgins, representing the Opposition; and Mr. Coaker, Mr. Foote and myself, on behalf of the Government, met and discussed the most expeditious policy of clearing up the Order Paper and considered the question of an adjournment until the Fall, as suggested by the Opposition a few days ago. An understanding was arrived at by the Committee under which the remaining Estimates, Ways and Means, and any business on the Order Paper could be disposed of by to-morrow night, His Excellency the Governor assenting to the outstanding bills to-morrow when an adjournment could be taken until Monday, December 12th, when the House will meet to discuss any matters of financial importance that may arise in the meantime.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by Sir Michael Cash-

in, on behalf of the Opposition, to concur in the statement made by the Hon. the Prime Minister. The Committee appointed by this House met and considered the question of an adjournment and after some discussion it was decided that the House should adjourn until December 12th next. In the meantime the Opposition wish to make it clear that they have no desire to prolong the present session in regard to the business to come before the House.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE.—I would like to draw attention to the serious situation of a number of men here who have served their time as mechanical engineers. They are a sober, industrious body of men and to-day they stand with their families practically without anything to eat. During the war time they could save nothing and in appealing to the Hon. Prime Minister I hope he will realize that something ought to be done and that he will do it. They are getting in despair, not so much for themselves as for their children. This is not a case of coming to the Bar of this House but of being forced to ask if something can be done for them. These 13 or 14 respectable citizens ought to be looked after. The only talk here is of the fishermen and labourers but these others should be attended to. I would like to see something done to enable them to provide for the winter and be able to send their little ones to school.

MR. BENNETT.—I wish to emphasize the remarks of Sir John Crosbie. It is very sad to see men of such capabilities as the marine engineers suffer from lack of employment. It is hard to put your finger on the cause but I think there ought to be some way of putting the shipping which is now idle, to work, profitably or at least to pay their way and give these men work. And not only the engineers but the sailors. As a class

our marine engineers are second to none; they are sober and competent and ready to take their chances in summer or winter. They have large families and are looking to the winter as idle months with anxiety, as their case will be serious when that time arrives. I appeal especially to the Minister of Shipping to employ the steamers in the coal trade which would be doing something to justify his office. I cannot endorse this too strongly as I know these men deserve the best consideration of the Government and of the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—I rise to endorse what Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett have said. There is shipping tied up in port and I know it is no easy task to figure on the remedy but I understand you will soon be sending a coastal steamer to St. Pierre for salt purchased by the Government. But this is not remedying the situation as ships here are idle and it will not do to take off a coastal boat. Why not send one of the others which would be employing both sailors and engineers. The coastal boats are needed now North and West and I ask the Minister of Shipping to take this into consideration as every little bit helps. These men must now be feeling the pinch. There are 30 or 40 three-masters idle, representing three or four millions and I know it is hard for the Government to meet the situation but something must be done to support these men. They cannot be sent to work on the roads. They are up against it and every chance should be availed of to help them and I suggest that the Minister of Shipping charter other boats than the coastal, such as the four sealers lying up at Powning's or at Job's.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The situation as put to the House by Sir John Crosbie and supported by Mr. Bennett and Sir M. P. Cashin, is

one of great magnitude and while the number concerned is not many, they belong to a class with special training. To secure work for them outside their particular line is not easy, as Sir M. P. Cashin said. I have already consulted with Sir John Crosbie on this matter and I trust shortly to be able to get them on steamers. The reduction in traffic by ships with auxiliary engines has thrown many out of employment but I trust in a reasonable time arrangements will be made to help them out as they are a most deserving class of men.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—The last day we were sitting I asked about some salaries. How about the operator at Marystown. Are you taking 10, 15 or 20% off him.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—He will be treated like the others.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—What about Bell Island?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—It was formerly paid out of contingencies.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 9.

The House met at 3 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

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

MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Finance and Customs to the manner in which the Old Age Pension's Department is carried on at the present time. The system is

very unsatisfactory. It needs a looking into. Letters are continually coming to this House asking why are not the cheques being sent out and we cannot get any satisfaction. Mr. Woods says the cheque in question has been posted, for instance I know where Mr. Woods said the cheque was posted on the 19th of June and yet it has not been received. If you ask him to look up his cheques at the Bank he says he has not the time or something else is the impediment. Whatever is necessary to expedite matters should be immediately supplied. Here is a letter of Mr. Maher of Placentia dealing with the cheque of Mr. Griffiths (reads). Two weeks ago I took the matter up with the accountant and he said he would send out the cheque when his book was numbered, well it must take a long time to number his book as the cheque has not yet been received. This is not the first complaint.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I shall be very glad to look into the matter to which the hon. member refers. The department has not been satisfactorily conducted. When I tried to get some accounts from Mr. Woods some weeks ago it may be remembered the question arose then and I requested Mr. Keating to look into the matter. I can easily appreciate the going astray of a cheque once in a while.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Not only have I received through my department a letter from Mr. Hunt of Dunville but there have been numerous complaints about the remittance of cheques and I know the Prime Minister will look into the matter.

CAPTAIN LEWIS.—I have received several complaints also, especially one from Mr. Brien of Long Pond. Dr. Jones and I have gone into the matter. I do trust the Prime Minister will remedy matters.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I would like to get particulars as to the number of men employed on the Deer Lake road to Bonne Bay. I ask that question because when the matter was brought up the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave us an assurance that the only men engaged on that road would be from the districts of St. Barbe and St. George's. I know men were engaged belonging to Burgeo and Fortune but I do not object to that. I do object to the employment of men situate east of the Gaff Topsails. I would like to know if it is possible to get this information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not think it possible to get the information accurately. I do not think an accurate record was kept of the number of men from any one district except in so far as Major Butler may have such record. So far as I know there is no account per district. I will be very glad though to find out.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—When the work started at Badger I commenced to keep a correct record but it got beyond me. Unfortunately the pressure for employment made it so that we could not control the number from any particular district. If the hon. member will come to my office for an interview I shall be only too pleased to discuss the matter with him.

MR. MACDONNELL.—I raised no objection to the building of the road as I thought it the best way to spend the public money and I had confidence in that thought as I believe the tourist traffic over it when built will warrant it. Then we got the assurance from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the same principle being involved as when he gave the assurance to hon. members for St. John's East when both of them were discussing the cutting of railway ties. I have not asked much information for the dis-

trict of St. George's. The Minister of Justice will bear me out as to the vast amount of unemployment in the four western districts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I will get in touch with Major Butler on the telephone.

MR. SULLIVAN.—The men who got Government guarantees some time ago to get supplies for the fishery from the merchants cannot now get one single article from them. The men have a good trap voyage yet they cannot get a bit to eat from the merchants. I would like the Prime Minister to get after the banks to assist the merchants.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This is entirely new to me.

MR. SULLIVAN.—Some of the men have three hundred quintals of fish on shore and yet they cannot get a barrel of flour.

MR. WALSH.—I wish to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's. Whilst we cannot expect the Government to give any further guarantees yet it seems a great hardship on those who have a fair voyage to date and who cannot get an advance from the merchants. I think if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will meet the hon. members of the district something substantial might be done. I am anxious that the Government provide a substantial vote for expenditure by the Department of Public Works as I believe the future demands that.

SIR M. P. CASHIN.—Well this afternoon we are told by the members for Placentia that the fishermen are in possession of a fairly good voyage and yet cannot obtain an advance on it. That is the position that will be for the future. I know what these gentlemen say is correct.

They received supplies on the fifty fifty basis and now that their catch is

landed the merchants are not prepared to advance any further. If the fish is not worth enough to warrant an advance then it is up to the Government to do something in the matter. They cannot sell the fish in its present state. On the other hand there are men who got none at all. What is going to happen to them?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—Mr. Chairman, the Government in their estimates are looking for eight million dollars, and we all know, the children on the street know that you cannot get six million. You estimate the catch of fish to be about a million and a half quintals. You think, Mr. Minister, that that would be a fair catch, do you not? Now put it at \$5.00 a quintal. That will not give you a revenue of more than three and a half million. Now where are you going to get the eight million that you are looking for? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that what I am saying is true, and I am trying to get the Opposition and the Government together to do something for the country. The Minister of Public Works says that the men doing relief work will be laid off in another couple of months. Now what does that mean? It means that you are going to have four or five thousand men walking the streets looking for work and their families starving if they do not get it. Is the Government making any effort to look after these men? Now I am not criticizing the Government. I am pleading with the Government and with the Opposition in behalf of the people.

While I am here pleading in behalf of the people some of the Government members are in other districts doing campaign work. They know that they cannot get elected again in the district that they now represent. Men who are out campaigning now in an effort to hold on to their jobs are not fit to be in this House, and I think

the people will see to it that they are not returned.

Now I want to tell the Government right plank to their cheek that while they are looking for a revenue of 8 million they cannot get 6 million. Have you not enough manliness in you to get up in your seats and say that what I am saying is true? You have entirely failed in your undertakings, and you have not manliness enough to throw down the gauntlet to someone who can do the job. Not only will things be worse on December 12th but before the end of the next forty-eight hours conditions are going to be worse. The Minister of Public Works admits that the only hope is to sell pulp wood to the United States, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries admits in his silence that we cannot get more than three and a half million dollars revenue from the sale of our season's catch of codfish.

This is no time for party politics, but I am the only man who would move out here to break up the party lines. Now I want to say to the Government members that if the statement that I have made that you will not get more than six million dollars revenue is not correct get up and disprove it. Now I am going to take my seat and let some members get up and disprove that statement.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech of the Hon. Prime Minister presented on May 25th is the most misleading document presented to this House in the 28 years I have been a member. Ananias, of whom the Bible says that he was struck dead by lightning, was a Mission Father compared to the Hon. gentleman, who has utterly disregarded the facts and given the House a wholly false impression of the financial situation from the first line in his Budget to the last.

For the financial year 1919-20, our

party was in office from July 1st to Nov. 15th, and for the whole twelve months the tariff in force was our tariff and the revenue collected was obtained thereunder. When we went out we secured from the Auditor General a statement which showed that for the previous year, ending June 30th, 1919, we left a Surplus behind us of, roughly, two and three-quarter million dollars. Then, for the year 1919-20, under our tariff, our estimates, and our votes, a further Surplus of a million and a quarter dollars was realized, of which, according to the best estimate, \$750,000 was obtained up to the time we resigned office. If you accept that date as closing our record, we left a cash surplus of three and a half million dollars to the present Government. If you agree, as we may reasonably claim, that we are entitled to credit for the surplus up to the end of June last year, then we left them four million dollars in cash. They cannot claim any of the advantages of that for themselves, because the Budget last year was not introduced until the 28th of June, two days before the last fiscal year expired. The present Government, then, began the fiscal year 1920-21, the first complete year under their administration, with four million dollars in cash to the credit of this Colony in the Bank of Montreal.

The Finance Minister, in his Budget a year ago, estimated a Revenue of \$11,201,000 and an expenditure of \$11,000,000. The Prime Minister, with characteristic evasion, says in the present Budget Speech that the Expenditure, shown by him at roundly \$11,300,000, was composed merely of Estimates of \$9,800,000 voted at the last session: Supplemental Supply \$1,152,000, and Expenditures under the Audit Act \$380,000, less Dropped Balances of \$127,000. But in order to make this statement there has had to

be a rigging and manipulation of accounts the like of which I have never seen or heard of in this or any other country. In his Budget Speech last year the Finance Minister spoke as follows:

"So far as we can at present estimate, our Civil Expenditure for the fiscal year 1920-21 will amount to about \$10,250,000 as compared with, roundly, \$9,145,000 for the present year, and the above estimated ordinary expenditure for 1920-21 is based on the fixed charges of civil Government which permit of a fairly close estimate, but to that we must add expenditures arising from war obligations, such as provision for disabled sailors and soldiers, vocational training, maintenance of Militia Department, and winding up of our military undertakings and charges incidental thereto, which properly ought to be placed under the head of Extraordinary Charges, as such disbursements cannot rightly come under any Department of the Civil Government and cannot be classified as ordinary expenditures. The amount required to meet these last named obligations I estimate at roundly \$750,000, which gives us an estimated Total Expenditure for the coming year of approximately \$11,000,000."

It will be seen from this that the Finance Minister estimated an Expenditure of \$11,000,00 without any reference whatever to Supplemental Supply and Expenditures under the Audit Act. These two items, Supplemental Supply and Audit Act expenditures, total \$1,530,000, so that if these expenditures for what I will call "post-war services" were met during the year as the Finance Minister proposed last year they should have been met, then the actual expenditure for this fiscal year would have been—not eleven and a quarter millions as the Premier untruthfully represented last week, but nearly twelve and a half million dol-

lars. Now, Sir, I say all these post-war expenditures were met in this way, but the Public Accounts were "cooked" by the Premier and his associates, and instead of charging all these accounts to Current Revenue, or paying them out of the Surplus as we did when we were in office, a fictitious charge was made of them against capital account, and then money was taken out of the Loan of Six million dollars raised the other day, to repay this to Capital Account, and it is now represented that this money was not spent during the past year at all. Not alone, though, was this done, but expenditures on account of the War in the years 1915-16 and 1917-18, which had been paid out of Current Account in these years, which had gone through the books and which were ancient history, were also dug out and charged to Capital Account, and repaid to Surplus Trust out of the Loan, so that the Premier and his associates in this political crime could have some more money available to meet the enormous losses they know will have to be faced in running the country's affairs during this year. Here is a detail of these three amounts, supplied to me in reply to a question which I tabled on May 26th:

"The One and a Quarter Million Dollars described as refund to Surplus Trust Account for an expenditure charged to that Account, which should have been charged to Capital Account, was paid over to Militia Department during the following years:—

1915-16	\$429,401.25
1917-18	470,000.00
1918-19	400,000.00

\$1,299,401.25

These items represent altogether \$1,300,000, more than two-thirds of the money that had been appropriated by previous Governments from the Surplus Trust Funds in past years towards meeting our War bills—money which had been paid; in other words,

out of the abounding Surplus Revenues we had in these years, so as to lessen our public debt, but which has been dishonestly added to the Public Debt of this Colony to form an extra obligation to be borne by our people for all time to come. The "frenzied finance" of the worst boodlers that ever afflicted American cities could conceive of nothing more discreditable than this transaction. Whatever excuse there might be for the Hon. Gentleman and his partners getting a refund, so to speak, of the \$400,000 of War Expenditure accruing during the year 1919-20, for which they are responsible themselves, they have not a shadow of justification for so dealing with monies that previous Governments had paid out of Surplus Revenue to lessen the burden of permanent debt on this Colony, and if this was a criminal proceeding in a private business, the man who perpetrated it would go to jail just as certainly as I am making this statement in the House, for gross and shameful manipulation of monies entrusted to him. But, Sir, even this does not tell the whole story. I have shown here how nearly twelve and a half million dollars was spent during the current year. During the same period, according to another statement furnished me last week as to Surplus Trust payments, the Government paid

For steamers	\$339,000
For salt	78,000
For sugar	184,000
For coal (boring)	50,000
For railway maintenance	250,000
For aeroplanes	13,000

That represents \$914,000 more than was spent in 1919-20 and the same method was adopted with regard to that. Instead of showing it as part of the ordinary running expenses it is charged against the Surplus Trust Fund, and now a Loan is being raised to pay for it. All these items are included in the Loan raised some weeks ago and the money thus obtained from bankers in New York, Boston and Toronto, was

I understand used to pay the interest coming due at the end of June, because otherwise the Colony would default and be posted as insolvent. Thus we find, Sir, that the actual Expenditure during the past fiscal year was not \$11,000,000, as shown by the Prime Minister, but nearly thirteen and a half million dollars, and I have no doubt that if I could get all the information for which I have asked, but part of which has not yet come to hand, I could show that probably another million has been smuggled away in the Public Accounts, to try and deceive the House and the country.

It might be said, too, Sir, that they spent the whole four million dollars of Surplus that we left behind us when we went out, but they have not spent that in the sense that they have spent these other amounts. They have spent that in using it to make up the shortage in the General Revenue which occurred from month to month during the fiscal year just ended. In other words, at the end of every month, when the bills came in, they had not enough money collected through the Custom House and the other revenue-getting departments, to pay them, and consequently they had to break into the Surplus and take enough money out of this nest-egg that we had provided for an emergency to make up the shortage.

The Finance Minister a year ago estimated that he would get a Revenue of about \$11,200,000 during 1920-21, and the closest approach he made to the possibility of a Surplus was to suggest that he might break even, or have a few thousand dollars to the good when he squared his accounts a month ago. Instead, however, of getting eleven and a quarter million dollars he got only eight and a quarter million dollars. That is to say, he was three million dollars short, an instance of financial and administrative incapacity never approached in our

history. The Premier and all his brilliant satellites, the Finance Minister who was to teach us all our business, and all the big public men on the other side, the party of clever and earnest young Newfoundlanders that the Premier boasted about, they couldn't bring Expenditure and Revenue any closer together than three million dollars, even according to their own printed Estimates and speeches. But, as I have shown above, the actual gap was nearly six million dollars, due to a policy of squandering and wasting and insane expenditures on fish, and salt, and steamers, and the railway, that has horrified the whole country. Instead of practising economy, instead of exercising care in the disbursing of the public funds, they have been throwing away money like drunken sailors.

They argue that they are not responsible for the shrinkage in Revenue, but that it is due to the world-wide depression which everybody now sees. I did not wish to be unreasonable or extreme in my views, Sir, and I freely admit that as a result of the depression everywhere it would be unreasonably to expect that this country should enjoy, during the past few months, at any rate, the same abounding revenues that were got in previous years; but, on the other hand, I maintain that prudent and capable men running our country would have governed themselves accordingly and would have pared down our expenditures and cut their garment according to their cloth. For instance, we know that nearly two million dollars of our money was given to the Reid Company to help to pay its running expenses during the past year. There was no justification whatever for taking a cent of that money, and this House never authorized the taking of it. Probably in his inmost heart the Premier himself was opposed to that money being taken, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was all-powerful in the Government. He got the

bee in his bonnet that he could run the railroad and make it pay. He was the father of the mighty thought of a Railway Commission. He conceived the great scheme of being Chairman of the Railway Commission. He got a Railway Commission appointed for one purpose, namely, to supervise the expenditure of a million dollars to be raised by Loan to furnish the Reid Co. with additional rolling stock and equipment, but then he diverted the Commission from its legitimate purpose into a machine for operating the Railway system, and he took nearly two million dollars of our money and handed it over to the Reids to help them to operate the railroads and steamers, and he thought he was doing a great thing when he got the Reids, on their part to agree, to contribute \$100,000 towards the deficit that would be caused in operating that system during the present twelve months. The thing is worse than comic opera, Sir. Gilbert and Sullivan never conceived anything more ludicrous than this. Here were contractors bound by law to operate the railroad or go under if they could not do it. Here was a Government that went to the country and got elected on a policy of denouncing the Reids and pledging themselves, if elected, to compel the Reids to carry out their contract. They were elected, and the people looked to them to force the Reids to live up to their contract. But they actually went and took all the public money they could lay hands on and gave it to the Reids to assist them in carrying on the Railroad, and did this without any authority from this House or from the country to do such an unheard of thing. They realize later what a monstrous outrage they perpetrated, because in his Budget speech the Premier told us that they did not intend to repeat this experiment after the end of last month, but that they were going to leave the Reids to run the Railroad as best they

could and that if the Reids could not run the Railroad it must go into the hands of a receiver. Now Sir, I have no hostility towards the Reid Co. nor have I any brief for them. I am here as a representative of the people, and I want an explanation of why the government went into this amazing experiment of taking part in the operation of the Railroad and putting up the money of the people of this country to carry out that expenditure. I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the man who conceived this brilliant idea, to get up here before this debate ends, and tell us why he diverted this Railway Commission from a Supervising Commission to spend certain money—a million dollars, or whatever the amount is—on rolling stock, into an operating commission to work the railway system, and why he took nearly two million dollars from the Public Treasury to give to the Reids to make good their losses, and I want to know if any of that money is going to be returned to this country and if not why not. A statement tabled here recently in response to one of my questions, showed that the Reids themselves, for the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June 1920, lost about \$1,400,000 on operating the Railroad during that year, and I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to state to this House whether he undertook the operating of the Railroad, through his Commission, without knowing what the Reids lost on it the previous year; and if he did not know why did he do so; and if he saw the statement and know what they lost, how was he insane enough—because I know no other word to describe it except insanity—how was he insane enough to involve himself and this country in such a transaction.

I have given him the credit heretofore of believing him to be honest in his purposes, though I have little opinion of his judgment, but I have to await his explanation of all this mat-

ter before I can hold him honest and blameless hereafter in view of the wrong he has done this country by this transaction, apart from any others. If he had left the Railroad alone or confined his Commission to supervising the expenditure of the Loan of a million dollars for Railway betterments, the people of this country would be two million dollars better off to-day than they are. That would have meant that the Loan raised the other day of six million dollars need only have been for four million dollars, because there would have been two million dollars more in the Treasury. Instead of that, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries threw two millions into this Railway sink-hole. The Government had to go to New York and get another two millions on loan and pay six and a half per cent. interest, and that money is now being added needlessly and indefensibly, to the Public Debt.

Another monstrous outrage on the Colony in connection with its finances the past year is that although the Estimates were increased by about two million dollars in the Supply we voted last Session, expenditure was increased a further million, seven hundred thousand by the Supplemental Supply we are asked to vote this session. A year ago, it may be remembered, the Finance Minister in justifying the increased Estimates, charged that it was a practise with us, when in office, to under-estimate our requirements every year and vote less money than we required, and he said that this government was abandoning this practise and was putting in legitimate estimates covering the entire amount that would likely be required, and he pretended then that little or no Supplemental Supply would be required at all. Here is one of his statements: "The expenditure on account of Civil Government having materially changed since last year's Estimates were submitted, necessitated

"revision which will be readily noticed on reference thereto. This division was made necessary and is based upon the report of the Civil Service Commission to whom was entrusted by our predecessors the duty of standardizing the salaries of Civil Servants." This referred to the matter of salaries. To the matter of increased votes for other departments of the Public Service he gave the explanation that I have already put forward, namely, that we understand, and then, with the hypocrisy that has marked this government in every particular, he pretended that he and his friends were going to act differently. But, as the Estimates show, they not alone expended all this increased amount of two million dollars, but they actually expended nearly another million and a quarter, and this, too, at a time when they knew that the Revenue was declining and that every dollar they spent over and above the legitimate votes, was only bringing the Colony one step nearer to bankruptcy.

The next item we come to, Sir, represents an even more shameful expenditure during the present year. It is the expenditure on ships. It will certainly be news to the country and probably be news to most of the members on the opposite side, of the House, that there was spent during the past year, on the buying and repairing of ships, nearly half a million dollars. This might be excused if the ships were any good, but as a matter of fact everybody now knows that they are utterly valueless for any service to the Colony. Three of them are tied up at the wharves here in St. John's to-day, because they cannot be used, because the expense of running them is too great, because it is cheaper to hire other steamers and lie these up. Here is a list of these steamers and what they cost, according to replies to questions furnished me here lately:

Lobelia (Gift from H.M.Govt.)	
cost to send here	\$25,820
Watchful (cost)	63,392
Watchful (Repairs paid to R. N. Co.)	42,392
Sebastapool (cost)	61,000
Sebastapool (Repairs, paid R. N. Co.)	12,684
Malakoff (cost)	61,000
Malakoff, repairs, paid to R. N. Co.)	51,553
Senef (cost)	61,000
Senef (repairs, paid R. N. Co)	13,063
Total cost	\$391,901

I might explain that these three vessels—the Senef, Sebastopol, and Malakoff, were purchased at once and they cost altogether \$184,000, so I have divided that amount by three and figure the cost of each vessel at \$61,000. The repairs to these three crafts is \$77,000 and the statement furnished us on May 5th shows that there was also an account of \$5,833 in dispute with the Reid Nfld Co. in regard to work on these vessels. In round figures, then, their repairs cost \$80,000, allowing this bill to be compromised, and I am informed that there is a lot of work yet to be done on them. We have not yet been able to get a statement of the cost of the Daisy, if she was purchased, and, if she was a gift what her repairs cost. There might be some excuse for this expenditure if these vessels were of any service, but public opinion is united that they are vestments I do not know, and I will be glad to have his explanation. Whether he was persuaded into this business by Mr. Collishaw, as rumor says, is a matter which we will probably get some light thrown upon next session, if not this.

Then, Sir, we have, as a further expenditure, that on the purchase of Labrador codfish last Fall, already the subject of so much debate in this House. In response to a question which I tabled here recently, I received a statement showing how our

account stood at that time which is as follows:

Statement of Account of Purchase of Fish.

CR.

By estimated required under Audit Act	\$380,000.00
By sales of Fish	33,045.25
	<hr/>
	\$413,045.25

DR.

To actual expenditure as per details furnished . . .	\$345,217.72
Anticipated cost. Job—\$26,000.00.	
Anticipated cost. Barr—	
\$25,500.00	51,500.00
	<hr/>
	\$396,717.72

To balance of this account \$16,327.53

There are some items in it that are not clear to me and that I would like to have explained. It seems that \$33,000 has been received for sales of fish and I would like to know how many quintals that represents. There are also two items of anticipated cost, Job \$26,000, Barr \$25,000. I would like to have these explained, but as it stands now the Colony has been let in for \$400,000 on this account, and practical men in the fishery business say we will get little or nothing back from it.

Then the Estimates show that \$184,900 of public money was taken during last year to buy sugar with, and the people of the country, having been obliged up to a few weeks ago to pay twenty-five cents a pound for sugar to try and reduce this amount in part, are to be still taxed two and one-half cents and a surtax; making, roughly, four cents a pound for sugar, for Heaven only knows how long, in order to square off this expenditure which never should have been undertaken. Another outlay during the last year was \$77,000 on account of salt, which mat-

for we have vainly tried since the House opened to get the rights of, but so far without any result. These are only some of the monies that have been spent in addition to what the Hon. the Prime Minister shows in the Budget Speech as part of the outlay for the past year. These facts and figures go to prove the statement I made in opening, that this is a dishonest, misleading, and utterly unreliable Budget Speech. Moreover, the claims set up by the Premier as to the reasons for the increase in Expenditure and the shortage in Revenue are utterly unfounded. He pretends that large amounts have had to be spent to carry out undertakings entered into by us, but the only ones he quotes are for the Lunatic Asylum and the Sanatorium, and these amount to merely a bagatelle. The chief increase of expenditure was the shameful waste of public money by himself and his associates in increasing the estimates a year ago by over two million dollars. Some of them now plead that they could not foresee the slump everywhere that took place; but Mr. Jennings, when he made a speech in Twillingate a few weeks ago, advanced as an excuse for the depression of the last year that evidences of this depression were visible in the fall of 1919. Very well, then, if evidences of depression were visible in 1919, why did Mr. Jennings and the rest of the members sitting on the Government side come into this House a year ago and vote to double their own salaries and increase by five times their sessional pay, and add to the number of public officials, by the list furnished me on Friday last. Here is the list and the salaries and I might say that it is not nearly complete, though it will serve my purpose at the present time.

New Appointments Since Nov. 15th, 1919, to date May 27, 1921.

T. E. Clouter, Secretary Minister Marine and Fisheries, \$1,200.00 p.a.

Miss Stella Davis, Typist and stenographer to the Minister and Secretary of the Codfish Export Advisory Board, \$840.00 p.a.

P. A. Brien, Assitant Accountant Marine and Fisheries Department, \$1,200.00 p.a.

V. P. Burke, Deputy Minister Education, \$3,600.00 p.a.

S. P. Whiteway, Principal Normal School, \$3,600.00 p.a.

Miss A. Doyle, Typist Education Department, \$720.00 p.a.

Miss E. Barnes, Typist Education Department, \$720.00 p.a.

Miss Olive Edgar, Typist Education Department, \$720.00 p.a.

Mrs. B. Howse, Typist Education Department, \$720.00 p.a.

Chas. Hamlyn, Messenger Education Department, \$460.00 p.a.

Miss Muriel Page, Typist Supreme Court, \$720.00 p.a.

S. Powell, Keeper Light Smokey Tickle, Labrador, \$100.00 p.a.

A. Chipp, Jr., 2nd Asst. Keeper, Gull Island Light, \$700.00 p.a.

James Moss, Lighthouse Keeper, Puffin Island, \$100.00 p.a.

Wm. Antle, Night Fireman, Sanatorium, \$1,200.00 p.a.

Sergt. J. Bartlett, Storekeeper, Sanatorium, \$1,000.00 p.a.

Martin Moore, Sub-Collector, Avondale, \$500.00 p.a.

Wm. Rowe, Laboratory Asst. Public Health Office, \$1,000.00 p.a.

Miss M. Edens, Stenographer Supreme Court, \$600.00 p.a.

Asst. Stenographer Supreme Court, \$480.00 p.a.

P. Whiteway, Local Constable, Musgrave Harbor, \$50.00 p.a.

In addition to that all salaries were increased, all public services were increased, and no attempt whatever was made in any direction to cut down costs or reduce public expenditure.

As I said before, the whole policy was that of throwing away money just as drunken sailors would do.

Now I will turn to the other side of the account, and deal with the plea that the reduction in Revenue was due to poor times. I admit, as I already said, that we could not expect during the last five or six months the same Revenues as previously, but I do say that no attempt has been made to collect anything like the Revenues that have been collected. To begin with, no attempt has been made to enforce the laws against smuggling over a great part of the coast, and thousands of dollars have been lost in that way. Then the management of the Custom House is nothing short of disgraceful. We had an example of six motor cars being allowed in on an order by the Minister of Finance without any duties being paid. We had cases also of men being allowed to get in stuff on temporary permits and not pay duties for months and months, and then, when I put a question on the Order Paper here some weeks ago, and the fact was exposed, there was a rush to the Custom House and quite a lot of money was paid in, but I am told there is still a good deal outstanding. But the worst scandal of all is the manner in which people have been allowed to defraud, for I may safely use the word, the Custom House by means of bonds for duty. I am told that there are to-day bonds outstanding for a quarter of a million dollars, \$60,000 brought forward from the fiscal year 1919-20 and about \$200,000 on account of the past year, a goodly percentage of which will never be collected, and yet it is all estimated in the Budget as good revenue, revenues which the country is asked to believe can be cashed in and utilized. I say that in spite of bad times, if there hadn't been such a squandering of extravagance and such a

failure to enforce the Revenue laws, the Colony could have made two ends meet during the past year. The Premier in his Manifesto denounced us for spending nine million dollars, but he is now spending eleven million dollars himself. If he had kept down the expenditures to nine millions, as he might have done the past year, the Revenue, small as it is, would almost have paid our way. But it must be remembered that if the present Government had not been in power, and if the ruin of our business community caused by the Fish Regulations had not been brought about, there would probably have been another million or two millions of Revenue collected during the year. The chief cause of the short Revenue, in my opinion, is the ruin brought upon our business community. Until the Fish Regulations were enforced and the whole of our trade was dislocated, the Revenue receipts were fairly good and if the commercial men had been let alone to do business as they did in the past, they would have continued to import, and sales of the imported goods would have been possible. But the Government interfered, enforced the Fish Regulations, held back the fish of Moulton and Harris and Penney and other people at the outset, then held back the fish of the business men along Water Street, and finally brought down the whole commercial structure flat on the ground. How could men like Moulton and Harris and Penney and Inkpen and Wakely, along the South Coast, import goods and pay duties when their fish was not permitted to go abroad for sale; and how could people in St. John's, like Goodridge and Steer and all the others whose names are in the public mind to-day, import goods and pay duties when the Government had created a machine which was grinding the life out of the whole of the trade

of the Colony, and all the time the Government were doing this on the one hand, they were destroying our resources and spending our money, at a rate never equalled in the history of the Colony.

I marvel, Mr. Speaker, as I look across the floor, how supposedly sensible people could ever be guilty of such a policy as this Government has carried out since it took office. The Minister of Fisheries was bitten with the crazy notion that he could upset the laws of Supply and Demand and club the foreign markets into buying our fish at our prices, and politicians who must have known better, men like the Premier and the Minister of Justice and others who knew something of business problems, allowed him to have his way and run everything and bring misery and destitution upon thousands of innocent people, even their own constituents, as in the case of Messrs. Foote and Cheeseman and Warren and Small. Now we have the same thing happening in the Northern Districts and delegations coming in to the Premier from Bonavista Bay last month asking for God's sake to be provided with some supplies to help them to prosecute the fishery this year, and then the Premier gets a loan of five or six million dollars at ruinous terms, and he asks the people to regard him as a public benefactor because he does so, when he knows full well that this sum is being added to the Public Debt, that the country will have to pay interest on it for all time, and that with a prudent economical administration there need not have been a dollar of a loan raised during the past twelve months, and this year, in the middle of the summer, about 500 men are building a road from Badger to White Bay, as a relief work, to keep them from starving, after nearly two years of Liberal-Reform Government.

Now, sir, let us look more closely at the question of the Railway and its connection with our deplorable financial position. A year ago the Legislature was invited to authorize the raising of a loan for a million and a half dollars to be expended for the following purposes:

For the purchase of six locomotives, \$250,000.

For the purchase and building of 100 freight cars—50 box and 50 flat—\$20,000.

For the purchase of a new lot of fish plates for the Railroad, \$300,000.

For the building of new freight sheds in St. John's, \$200,000.

For the building of a new terminal at Port aux Basque, \$50,000.

This makes up a million dollars and the other five hundred thousand dollars to be devoted to the exploration and possible purchase of coal areas on the West Coast. This money, we were assured, was to be spent under the authority of the Commission which was to represent the Reid Company on the one side and the Government on the other, and we were likewise told that this Commission was also to investigate the accounts of the Reid Company with the object of presenting to the House at this Session a new constructive policy for the Railroad in the future. After the Session closed and after the Premier and Minister of Justice had proceeded to London, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his capacity of Acting Premier, and with the mania for meddling in things of which he knew nothing and for which he had no competence, threw overboard this whole scheme and decided instead that this Commission, of which he appointed himself the head, should take over the operation of the whole railroad and steamboat system of the Reids, and made an agreement with the Reid Company by which they were to be

relieved of all responsibility for the cost of this venture over and above the sum of \$100,000 for the year. A madder undertaking was never undertaken by a supposedly sane and practical statesman. No attempt has been made to explain, not to say justify, the proceeding, and it is as great a mystery in this respect as the Premier's secret negotiation of the Loan which the House is considering this year. Why did Mr. Coaker make such an agreement with the Reids is the question that is being asked everywhere? Some people say that the Reids flattered his vanity and deluded him into believing that he was a great man who could do wonderful things with the railway. Other people suggest that he entered into it because he thought he could use it as a means of advancing his own political power in the country. Still other people suggest less creditable reasons for it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the House before this debate closes, just why he did undertake it and what defense he has to offer for its utter failure. We were told a year ago that it was so important, not alone to have this Commission, but to have it with full power to function, that it was necessary to have the Government assured of a majority on the Board and that it would be composed of four Government appointees including the Chairman and only three from the Reid Company. But I understand that the Reids refused to assent to any Commission consisting of more than six members, of which they would have half, and we now find that representation on the Board amounted to so little that the Government never appointed more than two men—Mr. Coaker as Chairman and Mr. Hall, Government Engineer, as Secretary, and that for the past twelve months the Reids actually had a majority on the Board all the time. Mr. Coaker, as

I say, undertook, as soon as he got the Premier and the Minister of Justice out of the country, to operate the whole railroad and steamship system, and everybody will remember now how he filled the Government newspapers nine or ten months ago with announcements of all the great things he was going to do.

First and foremost, he was going to cut out passes. Well, he did cut out passes for everybody except his own friends. He travels on a pass himself and all the people he brings to Port Union travel on passes with him. I am told that other members of the Government likewise travel on passes and that some adventurers who are in the country just now professing to be mining experts, are the recipients of similar generosity. But Mr. Coaker thought it was a wonderful thing to announce that there were to be no more passes, and accordingly they were abolished. Then Mr. Coaker decided on another wonderful thing, the building of the terminal to Argentia, and again there was a big parade of all the wonderful things that were to follow from this. The picture was painted for us in the public press, of the harbor of Argentia filled with big steamers loading pulp and paper and other products for conveyance to foreign countries, while of course the Kyle was to make Argentia her headquarters all the winter through and the enormous cost of operating trains across the Topsails was to be done away with. Well, the winter has passed, the trains operate across the Topsails just the same as usual and involve just as much expense to the Colony, and the man on the street says that the reason is that Mr. Collishaw, the man who owns Mr. Coaker, compelled him to keep these trains going in order to haul a few thousand cords of pulp wood from Mr. Collishaw's mill near St. George's to Grand

Falls, which he had sold there last fall and which he undertook to deliver before the 1st of July of this year. The Kyle didn't call at Argentia because the line was not completed, the wharf was not completed, and there were no freight sheds erected and the big steamers that were to take pulp and paper from there for the Harmsworth Company are still missing, because apparently the Harmsworth people are waiting to see what will be the end of Mr. Coaker's great project before they will commit themselves to any large expenditure in the matter.

These, however, Mr. Speaker, are only spots on the sun compared with the grand blunder of all, the enormous amount this Colony has had to pay because of the loss suffered in operating the Railroad last year. The Premier has already told us that at least two and a half million dollars would be required for this purpose, and I have made the prediction that the sum will be nearer three million dollars; and more than two-thirds of this amount will have been spent without any authority whatever from the Legislature. We are responsible, however reluctantly, for the following amounts: For the purchase and erection of the locomotives shown by an answer to a question here recently to have been \$320,000 or \$70,000 above the estimate; for the outlay on the freight cars shown up to the same time to have been \$275,000 or \$75,000 above the estimate; for the outlay on the Port aux Basques terminals similarly shown at about \$50,000; and for the expenditure on the coal areas at South Branch, which I will estimate as amounting to \$150,000. That represents \$800,000, and that is the sole sum for which the Legislature is responsible. The rest of the expenditure has been made on operating the Railroad without any authority from

the Legislature and in defiance of the pledges and undertakings given us by the Prime Minister here a year ago. In other words, the \$300,000 which we voted to be spent for fish plates has not been spent for fish plates, but has been taken and used to pay the bills of running the railway. The \$200,000 voted by us to be spent for new freight sheds in St. John's has not been spent for this purpose but has been likewise taken and diverted to paying the loss on operating the Railroad, and here I would point out that, at the present time, when there is so much unemployment in St. John's, this work should be set on foot and hundreds of people given a chance to earn something. In the same way, the balance of the half million dollars set aside for coal boring and purchase of coal areas, has not been used for that purpose, but has also been taken and used in paying the loss on operating the railroad. Therefore it follows that to-morrow, in order to improve the cross country railroad line—if the argument is sound that new fish plates will help—it will be necessary to get a further loan or to provide out of Current Revenue, \$300,000 to buy these things, which should have been bought out of last year's Loan. Similarly, if it is necessary to have these freight sheds in the West End of St. John's, the country will require either to raise a Loan of \$200,000 or get that amount out of Current Revenue to put these sheds up. In the same way, if the country has to buy a coal area on the West Coast, it will have to raise another Loan of \$350,000, or get the money out of Current Revenue to purchase a coal area, because the money voted for that purpose last year, like the money for the other two objects, has been improperly taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the assistance of his colleagues in the Government, and wrongfully

and fraudulently applied to a purpose for which they had no legislative sanction whatever and should never have undertaken. According to the figures given here in reply to a question by me recently, the cost of operating the Reid Railway by the Reid Company during the five fiscal years before the present year, that is to say during the last five years the Reids operated the railroad themselves, the annual loss was as follows:

1915-16	\$175,164
1916-17	143,751
1917-18	346,625
1918-19	714,512
1919-20	1,394,244

In other words, the loss on operating the Railroad for 1919-20, the loss the Reid Company had to face, was \$1,400,000. It was suggested in the House a year ago by the Prime Minister that the accounts of the Reid Company were padded or juggled with and that this did not represent the actual condition of things, and he asserted that the Government would bring an expert auditor here to show up all that was wrong in the Reid accounts. I understand that such an Auditor has been here since the beginning of the year, but, like the Auditors the Premier brought here twelve months ago to ferret out our alleged wrong doings, nothing has yet been disclosed to justify the Premier's statements or to indicate that the Reids presented false accounts to this House in the past. However, if we admit, for argument sake, that these accounts were padded and if we take a large figure and say that there are items totalling \$400,000 included which ought not to have been there, we yet have the fact remaining that the Reids lost a million dollars on operating the Railroad for the twelve months ending on June 30th, 1920. After that date the all-powerful and all-wise Mr. Coaker took hold of the operation of the road as Chair-

man of the Commission, and we must assume that, with all the wonderful ability he possesses for doing every kind of business he ran the Railroad efficiently, economically and honestly. Yet what do we find to-day? Why, that according to the Premier's own statement it cost more to operate the Railroad during the current twelve months under Commission management than it cost the previous year under Reid management, even if we concede that the Reids' accounts were padded. According to the Premier's figures, as near as I can make them, the total cost on Railway account--for betterments and for loss on operation--amounts to two and a half million dollars. I personally think it would be nearer three million dollars, but if we examine his figures we find that, as shown above, \$800,000 have been paid for betterments and \$1,700,000 has been lost on operation. But even that, Mr. Speaker, does not tell the whole story. The Railroad Commission, on taking office last July, increased the first class passenger rates by a cent a mile so that they have had for these twelve months the benefit of the income from that source, a very substantial amount, I understand, tho' I have not yet the figures, but I have put on the paper a question in relation thereto. Did ever anybody, Mr. Speaker, hear of any worse situation. Could anybody conceive of any worse situation? Twelve months ago the Premier got up here and denounced the Reid Company in every mood and tense. He ridiculed those in control of it, their methods, their system, their personnel. He sneeringly described the management as consisting of a lawyer, a geologist, and a food controller, and he told us of all the wonderful things he was going to do to improve the Railway by the changes he was going to make. And then Mr. Coaker who, whatever merits he

may have, could not be claimed by anybody to know much about Railroad system, put a lot of crazy ideas of his own into effect, which he now excuses on the ground that he was doing them with the best intention; and to-day we find that, as a result of this wonderful idea of Commission management,—efficient and practical and statesmanlike as we were told it was—it has actually resulted in causing more loss on operation than the inefficient, wasteful, and hopelessly muddling management of the Reid Co. in the previous year. This is another example, Mr. Speaker, of what Liberal reform has done for this country and its public utilities. The taxpayers of Newfoundland have now to pay \$1,700,000 or, more, likely two million dollars, out of their own pockets as the price of allowing Mr. Coaker to put into effect his insane ideas in regard to the railroad twelve months ago. All this money, two million dollars for loss on operation and \$800,000 paid for betterments, has had to be met by the Loan Bill we passed here last month. That has again added to the burden of the Public Debt and the people of the country will have to pay six and a half per cent. annually on this money for all time to come.

We have as a Legislature, some responsibility for the \$800,000 that was spent for these items of betterment and we have something to show for that in the way of locomotives, freight cars, terminals to Port aux Basques and coal boring, but for the other two million dollars, due to Mr. Coaker's ill-balanced idea that he could run the railroad better than anyone else, there is nobody responsible except the Government who permitted him to run amok in this fashion and saddle the country with a burden which it never should have been called upon to undertake. I know he will plead that if the Government didn't give this money the Reid Company would have refused to operate the Railroad, but

that is the position to which we are back to-day. A year has passed, two million dollars of our money has been taken and put into the swamp of railway operation, and now we are facing another year and though the Government repudiated any further responsibility for the Railroad, after the 30th of June, the Reids again refused, and the question arises what is going to happen. The Reids say, to operate it and the Government had to guarantee another 1 and 1-2 million dollars for this year.

We are now passing Sir, a bill which I never expected that any government would introduce, or that any Legislature in this Colony would accept—a bill to oblige the tax payers to furnish a million and a half dollars to the Reid Company to enable the Reids to operate the railroad during the coming year, besides making it possible for any amount of money to be spent on the improvement of the railway, and the Reids to give no return whatever for all this money and not to contribute a solitary dollar to the operation of the railroad. I will not go over in detail the arguments which I and those who sit around me advanced against it the past few days, but I cannot let the occasion pass without protesting strongly and as clearly as I can against this measure as a monstrous outrage against this Colony, its people and against generations yet unborn, who will have to bear the burden as well as those who live in Newfoundland to-day. I also protest against the plan as merely a makeshift. The Government fooled the House and the country a year ago and is fooling it again this year. The Government have had ample time since they took office to deal with this question. The Premier spent four or five months in Europe last year doing nothing, so far as anybody can learn, and he might have been devoting his time to this subject. He told us here a year ago that he was planning to bring out an

English lawyer to go into all the railway contracts, but this has vanished into thin air like so many more of his promises. He told us during the winter that something was going to be done, but we have been here now for over three months and no step has been taken, and, as far as I am concerned, Sir, I think the incapacity shown in dealing with this question is discreditable to the Government and everybody connected with it. Let us next go into the question of the Loan and try and throw some light upon it. Last year the House decided upon raising a Loan of a million and a half dollars, a million for railway betterments and half a million for coal boring. The Legislature closed on July 13 last, up to which time world depression had not become very evident, but no attempt was made by the Government to float that Loan locally then or afterwards. There was ample money in the colony but the government lifted not a finger to try and dispose of these Bonds here. The reason of course, was that the government realized they were so discredited in the opinion of our people, and especially in the opinion of people with any money, that no man in Newfoundland would invest a dollar in the Loan, not even themselves. Therefore, they went to the Bank of Montreal and got a temporary loan of this amount, having at that time between three and four million dollars of Surplus Revenue to their credit which we had left them, so that the Bank was amply protected. Then they took that money, according to the replies given to our questions in recent weeks, and handed it over to Mr. Coaker and his Railway Commission to expend as they liked in carrying on the Reid Railway during the twelve months and in doing some coal boring at South Branch. According to the replies given us, the amounts spent for coal boring up to the end of March was about \$120,000, and it was estimated that up to the

end of June it would probably reach \$150,000. This is a large sum to have spent particularly when no word was given us as to what the result had been until we forced from the Government an admission that the experiment was being abandoned as hopeless. Some more of this money was taken for the famous Argentia terminal as already remarked. The figures that we have got indicate an outlay there so far of about \$150,000, but there is a lot of work yet to be done, arbitrations on properties have to be completed, and I understand from fairly competent authorities that about a quarter of a million dollars will be spent on this project. Apart from this, of the whole of the rest of the Loan, a million and a quarter dollars, was thrown into the sink hole of the Reid Railway people in operating it during the year, and in addition another million dollars was taken from the Surplus Revenue during the twelve months and spent on operation as well and the Loan had to be increased by another million dollars so as to get that sum to put back to the credit of the Surplus. I have already shown that by the hocus pocus process of retrieving two amounts of nearly a million dollars of war bills paid in two past years out of Surplus Revenue and charging these to capital account, the Premier found an excuse for raising still another million dollars, the purpose of which, I understand, is to enable him to have that sum available at the end of December to pay the interest on our debentures due at that time, and failing which we would be faced with insolvency. This accounts for three and a half million dollars of the Loan which, as we know, was originally to have been four and a half million and the fourth million was, according to my information, to provide for the interest due on the 30th of June a year from now. But in the meantime the need for further money became apparent when the people dur

ing the past few months began to demand relief and provision for their fishery supplies on the ground that they had as much right to be fitted out for the fishery this year as Mr. Coaker's friends in the Northern Bays had to have their Labrador fish bought from them last Fall, and therefore the Premier, in arranging to raise his Loan, decided to increase the figure to six million dollars. Accordingly the Loan was made that sum and the House recently passed a Bill to authorize its being raised. This is the first time, I would point out, that money has ever been raised in this country for the purpose of paying Interest on our existing Loans and to be held in hand to meet deficits not existing at the moment, but which are being figured upon even twelve months ahead, and I say that it is a shocking thing for this country to contemplate, as it would be a shocking thing for any private business to contemplate the idea of raising money by Loan in this fashion to meet obligations that ought to be met out of the ordinary Revenues, instead of dealing with public finance as it ought to be dealt with, on sane business lines. As the days go by the fishy character of this loan becomes more and more apparent to the business people, financiers, and others along Water Street, and wherever commercial men congregate today two questions are being asked. One is why was this Loan effected under such circumstances of secrecy and concealment, and the second is why were the brokers, who made this loan, given the opportunity of cleaning up three-quarters of a million dollars on the transaction? Public suspicions regarding the matter are growing very decided, the belief is that the transaction won't stand the light and few people have any doubt that there is some "nigger in the wood pile." I will remind the House again, sir, that when I had the honor of being Minis-

ter of Finance and undertook the raising of loans, they were raised in the open with utmost publicity and with the sole idea of getting the best possible terms for the Colony. When launching the loan of 1918 we got one of the specialists of the Bank of Montreal down here to advise us and we put that loan on the market, locally and outside, at such terms and under such conditions as to challenge any suspicion. Moreover, I selected an Advisory Committee to associate with me, Sir John Crosbie, Sir P. T. McGrath, Hon. M. G. Winter, the late Hon. John Harvey and Mr. Conroy, and every development in connection with this loan was made in the public eye and with every circumstance of publicity attending it. I need not tell you how successful this loan was and that whereas we looked for only six million dollars we had offerings, at home and abroad, of nearly seven and three-quarter millions altogether. It was the same way with the loan of 1919. It was for a smaller amount and we did not need any expert, but we had the advice of the same gentleman and we conducted our business in the same way, getting competitive tenders again and securing such terms that the people who took the loan confessed that all they were able to get out of it was to exchange a new shilling for an old one.

In the present case, though, the Prime Minister kept everything secret. According to report, even his own colleagues knew nothing of the matter until the transaction was completed. Surely this was a very suspicious circumstance to begin with, but even more suspicious were the circumstances surrounding the transaction. These brokers in New York and Boston must have made, in this Newfoundland loan, the biggest thing they ever made in their whole history. It is impossible for me to conceive of

any man acting as the financial representative of a country offering such terms as the Prime Minister gave to these bond brokers. When the masses of our people discover for themselves just what was done, their indignation, in my opinion, will be greater than over anything yet done by this Government. It used to be a cause of complaint in years gone by that Sir Robert Bond made a bad loan after the Bank Crash, but Sir Robert Bond's loan in 1895 was a princely success for the country compared with this Squires loan of 1921. Sir Robert Bond had to go in the market to seek money for a bankrupt colony, a colony which was unable to pay its way, and it was to be expected that he would have to pay a stiff price for his money, but he got it on better terms than the Premier got his loan last month and, in addition, Sir Robert Bond's Loan had a Sinking Fund in connection with it, which is steadily reducing to the extent of our liability. But the present Premier, having to get his loan by misrepresentations of the country's affairs, could make no provision for a sinking fund, and the country will be faced with an awful burden quite unnecessarily. Let me repeat again what this loan means. It means that these brokers in New York and Boston paid into their banks \$88.00 for a Newfoundland bond worth \$100.00 and therefore they made nearly \$12.00 on every bond they bought. The total of the loan is \$6,000,000, so that the actual profit they made is \$720,000 or nearly three-quarters of a million dollars to start with. Put in another way these people gave us \$7.00 and we gave them a bond or security for \$8.00 and in addition we undertook to pay them 6½ per cent. on this \$8.00 twice a year for fifteen years. But that is not the worst of it, because it could be possible for these people, by working the markets,

to collect their interest here and get 12 per cent. additional added to the value of the coupon every six months or whatever the difference in exchange might be at the time. If these bond brokers held all this loan themselves, they would have made nearly \$720,000, but if as seems probable, they have sold some or all of the loan to their customers, they have contrived to retain about half this amount for themselves. They put this loan on the New York market at 93 3-8. In other words they kept half the boodle they made for the mere services of acting as middlemen and turning the bonds over from our Treasury to their own customers and they gave their customers the other half of the boodle.

Fifteen years from now these people will come back to us and we will have to pay them \$100 in gold or its equivalent for every \$88.00 in gold that was given us last month, and if the exchange is 14 per cent. as it is to-day, Newfoundland will have to find another \$84,000 to cover exchange if this amount is paid out to these people in New York. I repeat, sir, that there never was in the history of this or any other country a more ruinous financial transaction attempted, and I challenge successful contradiction of this statement by any person in the House or outside of it. We are told that the interest is only 6½ per cent., but if we take into account the reduction in value and the increased exchange you would come to find that the rate of interest is really 7 1-4 per cent. and probably when other items are allowed for, it will be more like 7½ per cent. In the midst of the war we were able to get loans for 6 1-2 per cent. and 5 1-2 per cent. Yet now, two and a half years after the war, and when the country ought to be in such condition that money could be more easily obtained, this Government is un-

able to get a man in Newfoundland to invest a dollar in the securities of the Colony, and has to go abroad and pay 7 1-2 per cent. for the money it needs to keep the ship of state above water for the next twelve months, if, indeed, it is possible to do that even with the assistance of whatever portion of this money can be made available for that purpose after the wasting and squandering which this Government has carried out is provided for.

Then we are told that the Premier made a good loan because France had to pay 8 per cent. for a loan in New York, but consider the condition of France with a million and a half of her manhood killed in the war and more than two millions crippled and disabled, with a fifth of her territory over-run and everything in it destroyed in such a manner as no person in this country can imagine who has not seen it, with all the factories destroyed, the machinery removed to Germany, the horses, the cattle, and every living animal in the region taken as well and the people reduced to beggary. I submit, sir, that France is no standard by which to judge this country. A fairer standard, I submit, will be to take some of the neighbouring provinces of Canada. I have in my hands a prospectus of a loan for the Province of Manitoba of 2 1-2 million dollars, twenty year six per cent. gold bonds offered to the people of Canada and this country at \$98.29 per cent. and interest, yielding 6.15 per cent. Here is a province in Western Canada somewhat more populous than our own, but no more prosperous in recent years than our own up to the ill-fated day when the present Ministry obtained office and started it on the road to ruin. Manitoba is to-day able to get a 6 per cent. loan as cheaply as we can get a 6 1-2 per cent. loan, and the effect of the transaction is to

save one per cent. in the interest payments. In other words, if we could get money on the same terms as Manitoba there would be a saving to this country of \$60,000 a year for fifteen years as against what we will have to pay under the Premier's arrangement. In other words this country in fifteen years would be nearly \$6,000,000 better off than it will be now by this transaction of the Premier's which he claims is a good one for the country. In addition to this circular about the Province of Manitoba I have also the prospectus here of a loan for the city of Edmonton, the capital of Alberta, another of the Western Provinces of Canada. Edmonton, according to the prospectus, has a population of 70,000 or 80,000 people, or about twice that of St. John's and yet this prospectus shows that it is able to get a loan of one million dollars at practically the same terms as the Province of Manitoba. Now, I ask again why was this transaction conducted in secrecy, why were the terms of the loan not advertised, why was no attempt made to induce other bond brokers, of whom there are scores in the cities of New York, Boston, Montreal and Toronto; to bid for the loan and by means of their competition to force the price up to such a figure that the country might have got some reasonable value for its outlay instead of being victimized in the fashion it has been. I ask a reply to these questions, which the country is waiting anxiously to have answered.

And now, sir, what of the future? To my mind it is black and desperate—more so than ever before in our history, not even in the days of the Bank Crash itself. If anybody wants evidence that it is black and desperate, he can find the same in the Premier's pitiful declaration here a few days ago that he must get a million dollars by means of the proposed Sales Tax. If

he wants further evidence he can find it in Mr. Cheeseman's withdrawal from the House and refusal to vote for that same Sales Tax because he realizes it is going to be destructive to business all over the country by imposing an unbearable burden of taxation on every class of our people except the wealthy, for whose benefit the Premier has legislated especially in removing the Profit Tax Law. If he wants still further evidence he will find it in the action of Mr. Archibald in withdrawing from the ranks of the Government because he found himself unable to support any longer a Party whose policy has proved so destructive to the best interests of this country.

I say that whatever other means of taxation might or might not have been rendered necessary, the Profit Tax Law should have been kept on. If nobody makes any profits; then the Treasury will not get any but if men do make profits and men are in business only with the hope of making profits, then where profits are made they have been made out of the people and a share of these profits should be returned to the Public Treasury. I repeat that our situation to-day is black and desperate, and I propose to give the reasons why I think so. For the first time in many years, ten or twelve at least, this Colony is to-day without a dollar of Surplus to its credit in the Treasury. During all the time the Morris Government and its successors were in office, we invariably contrived to have something put by for a rainy day. We had, when the present Government came in, between three and four million dollars, but now every dollar of that has had to be taken to make up the shortage in last year's Customs Revenue. I know we have at the moment the balance of the Loan raised by the Premier last month, but let us see where that stands. Already two

and a half million dollars of it has had to be taken to pay the loss on operating the Railroad during this fiscal year, and a half million dollars had to be devoted to the Municipal Council for civic purposes. Then a half million dollars was provided for roads and public works in May under the pressure of the widespread distress then prevailing, and more recently another half million dollars was taken without any authority, from this House, and used for the building of a highway from Badger to Green Bay and for the building of another from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay. This does away with four million dollars, but, for the operation of the railway during this year, the Government must set aside another million and a half dollars, and the Government has undertaken obligations in the way of guarantees for supplies for the fishery, totalling half a million dollars. This, therefore, means that every cent of the Loan raised two months ago is either spent or hypothecated and that all we can count upon getting back or having available later in the year is the amount that will be recovered by the Government from those on whose behalf it furnished fishery supplies. During the past year, as I have already showed, the Government took three million dollars that we left behind us, and used it to make good the shortage in the Revenues for that year so as to meet our running expenses and avert insolvency. Besides doing that, it had to raise this huge Loan to pay the shortage on operating the Railroad, to provide betterments for the Railway, to meet relief expenditures, and to ensure this year's operation of the Railway; but I ask the House and ask the Premier if any man can tell us where we are going to get the money to meet the shortage in Revenue that we will have to face during this twelve months. I may be told

that there will be no shortage of Revenue, but the answer to that is that for the past five or six weeks there has been a shortage in the Custom House Revenue as shown by the figures presented here, of nearly \$50,000 a week, or, roughly, two and a half million dollars a year. But, that is not the worst. That shortage is by comparison with last year's Customs Revenue, and it must not be overlooked that the Premier, realizing that last year's Revenue was not nearly enough, invited the House to impose new taxes for this year which will yield him two million dollars more than last year. There was the super-tax of 25 per cent. to yield \$1,170,000 and the sales tax to yield \$900,000 more. Now, the real seriousness of our position financially is that we are not even getting last year's Revenue, not to talk of getting any additional Revenue. The returns of the Custom House to-day are \$50,000 a week below the returns last year, and that with the new tariff in effect. This means that the old tariff and the new tariff put together do not give us as much money as we got last year. A continuance of this condition spells bankruptcy and nothing else, and it is only a matter of a few months before we have to face either bankruptcy or more Loans. The last Loan was raised by fraud, by putting before the financiers our financial statement of a year previously. That proceeding cannot be repeated. Any financiers we ask for money hereafter will want to see last year's statement, and it will not make pleasant reading nor encourage people to make us a Loan. We may get a loan, but if we do it only makes the thing worse, it only piles up more debt for posterity, it only makes the eventual crash a greater one. The other alternative is bankruptcy, and, as I say, I do not see how that can be delayed more than a few

months. I was amused to hear the Premier say a few days ago that our condition was only the same as that of other countries in the world, with this difference, that ours was better in some respects. I would like to hear him tell us in what respect our conditions is better than that of the United States or Canada, which are the ones we must compare ourselves with, because the standards of living, the rates of wages, the general conditions here, are the same as in these countries. It is no use to make comparisons with the countries of the old world, desolated as they have been by the war. We have to compare ourselves, I submit, with Canada and the United States, and I ask how do we stand the comparison? These countries have great areas and vast and varied resources. We have only one dependence, the fisheries. We have not even an agricultural industry of any consequence, in spite of all the money spent by the Premier and his man Friday, Dr. Campbell, in bringing in high grade stock the past year. We have nothing to depend on, only the fisheries. The mills at Grand Falls are now shut down by a strike, and if they re-open it will be at a reduction of wages of twenty to thirty per cent. The Bell Island mines are working a reduced crew, four days a week, and within the past twenty-four hours we have had it stated that they are shutting down also partly if not altogether. There is no outlet for work for our people except by the fisheries, and what the fisheries give rise to, and it is under these conditions, with fish prices certain to be not more than five or six dollars a quintal, that the Premier tells us that our country is in a good condition. I take leave to differ with him, and I say that this country is in the worst possible condition, that it is racing headlong to bankruptcy, and he and those around

him are either unable or unwilling to lift a finger to stop its progress. He certainly will have no money out of the Loan to help us and he will have no additional Revenue to help us.

Then the Premier in his Budget makes no provision whatever for Supplemental Supply. And I have already shown that he has under-estimated by more than \$300,000 the amount that will be required to pay interest during the next year on four and a half million dollars of the Loan now being raised. Furthermore, as I have also shown, many of the votes for public services, such as for fuel and light and other things of that kind, have been grossly under-estimated. These are services that cannot be cut down and they will have to be met out of Supplemental Supply. Now, I have been in the House for nearly thirty years and I have never known a session without a vote for Supplemental Supply on account of the previous year. The present Government has already introduced votes for Supplemental Supply for this year, or nearly a million and a quarter dollars, in spite of all the promises of economy and care in public expenditure, and I predict here and now that when we meet here, a year from now, we will be asked to vote for Supplemental Supply to the tune of not less than \$750,000. Then we are being asked to pass a Prohibition Plebiscite Bill, the cost of which will be at least \$50,000, and our good friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, may find some of his constituents unable to sell their Labrador fish next November, and there must be another demand for two or three hundred thousand dollars to buy the same, so I think we may safely say to-day that on account of the Railroad, on account of Supplemental Supply, and on account of other unforeseen emergencies of one kind and

another, every dollar that can be got will be required.

Therefore, it must be evident to every man who studies the question for a moment that every dollar remaining of the Loan and every dollar of Revenue that the Premier estimates for next year will be absorbed in carrying on the country, and that we cannot hope to have a dollar available a year from now even if he gets the Revenue he estimates, but is there any prospect of his doing so? In my opinion there is not. As everybody knows, things in this country and elsewhere are on the down grade, and so far as Newfoundland is concerned, I think we are all agreed that a long period of depression has to continue before any real improvement takes place. I held the Finance portfolio for nearly eleven years and tried as hard as any man could to keep down expenditure and to raise Revenue, and therefore I know somewhat of this problem. I say that his estimate of Revenue is absolutely worthless and that he cannot advance a single argument to support his claim that he is going to get this money. He has put on what he calls a special War Tax of 25 per cent. on the existing duties, which he claims will give him over a million dollars, and he adds to that a Surtax which he expects to give him \$900,000 more. In other words, he is imposing taxes totalling two million dollars in round figures, on the existing burden of taxation. Now let us look at what that is. According to a statement furnished me recently, the amount of regular duty and of surtax paid for each of the past five years is as follows:

Year	Reg. Duty	Surtax	Total
1915-16	\$3,506,356	\$328,818	\$3,835,174
1916-17	3,939,543	371,003	4,310,546
1917-18	4,367,118	414,816	4,781,934
1918-19	6,011,270	576,677	6,587,947
1919-20	7,426,376	715,569	8,141,945

We have not available, of course,

the exact figures of Revenue for the twelve months now nearly ended, but we have certain estimates and we have exact figures of Customs Revenue and General Revenue for the ten months ending the 30th of April for the past three years, which I submit for comparison:

Ten Months	Customs Rev.	Total Rev.
1918-19	\$4,532,108	\$6,321,039
1919-20	5,485,604	7,572,192
1920-21	3,488,725	6,102,774

A study of these figures shows that for ten months of the past year the Customs Revenue dropped two million dollars as compared with the same ten months last year, and a million dollars as compared with the previous year. Probably you would have to go back two years before that to reach a standard for this year's Customs Revenue, and be it remembered the Revenue even then obtained was stimulated by ascending prices for all exports due to the war. Now the war is over, prices are dropping, and the Revenue will drop in the same way. Wages are being reduced in this country, unemployment is more widespread than it has been for many years, and I say it is madness for the Premier to imagine he can raise two million dollars more of Revenue than he got the past twelve months out of our people, during the next year when we look at the conditions that confront the country at the present time and that loom up in the future. I say moreover that his estimate of \$900,000 from the Sales Tax is a mere shot in the dark. He has had made up for him by the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Customs, a statement showing what Revenue is collectable now and what can be obtained by adding twenty-five per cent. on to all duties if imports continue as at present. But I am told that already it is being found in the Custom House that in spite of the Surtax of twenty-five

per cent. the actual receipts do not come up to last year's, and while I know that just at the present moment, as a result of people taking goods out of bond to escape the new taxes, there has been a substantial increase in the Customs receipts, I say, with the full knowledge gained by an experience of nearly eleven years in that Department, that the Premier will find that, even with the new Surtax and the Sales Tax, he will be unable to realize anything like enough money to cover his estimate or anything like it. The reason is that the purchasing power of our people wont permit them to pay any such amounts. I quoted here some time ago a circular issued by Job Bros. & Co. showing that every fishery produced by our people is to-day unsaleable. Mr. Job is not a hostile witness, and the article I read convinced everybody, I am sure, that he about told the story as it existed. Now, if we have an average fishery this year and get a million and a half quintals of fish and it averages six dollars a quintal, that's nine million dollars, that is a reduction of fifteen millions on fish alone in two years. Then what our fishery products will yield it is impossible to say, but roughly not more than a third of what they realized two years ago. Then again at Grand Falls wages are being cut, and that is going to mean a reduced percentage for these people. It is the same way at Bell Island and Port au Port; in other words, if our people next fall have half as much money to buy with as they had in 1919-20 they will be doing very well. Yet this is the time when the Government comes in and practically doubles the taxation on our people. I use this word advisedly. The first thing the Prime Minister does is to impose a Surtax of twenty-five per cent. on the existing duties. Then he adds this Sales Tax, which, of course,

will be passed on to the consumer in the same way as the duty paid at the Custom House now. He figures \$900,000 which means ten per cent. on a Revenue of nine millions, and if the Revenue is only six millions, as it is more likely to be, then it is fifteen per cent. That means an increase in taxation of between twenty-five and forty per cent., but then it must be taken into account that everybody, Government officials, employees, and every business concern, fishermen, paper-makers, miners, lumbermen, everybody, is going to have his wages reduced, and therefore I say that this Budget represents in real truth a doubling of the taxation on the people of this country, and this is the fruit of eighteen months of Liberal Reform. The most destructive criticism though, Mr. Speaker, of the Government's policy is found in a statement for which I asked recently and which I have before me showing the deposits in the Banks for the past five years. They are as follows:

1916	\$13,437,367
1917	16,110,924
1918	17,962,313
1919	26,565,275
1920	21,792,899

During the years that we were in power, Mr. Speaker, the deposits in the Banks increased every year and in 1919 they increased by fifty per cent. over the previous year. No sooner did the gentlemen opposite take hold of things than they blasted and blighted everything they laid their hands on, and the consequence is that during last year five million dollars in round figures were drawn from the Banks by people who had deposits therein to make good the ruin wrought by the present Government, or because they had so little faith in the Government that they were unwilling to leave their money in their hands any longer.

Everybody knows that for our peo-

ple to be able to pay the taxes they are now called upon to pay, they must make large earnings, earnings similar to those they made during the war. But at the same time everybody knows that this is out of the question any longer. The price of fish, according to Mr. Coaker and according to Mr. Job, two fairly reliable authorities, will not exceed six dollars a quintal for Shore and five dollars a quintal for Labrador fish this year. This means that if we get a million and a half quintals of fish, the value of it will be only nine million dollars at the outside, and the estimate is that about one-third of this amount goes back to the Revenue. It is true we will have other products, our lesser fisheries, our pulp and paper, and our mines, but even these do not mean a very large addition to our total. I have some figures respecting our exports of codfish for the past seven years since the War began, which I include here and which the House, I think, will find of interest.

Yr. Ended	Dry Cod	Dry Cod	Value
June 30	Quantity	Value	Per Q.
1914	...1,247,314	\$8,071,899	\$6.47
1915	...1,094,242	7,332,287	6.70
1916	...1,421,327	10,394,041	7.31
1917	...1,568,020	12,876,847	8.21
1918	...1,821,206	18,829,560	10.34
1919	...1,681,770	24,318,830	14.46
1920	...1,786,015	22,677,625	12.60

They show that between 1914 and 1920 the value of our codfish increased from eight million dollars to twenty-two million dollars, and the value per quintal from 6.47 to \$12.69. During the last years of the War we had, curiously enough, enormously large fisheries coupled with big prices, but now it looks like as if the very opposite conditions would prevail. Certainly prices will be low and with so many of our people unable to get supplies the catch is not likely to be large. Consequently the earning power of

our people from their chief industry is bound to be greatly decreased. According to Mr. Job's circular already referred to, nearly every item of fishery produce which is produced in this Colony to-day is unsaleable or will bring in only the very lowest figures. Consequently our people will earn very little from them. Then again we know that so far as our agricultural products are concerned, the prices of these have been cut in half and the earning power of these people reduced in the same way. If we turn to iron mining we find that the Companies operating at Bell Island are now talking of shutting down almost altogether, which will mean that hundreds of other people will be thrown out of employment; and turning to our last industry, paper making, the position at Grand Falls to-day is that the employees have been on strike for six weeks and that their employers are enforcing a rule to cut their wages from twenty to thirty per cent. Add to all this the condition of unemployment in the city and in the outports, the fact that business concerns, factories, and the like are shut down, and he must be a very courageous man who will claim that anything like the Revenue estimated by the Prime Minister is going to be realized during the next twelve months. Here is another table, sir, which is of interest and importance. It is a record of the failures in this country since 1916 so compiled by one of the business men's agencies operating here. The figures are as follows:

Year	Firms	Assets	Liabilities
1916	10	\$31,055	\$90,100
1917	8	56,700	131,000
1918	1	400	2,000
1919	6	20,500	93,000
1920	44	765,800	1,603,500

There were nearly twice as many failures last year as during the four previous years and the Liabilities were

enormously greater. This, it seems to me, proves that business conditions in the country at present are not very encouraging, and also it seems to me to mean, from what I know and from what this House knows, of conditions at present, that there will be a much longer and more disastrous record of business failures during 1921 than there was last year. Indeed, I think it will be found that for the six months we are now ending there were as many, if not more, failures than for the whole of last year, and I make no false prophesy, I submit, when I say here to-night that we have not seen the worst of this situation yet.

And now Sir, I bring my remarks to a close with a comment on the insolence of the Prime Minister for his hypocritical action in condemning what he calls the unpatriotic conduct of those on this side of the House. The word patriotism or an appeal to patriotism comes with a very poor grace from a man who in the gravest crisis in the Empire's history "took to the woods" instead of giving some help to his native land and to the Empire he boasts about when help was needed. When the war began the hon. gentleman was well within military age but he took no steps whatever to give any service of any kind, I believe he was once sent out on a recruiting tour to Trinity Bay and word was sent into the Committee in charge advising that he be not sent again because the people in that district were asking why a young man like him did not go to the war himself instead of trying to persuade others to go. When other people, members of the Legislature or private citizens were working day and night trying to help out the Empire, Mr. Squires was very busy down in his office attending to his own business and only interrupting this procedure to attend a public meeting once in a

while where he could make a fancy speech and then escape before the collection was taken up. It was a matter of record in the debates of this House that early in 1917 Mr. Squires, then Minister of Justice in Sir Edward Morris's Cabinet was made the subject of a special attack by Mr. Coaker and his friends on this side of the House at that time insisted on putting into a Bill providing for the winding up of soldiers' estates a special clause to oblige Mr. Squires, in his capacity of Attorney General, to do this work without charge because, according to Mr. Coaker and his friends unless such a clause was introduced this gentleman who now prates so loudly of his patriotism, would have made a charge for his services and in which cases where the soldiers estates were small would have eaten up all the dead man left and deprived his relatives of anything whatever. Yet this is the man with his whole tongue and his cheek rebukes us for our lack of patriotism. I have yet to learn Sir, that we are any more unpatriotic because we criticized the wrong doing of the Government here than Opposition people in Canada or in Australia who similarly criticise the Government in power in these countries. The Canadian Parliament has just adjourned after a session during which the Government was subjected to the bitterest criticism not alone from the regular Liberal opposition, but from a Third Party called the Farmers' Party which has grown up during the past few years and which is just as determined to overthrow the party in power as are the Liberals, and so far as I have been able to see from my reading of the Canadian papers we have not exceeded in any way the criticisms directed at the Ottawa Government, but nobody at Ottawa has been so stupid as to talk about lack of patriotism on the part of these Op-

position groups because the Canadian people would laugh at any man who try to argue that the Liberals or the Farmers were any less patriotic than the men who follow Premier Meighen. Three or four times this year the hon. gentleman has boasted of his patriotism in this House. It is the last card he has in his hand and he is trying to play it for all it is worth, but what is his justification for his claim to be the super-patriot of this country. Here is his manifesto, on this document he sought a return to power in November 1919 and I can go through it from cover to cover and challenge anyone to truthfully contradict my assertion that every pledge and promise he made in it he has shamelessly violated or disregarded. Take the matter of reform. In what direction has any reform been attempted? Where is there any difference between the condition of things to-day and that when he was in office, except that he has made everything much worse than even he charged against the last Government. He has debauched every branch of the public service, prostituted every department, degraded everything and everybody and debased himself to a greater extent than anybody else, because he has cravenly eaten crow and put into practice policies which he is too intelligent to have any faith in and too unscrupulous to resist. Take the matter of salaries, read his denunciation of the salaries paid by the last Government and then remember that he and his colleagues doubled their own salaries, increased the sessional pay of their own followers to \$1,000 and lavished money on party heelers with a complete disregard for every sentiment of public decency.

Take again his treatment of the returned soldiers. Before the election his heart was bleeding for their woes, since the election he has treated them with contempt and what is true of

himself is true of all his colleagues. A few afternoons when the House adjourned to enable the members to attend a meeting to consider the erection of a war memorial not a single man on the other side of the House went to the meeting. Where the Premier was I do not know, probably engaged in concocting some political scheme where the rest of the members went, it is perhaps not very material to ask, because whether they attended the meeting or stayed away would make very little difference, but think of it, think of these men, all of whom, lead by the Premier, proclaimed from platform after platform what they would do for the returned soldiers and not a man of them could be found to do so simple a matter as to attend a meeting to arrange for a war memorial for those who fought and died for us.

Next we will take the Premier's attitude on the question of Prohibition. If there is any public question on which the Premier tries to pose as a purist it is on this question of Prohibition. We have all of us heard him declare time and again on the necessity for the prohibition enactment and that the curse of rum ought to be put an end to, but what do we find to-day, why, Sir, conditions in this country were never worse, not even in, what he has described as the bad old days when the saloons were open and people could get liquor without the need of a script. To-day it is a notorious fact that the Liquor Controller's Office is being run wholly and solely to get revenue, all idea of proper enforcement of the Prohibition Law has been abandoned and the motto now is "get all the money you can and do not be very particular as to how you get it, we need the money to get our own salaries, and to look after

our own friends and principles count for nothing." Some of the Premier's closest associates are in the "script" business. Dr. Mosdell, as you all know was Secretary of the Prohibition movement, but Doctor Mosdell is doing one of the biggest businesses in selling scripts. Probably it is from Dr. Mosdell that the Premier gets the "drop of stuff" that he keeps for the entertainment of these good prohibitionists like himself who hold up their hands in horror in public at the idea of the use of liquor but have their homes and cellars stocked with it for their private enjoyment.

I could go on Mr. Speaker through the whole of the subject disclosed in this Manifesto and show that in every one of them the Premier has abandoned all ideas of patriotism and principles and sacrificed the country in its best interest for his own private ends, and I make the prediction that he will continue to do so until the people rise in their manhood and drive him from the position he has outraged by his political offenses. His effrontery in criticising us for lack of patriotism is little short of colossal. It is well known that amongst his personal friends he has not hesitated to denounce all the measures adopted by Mr. Coaker while Acting Premier in his absence last year. Within a few weeks after the Premier's return from England last December it was public property on the streets that he was furlous over Mr. Coaker's arrangement with the Reid Company and it was stated and never contradicted that one of the chief grounds of objection he had was that there was not even a Minute of Council on record to authorize the taking over of the running of the railroad and the expending of a million and a half dollars of our money on it. Now this man

who condemns us for our lack of patriotism tolerated this procedure and has defended it in public and I shall be quite prepared to have him get up here now and defend it again as he got up and defended the fishery regulations and at the same time those in his confidence know that he spends his leisure hours denouncing these Coaker policies and everything connected with them.

None of us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, need fear to enter into a competition as regards our patriotism with the Premier and his associates. He entered the Cabinet of Sir Edward Morris shortly before the war began and he remained with us until Sir William Lloyd was chosen to succeed Sir Edward Morris four years later. There are men listening to me on both sides of the House who will agree with me when I say that the one man who during these four eventful years of the war gave the least service and did the least to help the country and the Empire, was the Premier who now talks of his patriotism. He did nothing to advance the country in these four years, but he has done much to ruin it in the past two years. When we were in control of the country's affairs we kept the country prosperous, the people had plenty, the deposits in the Savings Banks proved that, while we accumulated surplus revenues of nearly four million dollars. The Premier came in and everything he put his hand to he has blasted and ruined. The country itself has only been saved from bankruptcy for the moment by raising a loan of six million dollars, the merchants and business people have since themselves been reduced from comfort to beggary. The masses of the people are face to face with starvation, the outlook is worse than ever it was in the history of this country and yet the author of all this talks of

his patriotism and condemns us because we condemn him and those around him who helped to reduce our country to this wretched condition. However, I do not think that the people of Newfoundland who have had an experience of his capacity since taking office, are going to take very seriously his denunciation of us. What they want now is that the Premier and those around him will provide some of these good things which he promised eighteen months ago instead of increasing taxation and reducing wages which is the only policy he can put forward at present.

And it being past midnight,

WEDNESDAY, August 10th.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred and 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.

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, \$1330,406.41; Department Customs, \$515,936.66; Department Agriculture & Mines, \$92,500.00; Department Finance, \$2487,658.84.

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 Sir J. C. Crosbie the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 72 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Illegitimate Children" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Sir J. C.

Crosbie and with unanimous consent the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "Of Illegitimate Children."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Sir J. C. Crosbie, and with unanimous consent of the House, the Bill entitled "Of Illegitimate Children," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Vinnicombe gave Notice of Question.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn till this morning at 11 o'clock.

The House adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, August 10.

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

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

MR. VINNICOMBE asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs (1) If the mail clerks have as yet received their uniforms which are considered part of their remuneration; (2) If anyone in his Department is importing cloth for the making of these

uniforms and if so does he consider it right for a Government official to come into competition with business men in this city.

On motion the Bill to Regulate Cold Storage was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight,

THURSDAY, August 11th.

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

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act 1905" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Revenue Act, 1905" was read a second time and it was ordered that it 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 Revenue Act 1905."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Revenue Act 1905" 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 Respecting a Tax on Goods sold in Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Sold in Newfoundland" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Sold in Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Sold 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 Minis-

ter the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918" was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved it-

self into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1918" 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 on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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

Supplemental Supply, \$1,364,961.83,

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the

Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively, the 30th day of June 1921 and for the 30th day of June 1922, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively, the 30th day of June 1921, and the 30th day of June 1922, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

The Bill was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively, the 30th day of June 1921, and the 30th day of June 1922 and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An

Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1921; and the 30th day of June 1922 and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 12th.

The House met at 3 of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING.—I beg to present a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the people of Perry's Cove and other points in Bay de Verde, asking the Government to appoint a commission to deal with the rates charged for the lighting system. It appears the company doing the lighting have raised the rates and the people protest and ask that the Government look into the matter.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS.—I beg to present a petition from Carbonear and Freshwater on the same subject.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION.—I beg to present a petition from Bay Roberts, Hr. Grace and Spaniard's Bay on the same subject.

MR. ABBOTT.—I wish to present a petition from Glovertown re the main road; also from Broad Cove as to repairs to the public wharf and also from Spiller's Cove to the repair of the road.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I wish to present a petition Mr. Speaker, from the residents of Haystack, Spencer's Cove

and Bruly for \$500 to repair the road which is at present in such a condition as to make travel by it almost impossible. Owing to the fishery being a blank the work is needed and if the Government can see their way clear to allocate the amount it will be greatly appreciated as the people are destitute. The petition is representatively signed, particularly by the Road Board. There is also a petition from hundreds of people as to the road from Famish Cove to the station. It is in a similar condition to that at Haystack and the reason for asking for it is that the people must get employment somewhere. I have pleasure in referring this to the Minister of Works and asking that it receive his attention and if any funds are voted for relief works I feel sure these people will be given a fair deal. I might say that Little Hr. East has only some kind of a cowpath to the railway and ask for \$1,000 to finish it. It is impossible to travel by it now. I understand they wrote the Hon. Prime Minister and he said some \$25,000 had been cut out for such work and no doubt they will receive their share. They are bankrupt as far as the special grant is concerned as they got only \$25,000 for supplies. Regular main line grants ought to be provided in future and then there would be no trouble. I mention this as they might think there is discrimination.

MR. WALSH.—I have great pleasure in supporting what Mr. Sullivan has said. I am familiar with the sections referred to and think the sum of \$500 is very modest. The road is about three miles long and cuts off 8 or 10 miles around the headlands. The conditions there are the same as throughout the Island; there is lack of employment and something must be found to allow these people to provide necessaries for their families.

The wharves, roads, etc., should be attended to and I think now is the opportunity for me to make a similar appeal for these people to that of Mr. Sullivan. Day after day we hear of men being sent to Deer Lake and Badger. I have no doubt but that this Government will be called upon to pay for transportation for men from Placentia and other Bays to Deer Lake and Badger Brook. I have already pointed out in this Assembly what a wilful waste of money that would be, whereas these men could be more profitably employed on local works in their own districts. The petition asking for a road from Farnish Cove to the railway is one that ought not be turned down by any Government, because the building of such a road will not only benefit the people living in that immediate locality but would be advantageous to the entire people of Placentia Bay. The petition is signed largely by influential and representative people.

With regard to the other request for making repairs to the road between Spencer Cove and Haystack. In 1919 when we had control of our proportionate part of special grants passed by this legislature we promised our constituents that \$500 would be allocated for the completion of that road. Unfortunately, our party went down to defeat and we have not been in a position to carry out our promise. But now that the Government have embarked upon the policy of relief works I trust that the Executive will give this road that I referred to their most serious and sympathetic consideration. I have much pleasure Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petitions so ably presented by my colleague.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to refer to a certain matter, which, while under discussion on Wednesday night when Ways and Means were being

dealt with I did not happen to be in the House. I want to put myself on record as being in favor of the remission of the duty of gas coal imported by the Gas Company. This Company has been working under extreme difficulties and was now trying to establish itself firmly and on its behalf I would ask the Prime Minister for the most favorable consideration of the Executive Government. The Company gave a considerable amount of employment and some quid pro quo arrangement should be made between the Government and the Municipal Council in the matter. I hold in my hand a memorandum setting forth certain facts in connection with the claim of that Company and which I shall read for the House. (Reads Statement from Secretary of Gas Company.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my colleague for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, should have joined in the same expression of opinion that Mr. Higgins, the senior member for St. John's East, and myself gave this matter a few days ago. As I have already intimated that whilst I am in favour of helping the Gas Company by the remission of the duty on gas coal, I would point out that this is not a tax collected by the Government but it was collected by the City Council, and, consequently, was primarily a matter for the Municipality. However, I hope within a very early date that the matter will be seriously considered to the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively:—

"An Act to amend Chapter 82 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Illegitimate Children'."

"An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918."

"An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants."

"An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively: the 30th day of June, 1921, and the 30th day of June 1922, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Sold in Newfoundland."

"An Act further to amend the Revenue Act 1905," without amendment.
Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Cave from Bay de Verde re various matters.

Hon. Mr. Halfyard from Trinity re various matters.

Hon. Dr. Barnes from Bay Roberts re various matters.

Mr. Abbott from Bonavista re various matters.

Mr. Sullivan from Haystack re Road matters.

Mr. Sullivan from Famish Cove re Road matters.

At a quarter to four of the clock, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency, the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:—

May it Please Your Excellency,—
The House of Assembly has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the Expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the House of Assembly, I present the following Bills for your Excellency's assent:—

"An Act for granting to His Ma-

esty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the Financial Years ending respectively, the 30th day of June 1921, and the 30th day of June, 1922, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

"An Act to provide for the Temporary Operation of the Nfld. Railway."

"An Act for the Confirmation of An Agreement between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited."

"An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods sold in Newfoundland."

"An Act further to amend the Revenue Act 1905."

"An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants."

"An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918."

"An Act to amend Chapter 72 of the Consolidated Statutes (third series) entitled 'Of Illegitimate Children'."

"An Act to indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent Public Works.

"An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914."

"An Act respecting Fishery Supplies for the current season."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon, Dec. 12th at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, December 12th, 1921.

The House met at 3 of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker, since our adjournment in August last there has passed away from our Legislative halls a gentleman who during his long lifetime has

occupied an important position in the commercial life of the community.

The passing of the Hon. John Browning in early September has meant a substantial loss to the industrial and general commercial life of our Colony. His father, Mr. Gilbert Browning, was the founder of the firm of G. Browning and Son, and he whom we now mourn succeeded to the management of the business on the death of his father some years ago. Hon. John Browning was a native of the Island, and during his life has done much towards the Colony's development. He was a man of sterling character, business ability, and considerable intellectual vigour. His was an independence of thought that expressed itself, entirely irrespective of opposition. He was the type of man who made close friends and determined foes, as he himself was a loyal friend and an aggressive opponent.

During the War Hon. Mr. Browning was prominently identified with the Patriotic Association. He was a member of several of its most important committees and devoted a very great share of earnest effort to patriotic work. His wife was prominently identified with the Women's Patriotic organization, and gave unstintedly, both of time, money and effort, in the interests of our forces, both naval and military. The passing of Mr. Browning has brought very closely to my own mind the realization of the fact that no matter what may be the friendships or antagonisms of life, no matter how closely men may be identified in business associations or in public life, no matter how aggressive may be the competition in political and commercial activities, there is, nevertheless for each and all of us one common leveller which we call death, for the time will come when over each will be said the final words: "Ashes to ashes, dust to dust." In the case

of the death of Mr. Browning, I feel this particularly, because it is less than two short years ago that I waited upon Mr. Browning at his home and asked him to permit me to submit his name to His Excellency the Governor for appointment by His Majesty the King as a member of the Legislative Council of Newfoundland. He served his country in the capacity of Councillor for one session, that of the year 1920, and now, before the termination of the session of 1921, he has passed that epoch in life which we, mistakenly I think, call death. He has stepped out from that infinitely small period of eternity which we call time to what we all believe is a higher, nobler and more efficient field of activity of the nature of which we know so little.

To his widow and his sisters who mourn him, and to all those to whom his life was dear, I extend on behalf of the House a word of heartfelt sympathy.

I beg to submit for the consideration of the House the following motion:—

RESOLVED,—That this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since last sitting of the Legislature, of the Hon. John Browning, sometime member of the Legislative Council.

RESOLVED,—That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the relatives of the deceased Hon. Gentleman.

At four of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chambers.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, when His Excellency was pleased to make the following Speech to both branches of the Legislature:—

Mr. President and Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

It was your expressed desire in August last that the Legislative should stand adjourned till late in the year in case some trade crisis should demand immediate action. Happily this has not occurred, and I am glad to be able to announce that it is now possible to relieve you from further Legislative duties during this session, and particularly so, in view of the fact that within the next ten or twelve weeks you will be summoned again to your duties. Since the adjournment in August last, there has been considerable improvement in trade, and the outlook is much brighter to-day than it was four months ago.

The facilities provided by the Act regarding Fishery Supplies helped considerably in establishing confidence, and both merchants and fishermen entered actively into the prosecution of this important industry. I am glad to be able to state that the catch has been an average one, and that satisfactory prices have been realized in the foreign markets.

The Agricultural returns during the past season have been above the average. The various Root Crops have given good yields, while Hay Crop, so essential for the keeping of stock, is the best for some years.

Under the Act for the temporary operation of the Railway, a General Manager was appointed by the Reid Newfoundland Company.

He resigned after a few days, but is now acting in the capacity of Chairman of the Railway Operating Committee of the Reid Company directorate, and, in conference with other Railway officials, is endeavouring to secure the more economic operation of our Railway, so that, while giving reasonable and proper service, the de-

ficit on operation may be reduced to as low a figure as possible.

It will gratify you to learn that the fiscal returns for that portion of the year which has gone have exceeded the Estimates which my Ministers made during the earlier period of this session. The retrenchment in the public service, and the other economies effected will if it is anticipated, enable the Finance Minister to show a substantial surplus at the end of the present fiscal year.

My Ministers have given earnest consideration to the question of unemployment, so prevalent, not only in Newfoundland, but in all countries.

Unfortunately, the suffering from unemployment has been accentuated by the exceptional storms of the past weeks.

My Ministers, however, have been active in encouraging contracts with large employers of labour in the direction of the cutting of lumber, the repair of wharves, and the carrying out of other useful public works, in order that avenues of employment, during the winter months, may be opened to those people who are unable, without such help to provide sufficiently for their families during the winter. The financial situation is steadily becoming easier. With the opening of next spring, it may reasonably be hoped that industries, which are at present employing a partial staff, will be increasing their operations, and taking on more men. The prices of all commodities will be lower, and a general commercial and industrial improvement shall be manifest.

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

I have to thank you for the zealous attention which you have given to the question of the supplies for the Public Service.

While endeavouring to bring the ex-

penditures to the lowest possible figure in the various Departments, you have been careful that the public service shall not suffer. The supplies which you have provided will be dispensed with due regard to economy and efficiency.

Mr. President and Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In taking leave of you at the close of this session, I desire to express my

sincere wish for your prosperity and general welfare.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council by command of His Excellency the Governor, said:—

Gentlemen:—It is His Excellency the Governor's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be now prorogued until Friday the Twentieth day of January next then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

- Motion for, 7.
- Committee on, 23.
- Amendment to, 187
- Debate on, 187.
- Presentation of, 276.
- Governor's Reply, 277.

ARCHIBALD, MR.

- On Supply, 741, 1156.
- Unemployment Situation, 821, 828.
- Tariff, 856.
- Railway Resolutions, 976.

AUDITING OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS BILL, 329, 330, 712.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS, 850.

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS BILL, 195, 207, 246, 249, 425, 850.

BUDGET SPEECH, 484.

BENNETT, MR.

- On Fishery Regulations Bill, 61.
- Lotteries Bill, 201.
- Women's Suffrage, 283.
- Codfish Exportation Bill, 314.
- Supply, 399, 410, 550, 630, 635, 748, 1090, 1110, 1138.
- Profiteering Bill, 407, 422.
- Petitions, 462.
- War Measures Bill, 651.
- Sanatorium, 672.
- Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 675, 678, 710.
- Unemployment Situation, 718.
- Royal Naval Reservist Petition, 872.
- Railway Resolutions, 949.

Labrador Boundary, 1081.
Dominion I. & S. Co. and N. S. S. Co. Bill, 1084.
Cold Storage Bill, 1093.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF.

On Death of Hon. W. B. Grieve, 6.
Death of Hon. John Browning, 1189.

CENSURE.

On St. John's Daily Star, 24, 96.

CASHIN, SIR M. P.

On Address in Reply, 13, 15, 218, 230.
Fishery Regulations Bill, 130.
Labrador Boundary, 225.
High Commissioners Bill, 259.
Exportation of Codfish, 368.
Supply, 400, 411, 517, 756, 761, 792, 1114.
Loan Bill, 522, 570, 624.
Civil Servants Salaries, 542.
War Measures Bill, 646.
Sanatorium, 670.
Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 679, 680.
Railway Commission Report, 769.
Unemployment Situation, 824.
Railway Resolutions, 868, 885, 1011.
Railway Bill, 1053, 1054.
Labrador Boundary, 1079.
Dominion I. & Steel Co. and N. S. S. Co. Bill, 1083.
Cold Storage, 1091.
Marine and Fisheries Estimates, 1107, 1108.
Educational Estimates, 1130.
Closing of House, 1147.
Budget Speech, 1156.

CROWN LANDS BILL, 188, 199, 246, 248, 374, 850.

CIVIL SERVANTS SALARIES BILL, 532, 1184, 1188.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGE, 981.

CROSBIE, SIR JOHN.

On Lotteries Bill, 199, 203.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 212, 266, 268, 270, 271,
297, 303.

- Fishery Regulations, 275.
 - Supply, 415, 545, 547, 625a, 629a, 632a, 732, 762, 792.
 - Petitions, 452.
 - War Measures Bill, 646.
 - Maintenance of Public Roads, 707.
 - Unemployment Situation, 825.
 - E. Pike Affair, 843, 849.
 - Budget Speech, 920.
 - Railway Resolutions, 927, 934.
 - Election Bill, 1065.
 - Cold Storage, 1094.
 - Educational Estimates, 1131.
- D'ARCY EXPLORATION BILL, 589, 603, 610, 624, 664, 686, 699, 768, 850.
- D.I.S. and N.S.S. & CO.'S BILL, 211, 260, 665, 1084, 1087, 1151, 1188.
- ESTIMATES, 492.
- EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL, 211, 424, 425, 429, 563, 610, 623, 768, 850, 884, 1036, 1114, 1145.
- EXPORTATION OF CODFISH BILL, 212, 261, 294, 314, 338, 363, 368, 401, 687, 699, 768, 850.
- ELECTION BILL, 417, 615, 798, 799, 860, 1065.
- EDUCATION, HON. MINISTER.
On Supply, 1121.
- FOX, MR.
On Address in Reply, 190, 233.
Women's Suffrage, 281, 800.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 338, 348.
D'Arcy Exploration Bill, 589, 603.
War Measures Bill, 657, 658.
Unemployment Situation, 727, 728, 759.
Railway Bill, 776, 779.
Royal Naval Reservists Petition, 876.
Railway Resolutions, 956, 1045.
- FISHERY SUPPLIES BILL, 699, 702, 861, 932, 957, 1035, 1037, 1135, 1137, 1188.
- FOOD CONTROL BILL, 112, 247.

HIGH COMMISSIONERS BILL, 246, 249, 259, 261, 531, 850.

HIGGINS, MR.

- On Fishery Regulations Bill, 64, 67.
- Lotteries Bill, 189, 200.
- Women's Suffrage Bill, 278.
- Profiteering Bill, 422.
- Prohibition Bill, 529.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 612.
- War Measures Bill, 618.
- Supply, 635a, 762, 1087, 1115.
- Sanatorium, 672.
- Maintenance of Public Roads, 674.
- Unemployment Situation, 715.
- Railway Bill, 783.
- Royal Naval Reservists Petition, 876, 877.
- Railway Resolutions, 936, 1038.
- Election Bill, 1066.
- Labrador Boundary, 1079.
- D. I. & S. Co. and N. S. S. Co. Bill, 1084.
- Closing of House, 1149.

HIBBS, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 179.
- Maintenance of Public Roads Bill, 676, 682, 766.

INCOME WAR TAX BILL, 536, 571, 1184, 1185, 1188.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN BILL, 1119, 1135, 1136, 1182, 1183, 1187.

JUSTICE, HON. MINISTER OF

- On Lotteries Bill, 188, 201, 203.
- Neglected and Delinquent Children Bill, 208.
- Profiteering Bill, 422.
- D'Arcy Exploration Bill, 537, 596.
- Exportation of Timber Bill, 611.
- War Measures Bill, 618.
- Unemployment Situation, 761.
- Railway Bill, 802.
- Emmanuel Pike Affair, 846.
- Warehouse Receipts Bill, 853.
- Labrador Boundary, 1076.
- Supply, 1089.

JONES, CAPT.

- On Address in Reply, 11.
- Fishery Regulations Bill, 156.

JONES, DR.

- On Sanatorium, 673.
- Maintenance of Public Roads Bill, 681.
- Unemployment Situation, 723.
- Railway Resolutions, 987.

LEWIS, CAPT.

- On Fishery Regulations Bill, 68.
- Exportation of Codfish, 294, 295, 296, 307.
- War Measures Bill, 661.
- Unemployment Situation, 726.
- Tariff, 857.
- Railway Resolutions, 997.

LOAN BILL, 569, 571, 589, 599, 601.

LAW SOCIETY BILL, 582, 617, 623, 651, 768, 850.

LOTTERIES BILL, 188, 199, 246, 248, 599, 602, 850.

MacDONNELL, MR.

- On Fishery Regulations, 112.
- Neglected and Delinquent Children Bill, 208.
- Women's Suffrage, 280.
- Codfish Exportation Bill, 304, 307.
- Supply, 555, 730, 1113.
- Election Bill, 615.
- Unemployment Situation, 723.
- Railway Bill, 781, 1058.
- Railway Resolutions, 1005.
- Educational Estimates, 1128.

MARINE COURTS OF ENQUIRY BILL, 188, 199, 351, 850.

MOORE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 42, 44.
- War Measures Bill, 664.
- Railway Bill, 1037.
- Supply, 1112.

MINUTE OF COUNCIL, 176, 694.

- MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ROADS BILL, 569, 674, 683, 699, 703,
785, 798, 932, 1004, 1095, 1144.
- MUNICIPAL COMMISSION INDEMNITY BILL, 751, 752, 786, 799,
806, 817, 1188.
- MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 785, 1035, 1095, 1145.
- MUNICIPAL TEMPORARY COMMISSION BILL, 816, 826, 834, 850.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES ESTIMATES, 1097.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES, HON. MINISTER
On Fishery Regulations Bill, 47.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 212, 251, 267, 306, 308,
340, 347, 349.
Profiteering Bill, 757.
Warehouse Receipt Bill, 853.
Tariff, 854.
Closing of House, 1149.
- NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN BILL, 208, 246, 249,
797, 835, 1135, 1137.
- OPERATION OF RAILWAY BILL, 1035, 1037, 1064, 1074, 1082, 1144,
1151, 1188.
- NOTICE OF QUESTION, 23, 47, 88, 110, 129, 143, 195, 196, 223, 239,
244, 249, 250, 284, 290, 293, 311, 330, 333, 351, 363, 375,
395, 417, 448, 482, 505, 519, 531, 563, 569, 582, 600, 674,
712, 752, 765, 768, 786, 826, 839, 1036, 1059, 1069, 1083,
1095, 1119, 1145, 1151, 1183.
- PROHIBITION BILL, 699, 701, 1065.
- PULP AND PAPER CORPORATION BILL, 785, 798, 818, 853, 1057,
1065, 1135, 1145.
- POST AND TELEGRAPHS, HON. MINISTER
On Address in Reply, 113, 116, 117, 118, 120.
War Measures Bill, 653.
Railway Bill, 782.
Supply, 795.
- PUBLIC WORKS, HON. MINISTER
On Address in Reply, 122, 125.
Fishery Regulations Bill, 126.

Lotteries Bill, 203.
Prohibition Bill, 530.
Sanatorium, 671.
Public Roads Bill, 674.

PROFITEERING BILL, 239, 244, 406, 421, 429, 599, 850.

PRIME MINISTER, RT. HON. THE

On Address in Reply, 17, 20, 158, 166, 167.
Workingmen's Petition, 93.
Fishery Regulations Bill, 151.
Auditing Public Accounts Bill, 329.
Loan Bill, 418, 569.
Supply, 423, 571, 624, 744, 763, 1114, 1117.
Exportation of Timber Bill, 610.
Election Bill, 615, 1065.
Ways and Means, 700.
Public Roads Bill, 708.
Unemployment Situation, 823.
Naval Reservists Petition, 879, 881.
Railway Resolutions, 1011.
Prorouging of House, 1147.

PETITIONS.

Mr. MacDonnell, 72, 332.
Mr. Scammell, 110, 290, 312, 764.
Mr. Abbott, 129, 277, 312, 351, 645, 1186, 1188.
Mr. Hibbs, 172.
Mr. Winsor, 172, 195, 311, 351.
Mr. Targett, 172, 250, 351.
Mr. Walsh, 195, 250, 331.
Mr. Higgins, 195, 218, 290, 504.
Mr. Jones, 196.
Sir John Crosbie, 213.
Mr. Sullivan, 213, 249, 331, 620, 1186, 1188.
Mr. Small, 250.
Hon. Minister of Justice, 277.
Mr. Samson, 290.
Mr. LeGrow, 311.
Mr. Gosse, 425.
Mr. Foote, 450, 667.
Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, 645, 1186, 1188.
Mr. Sinnott, 666.
Mr. Bennett, 764.

Naval Reservists, 871.
 Sir M. P. Cashin, 1060.
 Hon. Minister of Shipping, 1186, 1188.
 Hon. Minister of Education, 1186, 1188.
 Workingmen, 93.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. MacDonnell, 47, 149, 257, 291, 396, 563, 587, 601, 713,
 754, 791, 854, 1064.
 Sir M. P. Cashin, 47, 91, 92, 111, 132, 134, 146, 147, 173,
 174, 196, 213, 214, 244, 257, 258, 259, 286, 292, 311,
 334, 361, 364, 366, 396, 397, 398, 419, 425, 426, 427,
 505, 506, 513, 520, 521, 557, 564, 586, 601, 620,
 694, 696, 702, 712, 753, 754, 768, 786, 816, 827, 828,
 830, 833, 834, 850, 858, 861, 884, 947, 948, 981, 1004,
 1032, 1036, 1037, 1063, 1069, 1070, 1083, 1096, 1146,
 1152.
 Mr. Archibald, 818.

QUIETING OF TITLES BILL, 674, 687, 729, 759, 1031, 1035, 1037, 1095,
 1145.

RAILWAY BILL, 785, 799, 835, 836, 885.

RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS, 949, 1005, 1030.

REVENUE BILL, 1183, 1184, 1185.

REPORTS.

Sir Geo. Burry, 865.
 Hon. W. F. Penney, 429.

RULES SUSPENDED, 687, 701.

SHEEP FARMING BILL, 199, 246, 248.

SEALFISHERY BILL, 250, 285, 519, 686, 699, 826, 850.

SALES TAX, 1184, 1188.

SINNOTT, MR.

On Address in Reply, 185.

SELECT COMMITTEES.

On Food Control Board, 136.
 Pension to Soldiers and Sailors, 144.

Neglected and Delinquent Children's Bill, 246, 786,
797, 1137.

War Measures Bill, 645.

D.I. & S. and N.S.S. & C. Companies' Bill, 1065.

Venereal Diseases Bill, 687.

Municipal Affairs Bill, 785, 1003.

Pulp and Paper Corporations Bill, 853, 1059.

Warehouse Receipts Bill, 854.

Naval Reservists Petition, 884.

Fishery Supplies Bill, 932.

Quieting of Titles Bill, 1031.

Prohibition Bill, 1065.

Exportation of Timber Bill, 1119.

Election Bill, 1145.

SUPPLY, 398, 413, 423, 448, 504, 531, 730, 1069, 1074, 1087, 1097, 1120,
1137, 1145, 1146, 1152, 1182, 1185, 1186, 1188.

SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPLY, 1185.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Opening, 3. Closing, 1189.

SCAMMELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 7, 138.

Exportation of Pulpwood Bill, 211.

SAMSON, MR.

On Address in Reply, 141.

SULLIVAN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 239.

Fishery Regulations Bill, 96, 326.

Supply, 459, 1112.

Exportation of Timber Bill, 611.

Fishery Supplies Bill, 715.

Railway Bill, 784, 803.

Naval Reservists Petition, 875.

Railway Resolutions, 909, 918, 919, 1021, 1022.

TERRA NOVA SULPHITE CO'S BILL, 188, 199, 374, 850.

TARGETT, MR.

On Election Bill, 1066.

VINNICOMBE, MR.

On Fishery Regulations Bill, 168, 169.

Lotteries Bill, 205.
Codfish Exportation Bill, 322.
D'Arcy Exploration Bill, 594.
War Measures Bill, 660.
Unemployment Situation, 721.
Railway Resolutions, 988, 1043.
Supply, 1115.

VENEREAL DISEASES BILL, 482, 505, 563, 687, 699, 702, 826, 850.

WAR MEASURES BILL, 246, 249, 617, 623, 651, 686, 768, 1188.

WAYS AND MEANS, 413, 504, 699, 1183.

WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS BILL, 818, 827, 853, 1119.

WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC TRUST FUND BILL, 850.

WALSH, MR.

On Address in Reply, 21, 26, 37.
Fishery Regulations Bill, 76.
Codfish Exportation Bill, 318.
Supply, 416, 640a, 1111.
Exportation of Timber Bill, 614.
War Measures Bill, 660.
Unemployment Situation, 719.
Railway Bill, 835, 836.
Tariff, 855.
Railway Resolutions, 966, 1039.
D.I. & S. & N.S.S. & C. Co's Bill, 1086.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

*During the Second Session of
the Twenty-Fourth General
Assembly of Newfoundland
1921*

UNION PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Legislative Council of Newfoundland

SESSION 1921

WEDNESDAY, March 30th, 1921.

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 C. Alexander Harris, K.C.M.G., etc., having arrived at the Council Chamber and being seated on

the Throne, 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; and they being come thereto, His Excellency was pleased to open with the following speech to both Houses:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

On this fourth occasion of addressing you at the opening of the annual session of the Legislature it is my first desire to express my sincere regret at the loss which has been sustained by the death of a member of the Legislative Council, who, though he was a junior in that body, was one of the most experienced business men and able speakers in this Colony.

The policy of the regulation of the marketing of the Colony's staple product which passed the House of Assembly in the summer of last year, without dissenting vote, was placed in the hands of the Codfish Exportation Board created for that purpose by the Act. The practical application by the Board of the policy so unanimously adopted has met with difficulties adventitious as well as those inherent in all policies which seek to regulate the trade of nations. I feel quite certain that should the matter come before you as legislators you will approach its consideration with one ambition only, namely, the welfare of Newfoundland, her commerce and her people.

A year ago I called your attention to the fact that the long-standing dispute between the Colony and the Province of Quebec had, by agreement between the parties, been referred to the adjudication of His Majesty's Privy Council. The final agreement to that effect was signed in London by the Attorney General of Canada and my Attorney General in November last, and substantial progress has already been made in the preparation of the Colony's case.

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

The Revenue for the last fiscal year showed a substantial surplus over all expenditures, but it is to be anticipated that the world depression, which we with all other countries must necessarily share, a depression which is the natural aftermath of war, will cause a large shrinkage in revenue for the current fiscal year. The revenue is so largely dependent upon ad valorem duties on imports that, while the finances of the Colony benefited largely by the greatly increased cost of imported goods during the war and immediately afterwards, this present readjustment of world conditions with largely reduced cost of goods must have a corresponding effect in reducing customs returns.

My Ministers have had this necessary readjustment of expenditures to income under careful consideration. The Estimates of expenditures and the Budget for the next fiscal year to be submitted to you will indicate the efforts which my Ministers have made to deal with the financial problems which you have to face in the readjustment of the Colony's expenditures, so that the great annual burden which the war has entailed may be met without curtailment and the necessary public services efficiently maintained. This will necessitate temporary curtailment of certain large expenditures which previous administrations felt justified in undertaking out of the inflated revenues of the war period, and such rigid economy as is consistent with the satisfactory maintenance of the various essential public services.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

My Ministers have kept in close touch with the Imperial authorities in the matter of Newfoundland claims against the German Government and I anticipate that certain legislation intended to harmonize the Statute laws of Newfoundland with those of Great Britain in the matter of the collection of the German indemnity will be submitted to you for consideration in due course.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain has expressed his desire to

meet the Prime Ministers of all the self-governing Dominions of the Empire for conference in London on important imperial business in June next. My Prime Minister has authorised me to accept the invitation on his behalf. I appreciate the great importance of Britain's oldest Colony being represented at this conference.

You will be invited to consider a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act to permit the exportation of certain pulp wood cut during the past winter, and an important Bill submitted by the Social Service Council relating to the welfare of children.

The Charter for the City of St. John's will, I am informed, be introduced at an early date, so that its many provisions may be fully discussed, and, it is hoped, finally dealt with at this session.

The subject of inland and coastal transportation will come before you, and reports will be submitted in the matter of the coal possibilities of the Island. An important arrangement is under consideration in connection with the exploration of oil areas and it is probable that sufficient progress will be made to submit a Bill in relation thereto within the course of a few weeks.

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

HON. MR. SHEA:—Since we last met death has removed from the Assembly one of its most prominent members in the person of Mr. Walter Baine Grieve. It is hardly necessary for me to speak to you of the position that Mr. Grieve held in this community, or of the leading place that Mr. Grieve's firm held in the commercial life of this Colony. For more than a century the names of Baine, Johnston & Co. and Grieve have been closely identified with the trade of Newfoundland and have been intimately connected with every new enterprise in the development of this country, and for more than forty years Mr. Grieve has occupied a foremost place in the public and commercial life of St. John's. There was no business firm in the trade whose name stood higher or whose history was more honourable than that of Baine, Johnston & Co. They were at the top of nearly every business enterprise of

any moment that has been established in the Colony for the past fifty years, and their name stood for all that was generous and honourable and the gentleman whose loss we deplore today was one of the leading lights in this distinguished firm. Personally, I was privileged to be on intimate terms of friendship with Mr. Grieve for over forty years, and during that long period I always found him a true, loyal and generous friend.

I feel sure that the resolution that it is my sad duty to submit to you this afternoon, will be fully endorsed by every member of this Council.

Following is the resolution:

RESOLVED—That the House records its sense of deep sorrow and regret for the death of the late Honourable Walter Baine Grieve, C.B.E., through whose decease this Council has sustained the loss of one of its most valued members and the com-

munity at large one of its most valued citizens;

FURTHER RESOLVED—That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the late Honourable Walter Baine Grieve, C.B.E., expressing the sympathy of the Council with them in their bereavement.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I avail of the opportunity to express my profound regret upon the loss which the country has sustained through the death of the Hon. Mr. Grieve. The Grim Reaper has indeed been very busy during the past few years amongst the members of the Council, and the loss sustained in the business and public life of Newfoundland has been very great. The Hon. Mr. Grieve was a prominent figure in the political and commercial life of the country; and from early manhood, his activities extended over a wide field, embracing almost every department of public affairs in the country that he loved so well and whose welfare he always endeavoured to promote. His passing removes from our midst a name which has been connected with the business life of the country for the past century, a name which must always, in the annals of this country, be associated with philanthropy, and a broad spirit of toleration, a name which I feel assured will be held in grateful remembrance by the people of this country for many years to come. Not alone was the deceased a man of culture and intellect, but he brought to bear, in debate and council, the tremendous weight that attaches to an experience of over fifty years spent in the public and commercial life of the Colony. It is during a crisis, such as the present, in the economic and business life of the Colony, that his ripe experience and his wise counsel would have been of incalculable value, not alone in our Legislative halls, but in our commercial life, where such men as Walter

Baine Grieve are now most sorely needed.

Mr. Grieve was a keen student of affairs, and his speeches demonstrate the thoroughness of his knowledge and the culture of his intellect. One could see at a glance that he was something more than a successful business man; he was the possessor of a generous and kindly heart; his sympathy and his charity knew not the artificial boundaries of class or creed. Far too liberal was he to admit of such distinctions; and his political life was marked by the same kindly characteristics. He personified the spirit of toleration, and it was this characteristic which in an especial degree endeared him to all and formed friendships which lasted throughout life. The memory of his generosity and his kindness of spirit will long remain green; we shall not soon forget the kindly gentleman, the ripe scholar, the ready and able debater, the capable, business man, who was so lately amongst us, and whose eloquence and wisdom were such acquisitions to the debates of this Chamber.

In a wider sphere the ability and debating power of our deceased member would have undoubtedly won him fame; nature had endowed him with all the qualities necessary for success, and education had developed within him those attributes so essential to one called upon to take an active part in the political life of a country.

His death severs a link with the past; for over fifty years he was actively engaged in the commercial life of the Colony, and upwards of forty years have elapsed since he entered the public life of Newfoundland. Apart from his inherent ability and force of character, the length and variety of his public services would alone have secured for him a conspicuous place in our public records. Why need I dwell upon these phases

of his many-sided character; for there are stronger links of remembrance than any which a mere official record may bestow. His kindly nature, his courtly charm of manner, his broad sympathy, his generosity cannot fade from our memories for many years to come.

The loss of such a man creates a gap in our public councils which it will not be easy to fill. It is but too true that our deceased member has passed to a better land; ours has been the loss, his the gain; it is also but too true that men of the type of Walter Baine Grieve are all too rapidly passing away. How sad is it for us year after year to contemplate the loss of such sturdy oaks as a Goodridge or a Grieve, of men who realized that there was something more laudable in life than the accumulation of wealth and the promotion of one's selfish ends to the exclusion of the common good.

Let us, therefore, find fresh bonds of patriotism, unselfishness and union in the contemplation of the memory of our deceased member; let us imitate his generosity and kindness, and let us emulate him in that broad spirit of toleration which was such a marked characteristic of his public and private life.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, it is a melancholy privilege to identify oneself with the motion before the Chair, and to add a word to the tributes paid to the memory of one who was a respected and valued member of this House and a worthy and distinguished citizen. While naturally in a newspaper career of thirty years I came into more or less frequent contact with the deceased, there are others here who can speak more intimately and with more knowledge and understanding of him as a commercial man and as a citizen of the older generation than I can, and I would devote my few remarks to a review of his

services as a war worker, in which capacity I had the honour to be associated with him from the outbreak of the struggle up to almost the very hour of his death. We were fellow workers of the Finance Committee of the Patriotic Association, which, during the first three years of the war, handled all the Colony's expenditure for the Newfoundland Regiment and also on the Board of Trustees of the Patriotic Fund, which disbursed the amounts contributed by the people of the country towards the maintenance of the families of those who went on active service. In both these capacities which entailed laborious and unceasing work, the late Mr. Grieve spent himself freely. He gave zealous and indefatigable service, and he was always ready to sacrifice every other consideration to the forwarding of the business of these two organizations.

After the death of the original Chairman, the late Honourable John Harris, and the pressure of other public business on the shoulders of Sir Michael Cashin, Mr. Grieve took over the duties of what I might call the Executive Chairmanship, and filled them with conspicuous fidelity until his failing health forbade further effort (when they were assumed by our Hon. friend, Mr. Browning), and in my last conversation with Mr. Grieve, some three weeks before he passed away, one of his keen regrets was that he was unable to attend the meetings of the Patriotic Fund Trustees, which still have to be held at intervals of every two or three weeks to deal with the claims for assistance which eventuate from time to time. In addition to that I was associated with him in the work of the Recruiting Committees, of which he performed the secretarial duties for a goodly period until the burden was such that he could no longer bear it unaided. Again we were colleagues on the committee for

the organization of the Forestry Battalion, in which he functioned as Chairman, and he and I had the honour to be selected to confer with the then Governor in regard to features of the organization which were provoking a certain degree of friction, and we were likewise fellow workers on the Imperial Red Cross Committee.

In all these capacities one could not fail to be struck with certain characteristics of the deceased, his gentleness, his tactfulness, his humanity, his broad-mindedness. Of the first it will suffice to say, I think, that there will be universal agreement that he was one of nature's gentlemen, a man whose urbanity, courtesy and agreeable demeanour, inevitably struck all with whom he was brought into contact. I never heard him speak ill of any or even slightly of those whom less considerate people would have found a target for contemptuous criticism. His tactfulness was exhibited in countless instances in the interviews in which he took part, the conferences in which he was associated and the various undertakings entered by him in connection with our war work and philanthropic matters generally in the community for many years past. His humaneness was made manifest to those of us working with him on the Patriotic Fund by the fact that in every doubtful case which arose during the whole period of its existence he invariably used his voice and his vote on behalf of the dependents of those on active service and his appeal ever was to consider the wives and children and the other relatives of the party in question and to give them the benefit of the doubt. His broad-mindedness was shown by the fact that he filled so many prominent positions not alone in regard to the war but in regard to every phase of the activities of the community. A proof of that is though

he was a devoted adherent of his own church he enjoyed, to an exceptional degree, the confidence and the good will of people of every class and creed and condition amongst us.

It is probably the fact that the serious illness from which he suffered two or three years ago and which compelled him to spend a winter in the south was due in part to the strain involved in carrying on these various undertakings while at the same time he gave the required attention to the demands of his large and extensive business and those of us who were working with him immediately realized in recent months that he was failing in health though few expected that the end would come so suddenly. Moreover he undertook with Sir John Crosbie and the late Honourable John Harvey the exacting duties associated with the effort to successfully market our codfish in the latter period of the war when great difficulties were experienced in that regard and this involved daily conferences and the closest attention to problems of the gravest character seriously affecting the welfare of the whole country. No doubt his end was also hastened by the death of his only son, one of the first to volunteer in the Newfoundland Regiment at the outbreak of the war and whose untimely demise a few months ago was due to disease resulting from wounds and hardships endured in the Gallipoli Peninsula. This blow coming to our good friend at a time when he had reached the allotted span of life as given by a Psalmist, cannot but have contributed materially in hastening his demise and saddening his declining days.

Mr. Grieve also gave of his substance with open handed generosity for every purpose associated with the war; as he did for every humane purpose that has appealed to the community since he began business here

half a century ago. In later years he has been conspicuous by his identification with many of the larger projects launched here for philanthropic purposes and his benefactions were always on a scale of princely munificence.

In his legislative career he played a worthy part. His advent to this House three or four years ago was the second time he occupied a seat on its floor, he having been a member of this Council nearly a generation ago for a brief period, then he served two years in the Lower House when he entered as a member for Bonavista and another as member for Trinity. In 1893 he sought the suffrages of the country as one of the leaders of what was known as the Grieve-Monroe party and it is interesting to speculate on what would have happened had he carried the country in that contest and been afforded an opportunity to show his qualities in a high office of state for which he had many conspicuous qualifications. However the privilege of serving his native country in that capacity was denied him. A circumstance in no way to his discredit and that he maintained no grievance is shown by the fact that after his call to this House in 1918 he brought to the discharge of his duties here an earnestness and a patriotism signally displayed in the discussions of the last session. He held strong opinions, but expressed them with due consideration for the rights and feelings of others and looking back, to-day through the few brief months since this House last sat we can see how prophetic were his views in regard to some of the matters which then demanded our attention.

Socially he was a man of great personal charm, with sunny temper and a genial, cordial manner. He was one with the literary quality well developed, it showed itself in his

speeches which were marked by a choiceness of diction rarely approached and in his writings which were equally brilliant. He was a close, discriminating student of literature and he followed affairs in the world abroad with a keen perception of the duties and cross currents which move nations and peoples in these days, which do so much to try men's souls. He was an outstanding example of the finest type of citizen, who as a captain of commerce, a legislator, a philanthropist and an eminent figure in the community, had earned the good will of all.

That the earth may lay lightly on his ashes and the green grass grow above his grave is the heartfelt prayer of all who knew and respected him.

I sincerely support the resolution of condolence and join with previous speakers in the expression of sympathy to the bereaved ones.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. President, I rise with pleasure to move the appointment of a Select Committee to draft a reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor delivered on this occasion. Before doing so I wish to join with honourable gentlemen of this House in expressing the great loss which has been sustained in the death of Mr. Grieve—my acquaintance with him was close upon a half a century. I feel sure that the sympathy so eloquently expressed by the gentlemen who have already spoken, is shared by all who knew him. His work is o'er—he now sleeps in a Silent City.

In moving the appointment of a Select Committee, Mr. President, it is not my intention at the present time to review to any great extent the Country's trade and Commerce—but briefly to put forth a few ideas as they occur to me. I shall deal with each paragraph from the Speech.

Paragraph 1.—Refers to the loss which the Legislative Council has

sustained through the loss of a member during the past year.

Paragraph 2.—Mr. President, the staple product of this country is the source from which its prosperity comes, we must not forget the fact this Dominion has to face a period of depression both in the value of our imports and exports. If the policy of the regulations which passed this House, and the Lower House have not been a success, and it is in the interest of the country, that the bill be repealed, let it be done in the best of good will—let unity and concord prevail in both Houses and throughout the country.

Mr. President, section two of the paragraph of the Speech from the Throne refers to the policy of the regulations of marketing the Colony's staple product, an Act which passed the Lower House without a dissenting vote, was placed in the hands of the Codfish Exportation Board, and in the carrying out of these regulations they have been met with difficulties adventitious as well as those inherent in all policies which seek to regulate the trade of nations.

Mr. President, I have been educated at a school, where I was taught the policy of Free Trade—Free Sales, and a Free Market—in Trade and Commerce. I feel quite certain that should the matter of these Regulations come before us as Legislators they shall be approached with one ambition only—namely, the welfare of the Dominion of Newfoundland, her commerce and her people. I am glad the Government has referred to the Regulations in the speech delivered by His Excellency this afternoon. The policy of fixing prices by an Act of Parliament has not been a great success nor yet entirely a failure. The experience gained the past year has been sufficient, and costly enough for this country to learn and to know—that we

are not the only nation that produces cod-fish. I am satisfied, Mr. President, that an honest effort has been made by the Government associated with the Fish Exporters to keep up the value of our national product, both at home and abroad. If a mistake has been made—we must all share in that mistake. The House of Assembly and the Legislative Council have been equally responsible. It is up to us now to work together in harmony, and the greatest cordiality for the future welfare of the country. Every effort must be made to retain our markets abroad, we must ever remember that cod-fish is an article of food, and should be well cleaned and cured. The following figures are interesting at the present time, and will give the fishermen of the country some idea of the prices in the past and something to consider for the future:

Year Ended	Dry Cod Quantity	Dry Cod Value	Value per Qtl.
1909-10	1,502,269	\$ 7,307,778	\$ 4.86
1910-11	1,182,720	6,544,604	5.50
1911-12	1,388,178	8,001,703	6.00
1912-13	1,408,582	7,987,389	5.67
1913-14	1,247,214	8,071,899	6.47
1914-15	1,094,242	7,332,287	6.70
1915-16	1,421,327	10,394,041	7.31
1916-17	1,568,020	12,876,847	8.21
1917-18	1,821,206	18,829,560	10.34
1918-19	1,681,770	24,316,830	14.46
1919-20	1,788,015	22,677,625	12.69

The above figures show the wonderful increase of our staple industry (dry cod) particularly during the years 1916 to 1919-20. Well might we ask ourselves the question: Have we reached the zenith of our prosperity—what of the future? During the year '19 and 1920 our imports were \$5,567,950 more than our exports, naturally our imports for the last six months of 1920 and the first six months of 1921 will show a great falling off in imports—especially in dry

goods and high priced goods—that pay an ad valorem duty. I am glad to note the Government are viewing this situation from an economic standpoint and will curtail in several departments of the civil service, and large under-

takings. The following figures will interest the trade—as they reflect what this country has been doing during the progress of the war—and since Armistice to the end of the year—1919-1920:

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Year ended June 30th, of each Year

Year	Imports	Exports	Total Trade
1913-14	\$15,193,726	\$15,134,543	\$30,328,269
1914-15	12,350,786	13,136,880	25,487,666
1915-16	16,427,336	18,869,493	35,396,829
1916-17	21,318,310	22,381,762	43,700,072
1917-18	26,892,946	30,153,517	57,046,463
1918-19	32,297,184	36,784,616	68,981,800
1919-20	40,533,388	34,865,438	75,398,826

Mr. President, for the future of this country I ask through this House, amongst all classes of our people, unity, concord and the greatest harmony in all departments of our national life. The Dominion of Newfoundland, like all parts of the British Empire in fact, Mr. President, like the whole world, we are bound to have, in the very course of nature's up's and down's of our country's trade and commerce. The whole world is floating on paper—the printing press to a very large extent, has created the world's currency—so that to-day the world floats on paper—give the world time—give our country time—we will yet rise to our proper position; if we only, in the best interest of our Island Home—work in harmony, and try at least to uphold our good name—both at home and abroad. Give the country a chance to recover herself—from the staggering blow of the great war—and the reaction in values of her trade, commerce and fiscal arrangements of the Dominion.

Paragraph 3.—Our attention is again called to the long-standing dispute between this Colony and the Province of Quebec. With His Excellency in his speech to-day we are

glad to note that substantial progress has already been made in the preparation of the Colony's case.

The Labrador possesses valuable cod, herring, trout and salmon fisheries. Pulp and paper mills have been founded at Sandwich Bay and Hamilton Inlet to deal with the almost inexhaustible supply of timber. Our share in this settled territory for Newfoundland will add a valuable asset to our country.

Paragraph 4. The revenue for the last fiscal year showed a substantial surplus, over all expenditures, but it is anticipated that the world depression, which is the natural aftermath of war, will cause a large shrinkage in revenue for the current fiscal year.

The revenue is largely dependent upon ad valorem duties on imports, while the finances of the Colony benefited largely by the greatly increased cost of imported goods during the war and immediately afterwards, the present readjustment of world conditions with largely reduced cost of goods must have a corresponding effect in reducing Customs returns.

Paragraph 5 refers to the readjustment of expenditures. Here we have

in sections 4 and 5 revenue and expenditure.

In 1914 I had the pleasure of reviewing the finances of the country under the Government of Sir Robert

Bond and of Sir Edward, now Lord Morris. Since that time the revenue has gone up with leaps and bounds, especially during the war.

FOUR YEARS OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MORRIS GOVERNMENT

Year	Revenue	Expenditure	Surplus
1909-10	\$ 3,447,988	\$ 3,137,774	\$310,214
1910-11	3,527,126	3,354,746	172,380
1911-12	3,736,456	3,524,653	211,803
1912-13	3,919,440	3,803,561	115,479
	<u>\$14,630,610</u>	<u>\$13,820,734</u>	<u>\$809,876</u>

FOUR YEARS OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE BOND GOVERNMENT

Year	Revenue	Expenditure	Surplus
1904-5	\$ 2,574,069	\$ 2,443,814	\$130,255
1905-6	2,660,805	2,591,235	69,570
1906-7	2,758,690	2,625,336	125,845
1907-8	2,829,078	2,785,835	43,183
	<u>\$10,823,642</u>	<u>\$10,426,220</u>	<u>\$368,853</u>

Mr. President, at the present time I have not before me the revenue and expenditure for the years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1920, 1921.

Paragraph two of the Speech from the Throne, I have referred at some length to the value of our cod-fishery and to our imports and exports—the year 1919-20 amounting to over \$75,000,000.

Mr. President, I entirely agree with His Excellency's gracious Speech from the Throne to-day—the present condition of the country's fiscal policy will necessitate a temporary curtailment of certain large expenditures which previous administrations felt justified in undertaking out of the inflated revenues of the war period, and such rigid economy as is consistent with the satisfactory maintenance of the various essential public services. In

carrying out this policy—I ask for the co-operation of all classes of our people in order to put our country back to its normal condition.

Paragraph 6 refers to the German indemnity. I have heard it stated that we should get an amount equal to our national debt. Whatever amount is due this country will be based on actual adjustments of our losses on destruction of shipping and other claims at the Imperial Conference to be held in June. I have no doubt but this will be one of the many important questions to be settled; our Prime Minister who has been invited to attend this Conference will see that Newfoundland will get all that is coming to her.

Mr. President, section 7 of the speech delivered to-day by His Excellency the Governor, refers to an in-

itation from the Prime Minister of Great Britain to meet the Prime Ministers of all the self-governing Dominions of the Empire for Conference in London on important business in June next, and that His Excellency has been authorised to accept the invitation on behalf of our Prime Minister—with His Excellency I join in appreciating the great importance of Britain's Oldest Colony being represented at this Conference, we shall look forward with much interest to the work of our Prime Minister, which, I am certain will be for the well-being of our people and the prosperity of the country.

The Imperial Conference

Resolutions passed in the Conference of 1907 the work of 1911—at the gathering of this Conference there will be the best brains of the British Empire to promote, build, and reconstruct, the great destruction of the World's War. This country will be ably represented by our brilliant young Prime Minister. I wish him abundant success,

Outline of the work done at an Imperial Conference, and some of the many questions that come up for discussion—the Conference of 1921 will be historical in many respects for the well being of our common country and the Empire.

At the last Imperial Conference the following resolutions was passed:

"That it will be to the advantage of the Empire if a Conference, to be called the Imperial Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and his Governments of the self-governing Dominions beyond the Seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will be ex-officio President, and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Dominions ex-officio members of the Conference. The Secretary of State

for the Colonies will be an ex-officio member of the Conference, and will take the chair in the absence of the President. He will arrange for such Imperial Conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective Dominions.

"Such other Ministers as the respective Government may appoint will also be members of the Conference—it being understood that, except by special permission of the Conference, each discussion will be conducted by not more than two representatives from each Government and that each Government will have only one vote.

"That it is desirable to establish a system by which the several Governments represented shall be kept informed during the periods between the Conference in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion, by means of a permanent secretarial staff, charged, under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the duty of obtaining information for the use of the Conference, of attending to its resolutions, and of conducting correspondence on matters relating to its affairs.

"That upon matters of importance, requiring consultation between two or more Governments which cannot conveniently be postponed until the next Conference, or involving subjects of a minor character or such as call for detailed consideration, subsidiary Conferences should be held between representatives of the Governments concerned specially chosen for the purpose."

Lord Crewe, then Colonial Secretary, sent out in February, 1909, letters to the Governor-Generals and Governors of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Cape of Good Hope, Transvaal Orange River Colony, Natal, and Newfoundland saying:

"I have the honour to request that

you will invite your Ministers to take into consideration the question of the nature of the business which may usefully be discussed at the next meeting of the Imperial Conference, with a view to the suggestion of any subjects which, in their opinion, should, in the interests of the Empire at large, engage its attention.

"That meeting, in accordance with the first resolution of the last Conference, is fixed to be held in the course of the year 1911, and it is desirable that adequate time for previous preparation should be given the case of any subjects which may require investigation and the accumulation of materials."

The correspondence which has taken place since 1907, and in answer to Lord Crewe's letter, is set out.

Resolution 2 concerned Colonial Representation on the Committee of Imperial Defence, through the Secretary of State, for advice any local questions in regard to which expert assistance is deemed desirable.

"That, whenever so desired, a representative of the Colony which may wish for advice should be summoned to attend as a member of the Committee during the discussion of the questions raised."

Resolution 3 was on a General Staff for the Service of the Empire.

"That this Conference welcomes and cordially approves the exposition of general principles embodied in the statement of the Secretary of State for War, and, without wishing to commit any of the Government's represented, recognises and affirms and need of developing, for the Service of the Empire, a General Staff, selected from the forces of the Empire as a whole, which shall study military science in all its branches, shall collect and disseminate to the various Governments military information and intelligence, shall undertake the pre-

paration of schemes of defence on a common principle, and, without in the least interfering in question connected with command and administration, shall, at the request of the training Governments, advise as to the training, education, and the war organisation of the military forces of the Crown in every part of the Empire.

Resolution 4 was on Emigration.

"That it is desirable to encourage British emigrants to proceed to British Colonies rather than foreign countries.

"That the Imperial Government be requested to co-operate with any Colonies desiring immigrants in assisting suitable persons to emigrate."

Resolution 5 was on Judicial Appeals.

The Conference agreed to the following finding:

The Resolution of the Commonwealth of Australia, "that it is desirable to establish an Imperial Court of Appeal," was submitted, and fully discussed. Other resolutions on this subject were by Cape Colony.

Resolution 6 concerned Preferential Trade.

The following resolution of the Conference of 1902 were reaffirmed by the members of the Conference, with the exception of his Majesty's Government, which was unable to give its assent so far as the United Kingdom was concerned, to a reaffirmation of the resolution in so far as they imply that it is necessary or expedient to alter the fiscal system of the United Kingdom.

1. "That this Conference recognises that the principal trade between the United Kingdom and his Majesty's Dominions beyond the Seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the Empire."

2. "That this Conference recognises that, in the present circumstances of the Colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of free trade as between the Mother Country and the British Dominions beyond the Seas."

3. "That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the Empire, it is desirable that those Colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom."

4. "That the Prime Minister of the Colonies respectfully urge on his Majesty's Government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufacturers of the Colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed."

5. "That the Prime Minister present at the Conference undertake to submit to their respective Governments, at the earliest opportunity, the principle of the resolution, and to request them to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it."

Resolution 7 concerned Commercial Relations.

"That, without prejudice to the resolutions already accepted or the reservation of his Majesty's Government, this Conference, recognising the importance of promoting greater freedom and fuller development of commercial intercourse within the Empire, believes that these objects may be best secured by leaving to each part of the Empire liberty of action in selecting the most suitable means for attaining them, having regard to its special conditions and requirements, and that every effort should be made to bring about co-operation in matters of mutual interest."

Resolution 8 concerned Commercial Relations and British Shipping.

"That it is advisable, in the interests both of the United Kingdom and his Majesty's Dominions beyond the Seas, that efforts in favour of British manufactured goods and British shipping should be supported as far as is practicable."

Resolution 9 concerned Preferential Trade.

The following resolution was agreed to by the members of the Conference with the exception of Sir Wilfred Laurier, who was absent, and whose vote was not recorded, of General Botha, who did not support it, and of the representatives of his Majesty's Government, was dissented:

"That, while affirming the resolution of 1902, this Conference is of opinion that, as the British Government, through the South African Customs Union—which comprises Basutoland and the Bechuanaland Protectorate—do not present allow a preference against foreign countries to the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and all other British Possessions granting reciprocity, his Majesty's Government should now take into consideration the possibility of granting a like preference to all portions of the Empire on the present dutiable articles in the British tariff."

Other resolutions dealt with (10) Navigation Laws, (11) Treaty Obligations, (12) Representative Trade Agreements and Treaty Questions, (13) Trade Marks and Patents, (14) Trade Statistics, (15) Uniformity in Company Law, (16) Reciprocity in Admission of Surveyors to Practice, (18) Imperial Cable Communication, (19) Naturalisation, (20) Development of Communication within the Empire.

The above gives but a brief outline of the many important questions that are brought before an Imperial Con-

ference. The last who represented this Dominion with credit to himself and our country was the Right Hon. Sir W. F. Lloyd, Prime Minister, at an Imperial War Conference.

In the interest of the country it is imperative that this Dominion should be represented at the forthcoming Imperial Conference.

Paragraph 8 of the speech refers to a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act to permit the exportation of certain pulp wood cut during the past winter—and an important Bill submitted by the Social Service Council relating to the Welfare of Children, both of which Mr. President, I am sure will receive the best consideration of this House—particularly to the Bill relating to the welfare of children. In addition to the many problems facing this country, there is none greater than that of children, and what to do with the boys. In London there is what is called the Future Career Association which was formed to aid parents, guardians, and schoolmasters in the choice of suitable careers for their sons, wards, and pupils.

- (a) By specialising on all forms of future careers at home and abroad.
- (b) By constituting a trustworthy and exhaustive bureau of information on occupations.
- (c) By furnishing expert advice as to courses of study, cost, prospects and advantages of all careers in life.

Many recommendations to solve the problem of child welfare can be made, but the great trouble is—to carry them out. We should have a well organised society for the Prevention of Cruelty to children, Curfew for Children, Child Labour, Boy Smokers. Juvenile smoking has increased rapidly during the last few years, and has a bad effect upon the general health and physique of the present generation, while

it must have even a worse effect upon the future generations.

Children's Police Courts

It is highly undesirable that young children whatever their offence, should come into close contact with criminals either in police courts or gaols. In many parts of the United States—Massachusetts for over 50 years has had separate courts for dealing with juvenile offenders. Nearly 20 years ago the Home Office directed London magistrates to take charges against children before their other cases, and children are not to be kept waiting, and are to be put in a separate room from other prisoners. No child is to be in court till its case comes on, and not after it is punished, and no adult prisoner is to be present while the child's case is tried.

The magistrates of London are satisfied with the result of these orders, and there is no reason why they should not be adopted in every court. Mr. President, I am prepared to support any Bill submitted to this House by the Social Service Council relating to the welfare of children.

Paragraph 9 refers to the Charter for the City of St. John's.

We are all anxious that the City Charter should become law this session. It will be remembered that the Charter was brought before this House during the dying hours of the last session. I think it would be a good idea for the Charter to be brought here as quickly as possible, as a great many sections require careful consideration, and there are more hon. gentlemen in this House interested in the Charter than in the Lower House, as the Bill is for the future government of the city and its revenue. It is a large document, some sections are not so important as others. It will, however, as time goes on place the Municipal Council in a better position to do the

things that are necessary for the improvement of the town.

Paragraph 10—the last in the Speech from the Throne—refers to the subject of inland and coastal transportation. Reports in the matter of coal possibilities of the Island, and the exploration of oil areas, and it is probable that sufficient progress will be made to submit a Bill in relation thereto within the course of a few weeks.

With regard to the first of these three important matters referred to in the last paragraph of His Excellency's Speech, that of Inland and Coastal Transportation. The trade and the country will look forward to much improvement, and that every effort will be made to provide the means for the better shipping of goods. With regard to the possibilities of our coal—I am glad to note it is the intention of the Government to use every effort to find out if coal in our Island Home is of sufficient quantity and quality to work as a commercial commodity, and that a Bill will be introduced at an early date.

With regard to the exploration of our oil areas—I understand the reports of oil in Newfoundland are good—as to the quantity and quality. I believe it is the intention to continue an exploration during the present summer. Should oil be found in this Dominion in sufficient quantities, it will be the making of our country and will be the creation of a new nation because oil, Mr. President, the oil fuel which is employed as a substitute for coal represents a comparative large proportion of the crude petroleum. The extraordinary demand for petroleum and petrol is leading to a keen search for new sources of supply.

Mr. President, I beg to move the appointment of a Select Committee.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Mr. President, in rising to support the motion I wish

to associate myself first with those who have spoken on the death of Mr. Grieve. With me his death is a personal loss in that it was my happy circumstance to enter the office of our late member when I left school. I was associated with him in that office not only as an employee but as a friend and that friendship has continued through two decades. He looked upon those of the office as one family and treated us accordingly. We on the other hand had every respect for him and for the firm.

When I heard that Mr. Anderson was to move that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, I felt very pleased when I had been asked to second the motion for I knew Mr. Anderson would not fail to fully cover all the subjects mentioned in the Speech, and in doing so would make my task of seconding a very easy one, and I shall not delay the House very long.

In looking over the speech, Mr. President, I find that this speech, like the speeches of the last thirty or forty years, contains three ghosts. I think every member will remember that every speech for many years has contained something about coal, something about our oil areas, and something about the Labrador Boundary question. The only satisfaction I have, Mr. President, is that I trust that this year and with this Government we shall do our utmost to lay these ghosts and will endeavour to find that there is more than odour in the oil, and more than froth of a coal prospectus, and that that there will be a definite boundary line fixed on the Labrador, so that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will be able to take his car and travel along the line which will mark the boundary.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—I do not think you will get the Labra-

dor Boundary settled because it has always been too profitable a thing for the legal members of the Government.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Mr. President, the honourable member opposite has grave doubts about these things, but we can at least say that if we can lay these ghosts we will be doing good service. I am glad, Mr. President, to see in the Speech From the Throne a reference to Child Welfare. I cannot speak with authority on what that statement means, but I understand it means the establishment of a Juvenile Court by which children will be tried instead of the ordinary courts as at present. It will be a private court, I presume, held in some room, and the idea is that instead of making these children criminals something may be done in connection with their punishment so that they may be kept out of vicious surroundings and put them on the right track. I understand it is also contemplated to have a section by which a child or infant who is being brought up in unsuitable surroundings may be removed by the State and put in some institution or home where it will be properly cared for.

The honourable member who has just sat down has said something about the fishery regulations. These regulations were brought in sixteen months ago. At last session we had the matter very fully debated, and the result of the debates of last session to my mind confirmed the opinion that they had been a benefit in the fall of 1919 when they were inaugurated, and that it was the desire to continue such regulations as would benefit. At the last session a Bill was brought in which put the regulations under the control of the Export Board made up of exporters of fish. Consequently the carrying out of this policy has rested in the hands of those who were most concerned with the exporting of their fish. But whether in the main

that has been successful or not, there seems no doubt that as the result of the operation of last year's regulations the fishermen were enabled to get a much better price for their fish, and the conditions of the country would have been much worse if they had not got such a price. Just as every other country is protecting its industries in every way—the United States Government is passing a Bill to protect their farmers, just as in England there is a protection policy on the table—so it becomes necessary for any country, regardless of any political affiliations, to protect its industries in such a way as will benefit the country as a whole. I do not think there can be any disagreement with that policy.

With regard to revenue and depression, I feel that it is unnecessary to burden the House with any remarks concerning this matter, as every member is conversant with the cause of it. The revenue was very much inflated up to the end of June, 1920, inflated because the price of goods brought in up to that period was abnormally high and also inflated because the supplies of goods imported up to the end of June, 1920, were very much in excess of the imports of any ordinary year. I think I may place the amount at seven or eight million dollars worth which was brought in before the end of June, 1920, which under ordinary circumstances would have been brought in during this current year. That would account for a shrinkage in revenue besides the general depression and the general stringency caused by certain lower prices.

To my mind, Mr. President, we are now in these two months entering upon a most important period. These are the months when the people are preparing for the summer's work, the months when stocks are needed to help men in their summer's work, and

when some assistance is needed, especially after such a year as last year, when many of the fishermen did not get fish enough to keep them during the winter even if prices had been very high. I most emphatically back up my honourable friend in his assertion that the co-operation of every individual should be obtained in an effort to make the wheels of industry move as smoothly as possible during the spring, with a view to the summer's work. If merchants will stop credit altogether it is very easy to see what will happen. Such a thing would not be good for the country or for any particular industry. The fishery industry now is the principal industry. Agriculture may come very close to it. but we need, Mr. President, some policy for the co-operation of all so that we shall enter upon this season with some idea fixed in our minds that every one will contribute what he can to make this season a successful one.

With these few remarks, Mr. President, I beg to second the motion.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Mr. President, etiquette prescribes that on occasions such as these the gentleman who is the official mouthpiece of the Opposition Party should extend congratulations to the gentlemen who propose and second the motion for a Committee to draft the Address in Reply. Unfortunately, the gentleman who is the official mouthpiece of the Opposition by virtue of the fact that he represented the late Government in this House is at present very far away from us, seeking restoration to health in California—in which effort I think I am safe in saying we all hope he will be entirely successful. He is a personal friend of mine, and I feel sure that if he were here he would himself, or if he were near enough to communicate with me he would ask me to do this and extend

to the mover and seconder of the motion congratulations on the way in which they discharged their duties this afternoon. My friend here came before us with a huge mass of statistics, showing the development of our industries for some years past, and he has given us this material to digest and study for ourselves and form our own conclusions. The gentleman who seconded the motion, with his customary modesty, has been briefer than he might have been, and he has presented the case for the Government with conspicuous fairness. I think the addresses they have given us contain food for substantial reflection, and I concur with them in the hope they hold out and the suggestion they make as to the desirability of concord and harmony. At the same time, in view of the fact that public feeling has been running very high in the country for the past few years in regard to the fishery and other matters, they will, I think, find it somewhat difficult to induce active politicians to take the same view of it.

Having discharged what I conceive to be my duty to a friend in speaking on behalf of Mr. Ellis, I now propose to offer some brief observations of my own on the Speech from the Throne and the remarks of the gentlemen who have dealt with it, but I would like to avoid any suspicion or misunderstanding and make it perfectly clear that I am not speaking as the mouthpiece of the Opposition or expressing any opinions but those of myself. When Mr. Ellis comes here, which I hope he will during the course of a few weeks, he will, I feel sure, give you the Opposition's viewpoint on the various matters. In the meantime, I take it that the customary standard would prevail here, and that is, that those who address the House on the questions that are laid before it will do so in the way of expressing such views

as appeal to them as correct views, not as the mouthpiece of any party.

Now with reference to the Speech from the Throne and the matters to which my honourable friends have referred, I do not propose to discuss the subject at any great length this afternoon, though when the Address in reply is submitted to us it may be that an opportunity will arise for some further comment. My object in rising this afternoon in this regard is to suggest to the honourable gentlemen who plead for the Government in this House the desirability of letting us have some further information in regard to what I consider the three outstanding features of the political situation. I use the word "political" in its larger sense, meaning by "political situation" the economic, industrial and financial situation of the country at the present time or in the present crisis. I think it would be desirable that we should have some information as to what is the intention of the Government with regard to the continuance or the repeal of the fishery regulations. I observe in the second section of the speech certain phraseology which indicates to me, though I may be mistaken, an intention to repeal these regulations; and I think, speaking now not as a partizan but as a citizen, that the sooner legislation is introduced and enacted and received the Governor's assent, the sooner will we make a firm and a long step towards reaching the beginning of the situation which these honourable gentlemen desire so earnestly, and which we all desire so earnestly, namely, a return to a condition of commercial stability in this country. I have no mandate to speak for what is known as "Water Street," but I have been giving a study to this question of the Fishery Regulations and their future effect. I think the result of the experiment of fixing prices for fish at

this end for a period of a year and a half has been such as to justify its ceasing now and for all time, and I think if the commercial community had an assurance that this would be so, then I think business people on Water Street, Duckworth Street, and all the other streets in St. John's, and all business people throughout the country, would say to themselves: "Now we know where we are. We know we can give you supplies and take the ordinary legitimate chances of trade for the coming year and the year after." But I do not think any man would be safe in doing that while this legislation is on the Statute Book and it is possible for it to be called into existence again and at some future date may bring about a repetition of the same conditions that we have experienced the past year.

Then I think it is desirable in the second place that we should know if it is correct that the Government last fall undertook the purchase of codfish with public funds, because I personally cannot conceive of any more dangerous policy. Lacking a knowledge of the facts, I am not prepared to say as to the justification or otherwise of that policy under any given state of circumstances, but there is this danger, that if it is done one year on a small scale, there may be a demand for it to be done a second year on a larger scale, and the whole commercial fabric of the country may be destroyed by the persistence of a Government in a policy which all students of political economy and the experience of the world during the past few years as in previous ages has shown to be disastrous.

There is another point which is gravely concerning the public mind at the present time, and that is the question of the railway. What is the relation of the Government to the railway and what is to be the future? I

observe that in the second last paragraph of the Speech there is a statement that the subject of Inland and Coastal Transportation will come before the House, and I take that to mean that some legislation is in contemplation, but, apart from that fact, I think the House ought not to be asked to wait until perhaps the last days of the session before it is informed as to whether or not the Government has undertaken substantial obligations in regard to the operation of the railway during the past nine months. I may say that to some extent this is a personal matter between me and my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. Last year when the legislation to provide for a loan for the railway and coal mining undertakings was before the House we discussed the matter in the room outside with the Prime Minister, but I took occasion to give a word of warning, and that was, of the danger of negotiations with the Reid Newfoundland Company unless everything was safeguarded and my honourable friend replied: "Quite so, we know that the Reids are lying awake in the nights thinking out how they are going to get ahead of us," and now I want to know whether they have or not. I think, Mr. President, we ought to have full information as to where the country stands with regard to this. It ought not to be permitted to become a matter of Party politics; it is too big for that. Only last night I was reading the story of the Canadian Railway told in the "Halifax Herald."

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—It's a bad story.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—But there is a big difference between it and our story, and that is, that the Canadian people went into this with their eyes open. The Canadian legislature passed an Act unanimously taking over the railway, but, as I un-

derstand it, this country has been let into a situation by the Government, or by somebody on behalf of the Government, that may mean the same mess the Canadians were in, and the people of this country had no say whatever in it. Now that is a difference, and an important difference, and I suggest to both honourable gentlemen who sit at the Executive Board the desirability of letting the country know where it stands.

The third matter to which I would direct attention is the question of the financial condition of the country. I think the Government is to be congratulated, Mr. President, on the fact that, judging from the two sections addressed more particularly to the Lower House as the guardians of the public purse, they have apparently decided that present conditions will mean a "curtailment of certain large expenditures which previous administrations felt justified in undertaking out of the inflated revenues of the war period." Well, I think the Government is to be congratulated on taking the bull by the nose, on making the best of a bad job, and saying "We have to cut down." This Government, the last Government, any Government, is not wholly to blame for conditions which confront this country or any other country to-day, the people are not wholly to blame. The world was engaged in a bacchanalia of extravagant expenditure during the last few years; the world went mad, Governments as well as people. Now we have the "Morning after" feeling. We are faced with bad times, and I say, speaking for myself, the Government is to be congratulated on making the best of a bad job and facing the fact that expenditures, possibly expenditures on roads and wharves, etc., must be cut out. I hope that essential expenditures for education will be the last thing that will be touched.

The honourable gentlemen will, I hope, endeavour to let us have at the next sitting such information as the Government considers it can, compatible with the public interests, give us on these matters, so that we can bring to the discussion of the Address in Reply some intelligent comprehension of what is underlying the situation as we see it.

The seconder of the motion said that he found three ghosts in the speech, coal boring, oil exploration, and the Labrador Boundary, and he hoped this Government would lay them. I doubt very much whether the Labrador Boundary question will be finally settled. As to the coal measures, I personally feel that we have never tackled the coal problem in the right way. I think we have got too cheap men to come here and dig. We have been pursuing a pecuniary policy instead of a coal one, but, on the contrary in the case of oil, I think the fact that an arrangement has been made with a company as big and important as the Anglo-Persian Oil Company is the best assurance I have seen in the years I have been associated with politics or the Legislature that any substantial, tangible result is going to come. We have now a company, as I see it, if this scheme goes through, that is planning operations not only here but elsewhere. In the last or second last number of "The Round Table" magazine and in the quarterly review of the Empire Parliamentary Association there are extended reference to the plans of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company for developments in America and other places, and, in fact, there is the draft in Parliamentary Journal of a contract which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company has made with the Government of Queensland or other Australian colony for exploration there, and I intended, when the contract came before us, to bring along that journal for

the purpose of comparing it with the contract that may be made here, but I say again that I personally believe that the fact that we are negotiating with such a company is the best assurance we have that something substantial will be the result. These people will determine for all time, I think, whether our oil fields are worth working or not. If these people will not touch them, then I do not think we ought to spend any more time on them. I have one complaint in the plans that are now being worked out for dealing with the coal on the West Coast. We are not dealing with it on a big enough scale. We have not had men big enough there.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Dunstan was a big man.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—I know he told us he was a big man, but he was only one fakir of the many who have come out here year after year.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Who brought him here?

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Sir Edward Morris, but he could be as easily fooled as some of the people who are here now. In the same way we have had people here dealing with all sorts of things. Then I understand there is at the present moment before the Government a proposition that the Government should guarantee the sum of \$750,000 in bonds for a copper property in Green Bay at eight per cent. Think of it! I am not prepared to state that positively, but I have very strong grounds for believing that it was put before the Government. I refer to this because it was only this morning that I read of a copper mine in Montana being closed down and I think the Government should think twice about it.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—You need not worry.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—

I am glad you can assure me of that. I feel that I have kept the House sufficiently long. I repeat my congratulations to the gentlemen who moved and seconded the motion, and trust the Government, or the gentlemen who speak for the Government, will give us some information on these points at the next sitting.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I quite appreciate the position taken by the honourable gentlemen in this regard, but I think he could hardly expect the Government to lay all its cards on the table in answer to three leading questions. As the session progresses that information will come up in the ordinary course of debate, but in the meantime I may say that there are no objections to conferring with the Government and hearing what the Government's views are in that regard.

HON. MR. GIBBS gave notice that he would on to-morrow introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Municipal Affairs in the Town of St. John's."

On motion the House adjourned until Monday next, April 4th, at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, April 4th, 1921.

The House met at 4.15 p.m.

HON. MR. GIBBS asked leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of St. John's."

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

HON. MR. POWER:—This Bill which the Hon. Mr. Gibbs presents is an important one and all the honourable members of this House should have an opportunity of looking through it. It is a very serious one to property owners and taxpayers. I hope it will not be rushed through, but that the Government will give every member an opportunity of studying it before it comes up for discussion.

I had to pay two hundred dollars taxes the other day. There is no protection for the owners of property. What about responsibilities of tenants? I got a slate roof of one of my houses repaired, at a great expense, many of you know what such a job means. After being repaired the tenant stripped off the ceiling, the rafters then gave way and finally the slates were loosened. Many people think that every man who owns property is a millionaire.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, might I suggest that the second reading merely affirms the principles of the Bill. When the Bill comes into Committee, discussion may arise. I entirely agree with my hon. friend, that as soon as the Bill has been read a second time the details should be considered. I was going to suggest after the second reading that it be sent to a Select Committee to have details thrashed out, otherwise it would take a great deal of the time of this House. It appears there is a clause in this Bill which deals with a claim made by the Municipal Council to that section of land extending from the old Promenade to the water front—part of the land on which the railway station and tracks are now built. Many of the hon. members may be aware of this that at the time, when the Government took over the Reid Contract of 1921 it took over this land. Sir Robert Bond promised that 150 feet of the area stretching from the promenade to the stream should be reserved for the use of the public. This fact was made clear to the Reid Co. The Municipal Council sets up a claim to all that land. That is one point to be thrashed out. This Select Committee could be given power to go into the details of such things and after due consideration of them they would be in the position to make definite statements concerning them.

This would be a great help to us in deciding matters, for according to my memory a lot of amendments will be necessary. It would be a good thing for all to be conversant with the details of the Bill before it is to be discussed. There are a lot of amendments to be made that was one objection I had to its being placed before us at such a late hour last session.

I would suggest to the honourable gentleman in charge of this Bill and the representative of the Government in this Chamber that the desirable course to adopt is that after the second reading of the Bill, which merely affirms the principle, we send it to a Select Committee.

On motion of HON. MR. ANDERSON the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was read a first time.

On motion of HON. MR. ANDERSON the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was read a second time.

HON. MR. MacNAMARA:—Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks on the gracious speech of His Excellency the Governor and before doing so wish to add my support to the resolutions of condolence moved on the death of the late Hon. Walter Baine Grieve, C.B.E.

So much has been said by previous speakers to the memory of our departed friend that I find it difficult indeed to find words to express further encomiums on his character but I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to the great loss the business community and the country at large has met by his passing.

Men of the stamp of the late W. B. Grieve are sorely wanted in our present crisis, and without the wisdom and experience of citizens of his class I fear Newfoundland will have a difficult task to recover from the trying position she is now confronted with.

By referring to the speech before us

I find that outside of the paragraph which refers to the Fishery Regulations that there is very little in this document worthy of serious comment.

This paragraph goes on to say that "the policy of marketing of the Colony's staple product which passed the House of Assembly in the summer of last year without dissenting vote was placed in the hands of the Cod Fishery Export Board created for that purpose by the Act."

The statement that this Act passed the House without dissenting vote I fear is not strictly accurate as I distinctly remember that Sir John Crosbie relentlessly opposed this measure from the very start as he looked upon the Regulations as dangerous and pernicious legislation.

Then again in this Chamber the late Hon. Mr. Grieve strenuously opposed them—Hon. D. A. Ryan opposed them and I think I am correct in saying that the Hon. Mr. Milley opposed them, and your humble servant also registered his vote against their enactment—I think I am justified therefore in claiming that these Regulations did not pass without "a dissenting vote." I opposed these Regulations from the very beginning as I was firmly convinced that they were unworkable and therefore impossible.

Last year in speaking on them I referred to the fact that you could not regulate the price of an article of commerce by legislation and argued that the simple and inexorable law of supply and demand would have to be taken into account and by no other process would or could the price of commodities be fixed.

We have ample evidence to prove that you cannot get away from the law of supply and demand—no matter what you do, and it has been demonstrated not only here but elsewhere that when the artificial fixing of prices is resorted to only one thing can hap-

pen and that is trouble, confusion, and disaster.

I was rather amused at the Hon. Mr. Mews' statement on the opening of the Assembly that he was in doubt as to whether the Regulations were harmful or not. Surely the Hon. Mr. Mews was not serious in his conclusions.

If he has any doubt about the harm these Regulations have done all he has to do is to ask the business people of the South West or West Coast or North East Coast or even here in St. John's and he will have no difficulty in learning of their injurious effects.

Look around the town and notice the army of unemployed people of all classes walking our streets if you want further evidence of the injury brought about by these Regulations.

I do not mean to say that ALL the depression in our midst at present is due to the Fishery Regulations but I do say that the depression and hard times that we are passing through are more pronounced due to the introduction of this unwise legislation.

I have no hesitation in saying that this Government interference in trade is ALL wrong and should not be tolerated and whilst it might have been permissible during the War there is absolutely no warrant for it now that the War is over.

This applies to all Governments as well as it does to ours and I was forcibly reminded of this fact in reading President Harding's inaugural speech a few days ago and whilst this address deals with American affairs principally there is one paragraph in it that applies very forcibly to Newfoundland. It reads as follows:—

"He gave significant notice of the abolition of Government experiment in business—no altered system will work a miracle," he said. "Any wild experiment will only add to confusion—our best assurance lies in the efficient administration of our proven system."

These are indeed words of wisdom from the President of the great American republic and Newfoundland would be well advised in taking them to heart and acting on them without delay.

He gave significant notice of the abolition of Government experiment in business. What has been the result of Government experiment in business in this country?

I will tell you:

As far as the fishery is concerned it has resulted in irreparable harm—we have lost all our southern European customers as well as the Brazilian market—it has impoverished a good many of our supplying merchants and has unfortunately helped to bring about all or nearly all the business failures that occurred here since December last, and has resulted further in stagnation, depression, disaster and distress.

I need hardly enlarge on what the Government experiment on sugar has meant to the public as it is well known to everybody sugar that could be bought and sold here within the last month or for so 11 to 12 cents per pound is costing the consumer to-day 24 to 25 cents per pound or in other words twice its value.

This Government experiment in sugar is costing the average householder \$75 to \$80 per year in increased taxation and I say that it is a shame and an outrage that this scandal is allowed to continue indefinitely.

Now we have the railway experiment that is being operated at a tremendous loss—we have the shipping experiment that is showing an estimated deficit of \$1000 a day when all the controlled ships are running and last but not least we have the experimental farm run by Hon. Dr. Campbell—I really do not know what loss this fad will show to the country but I

think I am safe in stating that it will be "a handsome one."

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Are you sure of it?

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—When the expenses of Dr. Campbell for his trip is laid on the table and the cost of the menagerie, I think the House will find I am right.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—And in relation to your steamship estimate I think you are wrong.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—I made an estimate only. I think it will be found that estimate is pretty near correct.

There is no doubt in my mind that when the obituary of this administration is written that it will go down in our history as the "Experimental Government of Newfoundland."

After all these failures I submit that there is only one thing left for the Government to do now and that is to discontinue experimenting at once and take off the Fishery Regulations without delay—wipe the law completely off the Statute Book and that good feeling and harmony and co-operation that the Hon. Mr. Anderson and Hon. Mr. Mews so eloquently referred to in their opening addresses may eventuate without undue delay.

To give you an idea of the business depression existing here at present I would like to state the following:—

About two weeks ago I received a telegram from New York offering a veritable bargain in provisions and I called on one of our supplying merchants and offered him the goods and tried to prevail on him to accept, and even hinted that he would require them for the spring's trade.

He answered me by stating that I am not going to issue 5c. worth of supplies until the House of Assembly is opened and the Fishery Regulations are removed.

There's the whole thing in a nut

shell—if the Fishery Regulations are rescinded there will be some limited supplying—if they are not rescinded there will be no supplying—it is obvious then that it is the duty of the Government to have these Regulations taken off the Statute Book if they wish to see commercial and financial stability established again in this Dominion.

Turning to the other points in the address it will be refreshing to learn that substantial progress has been made with the Quebec boundary dispute but it is to be hoped that this dispute will not be settled too quickly otherwise the chance of getting a trip to London will be gone and the excuse for the further delegations to the Old Country will hardly be available.

As far as this revenue is concerned it was to be expected that there would be a shortage owing to trade depression but it is pleasing to note that the Government intend to retrench and curtail and they are to be congratulated in so openly declaring that they will do something at least to stop their extravagance and lessen our annual expenditure.

It is to be hoped that the claim we may get from the German Government for our cost in the war will to some extent lessen the heavy charges to the Colony under this heading, and help to keep up and if possible increase the allowances and pensions of those who sacrificed themselves in our behalf in the great conflict.

I am pleased to note that the City Charter is likely to be passed this session as there are a great many sections in this Act to be discussed it will be important to have this document before us early in the session.

I will look forward to a good deal of interest to the subject of inland and coastal transportation and hope some sensible arrangement will be made to improve present trying shipping conditions confronting business people.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Mr. President, at the last sitting I asked certain questions of the honourable gentleman who represents the Government in this House, and I shall be glad to know, with your permission, sir, and that of the House, the Government's reply before I proceed with my few desultory remarks.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, as I said before, the questions asked by the honourable member Sir Patrick McGrath are what the lawyers would call "Leading Questions," and I thought it advisable that the answers should be jotted down after consultation with my colleagues. In answer to the question of the honourable Sir Patrick McGrath as to the fishery regulations and the alleged purchase of fish by the Government, I have to say that this matter is not likely to be before the attention of the Government in the immediate present. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be back to town within the course of a week or ten days, and it is expected that he will have information which may guide the future policy of the Government in this matter and also will be able to give information as to the purchase of fish alleged to have been made. In reference to the railway policy of the Government, that is a financial matter which appertains primarily to the House of Assembly, and undoubtedly during the course of the session the whole matter will be fully discussed by that body and come from them for discussion in this Chamber.

I can only say to the honourable member that I will be glad to secure for him information on any point in which he is interested insofar as that is practicable, and I will be happy to facilitate him in every way in getting all the data that he requires, consistent with the public interests and the procedure of the House, as it is the policy

of this Administration to take the public fully into its confidence in connection with all public matters when the time is considered opportune.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the honourable gentleman for the information he has given. It is satisfactory so far as it goes, and while I doubt it will satisfy the public, still in these matters we must be thankful for small mercies.

With reference to the question of the fishery policy and the purchase of fish, the Government's answer could be crystallized into a few words. Some years ago the people were told that they had to wait until Bond came back; now we have to wait until Coaker comes back.

With regard to the railway policy, I know it is a financial matter, yet in view of the fact that we are asked to discuss the present condition of the country and the future prospects on the Address in Reply, as that is the usual policy, it is a pity that we are not better informed than we appear to be with the information before us. However, there is enough I think available to enable one to set forth for the consideration of the Government some aspects of these important questions that I think it might be well for the Government as well as the country to give more consideration to than has been given so far. I do not as a rule advance suggestions in this House without having a pretty reasonable precedent for so doing. My suggestion that the Government inform the House as to their intentions in regard to what is known as the Coaker fish policy is based upon the fact that some weeks ago the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Chamberlain, made a speech at Birmingham stating that it was not the intention of the Government to re-enact in the next Budget the Excess Profits Duty,—E.

P.D., as it is commonly known. As honourable gentlemen know, nothing is more securely guarded than the information embodied in the budget. Here in this country the men who support the Government Party in the House are not taken into the confidence of the Government until the night before or until the morning of the day the Budget is to be presented. A similar procedure is observed in the Old Country, but in view of the unprecedentedly serious condition of affairs, Mr. Chamberlain took the course of announcing in a public speech at Birmingham the intention of the Government with regard to the matter of the Excess Profits Duty because there was such an agitation in the Old Country because of the alleged harm the imposition of this duty was doing and the Government felt that in order to allay public feelings and let the business people know where they stood, no time should be lost in declaring the policy of the Government in that regard. Now I think conditions in this country are sufficiently serious to justify the Government in making a similar departure and making an announcement without a moment's delay as to their intentions regarding the continuance or repeal of the fishery regulations. I quite agree that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be back here within the course of a few days, no very serious harm can result from a postponement until the end of this week, but I think, and I believe the commercial community will endorse my view, that the sooner the supplying merchants and those engaged in the trade of the country know where they are, the better it will be for all concerned.

With regard to the matter of the Government's purchase of fish, while the honourable gentleman says that it is the policy of the Government to give all information possible, I regret that

I cannot agree with him that that policy has been followed in this matter of taking public money to purchase fish. I think a good deal of trouble for the Government, as well as the country, would be saved if at the time that was done, if it was done, a clear statement of the case had been made. There is no sense in blindfolding the devil in the dark. If this thing has not been done, then the Government can give an answer; the fact that the Government has not given a clear and specific answer in regard to it seems to point to the fact that such a purchase was made. I feel sure than if the honourable gentleman who sits across the House, the Hon. Mr. Bishop, were here, he would strongly endorse the position I am taking, namely, that the people whose money has been taken out ought to have known long ago if it was taken for such a purpose and the reasons why, and furthermore, the reason why it was given to three or four members of the Advisory Board; if it was given at all, it was certainly given to these people, instead of being distributed amongst all the exporters and everybody put on the same footing.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—

With regard to the railway policy, I hear from sources which I have reason to accept that one of the causes of the delay in making an announcement is that Mr. Reid, the President of the Reid Newfoundland Company, is in the Old Country in connection with business matters. That may have some bearing on the subject, and therefore I believe that under these circumstances one cannot reasonably ask the Government to forecast what its attitude is going to be towards this question, but at the same time I think the Government should take an early opportunity to disabuse the public mind with regard to the stories that are current as to the enormous amount

of public money that has been spent and is being spent on the railroad for the current fiscal year. There is a statement in one of the evening papers to-day that two and a half millions have been spent. I assume that if two and a half millions have been spent it includes what I would call capital expenditure, that is, expenditure on account of the loan raised at the last session for the purchase of locomotives, freight cars, fish plates and the construction of the terminal at Port aux Basques and for other work of that character and, of course, everybody knew that had to be made, and nobody that I am aware of is going to throw any censure upon the Government on that account. But a more important matter is the question of a sum, estimated at \$100,000, that is reported as being taken from the Surplus Revenue of the country in the Bank of Montreal to be applied to the deficit in the affairs of the railway system now being run by the Reid Company and the Government. If any expenditure of that kind is being made I think it is an act of bad faith to the Legislature of this country, because such a utilization of our money was never contemplated when the matter was discussed here at the last session, and I think the Government will have great difficulty in satisfying the unbiased that this has been a justifiable expenditure. Of course, one does not want to misjudge the position, as we will later get information. As to the financial position of the country, that, of course, is a matter that appertains to the Lower House, but it should have been possible for the honourable gentleman who speaks for the Government to have reassured us with regard to the rumors that are current as to the condition of the country generally.

Turning now to the matters dealt with in the Speech from the Throne, I want in the first place to comment up-

on the argument that the administration of the Fishery Regulations is more a matter for the Codfish Exportation Board than the Government. That, I think, is not a tenable position. The Codfish Exportation Board is as much an institution of the Government as the Board of Works or any other Board operating under a Government Department. Moreover, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Government through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, took the precaution that five out of seven members of the Board should be appointed by the Government. The trade has only two nominees on the Board, and one of these it may be remarked in passing, is a gentleman who may be described as the most outspoken supporter of the Government on Water Street to-day, a man who stood by the Government's policy when every other merchant abandoned it. I think, therefore, to attempt to minimize the responsibility of the Government by suggesting that the Board is responsible is not a position that will be maintained. I think, like my honourable friend who has just spoken, that the sooner the Government decides to abandon this policy, the better in the public interests. There is one very outstanding example to-day of the unwisdom of this policy of governmental control, and that is the British coal situation. I do not know that honourable members would follow the condition of this matter as closely as I have possibly done,—being a newspaper man, I suppose it is more in my line,—but there is a good deal of similarity in the British coal condition and the condition in Newfoundland. Reading the Round Table Magazine of the last issue, I came on a paragraph singularly applicable to this country's position in regard to codfish. Dealing with coal, it went on to say that a temporarily weak situation was

brought about in the old country. Perhaps it might be of interest and of value if I indicated briefly what is the position with regard to coal. The miners and mine-owners were at war all through the period of hostilities, and for the past six or seven years repeated efforts at a settlement were made, but they had no permanent results. Every few months, as we know, there has been a strike, a demand for higher wages, the appointment of a commission by the Government, and then a compromise which has resulted in an increase of wages for the men. Applying the analogy, we find that here in Newfoundland there has been a steady persistent attempt to lift the price of fish for the fishermen,—perfectly justifiable if it can be done. In England the Government overcame the difficulty by largely increasing the price of coal for foreign export. This magazine goes on to say: "But the ink was scarcely dry on the agreement when the export price began to fall. The policy of financing the industry at the expense of the foreign buyer has left us with few friends abroad." Now that is precisely our position. We tried to pay high prices to our own people by charging our foreign customers an increased price for their fish. The time came when they refused to pay these prices, and the time has come in the British coal industry when the foreign customers have refused to pay the price.

In the Parliamentary report of the London Times of March first there are many interesting items. Mr. Bridgeman, the Secretary of the Department of Mines, said in answer to a question:

(Read extract).

The year before the war the U. S. exported to Europe half a million tons of coal; last year she sent them 13,500,000 tons. In 1913 Australia exported to Europe 100 tons; in 1920, 113,000 tons. The exports of Chinese

coal were not known when the report was prepared, but you can see in English papers reports of cargoes of Chinese coal arriving at various English ports, which were formerly supplied with English coal. And it goes on to add:

(Read extract).

The condition has come about in the Old Country that early in March the Government brought in a bill to de-control coal and to-day England is faced with what looks to be the biggest strike in her history. In the public message to-day Mr. Hodges is justifying the policy of withdrawing the pump men whose presence and activities are essential, which as I see it is a first step towards revolution. In a debate in the House of Commons the fact was disclosed that the Government expect to save twenty million pounds by effecting de-control on 31st March. This was done instead of continuing until August 31st, which was first intended. I think that is an illustration that the Government and the country should weigh well. We are facing essentially the same situation, comparing small things with great. We have attempted this cod-fish price fixing experiment. I agree it was a first attempt; I did not oppose it because hon. gentlemen in this House with more knowledge of the matter than I had expressed the opinion that it might do, and I was not prepared to cast my vote against an experiment that might be worked successfully, and might result in benefit to the country at large. But hon. gentlemen will remember I did not anticipate the success thought of. If we go to Canada we find a somewhat similar matter in regard to the control of the price of wheat. Now coal is a non-perishable commodity and what may be kept for four or five years without serious deterioration, but Canada abandoned that plan some time

ago and America did the same thing. From Canada, go to Australia, and we find a somewhat similar situation with regard to wool. The London Times of Feb. 19th last devoted pages to the production of wool in Australia and incidentally dealt with the situation created there in regard to the purchase of immense quantities of wool by the Imperial Government. The termination of the war left the British and Australian Governments which had commandeered all the wool in Australia in Imperial interests, and are now left with a tremendous amount of wool on their hands and are endeavouring to sell to the best advantage. But in the meantime there is a new clip of wool this year and there will be another clip next year and the outcome will be that new and old wool will be competing and prices will be beaten down. Now we have to-day more fish in this country lying in stores and fishermen's places around the coast than was ever here at this date, in modern history. I think that will be hardly disputed, and that fish is being sold to-day at a very low price, and within a few months will have to be sold still lower, because coming into competition with new fish.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—What is the amount?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am told between 350,000 and 400,000 qtls., almost one third of the catch. Of course it is easy to see how that has come about because up to the end of December no fish was sold in Italy, and while some sales have been made since they have been fragmentary I think hon. gentlemen here will agree with me that as a result of this inability to make sales we are left to-day with more fish than ever before, bearing in mind that the catch last year was only two thirds of several previous years. My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Mews, justified the regu-

lations on the ground that they had increased the price of fish to the fishermen and enabled them to get better figures than they would otherwise. Granting that that is so, it must follow that it must have been at somebody else's expense, that of the merchants and business people. I was rather startled on Saturday to see the statement made in the Daily News that the operation of the Coaker policy has resulted in a loss to the country of \$15,000,000.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—How did they arrive at those figures?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—First, loss of sale of fish five millions. Personally I would make it four millions. The catch last year according to Board of Trade figures was 1,350,000 qtls. and estimating an average loss of \$3 a qtl. would make a total of some four millions. Another statement is that on the stocks in their store here in St. John's and around the country, the business people by reason of reduced prices have made a loss of \$3,000,000. That accounts for two items. Then the loss in shipping is put down at \$2,000,000. I do not know much about shipping, but seeing that one firm on the West Coast that was estimated to own shipping at \$850,000 the book value of which is said to be now only about one third of that figure, I should say that two millions would be a good figure.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—What did they make out of freights during the war?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—What they made out of freights they lost last fall buying fish. There is another estimate on book debts which are five millions. That is an item I am uncertain about.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—If the fishermen got a high price for fish why cannot they pay their book debts?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I sup-

pose because they do not want to. The late Bishop McDonald of Hr. Grace at the time of the Bank Crash remarked that the planter robbed the merchant, the merchant robbed the fisherman and the fisherman robbed the boat. I say if the fishermen had been paid a smaller figure the merchant would have been in a better position. There would not be the insolvencies and we would not be faced with the appalling outlook we are at the present.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Instead of being put on a few, the losses would have been in the people generally. It is put on a few people who have been gambling. The trade of this country for the past 50 years has been nothing but a gamble. What has caused this very depression is this endeavour to gamble going on for the past 50 years. There has been no accumulation of wealth from the fisheries. It has always been gambling.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I maintain that the business methods pursued here are only the same as elsewhere pursued.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—No, sir, nowhere else.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well, let us take wheat. The trafficking in wheat in Canada and the U.S. is the greatest gamble in the world to-day.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I dispute the hon. gentleman. The wheat market is a very different thing from our fish marketing. The millers sell their flour to the buyers who sell it legitimately, and it is only the persons not in the trade who gamble. The people directly engaged in it do not gamble, but the people outside, who are not regular traders.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well the hon. gentleman knows a great deal about the subject and I know nothing, so I do not think we will get far in the discussion. But the bucket shop deals

in wheat as the greatest gamble of to-day.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—The bucket shop is simply a gambling concern and takes the quotations off the Board of Trade, steals them and sends them out to people who gamble in them.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It would be interesting if we had the time to have the hon. gentleman develop the point and illustrate where the people who handle wheat in the U.S. in competition with wheat from all parts of the world differ in their methods from the people who buy fish here and send it to Europe in competition with fish from other places. I would be glad to learn of the business being done differently, and how people who handle fish in this country do not do business on a basis that will enable them to do it safely and properly.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—The system of doing business here is the supplying merchant gets all the credit he can and all the fish he possibly can and uses every means to take it far beyond his capital, and fires it out of his store and has no more control over it. And no other product anywhere else is handled in such a way.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Then my hon. friend opposite suggested that it was most desirable that the merchants should continue to help out in a critical situation by giving the usual supplies. Now that is a very laudable proposition, but I would like to ask where the merchants are going to get the money to do it. I suppose there is not a merchant engaged in the business who has not made losses larger than ever before in his history. I do not want to give illustrations but I think that cannot be gainsaid. Three or four years ago our merchants sold fish to Roumania and took Roumania bonds. I have a clipping here.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Where did they get the money for supplies to the fishermen in 1894?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I think a good deal of it was found by the fishermen themselves.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Let them find it now.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I have yet to see the fishermen who are going to take all the money they got for fish last fall and put it into the fishery business this summer, because fish is lower in price this year than in 1909 which was the summer we swept the country twenty-three seats against thirteen; fish was then \$2 a quintal and flour a low figure.

Now gentlemen for all of these reasons I suggest that a case be made out for an abandonment of this policy in order to get back to the original legitimate methods of dealing in fish. My hon. friend says it will take two or three years of the most drastic economy to put the country on a firm foundation. One of the surest ways to bring about that is to do away with the regulations and let the people do business in the way in which they were accustomed before the war.

Having dealt with that matter, I wish to call attention to the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, dealing with the German indemnity. The facts concerning our share in this should be made clear. The hon. gentleman in other House who moved the Address in Reply expressed the opinion we should get a share of the German indemnity sufficient to recoupe from the war. My hon. friend on my left here expressed the hope that we should get enough to pay off our National Debt. The first thing to understand is we shall get no indemnity at all. The Peace Treaty does not provide for it. It cost the Colony fifteen million dollars to carry on the war. We shall never get a cent of it back. This is a strong statement, but I can back it up. I am

quoting the speech of Lloyd George March 4th. He said, in reply to the demand of the Allies, 11½ billion pounds sterling were to be paid in forty-two years. The Germans were to pay to France 2½ billions cash and deduct one billion as paid already in transference of ships and return of certain cattle and so forth to France and Belgium. Mr. Lloyd George went on to say, and so the Treaty of Versailles laid down, that the country which provoked the war ought to pay the cost of war.

That disposes of any idea, I assume, that we are going to get anything back of the amount which it cost us to carry on the war.

Now then it amounts to this: What we are to get as our share of reparation takes two forms. First, repayment to people who have suffered actual loss—people whose vessels have been torpedoed—these are the claims to be compensated in this country and the only claims. In France and Belgium a large number of people suffered loss through bombardments. Here the only people who have any claim are those who had vessels torpedoed. Here is what is mentioned. France is to get 55 per cent. Belgium 22 per cent of the 11½ billion pounds to be got from Germany in 42 years, if it is got.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—The Germans will pay. France paid in 1870.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Under entirely different circumstances. However, assuming they do pay, we shall only get our proportion of the 22 per cent of what they do pay, which may be nothing.

HON. MR. SHEA:—It will amount to nothing.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—One of the leading British Empire statisticians has an article in the National Review for March—(a London Magazine). He estimates that Britain's share of the war reparation will

amount in the pound, nineteen shillings to Germany's one.

I hope after this the public will have a better understanding of what we are likely to get from Germany as our share of the indemnity. This will disabuse the minds of people who have been living in a fool's paradise thinking we should get enough money from Germany to pay off our National Debt.

HON. MR. SHEA:—To which paragraph of the Speech are you referring?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It is on the second page. It begins 'My Ministers have kept in close touch with the Imperial authorities . . .'

HON. MR. GIBB:—This paragraph does not say that anything is hoped for.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Sir Michael Cashin said he had thirty million dollars. Perhaps that is the sum in the hon. member's mind.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I have followed the Peace Treaty too closely to think we shall get anything worth while. It is due to misunderstanding that the hon. members in both Houses think that the Colony is going to get a large sum of money from Germany to pay off the National Debt.

I had intended to make an observation with regard to the railway, but as I have spoken unduly long already, I shall conclude, Mr. President, and I may at a later opportunity speak on that subject.

I repeat that if the fishery policy imposed by the Government be repealed, it would be to the interest of trade and greatly assist in getting things back to normal.

HON. MR. RYAN:—In reading His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, I noticed that the subject of inland and coastal transportation will come before us. There is no doubt that the coastal system needs readjustment. For about fifteen years the Ethie did

good service in Conception Bay, the Dundee in Bonavista Bay and the Clyde in Green Bay, and gave general satisfaction. But the past two years the system, as far as the northern bays are concerned, is out of joint. Port Union has been made the terminus, and this service is not satisfactory to Bonavista Bay. It would be much better if the steamer for Bonavista Bay be confined to that Bay and if the other steamers were confined to their respective bays, then the service would be much better.

With regard to the coal areas. For the past few years we have heard of the coal possibilities of the country but so far nothing has been done. If the Government meant business why does it not get to work and supply the public with coal enough to meet their needs.

I cannot congratulate the Government on its policy since taking office because so far it has helped to bring disaster on the whole country. What is the condition of Newfoundland today? We all know the condition too well. The fishery legislation has put many in a deplorable state. Merchants had cargoes held up last spring, because they were not given clearance to sail, with the result that fish on arrival at destined port was unfit for food. These losses apply in a great measure to the West Coast and also to the north, to some extent. I contend, Mr. President, that these men of the West Coast who met with such heavy losses should be compensated by the Government, by whose bungling these losses have been sustained. These people deserve compensation and should get.

What about the firms who have complied with the regulations, and who up to the present have no returns.

What about the firms who have complied with the regulations, and who up to the present have no returns. Who is responsible for such losses?

Those who carry out the regulations. These are the results of the unwise policy of the Government.

I regret sincerely the death of Mr. W. B. Grieve, C.B.E., whose absence from among us to-day is greatly felt. If he were allowed to take part in this discussion I feel sure he would agree. He was so interested in the affairs of the country and was a man of so great foresight and knew exactly by what means the best results could be obtained. He could see that the Government was digging a pit into which we had to fall, and so we did.

I am glad the regulations on codfish are rescinded although it came too late. A vessel loaded in January last, belonging to Messrs. Hollett of Burin was no table to comply with the regulations and was delayed in sailing. If regulations had been lifted this would not have happened. It is generally understood that the Government arranged with some merchants here last fall to purchase large quantities of codfish at \$8, besides cost of storage and labour, etc. A great portion of this fish, so I am informed, is still here unsold. If we had no regulations, sir, this fish would have been marketed and gone into consumption long ago.

I hope the Government will repeal this Act concerning the Fishery Regulations so that they will never come in force again, and have same removed from the Statute Book, forever.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. President, this is one of the most important subjects which has ever come before this country. I differ somewhat from those who have spoken. I differ entirely from them, but as it is getting late I ask that this House adjourn until to-morrow when the matter can be again taken up and then I shall endeavour to give my reading as it appears to me, and give a review of the trade for the past fifty years. This country gets into exactly the same

position every five or six years to my knowledge.

A message received from His Excellency the Governor granting Hon. W. J. Ellis permission of absence from the meetings of this session, was then read by the President.

A statement of the Newfoundland Savings Bank was then placed on the table.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

TUESDAY, April 5th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. President, one gathered from the remarks made by the three gentlemen who spoke yesterday afternoon that they condemned the fishery regulations, which were the subject of their remarks, in toto. There was absolutely nothing in the fishery regulations that ought not to be done away with. That position, I think, is hardly tenable. I do not know that any of the gentlemen really feel that that was what they meant. I will ask, Mr. Ryan, for instance, if the regulations regarding the standardization and cullage of fish were not a thing which was desirable for the country. Mr. Ryan was most emphatic in condemning the regulations in toto. I think, Mr. Chairman, that very few persons indeed would condemn the standardization and collage of fish. Therefore, regulations in that respect have been most popular with the exporters of fish. If these regulations, so far as regards the fishermen, were good, the regulations might be given that much credit anyway, but that is not the object of the comments, so much as the after-realization of the fish, while the fish was in the hands of the fishermen and coming up to the exporters or coming up to be warehoused. I think all the fish from the days it is caught ought to be under regulations most stringent, so that the fish when it

comes to be warehoused and marketed would be of such a cull that it could command a very high price. That was the endeavour of the regulations of last year, however far that was carried out, supposing it was carried out, at all, and it is time that everybody should be aware that there was a great improvement in the cure of fish last year as compared with previous years. But the honourable gentlemen commented upon these regulations with respect to the fish being warehoused, and gave no credit whatever to the regulations for the endeavour they might give them credit for the improvement of fish. I think at least they might give the credit where credit is due. We all know that no regulations brought in can reach the maximum or be perfect. It is only by experience in dealing with them that they can come near to such a state. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that the regulations, as far as they were carried out, accomplished two-thirds of what they set out to accomplish. The other one-third was the realization. Well, we all have our opinion as to realization and the causes of their not coming up to what was anticipated. In previous years every man who had anything to do with the fishery was a law unto himself. He did just as he pleased with his fish. There was no control whatever. There was no organization for the realization of fish. There was no way of obtaining information as to the markets. All the information that was obtained from the markets was obtained by private people in their own interests and not given out in a public manner, as it was desirable that it should be. Therefore, there was always an endeavour on the part of the different exporters in some way to keep information from, or, I might say, mislead the country in relation to the information they may have got, and it was notorious how different the informa-

tion got from different exporters was. That was a most deplorable state of affairs, and it was not anywhere else that such a state of affairs existed. These regulations were enacted in order to overcome that. I do not care to enlarge upon that because in many cases it was not the fault of the people who were engaged in the business, but the fault of the system, and therefore, an endeavour to change that system ought to have been supported by everyone in trade in the country, no matter whether the regulations were promising or not. While the fish was in the hands of the fishermen they were encouraged to make good fish, and it is presumed that they did make good fish. If it is the duty of the country, the duty of the people, and the duty of the Government, to see that the fish was made well, it was also the duty of the country, the people and the Government to see that the fish was realized in the proper manner. Of course, last year was an exceptional year, and had we had regulations for some years previous to that, the disaster of realization would not have been such as it has been, but, being a new affair and meeting with such opposition, there could hardly be anything else happen other than the results that have been obtained. In the first place, nobody seemed to know that there was an abundance of fish held by the British Government. When this fish began to be placed upon the market, it was news to everybody that any fish was held. I understand that there was an endeavour to sell our fish to the British Government, but there was never a reference to the fact that the British Government was holding a quantity of Norwegian and Danish fish, which, of course, they had no use for after the War had closed. This fish being dumped, regardless of price or anything else, on the markets, made it easy for those

who opposed the regulations to say that there was nothing but disaster in them. Lack of concerted action has caused this country an enormous loss. I do not believe, sir, that there has been any harm done the fishermen of this country. You have to look at what we have passed through, and you will see every five or six years, just as truly as the clock goes round, this country has been insolvent. There is no person who can deny that for years this country has been practically insolvent. We who have been in business, whether actually connected with the fisheries or not, know it to be a fact that there are a few years of prosperity, and then adversity. Everybody is clamouring to-day to know where the fishermen are going to get supplies, but I think that fishery supplies were never given out except on a business basis. I do not believe to-day that there is anybody giving out supplies on a philanthropic basis. They are given out to get the fish back in return, as a business proposition, and for many years that has been the position. A man must have some security behind him, the merchant must see some way of getting back the money advanced, before any supplies are given.

It is the duty of the Government to provide the fisherman and the labor he has put into it and to give him fair return for his fish and I congratulate the Government upon their position last year in stabilizing the price for the fisherman. If that had not been done the fishermen would have been paupers and the merchants would not have been in a better position than they are to-day. It was unavoidable and will be so until the national control of the products of the country is put under regulation and people are penalized for breaking these. The weakness of the regulations last year was that there was no penalty provided. If there had been a penalty

for breaches of those regulations it would have been a far different matter. You talk of the recuperative powers of this country. It is an absolute by-word. No such thing exists as a matter of fact except by the say so of the fish merchants in the foreign markets. They have the control of the affairs of this country, of the wealth of our merchants and country. Sir Patrick McGrath cited instances of trade uncontrolled. There is no such thing. He cited the wheat markets: There is nothing uncontrolled.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—By supply and demand.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—By regulations made for the carrying on of the industry.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Who makes those regulations?

HON. MR. BROWNING:—The several boards. It is nowhere a law unto itself, as it is here. It is very hard indeed to draw a case between wheat and codfish.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Why?

HON. MR. BROWNING:—It is a different thing and a smaller market. If we had such a market as you referred to yesterday then we could go there and cover our options. That the few men who export fish are to be a law unto themselves as to what they do with the product of thousands of fishermen which we are depending on and the realization of their fish then we will be not one step further than we are. As regards supply and demand, that is an absolute camouflage. There is no such thing in this country as we make it. With fifty or sixty thousand quintals of fish in Oporto and fifteen or twenty vessels outside, is that supply and demand? And you call that supply and demand.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—That is supply without demand.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:— Does not the same thing apply with wheat? Who regulates how wheat goes to European markets?

HON. MR. BROWNING:—The purchasers. The curse of this trade is consignments. There are those vessels outside Oporto and as many more inside unsold on consignment with no control whatever. Sir Patrick McGrath referred yesterday to Lighter in Chicago. Since his day the wheat merchants of America made such regulations that there never will be another Lighter. And that is what we want to get here. He also referred yesterday to a concern here who accumulated a vast amount of wealth by fish within the past few years and today are embarrassed. It is true this was an abnormal year; true that the exporters were not informed as to the true position of fish held by the British Government. Had there been no fish held by the British Government which nobody seems to have known anything about, then larger prices would have been obtained. As to the poverty of the people in the foreign markets, I have grave doubts. It is not our business whether they are poor or rich. We are here to transact business and do the best we can for ourselves.

HON. MR. RYAN:—We transacted business in a very nice manner the past 12 months by our fixed prices. We put an exorbitant price on our fish as if there was no other fish on sale except in Newfoundland. To-day Spain has four times too much fish and about 400,000 qtls. remain in St. John's all brought on by fish regulation prices. If we had had common sense we would not have fixed such high prices on our fish. One hundred shillings for Greece. Why it was madness. I could send fish across and make money on it at 70 shillings, and others as well as I.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—What

brought the fish there is simply the incapacity and inability of those people who grabbed all the fish and sent it to market. If these people had the money to put into their trade instead of gabbling all the fish they could possibly get, there would be no necessity for this fish there. I grant you there was an oversupply of fish caused by the want of unity and want of organization amongst the exporters. There would not then be the glut of fish sent to the market, but unfortunately the fish held by the British Government was dumped on the market regardless of price and through the most unwise propaganda that went on here and exposing our position, and as I understand telegrams were sent over telling these people not to buy our fish. And on situation there was people were told not to buy our fish and they used this other fish as a lever, though it was poor fish. It would have paid this country to take all the poor fish and sunk it rather than send it over there. What we want is organization and not that every exporter of fish should be a law unto himself. Why should they do what they please with their product. It is not his money. They have not probably a dollar in it.

HON. MR. RYAN:—You are wrong in my case. I have got no money from the banks.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I was not talking of individuals, but of the rule. There are some hon. gentlemen I know who finance their own business, but there are others who are gambling on it. There is no such thing as a gamble in my business; but the fishery business is nothing but a gamble, and they are the worst sort of gamblers. There is no philanthropy in supplying the fishermen. No man goes on handing out supplies who does not expect to get a fair profit. There has been no loss in supplying for the fishery.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I should like to see my hon. friend Mr. Browning go into the fishery. He is not too old yet.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I have seen lots of accounts in the fish business. I do not say there are not some men who are endeavouring to do the trade of the country properly, but they are handicapped by others who are nothing but gamblers just as if they were operating with one of those wheels of fortune which we used to see on the Race Course some years ago. They have just as much control as that; they are permitted to win some years. As I said it is a cycle of years in the fish trade, and we are insolvent more often than solvent. A man begins at zero, or under zero, on credit; he makes a handsome profit, is permitted to do so by the merchant in the foreign market. He lets everybody know he made money and next year gets all the credit he possibly can. He probably succeeds the second year because it is the desire of these people, but the next year it is disaster. We are going on from year to year in the same way. Are we going to continue this and allow a few exporters in this country to run this thing from affluence to poverty? and that has been the result, to my knowledge, for the past 50 years. The only source of real permanent wealth here are the agriculture, the Grand Falls and other such enterprises. It would be a good thing indeed if the Government could see their way clear to spend an enormous sum of money and have a lot of men develop such land as we have. Not that the fishery is not sure; the fishery is just as sure a crop as any other crop. It is the abuse of the fishery, and therefore we want to stabilize something so that there will be something left afterwards. The worst of this system of realizing on fish is that these people who are successful for a few years get so greedy that they encroach upon everybody

else. I know several firms on the West Coast that have been crippled by this one firm that has been referred to in their endeavours to grab up all the fish. It is this lack of unity and co-operation amongst the exporters.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Even with the regulations on there was no unity amongst the exporters. Every man was doing the best he could to keep his information from his neighbour. Even on the Advisory Board some few parties had information which they would not give to others.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Endeavours have been made for years among a few to come together and make regulations, but they failed, and the Government was unwise enough last year to think that the fact of their making regulations would lead to everybody joining with them and give them the support they might reasonably expect. They did not know the absolute treacherous disposition of the people of this town. These are hard words but that is true.

HON. MR. RYAN:—It was a pity more did not oppose them.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I quite sympathize with Mr. Ryan because he has been brought up for years in that business. I wish to congratulate the Government on the comparative success of the regulations. I did not expect last year they were going to be a success, but I say they were partially successful and Mr. Ryan agrees with me that in their endeavour to standardize the cull of fish, they were successful.

HON. MR. RYAN:—But no sane man would agree with fixed prices.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—If this endeavour had been supported by all it would have been a success. Why was not this information given to a bureau that all would have, instead of treacherously going abroad and telling these people not to buy our pro-

duct, as I understand cables to that effect were sent from here to Italy.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I do not know anything about these cablegrams.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—But it is an absolute fact and I understand the Government are in possession of these telegrams. And fish would have been sold months before the Consorzio went out in Italy had it not been for the endeavours of persons here in St. John's. I hope the Government will take this seriously into consideration and make the rules more stringent that people in this business will not be a law unto themselves.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Yesterday Hon. Mr. Browning stated that after a merchant loaded his cargo of fish and sent it outside the heads, he troubles no more about it.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—He had no control over it.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I wish to say from my own experience and what I think is done by all the exporters in the trade, from the time the vessel commences to take cargo on board, the owner of that fish gets into communication with his broker in Liverpool or his agents in Greece, Italy, Spain or Portugal, offering his cargo for sale. He does not let the cargo go out of his mind altogether because it is worth so much money to him. Sometimes the vessel calls at Gibraltar for orders and if she is chartered he has to pay demurrage after 48 hours, but if he owns the vessel it often pays him to keep her there until such time as the cargo is sold. He does not forget that he has a cargo of fish at Gibraltar but he is constantly in touch with his brokers and agents in the foreign market until a purchase for that cargo can be got.

With regard to the standardization of fish, I may say, I know a great deal. From a boy I have been used to splitting, washing, salting and curing, and there is this, then, I wish to say. I

know merchants, a great many, in the fish trade who do not know the difference between fish. A lot of men go about talking about the curing and splitting of fish who do not know the first thing about it. Put a haddock by the side of a codfish and put a sculpin in the middle and they would not be able to tell the one from the other. My hon. friend knows one from the other for he has seen a great deal of fish one way and the other. The whole thing is a gamble as every other business is. Hon. Mr. Browning's business is a gamble. We are all gambling in this world.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—There may be competition, but not gambling.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Did not Mr. A. J. Harvey enter the business to break down your prices?

HON. MR. STEER:—Hon. Mr. Browning is now speaking on a subject of which he knows nothing.

HON. MR. RYAN:—If Mr. Browning went to the office and studied the letters and messages—cablegrams from Gibraltar, Liverpool, Spain and Portugal he would know a little more about what he is saying. If he saw the quantities of messages sent he would understand better.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—That confirms exactly what I said. A bureau is wanted. At the present time every man is a 'law unto himself,' and information is not given to the public.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I have been given to understand that when we had an Advisory Board, half the members were invited to attend certain meetings, and the other half were left out. Talk about bureau! Have we not wanted many things which we shall never get.

Talking about the standardization of fish—we had also to clean the black film off the fins of fish. That was tried ten or fifteen years ago by your humble servant and proved a failure.

I spoke of this at the Board of Trade and all laughed at me, but I did not mind that.

I was stopped from sending a vessel to Greece with a cargo of fish for which I could have got a good price, but I was not allowed to send it. We had fixed prices and these kill trade.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—What prevented your vessel from going there?

HON. MR. RYAN:—The price put on it. The people could not afford to buy, at the price—twenty shillings a quintal profit.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—How could you say you were prevented from sending your vessel?

HON. MR. RYAN:—I had communication with people in Greece, but was not allowed to send, because cargo was not sold. So I met with a loss of a few hundred pounds on the cargo. Putting a fixed price on our cod-fish when other markets were selling at reduced price ruined our chances. Had not the fixed prices been put on our fish it would have gone into consumption long ago, and the quicker the better.

I know a little about this, Mr. Browning, and I cannot, I am sorry to say, take a lesson from you, for I have been familiar with the fish business ever since I was a boy. You can tell me how to make biscuits and bake bread for I do not know anything about these things, but in dealing with the handling of fish I know what I am talking about.

You made a remark just now that two-thirds of the regulations had been carried out with good effect.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Yes, the standardization. There are three status—the catching, curing and warehousing, of it, and the other third the realization of it.

HON. MR. RYAN:—The catch last year was the same as it was a hundred years ago. No doubt the wash-

ing, splitting and salting properly, was a good thing, but the others were bad and caused the country to be in the state that it is now in.

With regard to getting price from foreign market. I can cable Greece, Italy, Spain, Oporto, and after twenty-four hours I know what I can get for my fish, and the quantities in that market, and then all that had to be done was to secure the services of the best agent one can get. I have been dealing with brokers in London for forty years, who were honourable and just in their dealings, but in 1914 I was forced to cut my connections with these men. On account of the Fishery Regulations I could ship my fish only through a gentleman by the name of Mr. Hawse. I was completely deprived of dealing with those brokers who gave me entire satisfaction. I can get a price in Italy, Greece, Spain and Oporto every twenty-four hours, where I can send my cargoes if I want to, also the amount of fish in the foreign markets—Norwegian and Icelandic. That is why we should have a free hand to sell, not send it over there to be put into stores to rot—and we have to pay storage and other charges. The fixing of prices will never work out. There is too much competition. The quicker the law is repealed the better for Newfoundland.

The twentieth of June will see if the regulations and fixed prices in the foreign markets work, and if the Act is not repealed, we shall see how many men there will be to go to the fishery this year.

HON. MR. STEER:—I should like to say a few words while we are on this matter. The attitude Mr. Browning has taken on this question has much surprised me. There is no man in Newfoundland who would object more strongly to any interference in his line of business than he. If there was an Advisory Board appointed to regulate the price of bread and bis-

cuits and when he ought to buy and sell, what would be his position then? He would certainly object and yet, he is an advocate of the policy that fifty or sixty fish exporters are to be dictated to as to how they should run their business.

His statement with regard to the regulations having improved the make of the fish, is incorrect. The opposite is the case. The fish was never worse. As far as the standardization is concerned, I think it works to the detriment instead of to its betterment, for I am given to understand that fish bought for \$4 a quintal poorly culled was reculled and shipped at Marceira for double the price.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—This is not the fault of the regulations.

HON. MR. STEER:—The Hon. Mr. Mews on the opening of this House expressed doubt as to whether the Fish Regulations were harmful or not, and said that at any rate they were beneficial in that they resulted in obtaining better prices for the fishermen than they would otherwise have received. Surely he did not intend us to take such expressions seriously for one has only to size up the situation during the past few months, and as it is at present (with so many firms being declared insolvent, others verging on the same, and others asking for extension of time to meet their liabilities, nearly all of them being connected, more or less directly with the fishery) and ask themselves what is the cause of such a condition of affairs. And whilst we must acknowledge that whilst a certain amount of the present depression amongst us is brought about by conditions which are world wide, it must be conceded that our state has been considerably aggravated as the direct results of the disastrous fishery regulations.

I challenge contradiction to the following facts:

The regulations have not benefitted

the fish exporters as is proved by the fact that they were practically unanimous in their demands a few weeks ago that all such regulations be lifted, and to-day are demanding that these Acts be wiped off the Statute Books.

The regulations have not been of any benefit to the fish exporters (more particularly those who are not fish exporters) but on the contrary have resulted in the majority of such firms being placed in a most unfortunate and embarrassing condition with heavy fishery accounts unpaid and the possibility before many of them of being wiped out of existence.

And even as regards the fishermen themselves, partly on whose account it has been pleaded that the regulations were framed, what is the condition to-day? As a matter of fact owing to the poor prices obtained for their catch (not much over \$4 per qtl.) the vast majority of fishermen have been unable to pay their current supplier, and are approaching the coming outfitting season with a heavy burden of debt upon their shoulders.

With these facts staring one in the face how can any member of this House seriously make the assertion that he is doubtful as to the result of the regulations and as to whether they were harmful or not.

We are to work in unity and harmony and forgetting all differences endeavour unitedly to reconstruct our affairs on a solid base and lift them out of the state of chaos in which they are to-day. We can only do so by facing the facts that are staring us in the face and no half-hearted uneasiness can be of any avail.

With regard to the present sugar situation, I fail to see where so much blame can justly be attached to the Government on this account. If you will remember last summer the Government was subject to severe criticism

isms on this very matter, and demands were made by certain sections of both Houses that they should control sugar and other commodities. Not only so, but all sections of the daily press joined in a popular clamour for control, and I take it, the hands of the Government were made to meet this popular clamour, and it looked at that time indeed that the control of sugar, at least, would be a wise measure. I personally was strongly against any such control and expressed my views rather forcibly here, for I have always considered that interference with the ordinary course of trade and the ignoring of the laws of supply and demand could never be made to work for ultimate good. Unfortunately my fears have turned out to have been only too well warranted although we have the consolation (if that can be any satisfaction to us) of knowing that others are in the same fix as ourselves. In England conditions as regards sugar are identical with our own. I will read an extract or two from English papers to prove this:

SUGAR "SLUMP."

Sir R. Park Lyle on Our Purchases.

The cause of the "slump" in the United States sugar markets and the position of the Royal Commission on the Sugar Supply in regard to it were described to a Daily Mail reporter by Sir Robert Park Lyle, a member of the Royal Commission and chairman and managing director of Abram Lyle and Sons, sugar refiners.

The Commission is responsible for the buying of sugar for this country and has been criticised on the ground that it has been caught with big supplies on a falling market. Sir Robert has been responsible for a great deal of the Government sugar buying.

"The Sugar Commission," he said, "began buying sugar from Cuba last autumn at approximately £39 per ton.

"Shortly afterwards the price increased owing to the Cuban crop being

estimated to fall short of the original hopes by 500,000 tons and to the anticipated increased consumption in the United States following prohibition.

Mauritius Purchase

"The Sugar Commission followed the rise for some time but have bought no sugar in the Western markets since June. About the end of that month we concluded a contract with the planters of our own Colony of Mauritius for the purchase of practically the entire output, 200,000 tons. The price paid was £90 per ton f.o.b. (free on board). This was when sugar in the United States was £130 per ton.

"While to-day the Mauritius sugar looks dear, there can be no doubt that that purchase, having put this country in an independent position, contributed largely to the present 'slump' in prices which will enable this country to buy its future supplies at a more moderate price.

"In the United States sugar became so dear that the expected increase in consumption due to the country's going dry has not materialised, and the Cuban crop is turning out better than expected.

"These combined facts have changed the whole position. Hence the 'slump' in prices. Sugar which in May was worth 23 cents (nominally 11½d.) a pound can now be bought at 10 cents (nominally 5d.)"—The Over-Seas Daily Mail, Sept. 11, 1920.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—With your approval, Mr. President, I shall deal with some of the questions brought up this afternoon. I should not really speak again except on motion of adjournment but I shall forego that privilege for the opportunity of speaking now.

This is a personal matter to me as I was a member of the original Food Control Board.

At the end of May, 1919, this Board practically ceased operations, owing to conditions at that time. We had to

continue operations in September till November, 1919. There was no Food Control Board then until the eve of the By-Election as there was the usual agitation for something to be done, and the Government appointed a new Food Control Board. The Government made a great mistake. If it had let good enough alone there would have been no trouble. If it had not revived the Food Control Board to deal with sugar we should have been a great deal better off. The new Board appointed confined its activities to sugar. The hon. member opposite can perhaps correct me.

HON. MR. MEWS:—They did something with flour. If I might explain in connection with flour. The Canadian wheat exporters said they would not deal with the Government but only with the Food Control Board. That was one reason for its revival.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—We had precisely that situation in the old Food Control Board. You refer to the reduction of \$2 on flour. This could have been settled if proper representation had been made at Ottawa. That \$2 was put on to equalize price with that prevailing in the United States, and to prevent speculation.

When it was pointed out to them the condition this country was in and the difficulties we had to face in getting supplies of food stuffs into the country before the 31st day of December to supply the northern outports, and when I asked at Washington for double supplies of sugar and other things for the last three months, they said "No, you cannot have them," but when I explained to them that all our northern coast and western coast was icebound for three or four months in the winter, they said, "That is a different matter. Give us your minimum requirements, and we will give you what you need." Similarly with this reduction of \$2.00 on flour, the Cana-

dian Government put on \$2.00 to keep supplies in their own country.

HON. MR. MEWS:—That is not quite true. It was to bring up the export value to the price the United States was charging.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The reason which appeared the previous year was that there was an agreement between the United States and Canada that trade would flow in the natural direction, that Canada would supply Britain and Northern Europe, and the United States the South. The Canadians put a tax of \$2.00 per barrel on flour, and that would apply to us, but of course the moment representations were made to the proper authorities, that was taken off, because their attitude was, as I see it, both at Washington and Ottawa, to treat us as one of themselves.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Why did they put that \$2.00 on?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Largely to keep flour in their own country for their own requirements, because there was a shortage.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—To keep it out of the United States.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—To keep it out of the United States and every other country until their own requirements were supplied.

HON. MR. MEWS:—The Canadians were getting flour \$2.00 cheaper than any other part of the world.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Exactly, and they put on an export duty to equalize the price.

HON. MR. MEWS:—It was \$2.00 that would go into the pockets of the farmers.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Yes, it was one of the difficulties that arose from the War. It was not a normal condition at all. But, not to dwell too long on this matter, the initial mistake I think was the appointment of the Food Control Board. As to the position of the existing Food Control

Board in regard to sugar, opinions differ. I might be regarded as an unfair critic. I think, if I may be permitted to say so, my honourable friend and his associates were very vigorous in their denunciation of me in their manifesto issued before the last election. Probably I might be permitted to say that in my opinion their mistake was that they did not do as we did. We operated for two and a quarter years and we never handled one dollar of Government money. We bought sugar and other commodities when people wanted them and paid for them. We said "How much do you want? Give us your cheque." Many honourable gentlemen here know that they had to put their cheques down before the food stuff was ordered, and we never took a dollar of Government money.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—You commandeered sugar coming into the country.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Yes.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—And you paid for it before it was bought.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—No.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I have known cases where sugar was commandeered and the person got his money to pay for it at the bank.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That may be so.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—That sugar did not pass into the hands of the consumer within a few days.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I do not quite get the honourable gentleman's point.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—When sugar arrived it was taken over by the Board and paid for, but the person under whose control it afterwards came had not bought that sugar in the meantime.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—But he furnished me with commitments. There are honourable gentlemen here who were in that class of transaction with me and who know that if they

wanted stocks they had to put down their cheques for it.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Oh, that may be so.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Certainly we commandeered sugar. We commandeered whole cargoes of sugar. We commandeered a cargo on Harvey & Company and we commandeered a cargo on Rossiter & Company, and we took it and distributed it amongst the trade, and we made the trade put up their cheques for the amount of sugar, and then we handed them the sugar.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Supposing you had not got commitments for all the cargoes, where would you get the money?

HON. MR. WINTER:—The Board would not order any sugar except what they had orders for.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—There may have been a time when there were two or three hundred barrels over. But, remember, whatever we may have done was done in War time. However, to get back to the point of sugar, I think the mistake made was in these gentlemen going into the purchase of sugar and taking a half a million dollars worth of public money to buy the first stock of sugar they imported, and they took a lot of that sugar out of the hands of private tradesmen who would have made a loss of \$35,000 on it except that the Food Control Board stepped in and relieved them. I think, though, it would have been very hard on these people if the Board had not done that. But if there had been no Food Board—

HON. MR. MEWS:—You are speaking now after the event.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I had two and a quarter years of experience, and I learnt something about it; at least, I flatter myself that I did.

With reference to the speech of my honourable friend, Mr. Browning, I do not want to make this a debating

point, but yesterday he said he considered the question before the House the most important one that was ever before the country. I agree with him that that is so, and because I think it is why I want to make clear some of the issues that are obscured by his presentation of the case. To begin with, he says that the chief difficulties that hampered or impaired the efficiency of the fishery regulations was that it was not known that there was any Norwegian or Danish fish to be thrown on the market. Well then, why did not the trade learn about it?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The same thing applies to New Brunswick. The lumber market there is very bad. The people of New Brunswick did not know that lumber was going to be unloaded on them as it was.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Not alone is the New Brunswick market demoralized, but the whole lumber market of Canada. Take our own condition. You cannot sell lumber in this place to-day. And our lumber is not the kind of lumber that can go out of Newfoundland and go into competition with lumber of other countries. The fact that lumber was unloaded on the market was only one factor out of many that made the price go down. I know something about it for this reason, that when we were in British Columbia at the Press Conference we were everywhere confronted with terrible stories of depression in the lumber market, due to the world depression.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—If my honourable friend would look through the proceedings of the British Columbia Parliament he would see that it was the dumping of lumber held by the British Government during the War on the market that made a surplus not anticipated by the trade, and so put down the price.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That was one of the factors.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—A very great factor. And the same thing applies to fish.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The dumping of fish on the market by the British Government was one of the factors, but when my honourable friend says that we did not know that was going to be done, I say, we ought to have known.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—They did not know that this lumber would be thrown on the market, and it is hardly likely that our people here who have no system of getting information could be informed of the fish.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—There is this difference which the honourable gentleman forgets with respect to Newfoundland codfish. We do not consume very much, relatively, in this country. It all has to go out. With regard to British Columbia lumber and New Brunswick lumber, there is a big demand all over Canada for it for all sorts of purposes, and I say that while the other factor operated to some extent, the big factor was the depression that brought about the collapse in the domestic market, but one of the arguments underlying this collapse of the fish regulations was that all the information was going to be available. Now I was never a strong partizan on this question of fish regulations, and all through the autumn I used to discuss with business men, members of the Advisory Board and others, who used to say, "We are going to win out on this," and I would say, "Are you satisfied that there is no fish available to come into competition?" The answer was, "We know where every cod is that is in the world." This was in October and November, and in December the bottom blew out of the whole thing. Now I could take my oath on that, that members of the Advisory Board said they knew where every cod-tail was that was in the world, and what do we find in the long run? But

my honourable friend's argument breaks down through this fact, that if there was this quantity of Norwegian and Danish fish available, our stock of fish was one-third smaller than ordinarily, and if we admit that there was an excess of fish in Norway and we can see there was less in this country, there could not have been much more than an average quantity available for the world's markets. And, getting to that point, I will now return to the question of Greece. My honourable friend here, Mr. Ryan, knows very well, but in the hurry of the moment I am sure he forgot to say, that the chief cause of our inability to make sales in Greece through the Codfish Exportation Board was the fact that the price of fish going to Greece was boosted up in order that people here who owned vessels would be able to get a paying freight out of the cargo. Let me take the famous case of Smith and Shipman. Figures which I could produce here to-morrow went to show that Smith and Shipman were making \$4.50 a quintal profit off fish that they bought here, sent to New York, and sent across by steamer. I went to a member of the Advisory Board and said "How do you account for this? Why is this man who is a stranger here, with offices in his hat, who has no connection with the country, how is it he is able to come down here and make \$4.50 a quintal profit?" and the explanation that the price was put up for Greece in order that our people who have vessels would be able to get a freight because these people put their money into vessels during the War, and now the value has gone down, and we think they are entitled to make some profit on the freightage of fish from here to Greece. I think that is why we lost the Greece market.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I do not think that is correct. It was the very high price of fish that was going there and

the fact that nobody was allowed to send a vessel unless the cargo was sold beforehand that made us lose Greece.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Whatever the cause, the fact remains that Smith and Shipman were sending fish from here via New York, at the same time that people were not permitted to send fish from here direct unless they got a very high figure, and everybody knows that Smith & Shipman went into court to look for a Mandamus, and the Government, rather than have the whole thing brought forward, agreed to give them the permit they were looking for, and they sent a shipment by the "Rosalind" last summer, and made \$4.50 a quintal on it.

Now we come to Italy. The story of Italy hardly needs to be retold. There are honourable gentlemen here who know that Italy could get all the fish she wanted and did get all the fish she wanted and did not take our fish. The suggestion that that is due to the newspapers, is, I think, not a sound one. After all, I assume that there are people in Italy who have agents here. I do not know who they are. But Spain and Portugal had agents here, and if Italy did, he reported to them how things were, and if Italy did not have an agent here, the Italians showed a great lack of foresight. When we talk about keeping information from ourselves, we must remember that Norway gives us information all the year around. Every week we can go down to the Board of Trade and see the returns of the Norwegian fishery for the previous week, and yet in the Bill that we passed at the last session, there was a clause, to which I objected at the time, to penalize people from giving information. In my opinion, no man is harmed by the Press. For four or five months the Government has held back the fact that public money was used to buy

fish. The sensible thing to have done was to give it out at the time. Nobody was deceived, and the only people who are hurt by it are the Government. I think it was a great mistake.

Now coming to Spain, Spain was not a regulated market at the beginning of last fall. The price in Spain was up to regulation figure, but because we could not sell anywhere else, people shipped their surplus to Spain, and the Spanish market became worse than any other, and I believe that that fish was sent to Spain for something like 25 or 30 shillings, or perhaps less.

Then take the Portuguese market, the price was put at an extraordinary figure, and ultimately we had to come down, and a few weeks ago we had to take the regulations off Portugal altogether. Take Brazil, the price was fixed at 102, and then a circular was sent out that 100 might be accepted, and then it was said, as about other places, that the members of the Advisory Board or the firms they represented, having inside information, sold their own cargoes first. Now I do not say that is true. I have no knowledge of whether or not it is true, but I do say this, that you can go to any Board of Trade man and you will get many to say that in their opinion, the people on the Advisory Board used their position for their own advantage. I cannot state the charge as a fact, because I do not know enough about the matter, but it does seem peculiar that the members of the Advisory Board or the firms they represented were the ones that made the sales of fish.

Now all these things go to prove that the regulations have been a mistake. I am not criticising the good faith of those who brought in the bills and supported them last year. I believe the regulations were a mistake, but I believe they were honest. I do

not agree with the regulations. They were an experiment. I was prepared to support them as an experiment. I am not prepared to advocate their continuance, because I believe the experiment has been a hopeless failure. My honourable friend suggests that, so far as standardization is concerned, it may be claimed that they are beneficial. I am not satisfied with the evidence that I have seen that they have been an advantage, and I will give my honourable friend my reasons. One of the regulations provided that there should be no fish shipped tal qual; it should be all culled. Well, I think it could be disputed that a firm which was connected with the adoption of the policy and with its enforcement shipped a cargo of talqual to Europe a few days ago. This was stated in the Board of Trade rooms, so that I have no hesitation in repeating it, though I do not guarantee it. And I do not think it can be denied that Mr. Harris of Grand Bank—Mr. George Harris, I think, the younger man—wired from Oporto a few weeks ago and instructed his people at Grand Bank that cargoes of fish belonging to that firm were to be shipped talqual in defiance of the regulations. So, so far as that rule has been concerned, it cannot have been a success, if that is the position. My honourable friend said that it was wise to get all information possible about the fishery. Well, that was the policy last year, but we all remember how our honourable friend, Mr. Grieve, so emphatically objected last year to that phase of it, that he and everybody else had to give information and it went into the Marine and Fisheries Department, where it became the property of the Minister—and I am not speaking of any particular Minister, but the Minister for the time being—and his Advisory Board, and these people could, if they so wished, use that informa-

tion for their own benefit. I do not say that they did do so, but you can find a lot of people who will say that they did. My honourable friend went on to say that we had a cycle of six or seven years resulting in insolvency, well, we are not singular in that respect. That applies to nearly every country in the world. The honourable member shakes his head. I rarely make a statement here that I cannot give some substantial evidence to support.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Other countries may have difficulties, but not disasters such as come upon us.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—One of the greatest financial disasters in the history of the world occurred in the United States in 1893, another occurred in 1900, and another in 1907.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Yes, that is an entirely different thing altogether. These panics were not caused by the general trade, nor did they effect the affairs of the country. It was their system of financing that was the cause of it. The country was rich in itself, but the system of financing they had was tight. At the present day this does not occur.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is not that precisely what causes every panic? There was a panic in the U. S. and in Canada in the fall and there is a condition of commercial depression there to-day. But what has brought about that condition? Only what has brought it about here. The fact that they have commodities they can't sell. My hon. friend suggested the regulations are a panacea for that sort of thing and he says we should continue to use them. He says he congratulates the Government. Does he consider the experiment a success?

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Not an absolute success; but if they had been supported they would have been.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It may conceivably be that a situation

may arise where a policy of regulation would be effective, but I do not think so in this country. I recollect making the remark in 1919 when the regulations were introduced that I hoped something might come of them, but I could not see why, if they had all the virtue claimed for them, nobody else had discovered it, and it was left to two or three people in Newfoundland to produce this panacea for all the commercial ills for 18 months with what result: that to-day four or five million dollars, according to some people has been lost on 1½ million qtls. of fish and that is an experiment I do not think we can afford to repeat. The illustration of my hon. friend is clear evidence of the lighthearted spirit with which this matter was gone into. Somebody thought he had discovered a wonderful thing in white nape fish, and the Advisory Board, presumably composed of men who thought they knew what they were doing, made the highest price for that, and then the next thing we saw was some unfortunate people going about from door to door trying to sell it. I trust, in the light of what has happened during the past 18 months, the Government will see their way clear to abandon the attempt of fish regulations, because I think such a policy is only going to perpetuate the evil conditions existing at present.

The Address in Reply then passed the House without division.

Second reading of the Municipal Bill was deferred.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 7th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Before proceeding with the regular business of the day I should like to draw attention to the report of Mr. Steer's remarks on the last day. That perhaps

may not appear of very much importance but as a matter of fact my ideas of interference of the Government in matters of business is entirely in the opposite direction. I consider it the duty of the Government to interfere in all business; that our Governments up to the present have not interfered sufficiently with business. As I understand the Government is revising the tariff, I hope when they do they will make a distinctive protective tariff, not only a revenue tariff, and in doing so they will be quite justified in insisting on the affairs of the company or private concern being inspected, thus assuring the public that advantage will not be taken to increase profits, but that they are worked in the interest of the public generally. Therefore looking at it from that point of view I say it is essentially the Government's duty, as witness the U. S. to-day where there is a great controversy over the proposed tariff to protect the farmers. Therefore I should like to repudiate his idea and go on record as favoring the Government interfering in all matters and seeing that the public is safeguarded. As a manufacturer and one who helped to build up manufacturing, I know what disabilities they are under and while the public at large have the impression that the manufacturers have a great protection, it is not so. Any person abroad with a surplus of stock can very easily prevent the factories here running in full as far as possible.

During the debate, I am sorry to say that personal business of hon. gentlemen came up in large measure and private matters used as a sort of red herring to place across an argument. It is embarrassing to individuals who are engaged in debate that their own business affairs which are quite outside should be brought in, and I do not think it is quite the

thing. There is another matter I wish to explain here publicly, as it was brought up here, and that is the relation between myself and the Rennie Baking Co. some years ago, as to their being closed up by Messrs. Harvey and ourselves. There was an arrangement for 10 years. The business was not satisfactory owing to the competition going on; there was no room here for three factories, it only made the goods more expensive. In the biscuit business at that time there was an investment of \$600,000, and just one per cent of that amount was paid for ten years. That was the arrangement, and I think it was a good one. It not only benefitted the three of us individually but the public at large. They were much benefitted by it because immediately after we were able to manufacture at a much less figure and prices were kept down, and at no time has the biscuit business been more than a mere living. And talking of these things while the public think the industry is highly protected with 40% on fancy goods and 2% per lb. on plain, it is not so, because the duty on the raw materials together with coals, &c., it was no protection at all. Therefore there was quite an amount of goods dumped in here not at the market price abroad, but at a figure that would compete with our prices here. With that explanation I repudiate this suggestion of Hon. Mr. Steer that I object to Government interference. I court it provided the Government makes a reasonable tariff for all industries and they have a right to go in and see the public's interests are protected.

HON. PRESIDENT:—Of course the public were under the impression that the money you paid out was taken from them, and not your own money.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Yes, Mr. President, that was the position.

HON. PRESIDENT:—I do not

think they appreciate it just yet. I have not been convinced of it myself yet.

HON. MR. RYAN:—The public pretty well understood when you and A. Harvey & Co. amalgamated in this business that it was in order to keep the price up and not to lower them.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—It was not so.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I think the amalgamation was made not for the benefit of the public, who used the bread and biscuit, but for the benefit of the two companies.

HON. PRESIDENT:—With that explanation I hope the country will be satisfied.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I avail of the opportunity to point out to Hon. gentlemen the particular portions or sections of the Bill which in my opinion will better regulate or control civic affairs and materially aid the good government of the city.

In introducing this Bill I am not doing so at the request of the Government, because it is not a Government measure, but really at the request of the Mayor of the city. The Bill is very comprehensive in its character. With most of the new sections introduced into the Bill I concur, but in my judgment the Bill does not go far enough; it limits the powers of the Council and does not give that freedom of control and action which in my opinion it should have. The present Bill has been before the public for some years and the contents of it are familiar to hon. gentlemen. I, therefore, propose to point out to the House only those sections of the Bill which differ from the Act now on the Statute Book.

The first section is Section 8. This deals with the qualification of voters. Under the present law every householder has a right to vote for a Mayor and six councillors. If the present Bill becomes law the franchise will be extended and the right will be con-

ferred upon both male and female taxpayers, tenants and occupiers or owners of property liable to taxation. It also purports to confer the franchise upon all persons male over the age of 21 years who are not ratepayers. Such persons will be subject to a poll tax for exercising the right of voting.

It must be apparent to all that we have a large number of persons in this city who get the benefits and advantages of city services without being called upon to pay for their upkeep and maintenance. The poll tax is, therefore, introduced for the first time in civic life in this city in order that that class of citizen may contribute directly to the city's revenues.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Was there a poll tax formerly?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—No. The right of voting could be only exercised by a householder.

The next sections are 22 and 23. Hon. gentlemen will observe that the Mayor and Councillors do not hold office for a full period of 4 years. The three Councillors receiving the lowest number of votes will hold office for two years; then an election takes place to fill vacancies caused by the retirement of the three Councillors. An election then takes place for a second year, the object being to have on the Board men of experience and knowledge of civic affairs; the incoming Councillors thus having the advantages of having had experience in the management and control of the city.

Section 24 deals with the amount of compensation to be paid to the Mayor and Councillors. Section 25 prescribes the form of oath of office and 26 makes provision for the filling of vacancies in the Council caused by the death or retirement of a Councillor.

The next sections are from 56 to 65. Ever since we have had city government no power exists by which it is possible to acquire property of any kind for the benefit of the city. No

power was given to hold or acquire property. These sections vest in the city, the city water supply, and all the plant, etc., connected therewith, the freehold of every street no matter how acquired, the parks, the Parade ground, Bowring Park donated by the Bowring family to the citizens of St. John's. I cannot refrain from expressing the gratification which I feel at the munificence of the gift of the Bowring family. It will serve to perpetuate a name which has been long honourably identified with the trade and industry of the country and every philanthropic object that aimed at uplifting and benefiting the whole country.

Under the sections referred to the Council will have power to acquire property which it may deem necessary for the use of the city.

Sections 70 and 71 make it obligatory upon the city engineer to prepare a plan of the city. This plan, as hon- gentlemen will see, will be of a very comprehensive character and is a very necessary record to have.

Sections 83 and 84 give power to the Council to borrow money for local improvements, but the money is not to be considered as part of the funded debt of the city.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—without limit?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Not in the sense in which the hon. gentleman asks the question. The money borrowed under the sections referred to will be repaid by the owners of land whose property is benefited by the improvements made. For instance the owner of the property may not be able to pay down the whole cost of the making of the improvements. The Council would therefore find it necessary to borrow the amount, giving the owner of the property time within which to pay the amount expended in making improvements in property.

The next section is 88. This gives power to the Council to acquire land

for the building of houses, to borrow money for such purposes, to lay out playgrounds, to sell or lease or build upon land that may be acquired. It is scarcely necessary for me to remind the House that housing conditions in this city, to say the least, in a most unsatisfactory state. A very large number of people are without anything approaching adequate housing accommodation. Where private enterprises fail to successfully grapple and cope with a matter of this kind, it is incumbent upon public authorities to step in and apply the remedy. If we have any regard for the future welfare of the citizen we cannot manifest it in any better manner than by providing proper homes. The home is the foundation of society and if it be undermined by economic conditions or by apathy on the part of public men, then a deplorable condition of affairs will result.

The next Section, 92, is a very important one. It deals with what is known as town planning. Under the law as it now stands and ever since we had municipal government houses have been built, roads laid out, streets extended without any pre-arranged plans. The town planning mentioned in the section will be similar to that found in other cities or places having any pretence to the name of one. The work of this Commission will be to lay out and advise a plan upon which the city in the future will be built. All extensions, improvements, no matter of what kind will be the work of this commission to plan in advance. This will mean that all extensions, improvements or work to be done in the city will be regulated and controlled in a large measure by this commission.

The 93rd Section gives power to the Council, whenever in their opinion it may be necessary to state that within certain areas houses or alley ways are unfit for human habitation because of the bad condition of the houses, the

narrowness of the street, or the want of light or proper convenience; are dangerous to the health of the inhabitants, either of the buildings in the area or of the neighbouring buildings, to expropriate the property in such area and to prepare some scheme for the improvement of it. The section provides the manner in which this shall be done and how compensation is to be assessed. I feel it is a section that will command itself to the favourable consideration of the House, because there are areas of the description in this city.

The next Section is 94. It is a very important one and I am sure that it will meet with the unqualified support of this House. Under this Section a lessee may purchase freehold of the land upon which he has erected a building by the payment of a sum equal to twenty times the amount of the annual rent. This applies to the assignee of the lessee as well.

The next section, 95, may be called retroactive legislation but nevertheless of a very necessary and desirable character. Under it persons who have built on land in this city will be unable if this section becomes law to apply for an extension of the lease beyond its original term and purchase from the owner the freehold of the land. If the lessee does not exercise the right of extension of lease or purchase of the freehold he will be entitled upon the expiration of his lease to the unexhausted value of improvements made by him or his assigns.

Section 96 deals with the manner in which the question of compensation for improvements is to be determined. Very large sums of money in the past have been expended by persons in building becomes the absolute property of the land owner without the lessee tenant being in any manner entitled to compensation, to extension of the lease or a right of purchasing the freehold. Large areas of land in this

city,—the most valuable section of it—are held by persons who never did reside in this country,—absentee landlords who are the curse of every country. The section referred to will help in a large measure to get rid of the incubus of absenteeism.

Section 120 enables the Council in the event of taxes being in arrears for more than six months to order the water to be turned off from any house in the occupancy of the debtor. This may seem at first sight a dangerous power to put into the hands of a Council, but if we will reflect upon the fact that since the tenant does not now pay the taxes to the Council the landlord is made solely liable: he collects from the tenant. Therefore no hardship will be inflicted when water is turned off from a house occupied by an owner of property who has defaulted in the payment of city taxes due by him.

Section 132 empowers the Council to pave the streets with material of a substantial and permanent character, and makes provision as to how the cost is to be borne—one half to be paid by the city, the other half to be paid by owners of property abutting on the street.

Section 139 provides that where property abuts on the side walk the City Engineer will have power to see that any spout or rain conductor on the building is connected with a drain or sewer.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is there to be a penalty?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—There is no special penalty provided for non-compliance but there is a section of the Bill which provides that where no penalty is otherwise provided that any person who contravenes or fails to comply with any provision of the Act, or with any bye law, rule or regulation passed by the Council shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$100,000 or in default of payment to imprisonment not exceeding 90 days.

Section 146 provides for the keeping of railway tracks when laid along or across any street of the city that they shall be maintained on a level with the surface of the street, the Company operating to be responsible.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Who is to be the Judge in these things?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The City Engineer.

Section 148 provides that a bell shall be rung by the engineer of any engine or cars before proceeding to cross any street and that the speed shall not exceed six miles an hour.

Section 149 empowers the Council to make rules and regulations requiring persons or companies operating a railway whose tracks cross any streets of the city to instal railway gates as a protection of the public. More than one accident has occurred because of the absence of any such law.

Section 150. Under this section Council may regulate or prohibit the ringing of bells, the tooting of horns or the blowing of whistles, in other words, all unnecessary noise. This is a very necessary provision to have in the charter.

Section 154. Hon. gentlemen, this section enables the police to remove cabs and trucks standing in front of unoccupied buildings to such a distance apart so that traffic or business may not be impeded.

Section 158. This gives power to Council to regulate traffic and also the erection of wires, the laying of pipes, conduits, etc., under the streets, and the removal of snow and ice from side walks and gutters.

Section 165. This deals with the liability of the city as regards damage to property over which the Council has no control. While this is the law the Council thought it necessary to insert it in the Charter because claims of various kinds are from time to time on the Council by citizens for compensation for damage done for which the

Council is not in any way liable, and may think that an injustice is done because they did not receive compensation. The Council is liable only for what it does or omits to do, that is where a Statutory duty is cast upon it, or where through the negligence of its officials damage is caused the citizen.

Section 173. This important section provides that when the owner of a building held under lease is assessed under Order of Council for the cost of local improvements, he should be entitled to recover from the ground rental at the termination of his lease the value of such improvements, and that the amount to be paid is to be determined by arbitration.

Section 178 enables the Council to promote the use of septic tanks in localities where sewerage connections are impossible. Various applications have from time to time been made for permission to construct septic tanks. The Council has had to refuse permission because it had no right to accede to the request.

Section 192 deals with slaughter of cattle and the dressing of same for human food and provides a penalty for non-compliance with the section by a person contravening it.

The next Section 193 gives power to the Council to regulate the management of abattoirs either within or without the city limits, and the maintenance and erection of public markets and to make regulations prohibiting the sale in such markets of any kind of article or produce. There is no power in the Council to regulate or control the sale of food to man within the city or to regulate the management of abattoirs.

The next new section is 194. This empowers the Council to devote such a portion of the revenues of the City as may be necessary to provide or assist other authorities in making medical examination of school children. In every well regulated city of the world

they are now paying more and more attention to the health of the future citizen. We know in all cities there are a good number of children who have defective teeth, or suffer from diseases of the eye, ear and throat, and whose parents are not possessed of sufficient goods of the world to enable them to pay for medical attendance.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Does the Council pay for this?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Yes. The revenues of the city may be utilised to carry out the objects of the section.

Section 196 enables the Council to establish a public library and to borrow money under the authority of the Governor in Council for such purposes.

Sections from 197 to 200 inclusive deal with the keeping of dogs within the city limits. From my own knowledge of civic affairs I do not think there is a greater menace to the health of the citizen and the cleanliness of the city than the manner in which dogs are kept here. It is next to impossible to keep this city clean, free from garbage and filth because dogs are permitted to prowl about the streets at all hours of the night and day overturning receptacles in which garbage is placed with the result that the contents are taken up by the strong winds which frequently blow and carried and deposited all over the city. It is absolutely necessary that the Council should have power to deal with the keeping of dogs and I earnestly hope that this section if it becomes law will be strictly enforced.

The next section I will call the attention of the hon. gentlemen to is Section 213. This defines the manner in which a large proportion of the revenues of the city will be raised. The tax is imposed by the rental value of property.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—A new tax?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—No. My own

opinion is that tax upon the rental values is wrong in principle. The tax should be placed upon the selling value of property and not upon the rental value. In this manner all buildings in the city would bear a fair and equitable proportion of taxation, but where you have a tax assessed upon a rental value certain classes of property do not pay the amount they ought, while another class has to pay more than it should, and until the present system of taxation is abolished and the tax be upon absolute value this anomaly will continue. There is one portion of the section, however, which must appeal to us all and that is that it makes provision of a reduction of 33 1/3rd per cent in the taxes imposed upon certain buildings having a rental value of less than \$120.00 a year. This is a very wise provision and will in the future have the effect of bringing about increased building operations in a class and style of house suited to the needs and requirements of the working classes.

Section 220 deals with the tax to be paid by occupants of shops or stores where merchandise is kept. The rate to be paid is not to exceed twenty-five cents per dollar on the average value of stocks carried.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is that a new tax?

HON. M. GIBBS:—No. But it is a slight increase on the present tax.

The next section is 224. That deals with unoccupied buildings and makes it obligatory upon the part of owners to notify the Council that they are unoccupied. As such they will be liable for only one-third of the rate imposed while the house remains vacant. At the present time there are no means of keeping a record of unoccupied houses and when the collector comes to collect the taxes he is very often met with the excuse "the house is unoccupied and has been for some time past." Under this section the owner must

notify the Council, otherwise he will not be entitled to the rebate.

Sec. 337 deals with the office of Appraisers, their duties and the manner in which they shall be performed. It makes provision that a month's notice be given by the Council to any person whose appraisal is in excess of the preceding one.

The next section is 238. This makes it obligatory upon the part of the Council to make up their estimates of revenues and expenditure before the 15th of January in each year.

Section 241 provides that when the tax imposed upon persons in the city is paid before the 15th of March or 15th September in any year he will be entitled to a discount of 10 per cent. This is really an inducement, as it were, held out to taxpayers enticing them to make prompt payment of taxes due the city.

Section 243 enables the Council to take proceedings for the purpose of recovering taxes in such a manner as they could not formerly do. In addition to the right which they now have, this section gives them an additional one—it vests in them the right to distrain upon the goods of a person to compel the payment of city taxes. This may appear at first sight to be harsh, but in all cities where responsibility is in the hands of the people the right of distress is given to those vested with the power of administering civic affairs to collect taxes, and I do not think that the power has even been abused.

Section 246 provides for a Commission to be known as the Municipal Commission. It is the duty of this Commission to deal with the arrears of taxes that may be due the Council at the end of each year. At the present time there is a very large sum of money due, but owing either to indifference on the part of Councils or the desire of the members not to unduly press people for payment these ar-

rears instead of decreasing have been increasing, and it is with the object of dealing with this phase of civic affairs that a Commission is to be appointed for the purpose of collecting such sums of money.

The next section, 249, provides for persons over 21 years of age who are not liable to the payment of any city tax on property exceeding a rental value of \$40.00 being liable to a poll tax of \$5.00 per annum.

The next section to which I will direct your attention is 253. This deals with persons who refuse without just cause to permit the appraisers to inspect premises of which they are owners, or who knowingly give the appraisers false information concerning the value of their property.

The next section is 257. This deals with the various forms of licenses which are to be paid. One of the objects of this section is to prevent fire insurance agents and others from evading the payment of the tax. For instance we have people who are agents for two or three fire insurance companies, and only pay the tax on one, and then others who carry on business for underwriters and evade payment of the tax.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Does this section increase the amount?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—No.

Section 259 deals with contractors and the fees to be paid by them. The fee now paid is \$500.00, irrespective of the contract price. It was thought that discretionary powers should be given to the Council. For instance a man may be a contractor for \$10,000. It would not be right for him to pay the same fee as a contractor for 50,000.00. It is for the purpose of meeting conditions of the kind that the section proposes to make the fee one-half of one per cent of the contract price, the minimum fee being \$100.00.

Section 263 deals with the taxes which banks doing business in the city

have to pay, and how the tax is to be computed. The tax now payable by banks with a capital of ten millions or more is \$2,000.00, if I mistake not; banks with a capital of \$4,000,000.00 to \$10,000,000.00, \$1,500.00 and banks with a capital of \$4,000,000.00 or less, \$750.00. This section gives power to the Council to impose a tax of one-sixteenth of one per cent, the tax, however, not to exceed \$3,000.00.

Sections 266-275 deals with water rates and the scale to be paid.

The next section is 279. Sub-section (b) is really the new part of that section. It deals with the appropriation by the Legislature of General, Special and Surplus Grants for roads, streets and bridges in the electoral districts of St. John's East and West. The city, as honourable gentlemen know, contributes its quotoa to the general revenue of the Colony, and it very often happens,—it has happened in the past and will happen in the future,—that large sums of money are needed for special purposes. In the past the City has not received any of the special grants which have been appropriated for roads and other like public improvements, and this section is to enable the city to get its share of these special grants which are voted by the Legislature for public improvements throughout Newfoundland, in other words get the same as outport districts, its per capita share.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That may be the intention, but I do not think this phraseology will carry it out; however, we will come to that later.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Section 286 is a very important section. It restricts the Council from undertaking expenditures in excess of the amount of its receipts or income without the authority of the Governor in Council.

Section 297. This deals with the borrowing powers of the Council, and prevents the Council from borrowing on the credit of the city unless au-

thorised to do so by the Governor in Council.

Section 298. This section makes members of the Council jointly and severally liable if any debt is incurred or money expended beyond the amount authorised, the Councillors voting for the payment of money or incurring of the debt being severally jointly liable for the amount.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Civilly or criminally?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Civilly.

The next section is 305. This section deals with the manner in which money borrowed shall be repaid. It is a very important section and one which will be of inestimable advantage to the city, because it makes its obligatory on the part of Councillors to make provision for the payment of the money borrowed.

Section 306 deals with the liquidation of loans, making it obligatory that the loans shall be payable in annual instalments, divided into an equal part of the principal falling due each year, the first payment to be due within twelve months after the issue of the loan.

Section 332 is the next section and it provides that a building which is not a dwelling at the time of the passing of this Act will when converted into a dwelling house become subject to all the provisions with respect to dwellings. It has occurred in the past that when a building has been converted into a dwelling, pressure has been brought to bear upon Councillors so that it may not be liable to provisions of the Charter in relation to dwellings. To remedy this condition of affairs the Commission deemed it advisable to have this section inserted.

These are the salient provisions of the Bill and the only new sections of it, and I may observe here that a great deal of unnecessary delay has already taken place in not providing the city with powers necessary to its proper

government and administration. For a greater number of years civic government has been suffering from a want of legislative powers enabling it to function properly. This has been due to apathy and indifference as well as to a groundless fear that any more powers given would be detrimental to the interest of a certain class of citizens.

Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self evident proposition that no people ought to be free until they are fit to use their freedom. The maximum is worthy of the fool in the old story who resolved not to go into the water till he had learnt to swim. If men are to wait for liberty till they become wise in slavery they may indeed wait for ever.

To those who are fearful of the march of city democracy I would say that from my own experience as Mayor of this city I have come to the belief that a people's government is better than a business man's government, and that instead of too much democracy we have too little democracy. A study of history has taught me that the progress of civilisation has been a constant struggle of liberty against privilege; that wherever privilege has been dominant liberty has passed away and national life has decayed.

This Charter is a decided improvement upon the old because it affords a means whereby some of the ills which the city suffers from may be cured.

How many of us realise that the modern city marks an epoch in our civilisation and that through it a new society has been created. Life in all its relations has been altered. A new civilization has been born. Many of us fail to appreciate the full import of this fact. The modern city marks a revolution—a revolution in industry, politics, society and life itself.

Its coming has destroyed a rural society whose making has occupied

mankind since the fall of Rome. Man has entered upon an urban age. He has become a communal being. The increasing pressure of population's fast filling up the waste places of the globe. This of itself forecasts the life of the future. And in consequence the city will no longer be an incidental problem. It has already become the problem of society and the measure of our civilisation.

The extent of this change is seen in the drift of population. Four-fifths of the population of Great Britain dwell in the cities. Nearly half the population of the United States dwell in the cities.

The nineteenth century unloosed the genii of industrialism and we cannot go back to the simple agricultural conditions of an early age. The city has become the central feature in modern civilization and to an ever increasing extent the dominant one. Never before has society been organised on such a basis and the earlier type of city offers little in common with the modern "abyss" which like a whirlpool draws to its vortex the good and the bad, the strong and the weak, and which in some form or other is the final form of organised political life. The modern city has erased the landmarks of an earlier society. Man has entered upon an urban age, the final stage of his development. The city has drawn mankind into an intimate relationship, a common dependency from which there is no escape. We have tasted the wine of many wants. Our life has become one of divided powers and responsibilities and society has developed an organism like the human body of which the city is the head, heart and centre of the nervous system. The city has become a tremendous agency for human advancement. It already serves us to a greater extent than the State.

The city has woven our lives into the lives of others. No longer is each

household an independent one, producing for its own wants alone and supplied from within. The city is but a part of a man's desire for a larger life, for free social intercourse, for amusement, as well as a response to the industrial revolution which has superseded domestic industry by the machine.

Within the city the game of life is played and there are many capital prizes. Here opportunity and fortune are to be found. Here business centres. Here life is full and human. Failure may come it is true, but there is the chance, and life, movement and recreation even in failure.

The humanising forces of to-day are almost proceeding from the city. They are creating a new moral sense, a new conception of the obligation of political life, obligations which in earlier conditions of society did not and could not exist. Step by step individual rights have become merged into larger social ones.

And it is this very increase in public activities that renders the city attractive to the poor as well as to the rich. In earlier days even the most elementary public functions were performed by the individual. He paved, cleaned and lighted the street before his door. He was his own constable. Such health protection as he enjoyed was the result of his own vigilance. To-day the city protects his life and property. It oversees his house construction and protects him from fire. It cleanses and lights his streets and collects his garbage. It offers nature in the parks, supplies him with opportunities for recreation and pleasure. It takes the refuge from his door and brings back water, gas and frequently heat and power at the same time. It inspects his food, protects his life, and safeguards him from contagious diseases.

All these intrusions into the field of private business have involved no loss

of freedom to the individual. Every increase in public activity has in fact added to personal freedom.

Such are some of the palpable gains which the city has brought. But the real gain of all is found in the fact that democracy has been forced into activities outside the sphere of government. We are being drawn into an intimacy, a solidarity which makes the welfare of one the welfare of all. But along with the gain there is a loss account—a terrible loss account. The city has replaced simplicity, industrial freedom and equality of fortune with complexity, dependence, poverty and misery close beside a barbaric luxury like unto that of ancient Rome. Vice, crime and disease have come in. The death rate has increased while infectious diseases and infantile morality ravaged the crowded quarters. The city exacts an awful price for the gain it has given us, a price that is being paid in human life, suffering and the decay of virtue and the family.

According to the investigations of Charles Booth a London born family disappears in three generations. In a manufacturing town only about half as many children grow to manhood as in the case of children of labouring people in a healthy country district. Were it not for the steady stream of rugged strength that comes from the countryside, the city would ultimately lose its population. And the unnumbered thousands who have come to the city, the artisans, workmen, girls, who gave their life work so long as work was to be had, are part of the sacrifice. And it is they who have built our homes, manned our industries and amassed the wealth which they did not enjoy.

There are certain economic tendencies in Anglo-Saxon institutions that seem to be inexorable. These tendencies are constantly increasing the masses of the poor, whether or not they are constantly making the rich richer.

It is difficult to believe that the advance in civilisation which has made all nature yield tribute to man's energy should produce such conditions and involve such burdens, or that the revolution in industry which has increased the productive power of the world a thousand fold should of necessity leave an increasing proportion worse off than before.

The movement of cities the world over is for home rule and a larger control of the machinery of government in the people. It is inspired by a demand for larger activities on the part of the city, a belief that democracy can best work out its problems when government is responsive as well as responsible to the immediate community which it serves. This programme of municipal reform contemplates that the city shall have the right to adopt its own Charter just as the people of a country make their own laws.

Under existing conditions the city has not the necessary powers as to its tenement or building laws; it cannot raise adequate revenues and it cannot exercise the necessary supervision over many matters which should be solely with its province. Under the present system of legislative control the city only enjoys such powers as the state may grant it. This bill in my opinion does not go far enough but nevertheless it is a decided improvement upon the existing one. The result of legal limitations is a lowering down of responsibility and a system of government which is wholly inelastic. The city has been placed in a straight jacket and it is then expected to develop strength and character. This is all the more unjust when it is remembered that within the city are to be found all the problems that confront the country at large.

The city is no tonly the problems of our civilisation: it is the hope of the future. In the city democracy is awakening; it is beginning to assert it-

self. Here life is free and eager and agencies co-operate to create a warmer sympathy, a broader spirit of responsibility, and a more intelligent political sense. In the greater number of cases it is better governed than the State.

The city is also being aroused to social and economic issues as well as to political ones. It is constantly taking on new activities and assuming new burdens. Everything tends to encourage this while many things render it imperative. All the twentieth century problems are to be found in the city. Proper and adequate housing, vice and crime, unemployment, education, care of health, juvenile delinquency, administration of justice, the vagrant and the tramp, the outcast—all of these are the result of false economic laws and of the growth of city life; they arise from the failure of those who comprise a community to live up to their responsibilities as members of society. True in this city these problems are not nearly as acute as exist elsewhere, but we have them at present on a small scale in our midst. In order to cope with them and prevent their growth we must view this Charter from a broad standpoint. It is not perfect by any means. Nothing that we can ever do in the world can attain perfection. The seal of imperfection is upon every act of ours. We can however use our best endeavours and our intelligence to aid in the carrying forward of a work of this character in which the interests of the city as a whole are so indissolubly bound up.

I cannot close without referring to the splendid services rendered the city by the gentlemen who have been in control of its civic affairs for some time past. In the drafting of the bill they have given their time and their abilities ungrudgingly in order to make the life of the city better than they found it. The Mayor, Mr. Gosling, has worked with a singlemindedness of

purpose, that whatever may be his faults—and who has not got them, merits approbation. His time and his talents have been given unstintedly to uplift the civic life of the city. At present we possibly fail to appreciate to the fullest extent the sincerity of his motives and his work, but as one who filled the office of Mayor, and who chafed under the manner in which the city was bound and gagged through the inelasticity of the present charter, I often wondered why he did not leave the office in disgust because of the want of power to grapple with the pressing needs of city life. Perhaps he has been more tenacious in his desire to secure adequate power than I was, or he may have found a greater awakening of civic thought, and a real desire on the part of citizens to meet the burdens of the complex life of the city.

I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the House then adjourned until to-morrow at 4 o'clock.

FRIDAY, April 8th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, I think we are indebted to the honourable gentleman for the very clear and comprehensive statement with which he introduced the Bill to the House on second reading, and equally, sir, I concur with him in his appreciation of the work done by the present Mayor and his associates, and I would add, by Mr. Gosling in his capacity of Chairman of the City Commission and those who were associated with him in that capacity to initiate the movement which is now coming to fruition in the Bill we have before us. The honourable gentleman's plea for Municipal reform was also appreciated, but I am afraid that we are a long way from realizing the

ideal which he sets out therein. With regard to his suggestion that any Council which should be in existence in the future should have further powers than set out in the Act, I would like to say that I entirely dissent from his opinion in that respect, and my reason for doing so is that I think it is always well to have a chain on a body dealing with public administration and the expenditure of public moneys. While I was going home yesterday afternoon I remarked to some of my colleagues who were going in my direction that one of the reasons why I was so strongly in opposition to that view was that at the present time practically every municipality in British Columbia is insolvent. That fact rather surprised those to whom I mentioned it, but I am able to confirm my statement by reference to the Toronto Financial Post of March 25th. I shall not read the article in detail; the headline will suffice: "Municipalities in British Columbia demand Provincial help. Many will go bankrupt if relief is not given. A new tax suggested. Province takes view that municipality having incurred debts should pay them." That refers, you will notice, to British Columbia. The tax in question is described in the Montreal Gazette of March 29th in these words: "A tax of \$5.00 on all male adults has been suggested in British Columbia as a means of helping the municipality out of financial difficulties. This is to be in addition to the goodly revenue expected from the Government Liquor Shops." You will remember that last year the British Columbia Government voted in favor of Government control of liquor and that the revenue obtained should be divided between the Government and the Municipalities equally, and the Gazette makes the comment: "The spending power of Canada and its representatives goes faster than the paying power of the

people." These references have to do with British Columbia, but I may add that in all the Western provinces very many of the municipalities,—most of them—are in the same position. When my honourable friend and myself crossed to Canada last summer the municipal situation there interested me a great deal. I took occasion to inquire both on the going and return trips as to the position. I found that the story was practically the same everywhere we went. The municipality was more or less bankrupt. In some towns there were municipal hospitals and other institutions of that sort which were hopelessly crippled. Take the cities of Calgary and Edmonton, these have a population of between sixty and seventy thousand each, probably the smaller number is nearer the actual population. That is about twice the population of St. John's. Both these cities had unpaid taxes of about three quarters of a million dollars. I believe our unpaid taxes are about \$120,000. Is that about right, Mr. Gibbs?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Yes.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well, you see, for twice the number of people they have six times the amount of unpaid taxes. That gives you an idea of the position. The Toronto World of March 31st dealing with the same question says editorially: "Quite a number of our Western Municipalities are falling down in the interest on their debentures and representations have been made to the Province of Saskatchewan"—I previously referred to British Columbia—"asking for some action on the part of the Province. The Hon. C. A. Dunning, Provincial Treasurer, declines to assume any responsibility in connection with the issue and is quite right in the attitude he takes. There is really no claim on the Province to assume responsibility for the municipality and the bond brokers are to blame." When

we were coming back, while we were at Edmonton, the provincial capital of Alberta, we were given a dinner at which the Premier, Mr. Stewart, spoke, and he stated his position with the most complete frankness. He said the Province wanted British money and British immigrants. He said he knew that British money that had been brought into Western Canada in the past had not had a square show, that a great deal had been lost through the unfair and dishonest representations made by speculators and traders in bonds and real estate, who had deceived the British investor absolutely as to the conditions that existed. He said, however, that in that province they had now taken action by which certain securities should be given through a special board created for that purpose, which would be a reasonable assurance at any rate to the British investors as to where they stood. I happened to travel in a car through a section of Jasper Park with Mr. Evans, a former Mayor of Edmonton, and he is my authority for what I am saying now, that all through that Province, as a result of the over-booming of Canada during the years preceding the war, numerous municipalities had defaulted; many more would default. In some of these towns you could travel by street-car for I may say miles through sections without a house, with wide streets laid in cement or asphalt, with fine sidewalks and with water and sewerage laid down, and not a house built. These were what they called suburban sub-divisions which had been speculated in, and again speculated in, and yet again speculated in, until they had to be sold wholesale for the taxes. I might say that when we were passing through to Victoria there was one paper we read with three pages of advertisements announcing the sale of property for unpaid taxes, and an editorial comment

upon the fact that unless the municipalities let up in their expenditure the entire Province would be bankrupt. Now British Columbia is perhaps the most interesting of all Provinces. The percentage of population of English descent is, I think, greater than in any other Province, except in the East, but the same thing prevails there. It prevails in Alberta and in Saskatchewan. It prevails in Manitoba.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—What portions of Canada more similar to Newfoundland, Montreal, for instance?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—But I would call the honourable gentleman's attention to the fact that Montreal is an outstanding example of municipal extravagance, and, I am sorry to say, corruption. Coming East, we get to Manitoba, well Manitoba has an example of municipal government, a surprising example of an entirely different character; that is the city of Winnipeg, which a year or so ago was in the hands of Soviets, who had practically thrown off all idea of recognising British constitutional procedure and getting down to the rule of the Reds. I travelled over a good deal of Winnipeg. I do not know how my friend opposite was placed in that respect, but I travelled once there with a man who had been a special constable, and he said that the greatest danger they had to face was the danger of fire. He was stationed for a time at a fire hose. Guards had to be on that place day and night to prevent these people from cutting the hose in the event of a fire. Now, of course, I do not need to argue that any conditions like that is going to arise here, but I do say that so far as the financial aspect is concerned, we ought to be chary of parting with the control by the Legislature over the money-raising authority which the Municipal Council should enjoy. It is a mistake, moreover, to suppose that in Western

Canada the Municipality possesses absolute control. That is a mistake entirely. If any one has the Montreal Star of March 26th he will find an article from Regina which shows that there is, to which all municipalities, and there are different grades, must submit their proposals for municipal or public improvements, and it is within the power of that Board to oppose them entirely. I will read the part. (Read extract.)

Now you will observe that even in that province some control is exercised by the government. In Ontario municipal affairs are administered in somewhat the same way. There is a department of the provincial administration which deals with all the proportions for public improvements and expenditure projected by the towns, villages, cities, &c., and anyone who has followed the progress of that province for the past few years will know there is a Hydro Electric Board, presided over by Sir Adam Beck, who have taken over the supplying of electrical energy, but the new Farmer's Government which went into power in 1919 has recently refused to endorse proposals for the extension of the Hydro Electric, taking the position that it has to be satisfied that this Board is working more efficiently and economically than the MacKenzie, Mann and other projects working side by side with it, and Premier Drury has appointed a Commission to inquire into the whole project and will be guided by the report of that Commission.

In Quebec, I regret to say, things are not municipally, as desirable as in Ontario. Montreal is an outstanding example of misgovernment and extravagance. The French Canadian is not adapted for financial administration, and the tendency is to administer affairs of the communities they represent. I was trying to recall the

phrase used some years ago—malversationists.

Sir Andrew MacPhail, who was here some years ago in connection with potatoes, described Quebec as the safety valve of Canada. The treasurer of the province is invariably an English speaking man. Mr. Walter Mitchell, being the present occupant of that office.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—It has been English speaking for 30 years.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Certainly as long as my recollection has been. But in the Maritime Provinces we find a condition approaching to almost where even the suggestion of dishonesty on the part of those in charge of municipal affairs, would not be seriously considered, but where there is a growing tendency towards illiterat spending and a lack of caution in spending money for civic improvements. A year ago I had the good fortune to meet Premier Murray and we had many talks on affairs in his province and our own colony, and he evidenced the growing tendency to spend money too generously. Of course at that time money was abundant. Very few people had seen the "cloud no bigger than a man's hand" that was beginning to overspread the sky, but now in the Maritime Provinces and all through Canada they are taking a much more serious view of this matter as we are ourselves. I mention these facts because I think it well to dispel the idea that prevails in the community that people are being unfairly dealt with, and that conditions are different from those elsewhere. I think it would be wise to stick fast to that principle in this country.

Turning direct to the Bill itself I would say that while I, and I think every member, we should ask ourselves whether the Bill cannot be considered or embodied, and whether it is necessary to have a bill of four or

five hundred sections to run the affairs of a city like St. John's, I am at a loss to understand.

HON. MR. MEWS:—This I take it is a consolidation of all the Acts.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well granted it is. I am going to cite an instance told me by a gentleman who is entitled to speak with authority in reference to a proviso for chimneys and he spoke of other instances, and said notes had been made on the bill and handed to the Prime Minister, and I suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill, he should get in touch with the Prime Minister and find out what he has before we go into committee. This man is of opinion that a great deal of the matter in the Bill might be eliminated and used in the form of bye-laws and amended from time to time as necessary, because once in the bill they cannot be amended unless in the form of an amending Act, at the next session of the legislature, but if in the form of bye-laws, could be amended by the Governor in Council or the Council as found necessary.

Another matter I take objection to is, the system of having half an election for different years, which means we are going to have all the trouble and expense of an election every two years, merely to put in three new men. The argument is you will still have at the Council Board some men who are familiar with affairs, but I would argue in reply that at the end of two years you will have to put in a new Mayor unless he wants to continue, and personally I do not see why we cannot have the lot elected for four years. Then again, so far as I know, in the Maritime Provinces, and certainly in Ontario, a Mayor and Council are elected every year, and there is no cutting of the Council in half, and they are prepared to have an entirely new administration. As a matter of fact, in Ontario the other day the new

membership of the provincial house was 83% of the total. We have seen similar occurrences in this country and I do not know, speaking by and large, we suffer from it. Then we ought to consider also whether it is wise to give the Mayor and Council the power to cut up the city in wards. The hon. gentleman opposite yesterday pointed out the danger of the jerry-mander. If the present system is the correct one, to elect 6 men at large, then I think that should be continued until the legislature sees fit to change it; if there is anything in favor of the ward system, let us start with it. There are many other sections in the Bill which I think, from our desultory talk yesterday, will need revision and alteration, but as regards the Bill as a whole I think there should be no objection to its being read a second time, which I now support.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Before the Bill is read a second time, I have a few observations to make, chiefly as a medical man. I have spent 20 years of my life travelling around this city from house to house, and am fairly familiar with conditions as existing to-day and as this has been introduced as a non-party measure, I think we should get our heads together and reason out as nearly as possible a charter that will improve St. John's. Like Hon. Mr. Mews and Sir Patrick McGrath last year I visited Canada and the thing that strikes one first is the cleanliness of the cities. There seems to be some hoodoo about St. John's. All Councils have been pledged to a cleaner city, but seem unable to do anything. I think the secret is they have not been provided with the funds by the citizens to keep the city clean. I think that is the trouble, not a lack of desire on the part of the people or the council, but have no funds, and this bill evidently aims to provide the necessary funds to keep St. John's, as it should be.

From a public standpoint and as a medical man, I think we should keep that in mind, a cleaner St. John's. Luckily epidemics have been wiped out. Our Public Health Department is most efficient in that respect, and we will never have another epidemic. Another point is the lack of transportation in the city. There is no question about it but St. John's must enlarge. It is congested, and the natural direction to go is Waterford Valley. Waterford is the most beautiful valley in Newfoundland, its climate is one month earlier than the city and it is due to the lack of extension of the street railway that that valley is not inhabited. As Sir Patrick McGrath states, in the west street car lines extend into the country for miles and miles, and here the service should have reached Bowring Park long ago, and that would have solved our difficulties in many respects. We should consider this Bill in the light of giving the Mayor and Council in the future enough of money from taxation to supply them with the means of cleaning up the city and keeping it as it should be.

HON. MR. POWER:—Mr. President, I think this Bill is a very elaborate Bill, and has so many paragraphs and sections we should send it to a committee to investigate and report on it. Some of the sections are ridiculous altogether, and I quite agree from my own experience, with Sir Patrick McGrath, that the power of the legislature should not be given away, but should retain its power over the Council and expenditure. They might go on and not care what they spent, and who is to pay: Only the taxpayers of this town. I would therefore move that a committee be appointed to take up the Bill and change whatever sections as might be necessary.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I am not prepared at this time to say anything regarding this bill except that I am sure

every member of the House is glad an effort is now being made to give the bill that will enable the Mayor and Council to deal with matters appertaining to the city as they have not had power to do for a long time. With the suggestion of the hon. gentlemen who has just spoken, I cannot agree, because it seems to me the best committee to consider this bill is the committee of the whole House, and I am sure the hon. gentleman in charge will afford all the time necessary to consider, and seriously consider, every paragraph of the bill that may need consideration as we pass through it in the committee stage. I think, sir, that there will have, necessarily, to be some amendments to a bill which is so comprehensive as this bill, but it is too late in the day to re-write it, and all we can do is to tackle it in committee and give it our best attention.

HON. MR. POWER:—I have no objection to the whole House acting as a committee instead of a special committee.

Said bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. McNAMARA gave notice of question.

HON. PRESIDENT announced the appointment by H. E. the Governor of the Commission of Internal Economy as follows:—Hon. President, L.C.; Hons. R. K. Bishop, Geo. Shea, Hon. Speaker, H.A., Hons. R. A. Squires, W. R. Warren and W. F. Coaker.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House then adjourned until Monday next at four o'clock.

MONDAY, April 11th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Municipal Bill. Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

On motion Section 2 was adopted.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, when the Bill was before the House on second reading it was suggested that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House. I thought I should avail of this opportunity to deal with this matter. In my opinion the facts of the whole situation is that we are giving the Council power to make regulations and rules in accordance with the Bill.

We are interested in this Charter to the extent of taxation. Now I have taken enough interest in this matter to go to a certain amount of trouble to find out the exact position of the city of St. John's at the present time, and what this Charter means.

Section 3 says "All Acts and parts of Acts specifically applicable to the city and inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed, and no general statutes or parts thereof inconsistent with this Act shall hereafter apply to the City." This begins our first lesson, so far as this House is concerned, of the responsibility of the House.

What was the condition of the city when the Hon. Mr. Shea was Mayor? With the permission of the House I shall briefly review it from that period to the present moment.

(Reads figures).

Expenditure and revenue under the different periods were as follows: (Reads figures).

It was referred to during the course of the debate on the second reading of the vast amount of arrears that had accumulated. The figures are as follows: (Reads figures).

At the present moment the consolidated debt of the city at 3½% is \$160,000. And at 4% is \$1,289,000. When Hon. Mr. Shea took over the mayoralty the debt was 2½ millions, but by arrangement with the Government in connection with land in the West End one million dollars was taken off. There is just now a floating debt bearing 6% of \$360,000.

There is one other matter I wish to refer to, and that is in reference to the taxation on stock in trade. (See Section 220, page 49.) The difference between the old tax and the new one is an increase of 25%.

As far as the other sections of the Charter are concerned, I agree with previous speakers there is so much of it. It is not a unanimous document presented to the Government; there are many sections we do not agree with, and we do not need to embody in a charter what are the duties of an engineer, or building regulations, because it may be necessary to-morrow to make a change. But I believe we should give the city a Charter, a liberal one, a fair one, and a workable one.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In answer to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's speech, I may say that this bill now before us embodies the experience of gentlemen who have been at the Council Board for some years, and they have found it necessary not to leave building regulations or the duties of a city engineer to the members of the Council, but that it should be set forth in the bill itself, because of the desire of some men in the Council to evade their responsibilities. For instance some regulations may be made that are not in the interests of a certain section of the community and pressure and influence are brought to bear on the Council and some are weak enough to give way to it, and the result is we are continually making regulations to satisfy some section of the community, whereas if you put in the bill, and say that is the Act and it cannot be altered, that ends the matter. I know from my own experience that that is so, and it is for the purpose of preventing things of that kind that these are now proposed in the bill. That is the object and I think it a very good one, from my experience.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

TUESDAY, April 12th, 1921.

Council met at 4.00 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself in Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's."

Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair. Section 8 read.

HON. MR. POWER:—I would ask if there is a recommendation from the citizens on the Charter? I think there is one in the other House.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The Citizens' Committee has approved of this Charter with very few exceptions, and as we come to the sections to which they have taken exception I propose to let their exceptions be known to the House. I have their memorandum here.

HON. MR. POWER:—I hope we will give consideration to it. I think the town should be divided into wards for Municipal elections. As it is now, each Councillor has to canvass the whole city, and if the city were divided into wards, every person in a ward would go to his own Councillor. What is the intention in relation to the way of carrying on the election?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The first election to be held under this proposed Bill, if it becomes law, will be an election at large, and then the Council will have the right to divide the city into wards if they wish to exercise it.

HON. PRESIDENT:—I was speaking to a party the other day who had been left a little piece of property, there were \$200 arrears in taxes on it. That was about the value of the property and yet it had been allowed to go on. Whose fault was that? I notice the collectors are very prominent

on Water Street, and when the bills are sent out, in three or four days the man comes in for a cheque, but does not go to the back lanes. If that is continued I do not think the thing will be a huge success, when people are not called upon for taxes for ten years.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Of course that is the trouble with all Councils. Nobody has ever been sued for taxes. They showed the same laxity in taking vigorous measures in that respect as in many other respects. It will be remembered that one of the strangest reasons put forward five or six years for wiping out the old Municipal Council and installing a Commission, was that with other people taking office a vigorous crusade would be undertaken for getting in arrears. Of course the new Council was the same as previous ones in that nobody was prepared to face the odium of collecting the taxes. And it will be the same in the future in my opinion. I can remember how the hustings used to ring in the past by candidates denouncing the failure of the existing Councillors to collect these taxes. And they will never be collected, and there is a confession of that in this bill where a section provides for the creating of a board to collect these taxes. To my mind the Council ought to have the courage of their convictions and carry out their duties for which they are appointed, and that is one of them, the collection of taxes. In every other municipality I know of, from Sydney to Vancouver, people are sold out when they fail to pay their taxes, and that should be done here. And until we have people who are prepared to face the situation, it will be the same, and we will go on until the arrears are \$150,000 or \$200,000, instead of \$120,000 as they are to-day. I think in past years statements in some way got into the Lower House which showed some

people on Water Street owed taxes for 6, 8 or 10 years back and never paid them, and then went insolvent, and this debt had to be wiped out like the others. Dr. Campbell spoke the other day of the city being kept clean. This it cannot be while we have this money owing. Another thing, we do not know what taxation means in this city compared with what cities of the same size on the mainland bear. I do not know if we can stand more, but I do know that every city on the mainland bears more taxation, and it is only by that they can get the clean streets they have. In Halifax most of the streets are paved. We thought it a wonderful thing when we paved Water Street, and we are not able to repair that or pave any other streets, and we never will until we get some means of collecting those taxes.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The same thing in relation to arrears of taxes accumulating in the future will not arise, as in the past when the manner of collecting taxes was very much different from what it is at present. In the past we levied the tax on the occupier of the house; now they are put on the landlord and are coming in much better. I judge that by the report here. In 1917 the arrears were \$114,000; in 1918, \$116,000; in 1915, \$98,000, and in 1916, \$108,000, so that under the present mode of collecting taxes, the same result would not happen in the future.

Sections 14, 15, 16 and 17 were on motion deferred.

Sections 18, 19, and 20 were on motion adopted.

Section 21 was on motion deferred.

Sections 22 and 23 were on motion deleted.

Section 24 was on motion adopted.

Committee on Municipal Bill rose and reported having made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at four of the clock p.m.

THURSDAY, April 14th, 1921.

The House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES:—I would move that "twelve" be substituted for "sin" in section 27, sub-section (1).

Sections 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, were on motion adopted.

Section 34 was on motion subdivided, Section 34 ending at words "election of the Deputy Mayor," new section beginning "In the absence of."

Sections 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 were on motion adopted.

Section 40 was on motion adopted subject to substitution of words "two daily newspapers" for words "one daily newspaper."

Sections 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 were on motion adopted.

Section 46 was deferred for consideration of recommendation of Citizens' Committee.

Sections 47, 48, 49 were on motion adopted.

Section 50 was on motion adopted subject to substitution of word "City" instead of "Colony" as last word in section.

Sections 51 and 52 were on motion adopted.

Sections 53 and 54 were on motion adopted subject to drafting of a new section dealing with authorization of Council employees.

Sections 55, 71 were read and considered. With the exception of five or six sections which were held over for further investigation, these were passed.

Section 72 was on motion adopted subject to insertion of words "by the Council" after the words "May be charged" in the fourth line.

Section 73 was on motion adopted subject to addition of words "which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld."

Sections 74 and 75 were on motion adopted.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. the President read a communication from the House of Assembly to the effect that they had passed a Bill "An Act to Amend the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920," and requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the same.

On motion the Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until 4.00 p.m. on Friday, April 15th, 1921.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1921.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920."

HON. MR. SHEA—In moving the second reading of the Bill, Mr. President, I may say that this is a Bill to make provision for the W. P. A. Trust Fund now that the W.P.A. is being dissolved. It makes also one or two alterations in the original bill passed last year

The first clause provides for the appointment of certain members of this committee. The second clause provides trustees for the disposition of this fund. The third clause deals further with this matter. I would therefore move the second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The House then went into Committee on the Municipal Bill, Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I am afraid Mr. Chairman, that we are going thru this bill too rapidly. Section 76 seems very objectionable. In my opinion the Council should bring the water to the house, and tenants should not have to pay its original cost.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. member does not quite understand the question This refers

to land-owners. These land-owners lease the land. As it is the land is practically worthless. With the improvements the land becomes one hundred per cent. more valuable. Who then under the circumstances should pay, but those who through no act of their own are better off.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—If land owners have to pay this tax, some are going to be very much injured. I have occasion to represent some land owners of seventy houses. If to-morrow we are ordered to put in sewerage I shall write and tell the beneficiaries who are poor people not to connect with sewerage. It would take 25 years' rent to pay these improvements, and in the case I cite this cannot be afforded.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Does the Council contribute any expenditure?

HON. MR. GIBBS—Heretofore the Council paid the whole cost, but that ceased a few years ago. The Council would not do it any longer, and now the landowner pays it all.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I thought that the Council paid their proportion. I have in mind now a case on the Harbor Main Road, and they have sewerage and water, and I think the City Council paid their proportion.

HON. MR. GIBBS—No, the landowner paid it all. I know of a case in which land that was suitable for building purposes was to be opened up, and the landowner was prepared to let the land at fifty cents a foot. The Council said, 'we cannot permit you to throw this land open for building purposes unless water and sewerage are laid down and a road made. He agreed, and increased the cost of the land from fifty cents to sixty cents or seventy cents, and it all went, and that is how he will get back his money.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—There is another difficulty that we should take into consideration. Supposing you take Waterford Bridge Road, and a man desires to have water and sewer-

age put over it, but it has to pass another area in which there is no water and sewerage, who is going to pay for the work done before it reaches the area of the man who wants it? The City is not responsible.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH—To begin with, taking the case cited by my honourable friend, the Council is not going to put down water and sewerage for one man, but only when the majority of the people living along that street want it. It might open up a large building area. Then all that is covered by Section 75. When the Council decides that it is going to open up an area, it has to give notice to the people. There is all the formality that is to be proceeded with to open up that land. The Council charges a share of the cost against every building site, and everybody has a share to pay. It is all very well to make a case against a scheme. I am not saying this in criticism of anybody, but it must be remembered that this town is nearly four hundred years old, and it is not thirty years that we have had a City Council. Then we got a Municipal Council, and first we learned to crawl, and then to creep, and now, suppose, we are learning to walk. My honourable friend, Mr. Anderson, started to put up houses. We all know it must have cost him a great deal more to build these houses than it cost people who built houses ten years ago, and it must cost the people who occupy these houses more than it cost other people in the same locality for their houses. These inequalities must exist, and it is idle to say that now we must not begin to tax people for improvements when we did not do it twenty or thirty years ago. If unfortunately it is found in the operation of the Act that people are not prepared to pay, then I assume that some other scheme will probably be adopted, but in the meantime I do not know any reason why if this idea has been operated and people have faced the

Inconvenience and disadvantages of building under it, we should throw out the section now merely because my honourable friend has found it disadvantageous in his particular case.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—The position I take is this, that it is the duty of the Council out of the capital stock of the Council to put the water there, and the owner of the land and the tenant should not pay for it. The honourable the President has referred to a case where one hundred houses might be built, and if we have to open up and put in pipes and water in every new street, at the expense of the landowner, then good-bye building. Speaking about expenses, in 1914, the cleaning up of the city cost about \$50,000; to-day it is \$80,000. And what kind of service does the Council get? It would be better for the Council to spend a million dollars to supply pipes for water and sewerage; it would be a sane policy for the Council to adopt. When the Hon. Mr. Shea, the leader of the government in this Chamber, was Mayor, the expenditure in the Sanitary Department was \$40,000. Now it will soon be \$100,000. Let us take a million dollars and clean up the city, and then we will have a clean town.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few remarks in answer to my honorable friend's assertions. My honorable friend says that the removal of the filth from this city costs \$80,000 to-day, while it costs only \$40,000 in 1908 or 1909. I want to inform the honorable gentleman Mr. Chairman, that it costs no more to-day to remove garbage and filth, proportionately to the increase in wages and other things than it did fifteen years ago, that the same number of men are employed to-day removing garbage as were employed fifteen years ago. What has gone up is not the number of men employed, but the increase in the cost is due to the increase in the keep of horses, the price

of horses, and the increase in the wages of employees. That is where the cost has come in. It is not fair to the city to say that it is costing \$80,000 or \$40,000 more to-day to remove garbage than it did five or ten years ago. He ought to state that that increased cost is not an increase in the number of employees, but the increased cost of materials and wages. We ought to be fair in this matter. Now the honorable gentleman says, what sort of work does the Council get? I want to inform the house that the Council gets work done more cheaply than it could get it done by contract, and I speak from actual experience of the fact. When I was Mayor of the city, we did a lot of draining and laying water-pipes in connection with the higher levels service, and we had occasion to advertise for tenders for the laying and trenching and digging for water-pipes, sometimes as high as seven hundred and two thousand feet, and we received tenders, and we examined the figures, and came to the conclusion that we could get the work done more cheaply ourselves, and we did it. You take the employees of the Council. They are able to do as much work of that character as three ordinary men. And the same applies to the removal of garbage. The thing is done exceptionally well and as well under the circumstances as it could be. Now the honorable gentleman says, "Why not the city spend a million dollars for the extension of water and sewerage?" Why should the city spend a million dollars for the benefit of the landowner? Why should the residents of this city extend water and sewerage along and through land that is now built upon, for the benefit of the landowner, because he will charge so much per foot frontage, whereas to-day the land is only worth so much for grazing. You take the case of land not far from where I live. It was rented for grazing purposes for \$200 a year. Let the Council go in and put

down water and sewerage, and build upon that piece of land. How much would it then be worth annually to the owner? Would \$10,000 not be a fair figure, and to-day it is not worth \$200. And still the honorable gentleman seriously contends that the Council should go in and put streets through that land, lay water and sewerage through it, increase its value to the landowner to \$10,000 while now it is worth \$200 and get no benefit. The Council says, there are certain preliminaries to be gone through. If the honorable gentleman would look at section 75 that has been quoted by Sir Patrick McGrath, he will see "Whenever the Council shall have decided, whether upon its own initiative or upon application from owners of one-half or more of the lands in question, to open up any locality and to lay out any land or lands for building purposes, notice of such decision shall be given to the owners, etc." This city ever since it has been a city has been run in the interest of the landowner. You take the man who fifty or sixty years ago built a house in this city upon land under a building lease, at the expiration of the lease the house goes to the landowner. He takes the benefit of the investment of the person who built upon the land, and made it valuable and increases the rent ten, twenty or thirty times more than he originally let it for. The landlord did nothing to bring about that value, but he has taken advantage of the improvements made by the tenant.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—It is not a sentimental view that I am taking.

HON. MR. GIBBS—People are penalized under the present system of leases, because for every dollar they invest in building the landlord gets the benefit. And now, if we are to accept the honorable gentleman's argument as correct, we must confer still greater powers upon the landlord.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—The Mu-

nicipal Council will get their taxes all the time.

HON. MR. GIBBS—But only for the upkeep of the streets and property.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It seems to me that there is a very great deal of force in the argument of my honorable friend. What is expected of the Municipal Council? Is it not to endeavor to provide accommodation for the people, and if there is a locality which they think unsuitable for building purposes, it seems to me that the taxes of the town should be used to provide for the laying out of the streets, and the laying of water and sewerage in the streets.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Who gets the benefit?

HON. MR. BISHOP—The whole city gets the benefit, and the streets put down are for the benefit of the whole population of the city who use the streets as well as those living on that street. You say the landowner should pay for the laying of the pipes, and so the occupier will not only have to pay high rentals because of the high price of building, but also rentals for the laying-down of the water and sewerage. Whether that appertains to every city in the United States and Canada, as has been said by the honorable gentleman, I do not know, but I contend still that it is a hardship, and it is compelling the occupier of a house to be erected hereafter in the town of St. John's to pay very high rentals, because the houses to be built must be built upon new areas, and that will incur additional rental not alone for land or rent, but also for laying of sewerage and water pipes, which would be for the benefit of the general public and upon which the Council have a right to charge an annual assessment, I think there is a great deal of force in the argument, in which the Hon. the President evidently concurs, that it is the duty of the city to lay the streets, provide the water, and

then assess all the property served by that for its upkeep, and if the present assessment is not sufficient, we know that will be increased.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Might I ask the honourable gentleman if that section gives any more powers to the City Council than they have already?

HON. MR. GIBBS—No, no more.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—How long have they used them?

HON. MR. GIBBS—For the past 3 years.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Nothing has been done within the past three years

HON. MR. GIBBS—There have been streets opened up.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—These people did it because they could afford to do it, and will make money out of it.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I would like to point out that the Citizens' Committee, which, as everybody knows, was giving a great deal of attention to this problem, was evidently satisfied with the situation, because you will find they say with reference to this "Sections 78, 79 and 80. These sections should apply only to new streets and not to old streets where people have been paying taxes for years." Note also that the words in 78 "or adjacent thereto which may be "benefitted" should be also inserted in 79 and 80. "This will prevent building sites near the Railway Station being taxed for improvements made near the Custom House for both places mentioned are on the same street." It is evident that the Citizens' Committee, which met as a representative body and went into this question very thoroughly was apparently satisfied with the section. I do not think that these people after the attention they gave to the question are more likely to be wrong than we are. Then my honourable friend said that he knew that people had opened up streets, and made money out of it. If

one can make money out of it, then everybody can.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I move that the Committee rise until Monday next.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again on Monday next.

On motion being made the House adjourned till Monday, the 18th instant at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, April 18th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Act, 1920. Hon. Mr. Browning in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and it was ordered said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved the appointment of a Select Committee to consider and report on the Municipal Bill.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—Before the motion is put I would like to say a few words on this bill. I was a member of the Commission when framing this Charter, and tho' we were unanimous, still we felt we might let it go to the legislature and they could amend any sections not suitable for the work of the city. Referring to Section 79 in regard to land owned by widows or orphans, these people might not have means to defray the cost of water and sewerage, and for that reason I think this section is a little arbitrary, and it will be modified I hope in Committee. Whether city government has been a success in Newfoundland is a very debatable question. We have had municipal government for 35 years I think and while I am prepared to admit the city is a good deal in debt and there are considerable outstanding arrears, a great deal of improvement has been

made. This question of arrears is a disgrace; no business concern here or anywhere else would allow such a condition of affairs. I understand that \$64,000 of this amount is considered good; \$24,500 doubtful, and \$32,000 bad. The reason so much money is owed is I believe that the Council have no power or authority to wipe out these bad debts. Some of them have accumulated for upwards of 20 years, and a good many are outlawed, and some of the people are dead. I notice there is a section in the Bill dealing with this, and I think it is desirable this should be attended to. Our hon. friend Mr. Anderson made one statement criticising the Council which I thought a little drastic. He said the Council was blocking building operations. Well that is true to some extent but not entirely so. The Commission felt that it would be very unwise and a poor policy to allow houses to be built contrary to the building regulations and without sewerage or water connections, and personally I was strong on that point because if we did not insist on that, we would be perpetrating the present unsightly night cars system. When the Commission took over affairs there were fifteen of these on the go, and now there are only three, and I think if the Commission did nothing else, that is a strong point in their management of affairs. On account of their being so many contentious paragraphs in this document, I support the motion for a Select Committee.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Before the motion is put I beg to table report I promised when discussing sections 61 and 68 in regard to Imperial property in the city limits. (Read report). I do not think we have the power in this parliament to transfer that land to the city. That means we have to have the Imperial Acts repealed before we would have that power and the bill now before us

therefore goes further than we have power to do. Besides that held as Crown lands, there are 51 different properties, and it is a much bigger order than the simple section of this bill would indicate.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It is a rather daring thing for a layman to question this matter referred to in the information read by Hon. Dr. Campbell, but there are some instances I know of. First, the Fort William property which is Imperial and was turned over to the Reid Nfld. Co. and you can see to-day the foundations of the hotel which was to have been erected on it and used subject to the rights of the Crown on it. With all deference to my hon. friend and his advisor, I maintain the legislature has a right to transfer Crown property.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Yes, Crown property, but not Imperial property.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—You know what was done with Fort William. Now then just opposite there, the land on which Devon Row houses are built is Imperial property. It is held under conditions that the houses on it are to be dismantled if at any time it was required for Imperial purposes. Up at Fort Townshend again Mr. McCowen built a house there. Subsequent to the completion of that house, the Government's attention was called to it, and the Government bought the house off his hands and it was held as a piece of Government property subject to Imperial rights, and I think, though perhaps it is a dangerous thing to state, I think, with all due deference, that there cannot be any question as to the right of the Legislature to make these properties over to the Municipality, subject to the right of the Crown to reassert ownership of the property at any time. There is Bannerman Park. It figures as Imperial property, and Bannerman Park has been in the pos-

session of the Municipal Council for many years. I think that, as this Bill is such a lengthy one and covers such ground, it should be sent to a Select Committee.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Mr. President, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the land is held by the Imperial authorities; it is held for the Imperial authorities in trust by the Government, and we are handing over trust properties to other governing bodies without the consent of the Imperial authorities, the persons for whom it is held in trust. I believe that the City Council is the proper body to deal with this land; I admit that, but I just want to point out that we might by doing this get into some tangle which it would be hard to get out of.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I have no objection to the Bill going to a Select Committee, though I think the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Bishop would have been a better one. There are many objectionable matters embodied in the Bill. For instance, section 83, reads as follows:

"The money necessary to defray the cost of such local improvements as above described, may be borrowed by the Council from a bank, and the amount so spent, with the interest thereon, shall be paid to the city by the owners of properties assessed, and until the amounts so spent are repaid, the Council shall have a lien upon the said properties, ranking next after the Crown."

There is the portion of the section "The amount with interest shall be a lien on the properties." Supposing a man does build on the property, he is liable to have the whole thing confiscated. A little while ago there was one of the best opportunities offered for the city. The Board of Works were going to extend the water to the Lunatic Asylum and the Sanitarium.

I am going to ask the Leader of the Sanitarium, there is a splendid

Government to table the correspondence that has passed between the Government, the Board of Works, and the Municipal Council, on the matter. There was a splendid opportunity to continue the west end main pipes along Waterford Bridge Road, but instead water was brought in in another direction. What the falling out was between the Council and the Government, I do not know.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Would not the reason be that there was not a sufficient supply of water?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I am not in a position to say whether that was so or not. I do not think insufficient supply of water could be any excuse at all.

However, I have no objection to the Bill going to a Select Committee, but at the same time I think the best place to discuss it is on the floors of this House.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. President, I would suggest to the House that in view of the fact that we have not any bill before us, and as we are not likely to have any business for probably a week or so, we might go on with the discussion of the charter until such time as we have some other business to occupy our time and attention. I may say that it is the desire of the Council that, if possible, the measure should be taken up by a Committee of the Whole House. I would like to get the opinion of honourable gentlemen on that matter.

HON. MR. POWER:—I think, Mr. President, that the best way to manage this Bill is that the various sections be dealt with by Select Committee. I do not think that in dealing with it we should occupy the time of the House, and I do not think it would be dealt with so well as by Select Committee.

I might answer the Hon. Mr. Anderson that so far as I know about the water going in from Petty Harbor to

supply of water, and it would be a very great relief to the town to take the water for the Sanitarium and Lunatic Asylum.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, the reason why I suggested that the Bill go to a Select Committee, and I now reiterate my suggestion, is that there are some sections of the Bill that none of us know anything about, and we are here beating the air discussing matters which if we got into conference with somebody who understood them would solve themselves. The honourable gentlemen in charge of the bill has a very great understanding of it, but, of course, a lot of the sections that have been included in this Bill are probably only understood in their detail by the gentlemen of the Municipal Commission who drafted the Bill and by the Citizens' Committee who went over it, and my idea is that after the Select Committee was appointed, it should get in touch with some representatives of the Commission which drafted the Bill and the Citizens' Committee and have a round-table conference with them for one or two evenings and endeavour to get a clear understanding of what the various sections mean, and then the Select Committee would be able to approve of these sections, or as much as in their opinion is desirable, and when the Bill comes back to the House with the report of the Select Committee, if there are any sections called into discussion, the members of the Select Committee will be able to inform the House of the why and wherefore of these sections. The Bill as it is has four hundred sections, and a lot of it is not understood by us, and I think it would be wasting a great deal of valuable time to deal with it here in this House. Everybody is willing to come here, but it will surely hardly be contended that we are giving any value to the country when we discuss three or four sections in

an afternoon and go away not knowing whether our deliberations had any reference at all to the matter, because somebody familiar with the conditions would be able to explain the whole thing so clearly and easily that no discussion would be necessary at all. For these reasons I favor a Select Committee.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I do not think, Mr. President, that there would be any question as to the most expeditious way. Here is a very large Bill embracing three or four hundred sections, and it is brought in here before a Chamber many of the members of which, as Sir Patrick McGrath says, are not conversant at all with the details of it, and are not in a position to deal with it satisfactorily. If it is put before a Select Committee of the House they will be able to deal with it in an expeditious manner and confer with the Municipal Commission and the Citizens' Committee, and that will eliminate a lot of unnecessary discussion. I have much pleasure in supporting the proposal that it go to a Select Committee.

The Bill was then ordered to be referred to a Select Committee.

House adjourned until 4 p.m., Thursday, April 21st.

THURSDAY, April 21st, 1921.

House met at 4.00 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Bill "An Act to Amend the Women's Patriotic Association Trust Fund Act, 1920," was read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message acquainting that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the House adjourned until Monday, the 25th April, at 4.00 p.m.

MONDAY, April 25th, 1921.

Present: The Honourable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 26th, at 4 p.m., for want of a quorum.

TUESDAY, April 26th, 1921.

Present: The Honourable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 27th inst., at 4 p.m., for want of a quorum.

WEDNESDAY, April 27th, 1921.

Present: The Honourable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, the 28th inst., at 4 p.m., for want of a quorum.

THURSDAY, April 28th, 1921.

Present: The Honourable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned until Friday, the 29th inst., at 4 p.m., for want of a quorum.

FRIDAY, April 29th, 1921.

Present: The Honourable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned until Monday next, May 2nd, at 4 p.m., for want of a quorum.

MONDAY, May 2nd, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. President announced he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, entitled: An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act, 1920, and an Act to Amend the Act entitled "Of Marine Courts of Inquiry," in which they requested the

concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the said bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled report of the War Pensions Commission for 1920.

Hon. Dr. Campbell tabled report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for year 1920.

Hon. Mr. Bell tabled certain resolutions of the Board of Trade of Grand Bank and also from Marys-town.

The President announced receipt of certain resolutions from Board of Trade at Burin which would be presented on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, May 3rd, 1921.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act, 1920."

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, I may say that this Bill proposes to cut out paragraph 5 in the contract which should not have got in. It was printed in error last year, by some mistake of the engrossing clerk or printer it got into the bill, but it should not have been there.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I do not want to delay the House, but is there any documentary evidence from the company that they are parties to this change?

HON. MR. SHEA:—The only information that I have on the subject is that the paragraph never should have been in.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I understand that, but you will see that if it was printed in the Royal Gazette as part of the Act, engrossed and signed as part of the Act, it has all the force and effect of law unless the company

by some document under its hand agrees to this amendment. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would find out, and let it stand for the present. It may be that the original agreement does not contain this clause, but if it does, then the company has a good case against this amendment.

This order was then deferred until to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of Enquiry.'"

HON. MR. SHEA:—I would move the second reading of this Bill. This provides that a Naval Officer may be allowed to act. I think, as a matter of fact, it is the custom to have a Naval Officer, but it is intended to make that sure by that provision.

This Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the following Bills, in which they desired the concurrence of the Council:

"An Act respecting Sheep Farming."

"An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918."

"An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

"An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

The said Bills were thereupon read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until 10.30, Wednesday, May 4th, 1921.

FRIDAY, May 6th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Marine Courts of Enquiry Bill.

The Committee rose and reported

the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Terra Nova Sulphite Co's Act, 1920, Amendment Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I beg to move the second reading of the Bill respecting Sheep Farming, the object of which is to give the Governor in Council power to grant land if satisfied that the applicant has done enough to deserve it for sheep farming purposes and maintains 500 sheep for ten consecutive years. It was found in one or two cases particularly in the case of a man who had taken a piece in Robinson's River some years ago had farmed it for some years and after some years had only about 250 sheep but in the meantime had spent about \$20,000 in connection with sheep farming, and then found the land was not fit for sheep farming exclusively, and under the present act he could not get a grant altho' he had spent that large sum, because he had not 500 sheep. The bill proposes if the Government are satisfied in cases of that kind they will be at liberty to grant the land.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Has the Minister any knowledge of what the conditions are. I should judge there must be some other obligations because these licenses are subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—There was never any others formulated by the department.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am not suggesting there is anything wrong in this, and I presume it is being brought in at the instance of the gentleman referred to and I would be the last to raise objection to a man who has spent \$20,000 in developing a sheep farm getting generous conces-

sion from the Colony but at the same time I would like to point out a man may now possibly for a trivial expenditure be able to get rights in fee because it will be noticed he is to get a full grant now.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Yes, if he keeps a certain number of cattle.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Pardon me, that is not a correct reading as I read it. (Read section). It leaves the whole thing to the Governor in Council I agree, but then is it desirable that such a condition as this might be continued in perpetuity? I think it all right for a man like him referred to, but remember the idea is that this shall apply in future and any man may come in and put up a bluff so to speak and get a grant for a very inadequate expenditure of money.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This is a case in which money has been expended, and there is no reason why this man should not get a license, but all future operations are under the Governor in Council, and it will be up to the Governor in Council to name the number of cattle which a man would be obliged to keep before he could get a license.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—May I ask the hon. gentleman what he means by "License."

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—A Crown lands license.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—A grant in fee? There would be no restrictions?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Under the Sheep Farming Act he has to keep a certain number of sheep.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—But I understand that that is superseded by this amendment. It leaves the future restrictions in the hands of the Government. But when once a man has kept his sheep and has received his license, is there anything to prevent him from selling the cattle?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This is

merely a matter of converting the word "Sheep" into "Horned cattle."

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that there is nothing in this phraseology to call for that at all. The Governor in Council might consider the provisions of this section fully satisfied by keeping cattle in the place for twenty-four hours.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—It is hardly likely that a Governor in Council would do that.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Strange things have been done, and stranger things may be done. What I conceive to be the danger is that political pull may be able to get agricultural land or other land by a mere nominal observance of the conditions of the Act. Now if this Act is amended by adding the two words "at present" if, in other words, you make this Act to apply to one or two cases which exist at the present time, where a man has attempted to comply with the conditions of the existing Act and has failed, then I take it that the House will probably be unanimous in agreeing that it would be a wise provision, but we are now asked to enact legislation of the most elastic character, giving the Governor in Council power to give people three hundred, or possibly more, square miles of the territory of this country. I suggest that we let the Bill go to second reading, and perhaps by the next sitting the honourable gentleman would be able to give us some further information. My suggestion is that somewhere in the first or second line two or three words be inserted to provide that this shall apply only to cases in existence at the present time.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, I know I am out of order in now rising, but my view is this: I am not opposing the Bill. I know nothing whatever about it, but it does appear to me that even the amendment sug-

gested by Hon. Sir Patrick McGrath is not sufficient. I think there should be a safeguard by which the Government would not hand over a large area of valuable land in fee simple to a man who had power within one week or one month or one year afterwards to get off that land, sell his cattle, and still hold the title to it. I think he should simply get a lease for as long as he operates the land. But to give him the fee simple, which he may avail of to make considerable money, possibly without carrying out the provisions of the Bill at all, is not a thing which should be allowed.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, I would be glad to inquire into this matter. The House could pass the second reading, and we would go into details in Committee stage.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918."

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to say that it proposes to amend the Crown Lands Act as regards licenses for minerals. The present Act allows the Governor in Council to reserve from any tract all the minerals. The object of the Bill now before us is to allow the Governor in Council to reserve all or any of the minerals, that is, that it may not be necessary to reserve all, and this section will add the words "or any" to the original section.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—This, I take it, has to do with the proposed oil-boring by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Yes, I may say that the Bill is brought in to meet the requirements of the Government in connection with some negotiations at present pending between the Anglo-

Persian Oil Company and the Government with regard to researches in oil properties in the Colony. The Government wanted to be in the position that if they wished they may reserve part only of the minerals in these areas, and that they may be at liberty to allow researching in oil and in minerals to go on at the same time.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I take it, Mr. President, that this Act is, as I suggested, to provide the necessary machinery to enable the Government to reserve areas for possible oil-boring or oil-exploration. I understood from the Attorney General, when I was in conversation with him when he came back from England, that he had been instrumental in negotiating arrangements with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company for coal-boring work to take up a period of two years, and that anticipatory of that the Government had under this section 3 reserved as from some date in February last all mining areas and did not intend to grant any more mineral licenses or leases for a period of two or three years. I speak subject to correction. But it was felt that this would operate harshly upon people who wanted to prospect and develop minerals other than petroleum, and consequently this amendment is made, so as to enable the Government to release all these areas for prospecting for the next two or three years and yet retain power to reserve the oil-bearing deposits. If that is the intention I would say that there can be no objection to it.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to say that the ob-

ject of the Bill is to modify the present law with regard to lotteries. At present all lotteries, for no matter what cause, are forbidden. As a matter of fact, we know that within the last few years the law has been the Magistrate. In other words, the object is to permit lotteries, within the discretion of the Magistrate, so that the authorities may have power to prohibit lotteries which may be of an objectionable character.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would say that up to now the Board of Pension Commissioners has consisted of three, and it is proposed to reduce it to two, as it is felt that this will be ample for all future requirements.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, I would ask the honourable gentleman if he would give us more information when the Bill comes before us in Committee as to the reasons which have influenced the Government in this matter. I speak with some knowledge, as I held the position of Chairman for some considerable period, and my personal view is that it is a mistake to reduce the Board to two. I know occasions when two out of the three were out of the country, and while I am open to conviction as to this bill, I prefer to withhold my opinion until I get further information on the subject. I will not delay the second reading, but would like to have some further information.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have not been advised as to the cause, but I presume that it is a matter of economy. The Bill has simply been sent

up to me, but I will get more information.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The Hon. the President informed the Council that he had received a message from the House of Assembly informing him that they had passed a Bill "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

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

Hon. Mr. Bishop asked permission to lay upon the table of the House petition from the Women of Newfoundland.

On motion the House adjourned until 4.00 p.m., Monday, May 9th, 1921.

MONDAY, May 9th, 1921.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Third reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 170 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Marine Courts of Enquiry.'"

On motion the Bill was read a third time and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly acquainting that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, it will be remembered that at the last session of the Legislature petitions were presented to both branches from the Women of Newfoundland claiming or praying for the franchise. I had the honour, sir, of presenting their petition to this House, and although honourable members did not generally speak at that time, those who did expressed themselves as being in sympathy with the movement, and if silence can be taken

as giving consent, then it must be assumed that the ladies have no reason to fear that other than whole-hearted support would be given to their Bill when it comes before this House. I feel, sir, to-day somewhat in the position of the schoolboy who has dissatisfied his teacher and is compelled to do his work over again. I may say, sir, that I feel somewhat diffident because after tabling this petition on Friday last I had scarcely reached my office when I was confronted by a triple alliance who charged me with nothing less than a breach of promise. You will not be surprised, sir, when I say that I collapsed and could not find breath even to plead "Not Guilty." After some moments, when I had got several gasps and was getting near utterance again, I heard "We are told you presented our petition and did not say a word." Then I was able to say "Ladies, there must have been some mistake which I will try to explain. I think somebody must have been trying to pull your sleeve, or you were listening to some of the rumors that are going around, and I can assure you that I have ample evidence that the rumors going nowadays are not to be taken seriously."

However, Mr. President, it would appear to me at least unnecessary that anything need be said in reference to this petition, still I must take my punishment and try to say something. The petition as it comes to us is as follows:

WHEREAS we regard ourselves as Partners in the responsible business of home-keeping which is so vital to the best interests of the Dominion; and

WHEREAS we are subject to all the laws and taxations which apply to men; and

WHEREAS many of us are workers helping to produce the wealth of the Dominion; and

WHEREAS in other parts of the

British Empire women enjoy all the rights of the franchise, and assume its responsibilities; and

WHEREAS the women of Newfoundland rose to every call made upon them during the Great War, and showed energy and executive ability in the organization of relief and other work, and that many of them served overseas as Nurses, V.A.D.'s and Ambulance Drivers;

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will, during the present Session, pass a law by which there will be given to the Women of this Dominion the rights of the franchise, on conditions similar to those commonly required of men.

The signatures to this petition are represented here to-day by a large number of the active, talented and prominent women of this city, and who would be bold enough to deny that in their ranks may not be found many who are eminently fitted by experience, by education, and other accomplishments to take practically, if not all, of the positions that are available in this country. For the information of our lady visitors perhaps I might say that they are not at present in the Chamber which echoes parliamentary eloquence, and that members here are not given to boasting of speeches of one, two, or three hours' duration, to be resumed, probably, at the next sitting, for another few hours, but that we are content to preserve our time, and we do not entertain in the way that is observable in the other branch, and for that entertainment we would recommend our lady friends to the popular branch of the Legislature. It seems to me that no argument can be necessary to win the unanimous vote of this House when a Bill is prepared and comes before us for consideration. But let us look at this petition again:

"WHEREAS we regard ourselves as Partners in the responsible business of home-keeping which is so vital to the best interests of the Dominion."

Yes, sir, they are the home-keepers and home-makers.

2. "WHEREAS we are subject to all the laws and taxations which apply to men."

Admitted without argument.

3. "WHEREAS many of us are workers helping to produce the wealth of the Dominion."

Can that be denied?

4. "WHEREAS in other parts of the British Empire women enjoy all the rights of the franchise, and assume its responsibilities."

Also undeniable, and why should not Newfoundland women be immediately placed as their sisters are in the various parts of the Empire?

5. "WHEREAS the women of Newfoundland rose to every call made upon them during the Great War, and showed energy and executive ability in the organization of relief and other work, and that many of them served overseas as Nurses, V.A.D's and Ambulance Drivers."

Yes, and with equal energy, devotion and self-sacrifice they would do it again, and they would do it regardless of whether their Bill is passed this year or not.

The women's appeal of last year, sir, was by petitions having approximately aggregating nearly ten thousand, coming from every electoral district in the Island but one, and for some unexplainable reason the petitions which were expected from Fortune District have not come to hand. And, sir, if the prayer of the petition be not granted and a Bill introduced

at the present session, we may expect to see them coming again next year, not with ten thousand, but with twenty-five thousand signatures, and supported by an equal or greater number of endorsements from the electors of this country demanding on their behalf that they be granted the franchise. I may say, incidentally, that several of these petitions are endorsed by a very large number of men voters. The women, sir, might reasonably have come to us with a demand, but their innate modesty and politeness induced them rather to come to us simply reminding us that we have not voluntarily granted them the privilege which has been given to their sisters in every other part of the British Empire. Is it necessary, Mr. President, to refer to examples? Much time might be taken in referring to the hundreds, nay, thousands of women throughout the Empire eminent in law, in literature, in the arts and sciences, in civil government, and in commercial activities, who compete, and successfully compete, with men in every walk of life. Let me instance just one or two. A few days ago one of our local papers had a picture showing a lady mayor and five council women of a town in the United States, who solely conduct all the civic matters of that town. In British Columbia some time ago the Attorney General was a Mr. Ralph Smith. Mr. Smith died, and at the next election his widow contested the district and won out. Mrs. Smith was offered by the Parliament the position of Speaker, which she refused, but she accepted a seat in the Cabinet, and to-day sits at the Council table of that Great Province. Saturday's "Evening Telegram" gives an instance from West Australia, where an election has been recently held, and where the Hon. T. P. Draper, the Attorney General, was opposed by Mrs. Cowan. Mrs. Cowan won out, and was elected to the State

Legislature. In Manitoba a well-known lady, Miss Dick, who has been engaged for years in philanthropic work, not only in Winnipeg where she resides, but throughout the entire Province, where her name is well known, is expected to be before long sitting in the Provincial Parliament of Manitoba. Crossing the water, I may say, sir, that it was my privilege last summer to visit in her home in England Viscountess Astor. As is well known, Lady Astor is an American by birth, but represents in the British House of Commons one of the most important districts of England. During our conversation I was asked many questions, and soon found that Lady Astor knew very considerably more about us and our country than simply its position on the map. She was quite animated in her reference to our men, our Newfoundlanders, who had fought through the War, and remarked upon their splendid work, courage and achievements. I said to her that it was gratifying to us at any time to hear of the valour of our men being so generally recognized and acknowledged, and that they had often been in very tight places, but that they had never flinched, but stood manfully to their task though they fell in great numbers. But, I said, Lady Astor, perhaps what we Newfoundlanders are proudest of is our women, and as they are now seeking the franchise, which I hope will be granted them at the next sitting of our Legislature, it is quite possible that, in view of the brilliant example they have in the sitting member for Plymouth, whose career they are doubtless following, many of them may ere long be also seeking Parliamentary honours in our country, and I assured her that we had many women who were fully qualified to take up such duties. Knowing then, sir, in so many countries, that women are filling so ably various positions and promin-

ence, and why should we hesitate in granting the prayer of the petition before us to-day. Mr. President, I promised to make my remarks brief; I do so, mainly because I am sure our lady friends are anxious to hear from all the members present. That they will be satisfied at the end of the session that as far as this branch of the legislature is concerned I am convinced of, and I cannot conceive that any member of this or the other branch can by refusal admit that his wife or his daughter is unfit or unqualified to have the privilege of voting in this country as their sisters have in various parts of the Empire. And I would say, sir, that if members are not disposed to speak at length, they will at least rise and express their sympathy with the prayer of the petition. I hope a bill, with certain restrictions if you like, will be before us the present session. I am very pleased to hear the ladies have a promise by a member of the Lower House that he will introduce a bill very soon, and that before the end of the session we shall have a bill passed the House of Assembly unanimously and sent up to us for concurrence, and I hope the midsummer nights dream of our lady visitors will see not hope deferred, but a full realization of their desire accomplished. I have much pleasure in moving that this petition be received.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I rise with a great deal of pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by the Hon. Mr. Bishop. It is quite evident the ladies in making their choice for some one to present this petition knew in whose hands to place it. Votes for women extends back as far as 1832, when it was first discussed in the British House of Commons. (Read extract).

My hon. friend has referred to the fact that if this bill is not given assent to this year the ladies should

come up the following year. They are only following the precedent of the ladies in Great Britain. (Read extract).

There is one strong feature of the great sacrifice of time and the interest that has been taken in votes for women by Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughter Sybil. It was only recently Miss Sybil was asked why she never got married, and she gave her answer that she had greater love for votes for women than for men. I believe our women here to-day whether married, single or widows have the same ambition. Now who are getting the votes for women? (Read extract).

Much can be said, Mr. President, about giving votes for women, but like my hon. friend Mr. Bishop I must curtail my remarks, beyond this, if a bill comes before the House it shall certainly have my endorsement. I congratulate the ladies. They say nothing succeeds like success. Yes, pluck and perseverance, and the ladies will get it yet, if not this year, some other year, but I hope this year.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition so eloquently introduced by my hon. friend opposite, and equally by my hon. friend on my left. I should think now that with the demonstrations of the successful manner in which women suffrage is operating in other countries, I can certainly see no violent objection to extending the franchise to the women of Newfoundland. I supported this last year and since then with my hon. friend Mr. Mews I had the opportunity of making a tour through Canada and we had the opportunity of meeting a number of cultured ladies from Canada and Australia who accompanied their husbands. I had opportunity to discuss this matter with them and I found that for nearly thirty years in New Zealand and one or two of the older Australian states, women suf-

frage has been an actuality. A member of West Australian Legislative Council made the argument in a speech at Vancouver that that question now agitating the public minds of Canada and England had been solved in his country a quarter of a century ago. Every state in Australia and New Zealand has Women Suffrage. The Old Country has Women Suffrage, so has Canada, and I think it would be a black mark upon the record of Newfoundland if it were to remain any longer the only portion of self governing dominions of the Crown which has not Women Suffrage. Looking back on the events of the past 8 or 10 years we see now among the other transformations which war has brought about the very remarkable transformation it has effected among the British people toward this question. Ten or twelve years ago the women of the U.K. were literally as well as figuratively thundering at the gates to make evident to the legislators of the Old Country that they wanted to have the vote.

HON. PRESIDENT:—Do not remind them too much.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—You are a little concerned, but I am not. The war came and the demonstration the women of the Old Country gave of their whole hearted support of the war dissipated all fellings against them on account of Women Suffrage, and the privilege of manhood suffrage is no longer a question in British politics. It is perhaps to be regretted that there is only one sitting woman member in the British Parliament and also that she is not a native born Briton.

HON. PRESIDENT:—There is another, but she is in jail.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—A good many had to go in jail to get this. But it must be conceded I think that as a representative Mrs. Astor is shaping more than above the average

of the present members of Parliament. Not only is she much more constant in her attendance, but she appears to have a greater grasp of the questions before the House, if one studies the debates of Parliament. It is unnecessary to say that in Municipal, educational and other questions, all these things have been a commonplace in the Old Country for many years. My good friend referred to Miss Green appointed to a position at Oxford. It must be remembered, her position is in a Ladies' College, and she has succeeded another lady, but it is no small tribute that you can get a succession of women capable of holding positions like that and training students in the very highest of Old Country educational establishments. I have in mind now the record of another distinguished woman, Miss Gertrude Bell, who occupies the remarkable position of political officer on the staff of the Government of Mesopotamia and whose efforts have won the support of the leading newspapers of the British Isles. If we come to Canada we find that Woman Suffrage, tho' introduced under circumstances that created considerable bitterness, has completely justified itself. My good friend referred to Mrs. Mary Ellen Smith. I had the good fortune to meet this very remarkable lady at Victoria. She was offered the position of Speaker and declined, and it is understood the portfolio of Public Health is to be given her, and I have no doubt she will administer it with signal ability and in the right spirit. I also met Miss Roberta Adams, the lady member of the Alberta legislature. She had been on active service during the war and offered herself as the Soldiers' Candidate and was triumphantly elected. In the limited opportunity I had of talking with her, she struck me as being a remarkably brilliant woman. In Winnipeg we met a lady member of the City

Council and at Toronto, another. I think that would make up the total of women legislators in Canada, but public men of all kinds, provincial and federal are always unanimous in agreeing that any fears that were felt may be disregarded as not at all serious, and that giving the franchise to the women of Canada is going to make for the purity of public life and the inauguration of reforms.

In the United States we find that Woman Suffrage while more recent being only introduced last election, yet Wyoming enacted it in 1869 and States to the number of 36 had it up to last summer.

Now whether we agree or not I think all must admit that wherever it has been tried it has been helpful and beneficial. I know there are people who think dreadful things will follow the introduction of Woman Suffrage in this Country, but I would remind hon. gentlemen that much of the same argument was advanced when open voting was done away with and the Ballot Act introduced, but I do not know that in the main the concession of greater liberty, the extension of the franchise has operated any worse here than in other countries. I am glad to note that since this petition was introduced in the Lower House the ladies have been successful in persuading a prominent member of that body, who is universally respected, to introduce a bill and pilot it forward, and I trust it will meet the endorsement of every member of the House, and when it comes here it will be equally fortunate. So far as I can do I shall be glad to forward the success of the movement.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Mr. President, I feel that I should get up promptly after the hon. member has sat down, because for some reason unknown to me he has brought me into his speech in referring to the trip we took together last summer. Most of the

escapades he described took place when I, his official chaperon on the trip, had left. I thought also of the two or three weeks that preceded the opening of the House last year when I was very happy in having two or three ladies coming into my office every day or sending billet doux that were very acceptable at the time, and I was reminded of the great difference this year, that up to one o'clock to-day no lady had brightened the threshold of my office. I do not know for what reason, but I intend to take the same stand I took last year, and that is, to support the petition. Just as Mrs. Partington could not sweep away the Atlantic with her broom, so I think 'mere man' would find it impossible to keep this from being granted the ladies.

There are two points I would like to touch on shortly. One is that the franchise should be given only to those who can read and write. Those who can do so can read the newspapers and gather some opinion. My experience is that those who are not able to read or write are inclined to be more biassed or prejudiced than those who can read the latest newspapers or books.

The other point is giving the women the vote and not the right to representation in the House. That is what I think, Mr. President, because to my mind it would cause more troubles than we have now, in that a great body of women would naturally look towards legislation affecting themselves and their interests, and they would then become one enormous opposition, always bickering and always finding fault. When this Bill comes before the House, Mr. President, I do not think there will be a member who will oppose it in any way. I am prepared to support it when the proper House passes it and sends it up to us for confirmation.

HON. MR. POWER:—Mr. Presi-

dent, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my honourable friend here, and I think it is only fair that we should pass this Bill when it comes before us. I think this should have been done twenty years ago. For instance, a woman may be a heavy tax-payer and yet not be represented, and there is an old proverb that there should be no taxation without representation, and for that one reason on principle I support the petition and I will support the Bill when it comes before us.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. President, I have very great pleasure in supporting this petition also. The two newspaper men who had that trip together last year have enlightened many of us as to their escapades, and if the things they said happened really did it is a wonder they have come back at all. I do not think we need go outside Newfoundland to get evidence of the justice that would be done to the women of this country by giving them the right to vote. We have simply to take the people of the outports and contrast the work done by the women with the work done by the men. If you really look into the conditions you cannot but come to the conclusion that the woman bears her full burden of everything that is done. I do not know either of any woman in St. John's who does not work equally with the man, though in a different sphere. For that reason, I think it is only just, and I agree with the Hon. Mr. Power that it should have been done years ago, so that here the women should have had the right to vote. I learn from the "Daily News" that the women are asking simply for the right to vote at twenty-five years of age. Why make any difference between the man and the woman? The woman will take her place and no doubt will occupy many positions that men are occupying to-day, and much more effectively. There are many

positions in life that it is more becoming for a woman to fill than for a man, and why should we not give them all the privileges that men have. They are the half of the community at least, and as to education and intellect, they are, in this country at least, certainly superior to the men. If you take any ordinary outport in Newfoundland, you will see that the women are the intellect of the place. There are many things to be said for it, and I hope the ladies will ask for the right to vote at the time when a woman is responsible for her own acts. I have great pleasure, Mr. President, in lending my support to this Bill, and I think that this House is practically unanimous, and probably also the other House. I am sure this House, Mr. President, would be improved by the addition of ladies.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—I rise, Mr. President, to support the measure upon the table. I have committed myself in this matter in framing the City Charter. I therefore, in order to be consistent, must support this measure here. I agree with the two honourable gentlemen who have spoken that the full measure of enfranchisement should be given the women. They should get the right to vote at twenty-one, because their responsibility at twenty-one is just as much as that of a man, and I also think that illiteracy should not debar a woman from voting. I am satisfied, Mr. President, that if the women of Newfoundland have a vote, we will have much cleaner politics than we have at present. I have noticed in travelling through the United States that there women are filling many positions, not only learned position, but women set type, play in bands, and drive street cars, and act as street-car conductors. Well, if they can do all these things, why deprive them of the privilege given the men? I have therefore much pleasure, Mr. President, in supporting this mea-

sure, and when it comes before the House in proper form, I shall accord it my endorsement.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Mr. President, I wish to support the prayer of the petition before this Chamber, and when the Bill comes here I will give it my hearty support. I do not see why the women of Newfoundland should be debarred from voting as well as the men. We have had that privilege very long, and they have been kept behind too long, and I am glad to see here this afternoon so many ladies taking such an active interest in the petition now before us, and when the Bill comes to us for consideration I will give it my hearty support.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—The honourable member, Mr. Bishop, did not tell us why Mrs. Ralph Smith did not take the position of Speaker; it was because she would not be permitted to speak.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company's Act, 1920."

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the House on second reading I endeavoured to explain what it meant. It really means the elimination of Clause 5, paragraph 5, in the original Bill which was agreed to be stricken out. It was printed in the Bill in error. In the agreement between the Company and the Government there is a clause to the effect that this Clause 5 is to be stricken out.

On motion 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1918."

Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is brought in with reference to negotiations pending between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the Government, so that reservations may be made of any minerals besides petroleum on lands which the Company may be prospecting, so that if the Company is prospecting for oil, the Government may be able to allow other companies to come in and prospect for other minerals.

On motion 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 House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, the object of this Bill is to modify the present law respecting lotteries. The present law makes all lotteries illegal, no matter for what purpose they may be held, and it is in order to modify that Act, giving discretionary power to Magistrates under certain conditions, that this Bill is brought in. A lot of complications have arisen recently with respect to the carrying out of the law, and it has been thought necessary to modify it to give power to the Magistrate to issue licenses if he is satisfied under certain conditions that the lottery is being held for charitable purposes, or for educational, religious or social purposes.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Just what is meant by "social purposes."

HON. MR. SHEA:—The honourable member would be able to gather that as well as I could. I suppose it means social entertainments, and would cover lotteries for a useful purpose not coming under the other three heads. The law has for a long time been more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and it has

been thought wise to give a discretionary power to the Magistrate, so that he will be able to decide whether a lottery would come under this heading of "Social."

In regard to the discretionary powers of the Magistrate, for religious purposes I have no objection, but I think it is throwing an unnecessary burden on the Magistrate if you are going to include "social purposes" which has no real definition, and the Magistrate will often find himself in a difficult position in deciding and refusing. I do not think the bill should be allowed to pass granting any discretionary power to the Magistrate for other than religious or educational purposes. When you say social purposes, that is simply matters of pleasure and I do not see why lotteries should in any way add to the enjoyment of a night's ordinary pleasure. Sweepstakes are regarded generally as harmful and could be gotten up and somebody offering 5% or 10% for some worthy object, which I think should not be allowed.

HON. SIR P. T. McRATH:—The original Lottery Act was passed 16 or 18 years ago to do away amongst other things with the scandal of what is known as a wheel of fortune operating in every block on Water St. during the Christmas season in particular, raffling turkeys, geese and all sorts of things. Then of course the sweepstakes scandal was almost as bad. Nowadays I do not think any lotteries are held for anything but these conditions. Social I think is meant to cover cases of charitable or educational purposes. You will notice there is no reference to religious purposes. As regards the point made by Hon. Mr. Bishop I think a section could be introduced providing that all funds should go to the cause.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—As I have been interested in this lottery business for a considerable period for

educational purposes, I may say it was in '91 or '92 when this bill was brought in, Mr. McKay I think had charge of it, and I appealed to him and gave my reasons for opposing the bill. I was interested in charitable and educational institutes where they had 600 boys receiving a good education, and they had to heat the building, but the funds at the disposal of those in charge were very low and we were not in a position to carry on our educational movement if we did not heat the building. At all events this matter was introduced and I explained to the late member for Port de Grave, Mr. McKay, the great hardship we would have to go through if this bill was passed into law. He said, Oh, you will raise it in some other channel. Well I need not tell you all those ways are exhausted and if those charitable institutions are not supported by something like a bazaar or drawing of prizes they will all fall flat. Now in regard to prizes that are given. I have an instance in mind now where an article of some value is given for a lottery, and it does not have the same effect as if you had a money prize. Some parties take a ticket if many prizes in addition, no matter how small it may be, but it has a greater effect in the disposal of the tickets. On general grounds I do not admire sweepstakes, but they will be always with us. I wish to support the bill on general principles. I do not quite understand the social part of it but more on the charitable and educational parts of it, and I hope you will take that side and if we find any mistake has been made, we can easily remedy it at the next session. I have a particular object in stating this. I know an institution here which is in debt to the extent of \$12,000, and if this bill does not pass through those people will not be able to continue their work because their funds are exhausted. If we find any objection to

the bill I would be the first to move its cancellation or amendment for next year. Or if you wish to make it for one year and are then not satisfied we could do away with it. I would like it to go through because of the charitable and educational grounds.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I am sorry the Hon. President misunderstands my remarks. I clearly stated I had no objection to charitable or educational work.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again, which report was received.

On motion, the House then adjourned until Wednesday next at 4 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 11th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Amendment Act and the Crown Lands 1918 Amendment Act were read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the House went into Committee on the Board of Pensions Commissioners Bill, Hon. Mr. Winter in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In reply to the Hon. Sir P. T. McGrath in regard to the reason for the reduction in the Board of Commissioners, I may say it is considered that two are sufficient for the amount of work to be done, and it is on the score of economy really that the Board is reduced. They hope to effect a saving altogether of \$3200.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—On the score of economy that is a very strong case, but from my experience of the work of the Board, covering a considering period, I think it is desirable to have the three men. I do not press the view but it must be remembered the Board acts in a judicial capacity and must pass on all cases and

there are 2000 of them, and while I do not question the ability of the two gentlemen, there may be times when one or the other may be out of the country.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Well they can appoint a substitute.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Of course, they can, under the Act, but he would not be as capable as those there familiar with the work. Of course to save \$3200 is very commendable, but I maintain a disability may easily cost the country more if given a wrong status. In Canada they have subordinate boards throughout the provinces to take the work off the shoulders of the main Board. Here these gentlemen have to do all the supervising themselves, and it may be in the long run this may prove more costly than we can see at present. However having put these points forward I am not disposed to criticise the bill any further.

The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment, which report was received, and it was ordered said bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I beg to move the second reading of the bill respecting the High Commission for Newfoundland in the U.K. which simply asks for legislative authority to make the appointment, which there was no legal power to do up to now.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I think the hon. gentleman and his associates ought in the interests of the country abandon this whole High Commissioner office and staff in London at the present time. I think the expenditure involved brings no commensurate return. It was very well while we had a gentleman who gave his services free of charge, but I have never been able to satisfy myself that apart from the spectacular aspect of it, any practical result followed, or that the Colony received any real sub-

stantial result through the position. I take it from what we read in the press as to the intention of the gentleman who at present occupies the position, and who I feel would fill the position with dignity and has an acquaintance with the Colony and its affairs which would enable him to make the very most of the position, but when it comes to a matter of appointing a gentleman at a salary of \$12,000 to \$15,000 a year, I think we ought to ask ourselves whether we should not abolish the position altogether and the staff as well. Some of the Canadian provinces maintain gentlemen in London whom they call Agents General. They rank below the High Commissioner, and represent provinces exceeding ours in population and resources, yet one finds in Canadian papers at any rate, questions as to whether it is desirable to continue these, it being argued that the High Commissioner is capable of doing all the work for the 8 or 9 provinces of Canada. But I would suppose that if estimates were taken of the cost of the offices and staff we must be incurring an outlay at the present time of \$10,000 or \$12,000 for the upkeep. Now if we add to that another \$10,000 or \$15,000 for Commissioner's salary, because I do not suppose a man could live in London and maintain the dignity to such a position for less than that, we are paying altogether too high a price for this work, and my view would be that we ought to avail of the occasion, utilize the circumstances which we know exist at the present time, to call off these expenses, make a substantial and really beneficial saving, and get along as best we can without a High Commissioner until the country gets back into such a condition of prosperity that we can feel reasonably safe in claiming that we can afford to maintain such an office in London, however **problematical** even then the benefit may be.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President. I may say in reply to the hon. member that this bill is not to make provision for any new appointment. It is merely to provide that the position of High Commissioner may be a legal one. As a matter of fact, the Government has nothing very definite in the shape of a resignation from Sir Edgar Bowring, and the question is under consideration now and until that is disposed of, I think it would be unwise to refuse to pass the bill as it stands. As I have already said, it is not the intention to pass this Bill with the idea of making a new appointment, but with a view to legalizing the position as it stands at the present, even if an appointment should never be made. I beg to move the second reading.

The bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The President read a communication from His Excellency the Governor granting leave of absence to Hon. S. K. Bell.

House then adjourned until Monday next, May 16th, at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, May 16th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Third read of Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Board of Pension Commissioners."

On motion this bill 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.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom." Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman,

this bill is brought in by the Government for the purpose of legalising the office of High Commissioner. So far as I am aware, there is no immediate intention of filling this position with any new appointee, and, as a matter of fact, the negotiations that have been pending between the Government and Sir Edgar Bowring are still pending, and the Government have received no official notification from him of his resignation, and in the meantime he is performing the duties of High Commissioner for Newfoundland in London. As it is, the position has not been legalised, and the Government thinks that the appointment and the position ought to be made legal.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if in the new estimates there is a provision for a salary for this office.

HON. MR. SHEA:—No, there is no salary.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Of course that would not necessarily prevent the Government from creating a salary. The danger I see about this, Mr. Chairman, is, as I said at the last session, that there is a temptation there to make an appointment at some future time. I hope, to begin with, that while Sir Edgar Bowring desires to fill the position, there will be no interference with him. If we can get a man of the standing of Sir Edgar Bowring to fill the position without salary, we are fortunate, but, at the same time, I personally grudge the expenditure of eight or ten thousand dollars for the upkeep of the High Commissioner. It is a striking commentary of my idea of the importance of the position and the part played by our representative on the other side that in the Daily Mail of recent date is a picture of Sir Edgar Bowring with this legend under it: "Sir Edgar Bowring, High Commissioner for Newfoundland, who has just arrived in London." I take it that these people

are under the impression that Sir Edgar Bowring is in London for the first time. I think that is a fair construction to put on it. I also made some reference last sitting to the cost of this establishment and since then I find a reference to Australia's High Commissioner and Agents General. The article goes on to say:—(Read extract).

You will observe that the under current through that whole article was that this position costing \$750,000 was not a success. I think the same about our office in London. I have made inquiries and find there are half a dozen officials of both sexes there and I am puzzled to find what they can find to do. I wish the Government instead of bringing in this bill would have brought in some measure to provide that if Sir Edgar Bowring gave up this position, it should be abandoned altogether as we ought to save every dollar we can. Were it not that Sir Edgar Bowring is enjoying the position at present and that any action we might take would be considered a reflection on himself, I would be in doubt as to whether we should consider this measure.

HON. JOHN ANDERSON:—I had occasion to be in London in 1916, and this office was not referred to then, the work of representing this Colony being done pretty well through the Pay and Record Office. Since 1913 Sir Edgar Bowring has been appointed High Commissioner and has given his services gratuitously. I am not going into all the details but would like to make some reference to what other Colonies and Dominions have done in this connection:—

London Representatives of British Dominions.

Indian Government. Pop., 315 millions; High Commissioner.

Australian Commonwealth. Pop., 5,250,000; \$800,000, High Commissioner.

New South Wales. Pop., 2,000,000; Agent-General.

Victoria. Pop., 1,500,000! Agent-General.

South Australia. Pop., 500,000; Agent-General.

Queensland. Pop., 725,000; Agent-General.

Tasmania. Pop., 220,000; Agent-General.

Western Australia. Pop., 330,000; Agent-General.

Dominion of Canada. Pop., 8,500,000; High Commissioner. Provinces: Alberta, rep. by the H.C., 400,000; Manitoba, 600,000; Prince Edward Island, 150,000; Saskatchewan, 600,000; Yukon, 90,000.

British Columbia. Pop., 500,000; Agent-General.

New Brunswick. Pop., 450,000; Agent-General.

Nova Scotia. Pop., 600,000; Agent-General.

Ontario. Pop., 2,750,000; Agent-General.

Quebec. Pop., 2,250,000; Agent-General.

New Zealand. Pop., 1,250,000; High Commissioner.

Union of South Africa. Pop., 7,000,000; High Commissioner.

Represented in London.

British North Borneo—The Secty. Court of Directors.

Malay States—Malay States Agency Sarawak—Advisory Council.

Sudan Government—Sudan Govt. Agency.

Crown Colonies—Rep. by Crown Agents for the Colonies.

Protectorates—Secty. of State for Foreign Affairs.

Newfoundland. Pop. 250,000; Agent General or High Commissioner, Sir Edgar Bowring; Capt. Victor Gordon, Secty. Vote—Estimate: 1919-20:—Secty., \$3500; clerk, \$2000; typist, \$600; messenger, \$600; total, \$6,700. 1920121—\$10,395.

Now I feel that if it is found that this Colony should be represented in London I fail to see why Capt. Victor Gordon, the present Secretary who does the work in the absence of the High Commissioner, should not occupy the latter position. I do not say the office should be abolished in the event of Sir Edgar Bowring retiring, but I do say this, if he does retire, I think the staff in the office at present should be sufficient and expensive enough to do any work that has been done up to the present time.

I regret the third reading of the Pensions Bill had passed before I entered the House, but if I may be par-

doned for making a brief reference I think it is a step in the right direction. No matter has created more debate and more concern in the British House of Commons than the extravagance and waste in connection with pensions.

What it cost the British Government, a table published by the Treasury shows that there are 25 Government Departments now in existence which were not established before the war. The present staff of all these departments numbers 69,382 and cost approximately \$6,345,000 last March or about \$76,140,000 per year. Chief of these are:

	Staff	Cost for the Month
Air Ministry	\$ 2,288	\$ 280,000
Ministry of Food and Wheat Commission	1,889	217,000
Ministry of Health	6,210	766,750
Ministry of Munitions	3,074	433,000
Ministry of Labour	22,627	2,068,750
Ministry of Pensions	26,206	1,860,000
Ministry of Shipping	860	90,000
Ministry of Transport	788	127,500

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have only to repeat what I have already said so far as the Government are concerned they have no intention of making any new appointment. Sir Edgar Bowring's official resignation has not been received and negotiations are pending now and for that reason I would be sorry to have any interference with the bill now, because it would place the gentleman who now occupies that position with credit and dignity to himself and the Colony in a very difficult position. The Government have no intention of making any new appointment so far as I know. I think with Sir Patrick McGrath we could get along very well without the position at all. It is looked upon as a luxury.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That

is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, and that is practically the position I am setting up. I think we are safer, the country is safer, in the matter of economy if appointments are only made when the High Commissioner asks. After all, let us try to reason 'out logically. What would any business man in this House do if he were establishing a branch in England tomorrow. He would send a manager over, and surely the logical thing would be that he would accept the suggestion of his manager as to how many people he wanted to staff his office. He might say, "Well, you are asking for too many. We cannot afford to give you any. You will have to try and get along with fewer people." The head of the business is not likely to say, "Well, you are not ask-

ing for enough. I am going to give you three or four more." That is not a logical position. I do not say that the High Commissioner is to name any person; that is not a part of his business; and it would not be a part of his business to object to anybody, but the point I am trying to make is that the Colony should be protected from having a number of needless officials dumped into the High Commissioner's Office in London to satisfy party claims here in this country. That is the position, simply that and nothing more. It is quite true that we will have to pay the bill, and the more people we have, the more we are going to have to pay. I think the logical position is that the person going over to act for us ought only to have the number of officials that he thinks he requires, and perhaps not even that number, but the discretion ought to be in the Government, and ought only to be exercised on the recommendation of the man who is filling the position.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how the proposal in any way curtails the authority or powers of the Government, so far as making selections is concerned. I think it would work well for the establishment in London if the Commissioner would not have officials sent from here or a staff sent from here whom he might think were unfit or whom he did not want, but at any rate I would move that the Committee rise, and I will get some further information, and then be able to take it up at a subsequent sitting.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the Committee rises, I would ask whether the High Commissioner makes a report on his office every year.

HON. MR. SHEA:—So far as I am aware, there is no report.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Do you know whether he makes an annual report?

HON. MR. SHEA:—I do not think he does. It probably would be wise to put in a provision in the Bill requiring the Commissioner to make an annual report.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, I would say a few words with respect to the High Commissioner's present Secretary, Mr. Victor Gordon. He is a young man of splendid ability, first trained here in the Bank of Montreal, then trained in Edinburgh, and he would make a thoroughly qualified representative. If the Government wanted to make the High Commissionership a permanent position, I do not think they would pass over Captain Gordon.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the House adjourned until Thursday afternoon, May 19th, at 4 p.m.

THURSDAY, May 19th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. President read message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the bills entitled respectively, "An Act to Amend the Profiteering Act 1920" and "An Act Respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber" in which concurrence was requested.

On motion said bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—In supporting the motion to adjourn, I wish to make a few observations regarding the condition of this country in relation to strikes. In reply to a question from Sir Michael Cashin, the Prime Minister informed him he had sent the following cable to Sir Edgar Bowring (read cable). Now the immediate steps that were thus taken by the Prime Minister deserve the best congratulations of this house. Grand Falls is a place for wages, Grand Falls is a town, but Grand Falls has fallen.

I have read with a great deal of interest about the trouble there. That letter altho' I do not know the author is a fair reasonable satisfactory explanation of the situation before the public of St. John's. I am a firm believer in Unions. We have a number of them here, but the trouble so far as this country is concerned with unions, has not yet started, and I am taking this opportunity of getting at least my voice to the ears of the government, though the leader of this house for some form of legislation for having a board of conciliation or some method whereby people can be prevented from going on strike. So far as Grand Falls is concerned, it appears there was to be a reduction in wages of 33 1-3 per cent. while coal was to be advanced over 100 per cent. I am not defending either the workmen or the Company, but I say some effort should be made through some channel to have the trouble adjusted. I need not dwell on the letter in its details; every honorable gentleman has no doubt read it, but what is going on to-day and will go on in connection with strikes?

(Reads extract.)

The great strike of 1912 cost the trade \$6,500,000 from the Union funds and thirty millions of dollars in wages

(Reads extract)

The present strike will exceed those figures by 50 per cent. Now as I have said we want some bill or law that will prevent strikes and save the laborers from much suffering and loss and I think some arrangement might be made between the government, and the Board of Trade when disputes arise. In 1909 a resolution was submitted to the Board of Trade by Mr. Reuben Horwood to this effect.

(Reads article)

Now, I submit these few observations to the leader of the government and I think that the government should entertain some similar scheme as they have in Canada. We have in

St. John's over 20 Unions. Now with all due respect to those unions which are affiliated with United States unions, I do not think it is fair to this country, a country very small as compared with the United States even with the capitals of that large country such as New York or Boston, to be in a scrap for the last three or four weeks in connection with printers, simply because they are affiliated with printers in a large country like the United States. Now I am not defending them for the strike, whether right or wrong, but it seems to me that we should not be affiliated with a large country such as I speak of, and more particularly in connection with trivial matters. I hope, Mr. President, that the honorable leader of the government in this House will take time by the forelock and bear in mind that we have trouble ahead of us, if we are not very careful, from what I have been led to understand in connection with bringing down to normal conditions the question of wages, and rather than have a strike I hope it will be in the interests of the government to bring in some sort of a Bill to the effect that negotiations must take place between the employers and the employed before a strike is begun.

HON. MR. SHEA—Just one word in reply to the honorable member. I shall take much pleasure. Sir, in communicating the views of the honorable member on the strike at Grand Falls to the government, but I am afraid he is giving the government a very big order if he thinks any course can be taken to prevent strikes. In England, America, and Canada they have for years had all kinds of organizations to try to control strikes, and we see for the last four or five years all these countries have been having strikes from one year's end to another. Now if that is the experience of countries like England, I think we can hardly expect to have any organization or any efficient machinery here to pre-

vent these strikes. However, I shall have very much pleasure in communicating his views on the Grand Falls strike to the Executive Government.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I thank the honourable the leader of the government very much indeed for his promise that he will take this up with the government.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I think, Mr. President, that the honourable gentleman is wrong. They have no such organizations in the United States. As a matter of fact, if he will look at public messages to-day he will find that in Washington the Secretary of Labor has been trying on behalf of the striking seamen to endeavour to make an arrangement on their behalf with the United States Shipping Board and the owners of shipping who have been held up for some weeks by striking marine workers. There is no organization, neither state organization nor nation-wide organization, to deal with strikes in the way of conciliation. In Canada they have what is known as the Rowell Act, which provides for the creation of conciliation boards, and makes it illegal to cause a strike until after a months' notice has been given, and an opportunity afforded for such a Board to act, but, as a matter of fact, the experience of late years is that there is a growing disposition on the part of workmen to disregard the law altogether. Consequently, it is impossible to enforce it when workmen get into such a frame of mind that they refuse to recognize the law, and we have seen instances of that kind of conditions when the coal miners in Canada went on strike, ignored the Rowell Act and the suggestions of the Board of Conciliation and their own organization, over-threw the delegates of the official force of their labor unions and held out for impossible terms, and after being out for many weeks had ultimately to agree to less satisfactory terms than they might have secured at

first. The same thing occurred in New York. There is a growing tendency on the part of workmen to disregard laws that cannot be enforced by Police or Troops or some authority of that kind. I think we all sympathise with the suggestions of the honorable members as to the desirability of such a step being taken. I have no wish to introduce any political partisan element into the debate, but I would remind the honourable gentleman that in the Manifesto of the Prime Minister there is the specific declaration of his intention to create a labor bureau and provide machinery for dealing with such matters. Possibly it may be argued that in the eighteen months that the government has been in office there has not been an opportunity of dealing with this. However, the facts remain that a definite promise to move was made in this connection. The honourable gentleman also referred to the undesirability of having Unions in this country affiliated with large unions abroad, and he instanced the printers. Having been connected with the newspaper business for many years, I would like to say on behalf of the printers that their argument in support of the policy of affiliation with the American unions is that there by it is made more possible for them to bring out a strike successfully. As to whether it is wise for them to strike, or threaten to strike, as often as they do, is another matter. In the present instance, I think the strike has very little to commend it. The only argument advanced in support of the strike is that by working fewer hours the printers would increase the length of their lives. Well, of course, that is absurd. If they work, then, only six hours a day, on the same principle they would live thirteen or sixteen years longer. If they did not work at all, they would live for ever. Such a proposition only needs to be analysed to show its absurdity, and I

think, so far as the printers are concerned, and their strike, they cannot get the sympathy of the community on a proposition of that sort. Without the sympathy of the community a strike has very little hope of succeeding. In further reference, would point out to my honourable friend that the strike at Grand Falls is a strike between three or four unions, all of which are affiliated with the large International Paper Makers Union in the United States and Canada, and they were affiliated for this reason. The original paper-makers brought to Grand Falls were from America and Canada. A lot of these men were of the most skilled character in their own profession and special inducements had to be offered to get them and keep them there. As to the merits of the contending parties in the strike I cannot say. One can have sympathy with men whose wages are being cut twenty-five to thirty-three per cent. My greatest sympathy is with the unskilled laborers who are asked to take a reduction of thirty-three per cent. While we would all like to see the working men get the most possible, it must be remembered that these paper-makers on their own showing have been making and will be making a great deal more than men in similar lines of work in this city, and while it has been charged that the cost of living in Grand Falls is somewhat higher, I do not know what the difference is. With regard to coal, I understand the position is this, that a number of years past the millworkers have been given their coal at much below cost, now the Company has decided that they can no longer do so. The Company last year bought a tremendous stock of coal, I am told they have two million dollars worth of coal at Grand Falls most of which will not be used for a couple of years. A lot of that coal had to be bought at a high figure, and then freight had to be paid, first freight to Botwood and then

freight from Botwood to Grand Falls. Under these circumstances, of course, the Company is not without a claim to consideration. Somewhat the same is the position of the Reid Newfoundland Company which has had to pay very heavy prices for its coal, and has supplied its employees or tried to supply them with coal at a figure below cost. I am not an advocate of one side or the other, but I think it is well that in discussing it we look at both sides of the question.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—I think the most trouble with Mr. Anderson is that he does not get into the papers quickly enough.

On motion the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 25th, at 4 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, May 25th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MILLEY—I would ask that the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries" stand over, as just before coming into the House I was asked to lay on the Table of the House petition from several clergymen of the city. This I will do, with the permission of the House.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act respecting the High Commissioner for Newfoundland in the United Kingdom."

Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the House at its last sitting the Committee rose to consider the suggestion made by the honourable member, Sir Patrick McGrath, that all officers and clerks for the High Commissioner's office should be appointed on the recommendation of the High Commissioner. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I am unable to accede to the suggestion, for the reason that the insertion in the Bill of such a clause might lead to possible complications that it is desirable to avoid. It would practically be

placing the appointment of any such official, clerk, or whoever might be the officer, in the hands of the High Commissioner, and that would tie the hands of the government down in a manner that would not be desirable. Heads of Departments here have no such power. That is the only question that has been raised with regard to this Bill, and I would move now the adoption of the first clause.

HON. MR. McNAMARA—Mr. Chairman Before we proceed any further I would like to say that I think we would be on the safe side if we went cautiously and considered the seriousness of creating the office, because it would possibly cost the colony about \$25,000 a year. I think we should ask ourselves before we proceed further if we can afford it, or whether we can possibly do without it. It must be admitted that we have been spending too extravagantly for the past five or six years. It is just as well for us to realize that we are hard up. I have a few extracts here, Mr. Chairman, taken from the report of the Board of Trade last year, and find that the exports to the United Kingdom in 1916 amounted to \$4,582,369; in 1917, \$4,836,084; in 1918, \$3,822,931; in 1919, \$2,713,089; in 1920 \$6,411,967; approximately \$22,366,440 for the five years, or \$4,473,288 per annum. Of these exports \$3,164,686 represented the exports of paper and other goods which would have gone to London if we never had any Commissioner there. If we subtract these \$3,164,686 it leaves a net result of our average exports to the United Kingdom for the last five years, the very small sum of \$1,308,602. That is a very small amount of business to have with the United Kingdom, but possibly the Trade Commissioner is not to be blamed for it. We turn to exports to Canada. I shall not weary the House with the amount for each year, but will give the average. The average to Canada amounted to \$2,390,067, roughly twice as much as

we sent to the United Kingdom. Taking the United States for a five year period, we find that for five years the exports amounted to \$24,648,569, or an average of \$4,929,713. Now we propose recalling the Commissioner at New York, who possibly influences five times as much exports as the Commission at London, and proposes to create the office of Commissioner in London. I take the word of the honourable gentleman who is leader of the government that it is not to be created, and I think there will be a great temptation to do so. That is my idea of the Bill.

Now in face of these facts, I think the Bill should be given serious consideration, as it is a large amount of money, and under our present financial circumstances we really cannot afford the outlay. I have some letters here sent to the office of the High Commissioner, and in turn to the Board of Trade here, asking for information, and I claim if the High Commissioner's office never existed these letters would be sent to the Board of Trade here. One of them refers to a new wire. I do not think it should be taken seriously. I do not wish to reflect on the services of Sir Edgar Bowring; I do not think it possible to get a better man, I think the country owes him gratitude for his self-sacrifice during the past 4 years, and if the result is not satisfactory the blame cannot be attributed to him. With further reference to the New York Commissioner, I think it would be a mistake to have him removed.

HON. MR. SHEA—I do not think there is any intention of having him removed.

HON. MR. McNAMARA—Well it is rumored on the street. I have always thought we should have a man there. On the ground of non utility and economy I am opposed to this bill, and shall register my vote against it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH—I regret the hon. gentleman and his col-

leagues has found it impossible to accept my amendment to the third clause It was introduced to read as follows:

(read amendment)

The meaning of this was that the High Commissioner himself should indicate the extent of the staff he should require, and its enlargement from time to time, and that he might not have people thrust upon him, political nonentities from here who might be sent over to him through political pull. The hon. gentleman says that principle did not apply. I think he is mistaken in that. All educational appointments are made not by the Government but on the recommendation of the heads of the religious denominations. If the principle is sound in educational matters I think it is sound here. However I hope if this office is to continue no Government will act in the manner I suggest as possible but I think it must be recognized there is always a danger that somebody with influence in political circles might have himself sent over there and put in the High Commissioner's office as a political job. With reference to the desirability of having such an appointment, our good friend the Chairman quoted us matter the other day in regard to this question which I presume he copied from Whittaker or some other year book. He showed that some of the Overseas Colonies or Dominions had representation in London and amongst them he mentioned several as Agents for certain Canadian provinces. Since then I came upon a Frederickton Bulletin of last week which reads as follows: (Reads Extract.) In other words the rest of the provinces find it does not pay to have these offices in London. With reference to the relative value of the Commissioners in London and New York being judged by the amount of trade shown I think our good friend, Mr.

McNamara will see that that is fallacious. Sir Edgar Bowring has been stationed in London for three years. For a good part of that time Britain was unable to handle exports or imports owing to the war. I am speaking in the judgment of half a dozen dry goods and other business men who were unable to get goods in London during the war when all manufacture applied to war materials.

HON. MR. MCNAMARA.—My figures applied to fish products only.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH.—Well take fish products; everything was pared down owing to the inability of getting ships, and I think that until the High Commissioner had a period of ten or twelve years it would be unfair to judge of the results of his work by the trade statistics. I think the argument unfair as regards the United States. The gentleman there only took up office last November and consequently any statistics quoted here apply to the period when we had no man at all. Personally I do not think the Trade Commissioner there will affect the situation one dollar but that to effect results of a policy of Trade Commissioners in the U. S. we would have to spend the whole of our revenue to do so. The same thing occurs in regard to Canada. A gentleman named Cooper was sent to New York on behalf of the Canadian Government, this office has just been suppressed, and recently I read a speech of his in which he advocated the appointment of consuls or trade agents to the number of 100 in various cities of the U. S., and said until they did that they would have no results. His argument is that the U. S. to-day has 93 consuls or trade agents in Canada and the charges realize enough to pay all the salaries and he argues Canada should do likewise and have a system of charges which would pay all their salaries without throwing

the burden on the Canadian Exchequer. Now that seems to me to be a sane idea but to suggest that any gentleman occupying an office on the 13th or 14th floor of a big building in New York will exercise any effect on the business situation of the U. S. or Newfoundland is a visionary idea and will not have any beneficial results. I say that without saying regarding the present commissioner's abilities. Having said this much I feel I have done my duty. I have said I think it a waste of money to maintain this office any longer than Sir Edgar Bowring is prepared to fill it without charge to the Colony. As to what we shall gain from having a man in the U. S. I do not think we shall ever get very far. Our trade with the U. S. has been largely the result of the physical contiguity so to speak and the activity on the part of the American business people. I believe with similar activity on our part much greater results would follow.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—My hon. friend on my right who has just spoken will remember I am sure listening to me in 1916 when I referred to the matter of a High Commissioner for Newfoundland. I take it that I am the father, if I may call it so, of that thought. I strongly urged then the necessity of having such an office in London. I remember when I was caught over there that year for four weeks and had to apply to the Canadian Commissioner to get out to Newfoundland with other Newfoundlanders who were there at the time. We were told several times to get a High Commissioner appointed for Newfoundland, as Canada had no voice in having Newfoundlanders sent home. Since that time the appointment has been made and I have visited that office over and over again and find it a great success and a help to me as a business man in visiting England for buying purposes. I will go

further and say that the Government ought to increase the vote and have better accommodation and a better office for Newfoundland than we have at the present time. We are known in London or England to be nothing but fish merchants. Well, Sir, we have local industries here which in my opinion if they had samples in London could be perhaps running today instead of being shut down. That perhaps is broad statement, but it is a fact as I know some items manufactured here could be sold in Great Britain at prices at which they are sold over there. I strongly believe it is a right step and instead of having a small office in Victoria St. on the 3rd or 4th story, we should have a place in some prominent position, either on the Strand or Regent St. with a good showing of what Newfoundland can produce. I would ask Hon. Mr. McNamara if he has ever visited London?

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—No.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—Well you do not know what you are talking about. As a dry goods' man it has been a great help to me and I hope and trust this House will not vote to throw out this bill. I give it my hearty support and I am sorry my hon. friends on my right has taken the position he has in regard to this bill.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Last year I took up as head of my department, with Sir Edgar Bowring, the subject of canker or wart disease of potatoes and he took it up in turn with the British Board of Agriculture and I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to the efficient work he did in regard to that matter. That was the only experience I had with his office. He supplied us with canker proof potatoes and all information as to handling the situation, and I am proud to say the result of our efforts here have been a great success. Sir Edgar Bowring personally took up

the matter; he is somewhat of an amateur farmer, I understand, and devoted a lot of time to the matter in London. I do not think we are in any position to discuss what that office is doing for Newfoundland. I do not think we should abolish that office. In reply to Sir Patrick McGrath I wish to point out that Canada early saw what could be done. They have had a High Commissioner for years and the provinces went even further and appointed agents general. If any province has abolished its agent they still have the High Commissioner, but if we abolish the High Commissioner we have nothing. I think we should know the amount of work done in the H. C.'s office in London and I think it would astonish this House and the country generally. He has done great work for the country. I also agree with my hon. friend Mr. McNamara. I think Newfoundland should have an agent in New York. I think it would be a mistake to abolish the commissionership in New York. He could at least help Newfoundland to direct its trade in the right channels.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Mr. Chairman, I had no ulterior object in bringing forward the issue I did when this bill was before the House a few days ago, that under present conditions and the present period of stress, we could not afford to maintain the office. But let us take the Hon. Mr. Milley's argument. He says the High Commissioner's office was of great service to him. We can understand that. The next question arises, was the service which the High Commissioner's office gave him such as to justify its maintenance at \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year. I suggested that he give us an idea of what the office did for him, and I regret that he does not see it possible to do so, but I maintain that because the hon. gentleman had some difficulty in getting a passage out and the High Com-

missioner's Office was of value to him as a dry goods man, that is not sufficient to justify the maintenance by Newfoundland of the office at the expenditure of many thousands of dollars, unless it is supported by some substantial argument. If we had lots of money, I would say, alright, but my point is that what money we have we can apply to greater advantage. I might say that I am sure the hon. gentleman could have got through the Crown Agent for the Colonies the same service he got from the Newfoundland High Commissioner, with this exception, that the Crown Agent for the Colonies may not have had the personal familiarity with the affairs of this country that Sir Edgar Bowring or another person as Newfoundland's Commissioner, might have. The Minister of Agriculture & Mines cites an instance of good service in the matter of canker in potatoes. Well, we must wait to see whether that clears the canker out of the places where potatoes are grown.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I can assure my hon. friend that it was a success last year. Read the Agricultural Report for this year and you will see. I think the canker will be entirely cleared out of the country.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Does the Minister reach that conclusion after one year's experiment? For me, I would prefer to wait and see. However, the point I make is this, that even if the argument were sound it would not be an argument in favor of the High Commissioner's Office; it would be an argument of value concerning Sir Edgar Bowring, because I take it if we asked that gentleman in his private capacity to go into the matter he would have done the same thing.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Yes.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—And, as a bit of an amateur farmer he would probably have given as

much time and thought to work out the same solution if he were not High Commissioner.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—He has done good service.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I agree, and while he will hold the office we ought to make the sacrifice necessary to keep the office open, but if it comes to a question of appointing a man to succeed him at a salary of \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year, then I think we ought to abandon it.

Now with further reference to maintaining a Commissioner at New York, is it proposed to maintain a Commissioner at Montreal or Ottawa, because if the argument is sound that a Commissioner ought to be maintained at New York and can give good service there, then the same argument applies to the man at Montreal. If you hold that a Commissioner in London can do service and a Commissioner at New York can do service, then one can do service at Montreal.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I would like to see one there.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I would like to see twenty or thirty commissioners, and if we could afford it I would vote for it.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I do not want to prolong this debate, but I wish to say that my object in being against the bill is purely on the ground of expense. I do not think that under present circumstances we can pay a representative in London an unlimited salary. I would also mention the fact that I do not think we had any report from Sir Edgar Bowring since he was in office.

HON. MR. SHEA.—I heard there was a report printed.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—That is not a report; that is merely a booklet on Newfoundland.

HON. MR. SHEA.—I might say with regard to this Bill, as I said a few days ago, that there is no intention on

the part of the Government to create an office, but under the present law there is no Legislative authority for the appointment. The late Government appointed Sir Edgar Bowring Commissioner, and so it has gone on year by year. So far as I am aware, the Government has no intention of prolonging the office for a moment longer than is necessary, but there is a gentleman there who has occupied that position for many years and has given unqualified satisfaction, and if we were to deal in any drastic manner with this Bill it would be placing him in a awkward position. The Government has no official intimation of Sir Edgar Bowring's resignation, and I believe that he will continue to represent Newfoundland. I quite see the force of the hon. member opposite, but I think it would be putting Sir Edgar in a very awkward position if we refused to pass the Bill, and it would certainly be treating him unfairly.

HON. MR. MURPHY.—Mr. Chairman, I think there is some truth in both sides. I think we are going on too much in the old way. I do not think we are advertising enough, and that is where the trouble comes in. But when we do take up anything new, we go to extremes. When we do adopt a thing, we are not satisfied to go any moderate measure. We have not advertised this country, its resources and its products, enough, and while at the present time we are financially in a very poor position, I think the withdrawal of Sir Edgar Bowring is a step backward instead of forward. I think we should continue the office and should always have there as Commissioner a man who is thoroughly acquainted with the business and resources of the country but not some political hanger-on who may be sent over there through political influence. We have been lucky in having as our repre-

sentative a man like Sir Edgar Bowring. I am sorry that I have not been there since he was appointed, but we have put him up in an attic in some of these old buildings over there. I think the least we could do would be to put him on a lower flat, and put him where he can have an exhibit of Newfoundland products. It is not for the people of London our goods would be exhibited, but for travellers from every part of the world who would be visiting London. They would see our products and we cannot tell what business would be developed in that way. I think it would be wrong economy to try to do without this office. If we must economise we can do it in other directions, and easily save enough to carry on this office and put it in proper shape. That is my idea of this Bill, and I think if we gave Sir Edgar Bowring proper quarters, we would not have to appoint any new Commissioner.

On motion the Committee rose, and reported that they had passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Profiteering Act, 1920."

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill I would say that it speaks for itself. It is a Bill under which it is proposed to create a Board to deal with the question of profiteering, and the Board would have power to investigate price, costs, and profits, to receive and investigate complaints that an unreasonable profit is being made, declare a reasonable price and require the seller to repay an amount in excess of such price.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Might I ask the hon. gentleman why this Bill is brought in this year when a Bill was brought in for the same purpose last year?

HON. MR. SHEA.—Last year's Bill provided that the Food Board should deal with it. This provides that a Board shall be appointed.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for special purposes."

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—In moving the second reading of this Bill I might explain the object. Last winter there was destitution reported from various sections of the country, and in lieu of giving able-bodied poor relief the Government considered it advisable to try to secure work for the people, and got several individuals to enter into contracts with the Department of which I am head for cutting pit props and pulpwood. In all, permission was given for the cutting of about 52,000 cords, of which between 25,000 and 30,000 have been cut. The agreement entered into was something like this: They were allowed to cut pulpwood on ungranted Crown Lands, and sell and export it themselves. Failing to dispose of their cut, on or before the first day of June they would give notice to the Department and we would give them \$6.00 a cord. We were to be notified on the 21st day of May by the contractors if they had failed to dispose of their cut. The 21st day of May is now past, and we have heard from only one contractor. Eventually we may have to pay the \$6.00 and then try to sell the wood. The object of this Bill is to confirm the agreement and to allow the exportation of the pulpwood. When the Bill is in Committee stage I will be able to give the details, and I will now lay copy of the agreement on the table of the House.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—

Are all the contracts in identical form?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Yes, except in relation to the percentage of fir and spruce. In some localities we could not get the percentage of spruce, and we altered it.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until 4.00 p.m., Monday, May 30th.

MONDAY, May 30th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment

On motion the bill respecting the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom was read a third time and passed.

House went into Committee on the Lotteries Law Amendment Bill.

The Clerk read a petition from a number of clergymen in reference to the said bill.

HON. MR. MILLEY—I move the petition be taken into consideration of the Committee.

HON. MR. MEWS—I do not know what this motion is, but I presume it is a motion to receive the petition. The honourable member advocated that it should be received, but I think he is working under a misapprehension about the idea of the petition in drawing attention only to the last paragraph. The idea of the petition is set forth in the first line, "Believing that the principle of lotteries is unsound." The idea is that they are against lotteries of any kind, and in that position I agree absolutely with the views of the petitioners. It is rare, I think, Mr. President, that we have a petition before this House emanating from such gentlemen as have signed this, and I think they are to be commended for their restraint in not coming before the Bar of the House according to the usual procedure this year. That being so, Mr. President, I think this should receive

the consideration that it deserves. I think with regard to lotteries that no matter whether a lottery takes place on Water Street, and a man lotteries his watch, or articles are lotteried to get money for charitable or educational purposes, it is the same thing. My objection to lotteries is not that one man is going to make a pile of money out of it, but the temptation that lotteries put in the way of young fellows to engage in that sort of thing, and I do not think a man should be stopped from doing so on Water Street and then go up to St. George's Field on any afternoon and find lotteries being carried on all over the place, and if this amendment passes, it means that wheels of fortune and lotteries of every description can be put up without hindrance of any kind. There is absolutely no consistency to my mind in a Bill which gives permission to any charitable or educational society, or social organization. Whether I have a lottery or whether a lottery is carried on by an educational institution, the principle involved is absolutely the same.

HON. MR. BROWNING—I disagree with that entirely.

HON. MR. MEWS—I am sorry that the honourable gentleman should take a position of that sort. As I see it, this Bill is one of the loosest things that we have ever had come before us. I understand that the Lottery Act as it stands on the Statute Book at present could not be enforced because of some difficulties of obtaining evidence from those who are engaged therein. You could not force them to give evidence against themselves, and this was what various Inspector Generals have been up against, and I understand the present Inspector General is open to agree on certain modifications.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—You would expunge that last section from the petition, surely.

HON. MR. MEWS—They did not mean that at all. They meant that

they trusted Newfoundland would not espouse the principle of lotteries. That is all it means. If the House does not throw this amendment out altogether I submit that we ought to make it as drastic as it can well afford to be. There are various points that perhaps we could take up later about the minimum fine being a larger one, and I would certainly cut out this social matter. There is no mention of religious purposes, as some think there is. I would confine the Bill simply to charitable and educational purposes, and let each magistrate have power only within his own jurisdiction. I think the Bill here gives power to any magistrate to legalize a lottery in any part of the Island, and I think also that there should be a provision that all the proceeds of the lottery should go to the charitable or educational object. I think these amendments will have to be made before the Bill will be acceptable.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. President, while I agree to some extent with my honorable friend in the position he has laid down, I think that the greatest difficulty we have now is, if I may say so, the amount of hypocrisy that is associated with these so-called "reform measures". We had a Liquor Law. That was wiped out by Prohibition, and I thoroughly endorse the sentiment that the curse of the community is the scandalous way in which that law is being carried out, the principal offenders being in many instances people who were unceasing in their denunciation of liquor, and in their demands for Prohibition. Now turning to this particular matter of lotteries, when we had this subject under discussion for the first time, I pointed out one of the principal reasons why the Lottery Bill now on the Statute Book was enacted, to prevent the lotteries at Christmas time and other festive seasons, when wheels of fortune were at every block on Water Street. It was certainly time that that

should be done away with. Lotteries properly safeguarded I do not see any harm in. If the young fellows my honourable friend talks about cannot have a lottery to invest their money in, they can play cards, and unless you are prepared to wipe out card-playing, I do not know why you should strain at this matter of lotteries within reason. With regard to this particular petition, I think that the pitiful thing about it is that the respected gentlemen who signed it did not know what they were petitioning about. Supposing somebody had not conceived the brilliant idea that there was a State Lottery at the bottom of this, would these gentlemen have signed this petition at all? Would they have signed this petition to stop the reform in the Lottery Law now before us.

HON. MR. BROWNING—I know one clergyman who thought positively that there was a State Lottery until I gave him a copy of the Bill, and then he said he could see no objection to that Bill.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I think this petition is a reflection upon the intelligence of the gentlemen who signed it. If they had signed the petition and left out these two lines, nobody could take any exception to it, but when clergymen, men of education, who are able to read newspapers and follow the trend of discussions in the Press, sign their names to a petition with a paragraph like that in it, I think it is a pitiful exhibition for this community. That is frankly my opinion. I would not reject the petition. I think these gentlemen, as guardians of public morality, are entitled to express their opinions. With regard to the principle of lotteries, I may say that I agree with them and with my honourable friend opposite, but I may say that all these things are matters of compromise. In every aspect of law you will find the same thing. As I pointed out here before, over in Eng-

land they refused to sanction a lottery of a pearl necklace during the war, but there are lotteries in England every week of the year. They refused to have a state lottery last year, but you will find forms of gambling practised almost in the House of Commons itself. Coming over to the other side, you see horse races in Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto. During the war it became such a scandal that the Dominion Parliament appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the desirability of allowing them to be continued, and the Commission made a recommendation to the effect that horse racing was desirable in the interests of the improvement of the breed of horses. In Ontario the Government allowed gambling at horse races to be continued, but they imposed a fine, or rather, they required every person who was going to run a lottery by machines which they use for that purpose to pay \$10,000 a day. That is the fee for running a machine of that sort at horse races in Toronto. I was at Ottawa in 1916, and I was taken out by a friend to see the horse races. I experimented with one of these machines, and I won. I had never seen them operating before. I do not know whether any of the honourable gentlemen is familiar with them. You take your ticket for \$2 or \$5 or \$10 on some particular horse. If that horse wins, all the money that goes in is divided between the parties who have tickets, less five per cent. to the company which operates the machine. It is an automatic scheme of gambling. The gentleman who went out with me bid for me and I lost. We tried a second time and lost. Then I bid myself. I did not know about the different horses, but I took a chance, and won \$57, I think. You can imagine what an inducement that is. I saw women, middle-aged and old, going about with bills between their fingers, bidding. That illustrates one phase of human nature. We are horrified at the idea

of a State Lottery, but State Lotteries are recognized all over America and large loans are raised by both the Federal and State Governments by means of lotteries which nobody thinks is any harm. To come back to the main subject, Mr. President, I would not reject the petition. I would endorse the motion of my honourable friend that we refer this petition to the Committee of the Whole that will be considering this Bill, but I think the fact ought to be made clear to these gentlemen, with all due respect, that when next they sign a petition they ought to take the precaution of familiarizing themselves with the subject matter of the question with which the petition purports to deal.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Mr. President, I have no doubt that the clergymen regarded this as a great moral question. The Inspector General gave notice that no sweepstakes were to be held, but nevertheless just as many were held this spring as before. Nobody is going to give information in connection with lotteries. Coming to this Bill, it seems to me that Section 3, sub-sections (a) and (b) is the principal section, and I think we should give it very careful thought. I do not know how Magistrates would look upon it. However, Mr. President, I support the petition from these gentlemen. On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries."

HON. MR. MILLEY—I would like the word "social" defined.

HON. MR. SHEA—I gather it means any entertainment or gathering where people come together as at a bazaar. It is rather a broad term, but that is what it probably means.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I should leave that in the hands of the man who gives the license. If people would rather have a dance or social party for religious purposes, would it

not be better to leave the decision in the hands of the Magistrate who gives the license. He will find out what the affair is for, and if it is not for these purposes, he can refuse them permission to have the lottery, or if he finds that it is for educational or charitable purposes, he can give permission. I avail of this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to suggest to the honourable gentleman the addition of this section to the Bill.

Add as sub-section (5) to section 6:

"(5) It shall be a condition of every lottery or scheme of chance for which permission or license has been granted that the whole benefit or proceeds thereof, after deduction of necessary expenses, shall be paid or devoted to the object for which the lottery or scheme shall have been permitted. Any person taking or receiving for his private use any share of the proceeds or benefit of such lottery or scheme, and any person knowingly aiding another in procuring such share for his own use, shall be guilty of an offence under this chapter. The term "expenses" above mentioned shall not include the payment of any sum by way of commission to any person concerned in the promotion of conduct of such lottery or scheme."

The idea of that is to cover a situation that I suggested, that a man might go to the Magistrate and say "I am going to get up a lottery for such and such a charitable purpose, and I am going to give half the proceeds to that charity and keep the other half." This section will mean that unless he is prepared to give the whole proceeds he shall not be allowed to get up the lottery.

HON. MR. SHEA—He cannot use this Act as a money-making scheme?

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Exactly. There is, I think, a confusion of mind amongst some honourable gentlemen as to this word "Social." They think it refers to some form of entertainment. It refers, I

think, to bazaars, dances, or anything like that, that may be got up for social purposes, as distinct from educational, religious or athletic purposes. Frankly, I do not see why it is necessary to have "social" there at all.

HON. MR. BROWNING—Would the proceeds have to cover the expense of that social function?

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—The Bill says "It shall be lawful for any person or persons to organize, conduct and engage in lotteries and other schemes of chance, whether in connection with bazaars, sales, entertainments and other functions or otherwise." That is to say, you may have lotteries and schemes of chance at bazaars and sales, or you may have them distinct and apart from these gatherings altogether, provided that you are having them for some one of the object specified.

There is a possibility of it's being overdone. On the other hand I do not see why reasonable lotteries that commend themselves to the good judgment of a large section of the community should be objected to, because if you do you only perpetuate the hypocrisy of having a law on the Statute Book and people who denounce these things taking tickets all the time. I am for reasonable lotteries not that I have any particular feeling for them. I may say frankly I have not been asked for years to take a ticket in any of these things. This word "social" is liable to create abuse but at the same time it must be remembered nobody can get a license unless the Magistrate is satisfied it is bona fide and the question is are we satisfied to allow the Magistrate this discretion. I have no doubt during the first six months there will be some scandals because Magistrates, like everybody else, can be deceived, but they will be in the public eye and in time we will have no more trouble, and personally I am prepared to al-

low the bill to go as it stands. If it is not satisfactory we can amend it.

The Committee rose and reported the bill with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on the Profiteering Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH.—This is one of those acts that in my opinion are brought in every year with the intention of never being carried out. Last year's act as I pointed out at the time was constructed from the English act with the same object. That act was a War Measures Act and was introduced in war times, enforced and very effectively. A year ago it was introduced here as a result of some discussion about the high prices charged, and a duty was cast upon the Food Control Board of investigating complaints, but the Food Board as I then predicted, never acted.

HON. MR. MEWS.—As soon as the act was passed prices began to fall.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—But as soon as this act was passed you charged us 25c. for sugar. If prices began to fall last year, what is the reason for the act this year? I presume the Government had some object in bringing it in but I am convinced in my own mind that we will never hear of this act after to-day. Now I understand this amendment is brought in because the Food Board is going out of existence, and it is necessary to have machinery to deal with matters of this kind. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that there is power already under the Customs Act but would not press that view. Last year the bill was taken so seriously by somebody that the Governor was brought down here solely on the tenth June to assent to it, I do not think there is any need to waste much time

on the consideration of it and do not think it will ever be heard of again.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I think with Sir Patrick McGrath there is very little necessity for this bill. There is one matter in which it appeals to me. There is a good deal of profiteering going on in regard to house rent, and I think there should be something in the bill in reference to that to protect tenants from landlords who are charging exorbitant rents, and it is desirable tenants should be protected.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—In relation to house rent I quite agree with Hon. Mr. McNamara. We had a bill introduced here last year and renewed this year, but so far as carrying out the law was concerned it was a farce. So far as the housing problem is concerned I have had some experience. We built thirty houses, started them in August and they were completed before the end of the year. We paid for wages, for labor forty cents and for carpenters seventy-five cents down to forty-five cents. We asked for contracts to build chimnies, and there was not a tradesman in this town tendered to put up the bricks unless he could buy the bricks. No plumber put in a tender unless he got the contract for importing all the material. There was no assistance but a bite was taken by tradesmen at every opportunity they could get. But I am as firmly convinced as I was then that with the best of co-operation amongst people who should have taken it up we could build houses and bring them down to a normal reasonable price. If you give work for carpenters, labourers, plumbers and lumber men you would relieve matters considerably in this town. Now we have built those houses and they are a credit to the city. There is a garden behind that is worth at least fifty to sixty dollars to grow potatoes and cabbage. The house itself is nicely finished with

lovely kitchen behind, place for hard and soft coal, scullery, and three bedrooms. We let them at nine per cent. on the cost which includes six per cent. for ground rent, insurance, taxes, etc., and I would extend an invitation to hon. gentlemen to go up and see them. Some of the tenants have taken an interest in the purchase of the place and at the present time they have a lovely home at an expenditure of \$13.50 a month. With the money they have saved they have bought a home and freehold.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—The difficulty about the housing problem is I suppose well described by Mark Twain who said "people are always complaining about the weather but nobody seems to do anything." The problem is there are more people looking for houses than there are houses to get, and while that situation exists you can have all the acts of parliament you like and it will do no good. It was stated here that people are prepared to pay all the landlords ask them rather than be put out of their houses, and we cannot cure that condition only by putting up a surplus of houses, and how that can be done I do not know, particularly in view of the remarks of the hon. gentleman regarding his experience of putting up those houses on Merry-meeting Road. That is an illustration of the difficulty; they put up thirty houses and the cost was half as much more than they expected. Very few people would be disposed to repeat that process. If prices drop men could be got to work at lower figures and what is more important to give an honest day's work for the wages they get, then we would get houses necessary to the needs of this community. I believe in the light of the absolute failure of the bill we passed here a few years ago nothing will be gained by adding anything to

this bill in the way of stopping profiteering in houses.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, for taking up so much time. As I pointed out to the workingmen over and over again, if they put their heads together and were united, in a very short time houses would be secured at reasonable rates.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—I would like to say a word or two on this Bill. We thought we would have one hundred houses as suggested by my honourable friend, but on account of the way the business turned out, we were unable to proceed. Everybody was calling out "Help the workingmen" but we could not get any mechanics to touch the houses. However, I hope we will be able to start the remainder of the houses, because we got the land much below the value of it. There are very few houses superior to those built up there.

On motion the Committee rose, and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for special purposes."

Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—I may say, Mr. Chairman, with respect to this bill, I explained on second reading was the idea was. Last year in various sections of the country we were up against destitution, and it was desirable that we should, if possible, not give able-bodied relief. We were unable to find anyone that would take up a contract for cutting pulpwood without a government guarantee. The government agreed with contractors to cut about sixty thousand cords, and in that way they gave relief in various places. The whole sixty thousand were not cut, but I think between twen

ty-five and thirty thousand. There is a clause in the agreement under which it was understood that all contractors were to try to sell their pulpwood, either within or without the country. I think they made efforts in most cases outside the country as well as within the country, but I do not think any of the contractors have succeeded in making a sale. There is a clause by which they give us notice on to-morrow, the last day of May, or on the first day of June, as to their success or failure, and if they have failed, the government undertakes to purchase the pulpwood at \$6.00 per cord. So far, five have notified us of their inability to sell, the wood amounting in all to about eight thousand cords. I think it would be well for the clerk to read the agreement, so that the whole thing may be understood. After the first day of June we will make every effort to sell the wood. We will meet some difficulty, but will keep at it and eventually succeed.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—The agreement covers five sheets of typewriting. Perhaps the honourable gentleman would just summarize it.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—When the agreement was being prepared, the department sought information on the subject of pulpwood, and the opinions it secured. Eventually we took the opinion of the Grand Falls people. We asked them to give specifications of pulpwood saleable in the United States and Canada. We asked for twenty-five per cent fir and seventy-five per cent spruce, but in certain localities, such as White Bay and the West Coast, we lowered the percentage of spruce to fifty per cent, and as it was found that Newfoundland fir was as good as Canadian spruce for paper-making. The diameters are the figures given by the Grand Falls people. To guard against indiscriminate cutting and piling we had surveyors from the Department visit the localities and we were sure that the pulpwood was piled and

grounded at safe harbors. We took the precaution that they should be piled at certain localities. Now when the pulpwood is handed over to us on the first day of June we will send our surveyors to examine it and report the quantity each contractor has cut. Then we will make arrangements to pay him \$6 a cord, and go about the business of selling it, which, under conditions as they are now, will be a difficult proposition. To prevent any stealing or looting of pulpwood, such as occurred in the pit prop venture, I propose to put watchmen on all areas where it is stored. I think that would be the proper course to pursue. It would not be wise to go through the experience of some of the pitprop owners during the war. I do not know that it is necessary to go through the contract. It is at the disposal of anybody who wishes to read it. I gave it to my honourable friend a day or two ago.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. Chairman, the humorous aspect of this matter is that it will give the government the opportunity of appointing more inspectors and watchmen. But there is no question about it that when this proposition of cutting pulpwood to give relief was put up to the government it was a desirable thing to do. I freely concede that the department acted with the best intentions, and of course nobody could have foreseen the trouble that was coming in the timber and pulpwood market. If there is any complaint, it is that the men who actually cut the wood got very little for their trouble. I think the contractors got the most out of it. I heard of a case where a man was paid \$2 a cord for cutting the wood. However, in all such cases, where public money is given for relief purposes, that is an almost unavoidable contingency. I do not think there is much prospect of selling this outside the country in the near future, because with every paper-making concern in Canada and the United States shutting down or going

on part-time, they are not likely to be able to pay the price required for this material, plus cost of freight. I trust, however, that the government will be able to realize something for it, so that part of the cost at least may go back to the Treasury. Before I sit down I want to ask the honourable gentleman if the Government has any intention of continuing this policy, or if it is simply an emergency measure. What is meant is, if the cutting of this wood on Crown land or other property for export is to be continued.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—It is not the intention of the government to continue it. This was purely an emergency measure, but, of course, if there is another occasion next year or any other year, the same thing may be done instead of giving able-bodied relief.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—There is a class of people who are all ways wanting the bars broken down, and a general export permitted. That would in my opinion, be a wrong policy, and I am glad the government is not adopting it.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—That might be a safe policy with respect to Labrador, but not in Newfoundland, with the limited amount of timber we have. I do not think we have half the amount we think we have.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I quite agree with the honourable member that we have not half the timber we think we have. We have lost millions of dollars worth already, and we are doing nothing to stop it. I have spent a good many years at the business, and, as I said here before, I left more timber in the woods than I took out. Now this destruction is still going on. We are taking no steps whatever to protect our forests.

On motion the Committee rose, and reported having passed the Bill with out amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon Mr. Shea tabled statement of

the Railway Commission to January 27, 1921.

On motion the House adjourned until Thursday, the second of June, at 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, June 3rd, 1921

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Lotteries" 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 with some amendments.

On motion the Bill "An Act to Amend the Profiteering Act, 1920" 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 with amendment.

On motion the Bill "An Act respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber for Special Purposes" 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 President informed the Council that he had received a message from the Assembly to the effect that it had passed a Bill "An Act for the Raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for the purposes of the Colony" in which it requested the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. SHEA—I beg to move the first reading of that Bill, and in doing so, I would ask of the House the privilege of its unanimous concurrence in passing the Bill through its various stages to-day, so that final arrangements may be made and the matter disposed of. It is important that this Bill should pass through the stages here, and matters be finally adjusted, because the loan has been negotiated at ninety-eight and three-quarters on the basis of eleven per cent. exchange.

As honourable members know, exchange is fluctuating from day to-day, and it is considered advisable that while exchange is more or less in our favour, the loan should be completed, and the Bill passed. We are advised that at present there are large funds being transferred from New York and there are some heavy loans on the market, which may possibly interfere with the exchange to our prejudice, and for that reason it is imperative that final arrangements should be made, and that is why the government is asking this House the privilege of passing this Bill through unanimously. I beg to move the first reading.

The Bill was then read a first time.

On motion the rules of the House were suspended, the Bill read a second time, and thereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Mr. Chairman, before the passing of the Loan Bill I would like to say that I congratulate the Government in raising a loan of six million dollars, which the Government has succeeded in getting at ninety eight and three quarters on a basis of eleven per cent. exchange. We hope that before the maturing of any of the interest the exchange rate will be lower. We must remember that since the declaration of peace all nations and all countries are borrowing. France now has a loan on the market in New York, a very large loan, for which they offer eight per cent. I do not wish to delay the House now, but simply wish to state that I congratulate the government that they have succeeded in getting this loan. I hope it will be the means of re-establishing confidence in the country, and that the trade and commerce of Newfoundland will begin to show some slight improvement. I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Bill.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill was there-

upon read a third time, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Hon. the President informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would arrive at the Council Chamber at 4.45 p.m. for the purpose of assenting to the consolidation Loan Act 1921.

The Hon. the President left the Chair.

At 4.45 p.m., His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Alexander Harris, Knight Commander of the Most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, having arrived at the Council Chamber and being seated upon the Throne, commanded the Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod, through the Hon. the President of the Legislative Council, to let the Honourable House of Assembly know—

"It is His Excellency's pleasure that they attend him immediately in this House."

Who being come thereto with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to give His assent to the following Bill entitled:—"An Act to Authorize the Raising of a sum of money on the Credit of the Colony for the General Purpose of the Colony."

The House of Assembly then retired.

His Excellency withdrew.

At 5 p.m. the Hon. the President resumed the Chair.

On motion made the House adjourned until Tuesday the 7th inst, at 4 p.m.

THURSDAY, June 9th.

PRESENT.

The Honorable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Honorable the President declared the House adjourned for want of a quorum until Friday the 10th inst., at 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, June 10th.
PRESENT.

The Honorable J. D. Ryan, President.

The Hon. the President declared the House adjourned for want of a quorum until Monday the 13th inst., at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, June 13th.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Bill "An Act Respecting Sheep Farming" was referred to a Select Committee of the House.

The President informed the House that he had received a communication from the House of Assembly that they had passed the following bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council:

"An Act to Amend the Law Society Act."

"An Act further respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber."

"An Act to Amend the War Measures Act 1914."

On motion the said bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until Thursday, June 16th, at 4.00 p.m.

THURSDAY, June 16th.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Second Reading of Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend the Law Society Act."

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Mr. President, I beg leave to move that this Bill be now read a second time. The only alterations differing from the present law is that provision is made that in the case of students who served with His Majesty's Forces and have served a portion of their term of clerkship the Law Society may, instead of compelling them to put in a full clerkship of five years, reduce the term to three years; by section 2 a three years'

clerkship may be reduced to two years, and by section 3 a four years' clerkship may be reduced to three years. This is for the purpose of assisting those who served during the War and who would have been through their clerkship except for the fact that they served with the Forces.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—May I ask if the sole object of this is to make provision for those who went on service?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Simply that, and nothing more.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—To how many does this apply?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I do not know; possibly three or four.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I know there is a young man King who is in some office on Water Street. But would this apply to anybody who waited the introduction of the Conscript Law?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—None that I know of.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Because I do not think that class of man ought to get the benefit of this law. I quite agree with the propriety of giving this to every man who volunteered, but I think it ought not to apply to anybody who was forced to go. Perhaps in committee stage the hon. gentleman would let us know to whom this would apply, because I would feel like making an exception in the case of a man who had to be conscripted before he did his duty.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act further respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber."

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—In moving the second reading of this Bill I might explain that it is to legalize the cutting and sale of timber cut in Twil-

lingate District to relieve destitution. There was an opportunity to sell railroad ties to the A. N. D. Co., and in preference to giving able-bodied poor relief we allowed the ties to be cut, and also allowed timber to be cut where the areas had been destroyed by fire and the wood would only become useless. This Bill is to legalise this arrangement, as under the Crown Lands Act they were not allowed to cut these railroad ties and sell them to the A. N. D. Co. In committee stage we will be able to go into details.

Second reading of Act to amend the War Measures Act 1914.

HON. MR. SHEA.—As hon. members will see this bill explains itself. It simply cancels the War Measures Act of 1914 and also any subsequent acts of that nature. The time has arrived when legislation of this kind is not necessary and I think all hon. members will be glad to see that bill taken off the Statute Book.

The bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Hon. President read a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills entitled respectively:

An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Ltd.; An Act to repeal the Act regarding the exportation of salt codfish; and an Act to amend the act entitled Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery, in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council, also an Act for the prevention of Venereal Diseases.

On motion the said bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled the report of the Militia Department from April 1920 to March 1921; also copy of the Newfoundland Customs Returns for the year 1919 to 1920.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

FRIDAY, Jun 17th.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

House went into committee on the Bill entitled An Act to Amend the Law Society Act, Hon. Mr. Steer in the chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Before we pass the preamble of this Bill, might I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he rise the Committee until we find whether anybody affected by this Bill is in the class of conscripts. We could probably have that information for next sitting.

The Committee thereupon rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill: "An Act further respecting the Cutting and Exportation of Timber."

Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Mr. Chairman, as I explained yesterday, this is a Bill relating to certain measures taken to relieve destitution in certain sections of the country. This Bill legalizes the purchase of certain railroad ties by the A. N. D. Co. from timber cut on Crown Lands. The latter part of Section 1 refers to certain timber to be exported from the Colony. These were cut by Mr. House and others on land, some, not much, Crown Land, but mostly private property. The object of the bill in toto is to prevent the pernicious habit of giving able-bodied poor relief if work can be given instead.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the War Measures Act, 1914."

Hon. Mr. Cook in the Chair.

HON MR. SHEA.—Mr. Chairman, as I have already explained to the House, this Bill rescinds the War Measures Act, 1914, and subsequent legislation passed I beg to move the reading of the first clause.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill entitled: "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited."

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to point out that it is for the purpose of confirming an agreement entered into by the Government with the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited. The agreement is set forth in the schedule to the Bill. The Company is given the exclusive right for a period of two years from the date upon which the agreement shall have been confirmed by the Legislature to explore on unoccupied Crown Lands in this country for petroleum when subjected to the process of distillation. Under the agreement the company has the right to enter upon all unoccupied Crown Lands, that is, all lands of the Colony which have not been alienated by grant or license or are unoccupied by any person, with a view of carrying on its work of exploration and development and do all things necessary to that end. In the event of the company in the carrying on of its work causing damage to the property of a third person, the company must pay reasonable compensation for the damage or injury, and must indemnify the Government against any claim which may be made in respect of any injury or damage done by them, the damage or injury to be ascertained by arbitration. Now if the company shall at any time during the prospecting per-

iod of two years notify the Government that it desires to test any other properties which it has been exploring for a year or any period less than two years, then if it so notifies the Government, it has the right to acquire an area not exceeding 3,600 square miles and the company shall be entitled during the remainder of its prospecting period to test the lands comprised in the area or areas of which they shall have given notice to the Government of their desire to test. Then there is a proviso in the agreement which makes it obligatory upon the part of the company to secure at least one test well within six months after the date of the prospecting period in respect of each area, and thereafter vigorously to continue the prosecution of the work of testing the area by sinking other wells, and a failure to do so operates as a forfeiture of their rights under the agreement. The area referred to in this section is an area which does not exceed twelve square miles. Another part of the agreement is that the company is given the right prior to the expiry of the period of three years, which is the testing period, to select from any area which it is testing such portions of the area as it may desire, and the Government thereupon shall grant to the company leases of such portions for the purpose of getting petroleum oil and other substances referred to in the agreement; the lease shall contain the usual covenants and conditions which are to be found in leases of mineral areas granted to individuals in this country, with an additional one that the company must continue work and develop the properties that are leased to them by the Government. Then they have to pay to the Government one-eighth of the value of the oil taken from such lands. There is a right upon the part of the company to select such Crown Lands as may be

necessary for rights of way or the building of tramways or for telegraph or telephone or for the purpose of building wharves or piers for the proper carrying out of the work, and there is also a proviso that the Company shall not be liable for any higher tax during the period of its operations in excess of the rate paid by any other person, company or corporation carrying on business in the Colony. There is also a proviso for keeping correct books of accounts, and the right upon the part of the Government to examine and inspect the books and accounts of the Company and take extracts, in order that they may determine from time to time whether the Government is getting its proper proportion of the amounts to which it is entitled under this agreement. Then again in another portion of the agreement it is provided that if the work of the company should result in petroleum oil being discovered in commercial quantities, the company is bound to develop the area in which it is found with all reasonable speed. There is not only that provision, but there is an obligation upon the part of the company to continue work and operate the areas or places where oil may be discovered. Hon. gentleman may ask the question, who is the D'Arcy Exploration Company? I may say that it is a subsidiary of the Anglo Persian Oil Company, which is regarded as the largest of its character operating within the Empire. It is not a company that speculates in petroleum areas. The company is a bona fide one, and it has come into this country for the purpose of finding out whether we have any oil-bearing lands in Newfoundland. On the directorate of the Anglo Persian Oil Company are two nominees of the British Government. The British Government is the holder of two millions of ordinary shares of one pound

each and one thousand Preference Shares of one pound each and £199,000 of debenture stock. It will be seen that this is a bona fide attempt to demonstrate the possibility beyond reasonable doubt of oil producing lands of Newfoundland. Personally, I think the agreement is a very good one. I think the right class of people is taking hold of something which may be of vast importance to Newfoundland. You will not get people who are more fitted and who, if we have petroleum here, will work and develop it on a larger scale than the Anglo Persian Oil Company. For nearly thirty years various attempts have been made in this country to develop petroleum properties, and I think that the failure to find petroleum in this country has been due largely to lack of capital. It requires a very large amount of capital to test and develop petroleum areas. I think the Colony is on the proper road now to have it settled once and for all, whether we have petroleum in this country in commercial quantities. I believe that this is a good agreement for the Colony because it affords the opportunity of making a complete test and setting forever at rest the question whether we have in this country petroleum in such quantities as to pay individuals or companies for undertaking the work of exploration and development. I, therefore, Mr. President, move the second reading.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I think, Mr. President, that we should all welcome this bill. It is the first real attempt I have seen to determine just exactly what we have in the way of commercial possibility for our oil areas. We have oil areas at Port au Port and other places on the West Coast. The late Mr. Howley has written exhaustively on these areas and made several reports, giving all the information regarding them, but

one of the difficulties, as the hon. gentleman has said, has been the difficulty of getting capitalists of sufficient strength to undertake this work. It is only within the last ten years, and very largely since the war, that the enormous development of oil enterprises has been realized. The substitution of oil for coal on shipboard and in a variety of commercial undertakings is only in its infancy. When we were crossing Canada last year I had an opportunity of seeing the electric plant in the little town of Vernon in the Rocky Mountains being operated by oil engines instead of steam, and only within the past two or three days I have seen an announcement by the Secretary of the British Admiralty of the intention of abolishing coal on naval ships in future on the ground that two tons of oil would do the work of three tons of coal, there would be less men required, and the oil would not cost nearly as much. The Anglo Persian Oil Company is actively associated with the British Government. It is now, one might say, practically controlled by the British Government. It has extensive areas in Persia and also in Mesopotamia. I have now before me the document to which I referred. The Journal of the Parliaments of the Empire, volume 4, October, 1920, gives the text of an oil agreement which received the Royal assent in Australia on the 29th of May last, and gives the wording of the agreement between the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of developing the Australian industry of refining oil. It is not necessary for me to quote extensively from the summary of the agreement which is embodied here. Every hon. gentleman has one of these and will be able to look it up. You will find the full text on page 694, but, in brief, the Australian Government contracted with this company for the purpose of

forming an Australian company, the company undertaking to go into the business not alone of exploring and prospecting, but really into the business of getting oil, refining it, selling it and putting the Commonwealth of Australia in a position where it would if necessary become absolutely independent with regard to oil supplies in future. Since that agreement has been made effective, I observe from the debates of the British Parliament that the British Government and the Australian Government have combined in creating another company with the Anglo Persian Company on somewhat the same lines; that is, they have created an organization to put up 50,000 pounds sterling for the purpose of exploring for oil in New Guinea, and the idea is now to determine the oil bearing possibilities of that country, and it is being done by the Australian and British Governments in co-operation with the Oil Companies. The details from what I have been able to observe from this bill appear to be very fair for the both parties but I would say that I am disposed to concede a great deal to this company which will come in here and go into this matter in a business like manner instead of tinkering with the type of people the Americans call fakirs which we have had experience with in the past. If the Anglo Persian Company, after two years experiment give the idea that our oil bearing properties are good it will be a great thing for this country. If they do not we will be no worse off and I think the Government could give even more concessions and I hope the outcome as regards this experiment will be fully realized.

The bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Exportation of Salt Codfish Repeal Bill

was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill entitled An Act to amend the Bill entitled Of the prosecution of the Sealfishery.

HON. MR. SHEA.—This bill simply makes some alteration in the Sealing Bill, removing the restrictions regarding the sailing of the steamers, and proposing that steamers shall sail as of old on the tenth March instead of the twelfth; also there is provision regarding second trips; changing the date of killing to the 13th March and the closing date to April 15th. It practically removes all restrictions and goes back to where we were years ago when the old steamers prosecuted the voyage. In view of the class of steamers now prosecuting the voyage it is thought all these restrictions should be removed and that they should have a free hand.

Said bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill to prevent Venereal Diseases.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—During the past five or six years Venereal Diseases have been largely on the increase not only in Newfoundland but all over the world. They are always present in seaport towns, but unfortunately are on the increase here and the Medical Profession and those who have been working at war work can realize that the bill although drastic is necessary. If diseases like these are allowed to go rampant it might have grave consequences. Not alone does it affect the individual unfortunate enough to be afflicted but also the offspring and leads to lubacy and many other things. The bill may be drastic but it is the only way. I beg to move the second reading.

Said bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on the morrow.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs presented the report

of the select committee on the Municipal Bill and asked that the report be received.

The report was received and the bill was ordered to be re-committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Monday next at four o'clock.

MONDAY, June 20th, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment

On motion the Exportation of Timber Bill and the War Measures 1914 Amendment Bill were read a third time and passed, and ordered sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House went into committee of the whole on the Law Society Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and it was ordered the report be received and the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into committee on the D'Arcy Exploration Company Agreement Bill, Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited."

Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

The Committee on motion rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10 11 Geo. V. Cap. 25 entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish'".

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair

HON SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr Chairman, before this Bill is passed I would like to make some observations,

not in a controversial sense, but with a view to suggesting to those interested in the codfishery business whether it is not possible to obtain the end that was desired by this legislation by means of some co-operative movement. Everybody knows the objections with which this Bill was met last year, and then recommendations under the War Measures Act prior to that were brought into force, no doubt with the best intentions in the world, and this succeeded in bringing about the most disastrous consequences which have come over this country as a result of any legislation, and I suppose that there has been no Bill the repeal of which has been viewed with so much satisfaction during the whole history of Responsible Government in this country than the Bill we are now taking off the Statute Book. It seems to me that it ought to be possible for some organization to be effected amongst the exporters themselves. I note one or two gentlemen rather laugh at the idea, but it is a remarkable circumstance if there is an impossibility of effecting some sort of agreement between those engaged in the codfishery in handling our principal product. Last year during the Imperial Press Conference I had an opportunity of seeing the possibility of co-operation as practised in the neighbouring Dominion. Starting with Nova Scotia you find in the Annapolis Valley that a million and a half barrels of apples are now being marketed by means of a co-operative association. That organization has been able to cut the freight rates across the Atlantic in half. It has cold storage or frost-proof cellars and cold storage warehouses of a capacity of a quarter of a million barrels, and by that means, of course, it is able to hand out apples from time to time, and not dump them on the market under conditions that would bring the price down. In addition to that, there is a co-operative movement in the form of a large ware

house that manufactures barrels in which apples are packed, not alone in Nova Scotia, but a tremendous amount of this material is exported, if I may use the term to Ontario, to be used in the same way in that Province. With my honourable friend opposite, I spent the day in the Annapolis Valley, and in the limited time at my disposal I made some inquiries and got access to a certain amount of information, and I have followed it up, and am endeavouring to give the House some idea of the conditions that apply now with regard to apples. If you go West to the Niagara section you find a somewhat similar condition of affairs. The most remarkable feature about the co-operative movement there is what has developed the past few months. The people interested have set on foot a movement to get a manager at \$12,000 a year to market their products. They offered it to Mr. Tolmie, the Minister of Agriculture, but he declined, and they subsequently got the services of a man named Manning who is connected with the same line of work, and they are now starting an organization, marketing the apples and other fruits, with a man at the head to whom they are paying a salary of \$12,000 a year. Then let us go west to the Prairie Provinces. Most people are familiar in a general way with what the farmers of the Prairie Provinces have done in the way of organization. The Grain Growers Association have secured better prices for their wheat. During the War, as you know, the Canadian Government took control of wheat and there was a gentleman named James Stewart, who was appointed Chairman of the Wheat Board, with a view to getting a supply of flour and other provisions, and last spring, at the end of June, the Canadian Government abandoned the idea of further control of wheat and now the Grain Growers have taken it upon themselves to intelligently control and limit the stocks

shipped at any time, so that they ship to the market where best prices can be obtained. This is a voluntary movement. The Saskatchewan Government is behind this movement, but only to the extent of giving it its blessing, so to speak. There is no Government machinery provided. And Mr. Stewart, who recently investigated the whole problem for the Saskatchewan Government, strongly recommends that it must be a voluntary organization only, on the ground that that provides more elasticity. Still more remarkable, I think, is the condition in British Columbia. In British Columbia you find a wonderfully effective co-operative organization. I was surprised when coming home last fall to find apples in boxes for sale in grocery stores in St. John's, I assume, from the same packing houses, certainly from the same area where we had seen the apples and other fruits being packed only a few weeks previously. It would be interesting to quote for nine years the value of the output of fruit in the Canard Valley, which is the chief section for apples. The organization now includes over four thousand, with forty thousand acres of land and an investment of \$35,000,000. The man who runs this organization is paid a salary of \$10,000, and they have frostproof storage where they can house 200,000 barrels. They have their system of cullage, and make some apples into cider; they also do business in evaporated apples. Now all these co-operative movements are ripe in Canada, and I had an opportunity of seeing something of their workings. We were through packing houses in British Columbia and we saw the organization at Niagara. It was an eye-opener to me to see what was possible by these organizations. But even more remarkable is the study of the raisin-growing in California. I do not know whether honourable members have heard much of it. I have studied it for a while past, and the figures are

even more startling. Where ten years ago the industry was at a dead stop as a result of competition and ruinous prices, the raisins now produce \$42,500,000, and the co-operative organization that controls that business handles ninety-two per cent. of the produce of the raisins for the whole state. Now I put these few figures forward for whatever value they may have. I do not know whether it is possible for any such organization to be created in this country. If it is, I think those whose business it is to handle our codfish for export could profitably apply themselves to the study of some of these matters, and endeavour to create an organization of the same kind here. Just before I came up here, I was reading some debates of the English House of Commons in connection with Budget, and one gets their figures, which illustrate the magnitude of the English co-operative organization. Of course, the English co-operative organization is distinct in its details from these, but still I think the underlying principle is the same. But the English co-operative concerns have a capitalization of over 700,000,000 pds. stg., and a reserve of 182,000,000 pds. stg. Rather startling figures when one hears so much of England being bankrupt at the present time. Again I say that if one considers these figures, one cannot help wondering why it is that the business people, the codfish exporting merchants of this country, cannot get together and endeavour to do something in the way of handling the principal product of this country, so as to bring about better prices for themselves and for the fishermen and better conditions of living generally for all of us in this country.

HON. D. RYAN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on the Bill now before us, the celebrated Bill brought in here last year, which has taken so much from the merchants of

Newfoundland in the selling of their codfish abroad. At the last session of the Legislature here I strongly opposed this Bill, as I knew it would work detrimental to the Colony's interests, which it has been. The Bill now before us for repeal has proved very detrimental to us, the exporters of Newfoundland, as well as the fishermen. We all know the result to-day. Exporters of codfish, who always had lots of money to use, and expand in any way they wished, are pretty bare, I think, just now, and the Government has to supply the fishermen instead of the merchants who always in the past did so. The Government now has to supply the fishermen, and is supplying them to-day, by giving guarantees. A pretty bad state of affairs! Was there ever anything in the country like this before? How many firms in Newfoundland are driven out of business to-day by means of these regulations which we had put in force last year? How many families are receiving relief North and South of St. John's to-day, all brought about by those fishery regulations which were put in force last year? How we a free hand to sell our fish as we always had, we would not be in the position that we are to-day, down and out. There are a very few firms in Newfoundland, but are standing very bad with the banks. And the Government is responsible for all the trouble brought upon us. If the merchants in the outports got their money for their fish exports they could have supplied the fishermen as they always did in the customary way, but they sent their fish abroad, which could not be sold at the exorbitant price placed upon it by the Government. We were cut off from all the fish markets of the world except one which we always supplied. Our competitors came in and supplied the market. Why? Because at the price fixed by the Government and the fish regulations not one in that market would buy. The Norwegians and Icelanders

went in and sold the fish ten shillings to fifteen shillings per quintal under the price fixed by our government. The only market that was open to us was Spain, and to that market we sent about five times as much fish as was needed for consumption there. The price went down. It commenced at eighty shillings and went down to twenty-seven. These are the result of the fish regulations.

HON. MR. RYAN—I understand you are going to run the railway here after June 30th. How have they done in England and Canada and the United States. I understand they have lost a little money, but I give my hearty support to this bill, and I am glad it is repealed, and I suppose every one in Newfoundland is glad. Those who handle fish will no doubt be pleased, and it is high time; nearly every one has failed in this business so to speak. We have too many regulations and combines and one thing and another. There is one other matter to which I could like to refer. Some years ago the Morris Government gave permission to the Imperial Oil Company to put up tanks on the South Side on their representing that by importing oil in bulk they would be able to bring in oil to sell at about half the price it was then selling for from fifteen to twenty cents a gallon. Now we find that the Imperial Oil Co. has driven everyone out of that business in St. John's. Last year we had competition in the Standard Oil Company, but they have amalgamated in some way with the Imperial Co. The Standard Co. has closed down and to-day the price of oil over at the Imperial Company's stores is 47 1-2c. per gal. and gasoline 51 1-2c. which I contend is an exorbitant price.

HON. MR. BROWNING—What can it be imported for?

HON. MR. RYAN—I did not go into that.

HON. MR. MILLEY—It can be sold for eight cents less than that

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Somebody imported some and sold it about five cents less. It is clearly a case of profiteering.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Was there no arrangement by the Morris Government as to price?

HON. MR. RYAN—I have been told there are letters in the Colonial Secretary's Office to that effect.

HON. MR. GIBBS—There was no such agreement.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I presume an agreement was made, and if there was none it ought to be possible with the machinery carried here to compel that company to sell at not more than a reasonable profit.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—Open competition ought to settle that.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Open competition cannot because this is a huge monopoly

HON. MR. RYAN—It is outrageous and that is not the only thing that is outrageous. There are other things equally as bad. We have butter factories today charging the people about ten cents more than they should, but have a combine and where do we stand? The fishermen have to pay it. Then there are the two bakeries; they are charging the same price now as they were in December, November and October \$9.60 when it should be about \$7.50. The price of flour has gone down about three or four dollars a barrel and why should not the price of hard bread go down also. I consider if the Rennie Baking Co. did not have a big fire they would be selling bread about \$7.50 per bag, and Brownings and Harveys would be coming down. I do not think I will go any further, but for all that, the price of bread is too high.

HON. MR. BROWNING—Of course as there has been a personal attack on me, it is up to me to answer it, and it is a pity the hon. gentleman could stand up here and make statements about matters he knows nothing about. He

is absolutely ignorant about what he is talking about. Mr. Ryan is speaking about the highest grade of flour which is entirely unfit for hard bread making. There is no such decline in flour. He challenges bread at \$9.60. I am getting \$9.00, practically, with discount, I understand the same statement was made in the Lower House and it is just as well the truth should be known. The flour costs us about 6 1-2c. a pound or say 6 3/4c., and we are receiving \$9.00 or practically 8c., and we have to pay the upkeep of an establishment, wages, loss in manufacture, loss in evaporation which amounts to sixteen pounds in a barrel. We not only dry out the water that is put in, but evaporate the natural water and instead of receiving 196 lbs. we receive about 180 lbs. I think it is. At one time when I came into the business first we could manufacture bread at sixty cents a barrel, and in that could include the bag. To-day it costs over two dollars a barrel to manufacture a barrel, so you can see what amount of profit we have at eight cents per lb. There has been no profit during the war, none whatever. For the first three years of the war we did not change the price, but kept along as best we could in the general interest, and when the Food Control Board came into being with Sir Patrick McGrath as Chairman, we then endeavoured to raise the prices owing to the cost of the material going up to such an extent, and as we had been going along at twenty cents a bag profit he would not allow us to go further. And that did not pay anybody, and still the leader of the Opposition took it upon himself without knowing anything about it or making any inquiry and Mr. Ryan has done the same here. I certainly court and at all times did, an inquiry into the profits of our business, not only now, but during the last thirty years. I am only too pleased for auditors to come in, men without bias, and not a man who is only

too anxious to have a fling at any body. There has been no profiteering at any time, and we never made what Mr. Ryan would call an ordinary dividend. He would not invest his money in the business

HON. MR. RYAN—I will go in with you at any time.

HON. MR. BROWNING—I have never taken advantage of my position had I done so, I would have been a very wealthy man to-day. I had the whole business in my hands at the time of the fire and worked night and day at ten cents a bag, when I could have just as well made fifty cents and no one would kick. I did not want to say these things, but when people get up and make statements that they have no foundation in fact for whatever it makes one resent that sort of thing. There is a limit to this sort of thing the irresponsible assertions of men who know nothing about what they are talking about. However, we were talking about the fish regulations, and the same spirit exactly has caused the disaster in this country as expressed this moment by Hon. Mr. Ryan, and the same disposition as caused him to make this rap at me just now. These regulations were promulgated with the best intention, but as Mr. Ryan admits it was the opposition to these things that made them unworkable. As Sir Patrick McGrath has said all thru Canada and everywhere else the trade and resources of the country have been organized and controlled. In this country it is simply everybody for himself and there is no unity, no exchange of ideas or anything for the upbuilding and benefit of trade, but the moment the fishery regulations were put into effect instead of receiving the hearty support and best endeavours of the fish handlers to make things a success, it was quite the opposite. They did everything unbecoming any man, when the least that could have been done was to give them a moral support and a fair trial. I have personally interviewed several of

the people, and more particularly one of the most prominent of those who opposed these regulations and he said we require regulations, but did not want political regulations. Well, I said, why not give your support to those and try them. Why condemn them and play into the hands of the enemy as it were. No one supposes that that is the only right thing to do, but they are working for the welfare of the country, and why not support them? Now it appears to me to be very unbecoming of us clear of all political matters to bring up personal matters when discussing public matters. Among a section of the Board of Trade some years ago, there was a feeling and an endeavour to get the firms together and make a mutual standard of fish and regulations for the shipping of fish, and it was largely for that the Board of Trade was formed, but it absolutely failed because the Board of Trade had no power to enforce regulations. I was on the council at that time, and some one of the members who was a great supporter of the regulations, and it came to a point where it was quite alright for a cargo of some other fellow to be inspected, but not for his. He was made to toe the line and said he was not going to submit to this. There was nothing to do; he defied them, and they could do nothing, and that is the situation today, and until you make some penalties for everybody he will do as he chooses. And the thing is how are you going to arrange it so that the trade can be handled. This petty argument is very unbecoming. I suggest the government ought to take up the matter with the Board of Trade, and see if it cannot utilise the Board and make penalties. There is no use having anything done by politicians.

The Board of Trade should have some sort of a charter that will enable them to control the trade, and until there is some such thing as that, some such organization or some oth-

er Board of an independent nature, we are just going to be in the same position as we were. As I stated here before, this is nothing new to the trade, absolutely nothing new, only there has been politics in it, and it has been a good thing to cry about. The trade is not any worse off to-day than it is every five or six years.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—Will it not have to find twenty per cent. more capital?

HON. MR. BROWNING.—That is brought about by war conditions.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—It is not war conditions to-day.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—Conditions are not normal that have brought things upon us now, but I say the trade is not any worse off than it was five years before the war.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—I do not agree with you there.

HON. DANIEL RYAN.—When had the Government to give guarantees to the merchants to supply the fishermen before?

HON. MR. BROWNING.—They had to give out poor relief, and that is the same thing.

HON. MR. RYAN.—There was no poor relief given out in June.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—It is just politics that has forced the Government to do this. Where is the twenty-seven or thirty millions of money that is in the Savings Banks?

HON. MR. MILLEY.—There was five millions drawn out during the last six months, and that has gone into the trade.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—That is a very good thing, and that is where it ought to be. It would be a good thing if the thirty millions were taken out and put into the trade. If we could only get together and let each other make a few dollars, this would be a very different country, but the position of hand 'er down, or pulling down instead of building up, is a

wrong one. The moment a man begins to get on his legs, immediately he is the butt of his neighbours, and if he gets a few dollars and becomes independent, we endeavour to crush him. That is the history of the trade. Now if we all pulled together and congratulated a man who made money, we would get along. I did not intend, Mr. Chairman, to get on my feet this afternoon upon this thing, but I want the country to see that it is necessary to have some regulations, and I would suggest to the Government that they would consider enlarging the scope of the Board of Trade in order that the business affairs should be controlled and guided in different directions.

HON. MR. RYAN.—In answering my friend, the Hon. Mr. Browning, with regard to the price of biscuit and butter and oil, the man who buys does not bother about your overhead. He only knows the price he is paying for it. He does not want to understand what you pay for labour, it is what you are selling it for. The only remark is that the price of flour has gone down from \$3.00 to \$4.00 a barrel since last year, but the price of bread has not moved a cent. The price of butterine has gone down six or seven cents, and sugar has gone down six or seven more, and then they have a good profit. You are asking too much. It is what you call a combine.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—The bakers were losing money when flour was \$18.00 a barrel.

HON. MR. RYAN.—Why did they not put their price up if they were losing? Mr. Browning was just saying that while the war was going on he did not make a cent. I would like to have some shares in his company, because I know he would be paying out a good dividend. He did not say he lost any. We have got a lot of men

in business, and they never make any money. With regard to unity amongst fish exporters, we have had in the past contracts drawn up and a penalty attached to them for shipping fish to Brazil, and what do we find? One of our leading merchants here sent fish to Brazil under the price, and went to the Bank of Montreal and got his money in cash.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—You cannot enforce contracts of that character. They are not legal.

HON. MR. RYAN.—I am only speaking of that merchant with regard to getting together to sign a contract to sell fish at a certain price. They signed that contract. There was a penalty attached to it. One merchant shipped fish and sold two cargoes to Brazil, and was paid in cash. Now there is no unity among our exporters on Water Street, and the Board of Trade, and all the Boards of Trade in the world, if they had to do with the business men of Water Street would not get them to agree, because there is no unity amongst them. What did the Board of Trade do last year when the fish regulations were in force? They petitioned and sent protests to the Government and the Advisory Board and sold fish under the contract price, and deceived those who were in the combine.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—That was not the fault of the regulations.

HON. MR. RYAN.—The regulations and the Advisory Board did all that.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—What have the regulations got to do with that?

HON. MR. RYAN.—The combine had to do with that, and you know the result of the fishery regulations. You know that too well. If you do not know it, the business men know it, and the fishermen know it, and we will all know it later.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I am asking a question. The hon. gentleman says the Advisory Board sold under the

contract price. What have the regulations got to do with that?

HON. MR. RYAN.—I know the question. With regard to the experiment on Water Street, you will never get them to act together, not until a regulation is made that will compel them to do so.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—There is no law to control the grain trade. There is only a grain exchange, operated with the Government's sanction.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—If you want to make laws and expect them to be perfect when you start, you cannot do it, and my idea is this, that the people who are endeavouring to do what is right and build up the trade, should have sufficient power and influence to form public opinion in the matter, and that would be a great benefit to the country.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Mr. Chairman, to get back to some of the aspects of this matter closer and to where we started, as it has drifted since, perhaps I may be permitted to say something with regard to price of the different commodities. It is the irony of fate that all through the elections I was paraded up and down the country as being the one man who was responsible for the high cost of living. The manifesto of the Premier went on to say that the activities of Sir Patrick McGrath had the effect of increasing instead of lowering the retail price of the necessaries of life. Now testimony has been given to the fact that the Food Control Board under my chairmanship was the agency that put out of business two of the butterine factories in this country, because we would not give them a living profit. When I was Food Controller we never permitted an increase in the price of butterine without having the books of the various companies audited by the Auditor General, and

a statement furnished to us which showed what the position was, and then on the basis of that we gave a living profit and no more, and during the last three years of the war there was never an increase in the price of butterine permitted except on the report of the Auditor General. Now with regard to hard bread, it is quite true that the hon. gentleman was only getting twenty cents per barrel. But there were others to look after, and the other side was that there was a war and prices were high and people were having difficulty to make two ends meet, and we would not consent to give them more than twenty cents per bag. It is true that people had to pay higher for sugar. We made the people use dirty brown sugar and "hog feed," and all we can say is that in the most critical period in this country's history we were able to get in enough of the necessaries of life to relieve the people from any danger of starvation or shortage. Newfoundland was the only country in the world where there was enough sugar on the people's tables. The American and Canadian Food Boards were good. They gave us every consideration. When I was at Washington, one of the things I looked after was the necessaries for butterine, and the man in charge said, "We cannot give you these things and give you butter at the same time." "No," I said, "that is fair. Give us the materials to make butterine, and we will be satisfied." "Well," he said, "I hope everybody was prepared to treat things as fairly as you are." During the war there was no profiteering in hard bread or butterine. I do not know what it costs my hon. friend to produce his hard bread. I do not know whether he is getting an excess profit or not. On the face of it, I do not think he is. With regard to kerosene oil, I think that is a case for inquiry. I do not suggest that these monopolies are de-

trimental, but it is not difficult for anyone to conceive that when we are at the mercy of an outside organization, every difficulty, every obstacle is put by a concern like that in the way of independent traders getting in the same commodity. I do not know what arrangements were made by Sir Edward Morris when he was given permission to go ahead. I understand they were asked for in the Lower House the other day. My impression is that one of the gentlemen who was prominent in developing this matter was of the opinion that certain agreements were made. If so, documents could be produced. However, if that precaution was not taken, no Government is all-seeing, and if that was overlooked, we have the machinery here in the profiteering bill to have the thing investigated and limit these people as to profits. Now with regard to the question of grain control, what I was arguing here this afternoon was for co-operative organization, and the development of that can only apply, similarly with any scheme of control for grain or fish, to the people who agree to become members. To-morrow if you created machinery to enable the Board of Trade to deal with it, the Board of Trade would only have control over those who were members. I think that could be developed here.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—And of course that is strong as far as it goes, but it is not conclusive argument that they never will. If they do not, I think the conclusion for this country is very serious. I disagree with my hon. friend that politics took too prominent a part in the matter of the fish regulations. I was prepared a year ago to listen to argument, and

you see the results of the matter. I do not agree that it was opposition to them that brought about the disaster. As I see it this thing being opposed to the laws of supply and demand could not succeed. Government control is a very different thing from a co-operative movement. There is this difference with a co-operative organization like the F. P. U., a certain number of people go into it and try to work it up but do not compel other people to do it, but when you get a government trying to do it that is a very different matter altogether.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—If the principle is right in one case why is it not in another?

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—No; my hon. friend when he talks of principle is referring to one thing, I am referring to another. There is a co-operative movement in England; they have a capital between them of 700 million pounds and a reserve of 182 million pounds but they do not control the trade of the country. If twelve Water Street merchants get together and say we will pool our fish and sell only under certain conditions they do not compel other people to do it. Take Australia to-day. Premier Hughes before leaving for England last month said Australia was on the verge of bankruptcy as regards the wool industry. During the war Australia and Great Britain made an agreement to control the supply of wool, and controlled it for two or three years, and accumulated an enormous supply of wool and kept it from Germany and when the end of the war came could not get rid of it. They could have sacrificed it of course, but that would have ruined the people in Australia who are producing wool now, so they had to make an organization to control the wool until they could put it on the market. To-day they have a fixed price like we tried to make a fixed price for

fish, of eighteen cents but have to sell it below that because nobody will pay that. We cannot do this thing by Government control. We can accomplish a great deal by co-operative organization such as they have in England and Canada. But I am convinced if we could induce the fish exporters here or number of them to get together and form some sort of co-operative organization, a great deal would be accomplished.

The Committee rose and reported the bill passed without amendment and it was ordered said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at four of the clock.

THURSDAY, June 23rd, 1921

House met at 4 p.m.

On motion the Bills "An Act to Amend the Law Society Act" and "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited" were read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendments.

Third reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal 10-11 Geo. V Cap. 25 entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish.'"

HON. MR. McNAMARA—Mr. President, before this Bill goes through its final stage, I would like to say that I am pleased to have the privilege of attending the obsequies of this measure. There will be universal rejoicing through the land that this Act is coming off the Statute Book. The whole Island has suffered from the enactment, and principally our business concerns which have been practically brought to bankruptcy by this legislation, and all we can do is to sympathize with these people in their loss. I strenuously opposed this Bill from its very inception. I felt it was impossible and therefore when this Bill

was before the House last year I argued that we could not possibly fix the price of an article of food by legislation, and therefore these figures could not be exacted for our fishery products. If we look around, we will find that all, or nearly all, the countries in the world have been trying to increase their exports, while here in Newfoundland we have endeavoured to stop the throttle by asking fixed and arbitrary prices for our products. It is a well known fact that if you do not export you cannot import, or, in other words, if you do not sell you cannot buy. I submit therefore, Mr. President, that it does not take very much commercial or business acumen to see that if you ask impossible prices for your fishery products you will be unable to realize them, more particularly when your competitors are prepared to sell at a low figure. There has been only one benefit derived from this measure, and that is a very costly one; it is the benefit of knowing that Government control of business affairs is a lamentable failure and is taking the business of the country out of the hands of the people who have conducted it successfully and profitably for generations. The harm done has been greater than anything contemplated in this country since we have had responsible government. However, these are only some of the troubles, and we pray that Providence may send us a continuance of successful fisheries to help us out of our present embarrassment. I support the Bill before the House.

The Bill was thereupon read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third

Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'

Hon. Mr Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say in reply to the inquiry from Sir Patrick McGrath made when this Bill was before the House on Second Reading as to why these concessions are given and restrictions removed in this Bill. The reasons are that the industry should give it all the encouragement possible to enable the steamer owners to continue the prosecution of this fishery. As honourable members know, the sealing voyage has very materially changed since the original Sealing Bill was enacted and these restrictions put on. We have now about eight steamers prosecuting the fishery, and the season before last was a practical failure. It was originally the intention to bring in a bill empowering the Government to make rules and regulations, but it was considered advisable by members of the House that the matter should be dealt with in a clear-cut way and that a Bill should be passed removing the restrictions and giving any encouragement that would thereby ensue. There might be a possible danger that if we allow a free hand the seals may be exterminated altogether, but in view of the small number of steamers prosecuting the voyage now, that is very improbable.

The principal change in the Bill is to allow the steamers to sail on the 10th of March instead of the 12th. Other sections have repealed, for instance, limiting the quantity of seals to be carried in any one steamer. The only possible object of these restrictions was to provide that seals should not be exterminated. In view of the voyages of the past few years and the limited number of steamers now prosecuting the seal fishery, there is very little possibility of that occurring.

Last year although the vessels were

pretty well fished, the voyage was unremunerative to those who sent the steamers out. It was thought that the government should give the owners every encouragement possible so that the voyage should not be altogether discontinued. I do not know whether there is any other information honorable members would like, but if so, I would be glad to get it.

HON. MR. SHEA—That covers all the ground there is, and as we go thru the Bill if there is any other information I can give, I shall be very pleased to do so.

SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I have had occasion to inquire from some honorable members of the Lower House since we last sat, as to the reason in adopting this legislation, and I find a substantial one, namely, that the sealing industry the past few years has declined so much in value that in last March was debated amongst owners for some time as to whether they would embark on it at all, and it was only, I understand, that the decision of Sir Edgar Bowring, wired from London, that induced others to come in, and I understand that no one steamer paid, and it was thought that another year under existing laws no one steamer would be sent out. It was therefore decided to change the existing law, and modify it as at present proposed, and for that reason I think the House would be justified in endorsing this Bill, in view of the shortage of our industries generally. Before the Bill is put through, I want to suggest to the honourable gentleman in charge that there is no provision in the Bill, I think, as to when the seal fishery is to end, and I think it wise to raise the committee and find out, if it is possible to have something put in.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself

into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Respecting Venereal Diseases"

Hon. Mr. Anderson 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.

On motion the House resolved itself into committee of the Whole on the Municipal Bill.

Report of Select Committee was received and adopted. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments, and on motion Hon. Mr. Gibbs and with the consent of the House it was thereupon read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments, in which it requested their concurrence.

House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, June 28th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Seal Fishery Amendment Bill and the Venereal Diseases Bill were read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

Hon. the President read a message from the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads" and a Bill "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with certain public works" in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea these bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled annual report

of Registrar of Births, Marriages and Deaths for 1920.

House then adjourned until Monday next at 4 o'clock.

MONDAY, July 4th.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 11 Geo. V. Cap. 40, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads'."

HON. MR. SHEA.—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Bill principally consists of one or two amendments to the Act passed last year. The rates are changed.

This Bill provides for specific charges according to the kinds of cars and motor cycles.

The other change is that instead of half the registration fees being paid over, the Government shall pay \$10,000 to the Commission, a fixed sum. The other alteration in last year's Act is that instead of having ten persons on the Road Commission, there shall be thirteen. These are the only changes, and I would therefore move the second reading.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The President informed the Council that he had received a message from the Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed a Bill "An Act Respecting the appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. President, I would move the first reading of this Bill, and in doing so I would ask the House the indulgence of adopting the

course followed in connection with this Bill in the Lower House, and that is to give it the three readings this sitting. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the period of the Municipal Commission expired on the 30th of June, and this Bill is to make temporary arrangements for the administration of Municipal affairs in the interim until the Council shall be duly elected under the new Charter.

Hon. members will of course see the urgency of this measure, and I hope with the indulgence of the House to have this Bill passed through all the stages now. I would therefore move the first reading of this Bill.

The said Bill was thereupon read a first time, and by consent of the House a second time, and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. The Bill was then, by consent of the House, read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that it had passed the same with some amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, at 4.00 o'clock.

TUESDAY, July 5th.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads."

Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA.—As I explained to the House on second reading, the present Act is to amend the Act passed last year. The principal amendments were to change the taxes paid

last year, which I understand are somewhat reduced. The other alteration is that the Commission is to consist of thirteen members instead of ten. I beg to move the first section.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—In regard to this refund, this year many owners have paid their fees on the same rate as last year. Heretofore it has not been the custom of the Municipal Council to refund money paid in, and there ought to be some expression of opinion on behalf of those who have already paid excess fees. If the Council follows the precedent established of retaining money, whether right or not, and telling the person to proceed to the Courts for satisfaction, there ought to be something in this Bill, so that these persons can get a refund. Others again have been told not to pay their fees, as there was a new Act going through.

The fees payable this year will be \$36.00, so that \$14.00 ought to be returned to the owners of these cars, as well as the sum returned to the owners of Ford and Chevrolet cars.

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. Chairman, I think that we would be going somewhat outside our province in dealing with this matter. This Bill would, I believe, be considered a Money Bill, and I do not think that we have power to make the alteration. I certainly would not take it upon myself now to agree with any amendment in that regard without consultation. It is very questionable whether the House has power to make the alteration. However, if the hon. gentleman presses the point I have no objection to rising the committee and getting information.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I do not think there is any necessity to make any alteration. While there is a great deal in what the Hon. Mr. Browning says, yet it is the duty of the Council to make the refund, if

any person has this year paid anything over what the charge for this year would be. I do not think there would be any difficulty whatever about the situation placed before us by Mr. Browning.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—I would like the position to be made clear. I think that those who have paid too much money should be entitled to have it returned. I think this Bill should be deferred until we find whether we have power to alter it.

The Committee thereupon rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The President informed the Council that he had received messages from the Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed Bills entitled, "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children" and "An Act Respecting the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

These Bills were thereupon read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The House then on motion, adjourned until Friday the 8th instant, at 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, July 8th.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the House on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 11, Geo. V. Cap. 40, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads.'"

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the committee at last session there were some questions as to refund of taxes charged this year for motor car and it was suggested that the Committee rise, and that I should make some inquiries with regard to these taxes. I am now

prepared to add another clause to this Bill, making a refund payable to these gentlemen who have paid their motor car taxes this year. There is another clause I am prepared to amend, and that is with regard to the constitution of the Road Commission. The Bill as it is before us provides that there shall be thirteen members, three named by the Governor-in-Council, six by the Newfoundland Motor Association, and the Superintendent of Public Works, the Assistant Superintendent of Public Works, and the Inspectors of St. John's West and East,—in all thirteen members. The Motor Association are not now desirous of having six members appointed by their body, and suggest that three be appointed by them, the same as last year.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—The proper way, then, is to strike out this new section entirely, and let it stand as at last year.

HON. MR. MEWS.—Mr. Chairman, do I understand by the section just passed that the new schedule would come into effect on June 1st of this year. If so, it would be better to put that in the amendment somewhere. I have looked into this and find that several motor-car owners have not paid the taxes due last year, they paid them up to the 1st of June, and then this new Bill was brought in increasing the rates, and some paid the increase and others did not; it seems unfair that these should get away with it. I understand that the lawyer for the Road Commission recommends that the easiest way out would be to put in a clause that would prevent the Council giving any licenses to any owner who is in arrears on last year's account.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—If they are in default the Council can take them into Court and make them pay. I do not favor putting in such a clause, as I think the Council has

full power already to make them pay, and it is merely throwing it back to us to give them an easy escape out of their difficulty.

Before we come to the fifth clause—the hon. gentleman tells us that June 1st was the date fixed by last year's Act. The Act itself says "Such fees shall be paid to the St. John's Municipal Council upon registration, and annually thereafter on such date as may be fixed by the said Municipal Council."

HON. MR. STEER.—The first Sunday in June last year the Council had the police out to hold up car owners who did not have their licenses. That was the date fixed, the 1st of June.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—The object of this bill is to indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for acts done by them in connection with the recent employment afforded the unemployed. It was necessary in the progress of this work to enter upon private lands for the purpose of new roads and this bill indemnifies them for acts done in that connection, I therefore move the second reading.

Said bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I would like to say a word or two in connection with the great services given this city by Mr. Gosling. I happened to be on the Commission appointed with Mr. Gosling and observed the great amount of work he did. I think his greatest achievement is the water supply. Then again there are these catch basins which were so much ridiculed when first erected. Then we can point to the new row of houses on Quidj Vidj Road. I think they are ornamental and useful and it was through his efforts they were erected. Mr. Gosling was very liberal and broadminded. His liberality will be admitted when it is known that for

the 7 years he occupied the position of Mayor, he gave his salary to some charitable object of the town. I would therefore like to go on record as appreciating the services of Mr. Gosling to the city. An item appeared in one of the papers recently in connection with a road being built and it was suggested it should be called Mayor Avenue. I think it should be called Gosling Avenue, and I hope when it gets its official christening it will be called that.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I too, would like to say a word of appreciation of Mr. Gosling. He has given 7 years of good service for the welfare of this community, and I think the city does not realize the full services given by him and his colleagues on the first Commission, such as Mr. Frank Bradshaw, the late Mr. Withers and others, so I join with Mr. MacNamara in congratulating Mr. Gosling on the great work he has done for the city.

Second reading of the Railway Extension Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA.—This is a bill to indemnify the Government for the expenditure on the Argentinia railway started last season. The cost to date has been about \$120,000 and it is estimated to cost about \$50,000 more before the work is completed.

The bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at four o'clock.

THURSDAY, July 14th. 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads Amendment Bill was read a third time and passed and ordered sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendment in which concurrence is requested.

House went into Committee on Railway Extension Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Second reading of the Bill for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children.

HON. MR. SHEA.—This bill has been framed as the result of a number of conferences held by leading clergymen of the city and for the purpose of giving the law authorities further powers for administering the law in regard to young children. The clergymen have given a good deal of attention to the matter and have been consulted in regard to the bill and endorse it fully. There are cases where it is impossible to take any steps to punish people for wrong doing to children, and this bill gives the necessary power in such cases. In reading over the bill I see many things which I do not think will be carried out, but even if only half of it is, it will be of great effect. We all know what has been done in regard to Child Welfare, and the amount of good so done has been incalculable, and I think it is about time people woke up for the protection of children, and this bill points in that direction.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I strongly support this bill and in addition to what the hon. gentleman has said, I would like to add, from what was said in the lower house, it is really done instead of providing a Reformatory. The Inspector General is prepared to appoint one or two probation officers to look after children and where these juvenile offenders are brought into Court, it is provided the Magistrate shall sit at other times from the usual court, in the afternoon and ill-used by their natural guardians lacking a Reformatory, they will be put in the custody of reputable people and fees provided for their maintenance to be provided by their parents or guardians. Now all that legislation

is quite in accord with social reform elsewhere, and I think it is quite true something of that kind was introduced in this country. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we will not be able to do all that is necessary, but I think it is time we made a step to do something.

This Bill was then read a second time.

On motion the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 19th at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, July 19th, 1921.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for Acts done in connection with recent public Works."

Hon. Mr. Pover in the Chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. Chairman, this Act purports to indemnify the Council for acts done within the limits of the electoral district of St. John's. If any of these roads had been made outside the Municipal limits by the Council, surely that would be improper.

HON. MR. GIBBS—No, there is an arrangement between the members for St. John's East and West and the Council by which a certain proportion of the St. John's road grants are handed over to the City Council to be expended. For instance, take a pipe line extending from Merrymeeting Road. That would be done by the Council, but the district would not be within the municipal limits.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Who would ultimately have to pay for it?

HON. MR. GIBBS—There is an arrangement between the representatives and the Council, and the cost of work outside the city limits would be borne by the road grants.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I can understand that, but is there any-

thing on record to satisfy us that is the position, because I could quite see a situation arising out of this where the Municipal Council, the residents of St. John's would be called upon to pay for work done outside the city limits.

HON. MR. GIBBS—This is simply an Act to prevent them being sued for things they may have done, such as entering upon lands and performing work which they had no authority to perform.

HON. MR. GIBBS—This is simply an Act to prevent them being sued for things they may have done, such as entering upon lands and performing work which they had no authority to perform.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—But even whether that is so or not, no man can enter upon private lands, nor can the Municipal Council or the Government, without being liable to compensate the man for damage done.

HON. MR. GIBBS—But my honorable friend will remember that the Municipal Law prescribes the procedure to be followed when the Council desires to enter upon lands for the purpose of making streets, laying pipes or other necessary Municipal work. If they wish to take the land, they have to notify the authorities, submit plans, hear objections, and then after a certain period of time they shall decide what may be done. Now none of that was followed.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—And because of that the Council could be sued for entering upon the lands. But that does not get over the fact that somebody has to pay the people for their lands and damage to property.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The Council has not got to pay for the land outside the city.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Well then, who has?

HON. MR. GIBBS—The representatives for the Districts.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—
But this provides that:

"1. No action shall be maintained against the St. John's Municipal Commission for anything done by itself or anyone acting under its authority in connection with the opening up of new streets or roads in the electoral district of St. John's" and

"2. Compensation for land taken shall be awarded by Arbitration as provided in the St. John's Municipal Act, 1902, and acts in amendment thereof"

Does that render the Municipal Council liable?

HON. MR. GIBBS—They would be liable only for acts done in the city limits, and for compensation for land within the city limits.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I think the honorable gentleman will see that there is something in my contention; otherwise the proper way for the section to be worded would be "No action shall be maintained against the St. John's Municipal Commission for anything done by itself or anyone acting under its authority in connection with the opening up of new streets or roads in the municipality of St. John's" That would make it clear.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot say what the object of the form is.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—I would suggest that the committee rise until that can be found out. I think that we should not pass it in the form in which it is at present.

The Committee thereupon rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

TUESDAY, July 19th, 1921.

House went into Committee on the bill respecting the extension of the railway system of the Colony, Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the bill with an amendment, and it

was ordered it be read a third time on to-morrow.

House adjourned until Tuesday next at four o'clock.

TUESDAY, July 26, 1921.

House met pursuant to adjournment

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the Railway Extension Bill was read a third time, passed and ordered sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with an amendment in which concurrence is requested.

House went into Committee on St. John's Municipal Commission Indemnity Bill, Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Indemnify the St. John's Municipal Commission for acts done in connection with recent public works." Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and, with the consent of the House the Bill was thereupon on motion read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the House resolves itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act for the Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children" Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair. Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again later in the day.

The Hon. the President read a message from the House of Assembly stating that they accepted the Council's amendments to the Bill "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads" as they found they did not conflict with the prerogatives of the Assembly with respect to Money Bills.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. President, I object that the form of that message is altogether wrong.

The gentlemen of the other House are labouring under a delusion as to what is a Money Bill. There is no such thing as a Money Bill now unless it is so certified by the Speaker as a Money Bill. I think the message ought to be sent back pointing out that a wrong message has been sent.

HON. MR. MEWS—I agree perfectly with what the honorable gentleman has said, and I cannot understand why such a message was sent. I pointed that out to them informally.

A message was ordered to be sent back accordingly.

The Hon. the President read a message from the Assembly to the effect that they had passed a Bill "An Act for the Quieting of Titles" in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was thereupon read a first time. Hon. Mr. Gibbs, in moving with the consent of the House the second reading of the said bill, said:

I would move the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so I would point out that its title is a very misleading one. The object of the Bill will be seen from a perusal of it. As honorable gentlemen know, by far the greater portion of land in this country is held by what is known as "Squatter's Rights". People go in and settle on a piece of land and never take the trouble of acquiring a title to it by grant from the Crown; they get it by adverse possession, and consequently when corporations such as capable companies come here and need land for the purpose of building houses, they require evidence of title before they will purchase land, and people who have acquired the land in this manner have no titles to give them. Corporations of that character will not purchase land for which they cannot get proper deeds or documents of title, and it became necessary therefore in cases where people had settled upon Crown Lands without acquiring

any grant from the Crown that some evidence of title should be given purchasers such as the corporations referred to, and this Bill outlines the form of procedure by which a person may acquire a proper title to the land upon which he has settled and lived for a number of years. The rights of all parties are protected in this Bill, and there is no injustice done any person. I would therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. President, I strongly support this Bill, and perhaps I could add a little more information to that already given the House. This Bill originated through the fact that the Western Union Cable Company was desirous of making advances to a number of its operators to enable them to build houses, but found with references to the land on which the houses were to be built, that an absolutely indefeasible title was not to be obtained. The original owners had got it by squatters rights and had not occupied it for the period of sixty years necessary for them to get a title as against the Crown, and while there was no question as to their proprietary interests, still a corporation from abroad naturally was disinclined to put up its money, certainly on a substantial scale, unless it could get some other and more assured title to the property. At the time action was taken for the bringing in of this Bill, two or three houses had been started, but the company was not willing to give any more money, and consequently building operations to a substantial extent have been stopped as a result. Moreover, the same thing applies all through the country. At any time the rights of people to property which they have occupied may be disputed successfully, and they may be ejected. This is not a desirable condition to permit if we can remedy it. This Bill, I understand, has been before a Judge of the Supreme Court. It is a Bill which I think we should have

added to the Statute Book years ago, and probably if we had, more in the way of development might have occurred. I heartily support the Bill.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley 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.

Hon. the President informed the Council that he had received a message from the Assembly that they had passed a Bill "An Act Further Respecting the Exportation of Timber" in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion the Bill was read a first time.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL in moving with the consent of the House the second reading, said:

MR. PRESIDENT—I may say in explanation of this Bill that it is a Bill for the purpose of allowing the exportation of timber from lands held under license from the Crown by private persons in the Colony. From a Government standpoint, this is desirable on account of the labor that it will likely give during the winter. The exportation of unmanufactured timber was allowed, both from Crown Lands and leased lands, during the War period when labor was plentiful. We are looking forward with apprehension to next winter, and we want to be able to employ men in the lumberwoods. However, there are certain objections from a National standpoint. It has been pointed out by my honourable friend Sir Patrick McGrath that the United States has practically no pulpwood, except in the northern areas. Canada is withdrawing her pulpwood, and possibly we in Newfoundland may be wise to hold back our pulpwood, hoping to make some agreement with the United States.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—Mr. President, I would suggest that

this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. This Bill, if enacted as it is, would deprive us of very valuable material in connection with a Reciprocity agreement with the United States. Within the past ten days the Congress has adopted almost unanimously a resolution urging President Harding to take up negotiations with Canada with a view to getting the Canadian Government to repeal or temporarily abandon the Act which forbids the exportation of pulpwood from Canada to the United States. If we were to pass this Act now without some provision we would of course destroy the value of such a factor. Once this Bill became law and people contemplated cutting and exporting, they would enter into their arrangements, and the Government could not bring in a Bill next year to repeal this measure after the people had put their money into it and after all the various undertakings had been carried out. For that reason I suggested that the Bill might be amended in some way and power given to the Governor in Council, so that the Act would not come into force until a Proclamation was issued in the Royal Gazette. I may say further, however, that I think the policy underlying this Bill is a bad one. I quite recognize the need for providing employment for the coming winter, and perhaps for some time after that, and for that reason I will consent to refrain from the opposition which I have always advanced in this House, and which I have always advanced in the newspapers against any policy of permitting the exportation from the country of unmanufactured wood.

To-day we have in our forest extent, the only property is the one at Grand Falls. That became possible only through the point that exportation of pulpwood was not permitted. If it were to become known that we were contemplating a contrary policy, that mill would not have been erected. If we

did not have Grand Falls we would not have the 1500 men employed there all the year round, and therefore, while I am prepared to see this bill go thru', still I think it is a pity that acts of this kind are finding their way on the Statute Book. It is quite true during the war we permitted it, but we permitted it as a War measure to get lumber to England for war purposes, use in mines etc., but the wood was not used because ships were not available, and it is safe to say not a dollar of it went back to the people who advanced the money to cut it. I do not want to delay the House unduly, but merely want to put myself on record. It was the policy of Sir Robert Bond, Sir Edward Morris.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL—It is the correct policy.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH—I am glad my hon. friend agrees.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken in regard to bills of this kind. Personally, I think it is a mistake and a serious one for this country to export its raw products in an unmanufactured state. The development of every country, no matter what its resources may be, depends on the manufacture of its raw products into commercial products and exporting them in a manufactured state. If the impression was to go abroad that this Act was of a permanent character we would not have any mills erected here in the future. The policy pursued by every country to-day which has an eye to its industrial development, is to utilize its products for manufacture into articles of commerce and give employment not of the hewer of wood and drawer of water type, but that which requires educational technical knowledge and skill and development in the country of a system of education which would bring along its own development and worth. As has been stated by the hon. gentleman, if we could manufacture every ton of

ore that has been and will be exported from this country into a manufactured or commercial article, it would mean very near millions of dollars to this country, and it is rather unfortunate that so many millions of tons of ore should go out of this country to enrich the people of other lands when it should be manufactured in our own country.

The bill was read a second time, and was ordered to be referred to a select committee, said committee to consist of Hons. Dr. Campbell, Gibbs, Browning and Mews and Sir Patrick McGrath.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill respecting fishery supplies for the Current Season was read a first time, and by consent of the house, a second time.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH—There is no provision for a penalty in the bill at all, and as half a million dollars of the public money is involved, I think we should provide that people who infringe on this law should be punished.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the bill ratifying a contract with the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the bill entitled an Act to amend and consolidate the laws concerning the Municipal affairs of the town of St. John's were read a first time, and the House thereupon went into committee of the whole thereon, Hon. Mr. Mews in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the said amendment without amendment.

House then adjourned until Thursday at four of the clock.

THURSDAY, July 28, 1921.

House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the bills An Act for the Quieting of Titles, and House of Assembly Amendments to the St. John's Municipal Act 1920 were read a third time, passed, and ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the Bill respecting Fishery Supplies was referred to a Select Committee consisting of Hons. Shea, McGrath, Steer, Mews and Anderson.

Second reading of Act for ratification of Contract with the Pulp Paper Corporation of America.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—This Company intends operating a pulp mill on Labrador capable of turning out 15,000 tons of pulp per year. Local as well as foreign capital is interested in it, and they ask nothing in concessions except what was granted to the Company at Lomond. I move the second reading of the Bill.

The bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

The Select Committee on the Exportation of Timber Bill reported having made certain amendments which they recommended to the House.

House went into Committee of the Whole on said bill, Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the bill with some amendment, and with the consent of the House the bill was then read a third time and passed and ordered sent to the Assembly requesting its concurrence in said amendments.

Hon. President read message from the Assembly that they had passed the bill for the temporary operation of the Nfld. Railway and requested concurrence of the Council therein; also that they had passed the Council's amendments to the Railway Extension Bill without amendment.

Bill providing for temporary oper-

ation of the Nfld. Railway, was then read a first time and ordered read a second time on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

FRIDAY, July 29th.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on Bill for Protection of Neglected, Dependent and Delinquent Children.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Committee on Bill to ratify contract with the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines whether the report that an advertisement for a thousand men to undertake logging in Newfoundland published in the Sydney papers has come to his attention, whether it is on behalf of this company or any other company operating under Act of the Legislature, and in either case, what steps can be taken to see that our own people are employed.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I think that is a fake message.

SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—That may be, but is there any other company contemplating operations?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Not to my knowledge. You must remember that people are permitted to export pulpwood from Labrador on leased limits, and there may be somebody intending to cut pulpwood, but in the present state of the market that does not appear to be probable. I will carry on investigations. There would be a number of lease-holders of undisputed territory or the Labrador. It would be an easy matter to find that out.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amend-

ment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Operation of the Newfoundland Railway."

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. President, it has fallen to my lot to move the second reading of this Bill, which is probably the most important bill that has come before this House during this session, in as much as it involves the expenditure of a million and a half dollars from the funds of the Colony for the temporary operation of the railway system of the Colony. For the last twenty-five years, Mr. President, we have been so identified with railway and railway policies in this country that we can hardly believe what we would be now if we had not a railway bill. In our national debt of fifty-one million dollars we have something like thirty million dollars expended on various railway policies that have been handed down to us from the initiation of the railway policy in this country, so that it would certainly be a stretch of imagination to think of ourselves without a railway bill. As long as the Reids were willing to continue the operations of the railway everything went well; no one asked any questions. The public generally were more or less apathetic as to the results of the operation of the railway, but the work went on and no one cried out, and years came and went, and the railway bills were paid, and there was nothing said about it. But last year, unfortunately, the Reids and the Reid resources were at an end, and we were brought to a standstill. The Government were then threatened with the position of the stoppage of the railway or worse consequences, and the result was that temporary arrangements had to be made with a commission appointed by the Government which operated the railway last year, and the results of

which, as we all know, were most unsatisfactory. That went on until we were brought face to face with a railway standstill again. It was not known what the fate of the railway would be, until the temporary arrangement now embodied in this Bill was thought out, and that is an arrangement involving a large sum of money for the continuance of the railway for the period of one year, and after that the whole thing is "in the lap of the gods." Now it is somewhat unfortunate, I think, Mr. President, that when this matter came up for consideration before the Legislature it should have assumed in the outset such a strong partisan view. It was brought before the House of Assembly in a suite of resolutions a fortnight or three weeks ago, and it was immediately taken hold of as a political weapon, which I think in the general interests of the Colony was somewhat unfortunate. When the Government was forced into the position of making some arrangements with the Reid Newfoundland Company, the Government invited the Opposition members to form a committee to consider what course should be adopted in the general interests for the carrying on of the railway or for the railway policy generally. That invitation, Mr. President, was declined, as the Opposition would take no responsibility for the policy of the Government on the railway question, and they said the Government might do the best they could. The Government then got Sir George Bury to visit Newfoundland. He investigated matters here. After consultation he made the proposition that is embodied in the Bill now before us, that the railway should be run for a year by the Reid Newfoundland Company. The Prime Minister, in introducing the Bill into the Lower House, stated the case fairly and squarely, and said

there were three alternatives; first, the idea of a Government railway operated and owned by the Government, second, the operation of the railway by the Reid Company, and third, the question of the abandonment of the railway policy altogether. These three alternatives were all strongly opposed by the Opposition, but no suggestion of any kind was made by them as to any other policy. The amendments which they proposed showed their hand, that they were making this a political question, and under ordinary circumstances they would be justified in doing so, but in a matter of this kind, I think it is a wrong way to deal with it. I believe that this is a case of two heads being better than one. However, that was the course that was pursued, and the amendment they proposed in the end showed their position, that they merely wanted to embarrass the Government. I do not think there was a member of the Government that was in favor of the arrangement, but the position was that there was no other alternative, and it would give the Government time to look around and see what could be done. As I see it, if the people of the country want railways, they must pay for them. Up to this the Reids have paid for it. The Reids can no longer do this, and if the cry is for a railway, the people must pay for it. Sir George Bury gave this matter a good deal of thought, and he stated that as the railway was now run nobody could make it pay. I do not know that he stated that to the Government officially, but that was what he told me in conversation. We must take the railway bill as it is, or else we must close up the railway altogether. That is the position I take, and I think other men outside take the same. Railway work, like everything else, requires expert knowledge; it is a large proposition; and I think

that before the New Year the Government will have some complete plans to lay before the Legislature when it meets again, so that we may have a little light on the railway horizon. I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. President.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Mr. President, inasmuch as this bill is certified by the Speaker of the House of Assembly as a money bill within the terms of "The Legislature Act, 1917," the only course open to us is to express our views on the measure itself and the policy which it embodies. The Hon. Gentleman, (Mr. Shea), who moved the second reading, expressed his regret that the Opposition in the other House had treated this as a political issue and had refused the invitation of the Government to join with them in working out a measure that could be satisfactory to all; and thought this a mistake and that the amendment which the Opposition moved showed a desire to make political capital out of a very serious situation in the country. I would point out that if this railway question has been made a political issue the blame for that is due not to the Opposition, but to the present Government, which fought the last general election campaign largely on the cry that those then in power were friendly with the Reids and were allowing them to escape their obligations, and that if the party then seeking power, and now enjoying it, was elected it would make the Reids toe the mark, live up to their obligations and carry out the railway contract in the manner in which it ought to be carried out. As I pointed out on the first day of the session, it is very easy for those in power to issue invitations to those they have turned out, to join with them in solving problems like this, but, human nature being what it is, it is rather much to expect that men who have been the victims of such a

course should do anything else than leave a Government to flounder in the mess which it has made itself. I am not speaking for the Opposition, as they are capable of defending themselves, but I would say that in England, and in Canada, where they have important railway bills before Parliament, of a character analogous to our own, the Opposition parties—the Liberals and the Laborites in England, and the Liberals and the Farmers in Canada have pursued exactly the same policy as our Opposition in refusing to give the Government any assistance and have criticised the railway legislation to the fullest extent.

I agree with the hon. gentleman in saying that this railway issue is a very serious one and that the policy embodied in this bill is one that cannot be continued. I do not agree with him that there was no other alternative, or that this bill was the best that could have been devised. I think it is probable a worse solution would have resulted if the Government had succeeded in getting the House closed before they tackled this railway problem, as was the idea five or six weeks ago, when it was proposed to close the House on June 21, and notice was given of suspension of the rules in the other Chamber. I believe that if the working out of this plan had been done quietly between the Government and the Reids, after the House closed, without any chance for public opinion to express itself, a worse measure would have resulted, but, on the other hand, I think that if the Government's hand had been forced much earlier in the session, so that public opinion could have been brought into play, we would have had a much better bill than this is. I agreed with him in his statement that until recently the Reids paid for running the railroad and that while the Reids continued to pay there was little complaint, but that now,

when the Reids can no longer pay, there is much public outcry, but this, of course is only natural, particularly when we remember that the Reids had a contract to run the railroad, and especially when we know that all the money-making features of the Reid Company's holdings have been recently transferred to other companies and that the Colony has been put in a very detrimental position as a result. The hon. gentleman tells us that this measure is only temporary, to enable the Government to get time to look around and bring in experts to tackle this question seriously, and in a way to ensure a permanent solution. I hope that something in this line will be done, but I have my doubts, because a year ago the same promise was made, the same hope was held out, but nothing came of it, and I doubt if the Government is able or willing to take up this question as it ought to be taken up and to develop some permanent solution of it. To say as the Government says "This is the best we can do; take it or leave it," is in my opinion a negation of statesmanship and a confession of bankruptcy in administrative ability.

This question was so very exhaustively debated in the other Chamber that few aspects of it were overlooked, but it was treated entirely on its local features, and I thought it might be helpful if this House looked at it in the light of conditions abroad. In discussing it, moreover let us in Roosevelt's words: "look it squarely in the face, unblinded by preconceived prejudices, and unaffected by partisan feeling." Let us also recognize our obligation to say our say upon this measure, whether for or against it. When the 1898 contract was before this Chamber most of its members were content to give a silent vote and it was held against the Council for years afterwards, in all the contro-

versy in the Legislature, in the press and on the political platform, that except for the late Hon. D. J. Greene, who introduced it here, and who was Mr. Reid's Attorney in signing it, no member spoke, and that only one, Hon. George Knowling, whose poor health prevents his being here to-day voted against it. Strong arguments can be made for and against that Bill, and I am not going to enter that field, but I say that nothing in its history so shattered the prestige of this House for years after 1898 as the failure of its members to voice their views on the '98 contract when it was before them. Similarly, the most dispiriting feature of the passage of this Bill through the Lower Chamber was the absolute silence of the Government members. The Opposition, of course, opposed it bitterly. It is the duty of an Opposition to oppose and harass a Government, and they did it to the fullest, but it can hardly be disputed that they had a strong case, a far stronger one than an Opposition has many a time. But, whatever the merits of the matter, the Government's case was decidedly made worse by the failure of its advocates to put up any defence for it, the sole excuse advanced being that this was the best the Government could do. This Bill is the feature by which the present session will be remembered, just as the Cod Fish Exportation Bill will make the session of 1929 ever memorable, especially to those who suffered so disastrously by it. That bill was the outcome of the belief by the Government that they could disregard the principle of supply and demand and make laws unto themselves, which laws they could oblige our customers all over the world to agree to. That experiment cost us directly five million dollars, through losses in the sales of our fish, and indirectly perhaps as great an amount through the losses in the value of commodities under forced

realization and otherwise. Now we have in this bill another experiment, in regard to the operation of the railway, which bids fair to be just as costly and just as disastrous. We have paid already on account of it 2½ million dollars, for the operation of the railroad last year and for the providing of improvements thereto, and the Colony is now facing the payment of a similar amount during the current twelve months. This frightful burden upon our people results from the delusion which the present Government has launched to operate the railroad. The theory prevails in some quarters that the Reid railway is the only mismanaged and badly-run railroad in the world and that for the conditions which exist in regard to it the Reids are responsible. This view was widely proclaimed in the last election campaign, it was reiterated here last session, and it is being repeated again now. Because of it the country has been sadly burdened and an intolerable confusion created for the future, while because of it, too, we see that the Reids, fearing the worst, have utilized their opportunities to transfer all the money-making branches of their enterprise in this country to subsidiary corporations, from which we are powerless to get them back, while at the same time the Reids are holding the country responsible for every obligation which it undertook under the contract of 1901, but when it comes in turn to hold them liable for the responsibilities and obligations which they undertook, we find ourselves dealing with an admittedly bankrupt company, from which there is nothing to be obtained. Let me recall again to the memory of those around me my prophetic words on the last night we sat here a year ago. We were discussing the railway problem then, in the last hours of the session, passing last year's bill to give the Reids a loan for rolling stock and other improvements.

Our hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture. (Dr. Campbell) had explained that the Government would negotiate with the Reids during the recess for new legislation this year. I observed that if so, I hoped the Government would go slowly, act cautiously and take every precaution to protect the country's interests, because the country had, unfortunately, bitter reason already to realize that the Reids when negotiating in these matters left no stone unturned to protect themselves. And you will all remember the good doctor's interjection: "Oh, yes! we know the Reids are lying awake in the nights trying to work out how they can get ahead of us. But we are on the alert and are more than a match for them." I replied that I hoped it would prove so, but I had my doubts, and to-day everybody knows that these doubts were justified. Everybody is to-day awake to the ghastly realization of the situation, to the fact that the Reids have "put one over" on us, to use the jargon of the hour, and that the Government were either caught napping or were parties to this procedure, either of which alternatives is very discreditable to them. The Reids may have been lying awake earlier in the session; but they could sleep peacefully, when our hon. friend Dr. Campbell spoke, because some weeks before they had got an innocent, unsuspecting little bill through the House, entitled 'An Act to amend the Companies' Act' so that provided them with the machinery by which to make this transfer, something they could not do, lacking this, without the consent of the Government, a consent which every Government since 1901 had refused to give them. But our hon. friend and his colleagues obligingly provided the machinery, either unwittingly or knowingly, and his boast of last year comes to nothing.

I do not blame the Reids for protecting themselves. Having sunk millions of their money in the railway

enterprise and having to do with a Government exhibiting such undisguised hostility to them, fearing the worst in view of the outlook, I do not know that their action in converting their profit-making assets into subsidiary companies is so very reprehensible. But I think the Government is deserving of censure for providing the machinery to enable this to have been done. If the Government did it deliberately it was criminal; if the Government was hoodwinked they were guilty of a blunder that was worse than a crime. It is the people of the Colony, and generations yet unborn, that will suffer from it, because I predict that Newfoundland will be launched into a maelstrom of litigation as a result of this and other developments in this railway problem the past year or so, which cannot fail to have ruinous consequences to our whole fiscal fabric. I speak here to-day neither as an advocate nor a critic of the Reids. I sincerely sympathize with them in the collapse of their many plans for the advancement of this colony's fortunes, and incidentally of their own, and especially on their enormous financial losses, notably in the last few years, losses which have subjected them to much censure that is wholly undeserved, accusations of blundering and incompetence based on the altogether mistaken notion that nowhere else have railway systems met such monetary losses, run behind in upkeep and equipment, or suffered such impairment of public confidence as is the misfortune of the Reid Newfoundland Railway to-day. As I know that similar conditions exist with regard to the British, Canadian, American, South African and Australian railways it has occurred to me that it is getting an idea of some unsuspected phases of this problem, if

I were to submit some facts and figures showing the position of the railways

in these countries, how closely it ap-

proximates to that of our own rail-road, and how equally gloomy is the outlook for their future as well as ours.

As it happens, the British Parliament is now discussing a railway bill, introduced by Sir Eric Geddes, Minister of Transport, on May 26, and from his speech and those of other members on the second reading debate, I extracted the following facts: England, of course, saw the first rail-road, nearly 100 years ago. From then till the war, over 1,000 railway companies were promoted or took shape in the British Isles. In the summer of 1914, when war broke out, there were about 200 separate rail-ways there. The Government at once took over the essential ones, 114 altogether, leaving small local ones, and light railways out. The conditions on which the Government control was put in force were (1) the Government was to get immediate control and absolute control, operating the system as a unit through the managers of the principal companies as a Board of Management; (2) the shareholders in the several companies were to get the same rate of dividends, all the time control continued, as they did in 1913, the year before the war, which was a very successful one for British railways; (3) the Government was to maintain the railways and their rolling stock during control, up to the same standard as 1913, as far as possible; and when decontrol came the Government was to pay a sum sufficient to make good any defaults in the latter particular. Such were the conditions on which the British railways were operated during the war, and up to now. Decontrol is to come in August 14, a fortnight hence, and the new Bill, which I will describe later, is to provide for it. Under the existing status it cost the British taxpayer thirty-seven million pounds, or about seventeen shillings a head, allowing the

population of the British Isles to be 45 million persons, to make good the loss on operating, paying dividends and providing betterments for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1920, and forty-six million pounds, or over a pound a head, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1921, while for the 4½ months to the decontrol date, August 14, it is estimated that there will be a loss of about thirty-five million pounds more, due to the loss in April being nine millions. Similar losses being expected for May and June, during which months the strike continued, and about eight millions for July and half of August. And, be it noted, the British taxpayer had to meet such deficits each year, besides having to pay largely increased rates for passages and freights all this time. The increases in passenger rates since 1914 were 75 per cent., and in freight rates 112 per cent. The official figures show that the earnings of the railways were:

Year ended March 31,	
1913'	1921.
	(Passenger.)
£ 44,000,000	£105,000,000
	(Freight.)
78,000,000	188,000,000
	(Other earnings.)
13,000,000	25,000,000
£135,000,000	£318,000,000

This means an addition of £163,-000,000 over pre-war charges, and as there was very little luxury travel in England during the war, this is really an additional charge on industry. But this is not the worst. When decontrol was approaching it was found that the British railways, like Coady of happy memory in our other Chamber, "had a claim" and the Government appointed a committee under Lord Colwyn, an eminent colliery owner and financial authority, to investigate it. This claim was for "deferred betterments," that is to say,

for what the Government had not been able to do in putting the railroads in as good a position as when it took them over; and Lord Colwyn's committee after a painstaking inquiry, lasting five months, found that the railroads had direct claims totalling £158,000,000 and contingent claims for about £50,000,000 more, say £200,000,000 altogether. Recently Sir Eric Geddes made an amicable agreement with the companies by which they accepted a lump sum of £51,000,000 in full settlement of all their claims against the British Treasury; and one of the objects of the Railway Bill now before the Mother Parliament is to provide for the payment of this money. But its principal object is to provide for the future of the railways nearly all of which are facing bankruptcy. Indeed; Sir Wm. Granet, who was British railway controller during the war, stated recently in New York, that there was only one solvent railway in the British Isles, presumably his own—the Midland. It may be asked why are they bankrupt? The answer is that if the Government lost so much on running them, it is unlikely that the companies can make them pay and earn a dividend. Some authorities attribute their bankruptcy to the war alone. Geddes disputes this. He claims they were running behind for years prior to the war. He shows that from 1896 to the start of the war, British railway stock was steadily declining in value and that the average dividend they paid in 1913 was only 4.1-2 per cent. He ascribes this, curiously enough, to inefficiency in management. He says that every country in the world except China, which we regard as asleep, operates its railroads cheaper than Britain. In 1813 it cost one cent to move a ton of freight one mile on the American railways, 1.1-4 cents on the German, 1.1-2 cents on the French and 2 cents on the British. In Am-

erica they got 1,300,000 tons of freight over every mile. In Germany 740,000 tons, in Britain only 500,000 tons. In America the load of a freight car is 23 1-2 tons; in Germany, 9 tons; in Britain, 5 1-2 tons. This is due to various causes—the cost of building railways through a thickly settled country like Britain, where land costs are huge, the multiplicity of companies with directorates and managements duplicated abnormally, overhead costs unnecessary and the like. The Government now proposes to force an amalgamation of the English and Welsh railways, over eighty in all, into six groups, covering different sections of the country, and hopes thereby to save about £25,000,000 on an operating expense of £76,000,000, which if realised, should give the companies a fair profit, and it is also proposed to permit them to fix rates, so as to assure them of a decent dividend—5 per cent. per annum. Whether it eventuates in the way expected, though, is another question. However, it is interesting to compare this situation with ours. The Reids operated our railroad for nearly twenty years, not alone getting no dividends but actually putting up their own money every year to make good losses; enormous losses during the war, when the British railways were guaranteed upkeep and dividends, and now when the British railways are decontrolled, legislation is being provided to enable them to operate profitably in the future, while the utmost we can vision is this makeshift arrangement to enable us to "side-step" this problem for another twelve months.

Before leaving the general topic of the British railways I would like to deal briefly with one of the Scotch railways that presents some features almost identical with our own. That is the Highland railway, a single line of 666 miles that runs through the

North of Scotland and alone serves it, as the Reid line of 900 miles does our country. In a speech by Sir Halford Makinder, M.P., for Glasgow, who made a strong plea for this railway on the score of its being bankrupt, I found though, to the amazing fact set out, that while the population of Scotland, is about 3 3-4 millions, all but 300,000 of these are in the Lowlands or Southern part, and that in the Northern part, the Highlands, the larger half in area. the population is only this 300,000 or slightly more than the population of Newfoundland. Moreover, there is the further similarity that the main line runs through unpeopled wilderness, with branches to cities and towns on the East, West and North Coasts, where connections are made with steamboat services that ply to other points, and that the country is as deeply indented with bays and firths, and lochs as our own. Another resemblance is in the physical features of the railroad terrain the line having to traverse passes 600, 1200 and 1500 feet high, whereas the highest point on our road, on the Topsails, is only 1132 feet above the sea. Here, then, is a single line, like ours, with a mileage like ours, running through a region like ours, serving coastal areas like ours, and facing the same physical difficulties as ours, even as to winter snow falls as in this country. I gather the latter fact from this quotation from his speech: "Consider the conditions when you have, as a normal preparation for what is likely to happen any day in the winter, to keep a snow plough with three powerful engines behind it ready in case there should be a snow drift impeding a train. That plough with its engines has to be ready to proceed to the scene of the obstruction and has to go full charge into that heap of snow. If the snow happens to give, well and good, then the train may follow and make its way

through; but if the snow does not give, then you have to dig the snow plough and the three locomotives out of the snow so that they can go at it again."

Over this single railroad during the war were hauled all the commodities for maintaining the life and trade of the Highlands, because of the lack of shipping and of the submarine menace, and over it also were hauled to Thurso, its most Northern point, and the jumping-off place for Scapa Flow, all the men, munitions and materials for the Grand Fleet, based, as we now know, on that Orkney fiord, and also for the Naval dockyard, at Invergordon in the Moray Firth, on one of its branches, and the large garrison that protected it. Now that railroad is bankrupt, so we can hardly feel surprised that our railroad, on which we depended mainly for our existence during the war, is also bankrupt and chiefly because of its war-time losses on operation. Finally, may I remark that the proper place to go for a general manager for our railway, if you wanted one, would seem to be, not to Montreal, or Toronto, but to the Highland railway of Scotland.

So much for the British railways. I turn now to the Canadian. Before the war these were on the down grade, and after hostilities began the downward process greatly accelerated. Today all the railways in Canada, except the C.P.R. and a few small lines, have had to be taken over by the Government and operated as a National system under Government control. These are (1) the Intercolonial, connecting the Maritime Provinces and Montreal, and always a Government line, the price of the Maritime Provinces entering Confederation; (2) the National Transcontinental, from Moncton to Winnipeg, built by the Laurier Government, fifteen years ago and leased to the Grand Trunk; (3) the Grand Trunk, Canada's original railroad, operated from London, as a result of

which it never half utilized its opportunities, running as it did through the most fertile sections of Quebec and Ontario, and with 30 subsidiary connections in the United States; (4) The Grand Trunk Pacific, an extension of the National Transcontinental from Winnipeg to the Pacific Coast, to give the Grand Trunk, a through line from coast to coast like the C.P.R., and (5) The Canadian Northern, another ocean-to-ocean line enterprised by Mackenzie and Mann, two highly successful railway builders, who in the past twenty years built or bought lines in the various provinces and pieced them out from time to time as opportunity and money offered. All these were sagging before the war. They flourished in the boom times and wilted in the dull days. When I first crossed Canada in 1911 the decline was plain to any eye. To-day all are bankrupt. The Intercolonial, built as a political railway, always showed a deficit. The Trans-Continental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, never came anywhere near earning their operating expenses, not to say dividends. The Grand Trunk paid in bygone days, but the profits latterly were swamped by the losses of its western outlet. The Canadian Northern, cheaply built and operated, might have survived but for the war. There is an interesting article on the Canadian railway imbroglio in the current number of the "Round Table." I have studied the subject myself and written of it for American periodicals. In the April (1920) issue of the American Review of Reviews, Samuel C. Dunn, Editor of the "Railway Age" of Chicago, treats of American railways; myself of Canadian, and Judson C. Welliver, London correspondent of the New York Herald, of the European railways. I am, however, delving for the data on the Canadian railways. I am using here, on an exhaustive article in the Central Star of June 1st, by Mr. J. L.

Payne, for many years statistician of the Department of Railways at Ottawa and recently retired through age. He shows that after the war began the Canadian Government, which did not take over the railways, as Britain and America did, but operated them through a Railway War Board, composed of their managers began exactly as we are doing, by giving them large sums to cover their losses on operations, and ended by taking them over altogether, as I believe we will eventually have to do. For the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1920, the deficits on these lines, now grouped together as the "Canadian National Railways" and run by the Government, was \$40,000,000, and for the year ended last March it had increased to \$76,000,000. These figures, of course, do not take into account any interest on the money spent on building or laying these lines, which is included in the public debt, and gets its dividends through that medium; and up to the end of 1918 Canada had given the railways cash subsidies of \$275,000,000, guarantees of \$345,000,000, and land grants of \$44,000,000 acres. To this must be added cash grants the past two years to the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific lines, and the award for taking over the Grand Trunk itself, now under arbitration at Montreal, with Mr. W. H. Taft, former President of the United States, acting for the Grand Trunk, Sir Thomas White, late Finance Minister at Ottawa, for the Canadian Government, and Sir Walter Cassals, head of the Exchequer Court of Canada, as Chairman. Sir George Fury, who was here some weeks ago, advising the Government on this question, was quoted by the Daily News last Monday as having declared himself at Winnipeg as opposed to Government ownerships of railways and in favor of Lord Shaughnessy's plan for dealing with the Canadian National system. That

plan was sketched by Lord Shaughnessy in a letter to the Canadian press last April, covering a memorandum he had addressed to Premier Borden in 1917 and, after revision, to bring it up to date, to Premier Meighen a week before he gave it to the newspapers. Briefly stated, it proposes that the "National Railways" be handed over to the C.P.R., which would cut out a lot of duplicate mileage and run the combined system for a guaranteed dividend, and he showed how by this means the doing away with useless duplication of management, staffs and mileage, and having all the C.P.R.'s splendid equipment of engines, cars, repair shops, etc., available,—the combined system, which now totals 40,000 miles, and would be reduced by this to 30,000 and according to some authorities, could ultimately be made to pay. The proposal was not adopted, nor is it, I think, likely to be, mainly because the Canadian people fear it would mean a monopoly and also less efficient management, with the C.P.R. guaranteed its dividend, than if it had to get its dividend by its good work at present, but even the critics concede that Lord Shaughnessy was influenced solely by a desire for Canada's welfare in advancing it. Meanwhile, Canada must continue to pay 60 or 70 million dollars a year until things change or it can sell the system to some other corporation like the C.P.R., a policy which is advocated in many quarters. The particular point for us to remember, in connection with Canada's railway muddle, is that since the war began down to the present time, the Dominion Treasury has borne the loss on the railways every year, first by payments to the Companies to cover their losses, then by taking over the roads and compensating the owners, and now by operating the various lines as a united system and meeting the shortage from the public funds; whereas here the

Reids met all the losses themselves until last year, when the Colony met them and is now being asked to repeat the process this year. Obviously, this cannot continue, and the need for a permanent settlement of this railway problem ought to be manifest to everybody. May I point out, also, that while the present condition of these Canadian railways is regarded by the unthinking as an absolute condemnation of Government ownership, the fact is that two or three, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern, built by private capitalists, became insolvent during the war, and the Government had to take them over and run them to prevent their default; and now is unable to get rid of them. On the other hand the C.P.R., built when labor and materials were cheap, and splendidly managed ever since, is able to pay a 10 per cent. dividend every year.

I now turn to the American railways and the problems they present. I quote from the last word on this subject, an article by Mr. S. O. Dunn, Editor of the Chicago Railway Age, in the London Times special American supplement of July 4th. He says that America had before the war 257,000 miles of railroad, all privately owned. For ten years before that the railroads had been getting into discredit as a result of the struggles of financiers like Vanderbilt, Gould, Harrison Hill, Mellon and others to secure supremacy, and the Federal Congress and many state legislatures passed acts regulating them. As a result of this, further advances in rates were prohibited and as the owners needed to renew their equipment they had to take the money from that put aside for dividends, with the result that the value of railway stock steadily declined there, as in England. This in turn meant that they could get little or no additional capital, and when the war came, although they handled more

traffic than ever before, they were unable, because of inadequate equipment, to handle all that offered, and this and other conditions resulted in the Government taking control of them as a war measure on January 1, 1918. It took them on virtually the same terms as the British railroads were taken, namely, to pay all operating costs, to give the shareholders a standard dividend, and to restore the lines and equipment in as good a condition as when they were taken over. It kept the railroads for two years and two months, returning them to their owners on March, 1920, and in these 26 months it cost the American Government more than two billion dollars to make good the losses on operation, and another billion to assist in restoring the lines to the physical fitness they possessed when taken over by the Government. The American Government, indeed, continued the dividends for six months after the restoration to private ownership, but it left the roads running behind at the rate of approximately a billion dollars a year. Further, the Government's provision of funds for restoring the physical equipment was altogether inadequate, and he asserts that large numbers of locomotives, passenger cars and freight cars were scrapped and that the Government did not employ the cars in use so effectively as when the owners ran them. He adds that "since the big decline of business began last fall most of the railways, to save themselves from ruin, have had to cut their expenditure in the maintenance of permanent way, locomotives and cars as they never cut them before, in spite of the fact that the properties were not in good condition when returned by the Government." He adds that freight cars were less by 126,560, that 316,000, or 13½ per cent. of the total were in bad order, that 12 per cent. of the locomotives were also out of service in

need of repairs, and closes by saying that "never since records were kept did such bad conditions exist."

It will be seen, therefore, that in the United States, as in England, and in Canada, Government operation of the railroads during the war resulted in a tremendous deficit for each country, and that whether the railways are in private or public hands to-day it is a task of the greatest magnitude to operate them so as to reduce the deficit to the lowest figure possible, not to speak of earning a profit. In America, as in England, the legislation restoring the roads to private ownership is designed to enable a Board to give them rates which will suffice to pay a dividend, in England of 5 per cent. and in the United States of 5½ or 6 per cent., but in the first six months under pre-war operation the American lines, under the rates then existing, did not make much more than 2½ per cent., and it is doubtful if with the agitation for a reduction in passage and freight rates now prevailing they will be able to do much better in the future.

The cause of these deficits everywhere is much the same—increases in wages, in fuel and costs of other items of expenditure. For instance, in England, Lord Farringdon, presiding at the annual meeting of the Great Central Railway Company in April past, told his shareholders that the wage bill of the railway had risen from £2,432,000 in 1913 to £7,900,000, an increase of £5,468,000 and that every other item of outlay showed an advance of a startling character. "As a controlled undertaking," said Lord Farringdon, "we have no means of curtailing this expenditure, but it is obvious that if the railways are again to be put upon a commercial basis, drastic reductions will be essential." The Chairman of the Northeastern Railway, at the annual meeting of that company, said that wages had increas-

ed from four million pounds in 1913 to thirteen millions, a rise of 225 per cent. The increase on some Scottish lines was, he said, as high as 310 per cent. Mr. Fane Vernon, presiding at the annual meeting of the Great Northern railway Company of Ireland estimated a wage increase on Irish lines of from about £1,500,000 in 1913 to upwards of £5,300,000 in 1912, a rise of nearly 300 per cent. "I need not say," was his comment, "that when the Irish railways are returned at the expiration of control to their owners, they will be, as a whole, unable to pay these enormous wages. In fact, some of them may not be able to pay even their working expenses.

Take the Canadian railways, in the same way. For the six years the gross cost of operating them increased by \$210,000,000 to \$250,000,000. Wage increases represent a gross additional annual payment of \$125,000,000, or \$140,000, while the cost of supplies represent an additional amount of \$100,000,000, annually. Hon. Dr. Reid, Minister of Railways at Ottawa, in his speech on the railway situation, on March 17, stated that of every dollar earned by the Canadian railways 75 cents is paid out in wages, and 20cts. for coal, leaving only five cents to meet all other items of expenditure, which require 29 cents, and to meet these he had to draw on the Canadian Treasury for seventy million dollars.

Mr. Dunn, too, writing of the American railways, says that while the Government controlled them, they increased the number of employees nearly 110,000 the first year, and 150,000 the second year, so that the lines when taken back had 260,000 more men employed on them than when the Government took them, and that these were being paid wages of nearly a billion and a half dollars more than in 1917, or an increase of 82 per cent. The operating expenses also increased during the two years by 80 per

cent., although the volume of business done was increased by only five per cent.

The story of the present condition of the South African Railways, of which it is only necessary for me to say that they are narrow-gauge, like our own, and like ours also, run through much unpeopled country, is briefly, but adequately told in the current number of "The Round Table," page 709, in these words: "The financial condition of the railway also give cause for anxiety. Under the Act of Union the 11,000 miles of line controlled by the Government are financed separately from other branches of the administration. Railways have to be run on business principles, and not, as in the past history of the South African colonies, as sources of revenue to the State and prolific source of quarrel between States. The past year's working has resulted in a deficit of £591,000, making a total accumulated deficit for the period 1916-21 of £2,138,000. Passenger fares and goods (freight) rates have been raised to the limit of payability, and yet the railways are not paying the full interest on capital expenditure already incurred. The coal-owners of Natal and Transvaal allege that their export trade has been strangled by the high railway rates, and that shipping has been driven off the Cape route in consequence. Since the coal strike has come to a head in Great Britain, however, rates for export and bunker coal have been reduced drastically in the hope that the revival of export trade will make up any loss due to the reduction."

For part of the data respecting the Australian railways I refer to an article in the Montreal Star of March 5, by Mr. Payne, the Canadian railway statistician, already quoted. He says that "the financial condition of the Australian railways was very bad, they confronting increasing deficits

and reduced traffic. To pay interest on a capital cost per mile of line almost identical with our own (Canadian), the Australian railways have to charge tolls more than twice as high as ours, and they do not earn nearly enough to pay the bill." To supplement this the London Times of April 2, has an article describing the work of a commission of experts then sitting at Melbourne working out a scheme for the uniting of the various railway gauges of the country, for there are three of these. Victoria and South Australia have 5,216 miles of wide gauge—that is 5 feet 3 inches. New South Wales and the Commonwealth Railways have 6,062 miles of standard gauge—or 4 feet 8½ inches. Queensland, South Australia, West Australia, and the Commonwealth Railways through these provinces have 120 miles of narrow gauge—3 feet 6 in. Therefore, it is not surprising to find a recent eminent English traveller, Capt. D. W. Pearce, F. R.S.S., saying that "the Australian railways present a worse plague to Australia than the drouth."

This review deals with the railways of the whole English-speaking world, and it shows that everywhere the railways are approaching if not viewing bankruptcy. Dealing specially with Canada and United States of America, where the conditions more closely approach our own, than anywhere else, I find from Mr. Payne's figures that Canada has a mile of railway to every 195 people, and America one to every 404, while if we figure Newfoundland's population at 270,000, with a mileage of 900, this country has a mile of railway to every 300 people. That is to say, we have a greater proportionate mileage of railway than the United States; and if we take European countries, France with only a mile to every 1347 persons, Britain with but one to every 1943 persons, and Germany with one to every 2098, the dis-

parity becomes more and more pronounced. Let us look at a few more comparisons. Canada gets back 77 cents in revenue for every dollar she expends on her Government railways; we get back only 50 cents. Canada's railway deficit represents a tax of \$9 a head on her people; our deficit, for a much poorer country, represents a tax of \$6 a head.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH.—Mr. President, when I closed Friday afternoon I had completed my review of the condition of what I may call the foreign railways, and it showed them to be generally in such a decrepit condition that some amongst us thought our railroad very satisfactory by comparison. I am sorry, however, to have to dispel this view because, as I see it, our position is certainly worse than that of any other country in regard to its railways, for the reason that whereas most of the railways in the other countries I referred to paid their way, and some earned dividends before the war, ours from the very outset was operated at a loss, and never paid its way. By all the logic of facts we should never have built a railway, if we expected it to pay as a commercial proposition, but I maintain that we could not be till this day without railways, depending, for instance, on connection with Conception Bay by the old coach to Portugal Cove and a steamer to Harbor Grace, and that we were as much entitled to have a railway as to have other public utility, provided we kept within bounds. Possibly we overbuilt in late years, but if so, we sinned in good company. Editor Dunn, of the "Chicago Railway Age," whom I have already quoted, says that America built, between 1901 and 1911, no less than 52,000 miles of railroad, a larger mileage than the whole existing railroad system of any other country in the world at the time. Mr. Payne, of Ottawa, whom I also quoted, says that

Canada within the same period built 12,000 miles of railroad and we, between 1909 and 1917, built 291 miles; the Bonavista branch 89; the Heart's Content branch 43; the Bay de Verde branch 104. But these were no burdens, as I shall presently show. My second point is that with the existing condition of depression throughout the world, with the poor times ahead of this country, the loss of traffic by the railroad system, the competition of steamers, which will probably be keener than ever, the burden of carrying the railroad must be almost unbearable. Messrs. Coaker and Hall, in their report, estimate only half the traffic for this year of last year, and the Customs Returns of imports show that these will be shorter than in probably any year since the Bank Crash. My third point is that large sums will be necessary to rehabilitate the railroad, and that neither the Reids nor the Government is able to get the money to provide these betterments. The Reids are confessedly bankrupt as to the railways, and the Colony is not much better off. In a report by Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, to Mr. Halfyard, Colonial Secretary in the Lloyd Cabinet, in April, 1919, quoted by the Premier in the Lower House in discussing this Bill, and which was tabled here Friday in response to my request, Mr. Hall made an estimate of betterments he considered necessary, running into millions, the cost to be distributed between the Government and the contractor, but owing to hard times, neither has been able nor is likely to be able to get the necessary funds for many years to come.

My fourth point is that the idea of shutting down the Branch railways to effect a saving is a delusion. I know our good friend opposite (Hon. Dr. Campbell) thinks the branch railways are the cause of the whole trouble,

but I can undertake to prove that the cause of the collapse must be looked for somewhere else than in what he called the Morris Branch Railways, about which he said here Friday that the Government was at its wits end to get the money to pay the interest on them and to meet their other obligations. I would remind him that these railways are no more Morris railways than Squires railways, because the present Premier was a member of the Morris party and voted for them, and equally they are no more Morris railways than Gibbs railways, because our hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Gibbs) was a member of the Morris Cabinet which negotiated them. But I will add this that neither Gibbs nor Squires need be ashamed of having voted for them, or need feel that by doing so they imposed any burden on the country whatever. Another document tabled here Friday in response to my request was a statement made by Contractor Reid to Colonial Secretary Halfyard in April, 1919, making certain propositions with regard to the railroad in which he gave the following table showing the expenses of operating the road, the earnings therefrom, and the loss on operation for every year from 1903 up to 1913, and for the last three years I take the figures from a statement tabled by the Premier last week. This table shows, if it shows anything, that the branch railways were not the cause of the collapse. The loss on operating the railroad system in 1917, with all the branches going, was only \$141,000, while the loss in 1907, ten years previously, with none of these branches built, was \$154,000. Nor was this an exceptional condition as the figures show. Here is the statement:

Year ending	Expenses	Earnings	Loss
June 30 1903 ..	\$322,211	\$729,928	\$92,283

1904 ..	522,600	430,970	91,630
1905 ..	523,962	414,476	109,485
1906 ..	556,591	444,774	111,817
1907 ..	602,303	448,147	154,534
1908 ..	620,303	468,180	152,123
1909 ..	601,314	530,666	70,648
1910 ..	608,845	589,683	19,762
1911 ..	648,103	614,273	33,830
1912 ..	755,514	622,076	133,438
1913 ..	861,620	725,520	136,100
1914 ..	972,773	766,582	206,191
1915 ..	878,628	677,966	200,662
1916 ..	977,786	810,671	167,115
1917 ..	1,231,976	1,091,887	141,089
1918 ..	1,584,668	1,238,229	346,440
1919 ..	2,153,000	1,465,000	688,000
1920 ..	2,767,000	1,432,000	1,335,000
1921 ..	3,148,000	1,498,000	1,650,000

It shows that during the whole fourteen years 1903 to 1917 the deficit never much exceeded \$150,000, except in 1913-14 and in 1914-15, in both of which years it went to \$200,000, but the explanation is simple. The first year the Reid Company was operating a daily express service and running 2 boats across Cabot Strait. My hon. friend says this was an election kite but he can hardly be serious. Does he suggest that the Reids went to Scotland twelve months before that and built the Lintrose, a sister ship of the Bruce, at a cost of \$200,000 as an election kite? I say this very question proves that the hon. gentleman has got a wrong idea of this problem entirely. The Reids started the daily train and built the Lintrose to ply with the Bruce as part of their deliberate policy of development in this country, and but for the war I believe these trains and steamers would be running yet. The explanation of the loss of \$200,000 in 1914-15 is that it was the first year of the war, when the bottom dropped out of everything, but in 1916-17, when trade became brisk again, the deficits were reduced and in the latter year, as I say, the loss was down to \$140,000.

The real cause of the collapse of the railway is what has happened in the past four years, the enormous increase in the losses during that period, for which no explanation, certainly no explanation satisfactory to me, has yet been given. If the foregoing figures prove anything they prove that the branch railways are not the cause of the collapse. In my opinion the least profitable section of the entire railroad system is that from Millertown Junction across the Topsails, where no man lives and where nothing is produced.

It is now rather the fashion to decry our railways and say that the whole system ought to be abandoned, but it should be remembered that every public man and every political party in the country was identified with railways. Indeed, as long ago as 1875 a joint committee of the Legislature recommended the building of a railroad through the interior to Hall's Bay to develop our copper areas, and some of the leading merchants of our country were members of the committee and signed the recommendation. Every public man for the past forty years, Whiteway with the original railways, Thorburn with the Placentia branch, Winter with the 1898 contract, Bond with the 1901 contract, and Morris with the branches in 1909, subscribed to the policy of railways, and as our hon. friend, (Mr. Shea) says, any man in this country who opposed railways any time the past quarter-century would have been looked upon as a public enemy. While I am on this feature of the question I would say that the estimate of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Shea), that the railroad cost thirty million dollars is somewhat excessive. Our total debt is fifty-one million dollars, including the six millions which the Premier raised recently. We know absolutely that our war

obligations amount to about sixteen millions and if thirty millions are added for the railroad it would mean forty-six millions, leaving only five million dollars to represent all the other public properties and outlays in this country, public buildings, roads, bridges, marine works, lighthouses, thousands of miles of telegraph line, etc. I think he will agree that his figure is excessive and that twenty-five million dollars would more likely represent it. This, however, is bad enough; at any rate in these times when it is so difficult to get money for any purpose and the burden of interest which it involves, say a million and a quarter dollars, estimating the interest all round at five per cent., is a formidable obstacle to the country's progress just now. But we must remember that only a few years ago we could face it cheerfully, and the day may not be far away when we can face it cheerfully again. The outlay which is disturbing me is the expenditure of another million and a half dollars a year to operate the railway, an utterly impossible expenditure in my opinion. I say that deliberately, and would point out that for us to find a million and a half dollars a year to put into the operation of the railroad means, in other words, the providing of a surplus in revenue to that amount every year. The biggest surplus we ever had in Newfoundland before the war was in 1911-12, of \$211,000, to which good times and the building of the branch railways contributed not a little. Today we are facing a deficit in revenue. The Premier's estimate in his Budget Speech was that he could about make two ends meet, but he figured for an increase of revenue which he can now have no hope whatever of realizing. He estimated to get forty per cent. more revenue through the Custom House by new taxes than he got last year. The fact is that so far he is

thousands of dollars below last year's figures, not to speak of getting anything extra, and a continuance of this condition of affairs for a very few months spells, to my mind, absolute bankruptcy. I know it will be said that the Government has the money in hand and earmarked from the last loan to meet this call for operating the railroad, but I believe that the Government will soon have to break into that money to get the necessary funds to carry on the public service.

Therefore, I cannot support this Bill. I believe, in the first place, that for the reasons I have just stated, it means bringing bankruptcy for the Colony appreciably nearer. I oppose it in the second place because it is absolutely unbusinesslike, because no business man would be a party to a scheme of this kind by which he would find the money and somebody else expend it without his control or supervision. I think last year's arrangement was better than this, because it provided for somebody on the Railroad Commission to represent the Government. There was the Government Engineer, with a good practical experience, who could at any rate report what was being done. Now we have nobody. We give the Reids a blank cheque for a million and a half dollars and we say "Go ahead and spend this money on the railroad!" We ask no questions and impose no limitations as to how it is to be spent, provided, of course, it is spent legitimately. I oppose it in the next place because we have no information regarding the railway, no explanation of the cause of the enormous increase in operating costs of the railway the past few years. I have in my hand a statement of railway statistics tabled by the Premier in the other House a few days ago, which I have analysed to some extent. Perhaps the House will bear with me while I quote some of the

figures it exhibits. Between 1904 and 1921 the earnings of the road increased three and a half times, from \$430,000 to \$1,493,000. In the same period the expenses increased six times, from \$522,000 to \$3,143,000. The cost of conducting transportation has grown more than seven times, from \$224,000 to \$1,652,000, while maintenance of way and structures has cost six times as much, from \$121,000 to \$757,000. Maintaining rolling stock has increased nine times, from \$62,000 to \$558,000, but general expenses—whatever they mean—have grown hardly one and a half times, from \$99,000 to \$140,000, save for a jump to \$347,000 in 1919-20, the last year under Reid management, an expenditure so abnormal that I should like to have it explained. The cost of agents and station service is swollen eight and a half times, from \$40,000 to \$342,000, but that of station supplies has grown only one and a half times, from \$40,000 to \$26,000. This, I may say, is the only item in the list that I can understand. When we remember that in 1904 the Morris branch lines had not been started, and allow for the stations on 290 miles of branches and the higher cost of supplies, this figure seems about right, but all the others are to me unexplainable. For instance, the cost of train service—I do not know what it means—jumped fourteen and a half times, from \$8,000 to \$115,000. The pay of engineers and firemen advanced nearly six times, from \$31,000 to \$176,000, then fuel for locomotives rose nearly ten times, from \$80,000 to \$758,000, while the cost per ton shows only a fourfold increase, from \$3.85 to \$14.00. The whole pay roll advanced seven and a half times, from \$241,000 to \$1,769,000. But no figures exist, or at any rate have been made public, as to the increase in the number of employees. Last year the pay roll under Government operation

increased to \$1,625,000, from \$1,315,000 the previous year under Reid operation, an advance of roughly 25 per cent. The most appalling figures are that in 1920 the total earnings were but \$1,432,000 and the pay roll was \$1,324,000. In other words, out of every dollar the railroad earned 99 cents had to be taken for the pay roll, and to pay the other expenses, amounting to \$1,335,000, the Reids had to break into their private funds and obtain the money from there. Even worse, though, is the position for last year. The total earnings amounted to only \$1,498,000 or, in round figures, one and a half million dollars, while the pay roll amounted to \$1,769,000, an increase of nearly \$300,000. That means that the whole earnings of the railroad last year only sufficed to pay eighty cents to the dollar of the wages of the men employed and that for the remaining twenty cents, and also for the whole of the rest of the expenses of operation, the necessary amount, nearly a million and a half, had to be obtained from the public treasury.

Again, maintenance of ways and structures increased from \$545,900 to \$767,000, an advance of \$212,000, or over 40 per cent. Maintenance of rolling stock increased by \$68,000, or from \$490,000 to \$558,000, roughly fourteen per cent. The cost of agents and station service increased from \$285,000 to \$342,000, or by \$57,000, an increase of 12 per cent. The cost of train service more than doubled—from \$53,000 to \$115,000. The fuel for locomotives advanced from \$590,000 to \$158,000, an increase of \$168,000 or over twenty-five per cent., while the cost of coal per ton went up only fifty cents. Last, but by no means the least, and an illustration of the way things were developing, oil, waste, etc., which cost \$11,000 in 1919-20 under Reid management, cost just \$22,000, or

twice as much a year later under Government management.

Then, in a statement submitted by Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, to Colonial Secretary Halfyard in April, 1919, in which he discussed the necessary betterments for the road and how they were to be provided, a matter of some million dollars, the cost of which he distributed between the Government and the contractor, he urged that ten locomotives, fifty flat cars, and 110 box cars be procured. Last year the Government ordered six locomotives. Mr. Hall in his memorandum estimated the locomotives would cost \$27,000 apiece, but the ones the Government got last year cost about \$50,000 apiece, or twice as much. Then, as to flat cars, all of these were built but none of the box cars were built. Seeing that his recommendation was for only 50 flat cars and 110 box cars, the logical conclusion would be that the box cars were twice as necessary as the flat cars, but the flat cars to carry lumber and such like were provided while the box cars which would carry provisions, groceries, dry goods, etc., were disregarded altogether. I would like to have the explanation, and I think the country ought to know why all these expenses have been incurred, why there has been such an increase and what is the explanation of the tremendous advance of the cost of operating the road the past four years.

In my opinion the first necessity now is to have a thorough investigation and a full report on all this. Some of the questions that ought to be answered by such an inquiry is as follows: Is the work under the branch line construction completed and if not, what is the value of what remains undone? Did the Railway Commission operate the Reid steamers last year, and if not, why did they put boilers, shafts, and other improvements into

some of the boats? If the steamers were not included, why is operation expected to be so costly this year with part of the line shut down? Why did Messrs. Coaker and Hall in their report say they spent liberally on ties, ballast, locomotives, and on steamers last year, and yet with none of this to be done and a curtailed operation, why do we need to put up a million and a half dollars this year? Why does the Government not have Mr. Hall or somebody else on the Commission to see that the money is properly expended?

What items are included in these increased costs which the Colony might fairly challenge if a statement of the issues between it and the Reids had to go before an arbitral or judicial tribunal. Are the expenditures for which we are to repay Reid at the end of fifty years included in the estimate of losses on the railway? What is meant by "losses on operation?" Who is to decide what is legitimately operating and what is capital outlay? I do not mean by this inquiry to suggest that our money will be made away with, but I say that any legitimate work on the railway can be charged to operation and great improvements made in the road which the Reids may expect to get back into their hands under new conditions in a year or two.

Then, I contend there ought to be a new deal, a new contract with the Reid Company. The present 1901 contract ought to be terminated. A formal default ought to be enforced and an entirely new arrangement ought to be made. No man really desirous of the country's future welfare should want to cripple the Reids. They have large commercial and industrial interests here. They have big enterprises in St. John's. They have great quantities of land throughout the country, they may develop great labor-giving enter-

prises in the future. Therefore we ought not to lightly overthrow them, but we ought to insist that the country gets a square deal. Twenty years ago we made this contract with the Reids to operate the railroad for fifty years. World conditions, for which they are in no way responsible, have made it impossible for them to carry out that contract. The country ought not to be so unreasonable as to expect them to do so, but on the other hand it should not be held to the obligations which under the contract it accepted on its part. For the operation of the road for fifty years we paid the Reids in land. They have operated for only twenty years and they say they are insolvent, they cannot do it any longer on the present terms. Therefore, in equity they are entitled to only two-fifths of the land, but they have taken all the land, transferred it to another Company, and now we cannot get it back. They say they are justified in this because they have lost millions in the operation of the railroad, and I say that I do not blame them for protecting themselves in view of the attitude of certain members of the Government towards them. But they have sold some of these lands to the Harmsworths, to the Timber Estates, and to other people, and they have projects pending in regard to other areas, and at any time, but a fortunate strike in forest areas, water powers, mines, or otherwise they can recoup themselves for all they have lost in the operation of the railway, but the Colony can never get back the million and a half it spent last year, the million and a half more it is being asked to spend now, and any money it may spend in future in helping the Reids to bear the burden of operation in the meantime.

Therefore, I say we ought to have a new deal. We are trustees, we in both Houses of the Legislature, are trustees for the country. We ought to

hesitate before we spend a dollar without knowing the why and wherefore, but yet we are asked to vote now a million and a half dollars without any information whatever to justify it, except the Governments' explanation that this contract is the best they could make, and that if the Reids aren't given this money they will shut down the railway altogether. Let us insist, and let the Government insist, that the 1901 contract be cancelled, with all its nightmare of litigation, financial burdens, claims for arbitration, and the like, which will hang over us otherwise for the next fifty years and increase all the time, and let us have a new contract suitable to present day conditions. Another reason why I am opposing this Bill is because the action I am now advocating, the making of a new contract, ought to have been done long ago. The Government was elected to deal with the Reids on certain lines. I will not discuss manifestoes or party speeches, but I will say that a year ago this question was acute. The House, however, was not asked to deal with it, but was only asked to vote for a loan to help provide the Reids with rolling stock, and not a word was said about operation. But then, after the House closed, the Government, without any authority from the country or the legislature, made an arrangement to finance the Reids and give them a million and a half dollars to pay their bills for working the railroad during the past twelve months.

Then this session opened and went through a normal term, and I believe would have closed without tackling this problem, even in its present fashion, only that the Opposition insisted on some action being taken. Notice of suspension of rules was given in the other House about two months ago, the idea being to close it by June 21st. If that policy

had been carried out this arrangement would not have been made with the Legislature in session, but privately by the Government afterwards. This, to my mind, was not giving the country a square deal. Three or four Premiers in the past have dealt with large questions right after their election without any delay. For instance, Whiteway in 1893 put through the contract, after his election, to continue the railroad across the country and operate it for ten years. Winter and Morine in 1898, with our honorable friend, Mr. Shea, a member of the Executive, elected in November, negotiated and enacted the contract of that year in the following February. Bond in 1901, with a mandate from the country to destroy that contract, negotiated two new ones, the first not being acceptable to a large element in the country, and another becoming necessary. In 1905 Bond again, after coming from an election, put through the big Harmsworth deal now bearing shape in the mills at Grand Falls. Morris in 1909, with a mandate from the country, put through the Branch Railway contract and in 1914, after his second election, did the same with the Carbide enterprise for Bay of Islands, though as a result of the war and for other reasons it has not come to anything yet. The present Government, however, evaded this issue at the last session and now offer us only a temporary expedient instead of a permanent settlement.

A year ago in an informal conference with us of this House, had with Premier in the room outside, for the introduction of last year's railway legislation, so that we might get the whole subject explained to us briefly and then put the bill through all its stages without formal discussion in here, we were informed that a Canadian Engineer would be brought in to superintend repair work, and other

undertakings connected with the railway and that an English lawyer skilled in company law would be brought here to unravel all our past railway contracts and their relation to each other. Neither of these things has been done and no real attempt has been made, so far as we know at any rate, by the Government to deal with this question, until the Government was forced into action by a refusal of the Opposition to allow the House to be closed without something being done. We are told now that offers were made to the Opposition to join with the Government in dealing with the problem, but that the Opposition refused. I do not know the reasons which actuated the Opposition for so doing, but I repeat what I have already said, that I can readily believe that the Opposition did not want to involve themselves in this complication which the Government had created and which they ought to get out of. Then Sir George Bury was brought here, but I do not take his report seriously, for he simply adopted Mr. Hall's report two or three weeks previously, and the money we paid Sir George Bury is money thrown away. I do not mean to question his capabilities as a railroad man, but I say he came here in the middle of the summer, stayed only two or three days, when he saw the railroad and everything connected with it at its best, whereas, in my opinion, the time to get a man here to study the railroad problem would be in the winter, when the present difficulties would have to be faced. Another thing is that we did not need a man to come here and tell us to make a temporary agreement with the Reids to carry on the road for another twelve months. What we wanted was a man to give us some permanent solution of the problem, something that we could deal with

and say "well, the railroad problem will not worry us any more for years."

Our Hon. friend (Dr. Campbell) says the Governments' interests will be looked after by the new General Manager. This I submit is altogether a mistaken idea. The new General Manager will be engaged by the Reids, will be paid by the Reids, (out of our money I admit) and will be discharged by the Reids if he does not obey their orders. He will not be responsible to the Government or to the Colony. If the Government was bringing in a man like Sir George Bury, or some other Canadian railroader and putting him in charge for four or five years and backing him with money to see what he could do, it would be a different matter, because he would have a free hand. But this General Manager coming here subject to the Reid directorate, will not be half as good as John Powell, and the money paid him will be simply wasted. I have no rhetorical flourish to end with! I simply repeat that I cannot vote for this bill, because to me, it means the last push needed to send the country speeding down the declivity that leads to bankruptcy and all the evils that will follow in its trail, and I regret that the Government has not been able to offer the Legislature and the country some more satisfactory solution of the question than this bill embodies.

MONDAY, August 1.

The House met at 4 o'clock.

"An Act for the Ratification of the Contract with the Pulp and Paper Corporation of America," and "An Act respecting Fishery Supplies for the current season" passed the third reading.

The Committee on the Neglected, Dependent, and Delinquent Children Bill rose and reported the bill with some amendment and by consent of

the House the said bill was then read a third time, passed and ordered sent to the Assembly requesting concurrence in said amendment.

Second reading of the Railway Bill.

HON. F. McNAMARA.—Mr. President I am quite aware of the fact that on account of this railway bill being a money measure that this House has no power over it, and it therefore follows that anything we may say here regarding it will be of little effect. However, I cannot let this opportunity pass without registering my protest against this Act which calls for the allocation of the large amount of one and a half million dollars for the carrying out of the Government's ideas on our railway problem. It is admitted that there was a loss of \$1,625,000 on the railroad operated last year by the Government Commission, and this loss as well as the recommendation of Sir George Bury is given as the principal reason for asking for the large sum of money (one and a half million dollars for the carrying out of the Government's ideas on our railway problem. It is admitted that there was a loss of \$1,625,000 on the railroad operated last year by the Government Commission, and this loss as well as the recommendation of Sir George Bury is given as the principal reason for asking for the large sum of money (one and a half million dollars) from the public treasury today. The hon. leader of the Government stated in his address yesterday that there were three propositions to be considered in connection with our railway problem. He admitted that the Reid Nfld. Co. had met the end of their resources and were unable and unwilling to continue operations without assistance. The Government would have to continue as last year or the railway would be closed down. Two of these propositions of course

were impossible namely closing down or operating by Government control. There was apparently only one other thing to do and that was to make some arrangements with the Reid Nfld. Co. to carry on our railroad service. The hon. leader of the Government also stated that all the Opposition did in connection with this measure was to criticise it and find fault with it in all its moods and tempers, and regretted that after being invited by the Government to confer on the matter that they refused to have any meeting on this problem. I submit that the Opposition were perfectly justified in not giving their ideas to the Government, and were further justified in advocating an appeal to the people on the matter before subjecting every family in the country to a tax of \$30.00 per annum on account of this railway trouble.

I consider it a most abject display of weakness on the part of the Government to admit that they would invite or even consider the ideas of the Opposition on this railway bill, and further claim that even if the Opposition consented to confer with the Government on this matter, and if everything did not go satisfactorily they would be blamed for any trouble that might ensue, as they were blamed in the case of the fishery regulations for not opposing that measure. It will be admitted that the most important part of this bill is the money part of it. We are asked here to acquiesce in the voting of one and a half million dollars for the estimated loss on the railway operations for the next twelve months. I do not think that it is fair, right or just to ask for this large amount of one and a half million dollars for this year's estimated loss as last year's railway operations, and this year's operations will not be parallel cases. To begin with

the sum of \$153,000 was spent last year on fighting. All or nearly all of this amount should be saved this year according to the new schedule with the winter cross-country service abandoned. Then again the railway service is practically cut in two—wages have been reduced—the staff of men employed is being lessened from day to day by the Reid Nfld. Co.; then add to all these the fact that the cost of coal is much lower in price than last year, I therefore cannot see why this large amount of \$1,500,000 was named as the probable loss on this year's railway problem. The Government by agreeing to pay losses up to one and a half million dollars on railway operations have practically handed the Reid Nfld. Co. a cheque for this amount, and have said 'here take this money, go on with the railway, slash away with this allowance as long as it will last, but be very careful with your own funds because if you spend anything in excess of this allocation it will have to be paid back to the Treasury later on by your corporation.'

I submit that this is a very unbusinesslike bargain and as there is no incentive to economy the chances are that no economy will be practised and the country will very likely be called upon to stand for the full amount of one and a half million dollars at the expiration of this contract, this time next year. Section 4 of this Act reads as follows: "The Government shall pay the actual loss of operating the railway during the term of this agreement provided that should the loss exceed the sum of one and a half million dollars such excess shall be borne by the company. The payments by the Government shall be made in such manner as may be agreed upon between the parties hereto." I claim that the second sentence in this Section is too loosely

worded and not at all fair to the interests of the dominion. The payments instead of being made 'in such manner as may be agreed between the parties hereto,' should be made monthly, and at the end of every month the R. N. Co. should be made furnish a detailed statement of every dollar spent during the month. They should also submit a statement of the number of men employed, and all other particulars of operation so that we may have a strict and accurate account of the cost and maintenance of our railway service. This is only what any business concern would ask under similar circumstances and the Government in the public interest should demand these particulars, otherwise there will be no (Fhish of McNamara comes in here.) means of keeping track of this large expenditure. In connection with this matter I may add that I intend suggesting an amendment to this clause as soon as the House goes into committee on this measure. Section 8 reads: "No salary or fee shall be paid to any director of the company for services in connection with the operation of the R. R. except with the approval of the Government in Council." Of course it is hard to expect any men with common sense to take this section seriously. Does the Government think that the directors of the railway are going to put in their time and services without any remuneration—why the thing is simply ridiculous.

Instead of making this issue cloudy and misleading, the Government should be manly and come right out and state exactly what they are going to pay the directors of this company for their services, and not, later on, do it in the very convenient way of "by Minute of Council." When the Railway Deal of 1898 was made law 23 years ago, the total revenue

of this country then was very much under two million dollars, and here we are to-day practically voting away the full amount of the revenue of that date to maintain this service. If it were stated at the time this 1898 Railroad Deal was going through that in twenty years it will take all 1898's revenue to run the railway later on, you can imagine the hue and cry that would be raised throughout the island. Still we are voting this amount to-day with complacency, and there is hardly a word said about it by the tax payers, who have to ultimately find this money. If the Government are really sincere in this railway business, and if they have any regard for the funds of the Dominion they should practice economy, and cut this service to the bone. To begin with I would discontinue the Bay de Verde, Bonavista and Trepassey branches altogether—we have Coastal steamers both North and West which can serve these points very satisfactorily. In addition to this there are lots of schooners and freighters that can be employed and which public enterprise will find if circumstances should warrant it. Placentia and Argentinia would be served sufficiently I submit with a tri-weekly instead of a daily service. Hon. Dr. Campbell stated yesterday that the Branch Railways cost us 11 million dollars and that they were "bringing us down." This is the best argument I can adduce coming from a member of the Executive in favour of reducing the service as much as possible and I hope he will show his consistency by supporting my ideas for further curtailment of our R. R. facilities under our present circumstances. I view this R. R. problem very seriously and look upon it as a most portentous measure and shall record my vote against its enactment.

HON. MR. TEMPLERMAN.—I think it is a very stupid thing to shut down

the branch railways. As Sir Patrick McGrath has demonstrated that these branches have not been the cause of all the trouble, but have been a source of revenue to the main line. If the Reids had attended to their business, it would not have been so bad as it is to-day. What is the Government going to do with Bonavista in February and March if they close down that branch? It is the most badly managed of all the lines, and the Reids have enough men on it to run three branch lines, but they don't do it right. When it was blocked last winter they sent a few men along in a caboose to shovel the line to Bonavista and when they had it shovelled, it was filled up again, when if they had put out men at Clarendville, Trinity, Princeton, Port Rexton and Catalina, it could have been all done in one day. Why should the Reids get a million and a half dollars to carry on their business when I have to run mine without any such support? Why should they be protected any more than the merchant who is supplying? If they cannot run it without going bankrupt, then let them go bankrupt. We should never have had a railway at all. We could never afford it, but now we have it, do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg by cutting out the branches. Last year we had a Government Commission running it and they showed up very badly. I do not agree with Hon. Mr. McNamara as regards cutting out the branches; at least as far as the Bonavista branch is concerned. You cannot get steamers to Bonavista in the winter. The Government who built it must have seen some good in it or they would not have built it. It runs through better country than the road to Port aux Basques, which is no good at all except to bring down travellers who sell us shoddy goods and go around the country filling up every store with rotten

merchandise. We could have lived another 50 years without the railway, but now we have it I do not see why the Reids cannot be kept up to their contract. If I understand it rightly all the Reid's paying industries have been transferred to somebody else. Was the Government asleep when all that was going on? They must all have been dunderheads. I am very sorry we are up against such trouble, but now that we are, do not allow people to hoodwink us. However, it is not much use talking about it as we cannot change this bill as it is a money bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Before the bill is read a second time I would like to make a few observations in relation to some of the criticisms against it. The last two gentlemen who have spoken and their remarks show how divergent their views are. One hon. gentleman says the branch lines should be shut down and another says they should be operated. As really they are feeders for the main line, with some of the criticisms indulged in I thoroughly agree and with some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who spoke at length I agree also and that is that we should endeavour to make an entirely new contract in connection with the operation and maintenance of the railway in this country. I believe that is the only and true solution of the difficulty. But we are faced with the fact that the contractor is unable to operate the railway without assistance from the Government. There is no gainsaying that fact and as the railway is a public utility and must be maintained for the public use, no Government could entertain the idea of allowing it to close down. Unfortunately for us here that development which the contractor anticipated did not take place in this country.

The debate was here adjourned until

to-morrow, Tuesday, August 2nd at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, August 2.

The House met at 4, pursuant to adjournment.

Second reading of Railway Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—When speaking to this motion yesterday, Mr. President, I referred to the fact that the excellent speech of my friend, Sir Patrick McGrath did not offer any better solution to the railway question than the Bill before us. It is the same with the Opposition. They have no alternative proposal which would more efficiently help this Colony in connection with this railway policy. The hon. gentleman expressed the opinion that the bill means bankruptcy, that it is simply slashing away money and that there is nothing to control the operations of those who may conduct the railway, but if the hon. gentleman will look at the bill he will find that the Company not may but shall during the time of the agreement operate the road at the minimum cost consistent with giving a reasonable service. Otherwise it is a breach of this agreement and parties committing a breach are liable to damages. The Government takes power in the Bill to appoint one or more auditors who shall have access to the books and records of the railway and the right to take copies &c. of accounts in connection with the operation of the road and determine whether it is being run economically and efficiently. Of course I do not presume to say this is the best measure that can be put forward, but it is the only one that has been brought forward. It has been criticised by the Opposition in the Lower House but they offer no alternative proposal. The only thing they want is an appeal to the electorate. Well we all know how absurd that is. It has been

known I think for some time past, not specifically, that the Company has been in difficulty, and we all regret that they are, because when they undertook the operation of the road they made a sincere, determined and I believe honest effort to operate it efficiently and well, and because the development they hoped for has not taken place the road has not paid as they expected it would, and this is regrettable because the success of this country is bound up in the railway and the operations of the Reid Nfld. Co. I had proposed to go into some of the figures in regard to the English railways as quoted by the hon. gentleman, but time is passing and I refrain from doing so, except to point out to the hon. gentleman one feature which he evidently did not take into consideration, namely, that the Government gave a guarantee to the shareholders; and they gave another as well, which was that the railways should perform such Government work as was required for transport of soldiers, stores, munitions, &c., free of charge, and if they had made a charge the deficit referred to would have been wiped out.

I submit that so far as my judgment goes, there is no other alternative left for this country but to assist the Reid Nfld. Co. in a temporary manner such as this bill proposes in order that the railway may be operated in the interests of the trade of this country. We cannot afford to let it stay idle and leave 2,500 people who are employed there idle. There are thousands of others dependent on the railway for their existence and the Government would be compelled to provide for the maintenance of some 15,000 or 20,000 people. The wage bill last year was about \$1,700,000 and nearly half of that comes back to the exchequer in taxation upon the goods consumed by them, and the Colony

meets less than half of the proposed expenditure.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—This is a very momentous bill, probably the first of its kind to be submitted to this House. I listened with great pleasure to his exhaustive review of the railway situation of practically the whole world, and he proved conclusively to my mind at any rate, and I think to his own, that the railway is a national utility, and that if private companies cannot support them through stress or depression, then it is up to the nation to give them such assistance as is required to carry on that national utility. He referred to the branch lines promised by Sir Edward Morris in 1903, and since built. At that time I made a prophecy that where these branch railways were going to land this country, they have led us. The wonderful prophecy has come to pass, and for a great deal of what we are paying to-day the branch railways are to blame. However this country must have a railway, and we must not allow it to close down. This is not the time for politics and one side fighting with the other. This is the time for the best of harmony and co-operation until such time as we get the country back to prosperity, we shall need the railway to bring our goods to the other centres of industry. Even supposing we have to make a present of \$1,500,000 to carry on this great national utility for one year, it only means at 6%, \$90,000 or 35c. per head of the population. It is good policy for the Government to make provision to run the railway at least for one year at the cost laid down, but as I said before this is not the time to pare and cut upon a great national question such as the railway. As has been pointed out, no alternative has been offered up to the present. I hope the Government between now and next season will seriously consider

this problem because no greater one is facing the country at the present time than that of the railway.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I do not want to be put in the position of taking an extreme view, or posing as a champion of the Reids or anybody else. With reference to the statement that the Reids are "incapable, incompetent and useless," a lot of people believed that and still believe it but after all the fact remains although the Reids suffer from all these things the fact remains that up to four years ago, the operation of the railway was no worse than that of any other railway in the world except the C.P.R. I was over the finest railway in Canada eleven years ago, the Grand Trunk Pacific, that cost \$163,000 a mile for the prairie section and there were other sections that cost more. Two of the best railroaders, McKenzie & Mann who built the Canadian National, went broke and the Canadian Government had to take over the railway as a legacy and meet the losses. The Grand Trunk, the G. T. Pacific and the National Trans Continental from Montreal to Winnipeg has gone bankrupt and it is only fair to assume that proper men were chosen to build and run these railways.

The next thing is "the Reids will have a barrel of detectives, lawyers, &c." If he and his friends in the Government know the Reids are going to do this, why are they giving him this money?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—I made that remark to point out their temperamental attitude.

HON. SIR P. McGRATH.—This money is given to operate the railway and we put an auditor there to prevent them misusing the money. They cannot employ lawyers and detectives with this money. My hon. friend next talked about eleven millions.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Did you

not propose to give it to them in the National Government?

HON. SIR P. McGRATH.—Which National Government do you refer to? Squires was in the National Government.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Was it not the succeeding Government to the National Government?

HON. SIR P. McGRATH.—The first I heard of the \$11,000,000 was quite recently. But after all if the Reids wanted \$11,000,000 to operate the railway was it any worse than for Mr. Blacksted from some place in Norway to come here last spring with a proposition for us to guarantee the principal and interest of \$25,000,000? That is a proposition no Government ought to entertain for railways or any other scheme. We have done too much guaranteeing. I am willing like everybody else to give a guarantee of interest to some little struggling local interest to set it on its feet, but any outside proposition we should put aside without any question whatever. I saw a prospectus with reference to \$11,000,000, I heard discussion about it; I understand the Government had it before them. I do not know what attitude they took about it. I know what attitude I would take about it; the same as regards the Blacksted proposition. To guarantee principal and interest is a confession of unbelief in the proposition at the outset.

However in regard to the railway, to my mind the fatal mistake was in allowing the last twelve months to pass without anything being done.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Well I explained why. The Reids were approached five months before the expiration of the agreement.

HON. SIR P. McGRATH.—Then he says we would have to buy the locomotives. I do not know about that, but I do know that a gentleman named gave the Govern-

ment recently a very strong opinion as to the Colony's position in the matter. However, it all comes down to this, the thing to do is to make a new contract, getting rid of the 1901 Contract and the other contracts back to 1893. That is what my hon. friend would be faced with at every meeting of the Executive, that every contract dovetails into the other. The sooner we can get rid of the '98 contract and make a new contract with the Reids, if possible, but with somebody else, if not possible, the sooner the better.

The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment. Ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill re agreement between the Government and the D. I. & S. Co. and the N. S. S. & Coal Co., Ltd.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—This is a new agreement between these companies recently formed into a merger for the collection of a royalty on hematite ore mined at Bell Island. We may recall that some years ago it was suggested that if we taxed these companies it would ruin the enterprise and they would cease operating here. I must give credit to some of the late Government for something. They tried that out, called the bluff and my hon. friend Sir Patrick McGrath, negotiated a deal whereby we secured 7½c. a ton for all ore mined on Bell Island. They stood for it and prospered and have been thriving very well ever since. The term was for ten years and expired in 1920 and we are now prepared to try them with another agreement, so that we get 25 cents a ton for all ore sent to Cape Breton and Nova Scotia. All ore exported to foreign market and other parts of Canada is free and covering that there is a penalty of ten cents per ton if they do not fulfil agreements they have made for the betterment of con-

ditions at Bell Island and as set forth on page three. I would move the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill was read a second time.

An Act respecting Warehouse Receipts.

HON. MR. SHEA.—Mr. President, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill which has been recommended to the Government and this Legislative by the Board of Trade.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—Mr. President, I oppose the second reading of this Bill. This question was discussed at the Board of Trade, and the sense of the meeting called was against this measure. I took the definite position that this Bill was improper and opposed it to the best of my ability accordingly. So unanimous was the meeting that hardly a member there but applauded the position I took. But in the afternoon it was quite a different thing. Then what are we to presume? At that meeting one Bank manager said, "This thing has been going on for 20 years." I asked him had there ever been any default and he said, "No." Well then what is the reason for it to-day? Simply that we are in such a position in this country that they are taking advantage of it to squeeze us and put a grip around the trade of this country that we will never get over. Why should the banks get this? Because they are banks and we are afraid of them. Where is the reason for it and how many does it facilitate if anybody. The man who cannot conduct his business and hasn't enough credit to get goods, let him curtail it and do his business within his means, and not go to disaster as he is bound to do. Are the people who supply these merchants and take their notes going to be subject to put them into the bank so that the bank will gobble the whole thing up? Here we have the case of Ephraim Inkpen & Winsor,

concrete cases. Out of Inkpen's estate the creditors got eight cents in the dollar. One firm in this town lost \$35,000. Of course you will say they could not have been watchnig their business to get in to that extent. That is not correct. They have been doing their business as they have always done. They did not realize the situation of the bank going in and gobbling all up; did not think the bank would be so contemptible. The excuse the bank made was that the manager had been drinking and he would be removed. Did the Head Office change the matter however? No, they took it over and paid others eight cents. All the book debts, ships and everything they could hypothecate they took. And now we are asked by the banks to pass another act that God knows how far it will go. Want we want to do is to curtail these banks. They have been taking chattel mortgages and in their Act they are not supposed to do so. I oppose this bill absolutely on principle and I hope this house will not accept the principle at all. It is a bad one and if this bill is accepted it just means that in another year or two there will be mighty few will be able to walk the streets of St. John's without permission of the banks.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I agree with Hon. Mr. Browning that this bill on the face of it looks very innocent but might be very far reaching. It looks to me to be a form of gambling and might be a breach of the Lottery Act; advancing money on fish swimming in the sea. Take the case of Winters or Harveys or some large concern. They sell 100 barrels of pork and as soon as the buyer gets it in his possession he goes down to the bank and asks for an advance. The bank advances him \$5,000 on that pork and before the promissory note that paid for that pork falls due, the concern goes insolvent and Winter or

Harvey find the bank has a mortgage on the pork they supplied. I think we should be very cautious and careful before letting any more of this legislation go on. The banks should take the same risks as any other man and should not get any protection other than he or any other man in business, and it is unfair and unreasonable for them to expect us to pass this measure.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I do not know that we ought to go to the extreme of rejecting the second reading. In all these cases I suggest a select committee to endeavour to find a solution. I am no apologist for the banks, but there is this difference between the banks and the ordinary trader. The trader lends his own money and the banks other peoples and are therefore entitled to some security on that account. With the desire of getting the greatest amount of knowledge possible I attended the meeting of the Board of Trade at which this matter was discussed and our hon. friend opposite took quite as strong a stand there as he did here. In the morning one gentleman moved an approval of this and could not get a seconder. The meeting adjourned until the afternoon and after the discussion a motion was put that the bill be endorsed, the suggestion being that the people objecting had been whipped into line by the banks. The plea advanced by the banks was that this was merely a movement to remove debts. The principle underlying this bill was that the banks would accept from a given person an understanding that when he got fish in his possession that was going to be caught that summer he would give a warehouse receipt. A similar question arose somewhere in Canada in regard to wheat growing in the ground, and a decision had been given by some judge that it was not valid. I subscribe thoroughly

to what my hon. friend said in regard to the banks being given too much power. On the other hand there is this aspect to be considered, that this is not the time to curtail the banks in giving legitimate credit. I admit during the past 3 or 4 years from what I can learn the banks have encouraged overtrading, and provided facilities to small men to trade beyond their capacity. I think my hon. friend will admit if he or I had all the money the banks lost in this country the past 2 or 3 years, we would not have to work any more.

HON. THE PRESIDENT.—Still they are paying ten and twenty per cent.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Well, take the Harris case. The Bank of Nova Scotia must have been struck very heavily in that case. Take Inkpen. He went into insolvency owing something like \$280,000. Is it not reasonable to suppose the bank lost considerable as a result of that.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—It was \$300,000 and \$100,000 of that was to the trade generally on which they got 8 cents on the dollar.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Take again Wakely. It is stated the local bank manager advanced this man \$100,000 with practically no security whatever. I suppose the bank will lose a great deal of it. Then there is Winsor's case and similar stories told about that. I cannot satisfy myself that the banks have not lost heavily on all this contraction and deflation of business in this country the past year or two.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—They made it during the war.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—That is the position of all the business men in the country. Returning to the bill I think the thing to do is investigate it and decide by the evidence put before us whether we should recommend its acceptance or rejection. 1

think that beginning next January there ought to be some modification in the banking act. We have one I suppose, and if not, we ought to have one, and it ought to be so framed so that the banks can do business legitimately but other people should have reasonable protection as well.

The Bill passed the second reading.

The House adjourned until Friday, August 5th, at 3 o'clock.

FRIDAY, August 5.

The House met at 3, pursuant to adjournment.

Committee on Railway Bill.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—I do not see what the Government is going to do if they close down the Bonavista branch in winter. Now is the time to close it down because you can get down in a motor boat or steamer, but in the winter you cannot get down at all. Now is the time to close down and open up again 3 months from now, especially this year when you will not find Bonavista filled with goods as it has been in the past. It is not much difference to me; I can go south and live on oranges or something else, but there are people there I don't know how they will manage. Talk about wasting money; the Government think no more about wasting money than about a fly. The year before last it cost me \$100,000 because the Reids would not clear the line between Catalina and Bonavista. I offered them the coal myself and could not move them and Mr. Powell up here at the Balsam looking at the balsams, while we were at our wits end not knowing what to do. I say if the Bonavista branch was properly managed it could pay. Any ordinary man could have worked it last year and the produce could have been got away to market. If that line was not there I would not have had my produce there in February. I would have got it out in December.

The line is badly managed and cost me \$200,000 and I must suffer because of a lazy crowd of people on the railway including the Reids themselves. If a million and a half dollars is good to the Reids, a hundred thousand is good to me and a lot more like me. If the Reids cannot stand up, why should the Government bolster them up.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—It is a public utility.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN.—It is a public nuisance, and that is all it ever was. I am sorry to have to speak this way but I feel it my duty to say this. I do not agree with giving Reids \$1,500,000. They had their chance and should take the same risks as everybody else.

The bill was read a third time and passed and ordered sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House went into Committee on the Bill respecting Agreement between the Government and the D.I. & S. Co. and the N.S. & Coal Co.'s, Ltd., Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and by consent of the House the Bill was then read a third time and passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House then adjourned until Monday, next at 3 o'clock.

THURSDAY, August 11.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. PRESIDENT read message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills in which they requested concurrence, namely: An Act to Amend the Act entitled, Or Illegitimate Children; An Act for granting to H. M. certain sums of money for defraying certain public

services; An Act further to Amend the Income War Tax Act 1918; An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants; An Act respecting a tax on goods sold in Nfld.

On motion, the Bill respecting Illegitimate Children was read a first time, and by consent of the House a second time and House went into Committee thereon, Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment. Bill was then read a third time and passed. Ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. SHEA moved first reading of the Public Service Bill. Done accordingly and by consent of the House bill was passed through all stages and passed and ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved first reading of the Bill respecting a tax on goods sold in Nfld. This bill provides for the imposition of a tax of 5% on all goods imported into the Colony, including the invoice cost, freight and customs duties. In the matter of flour the tax is made 3%. This section of the Act I have referred to does not apply to goods named in Schedule A, which are exempted by Act of the Legislature.

Section 3 deals with another class of goods, and authorises the imposition of a tax of two and a half per cent. upon all goods upon which excise tax is payable. The tax shall not be included in the selling price when computing the tax. Now the excise goods upon which taxes are collected at the present time are tobacco, olio margarine, etc. In the case of other goods, the tax is three per cent. upon the rate at which they are sold. The section, however, does not apply to ar-

ticle enumerated in Schedule B, namely:

SCHEDULE B.

Goods exempted by Act of the Legislature from taxation.

Fishery and agricultural products of all kinds.

Goods sold for export out of the Colony.

Goods manufactured from raw material the whole, or substantially the whole, of which is produced wholly in the Colony.

The remaining sections of the Act simply deal with the manner in which the duties are to be payable and collected, and gives power to the Tax Assessor in certain cases where he may have reason to believe that some person is not furnishing proper returns to require the production of certain accounts and books, as the case may be, such as he may require now under the Income Tax and Profit Tax Acts. Then the Act provides certain penalties, same as in the Profits Tax or under the Customs Act, in the event of non-compliance with the provisions. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. THE PRESIDENT.—Does that apply to goods for charitable purposes?

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Goods for charitable purposes do not pay the ordinary tax, but they pay this Sales Tax.

This bill was thereupon read a second time, and on motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—Before the motion is put, Mr. Chairman, could we have some concrete, specific example of the application of the local side of the Bill; that is to say, the tax that is levied on local manufactures. What, for instance, is meant by raw material within the scope of the Bill? No one wishes to

obstruct the passing of the Bill, but this is new to me, and I would like to know what I am legislating about. What are the local manufactures to come within this? I do not expect anybody to give us complete information, but I would like to have a few examples. My hon. friend Mr. Browning makes biscuits, could he give us an idea as to how the Bill applies with regard to his business.

HON. MR. BROWNING.—I understand that there is a slight protection for local manufacturers to the extent of two per cent., but just how it works out I do not know.

Committee on the Saes Tax Bill rose and reported the bill without amendment. Said bill was then read a third time and passed and ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment, but calling attention to the fact that a verbal change was necessary and asking consent to the same.

Hon. Mr. Shea moved first, and by consent of the House, second reading of the Income War Tax Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA.—This bill is to provide for exemption only of the salaries of the Governor, Judges and the clergymen of the various religious denominations.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—While I take no exception to exempting the income of clergymen, I think exempting Judges &c. is wrong. In England the King pays the Income Tax; in the U. S. the President and all Judges do so also and I fail to see any reason why these well off gentlemen should not contribute their quota. I do not think the present Governor should have to pay, because he came here with a certain understanding, but future Governors should do so. Then again in this connection; in regards to travelling expenses, the Governor

should only be recouped for actual out of pocket expenses. The practice now is that in addition to his salary he is allowed \$2,500 for travelling and drew it every month he travelled or not. That principle is wrong and is not allowed with minor officials. I think also any future Governor ought to be put on the same footing as governors in Australia, where they are not given free entry for articles required for their use, and are only allowed light and heat for the public portion of Government House and has to pay for the upkeep of his private apartments himself. Perhaps that may be straining a point but if wealthy countries like Australia do that it is only right to ask ourselves whether we should not do something along the same lines. Now there is nothing personal in these views; I have the highest respect for the gentlemen who come out here from time to time, and the gentlemen officiating at the Supreme Court. We pay our Judges exceedingly well. Of course we know they give up substantial emoluments to take these positions, but it must be remembered that a lawyer's health may go wrong and he would have to give up work with no fees coming in, whereas a judge would have a substantial pension coming to him in a similar case. In times of stress I think the judges and the Governor like everybody else should take a share in the economy necessary.

The bill was read a second time and committed. The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment. It was then read a third time and passed and a message sent the Assembly informing that body accordingly.

Hon. Mr. Shea moved the first and second reading of the Bill respecting the salaries of Civil Servants, and

House went into Committee thereon, Hon. Mr. Shea in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA.—I regret exceedingly that it is my duty this afternoon to present this bill for consideration, because I think it is a bill that will bear very hardly on a very large portion of the community who can ill afford to bear it, and the only excuse that can be made for such legislation is the extremely difficult financial position the Colony is in at present. Personally I very much dislike this measure but at the same time it was made clear to me there was no alternative on the part of the Government but to bring it in force. I regret that it will bear hardly on a very deserving class of people. I have always felt that the Civil Servants were the worst paid people in the Colony; worst paid than any other Colony and were paid the same salaries for years, and I have always contended they were a very unpaid body of men, and it is unfortunate that it should be my lot to bring in this bill and present it to the House. But such it is and there is no way out of it, and the only hope that can be expressed about it is that when times get better we may be in a position to take this matter up for further consideration and put the salaries back on the footing formerly placed at.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH.—I think the hon. gentleman's statement on this matter of his personal feelings is highly creditable and I have the same idea as regards his colleagues, but I think the Government might have refrained from reducing the salaries of officials getting less than \$500. In the black days of the Bank Crash we did not take anything off salaries below this amount, and I think from what the Government will save in these people they would have acted wisely in leaving them untouched. Take the Outport Postmasters,

&c., the game is not worth the candle. Above \$500 the fact might be recognized the times are bad and everybody has to make a sacrifice, but there again I think the Government would have done better if it had wiped out the Education Department and some other of the additional features to the public service created the past year or two. I mentioned the Education Department because of late it has been in the public eye, and we know that one feature of its program has been abandoned lately, and I do not see why it should be maintained at a cost of \$25,000 or \$30,000 when there is nothing for it to do. Of course it may be said it is very easy for people who have nothing to do with running a Government to come in and say changes should be made. But I think evil times have come and for a great deal of it causes over which none has any control had a great deal to do with it, and therefore we cannot blame people in charge for that, but on the other hand, I think a great deal of money has been spent the past 18 months for which no adequate return has been obtained. With regard to public expenditures generally, I am not going to criticise them, because they have been discussed in the lower House, and I do not think anything would be gained by re-opening them.

I had the advantage or otherwise of being in political life twenty-five years ago when the crash occurred, and of being an attachee of the other branch of the Legislature, and of seeing what the Government had to face, and I do not dispute of our surviving the present catastrophe, but I do not think we can survive it if it is not grappled with in a more serious manner, I think an altogether too light-hearted view has been taken of the situation as it exists and as it is in prospect. Apparently the most that is expected to be realized for our cod-

fishery catch is \$6.00 a quintal. Well if we assume that every quintal of fish that is brought in is sold, and say there is a million and a half quintals, that gives about nine million dollars. Our codfishery exports are about two-thirds of our total exports. That would mean a total export of fifteen million dollars for the coming twelve months, and if we allow that we get half of that back in taxation—the allowance used to be 33 per cent.—then you have only seven million dollars altogether. Now that is working on the assumption that everything is going well, but we have to face the fact that Grand Falls is operating only on a small scale, that it is going to operate on a small scale, because within the past few weeks that company sent away one hundred and thirty-two of its horses to Canada to be sold, which means that there is practically no logging to be done in the interior during the coming winter. How serious a situation that represents can be realized by remembering that last year the A. N. D. Co. had practically the largest operations on its own account, and, in addition, it got logs from people in various parts of the country and accumulated a tremendous pile of raw material. Then take the Bell Island companies, they are operating today about 750 men four days a week, or, say, 500 men the week round. But there is no indication that that will be substantially increased. I would call attention to the fact that within the last few days there has been in the newspapers a statement from Mr. Gillis, who was here representing the companies, that he expected the company would take from Bell Island "from 100,000 to 150,000 tons of ore. Well a normal demand from Sydney is 650,000 tons. The companies now have nearly a two years' supply for normal times on the surface. They are negotiating for the sale of 40,000 tons. But

that sale was to be made at a figure that would net the company a loss, and no company can sell its raw material at a loss and expect to go on producing more. These are the two substantial labor giving industries apart from the fisheries. You may say there is Bay of Islands. No doubt there will be a fairly active prosecution of the herring fishery the coming winter, but the return from that would be infinitely small as compared with past years. Hon. members will bear me out when I say that the bottom has dropped out of the Scotch Cure Herring industry, and we have got to get back the despatching of our herring to the United States at \$2.00 or \$3.00 a barrel, perhaps more, perhaps it may go to \$5.00, but I should think that for salt herring to be handled by the Americans in their own markets our people will not get any large figure. I think the decision to adjourn and meet in December is a very sensible one. I think by that time conditions will be in a shape where legislative action of some kind will have to be taken. I hope that in the interim the Government will be able to work out some scheme to cope with this situation, and I hope, especially as this is the last opportunity we will have to discuss these matters, I hope that the Government will find it possible to give attention to the railway situation. I think if we drift along as we have the past twelve months without finding any permanent solution, it cannot mean anything but disaster to the country. I do not want to take a too pessimistic view, but I think it is a mistake to hide our heads in the sand and imagine that everything is going well, and therefore I say that the seriousness of the situation will have to be realized, not alone by the Government and the Legislature, but by the country in general, as being

much graver and darker than we have regarded it up to the present time.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and by the consent of the House it was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

The Hon. the President read a message from the House of Assembly informing the Council that they had passed a Bill "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion the Bill was thereupon read a first time, and by the consent of the House a second time, and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the House then adjourned until Friday, August 12th, at 2.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, August 12.

House met at 2.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905."

Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and by the consent of the House, on motion it was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

House then took recess until 3.15 p.m.

At 3.15 p.m. His Excellency the Governor arrived, and the members of the House of Assembly having been summoned to the Bar of the House, gave his formal consent to various bills, after which the House adjourn-

ed until Monday, December 12th, 1921, at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, December 12.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. R. K. BISHOP.—Since we had adjourned in August, the Council had lost its youngest member in point of appointment, but one who had brought to the debates a wealth of knowledge that decidedly made him a member which the chamber could ill afford to lose. I feel it is unnecessary to make any lengthy remarks on one who was so well known in the city and country, and whose activities in business and in patriotic work had brought him well-merited esteem. He was a member who held strong views and on any subject no one was left in doubt as to his position. His passing was almost sudden and great shock to his family and us all, and I would move that a resolution of sympathy be passed and sent to the relatives.

HON. M. P. GIBBS.—I beg to second the motion proposed by the hon. gentleman. I feel assured that it was with feelings of profound regret that we learned of the passing of the deceased gentleman. Upon taking up his duties as a member of this Council he showed a high order of intelligence and a ready grasp of the different matters which came before us. His conduct as a member showed him to be possessed of a sturdy independence of thought and action so necessary in the public life of the country. To those who knew him this was expected because throughout his business career that same sturdiness and independence was always in evidence.

The death of Hon. Mr. Browning is a loss to the business and public life of the country. The knowledge and experience of men of his type are more needed to-day than ever before to help in solving the many economic and industrial problems that confront

us. Hon. Mr. Browning had great faith in the future of the country as is shown by the many labour giving industries with which his name is so prominently identified; the success of some of them being in a great measure due to his initiative. A worthy citizen, a public-spirited man, he could always he relied upon to preform his part in any emergency or crisis that might arise. He was a man of strong convictions, tenacious in his opinions and not easily swayed from that which he conceived to be the path of duty.

Discussions relating to legislation, which came before this House, showed him to be a keen student of public affairs, and his readiness in debate revealed him to be the possessor of a keen intellect.

Although but a few years a member of this Council he nevertheless during that period evinced a zeal for the public welfare and the stability of law and order which in those times of unrest was necessary.

In some of his addresses in this Council we saw evidence of that new school of thought in business life which is finding many advocates. I remember his expounding on more than one occasion the principle that business should not be conducted by the individual solely for his own interest; that he had a duty to perform to the community in which it was carried on, and that it should be conducted with a view of benefitting the people. No man should conduct a business who did not aid in the material or moral welfare of the people of the place where it was carried on. The wealth which he accumulated from it was not solely his own, he was merely a trustee and should use it, after due provision for his own wants, for the benefit of his fellow-man.

The passing of a man holding such broad and humane views as to the proper use of wealth is a great loss

to any community. But we must all bow to the inevitable. There is nothing more certain than death. It hovers around us at our birth and our cradle is rocked in the grave!

At 4 o'clock His Excellency the Governor arrived and having called the members of the House of Assembly, addressed both bodies.

THE GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The speech of prorogation, delivered by the Governor, follows. The Governor, who was attired in the ceremonial uniform, was attended on the dias by Capt. J. Hamilton, Secretary, and Capt. P. Saltmarsh, A.D.C.; Capt. Kerr, of the Briton, Lieut.-Col. W. F. Rendell and Inspector General Hutchings. A police guard of honor was also in the Assembly grounds. The speech follows:

Mr. President and Honourable gentlemen of the Legislative Council, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:—

It was your expressed desire in August last that the Legislature should stand adjourned till late in the year in case some trade crisis should demand immediate action. Happily this has not occurred, and I am glad to be able to announce that it is now possible to relieve you from further Legislative duties during this session, and particularly so in view of the fact that within the next ten of twelve weeks you will be summoned again to your duties. Since the adjournment in August last, there has been considerable improvement in trade, and the outlook is much brighter to-day than it was four months ago.

The facilities provided by the Act regarding fishery supplies helped considerably in establishing confidence, and both merchants and fishermen entered actively into the prosecution of this important industry. I am glad to be able to state that the catch has

been an average one, and that satisfactory prices have been realized in the foreign markets.

The Agricultural returns during the past season have been above the average. The various root crops have given good yields, while the hay crop, so essential for the keeping of stock is the best for some years.

Under the Act for the temporary operations of the Railway, a general manager was appointed by the Reid Newfoundland Company. He resigned after a few days, but is now acting in the capacity of Chairman of the Railway Operating Committee of the Reid Company directorate, and in conference with other railway officials, is endeavouring to secure the more economic operation of our Railway, so that while giving reasonable and proper service the deficit on operation may be reduced to as low a figure as possible.

It will gratify you to learn that the fiscal returns for that portion of the year which has gone have exceeded the Estimates which my ministers made during the earlier period of this session. The retrenchment in the public service and the other economies affected will, it is anticipated, enable the Finance Minister to show a substantial surplus at the end of the present fiscal year.

My ministers have given earnest consideration to the question of unemployment, so prevalent, not only in Newfoundland, but in all countries. Unfortunately the suffering from unemployment has been accentuated by the exceptional storms of the past few weeks. My ministers, however, have been active in encouraging contracts with large employers of lab-

our in the direction of the cutting of lumber, the repair of wharves, and the carrying out of other useful public works, in order that avenues of employment during the winter months may be opened to those people who are unable, without such help to provide sufficiently for their families during the winter. The financial situation is steadily becoming easier. With the opening of next spring it may reasonably be hoped that industries, which are at present employing a partial staff, will be increasing their operations and taking on more men. The prices of all commodities will be lower, and a general commercial and industrial improvement will be manifest.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly: I have to thank you for the zealous attention which you have given to the question of the supplies for the Public service. While endeavouring to bring the expenditures to the lowest possible figure in the various Departments, you have been careful that the public service shall not suffer. The supplies which you have provided will be dispensed with due regard to economy and efficiency.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:—

In taking leave of you at the close of this session, I desire to express my sincere wish for your prosperity and general welfare.

Hon. Mr. President announced His Excellency's desire that the House stand prorogued until January 16th, 1922.



INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

- Motion for, 9.
- Committee on, 9.
- Presentation of, 49.

ABSENCE, LEAVE OF

- Hon. W. J. Ellis, 35.
- Hon. S. K. Bell, 92.

ANDERSON, HON. JOHN

- On Address in Reply, 9.
 - Municipal Affairs Bill, 66, 75.
 - Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Bill, 69.
 - Women's Suffrage Bill, 84.
 - High Commissioners Bill, 93.
 - Labor Strikes, 95.
 - Lotteries Bill, 107.
 - Profiteering Bill, 109.
 - Loan Bill, 113.
 - Operation of Newfoundland Railway Bill, 166.

BISHOP, HON. MR.

- On Municipal Affairs Bill, 72.
 - Women's Suffrage Petition, 81.
 - Death of Hon. J. Browning, 175.

BROWNING, HON. MR.

- On Fishery Regulations, 35.
 - Address in Reply, 50.
 - Women's Suffrage Bill, 87.
 - Exportation of Salt Codfish Bill, 123.
 - Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 132.
 - Warehouse Receipts Bill, 168.

COMMITTEE, SELECT

- On Address in Reply, 9.
 - Municipal Affairs Bill, 76.

Exportation of Timber Bill, 139, 140.
Fishery Supplies Bill, 14.

COMMISSION OF INTERNAL ECONOMY, 66.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF
ON Death of Hon. W. B. Grieve, 5.

CAMPBELL, HON. DR.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 65, 74, 75.
Sheep Farming Bill, 79.
High Commissioners Bill, 101.
Exportation of Timber Bill, 104, 111.
D.I. & S. Co. & N.S.S. & Co. Company Bill, 167.

CROWN LANDS BILL, 78, 80, 88, 90.

CIVIL SERVANTS SALARIES BILL, 171.

D.I. & S. CO. & N.S.S. & C. COMPANY BILL, 167, 170.

D'ARCY EXPLORATION BILL, 115, 116, 119, 128.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL, 95, 104, 110, 112, 114, 119.

EXPORTATION OF CODFISH BILL, 115, 118, 119, 128, 138.

FISHERY SUPPLIES BILL, 139, 140, 161.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.
On Resolutions of Condolence, 6.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 51, 70.
Law Society Bill, 114.
D'Arcy Exploration Co's Bill, 116.
Exportation of Timber Bill, 139.
Operation of Nfld. Railway Bill, 164, 165.
Sales Tax Bill, 171.
Death of Hon. J. Browning, 175.

HIGH COMMISSIONERS BILL, 81, 92, 98, 105.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN BILL, 170.

INCOME WAR TAX BILL, 171.

LOAN BILL, 112.

LOTTERIES BILL, 78, 80, 89, 98, 105, 107, 112.

LAW SOCIETY BILL, 114, 119.

MILLEY, HON. MR.

On High Commissioners Bill, 101.

MURPHY, HON. MR.

On High Commissioners Bill, 130.

MEWS, HON. MR.

On Address in Reply, 17.

Women's Suffrage Bill, 86.

Lotteries Bill, 105.

Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 153.

McGRATH, HON. SIR P. T.

On Resolutions of Condolence, 7.

Address in Reply, 19, 28, 47.

Municipal Affairs Bill, 23, 61, 64, 68, 70, 73, 74.

Fishery Regulations, 47.

Sheep Farming Bill, 79.

Crown Lands Bill, 80.

Pension Commissioners Bill, 81.

Women's Suffrage Bill, 85.

Lotteries Bill, 89, 106, 108.

High Commissioners Bill, 91, 92, 99.

Labor Strikes, 97.

D'Arcy Exploration Bill, 117.

Exportation of Salt Codfish Bill, 119.

Municipal Council Indemnity Bill, 136.

Quieting of Titles Bill, 137.

Exportation of Timber Bill, 138.

Operation Newfoundland Railway Bill, 142, 167.

Warehouse Receipts Bill, 169.

Income War Tax Bill, 172.

Civil Servants Salaries, 173.

McNAMARA, HON. MR.

On Address in Reply, 24, 26.

Municipal Affairs Bill, 73.

Women's Suffrage Bill, 88.

High Commissioners Bill, 99.

Exportation Salt Codfish Bill, 128.

Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 133.

Operation Nfld. Railway Bill, 161.

Warehouse Receipts Bill, 168.

- MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 23, 49, 69, 73, 139, 140.
- MARINE COURTS OF ENQUIRY BILL, 77, 78, 81.
- MAINTENANCE PUBLIC ROADS BILL, 130, 132, 134.
- MUNICIPAL COUNCIL INDEMNITY BILL, 130, 131, 135.
- NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN BILL, 132, 134, 140, 161.
- OPERATION OF RAILWAY BILL, 140, 141, 161, 170.
- PETITIONS.
 Hon. Mr. Milley, 98.
- PRESIDENT, HON. MR.
 On Municipal Affairs Bill, 70.
 Exportation of Timber Bill, 138.
- POWER, HON. MR.
 On Municipal Affairs Bill, 23, 65, 67, 75.
- PENSION COMMISSIONERS BILL, 78, 81, 90, 92.
- PROFITEERING BILL, 95, 104, 109, 112.
- PULP AND PAPER CORPORATION BILL, 139, 140, 161.
- QUIETING OF TITLES BILL, 137, 140.
- RAILWAY BILL, 132, 134, 136.
- REVENUE BILL, 175.
- RYAN, HON. MR.
 On Address in Reply, 34.
 Fishery Regulations, 38, 40.
 Exportation Salt Codfish Bill, 121, 122, 123.
- STEER, HON. MR.
 On Fishery Regulations, 42.
- SHEA, HON. MR.
 On Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Bill, 77, 88.
 Sheep Farming Bill, 79.
 Pension Commissioners Bill, 81.
 Crown Lands Bill, 89.
 High Commissioners Bill, 92, 93, 98.

Loan Bill, 112.
Maintenance Public Roads Bill, 131.
Neglected and Delinquent Children Bill, 134.
Civil Servants Salaries Bill, 173.

SHEEP FARMING BILL, 78, 114.

SEAL FISHERY BILL, 115, 129.

SALES TAX BILL, 171.

SUPPLY, 171.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Opening, 3. Closing, 176.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. MR.

On Operation Newfoundland Railway Bill, 170.

TERRA NOVA SULPHITE CO. BILL, 77, 78, 90.

TEMPORARY COMMISSION ST. JOHN'S BILL, 131.

VENEREAL DISEASES, 115, 119, 130.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE PETITION, 81.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE PETITION, 81.

WAR MEASURES BILL, 114, 115, 119.

WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS BILL, 168.