

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

DURING THE

FIFTH SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1928

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

PROCEEDINGS

of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1928,

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

WEDNESDAY, May 2nd., 1928.

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

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

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber; and being returned to the Assembly Rooms, Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to make a gracious speech to both Branches of the Legis-

lature, 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:

I welcome you at the commencement of this, the last session of the present General Assembly, and I trust that the Session may prove fruitful in legislation of much public benefit and advantage.

I congratulate you upon the marked progress the country has made during the Legislative term now ending, and especially upon the advancement during the present year.

The prosecution of our fisheries during 1927 resulted in better returns to many of those directly interested. Shore Codfish sold at remunerative prices and stocks remaining over are smaller than for many years past thus creating a healthy, market condition for future operations.

The Seal Fishery just concluding will show a larger catch than the previous year and the increased demand for Sealskins has permitted the payment of higher prices with proportionate benefit to those engaged in this hazardous industry.

The Pulp and Paper Industry showed an expansion and the activities in connection with our mineral wealth give promise of marked development.

The legislation enacted at the last Session, rendering it possible for

new interests to acquire the paper-making enterprise at Corner Brook, resulted in the transfer of the property to other ownership early in the present year, and the new proprietors are taking the initial steps towards the advances therein contemplated. On the other hand, the Act designed to facilitate the construction of a mill in the Gander Valley has not been brought into operation, though it is possible that this step may be taken at a later date. It is very desirable that a mill may be established there, and the owners of the property are hopeful of bringing about this result.

The visit of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress to the Island last Autumn was in itself an evidence of the increasing interest of the outside world in our mining possibilities, and was followed by much discussion and activity at home and abroad in relation to our mining areas, stimulated by the development now in progress at Buchans River. The American Institute of Mining Engineers have expressed their intention of sending a deputation of representatives here next September.

It is felt that as a result of the great interest which is being shown in our mineral possibilities a revision of our mining laws is now essential and you will be invited to consider a measure for bringing these laws into conformity with the trend of similar legislation in other parts of the Empire.

Operations at Bell Island have latterly been more regular and sustained, with consequent stability of employment for those engaged there; but an increase in the wage rates is desirable. My Ministers have opened negotiations with the owners of the mines to secure some advantages for the iron miners in this Colony corresponding to those recently secured for

the coal miners in Nova Scotia employed by the same corporation.

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

The Estimates for the coming fiscal year will be submitted at an early date and you will be invited to make the customary provision for the needs of the public service.

I am pleased to inform you that the Government was able to negotiate the loan authorised at the last Session on better terms than late issues, a fact which indicates the high credit enjoyed by the Colony in the financial world.

Within a few weeks the War Loan authorised in 1918 will mature and steps must be taken for the raising of money to meet this obligation, retiring the bonds of that loan, which bear interest at 6½% and replacing them with securities to carry a lower rate of interest. Therefore a Loan Bill including this amount which is slightly in excess of \$7,500,000, with other items, will be submitted to you at an early date.

The financial operations for the current fiscal year will show a small deficit. There has been a decided increase in the customs revenue, approaching \$750,000.

The operations of the Railroad have resulted in bringing the receipts within \$300,000 of the Expenditure, a reduction in the deficit by \$300,000 compared with last year, and giving promise of the early approach of the day when the great public utility will be self-supporting.

The difficulty and expense of operating a Winter service over the Railway Line has in a large measure been due to combating snow drifts on the central plateau known as the Topsails, where the rail rises to 1500 feet above sea level. My Ministers

are convinced that a diversion of this line can be made so as to bring the main line to the town of Buchans and at the same time reduce the line's elevation by 400 feet, and that this alteration will repay the cost of this new construction within a comparatively short time. You will be invited to consider the provision of funds for this purpose.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

Bills respecting various matters have been prepared by the Departments concerned and will be submitted to you.

In the near future a General Election will require to be held under the Re-distribution Act passed in the Session of 1925, when the principle of single-membered constituencies will prevail almost entirely, and women, as well as men, will exercise the franchise thruout the Colony.

The Government have taken the necessary steps to compile the new voter's lists and to provide for all the contingencies which the creation of the new constituencies will occasion, in order that the election may be carried out with the greatest facilities for the electorate.

I trust the Almighty may guide your counsels and endeavours for the promotion of the true interests of the Country..

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. BROWNE.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that an Address of thanks be presented to His Excellency the Administrator in reply to the gracious Speech with which he has opened this session of the Legislature this afternoon and that a Committee of this House be appointed to draft this Address in Reply.

This is the fifth and final session of this Assembly and it is the second one to be opened by the Administrator. On the last occasion His Excellency the Governor, Sir William Allardyce, was away from the country on a health trip; this year, I regret to say, he has left the country to go into retirement. I think, Sir, that everyone who has the country's interests at heart will regret exceedingly the departure from our shores of Sir William and Lady Allardyce. Sir William, if I may use the term, made himself very popular by his kindly and tactful manner; Lady Allardyce had endeared herself to thousands of men, women and children throughout the length and breadth of this Island by the industry, energy, tact and goodwill she displayed on every occasion. She has left a work that will endure, and if it does not, well, it will be a poor comentary upon the character of the people of Newfoundland. I refer to the work of NONIA, which she instituted, developed and encouraged and succeeded in putting on such a sound and substantial basis that its future success is assured. Knowledge of the establishment and existence of this institution has spread over a great part of the world, and today NONIA products of the most excellent quality can be seen upon Kings, Queens and their children.

During the past four years of Monroe administration I submit, Sir, the country has witnessed a period of sound, steady and consistent progress. Coming into power at a time when the affairs of this country were in a state of chaos and administrative demoralization, the Monroe Government have succeeded in restoring order where there was disorder, honesty where there was dishonesty, faithful and sound administration where mal-administration obtained so long before; the debts and customs duties of

this Colony have been collected with a firm hand and laws have been administered and enforced with equity and justice. Take the progress of the past year alone, as shown in the development and expansion of the Pulp and Paper Industry. It is but a year ago when we were asked here to consider the passing over of the mills at Corner Brook into the hands of an American concern, and since that time the production of these mills has daily increased. We have also seen the rise and growth of a new industry at Buchans Mine within the past year; and we have seen a development in the tourist trade beyond all expectation. I am assured that the accommodation on the passenger steamers coming into this country is not sufficient to take care of the bookings for passages here next summer.

But good times in this country depend mainly on our fisheries. Good or bad times come from good or bad fisheries. Last year, although the total catch of fish was not large, good prices were maintained, and those who were fortunate enough to hold on to their catches did very well. Now this industry has its sidelines in the way of production of codliver oil and fish meal. Within the past four years the codliver oil industry has increased from an annual export of from 30,000 to 40,000 gallons per year at 80 cents a gallon to 500,000 gallons for 1927 at \$1.25 a gallon, and if a quintal of codfish is equivalent to a gallon of codliver oil, I look forward to the day when this codliver oil industry will reach one millions gallons per year. At the present time everything points to the fact that there is a big trade possible for the by-products of our fisheries. Take the matter of the utilization of the waste or offal of our fish. Hundreds of tons are thrown back

into the sea each year of this waste while we witness the anomaly of having to import meal from other countries to feed our horses and our cattle, etc. This problem should be grappled with and the waste utilized to yield profitable returns to the people of this country and help make fishing a more paying occupation. Another point that I thought worth while mentioning this afternoon is the remarkable difference between the exports from this country to these places where our fish is bought and the imports from the same countries here. Looking over statistics for the year 1925-26 I was astounded to find that we exported ten and a half million dollars worth of fish to Spain, Portugal, Brazil, Italy, Costa Rica, etc., and from those same countries we did not import more than a half million dollars worth. Now those countries produce what we need in this country and I think it will be a pity if we do not establish direct trade with those countries, because if we don't, other countries who are buying from them and who are competitors of ours will take away our trade.

Mr. Speaker, it is another fortunate thing this year that the price of fat from the sealfishery is high, and it is a question whether that is the result of the demand for seal oil, or the result of the demand for furs, which the ladies wear. The furs, it is true, are more valuable and it is regrettable that that value cannot be regulated in a way that would be a greater benefit to the men engaged in the prosecution of that industry. Personally, I am inclined to agree with an article that appeared in the press recently stating that the auxiliary type of schooner, such as the "Young Harp," is the type that should be utilized for the sealfishery. The crew of the "Young Harp" made a bill this Spring of \$196.00 per man, whilst

the crews of the large steamers made from \$50 to \$60 a man. It seems to me that there are large overhead expenses to be borne in connection with the outfitting of the big steamers like the "Ungava," "Nascopie" or "Beothic" and which are bound to militate against the crews making good bils. Besides, the range of the crews on these larger steamers is no greater than the range of the crews of the smaller vessels.

I am sure, Sir, we all regret that the Speech from the Throne this year is not able to announce that the Gander project we all have heard so much about the past four years is not an accomplished fact. However, I do not think that any blame can be laid on the shoulders of the present Government for this, because if honorable members will turn their minds back to last year they will recollect that only three members sitting on the opposite side of the House voted either pro or con on this measure last year. The Government did all they could to facilitate the erection of a mill on the Gander River. I think it would be better to have a mill built on the Gander than that a somewhat larger mill should be established at Corner Brook because it would mean a better distribution of labour and a great benefit for the people throughout the whole country. I would like to see a number of mills established in different parts of the country, and such an arrangement will give more general prosperity than the concentration involved in one very large plant.

Last year we had a hurried visit of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress and I believe that credit for the presence in this country of this Congress is almost entirely due to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I believe that his early experience in mining matters has given him a

knowledge and sympathy towards the development of our mining areas that not every Minister of that department could possess. Since those people were here articles have appeared in leading journals throughout the world commenting upon the great mineral possibilities of this country, and the resultant publicity generally of their visit has been the means of stimulating interest in Newfoundland besides bringing about the formation and organization of mining companies with millions of dollars capital. Due to the discovery of Buchans, the outlook is very rosy indeed. It is very refreshing to hear that the Government intends to deviate the Main Line of the Railroad through the Buchans Mine settlement and I suppose that the \$750,000.00 voted here last year for the building of a railroad along the Gander will be used for the building of this railway through this great mining town, and hand in hand with that development I think that attention should be given at this session of the Legislature to the revision of the mining laws of the country.

Little attention need be given to see that the bona fide miner and prospector is not given a fair show in this country. At present if John Jones goes out and discovers a mine on his property and John Smith his neighbour hears of it and he may deprive John Jones of the benefit of his expenditure of labour and capital. Large areas have already been taken up. I doubt if the Minister can tell me now if there is any available and if I discovered a mineral if I could get a claim. I know that just at present I could not as they are not being granted, but I doubt if there is any likely part of the country upon which a claim hasn't been taken out except probably the hitherland.

Everybody too I am sure is pleased of the change of affairs at Bell Is-

land. Year after year the Government has been faced with great problems because of happenings over there and it seems that at last some important change has taken place in connection with the Besco concern; that new financial interests will be taking hold. I believe Messrs. Wood-Gundy and Sir Herbert Holt, two of the greatest financial institutions of the Dominion of Canada have become interested in this concern and that evidence of their organizing ability and financial knowledge are being seen in the good results of the arrangement they have made with the miners in Nova Scotia. I believe that a reorganisation has been made on a profit sharing basis and I am sure if that system were applied to Bell Island the lot of the Bell Island miner would be a happier one by far.

Last year the Finance Minister was successful in raising a loan beyond all expectation. I was of opinion at the time that New York would be a good place to float the loan and I don't know whether it was a coincidence or not that the International Paper Company was present in the country at the time; whether or not the coming of the Company into the country affected favorably the attitude investors showed toward this country. However, it is significant to remark that the common stock of the International Paper Company has risen 20 points in the past year and if investors in the United States have confidence in the International Paper Company, I feel sure they are going to have confidence in this country. We have this year to consider the question of the war loan of 1918 of over seven and a half millions which was raised in a critical time in the life of this Empire and of this country. It was raised at $6\frac{1}{2}\%$ and as money can now be had at a much lower rate we will save something over one hundred thousand a

year on this loan in interest. It is a pity I think we do not give more consideration here to the question of re-funding our loans by establishing a sinking fund. I notice this year from the budget of Mr. Churchill the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain that he is providing the great sum of \$350,000,000 for the paying off in 50 years of the public debt of that country. Then, too, we learn from the speech this afternoon that the financial outlook of the country is not so dark after all. The Finance Minister told us last year that we were to have probably a deficit of \$850,000, but that he did not think it necessary to put on an increased taxation. We were all very glad to hear that and now I am sure we are gratified to find that his best expectations have been fulfilled and the revenue has increased so much that the deficit is going to be very small and not near the eight hundred thousand mark at all. Then when we hear too that the railway is almost paying I think the country has reason to congratulate itself. This is particularly fortunate for the Government because this year is election year. The Government must go to the country this year. Rumors have reached us here, borne on the icy winds of the north, that some people wanted an election this spring, but I hold that would not be the wish of the people if the disadvantages of a spring election had been put before them, as forcibly put before them as the advantages of spring election were put before them. In 1861 those in this House passed a resolution against the holding of elections in the spring of the year and from that time to this there have only been three elections in the spring and one of these, the one held in 1923, was the only one unnecessary. That was an extravagance which the country could ill afford at that time. In 1909 it was compulsory.

It was compulsory in 1924. But it is not compulsory this year while there is a Government in power as capable and efficient as the Monroe Administration. Looking at it from the constitutional point of view, which issue has been raised by some honorable members sitting opposite, I might say that this issue was thrashed out in 1912 between the Acting Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. M. Kent, now the Honorable Mr. Justice Kent, and Sir Edward Morris, now the Rt. Hon. Lord Morris, and Sir Edward Morris then pointed out that constitutionally the House of Assembly was elected for four years; and it is the same now, for this Government was elected on the 4th of June and this House opened on the 9th of July and therefore the term does not expire until the 9th of July, 1928, and therefore any Government which is worth its salt would not abdicate at the murmurings of any section of the people. I am sure my honorable friends must remember what has happened in England in recent years. Take the time when Ramsay MacDonald was Prime Minister for several months when he didn't have a majority in the House at all, and those honorable gentlemen who may be historically inclined may turn their minds back to the days of the younger Pitt who suffered defeat after defeat in the House of Commons and went to the country inflicting a crushing and overwhelming defeat on his opponents as the Monroe Administration will do next fall.

There have been two outstanding achievements in addition to those mentioned. I refer to the establishment of single constituencies and the passing of the women's franchise. Sir, the Prime Minister came into the government of this country somewhat against his will, like myself even; he was a very tyro in political affairs when he became a member of this

House and Prime Minister of this country. I believe he will leave it a poorer man by far, because he has made a greater sacrifices than any of his predecessors. He took no honors, though open to him, and I feel sure that the honorable gentleman sitting in the Prime Minister's chair should realise that he need have no fear if he should wish to place his splendid personal and Government record before the people of the country.

MR. POWER.—Mr. Speaker and Honorable Members, in rising to second the motion before the Chair, I would simply repeat what I have said last year that I do so reluctantly in a way because I feel that there are other members, other private members of the Government ranks who are better able to grace this occasion. It seems strange to me that on the same occasion last year I was placed in the same position as I find myself today and stranger still to find this privilege was given to me just a few hours before the session opened. It affords me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to offer my sincere congratulations to the honorable mover of the motion before the House for the able manner for which he has covered practically all the items contained in the Speech. I particularly thank him because he has taken over altogether the weight from my shoulders, as he has left but little indeed for me to refer to. I fully concur with the honorable member in the references he has made to the Governor and Lady Allardyce. I think it is a pity, a regrettable fact, that people of the type of the Governor and Lady Allardyce should be removed from this country just about the time when they have fully entered into the hearts and affections of the people. I think I feel safe in saying that every class of citizen in the country today realizes that the going of the

Governor and Lady Allardyce is a distinct loss. My honorable friend the proposer of the motion has made reference to our fisheries and there are just one of two points in connection with this that I would like to refer to. It may be recalled that on the occasion of the session last year a kind of gloomy picture was painted for the then coming season and the markets looked very poor. However today the aspect is much brighter. There is more optimism abroad. Some new blood as well as new capital is being introduced into the country. I particularly refer to the advent of the Hudson's Bay Company whose coming in and investing largely in the country's resources lend a stimulus to our fisheries. This company with such vast wealth and vast resources must have a good effect with us. Again we have the re-opening of the lobster fishery which has been closed for the past three years, and with regard to this there is one matter in particular that I would like to refer to and that is in connection with the fixing prices of canned lobster. For some time rumors were going around that the prices of lobsters were very bad. It was said that other kinds of fish had taken the place of Newfoundland lobster in foreign markets. These rumors scattered thru the country and many fishermen hesitated to go to the fishery at all.

I am very glad to be in a position to say that I have gathered from a very reliable source the fact that Newfoundland Lobster will be in good demand and the price for packed lobster will be not less than \$22 per tierce.

Besides that two very independent firms of St. John's have been spending a good deal of time and gone to a good deal of expense in finding out if it were possible to market our lobster

in a live state in Canadian and American markets.

I feel, as I understand from the information that they have gathered, that the proposition is both a practical and profitable one and I have been told by the proprietor of one of those firms that he was just about ready to give this matter a practical try-out.

Should this be a success, which I feel every reason to believe that it will, it will revolutionize the whole lobster fishery. It will eliminate the time lost in packing.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the deviation of our railroad from the much-dreaded Topsails down through the Buchans country. It is also contemplated. I understand, by the Railway Commission, to re-rail the western division.

As far as the deviation of the road from over the Topsails goes, I feel safe in saying that the Railway Commission could not make a more popular move. I think it will be admitted by all who have the least conception of the conditions on these hills, that it is a move in the right direction. Every railway official will tell you that from the point of view of economy that having the railway removed from the Topsails and deviated down to the other side will repay the country within a few short years.

Not alone is it a good move from a financial point of view but from a humane point of view also. Only those who have had actual experience on those hills can fully realize the hardships experienced there.

To my mind it is beyond discussion. By deviating it down the other way we will place on the main line the new and promising town of Buchans, as well as run the railroad through the more promising country than over the Topsails.

I understand that consideration has

been given also to the idea of re-railing the western division.

I think this idea has been given consideration because of the fact that the International Power & Paper Company, Ltd. are seriously considering the erection of a large pier and warehouses at Port aux Basques.

If this is accomplished there will be probably no less than two trains running from Corner Brook to Port aux Basques. The position with the Corner Brook people today is that practically from the early part of January to late in April or the early part of May the whole Bay is tied up and consequently all the winter's output is tied up.

This not alone interferes with the summer output but ties up a lot of paper that would otherwise be on the market. Should this happen I would like to point out to the Prime Minister as Chairman of the Railway Commission, and other members of the Commission, that when the re-railing of the western division takes place that particular attention be given to two places, namely Crow Gulch and Mount Moriah, these two most dangerous sections on the line. It is true that we have had so far no fatal accidents at Crow Gulch, but that is not true of Mount Moriah, and I would like them to bear in mind now because I am sure that if some improvement was made there it would tend greatly to the safety of the railroad.

My honorable friend has made reference to the paper industries and naturally the vast enterprise at Corner Brook, being in the district I have the honor to represent, is of more than passing interest to me.

As it will be remembered, when this House met last year a kind of dual control was going on at Corner Brook, namely, the Nfld. Power & Paper Company and the International

Paper Company.

It is not necessary for me to dwell on what happened prior to the taking over of Corner Brook by the new company because every phase of the Corner Brook deal was much overhauled in this House, when the honorable members discussed the Corner Brook deal.

While I admit, Mr. Speaker, that it little profits for one to form any opinion yet as to how we are to fare with the new American company, yet from those who have watched so far the operations there it appears that this country will have no regrets as regards the deal we have made there.

Unfortunately the manager, Mr. Charlton, has been compelled to be away practically ever since the deal went through in January last and he has had very little time to attend to the claims at Corner Brook. However, he is back now and will be able within a few short weeks to let us see signs of his action.

I understand that the Company has planned for the extension of the town-site as well as its plant but to what extent that will take place largely depends on the paper markets.

The Company has, I know of my own knowledge, made every effort to operate a feeling of good feeling and good fellowship amongst its employees. It is doing everything that is humanly possible to make their employees contented and happy.

Just now they are erecting some houses and those houses will be erected at the cost that will suit the earnings of the parties that will have to occupy them.

Whilst I see no reference, Mr. Speaker, to any highroads policy for the coming season, I understand that some consideration will be given to it.

It is, Mr. Speaker, time that they be given roads on the West Coast.

The old situation has so changed in the district of St. George's and in the adjoining districts that it can be no longer left without some kind of decent roadways.

Whether this road policy will begin this year or next it certainly must come soon. The position up there can no longer be viewed from the point of view that has been expressed for many years, that is a place some five hundred miles removed from St. John's with a handful of people. We have, as the honorable members know, during the last few years industrial developments there and we have other most promising developments which are sure to take place in the near future. We have valuable deposits of gypsum, valuable deposits of iron and coal.

We also have numerous and famous salmon rivers, and the day is coming when the Government of this country will have to give some consideration to it. It can be no longer viewed as it has been viewed before. This is a question to my mind that should be viewed in the broad sense. It should be viewed from the standpoint as to how it affects the country. It is to my mind a national question.

I have much pleasure in seconding the Motion for the appointment of a committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech which His Excellency the Administrator was pleased to make.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, as it is customary for the leader of the Opposition to make some remarks in reference to the Speech from the Throne, I intend to say just a few brief words. I first must congratulate the Government and the Prime Minister on selecting two such able men to move and second the motion for the Address in Reply. They have selected two of the most long-winded orators on that side of the House, and

they have also selected a lawyer, as they knew they wanted somebody to make a good case out of nothing—the Speech from the Throne. We have come around again to the opening of parliament for the despatch of the country's business and it is a most unusual occurrence for the House to meet in the month of May. It is not only unusual but detrimental to the country's interests. In this country we have only one session in the year, and during that session the whole business of the country is conducted and finalized. In Britain and the other Dominions they have sessions throughout the seasons, which is quite different. This is the season of the year when the members who are interested in the trade of the country should not be in St. John's; they should be at their homes looking after their business and the country's interests. I expected that the Speech from the Throne would give us a full outline of the legislation that is to come before the House. I understand that there is no contentious legislation to come up. It is simply a matter of putting through the necessary business of the House so that the country's business can go on until next session after the next general election. The Government and the country have lost very much time by this improper procedure and the country is very anxious to know what is going to happen. Some of our people throughout the country now are wanting to see the atmosphere cleared and they want to know what are the prospects for the coming session. To the opening of parliament by the present Government at this session there is no legal objection. This is the fifth session of this House during the term of office of this Government and usually there are only four sessions. While there is no legal objection, there is a moral objection and

also a constitutional objection. The practice has always been in England and the other Dominions, when the Government has not a sufficient majority to enact the legislation in the interests of the country, for the Government to resign their office. At the present session we are in equal numbers and we could, if we wanted to, defeat any legislation that would be brought forward by this Government. That Government has not a sufficient to enact the legislation in the interests of the country, for that Government to resign their office. At the present session we are in equal numbers, and we could, if we wanted to, defeat any legislation that would be brought forward by this Government. That, however, is not my intention. I do not want to do anything that would precipitate the country into a turmoil and general election at this season of the year when trade is just beginning. We have passed through two or three years of very bad trading in Newfoundland. Both the fishermen and the merchants, and particularly the small outport merchants, have suffered severely in their trade, and I think it would be very detrimental to them if, at this time, we were to throw a monkey wrench into the works of the Government. The Prime Minister, I understand, is responsible for the House opening at this late date. His position is one of great importance. It is an exalted office. The powers of the Prime Minister are very great. His functions and duties are very important. He is not only the leader of the House and the Government, but he is the spokesman of the country; he is also the custodian of the people's rights. His actions should be well weighed in connection with anything in the interests of the country. I do not want to be misquoted, but I would like to repeat that I do not think that the present session

of this parliament shows faithfulness to the Crown, to our people, or to the Government themselves. It is a matter of necessity that we preserve the rights which our ancestors obtained after long struggles. The present Government will be going out of office, and I would liken them today to a polar bear on an iceberg drifting towards the Gulf Stream.

In the reference to the Speech from the Throne there are many prospects and negotiations. Prospects and negotiations do not satisfy me. What we want is something tangible in the way of labour. The visit of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress I attribute to the good work of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I believe it was through his efforts that these people came here last year, and their visit was certainly of great importance to Newfoundland.

The reference to the raising of money on cheaper terms than hitherto is only a coincidence, because money is cheaper all over the world to-day. In Canada and United States big corporations like insurance companies are looking for investments to-day and there is no trouble to sell good securities. If a loan is about to be raised in this country I trust that it will not go over four and a half per cent for which the Government should get very near par.

The re-railing of the road and the diverting of the line is no doubt in the interests of the country but can we afford it. The present Government have not since they have been in power balanced their budget one year, and this year we are told in the Speech from the Throne there is a further deficit. I want to inform the House for the benefit of the House, that there has been a strike in the Liberal Party. I will read for the benefit of the House the letter which was addressed to the Hon. the Speak-

er of the House of Assembly;-

The Honourable Cyril J. Fox,
Speaker of the House of As-
sembly.

Sir,

We have the honour to inform you that we have organized a Liberal Legislative group for the more efficient conduct of public business at this session of the Legislature. We support the policy of Liberalism as distinct from Conservatism and propose to work for the liberal cause under the leadership of Sir Richard Squires.

We have elected as House Leader for the coming session Mr. W. W. Halfyard, senior member of the Liberal group.

We would be obliged if you would notify His Excellency the Administrator and the Honourable Prime Minister accordingly.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

W. W. Halfyard, I. R. Randell,
E. J. Godden, J. H. Scammell,
K. M. Brown, G. F. Grimes,
R. Hibbs, F. G. Bradley, H. M.
Mosdell.

I want to notify you, Mr. Speaker, and this House of Assembly that these gentlemen are not now associated with me and the Liberal Party and that any utterances of theirs we will not be responsible for. I think that I have got out of it pretty well. I want to tell the House this, that I have no intention whatever of vacating my seat as leader of the Opposition in this Assembly and I have no intention whatever of resigning my seat as Leader of the Liberal Party.

I would make some further remarks in reference to one of the honorable members who was associated with

me, but who has sent a circular thru-out his district in which my name was mentioned not in my interest, but as his name is associated with those on this notice, then I will refrain from making any further remarks.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, first, before I inadvertently omit it, I must thank Mr. Hickman for his courteous advertisement of the action of what he called the Liberal group on the Opposition side of the House within the last twenty-four hours. History has been made, I presume. I do not know whether we have any precedent for such document as has been read by Mr. Hickman. But it was not my intention to speak on this phase of political activity. Rather I would say that everybody knows our attitude now and that is why I am speaking this afternoon to the motion that is before the Chair for a Committee to be formed to draft an Address in Reply to the Administrator's gracious Speech.

We hope that nothing will interfere with our personal relations, no matter what person's banner we are under. It has always been my policy since I came into public life in 1913 that what I have had to say to any public man in a public position was in a public way and had nothing to do with our personal relations, and I am sure that Mr. Hickman and myself are as one with regard to our attitude towards the present Government. Mr. Hickman has very clearly and very lucidly this afternoon pointed out the maladministration of the Monroe Government and has prophesied their fate. They are drifting to their doom. I hope my remarks will be brief now, as there will be ample opportunity between now and the time the House closes—as we cannot be here any longer than July 9th when the term of office of the Government automat-

ically expires—to discuss any measures brought forward by the Government. However much I may differ from the conclusions and deductions drawn by Mr. Browne and Mr. Power from the Speech from the Throne, it is not my intention this afternoon to unduly criticise the statements they have made, as it is not considered proper form to discuss the Speech on opening day, but any measures that are brought in in Bills and Resolutions will be debated by us in due course. With regard to the proposer and seconder of the Motion for an Address in Reply and their associations with the Monroe Government, no doubt their action may be considered by them politically as a good one, because in 1924 they were younger and inexperienced men and were imbued with the idea that they could serve themselves and their country best by identifying themselves with the Monroe Party, considering the praiseworthy document that was put into their hands to present to their constituents. I do not criticise them for their action, rather do I sympathise with them, because they are supporting the Monroe Government. Some of us make up our minds to go under one person's banner and then we go under the banner of somebody else, and, of course, that is what these two gentlemen will do in a few weeks time. I am inclined to refer to one or two outstanding statements contained in that wonderful manifesto of the present Prime Minister four years ago, statements which no doubt were a delusion and a snare to 95 per cent of those who supported and voted for the Monroe Party at the last general election. However, the proposer and seconder of the Speech today have been with that party so long now that it is hardly worth while for them to cause any semblance or disloyalty to their leader at this juncture. We are

here today not at the will of the Prime Minister, and when this House prorogues in a few weeks' time, and the Prime Minister resigns, and no appeal to the electorate is made, irresponsible people will be running this country until next fall, such procedure, Mr. Speaker, I submit is not good enough.

Mr. Hickman has described the Government as a poor outcast polar bear on a pan of ice drifting towards the Gulf Stream. It seems to me to be like the funeral obsequies of the Monroe Administration. Perhaps it would be more correct if I described the Government as a corpse and the corpse has got to be buried at the public expense, because there is absolutely nothing to be gained by holding this session of the Legislature. We are here to pass estimates and vote ourselves our sessional pay and the session will cost the Colony some sixty thousand dollars. The Speech from the Throne foreshadows nothing. It contains only a suggestion and a hope. Therefore we are here to bury a Government at the public expense. The Prime Minister intimated through the public press that it was not his intention to lead a party, either in this House or at the polls this year. Then why are we here today? We are not here at the wish of the Prime Minister or at the will of those who have the best interests of the country at heart. Rather are we here at the behest of opportunists who want to hold on to positions of emolument, rightly or wrongly, and then to continue in office until November next. During the last session of the House the Prime Minister made a pronouncement that there was great necessity for the enactment of drastic legislation, but his ranks were so depleted he could not put through that legislation. He anticipated that something would happen within the

next twelve months that would strengthen his Government and enable him to come to this House and put thru the necessary legislature. Still the member for St. John's West today said that this Government would go on record for progress that was sound steady and consistent within the past years. The Honourable Member by his superior education has a gift of language by saying things that would make it difficult for the ordinary layman to understand. It bordered on sarcasm, but I would say that the progress he talks of brought death, difficulty and disaster in its train.

MR. SPEAKER; In noticing the countenance of the members of the Government since this House has been opened this afternoon it has been like the phases of the moon, sometimes full, sometimes waning. There was the idea "we are here another six months, and that will help us to get a little more fat and sleek than we are now, and we are fairly well as it is," and then the thought came that the patrimony we now enjoy will end with the decease of the present Government. The Government, rightly or wrongly, has been trying to hold on to office. I need not repeat that; everybody knows that. The Government, rightly or wrongly, has been trying to hold on to office. What for? Well; to departmental heads it means the loss of \$300 or \$400 a month, and then to the beloved army of followers in patronage received goodness knows how much it means. I sympathize with the Prime Minister to a certain extent; I can blame him from another point of view. As I told him last year, I would not be here to be the goat for a crowd that wants to remain on in office. I would not do it, and I wish I was as independent of men and means as he, and I would tell them to go to where they would not want the necessities of life.

In reference to the industrial situation and labour giving industries of this country, we can go back to the operation in Corner Brook and we can take our minds back for a few years and turn up the files of the newspapers and find criticism made against those who were trying to introduce those industries who were to bring into being those mills at Corner Brook. Why, it has been the salvation of this country; and it was thought last year that possibly another mill would be in operation on the Gander. We regret that that has fallen through but we hope that the next Government will bring the matter to a successful issue. I don't suppose it will be done now before the general election. But the present Government cannot take any credit for any industrial activities in the country at the present time. It was brought about in spite of some of the members and followers of the present Government and it was the irony of fate that some of those men who had opposed the proposition were there at the opening of the mills. Can the present Government point to any great labour giving industry? I am glad to hear the Finance Minister hopes to have a small deficit. We shall see more about that later. We all know that things can be covered up easily, especially when a Government is going out and they only have to let the other people take care of the trouble after they have covered things up. Anyway we are all glad to hear that the financial standing of the country is a little better than anticipated. When the present Government took charge in 1924 they said with regard to the seal-fishery and codfishery.

(Reads Extract)

What brought about this very desirable state of affairs? Was it because the Monroe Government was

in office six or seven weeks it led to employment? Absolutely not. The tide had been running adversely and they came in on the tidal wave of what appeared to be future prosperity when it turned for a while. That lasted for the next year; but what happened then?

Since then look at the huge price you had to pay to keep the people from getting the dole. Since 1924 you had to build the dock at a cost of two millions; spend two and a quarter millions on highroads, tourist roads, and a hotel; all visionary undertakings; which in a great many cases are a liability and a tax on the earnings of the country. Can this Government point to any one undertaking during its regime which means increased earning power to the people. You have increased the public debt several millions and have't been able to put the Gander on the map.

Mr. Speaker; I think it is better for me to stop as I may continue here and weary the ladies. I have no regard for the feelings of the gentlemen but I hope if God gives me strength that I will be out asking the ladies for their vote in a few weeks and I will not weary them with any further remarks on the subject matter before the chair. Now Mr. Browne the Member for St. John's West was very good. Of course he was inclined to get out of his depth a little when he talked about the seal fishery and codliver oil, talking about having a million gallons of codoil exported; but he did very well; he has superior knowledge and education [but] not having practical knowledge of these things. The seal fishery it is said brought remunerative results to the men. I cannot concur with that. It has brought very unsatisfactory results to the men prosecuting it this year. Do we ever hear talk of an arrangement between two

parties entering into a commercial undertaking whereby both parties get returns from that undertaking and what they receive depends on what the undertaking produces? Here we have the seal fishing industry and the men sign up for one third of the catch. It is generally regarded as actually one third of the catch and that the men can demand one-third of the seals to do what they want with them. This year the value of the cargo brought to St. John's from the icefields does not depend so much on the quantity of the fat as the quality of the skin because the value of the cargo depends more than it did on the value of the fur which is more in demand. Now the sealers before they went to the icefields wanted to know what price they would get for fat before then went out and the men interested in the seal fishery said "alright, we will pay you five dollars for fat"; but do you think that they would have so readily consented to offer \$5.00 for fat if they did not know that they could anticipate getting 3 seal skins for that amount of fat and these would possibly be worth \$4.00 each or \$12.00 for the three without any value at all on the fat. I don't think you are going to find men to go to the ice next spring without arranging their share as the fair value of the cargo. It will require some book-keeping but the merchants should get down to it, and place their cards on the table and give a statement of the gross earnings and expenses. That is the trouble; none of us are honest; as I have told some of my constituents asking for things I couldn't possibly get. I said if politicians and constituents were honest it would be a different world altogether. And we have to be if we want to get the confidence of the people.

I apologise Mr. Speaker and I thank you for your gracious indul-

gence for I have spoken not in a set speech but just as things came to my mind; just the general point of view and that is what we are all interested in. At any rate now that we are here, put your legislation on the table tomorrow. Bring it in and let us get through as quickly as possible. We should not be here; but now let us get through quickly.

MR CASHIN: Mr. Speaker; I did not intend to make any remarks here this afternoon but recent political events have forced me to the position that I have to take the opportunity this afternoon of making one or two personal explanations. Other speakers made reference to the Speech from the Throne that has been read by His Excellency the Administrator in the other Chamber and which was read by you Mr. Speaker to this House just a short time ago. With regard to the contents of that Speech I do not at the present time propose to deal with, but at some future date I propose to make a few casual remarks in reference thereto. It has been customary in the past that the annual political drama takes place in the Legislature and men on both sides of the House play their specific parts. This year the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved by my friend Mr. W. J. Browne and seconded by Mr. Power the Honourable Member for St. George's and they were replied to in customary manner by the Leader of the Opposition and he was followed by Mr. Halfyard who assumed a new leadership during the past few hours. And first while it has been customary for individuals to congratulate the various Members performing in the various roles. I regret that I feel that those individuals were placed in those positions to play their part in those roles and that there was no sincerity behind them. I will pass from that

matter for the present and I wish to refer to a circular letter issued by Mr. Hibbs the Member for Fogo a short while ago and with your permission I will just read one short paragraph which has personal reference to me. I might say Mr. Speaker that this letter was in the form of a manifesto it seems, but to be brief this afternoon I shall not deal with the contents of that famous document but shall refer to it later on in the Session, but for the benefit of the Members of the House and those outside the House some of whom probably may have a certain amount of confidence in me, especially the people I represent in Ferryland District, I feel it behooves me to make this explanation this afternoon.

(Reads Extract)

from circular letter referred to above

Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted here this afternoon I would put a construction on that paragraph which I regret to say would not be pleasing to the spectators who thought it worth while to come here and witness this annual drama.

I think that members on both sides of the House and people outside of the House will recognize the fact that if any man has fought the present administration fearlessly, if I must say so myself, honestly and straightforwardly, with neither backbiting nor dagger drawing, it was Peter J. Cashin, member for Ferryland, and I say here today that no member of the Opposition side of this House has used his efforts any better than I have done to defeat the present administration.

I have used my time and personal influence and I have fought a by-election, helped to fight them, and spent my own money on it and feel that I can use my mind and that it is pri-

vilege not to have to first apply to Mr. Hibbs or to any one else to ask them what I should or should not do.

I thank God that up to the present time I don't belong to either liberal party or tory party, because local political parties are so much nonsense, and we have to say here that you belong to one of these two parties, sometimes liberal and sometimes tory. There is not a member in the House who has not been on either side at one time or another, who has not been either Liberal or Tory, Tory if it suits them; Liberal if it suits them.

And there is really no Liberal party in Newfoundland because there is no strict policy of liberalism in this country.

There is no Liberal party in this country.

It is a case of every man for himself.

Mr. Hibbs, the writer of that circular; knows that its contents as far as I am concerned, is an absolute fabrication.

Those persons who associated themselves with me and with Mr. Brophy in connection with the by-election in St. John's East to defeat the present Government, know that I used every effort to beat the Government and that I helped to beat them, and Mr. Hibbs issued papers for which I paid for personally.

And behind my back he writes a base fabrication to his constituents in Fogo.

I will take the necessary steps within the next two weeks to prove my position and I am prepared to spend more dollars to tell why that circular was issued.

I have had my own opinions as regards the spring election and I don't think that is anyone's business.

I was always opposed to a spring election, but I think that if the different departments of the House will remember last summer and those who want to take the trouble to look up the Hansard, will find that I was strongly in favour of bringing about an election last fall.

I mentioned there then that the Monroe Administration had not the confidence of the people and I say again today that they have not got the confidence of the people, and as the Opposition members last year opposed the Monroe Administration today they come in here as members of Liberal and conservative parties and I will be doing my share in the House to fight the Government just as well as Mr. Hibbs or any other member of the Opposition, whether Liberal or Tory, and when the time arrives I can side-step to either of these, and that time is not going to be very long coming.

I have failed to hear any gentleman on this or the other side of the House give any consistent reason why there should be a spring election.

I agree that for political reasons it might be best for Mr. Hibbs to have a spring election.

At the present juncture I am in business in this country and all my interests are tied up in that business, and it is my duty to protect my business.

I feel that a spring election does not look out for trade or commerce in this country because the spring of the year is the time when everybody is preparing for the season's business and cannot be taken from his business for political doings of any kind.

But at this particular juncture that is the particular reason why I do not favour a spring election, and I re-

alize that the Members of the Monroe Administration want to stay here in office in order to draw their monthly pay as long as they can.

We see in the Speech from the Throne that we have got to raise a loan to pay the seven and a half millions coming due on the 30th of June.

Supposing for the sake of argument that we were having a spring election tomorrow. It was around this time that we had it three or four years ago. Supposing a spring election took place within the next two weeks no Government, Liberal or Tory could get into office before the first of June. The Legislature could not open until the 10th.

Could the necessary funds be raised and placed to the credit of the Colony in the Bank of Montreal by the 30th of June in order to meet the demand for the seven and a half millions due on that date?

What would happen then?

We would have people knocking down the doors of Customs House looking for their money and no money to pay them. Would the credit of the country be impaired. Certainly it would.

Members of this House who advocate a spring election have not got the interests of this Country at heart.

That is one of the reasons why I oppose a spring election. I oppose it now and I am not supporting the Government and I am not a member of either the Liberal or Tory party. Neither one matters a snap of the finger to me.

I would like during the course of this Session for Mr. Hibbs to explain why he thought fit to use my name in his Fogo manifesto without

my permission.

I think I am entitled to some recognition in this House.

I have never been approached by any member on the opposite side of the House to find out if I would support the Monroe Government and told them I did not want a spring election.

And if it comes down to brasstacks, when discussing various matters with the members of the Government, I told them that I was opposed to a spring election, I told them why they wanted to get rid of it was because they wanted to hold on to office.

I do not want a job in the Government, but I was opposed to it on principle, and I am prepared to stand up here until six o'clock and show Mr. Hibbs that I fought the Government harder than he ever fought it and ever could fight it and that when the election comes around I will fight it harder than he will.

Mr. Speaker I have to offer my apologies to the House and to those who took the trouble to come here to witness our annual drama for having to express myself in such a manner but I feel that in offering an explanation to the people you will realize that in view of the facts, there was no other course open to me, as one who has fought the Government consistently during the past three years.

I want to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that while the famous note said "Cashin and Moore left the Government two years ago" that the writer's memory lapsed because Cashin left one year before Moore.

I came across here first and Moore followed the next year.

And Mr. Speaker the writer may be able to turn to the records of the House and find out if the statements

that I made are correct or incorrect.

I left the Government in 1925 on policy. I went with the Government in 1924 pledged to certain conditions which they failed to carry out. When I had driven them as hard as I could, without avail I left them.

I am not ashamed to say so today.

The Monroe Administration knows that I did it with the best of intentions and members of the Opposition will agree and back me up when I say that from the time I crossed the floors of the House up to the present moment that Cashin fought consistently and that he will yet tell the Monroe administration where they get off before the present session closes.

We have heard several references made to the polar bear on a pan of ice but I think that I have coined an illustration of public life in this country as we have it today.

While there are many who go to the seal fishery once a year have a belt and sheath on for five or six weeks in order to help them with their seal fishery, there are some of the politicians who carry a belt and sheath the whole year around and draw the knife when they are not noticed to do injury to a public man.

I would like to know whether Mr. Hibbs has attempted to do me a political or a private injury.

It is of no interest to Mr. Hibbs whether I support the Government or not. No, he has another reason and before the Legislature closes I will tell him the reason.

But Mr. Hibbs has to explain why he arrived at such a position that he has brought my name into his manifesto and I want him to tell me right

here and now that that document is incorrect and if he states that it is correct and what he put in there is true, then he lies wilfully. And I demand right here in this Legislature that he proves the statements or take it back before this House and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who are noted for your fairness to both sides to see that it is done.

MR. HIBBS. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I desire to reply to the Honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat. While I scarcely expected that such an honour as becoming the subject of so much attention from my honourable friend would be thrust upon me this evening, I may say that it is not altogether a surprise to me. Though the medium of various telephone calls, and otherwise, I was informed this morning that Mr. Cashin had taken exception to a statement in a letter which I had recently sent through the mail to certain constituents of mine in the District of Fogo, and that he proposed coming into the House this evening to attack me with regard to the matter. I wish to say at the outset that I have no apology to make to Mr. Cashin or any other person because I wrote that letter. That was purely my own business. I represent an extern district and a number of intelligent electors of the District are anxious to be informed as to the trend of political developments, and it will not be disputed, I am sure, that it is part of my duty, among other things, to supply them with reliable information, and I shall continue to do so from time to time. Enquiries have often been made by them as to where Messrs. Cashin and Moore stood politically.

Mr. Speaker, before replying further to Mr. Cashin's remarks here this evening. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Posts and Tele-

graphs to the fact that the letter from which Mr. Cashin has read a paragraph, was stolen from the mail and brought to the Daily News Office, and there garbled for political purposes, and extracts from same published in yesterday morning's News, I repeat, Sir, that the article printed in the Daily News and purporting to have been sent to Fogo was manufactured in that office and the writer did not hesitate to stoop to the depth of making a sectarian appeal for the purpose of injuring me. Had the author of this infamous transaction been clever enough to wait for a few days more until a return mail would have time to come from Fogo, then he may not have been caught redhanded. No person in Fogo, either friend or foe, would think of writing such a letter as appeared in yesterday's News, and furthermore at the moment when this scheme was being hatched in the Daily News office that lying article was being written, the mail carrying my letters had not even reached Fogo, not to speak of a reply coming back.

Mr. Speaker, I assert here this evening that His Majesty's mail was tampered with and one at least of the letters, which I had posted in the regular way, has been stolen and that the Daily News knew of that fact when that garbled report was written and, Sir, a gentleman who represents that newspaper is holding a seat opposite me in this House, and I challenge him to make an affidavit that what I have said here this evening is not correct.

MR. PUDDISTER.—I do not want to make an affidavit; it is absolutely incorrect.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but my knowledge of the incident and the gentleman in question, makes it impossible for me to accept

that statement, and I again challenge him to make an affidavit. We are now come to the position in this Country when even His Majesty's Mail is not safe.

MR. CASHIN.—I suppose that the honorable member does not mean to insinuate that I was a party to breaking into the post office and stealing the document.

MR. HIBBS.—I made no such statement, but I do most emphatically state that the letter or circular, if you like, was stolen from the Mail and brought to the Daily News office, and I must ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to take due notice of this fact.

Mr. Speaker, I am standing behind every word and syllable in that circular letter from the first to the last word. It contains no statement that was not correct, and I shall be glad to present every gentleman in this House with a copy, if they so desire. It will not do the government members any harm if they have a copy of that letter, as it contains a statement of my opinion of the Government's policy, an opinion which is shared by the people of the Country, and it gives expression to my own views as plainly as I can, and will, express them on the floors of this House during the Session.

With respect to the particular statement complained of by Mr. Cashin and Mr. Moore, although the latter has not yet spoken, it is hardly necessary for me to read the paragraph, as Major Cashin has done so, and I am sure that every person in this chamber has had an opportunity of hearing it, as he possesses a very good voice.

Now, Sir, if I were to make a statement in a letter with reference to Mr. Cashin, or any other person that

was not correct, I would not hesitate to withdraw it. I would be sorry to misinterpret anyone's attitude, but with reference to the incident in question, I want to ask Major Cashin if he remembers walking down Water Street with me some time in January, and in discussing the political situation, making the statement to me that he intended to support the Government as against the Opposition in order to keep the Government in power until the Fall of the year. I now ask Major Cashin if he will deny this statement.

MAJOR CASHIN.—I might have said that, but I am opposed to a Spring election.

MR. HIBBS.—I again ask Major Cashin if it is correct that he stated to a prominent public man, whose word I am prepared to accept, when leaving his presence some time the past Winter, that he was then going down to see Mr. Monroe to offer him his support against the Opposition, in order that the Monroe Government may carry on till the Fall of the year.

I have had the pleasure of a conversation with Mr. Cashin in his office on two occasions recently, and we, in a friendly way, discussed the political situation. We disagreed on some questions, and Mr. Cashin at least conveyed to me the impression that he would not be supporting the Opposition. The statement in my letter to Fogo constituents stated the facts as I understood them from Mr. Cashin himself.

With regard to Mr. Moore, it is well known that he has repeatedly made similar statements during the last few months, and I am sure that there are hundreds within the sound of my voice this afternoon who realise that the honorable gentleman had offered to support the Government

and to keep it in office until the Fall of the year.

I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and say right here that if a resolution was moved this evening by the Opposition retaining office after their legitimate time expires that Major Cashin and Mr. Moore would support the Government as against the Opposition. That, I think, confirms all that was said in the circular letter complained of.

The writer in the News endeavored to raise the sectarian issue because I mentioned only the names of Mr. Cashin and Mr. Moore. No person in Newfoundland who knows Hibbs, would associate my name with a sectarian appeal. No person in this country has ever known me to bring the question of religion into my politics. I have never done so, and I never will. If one wishes to find sectarian fire bugs, you have only to go to the newspaper office from which that letter was published.

The object of this low down attack was to cause strife because Mr. Cashin, Mr. Moore and myself do not happen to worship at the same shrine. Those contemptible tactics are too well known to have much effect.

With regard to a Spring election, I am strongly in favor of an election in the early Spring, and it is sheer nonsense to talk about upsetting trade, but I do not think that I should discuss this question at this juncture, but will express myself in this connection later on.

With regard to Mr. Cashin's statement that he would take up this subject later in the Session, I assure him that he will find me quite willing to debate the question when the occasion arises, and I think it will be proven to his satisfaction that the paragraph in that letter was correct and con-

tained no suggestion of a sectarian tinge.

MR. CASHIN.—I did not say that anything sectarian was meant.

MR. HIBBS.—Well the same cannot be said of the Daily News, as that object was deliberately planned.

In concluding, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that two prominent gentlemen in a telephone conversation this morning, stated that they were prepared to prove that the honourable gentleman for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, had stated to them within the last few days that he was going to support the Government in the event of any vote that would interfere with their remaining in office until next Fall.

MR. MOORE.—Name them?

MR. HIBBS.—That has been common knowledge through the City for some time past and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am standing behind every word in that circular and have no apologies to make to any man.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be the afternoon for testifying and I hope and trust that you will give me the privilege that you have given my colleague and the honorable member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs. I must first congratulate Mr. Brown and Mr. Power. I think that their speeches this afternoon create a different atmosphere from what they did last year, and I heartily congratulate these two gentlemen. I must also congratulate the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, upon his efforts this afternoon. But now to refer to what brought me to my feet, in connection with this circular issued to the electorate of the district of Fogo, by my honorable friend, Mr. Hibbs. Mr. Hibbs did not have my permission to use my name in that connection. I did not walk down the

street with him and tell him that I was going to support the Government in any way, and I want to make the statement now that no member of the Government and no supporter of the Government ever asked me to support them in any measure that was coming before this Chamber. It is a case of making a hunt of the poor bayman again. That is the meaning of that paragraph there. He knew very well that Major Cashin and myself never intended to support the Government. I left the Government and came over here for certain reasons. I owe no allegiance to any man in this House, except the party that sent me to represent them and the people of this country. When any legislation comes down here for the betterment of this country, I intend to support it, irrespective of any party. If I am privileged to go to the polls during the next election, I hope that I will go in a party that this country can look up to and respect. I want to state that the paragraph in that epistle that was sent to Fogo District by Mr. Hibbs is false. And I am going to take the first opportunity that I possibly can to contradict that statement in the district of Fogo. And I will tell them something possibly that they would like to hear.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for granting me permission to make this contradiction.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at the present time to discuss the Speech from the Throne. Early this year an editorial appeared in the Evening Telegram with regard to having prayer offered at the opening of the session. I had hopes that the editorial would have been considered by the Government and that some prayer would have been offered up to Almighty God at the opening of this session. I deem it

my duty to bring to the attention of of the Prime Minister and the members of this House the fact that no provision has been made in this parliament for a prayer to Almighty God and I would suggest that each day that the House is open that a passage of the Scripture should be read and the Lord's Prayer repeated. We have just recently taken a new coat of arms on which are the words in Latin:

"Quaerite prime regnum Dei" which means "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."

We are told that if we seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness that all other things will be added unto us, and I believe that if we acknowledge Him in all our ways that he will direct our paths.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks just made by Mr. Ashbourne, I would like to support the suggestion made by him. It is not anything new that he has suggested. It is a daily occurrence in the Congress of the United States to have some representative of one denomination or another to open the proceedings of parliament with a short prayer and it must have some influence in the House in having debates conducted along the proper lines, and I trust that the Government will consider the suggestion that has been made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, we have listened to many addresses this afternoon, but I am not quite sure whether every member who has spoken represents a different party. We had a great many parties at last session, but they were not so well defined as they are this year. I would like, Sir, to congratulate Mr. Browne and Mr. Power on the very excellent addresses they

made this afternoon, and I particularly congratulate the official Leader of the Opposition, inasmuch as he had the hardihood to stand by the position he assumed when this Assembly first came into being. It seems to me that it was very absurd, very unkind and very rude for members of the Opposition to try and throw aside Mr. Hickman at this last session of the Assembly after he had been good enough to act as their leader for four years. I can see no possible sense in that ridiculous statement that was forwarded to me this morning through the Speaker. The statement has been read to this House by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon and it sets out that there is going to be created a Liberal Legislative group. As far as we are concerned we only know a Government and an Opposition. We have no Sir Richard Squires in this House, and there is no sense in having any distinct and separate leader representing his political group. For that reason I say that when Mr. Halfyard referred to Mr. Browne and Mr. Power supporting a Leader in the House this year because it was hardly worth their while to change, so do I say to him that it was hardly worth his while and others to change at this late hour, after being four years in office under the leadership of Mr. Hickman.

With regard to the Manifesto that Mr. Hibbs saw fit to send out to his constituents in Fogo district, I think that the member for Ferryland has a great deal of justification in feeling injured. Why should I receive the first notification of the fact that Mr. Cashin and Mr. Moore were going to support me in this House through the Manifesto of the member for Fogo. Neither Mr. Cashin nor Mr. Moore has ever approached me with even a suggestion that they were going to support me in this House, and, if

they had, I would have been inclined, as has been suggested by Mr. Halfyard, to tell them that it was hardly worth while to bother about it now. We have our nineteen members as we had at last session and we are quite prepared to carry through the legislation necessary. It is perfectly true that our ranks being depleted somewhat made it difficult for us the past few years to put through legislation that we would have liked to have enacted, but we have carried on as usual, and I have no regrets to express and no reason to feel in any way ashamed of anything we have done. We will go out of office at the end of our term, feeling quite satisfied that we have done our best and feeling that no other body of men would have done better.

Reference has been made to the absence of a spring election, and we are told that we should not have carried on into this session of the Legislature, but we then pointed out that if it had been found desirable to hold an election last Fall it would have been impossible to hold it in the light of the multitude of detail work that was brought about by the Re-distribution Bill and Women's Franchise Bill. However, I called the party together in the early Spring of the year and I told them that I was in no way desirous of holding on to office and I wanted them to decide if there should be a Spring election. The members of my party unanimously decided that, speaking for their constituents and not for themselves, they did not want a Spring election. Mr. Browne called attention this afternoon to the fact that away back in 1861 the members sitting in the Legislature at that time decided that there was to be no more Spring elections, as they were not in the best interests of the country. Well, I had experience of only three elections in my life, two of them in

the Spring, and I have no desire to go through any more Spring elections. Not only is a Spring election inconvenient for members getting around this country to their constituents, owing to conditions in the Spring which makes it impossible for people to see their constituents, but what is the good of holding a general election unless the electorate is informed of what is going and can know the true condition of things. Now there would be no talk of a Spring election at all if in 1923 the Squires administration had finished their term and given an account of their stewardship for their four years of office; but, instead they went to the country in 1923 and shouted "Humber," "Humber," when there was no need of holding a general election and when the entire legislature were agreed to the Humber deal. The whole country at that time was perfectly agreed on the Humber business, but the Squires administration brought about the Spring election for the reason I have mentioned.

A great deal has been said about the Speech from the Throne this afternoon and I do not propose to dwell on it at any length, because I know that some of the ladies here this afternoon are already tired from listening to "wordy" parliamentarians; but I would like to refer to one remark made by Mr. Halfyard in which he said that we were not able to put through the Gander proposition. I think this requires a little explanation, because I deplore the fact that there is not in the immediate future the labor-giving operations for our people that I would like to see coming and it is for that reason that the Government is trying as soon as possible to make provision for the diversions of the railway through Buchans Mine and around Howley. The Government felt it necessary to suggest this because it was evident that there

is no immediate work in view for our people on a large scale and that is to some extent due to the fact that the Gander is not coming into being, but it is through no fault of the Government that it is not coming into being. in December 27th last I communicated with the I. P. & P. Company to know if there was any progress being made with the Gander proposition and I got this reply back from Mr. Head. The correspondence that exchanged between us is as follows:

(Copy.)

December 21, 1927.

Neil C. Head,
International Paper Co.,
Pershing Building,
Park Ave. & 42nd St.,
New York.

A matter in connection with possible sale of a quantity of rails at Glenwood is reason for asking you again when we may expect a decision regarding Gander development.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE.

(Copy.)

New York, December 27, 1927.

Hon. Walter S. Monroe,
St. John's, Nfld.

Charlton's figures on Gander proposition practically complete and they show construction at Gander impossible and only solution is four additional machines at Corner Brook. Suggest you appoint Engineer to represent you and verify our figures. This requires Engineer familiar not only with water power but also paper mill construction and cost of production. Outstanding men in country are Hardy, Ferguson and George F. Hardy. Ferguson made up Reid figures, which eliminates him, so I would suggest George Hardy as best man obtainable. He is not employed by or connected with us. His ad-

dress is 309 Broadway, New York City. As Charlton must leave here January 10th at latest for St. John's would appreciate prompt appointment your Engineer. This answers your wire of December 21st.

(Sgd.) N. C. HEAD.

(Copy.)

St. John's, Nfld.,
December, 29, 1927.

Neil C. Head, Esq.,
International Paper Co.,
Pershing Building,
New York.

Government extremely disappointed. As I understood Reid's Engineers were getting together with yours and failing an agreement with them a third party was to be called in to decide if scheme could be economically carried out. What object is there in our having figures checked if under any circumstance you have decided not to build mill on Gander.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE.

(Copy.)

New York, December 30, 1927.

Hon. Walter S. Monroe,
St. John's.

We are in practical agreement with Reid Engineers on amount of water power available Gander and cost of development power. We differ with Reids on amount of power required to produce ton of paper and consequently size dam required is greatly in excess that proposed by Reids. This high cost dam makes cost of producing paper at Gander prohibitive. We are willing to go forward with all conditions Gander charter if allowed build two Gander machines at Corner Brook which would mean four additional machines at Corner Brook by 1928 with minimum expenditures starting 1929 as provided in charter.

If our figures are correct no one can build at Gander which justifies Government removing requirement mill be located on Gander. If our figures are wrong will be glad to be shown by your engineers. We assumed Government would prefer check our figures independently before taking any action based on them.

(Sgd.) NEIL C. HEAD.

(Copy.)

December 31, 1927.

N. C. Head,
International Paper Co.,
Pershing Building,
New York.

Government does not feel under existing circumstances that it should take any definite action seeing nothing has been heard from Gander Valley Company with whom contract was made.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE.

That is the policy we adopted last winter and that is the policy we adopted this spring when the I. P. & P. Company and the Reids came along with an agreement that had been signed between them. We said to the International people "let you both come together with your proposition and let us know what you want and then we will listen to you." The Gander Valley & Power Company refused to come. I understand the Reids feel confident that they can get somebody to come to build a mill on the Gander and I am glad if they can, but if a mill is not to be built on the Gander it might be more advantageous to have additional units at Corner Brook together with another glorified Hampden.

We have a mill on which we guaranteed ten millions at Corner Brook and naturally we don't want to see it fail. I don't think it is going to fail.

If there were added four additional units so that the mill were doubled up, I don't think there is any question at all about it now. If we had an assurance that they were going to build at the Gander or Corner Brook there would be immediately development and some labor given, if they are going to build four additional units at Corner Brook there would unquestionably be other work building a \$600,000.00 pier at Port aux Basques which W. I. Bishop has made plans for. The International Paper Company have taken over the interests of Mr. Crowe in Bay D'Espoir water power and there are ten millions or somewhere thereabouts to be spent in developing a power which that Company will probably sell. The Government has at present the amount of \$130,000.00 on deposit for the security of the development of that water power within five years, and we all know the International Paper Company has as much interest in the development of power as in the sale of paper. Their business is the development of power as well as paper manufacturing and they have plants where they develop power for the purpose of selling to other industries. When that industry is developed there will be another great big industry somewhere in the neighborhood of Bay D'Espoir. These are matters of importance, but they don't give immediate relief. The mine at Buchans is an important development, an enormously valuable thing for the country. I look forward to the time when the returns to the Government from that industry are going to pay at least half the interest on the public Dept. I am perfectly satisfied that is coming about; but in the meantime even Buchan's Mine is not going to give us any very enormous labour relief. The working of a mine as you can understand may be compared in this respect to the dis-

charging of a schooner load of fish. While working in the hatch only a few men are required but when half the cargo is out you can put a large staff of men out to do a lot of work, Buchan's Mine now is the "hatchways" stage. Three hundred men is as much probably as will be required; and so the Government is considerably concerned as to the labour situation, and and that is one of the reasons why we bring forward this proposition to get work by doing something that will eventually be a saving to the country that is putting the railway around in another direction. It should have been done in my opinion long ago and the fact that Buchan's Mine is on the main line of the deviation necessary, is all the more inducement for the doing of it now.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this session of the legislature is going to be a pleasant one, in spite of some parties that are going probably to have a little bit of a fling at one another in the opposition ranks. I have no reason to suppose that the gentlemen sitting opposite are not as desirous of getting out of this House as we are ourselves, and they certainly will have all the opportunity they want for talking politics the next six or eight months; and consequently I ask the Members of the various opposition parties to do their best not to waste any time. We like to see Mr. Halfyard get on his feet, but sometimes we like to see him getting off them, because he has a habit sometimes of speaking a little longer than he intended to do. Some of the members of the House may feel it is necessary again to take out my Manifesto which has been read so strenuously to me the last four years and read it again before I go, but I ask even in respect to that to restrain themselves.

There is a group now that have advertised themselves this afternoon;

we don't know who is behind the other groups. Mr. Hickman has not told us whether he controls the rest of the gentlemen in the House on the other side; but Mr. Halfyard apparently has brought his party together and they represent part of the executive probably of the next Government that they think is coming into power. All I can say is if they do come in power and have as fine a looking group sitting in their ranks as I see sitting opposite, I shall feel very much like getting a seat in the Opposition in order to have a good look at them.

I want to congratulate again the gentlemen who moved and seconded the motion for the address in reply.

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS

It was moved by Mr. Browne and seconded by Mr. Power that an Address of Thanks be presented to His Excellency the Administrator in Reply to the gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature, and that Select Committee be appointed to draft such an Address in Reply. The Committee to consist of Mr. Browne, Mr. Power, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Randall.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Randall gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Before the House adjourns I would like to make a formal motion that the House place on record an expression

of sympathy to the relatives of the late Honorable Mr. Justice Warren, former member and one time Prime Minister, and the late Hon. Mr. Power of the Legislative Council.

I need not say how Mr. Justice Warren, who was a great personal friend of mine, whilst accepting a seat in this House, was respected as one of those who deports himself well and was considerate of every other man's views in this House.

Never was there a member who was more popular than Mr. Justice Warren, and his death, at a very youthful age and when he had just attained to his position on the Bench, was a tragedy that I think the whole community felt.

The Honorable Mr. Power was the first Chairman of the Municipal Council, a member of the Legislative Council and a man of very high character. He was father of the member for St. George's, who has spoken this afternoon.

I beg to move the resolution just read.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to second the resolution of sympathy proposed by the Honorable Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Justice Warren passed away a few months ago and on his passing has left a vacancy which the Government has apparently found difficult to fill.

Mr. Warren was connected with this House for many years and represented many districts, the last of which was the district of Fortune, where he was elected as an independent candidate, by a very large majority, showing his personal popularity amongst his constituents.

He was known as a courteous gentleman, respected in the social, legal, and legislative ranks and is sure to be very much missed.

During the last few months of his life he bore the burden of a terrible disease that was upon him and he bore it with all the joy of those who see in death only the severance from his strongest ties for only a short time.

I also wish to second the resolution of sympathy to the relatives of Hon. Michael Power, member of the Upper House.

I had known the Hon. Mr. Power for many years. He was one of the first men I knew when I came to St. John's. He was then interested in civic affairs, in the commerce of the city and carried on a large mercantile coöperation. The export of packed cod fish was just beginning then and he supplied many of the packages.

He was highly respected by everyone and I am sure that though his age was great he will be sorely missed by everyone.

I wish to second the resolution of sympathy proposed by the Prime Minister.

MR. HALFYARD.—I wish to associate myself with the Honorable mover and seconder of the vote of condolence before the Chair to the relatives and friends of the Hon. Mr. Justice Warren and the Hon. Mr. Power

I think that it was twenty-four years ago since I first saw Mr. Warren to know him. That was at a political meeting at Carbonear. Dr. Lloyd and Mr. Warren were holding a joint meeting and I was chairman for them. I enjoyed that meeting very much.

Mr. Warren was very young at that time, but very soon after he came

here and has played many parts in the public and political life of this Colony and with credit to himself and no doubt he used his best talents to the advancement of the country. I sat with him on the Council board when he was Attorney General during the most trying time when the country was passing through a difficult period and he was always quick in his decisions as Attorney General.

He attained to what I suppose is the ambition of most lawyers, to become a judge of the Supreme Court. His promising life was cut short and we express our sorrow and regret.

I knew Hon. Mr. Power during the Squires Administration and I was led to have the greatest admiration for him.

In the past he has helped make this country what it is and without him it would have been a lot worse.

I am glad to associate myself in this motion.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Mr. Hickman seconded the following Resolution:

RESOLVED—That this House place on record an expression of its sympathy with the relatives of the late Hon. Mr. Justice Warren, a former Member of this House and one time Prime Minister of the Colony, and of the late Hon. Michael Power, lately a Member of the Legislative Council.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS gave notice that he would on tomorrow move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend

Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals.'"

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the guaranteeing of a Loan for the Directors of the Church of England College.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to Harbor Regulations and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Society Act."

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.

THURSDAY, May 3rd, 1928.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Ashbourne, from Moreton's Harbor, re Telephones;

Mr. Hibbs, from Noggin Cove, re Coastal Steamer.

REPORTS TABLED

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the following statistics relating to the St. John's Municipal Council: Revenue for the year 1927.

Expenditure for the year 1927.

Balance Sheet for the year 1927.

Estimated Revenue for the year 1928.

Estimated Expenditure for the year 1928.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—tabled Report of the Board of Liquor Control for the year ended January 31st, 1928.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

MR. BROWN on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency the Administrator's Speech, presented the report of the Select Committee, which was on motion received and read, as follows:

"To His Excellency Sir William Henry Horwood, Knight, Administrator and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Colony of Newfoundland:

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

Signed,

W. J. BROWNE,
THOS. J. POWER
J. C. PUDDESTER,
T. W. G. ASHBOURNE,
I. R. RANDELL

Assembly Room, May, 1928."

DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker, before the report is formally adopted I would like to avail of the opportunity to say a word or two on the motion before the Chair. We are proposing by this motion to thank His Excellency the Administrator for the Address which he delivered to us yes-

terday. Of course we all of us know, and it has time and again been repeated from the floors of this House that the Address is, as a matter of fact, the Address of the Government, put into the hands of His Excellency the Administrator and delivered for the special occasion on the opening day. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I should say at the start that it is not my intention to speak at any great length to the motion now before the Chair. Nevertheless, on the other hand, I feel that one has a sort of duty to discharge and as a representative of the people, ought to avail of an opportunity like this and not merely to reflect one's own opinions on such questions as arise, but to reflect what is perhaps the opinion and feeling of the people he happens to represent in this Chamber. We are here witnessing or enacting what Mr. Halfyard referred to yesterday afternoon as the last scene in the last act of the drama of the Monroe administration, and the evils of this administration and the effect of those evils upon the country are so generally well known now and have become public property to such an extent that it is not really necessary that any of us from this side of the House, as strongly as we may be opposed to the Administration, it is scarcely necessary for us to labor them much longer. The Prime Minister speaking with a good deal of what I might term effrontery, referred to his Manifesto and said if we were to trot it out again to read he hoped that we would make the operation as short as possible, or words to that effect. He hoped, I suppose, in order that, as far as he was concerned, it would be less painful. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Prime Minister ought to have that Manifesto read to him again this session, and I don't know but it ought to be read to him every day while this debate on the Address in Reply is on. It may be of interest

to him to know that there are some people in the country still interested in that Manifesto. Only a few days ago I received a letter from a man asking me if I could procure a copy of the Prime Minister's Manifesto. I told him I was very sorry I could not, as the only copy I had was my own, and I had no intention of parting with this document at least for some time to come yet. It is customary for speakers on this side of the House to convey a word of congratulation or something of that nature to those fulfilling the onerous duties of proposer and seconder of the motion for an Address in Reply to the Administrator. Yesterday that duty was performed by Mr. Browne, the honorable member for St. John's West, and Mr. Power, member for St. George's. I feel that as the member for St. John's West with his scholastic abilities and his great abilities in other directions was worthy of a better task than the one which his Government committed to him yesterday. Nevertheless, he made the best of a bad job, and if there is one aspect of his remarks, one aspect more than another, which must have struck members in this chamber and those who were listening, it was the fact that the honorable member could not have been speaking from conviction. As a matter of fact, he had a hard job to perform and he did the best he could, but neither by his voice nor his language did he convey a ring of conviction or a ring of sincerity, and if the honorable member was as sincere as he professed to be yesterday afternoon and had sufficient feelings within his breast to equal the spirit that he professed, I am sure his remarks would have carried a good deal more conviction than they did carry and probably some people might have gone away convinced that after all there was

some good left in the Monroe administration and after all perhaps they were not quite so bad as painted from time to time by their opponents. But, I repeat that the honorable member's whole attitude and lack of sincerity was such that the majority of people within sound of his voice had no doubt but that he certainly was not speaking from anything like conviction and sincerity. He was especially weak, I noticed, on the subject of a General Election. He carried us back to the days of the younger Pitt and from a historical reference to what happened in those days, tried to establish some sort of precedent for the conduct of the Monroe Government in having the effrontery to attempt another session of the Legislature. He went back again to 1861 in our local history and pointed out that the gentlemen, estimable gentlemen no doubt in their day and generation, had made the rule that there be no Spring elections in Newfoundland.

There is one thing that has been repeated here time and again that it is a privilege of the people and that we have no right in certain instances to legislate for future generations, and if the honorable member felt so strongly on the subject of the general election and is so well informed on practice in connection with it, I submit he was just as well informed in 1923 and 1924. Then it is a wonder, with all his knowledge of historical conditions in the country, he was not prevented by these precedents from taking part in those two elections. The honorable member was not at all restrained by the fact that those people in 1861 had said there should be no Spring election and was glad enough in the 1923 and 1924 Spring elections to take part. So I think in that instance, at least, I have proved my contention that the honorable

member could not be speaking from conviction when making those references.

Now there are some other remarks that were made by the honorable member for St. John's West that I shall refer to later in my remarks this afternoon.

That remark of his in which reference is made to the icy blast from the North and I also notice that he said that if the people of the country had the issue of a general election placed before them and had been informed of the disadvantages of having a Spring election as forcibly as the contrary had been placed before them, they would perhaps have a different opinion today.

I feel that the honorable member had me in mind when he made that statement in that connection. I have done a great deal of travelling during the past winter, up and down the country and I had something to say here and there on the subject of a general election, but I would tell the honorable member and this House that as I came in contact with the people, it was no creation of mine for the feeling already existed as I have expressed it here this afternoon, that there should have been a general election this spring. I am only giving you that section of the public opinion that I came into contact with since the last session of the Legislature.

The Honorable Member for St. George's is coming on and I should judge from his remarks that he is taking a keen interest in those substantial things in which the majority of the people are interested.

Mr. Power, I take it, does not claim to be such a scholar as the member for St. John's West, but he showed

in the course of his remarks that he was interested in some features vitally concerning the laboring people of this country of ours, and I listened with a great deal of interest to those remarks, and trust that I will have a word to say to him as well .

He talked, too, very sensibly on worth-while features, particularly the lobster fishery, and I trust that his optimistic views will work out in effect, but I very much fear if lobsters are going to pay this spring. If I thought so, and if the honourable member had substantial authority to quote the figures given to him, and good reason to be obtained. I know many people on the Coast of Newfoundland who would be only too glad to obtain \$22,00 a case for their lobsters during the middle of summer.

But I am digressing, Mr. Speaker.

We are here on the fifth session of the Monroe Administration and I contend that we ought not to be here today, at least not in the complication that we are.

I contend that we are here this year and we should not be here, because there should have been an appeal to the country.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I say so unhesitatingly, that the present monroe administration are here playing false to the people of the country and to the failing to give the electorate and the people that square deal that they promised so readily and easily in 1924.

We have heard a great deal of talk as to what effect a general election in the spring would have on the trade of the country, and we are told that the group that stands on this side of the House today, which was so much

referred to yesterday, wanted a general election this spring because it was politically expedient for them to have a general election.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it was political expediency, and political expediency alone, that kept the present Government from having an election in the Spring, and if the present administration found it politically expedient to have a general election last autumn they would have had it; and if they found it expedient to do so in the spring they would have had it. They had some doubt as to the advisability, so they started to put their house in order, for the very fact that they took the voters' list showed that they expected something. If they did not contemplate the expediency of having a general election this spring, if they did not contemplate the situation, I believe they would not be in such a hurry to have the voters' list taken during the middle of winter.

You were contemplating an election but for the sake of political expediency, you decided not to have it and you kept the House closed until the second day of May when you knew that it would be too late for a general election to be warranted, either politically or financially.

That is the way that you are playing false with the people of this country.

Putting aside the question of political expediency of your conduct and the conduct of the group on this side of the House, and putting aside any historical precedents, you know as well as I do, that there should have been a general election and an appeal to the people of the country this spring.

I am not going to spend any time discussing the constitutional posi-

tion, but I do say the position that you are taking is an outrage to the constitution of this country.

You are not only outraging the wishes and feelings of the people of at least two-thirds of the people of this country, but you are outraging the constitution and creating a situation in this country that would not be tolerated in any other British Dominion. And what have the legal gentlemen of the other side of the House to say about that. We are creating a new precedent that would not be tolerated under the British flag to-day.

We have information from the Prime Minister that it is his intention to retire from public life.

Listening in on the radio when the Prime Minister made a rather fine speech from a certain social gathering in town, and I recollect that he promised, in the course of his remarks, to some people in Bonavista Bay, a radio receiving set.

I thought it was a very generous offer; and he followed it up with the explanation that he did not wish his offer to be construed in a political sense, that he merely wanted to do something for the people of the district that put him into office.

He quoted from President Coolidge, that he "did not choose to run" or was not going to run, or something of that sort; but his meaning was absolutely clear.

It is plain that the Prime Minister proposes to retire, and he will be retiring before the general election takes place. He has to recommend to His Excellency the Administrator some other gentleman in his ranks, or out of them, to form a Government. That gentleman will undertake the job and form a Government and we

will have a Government directing the affairs of this country responsible to nobody, referred to yesterday as an Irresponsible Government. Irresponsible, not in the worst sense of the word, but in the general sense of the word; responsible to nobody, requiring no mandate from the people of the country for any action of theirs, and need never appear before the electorate either for confirmation of authority or condemnation.

And if you are looking for a precedent, and if you are going back to the time of the younger Pitt and 1861 to establish a precedent for your conduct of today, I submit, that the Government is establishing a precedent here in this House this session, and a very dangerous precedent and one that should not be established as being unfair to the generations that follow us in this Chamber.

The people of this country want a general election and want an election this spring.

I take the position that you cannot adduce two substantial arguments showing that a general election in the spring would have interfered with the trade.

I would go to the fish exporting business. What would the general election have to do with the business of supplying goods to the fishermen. If the price of Labrador fish is good enough to warrant any fish exporting firm in this country supplying largely for the fishery or taking on more men, they would do so, a general election notwithstanding.

The fact that there was a general election in the country this spring would not for one minute interfere with the business of a fish-supplying firm prepared to increase its business because the market conditions war-

rant it in so doing. If any fish-exporting firm has found that the market conditions seem to warrant them going into the market, the fact that the general election is on would not cause them to alter their plans.

Firms are dropping out this year of the Labrador fishery. Does any one mean to tell me that if there had been a general election they would have been inclined to go ahead and supply.

No firm intending to enlarge its business will be interfered with by the fact that there is a general election.

Mr. Speaker, as regards the retail stores on the streets in this city. The business of these stores would not be interfered with by the fact that there was a general election; it would not in any sense be interfered with.

I have talked with a good many men who have been in contact with the retail business here and only one man that I met put up the argument that an election interfered with his trade. Although he is a very able man, he has no argument after all. His argument is that he will not sell as much goods. This is no argument, because of their very nature the goods will sell and it will not interfere with him if it sold at a different time. The spring is the wrong time and it is in the autumn of the year that most of the business is done. It is in the autumn that the outport people come into St. John's and goods are bought by the city people themselves and that is the time when the firms on Water Street will likely show the largest sales.

The argument that a Spring election interferes with trade holds no weight, and I would challenge business men on either side of the House or with-

in the limits of the city to adduce sufficient arguments showing how a general election this spring interferes with the trade of the country. This argument was originated by the supporters and friends of the Government themselves, and has been handed along by their friends, no doubt in the hope that it would accumulate to a large proportion and be considered a deterrent to those agitating for a spring election. The people of this country want to sever themselves from the Monroe administration. They want to send the Monroe administration about its business. The people of this country have found that the Monroe administration has not played fair with them. The Monroe administration has not done all those things it ought to have done, and it has left undone those things which it ought to have done. Not all of those things in the Prime Minister's Manifesto have been done, and many things to which no reference has been made in the Manifesto without a mandate from the people for so doing, and the result has been that the people of this country have been disgusted. The people of the country not only wanted a general election this spring in order to rid themselves of the present administration, but they wanted a general election this spring in the hope that they would be able to replace it by an administration that would make some effort to give better effect to their own wishes and desires. This administration professed to be the friend of the common people of the country in 1924. This administration conveniently forgot the common people of the country and went and made friends, as it were, with the mammon of iniquity. The administration that sits opposite me to-day has not in any sense been the administration which the Prime Minister envisaged before the country in the

Manifesto of his in 1924. The administration which sits here in the House today against the wishes of the people of this country is an administration which has conveniently forgotten the common people of the country as soon as they were safely in office, and went and made it their business to exercise themselves to the fullest extent on behalf of those industries that were well able to take care of themselves. I defy the Prime Minister to bring down on the table of this House the various Acts and Statutes which have been passed since this administration came into power and show this Legislature and the country where, throughout the five sessions of this administration, it has tabled any one Act which in any way tends to improve or ameliorate the conditions under which the average man has got to live in this country.

On the other hand, he can bring down all the Statutes that have been passed during the last five years and it would be no difficult matter for this House and the public to discover there its great solicitude for what I term the big business of the country. I do not make this statement because I am averse to your doing all that is lawful and necessary and that ought to be done to settle the business of this country by giving a helping hand to industries when they require it, but I do say that in your eagerness to do all you can to advance the big interests, so to speak, in this country, your biggest crime is this, that you have forgotten to do anything for the common people to whom you were pledged in 1924. That is another reason why the electorate of this country want to dispense with your services. Apparently you are not as anxious to retire as the electorate are to retire you. I am reminded of Bright's Parody on Gray's Elegy. The Parody, I think, goes something like this:

“quotes”

Indeed, Sir, the administration finds it difficult to leave the warm precincts of its treasures. Indeed, Sir, honorable members holding Government positions find it hard to make up their minds that they have to part with the control of affairs, and I have no doubt but that the friends of the Administration feel in a similar way as regards every source of income from the present administration. I charge that not only have you betrayed the people in denying them an appeal to the country this Spring; I charge that you not only outraged constitutional practice and created a very dangerous precedent for future parliaments to follow, if they choose to recognise it, but that you have shown to the country that after all your chief concern is yourselves. I should imagine that honorable members must have had their ears to the ground, that some of them probably have been looking to the political effects, and have been attempting to effect some reform, and if they have, they cannot say that they have not come in contact with that large body of public opinion in this country which was so strongly in favor of a general election this Spring. Before I leave this subject let me say that the people wanted a spring election in the hope that this Government would be replaced by a Government this Spring that would get down to business and have some programme to submit to the electorate in January of next year that would mark an advance towards something being done for the common people of this country. I cannot leave this subject without referring to the position that must occur in this country when the Prime Minister resigns. His Government will automatically go out of the House and another Government will be formed.

That Government will do certain things. It will have no mandate from the people for those actions. It will be responsible to no one for these actions, and need never be responsible. I consider that constitutional practise ought at least in the final analysis to have convinced the present administration that it was doing something very wrong in attempting to carry on in office under the terms that I have outlined, and as far as I am concerned myself, if I happen to be a member of a future administration, I for one minute do not propose, if I have any power or influence, to permit such actions to be regarded as binding. I just throw that out to the honorable members, because an incoming administration cannot be bound by the acts of a government which is responsible to no one, and for whose acts no mandate was given. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of the document which forms the subject before the chair this afternoon, the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne is a barren document. It had to be barren. It does not even foreshadow an eleventh hour repentance. The Government no doubt has given it up as a bad job, and they have made up their minds that they have to go anyhow, and as the saying goes, they consider that it just as well to be hung for a sheep as a lamb. According to this Speech from the Throne, the Government has no intention whatever of showing the country that they have made an eleventh hour repentance. Of course no one knows what will occur during the summer and perhaps we will be in a better position to define what is in the minds of the Government when the Loan Bill and other things are brought before the House. When we arrive at the stage where we know how much money the Government wants we will be in a better position

perhaps to define just what the intentions of the Government are regards trying to rehabilitate themselves in the country. But they have not shown any eleventh hour repentance and I suppose that the Government has become such hardened sinners that repentance is almost a thing of the past.

The Speech from the Throne I say is a barren document. As usual, it has reference to everything but the fisheries. It is true we have here a passing reference to the fisheries, but it is only a slight reference and goes to show the small amount of confidence that the administration places in this all-important subject.

Before I come to the subject of the fisheries I want to say a word or two in connection with the other industries referred to in this Speech, namely, the Pulp and Paper Industries. We are asked to rejoice that there has been a continuation of its activities in this country. Reference has been made here to Buchans Mine, and we were told here by the Prime Minister yesterday that he sincerely believed that the day will arrive when Buchans Mine will be fruitful enough to return to this country direct substantial revenue sufficient to pay half the yearly interest on our public debt. Buchans Mine will have to go some before that happens. It will have to be a pretty speedy outfit to keep pace with the rate that the present Government has piled up the interest on the public debt. If this administration were to continue in office and keep borrowing money at the rate that it has been since it came into power, and increasing thereby at a great speed every year the interest on the public debt, then I say that Buchans Mine will have to be pretty speedy to keep pace with them. A statement such as this coming from the Prime Minister

I consider nothing more nor less than ridiculous. And I believe that the Prime Minister is unable to bring forward any figures to show how he arrived at such a conclusion as he gave us in these words yesterday. You are talking here about Buchans. It is great to have a good memory. Last year when we were here fighting the concessions that were given to this outfit, voices were not lacking to point out to us as to what was going to happen to Newfoundland when once this industry got going. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines used every ounce of energy that he was able to muster day after day. He used every word in the dictionary that could be applied to the picture that he sought to paint as to what wonderful things were going to transpire when once we had given these concessions and had got Buchans industry under way.

Now, if the Ministers of the Crown are so deeply interested in the people of the country and in the development of Buchans Mine as they profess to be, here is a job for them to tackle through which they can do something of benefit to the people of the country. Appoint a Royal Commission and have them go to Buchans Mine and investigate the conditions under which the laboring men are living today and find out the conditions under which they worked and lived the past Winter and then come back and see if they can paint a picture as rosy of Buchans Mine and the conditions that obtain there as they are painting today. Why, Sir, it is a disgrace the way our people have been treated at Buchans Mine. They lived more like dogs than like human beings the past Winter. This was the great and glorious concern, we were told here last year by the Government, that was going to transform and revolutionise the industrial life of Newfoundland. If

the Government are looking for acts of eleventh hour repentance, they could not do better than carry out the one I suggested, and I feel sure that if they act on the suggestion they will find out things that will stagger and appal them. There is not a member on the Government side tonight who has any correct idea of what conditions are like or what men have got to live under in the Buchans area, nor is there a member on the other side of the House who has been in contact with the men working at Buchans. The stories I got from workingmen there would make any Newfoundland-er's blood boil. When you consider, Sir, how our Newfoundland working class of people are taxed as heavily as they are and then to discover that they are treated as they are by the very people who were granted huge and unlimited concessions by your Government, I say, Sir, that one cannot help having the deepest of feelings in connection therewith. Surely you have some consideration for the people who allowed you to hold your seats in the Government the past four years; surely you have some consideration for the people on whom you have increased taxation 25 per cent. since you took office; surely you have some consideration for those whose resources you have taken and given to wealthy corporations, and surely you will give some consideration to the suggestion of having a Royal Commission to enquire into conditions prevailing at Buchans Mine where our men are working like slaves and living like dogs at the hands of those who have been given such tremendous concessions by this legislature. Personally, I sincerely believe that if a Royal Commission were appointed by the Government to investigate the doings of the Buchans Mine Corporation and their treatment towards our men that it would have a salutary ef-

fect up there. Now, if I were sitting on the Government benches and a member of the Opposition made such an appeal as I have made this evening, I would not let it go unheeded and unheard. However, I merely throw out the suggestion again for the consideration of members of the Executive Government. All we are getting or are going to get out of Buchans Mine is sweat and Buchans Mine is never going to save this country or put us on the map industrially. Buchans Mine is not going to increase the Customs revenue, nor is it going to decrease taxation on our people.

It appears to me that the Government have been sailing in the wrong direction ever since they came into power. The Government started out well in 1924, but if they had spent one-fifth of the energy in supporting the fisheries and the working classes of the country that they have spent in granting concessions to wealthy corporations and companies, the Finance Minister would not have to come here with a deficit and with millions of dollars piled on to the public debt of this Colony.

With regard to the pulp and paper industry, I am sure we are all glad to know that its activities show signs of expansion, but there is no evidence to show that it is going to be as good as we would like to have it. And it is all very well to come here and take stock of our mineral resources. These things can take care of themselves. But the main thing that we have got to concentrate upon in Newfoundland is our fisheries, such as the Government told the country in 1924, through the Prime Minister's Manifesto, they proposed to do if they were elected to power. There was very little said in the Speech from the Throne about the codfishery, except that we are told that "the prosecution of our fisheries during 1927 resulted in better returns

to many of these directly interested. Shore fish sold at remunerative prices and stocks remaining over are smaller than for many years past, thus creating a healthy market condition for future operations." That statement, Sir, is misleading, and you have no foundation in fact for putting that statement in the hands of His Excellency the Administrator. There is now just as chaotic a condition in connection with the codfishery as there has been for the past four years. Do you mean to contend that the Labrador fishermen who had to come here last Fall and organise a strike in order to resist the \$3.50 a quintal that was offered them for their fish are going to take that statement at face value? Did they consider, I wonder, getting \$3.50 was "better results" for their toil? In 1926 the price for Labrador fish was \$4.50 and yet the bulk of our Labrador fishermen when they came here last Fall got \$3.60 after putting up a fight to get more. Remember, the rank and file of Labrador fishermen are going to think seriously over the treatment that was accorded to them last Fall before they support a Tory Government again. Still we are told in the Speech from the Throne that was put in the hands of His Excellency the Administrator by the Prime Minister that those directly interested in the codfishery got "better returns." If better returns were got, it was the exporters of our fish who get it, and not the men who caught and made the fish for export. I have no doubt that the exporters did get "better returns" because I suppose they got the fish cheaper from the fishermen than usual and the fish went into consumption quickly on the other side of the water. But is that making things better for the fishermen, the producers?

I notice that no mention is made in the Speech from the Throne as to how the \$200,000.00 that was voted last year is going to be spent. Some members of the Government apparently seem to have forgotten all about this, although this amount was earmarked in the loan for a specific purpose. Last year the Prime Minister was asked how he proposed to spend this amount for the encouragement of the fisheries and he said that he did not know any more than "the man in the moon," except for the opening of new markets for our fish. Now, if my memory serves me well, when the late Government that I was a member of sent trade commissioners abroad to secure new markets we were ridiculed for such a policy and I think that the Prime Minister of today was the first man who severely criticised that policy when he was vote-seeking in Bonavista Bay four years ago. We had Sir Alfred McKinder here last year as Chairman of a British Empire Commission for the purpose of essentially examining our products with a view to buying from us what they did not produce at home. We had on that Commission Hon. W. C. Job and Hon. V. Gordon, High Commissioner for the Colony. They enquired into various products and I think the fifth report was on fish. However, Sir Alfred addressed a meeting of the Board of Trade. His address was very interesting and some very striking facts were disclosed. He practically told in his address that the net result of his investigation here was that the day of the dried or salt fish was almost over. He did not mean to imply that there would not always be a market for it, but he did make it plain that the market for it was gradually diminishing. He made a statement that if we wanted or expected to improve our condition, the one way to do it was by securing new

markets for our salt cod and I think he recommended that we turn our attention in that connection to the West of Africa. But it seems that the present Government have gone to sleep and have forgotten all about this matter since then. The Government evidently do not want to do anything to encourage or enhance the value of our fisheries. I think, Sir, they should have attempted to do something, even if they did not succeed. But, of course, it is like every thing else that they talked about doing. They have begun a lot of things, but did nothing in a practical way. I think it is a crying shame that, in view of the four years you have been in power, you have done nothing to help the codfishery, rather have you assisted in its discouragement. In 1924 the Government in their Manifesto led the people to believe that there would be a bonus paid on fish—a matter that you were well aware the fishermen were interested in. But what have you done in that direction? Simply nothing. Last year I presented petitions in this House signed by thousands of people, representative of all classes and creeds and political opinions, praying for standardization of our codfish. Liberals and Tories, union and non-union, fishermen of every description all united in the one desire that is, to seek to impress upon the Legislature, upon the powers in authority, that they were sincerely desirous of having the codfishing industry questions tackled and improvements made in some way. Furthermore Mr. Halfyard presented a petition from another Liberal organization also with thousands of signatures praying for the enforcement of certain things, standardisation in particular was mentioned. You have done nothing. The matter is forgotten; But as far as the fishermen who sent in these petitions are concerned the mat-

ter is not forgotten. The fishermen believe that whether they are right or wrong the Government should give serious consideration to the codfishery to see whether ways and means can be devised to make it a more profitable undertaking. While our codfishery is slipping the country is slipping. Now I have here before me the report of the Council of the Board of Trade for 1927 and which I consider quite pertinent to the discussion. It is a good sign to see those gentlemen who compose the Board of Trade coming round to take a larger view of these problems. For years and years as you know we have been working for some sort of regulations. We have heard a good deal about regulations. We know that regulations were in effect before and probably every post war disaster that came upon business was blamed on adopting the fish regulations whether there was justification or not. I always contended that if there were weak spots in those regulations they should be eliminated, but some regulations should have been kept in effect so that the exporting business would be carried on in a little more systematic fashion. It is pleasing to know that the gentlemen who compose the Board of Trade are coming round to that point of view; and there is a very interesting paragraph in the report in which it is said: (Reads from the Board of Trade Report)

(Reads)

That is a well-written paragraph.

That is just one of the benefits that would follow from the establishment of such a system.

I would give outside buyers the opportunity of assuring themselves what they were getting because I assume a system would have to have be hand inhand with that measures for the

proper grading of codfish. However they say "the time is now come when the fishing industry must be regarded as the national industry and treated as such." Now there has always been a feeling abroad that a Government has no right to interfere with private business. Up to a certain point that is very correct. I read recently a very learned article in a magazine discussing the situation the economical or financial situation in the Old Country and suggesting plans for the public to make revenue. The writer discussed this very question of industry and pointed out that a man who controls a private industry must realise that in return for being granted the undisputed right to remain in possession of the industry he must see that the business is carried on in a national way so that it benefits the whole community. For instance if exporters will plan out the marketing of fish and everyone suffers thereby then they are wrong and so I am for having someone take the bull by the horns to speak and getting people to do things with some system.

I do not believe that fish regulations should be obnoxious in the way of including what might interfere with private business but I do believe in the interests of the whole community something along these lines will have to be done and I only hope that the gentlemen of the Board of Trade who gave expression to these laudable sentiments will assist to put into effect the ideas here outlined when the attempt is made. I would like to impress upon Honourable Members and every Honourable Member who has tried to take serious stock of the condition of the country I know will come face to face with this fact that our debt is never going to be paid off and taxation never reduced and we are going to have no surplus revenues until the

earning power of our people is enhanced; and I contend that the majority of people are still directly interested in the prosecution of the fisheries. You can have your pulp and paper mills and your Buchans Mine and any other mineral discoveries and they are all very good to a certain extent but the main basis of existence of our people is the codfishery and it is the codfishery we ought to concentrate upon. There was expressed last year great jubilation that the value of the exportation of pulp and paper had gone up to about twelve millions. I have here a review of the trade of last year taken from the Trade Review and published in the Daily News early in January and I notice the value of the codfishery put down here was about eleven millions on the whole, and of pulp and paper round about thirteen and a half millions and there was a good deal of jubilation over the fact that pulp and paper exports had at last gone ahead in value of codfish. I see nothing in that to be crowing over, because that thirteen and a half millions has not meant as much to Newfoundland as the eleven millions for codfish. For that eleven millions for codfish Newfoundland got one hundred cents to the dollar; but we can't say the same for pulp and paper. The probabilities are, though I wouldn't be able to say offhand, I would be inclined to say that if the export value of a ton were \$70 when ready to go out of Newfoundland, at most there would be only \$25 or \$30 of that coming to Newfoundland. But every quintal of fish means to Newfoundland one hundred cents to the dollar for its value.. That eleven millions goes round amongst Newfoundlanders; is distributed amongst fishermen, coopers and others connected with the fishery and is distributed in the trade of the country. Some of it goes in-

to profits and goes for the expansion and development of business, but the figures for pulp and paper don't mean value in that way. I question if our people make more than thirty cents in the dollar from that amount of the value of our pulp and paper and if the expansion of this industry is so wonderful as to be referred to as of more value than the codfishery means so much to Newfoundland, why is it that we still go on facing deficits and carrying heavy taxation to pay interest and go on borrowing. Let the Government get serious, even in its dying moments, and make some attempt to enhance the value of the codfishery. Let this be done, and it will not be many years before you will find that coming in here and borrowing money to liquidate deficits will be a thing of the past, and you will have surplus revenue and you will be able to reduce taxation. I don't attach much importance to the talk about reducing taxation by reducing Government expenditure. I have no intention of trying to bluff any section of the electorate of the country by telling them that any Government I am associated with will be able to make any substantial reduction in expenditure, but I do say that we will be doing something to enhance the earning power of the people of the country and when that is done the revenue will correspondingly benefit and we will be able to look for reduction in taxation and not before. I say again, it is a good sign to see that the gentlemen who compose the Board of Trade are giving the matter of the codfishery new attention and consideration and, as I said before, too, I trust that when the day comes that some body of responsible men will make an effort to bring about better conditions, those gentlemen who have subscribed to these ideas will be behind them in

their endeavors. The outlook for the fishery today is a question which is puzzling everybody. It is a question on everyone's lips who is seriously-minded in respect of the affairs of the country. You can hardly find two men interested in the business of the country who think alike with regard to the outlook. Speaking to one merchant the other day, he said the outlook was so black he was too sick to talk about it; and another exporter was inclined to be optimistic. The Finance Minister led us to believe that the price of fish would be better next year, and it didn't obtain. I realise it is a very difficult matter for any man to predict what the price of fish is likely to be in October or November. The rumor has come to me that four firms which supply for Labrador are not going down this year. I have been informed that Munn's, Dawe of Bay Roberts, and McRae of Harbour Grace are not going down; and there in itself you have something that is going to aggravate the unemployment situation the Prime Minister made reference to yesterday. It is when we are brought face to face with facts like these we have brought home to us how important really the fisheries are. In reference to the Labrador fishery our own firm in Port Union had a letter from Greece (it is no business secret I am telling) saying that the quality of the Newfoundland fish was not in any way satisfactory, and I am inclined to think the same. I think we are not making Labrador fish as it ought to be made. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows we are not taking the care and trouble with it that the people North took with it twenty-five years ago. I would like to see encouragement given to make better fish. I do not believe that fish caught on the Straits of Bell Isle should be salted in the

Labrador style cure. I believe these things have a detrimental effect on the Labrador market and that strikes a bad blow at the whole fishery.

I believe that these things have a detrimental effect on the Labrador markets, and if the Labrador markets fail it will effect the whole fishery position.

In Port Union the masters of the schconers will go and prosecute the Labrador fishery and if the Labrador fish is not able to make profits the bottom goes out of the business to some extent.

In your Manifesto you went too far when you talked of giving a bonus on fish. If you had said that you would give a bonus on first class fish for the encouragement of producing better fish, then you would have done something worth while.

I want to see some attention given to the cull of better fish and I believe that if some encouragement be given in this connection that you would find that we would get a better quality of fish and consequently better prices that we were getting formerly.

It is a very difficult thing to handle, but take the case of a man who has a catch of one hundred quintals and possibly of these sixty quintals come out No. 1, and on the fish culled as No. 1 he would be paid a bonus. This would encourage him to try to make all the catch No. 1 next year.

Thoughts like these should actuate the minds of all honest people in this country. But the people of Newfoundland are expecting you to take a hand in this connection and try to do something for them, and if you will I have no fear in saying that you will be doing something of service to the people of this country.

This is a point on which you are going to be judged.

I noticed here yesterday that some reference was made to the fact that we have no direct communication with foreign markets. Our kind friends of the people of this country who tried to have direct communication with some of the markets were badly assailed for it.

Sir William Coaker and Mr. Hickman some four or five years ago considered the West Indies service development in this country and the idea was laid before the electorate as part of Mr. Hickman's manifesto and he was ridiculed for that, and now it seems that some other people are coming around to that idea.

The Board of Trade report comes in handy sometimes, but this shows the change of thought and outlook that is coming over the people of this country.

Reference is made to the trade with Jamaica.

(reads)

With reference to that paragraph I would say in return that we have not got the necessary machinery here to manufacture the raw materials that they could send us.

When we talk of the West Indies we are told that we are trying to do something to boost up your own business; but these ideas have something more behind them than mere personal interests.

There is a difference in the outlook with regard to that particular trade.

I find on reference to the Customs reports that the West Indies imports amounted to \$281,000 and the exports to \$1,604,000. So there is a little room and it can be seen that we are buying very much from them.

All these ideas, Mr. Speaker, are conditional on the cod fishery and I take leave of the subject with the remark that the Government was so derelict in this connection as to show that they were really not serious in their promises made to the electorate in 1924.

Now, before I am through with the subject of the fisheries I would like to say a word or two about the herring fishery.

The herring fishery is not as good as we would like to see it.

I am glad that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in his seat because there are some things I would like to say to him personally in connection with the herring fishery.

Last year there was a decrease of \$10,000 balance as against 1925.

Now the chief references that I wish to make is in regard to the matter of inspection. There seems to be something gone wrong with the system of inspection.

I would suggest that some attention be given this matter. The cost of herring fishery inspection today is \$15,000 a year, and in return for that surely our produce should be regarded abroad when once inspected and the Government brand put on them.

I have a story to tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of a man whose fish was inspected by the Government inspector for St. Barbe and the refuse condemned, and it was culled again when it arrived at its destination. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister through you, what is the use of going to the elaborate expense in connection with herring inspection if people abroad are not prepared to take our branded goods

when they are sent to them?

I want to read a letter I received from a gentleman who writes me from Bonne Bay and says:

(Reads)

This man goes on to say (I am not reading all the letter to the House, but the Minister can have it if he wishes to.)

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker, I contend that this is rather a serious matter and I fail to see what is the good of spending \$15,000 as the cost of inspection of herring if our brand is not to be recognized as being worth while. I got the \$15,000 by taking the salaries as given in the estimates and allowing \$3,000 for expenses—at any rate the herring inspection service costs at least \$15,000.

By the establishment of the herring fishery the Government would do something that would be a benefit to the people of the country and a service to the fisherman.

Instead of the Inspector coming to the fisherman's place, he has to take his herring and go to the merchant's premises and have them inspected there.

The Minister was pestered with letters and telegrams in connection with this from the West Coast last year, and are you going to take action to see that this inconvenience does not occur again this year.

If you are going to insist on inspecting herring, see to it that the inspection amounts to this, that the people abroad will respect the Government brand when it is put on here.

The man who wrote that letter, as far as I know, is not paid for his herring yet. It is a very interesting point.

Now my friend, Mr. Power, is not in his seat. I don't want him for anything in particular, but I would like to say a word or two in connection with the lobster fishery.

The lobster fishery is on the go again. After a close season of three years the people are permitted to fish.

The Minister knows the story of what transpired last year. New sets of regulations had been drafted and I thought these regulations were stringent, particularly where it required \$25.00 for a fisherman to get a packing license.

I laid my objections before the Minister and was pleased to notice that an alteration was made in this respect.

I realize that it is not a very easy matter to control the indiscriminate giving out of lobster packing licenses. It is a very difficult matter to refuse a man a license.

Now in connection with the lobster fishery this year, as time goes on you can get the people educated to many new methods of more systematic packing or other processes that you think necessary.

You should not be too hasty at first or it may be impossible to carry your improvements out. There is sure to be a great deal of grumbling, but you will eventually bring them around.

I said that the honorable member for St. George's appeared optimistic. If he is having any fresh lobster coming from St. George's soon he can let me have a couple because I am very fond of them. But he states that he

thinks the price this year will be \$22.00 a case. The present situation does not lead me to be optimistic.

Many of the old markets have been lost and there is a great deal of competition in the foreign markets, particularly from Japanese crab.

The suggestion has been made that before a man becomes an inspector he should take a course in the Normal School here in St. John's. While I do not see myself the feasibility of the plan, yet I do hope that there are reasons for the idea. But if it required that the inspectors do have to take a course in the Normal School in order to qualify, then I hope that the outport man will be given the chance to come along and take the course and not have the situation where only the man who is living here in St. John's will have the opportunity of receiving the position of inspector.

Finally, I want to say a word or two in connection with the financial situation in this country. We are told that we shall have to raise another loan, a refunding loan, I presume. There is something mysterious about this loan which I would like to hear the Finance Minister explain. The loan will be in the vicinity of \$7,500,000. I cannot find in the Parliamentary Summary of our loans any reference to the odd million and a half. There was to be six million raised and there appears to be a great deal of mystery amongst a great many people as to where the other \$1,450,000 comes from. However, my point is this, that in connection with the raising of this loan I trust that the best will be done. Mr. Hickman here yesterday evening stated that it will be possible to borrow that money at four and a half per cent. I hope it will. If that can be done, the Finance Minister ought to spare no effort in

trying to discover in the financial markets of the world where it is possible to float this loan at such a low rate. A four and a half per cent. loan would leave a record for the incoming government to adhere to. It would mean a considerable saving to the country. That is one part of the story. The rest of the story is that in addition to the seven and a half millions you have got to tack onto that three and a quarter million for various deficits on the railway, etc., and I dare say that you are going to take care that you have something in the treasury that I may refer to as the sinews of war, in case you are determined to go forth to battle. We promise that we on this side of the House will watch the government very carefully in connection with their movements in that regard. And it is not very much that we are going to let you have if we can possibly keep you from getting it. You will have to get enough money to pay off the deficits, and I think that is as much as you can safely be trusted with for the next six months. Your record in borrowing will certainly be illuminating. You came into power with an annual debt standing at something like \$56,000,000. You have done very well for five years you have been in power. During that time the national debt has increased from \$56,000,000 to \$84,000,000. That is not a very bad record for a government that came into power pledged to a reduction of taxation and expenditure and various other wonderful transformations that were going to take place all over the country. For the five years that you have been in power you have borrowed practically as much money as all the other Governments that preceded you did for fifty or sixty years. These facts are staggering and just show how far

out this administration was in its estimate of what it was able to do when it appealed to the electorate for its support in 1924. Now as far as I am concerned, I do not get any pleasure out of kicking a man when he is down. You are down now and you will soon be out. Down and out. Your places will know you no more once the doors are barred on this session. I leave you there, and I want to assure you all that for your sins of commission and omission, for the manner you have played false to the people of this country during your four years in office, for the manner in which you have broken every pledge that you made to the electorate, for the manner in which you have done things to the detriment of the power of the people, for the manner in which you have outraged constitutional practise in attempting to continue in office for another six months, I say to you, through the Speaker, that for all these acts the electorate in Newfoundland is determined to mete you out a severe thrashing .

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and in doing so I would like to congratulate the seconder of the motion. I can't say that I congratulate the mover, because I cannot. I would not be honest in doing so, because the mover of the Address in Reply told us nothing yesterday that is of importance to this country. Coming from an Oxford man, we expected something. From a man of his education and supposed ability, we expected to hear something that would be beneficial to the country and all concerned. He made no point in trying to bolster up the position of a dying government. I must congratulate the seconder on

his efforts. He did well. He is one of the silent men of this Legislature. A man who never had much to say, but when he did speak, what he said had something in it. I am not a bit ashamed, Mr. Power, to give you that credit this afternoon. You did your best and you did it very well.

The Speech from the Throne is famous for what it does not contain. There is nothing in it, anyhow. It is too bad that the like of this was placed in the hands of a man of the ability of the Administrator to read to both houses of the Assembly. There is really nothing in it. Absolutely nothing. The first thing that we take up is the prosecution of the fisheries during 1927.

(Reads)

There is not one word about the Labrador fishery. The Government is afraid to mention the Labrador fishery in that Speech. They have acted so ridiculously with the fisheries of this country that they dare not speak of the Labrador fishery. And what was paid for Labrador fish during the Autumn of 1927 does not pay the fishermen to prosecute that fishery. They are not going to prosecute that fishery. They get no returns, and within the next few months the labor situation in this country will be worse than it has been for years. The only thing I see that can be done is to get a loan and pay every man's passage and get him out of the country. And get them out of it just as quick as we can, because that is what is going to happen. In the Autumn of 1927 the price of Labrador fish was \$3.60. I think it went up to \$3.80 later in the season. A disgrace to a government that went to this country and promised a square deal to the fisherman and the workingman. The Prime Minister in his remarks yesterday said that likely dur-

ing this session somebody would be again reading his Manifesto. I am going to read it now. This is going to be the Prime Minister's burial service. This is what was responsible for electing the Monroe Government to power. And this is what is going to be read over it when it dies a political death. It answers both purposes. "Conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin," it is so miserable that I can hardly hold it in my hands to read it.

(Reads)

You did believe it at that time. You believed for your own interests, because you wanted to deceive the electorate into putting you in that little chair in this House of Assembly.

(Reads)

Have you paid that bounty? I represent a fishing district as well as a laboring district, and I ask you if you have made any attempt to pay that bounty on fish. You have not and you will not until next fall. And you are going to the country again. There is no question about that. Yes, sir; they are going to make you. That will be the best thing that could happen to the Liberal party, the day that you lead the government to the polls. You have failed miserably and you and your government have absolutely ignored the wishes of the fishermen of this country. You have ignored the main industry of this country. You can talk of paper mills, but they have nothing on the codfishery. I will be right in what I am saying. When the Prime Minister, who in my opinion is going to the country as leader of a party the next time, the chances are that while he is down in his district seeking the votes of the electorate, then, and only then, a bounty will be paid on fish in order to get him elected. That is

what is going to happen the codfishery next fall. The Prime Minister in another section of his Manifest wants to tell us:

(Reads)

I think that the Prime Minister is next to Mr. Morine in this country and that is going some. The Prime Minister had made promises in this famous document that he not only did not carry out, but that he never intended to carry out. That is why the country is in such a bad condition today, with men out of employment and the fisheries on the rocks.

(Reads)

Now, in the dying days of your government and in the last session of your assembly, let me tell you that you have failed, and failed miserably, to carry out the promises that you have made to the country in your Manifesto of 1924. You have ignored the wishes of the people of this country in every particular, except where members of the Government wanted to suit themselves for their own personal and financial advantages. This session of the Legislature did not open until the second day of May, although you promised in your Manifesto earlier sessions of the Legislature. We will probably be here until the 9th day of July next, when the life of the Government automatically expires. It is all very well for you men on the Government side of the House who are in office, because you are simply holding on for the money that you are getting out of it. Now, Sir, this Legislature was kept closed until this late time of the year because Captain Winsor had to go to the ice, and, knowing that your numbers were small, you could not open without him. This is the reason why we are here this late day of the year. The Government has ig-

nored every pledge in their Manifesto and still they have gall enough to try and face the electorate again. I hope the government does face the country again, as nothing will give me greater pleasure, because there is where they will meet their Waterloo, and the quicker that happens the better for this country and all concerned. The Government were afraid to open the House before May month because they were afraid that pressure would be brought to bear and that a smash would come and you gentlemen opposite would have to face the electorate. I wonder what do the people of Bonavista Bay and all the other districts think of this idea of opening the House at this late day of the year, contrary to what was promised in Mr. Monroe's Manifesto. The Prime Minister in his Manifesto deceived the people and that is why the country is in the position that it is in today. Now, Sir, the idea of delaying the opening of this House because a certain member of the government wanted to prosecute the sealfishery is ridiculous. This was done to avoid a Spring election. Now I would like to know what benefits are derived from the sealfishery by the rank and file of the country; are not the owners of the ships the greatest beneficiaries? The prosecution of the sealfishery by iron steamers has not been very remunerative for the sealers and in future there will be "Young Harps" prosecuting instead of big steamers, unless something is done to remedy matters that obtain at the present time. The sealers in the big steamers this year made fairly good trips, but made no money, but the Government are not interesting themselves to make things better for these men. Some years ago Sir William Coaker and his associates introduced and were successful in getting passed a sealing

bill whereby the sealers would get fair treatment. Matters went on alright for a few years but within the past four years conditions for our sealers are worse than ever. A ship returned to port a few days ago with two and a half bags of bread on board—this to feed a crew of nearly two hundred men. Supposing that ship had become jammed for any length of time, naturally the crew would have starved, and the fault would be with the Government, because why did they not see that the laws governing the seafishery were not lived up to. I know that the Prime Minister does not like to hear this. It is a bitter pill, but he has got to swallow it. A few days ago a sealing steamer was discharged and no ship could be secured to take home the crew; but if these men had been government supporters a ship would have been easily found; and if Captain Vardy had not been come across those men would have to walk home to their various districts North. Those men went aboard Mr. Vardy's vessel and were compelled to live like dogs and rats until they reached home. I know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Captain Winsor) was aware of this circumstance but he did not take any action in the matter; but if it had been the crew of the Ungava, a Government ship would have been easily found to take these men home. I know that the Prime Minister or his Government do not want to hear this, but such conditions should not exist, and we as members of this House should not allow it to exist; and if I were a member on the Government side of the House tonight, I, for one, would not allow it to exist. The men who go to the seafishery are treated like dogs and nothing better, and until we get a Government in power who has the sealer and the working-

man of the country at heart, conditions will never be any better for the working class of people in this country. The same can be said in respect to the logging industry in this country. The condition of the logger today is deplorable. Men go into the woods on the sub-contracting basis and they have to lie on bough bedding and have to pay \$18 a month board. Where are the Logging and Sealing Bills now? Surely Mr. Sullivan ought to see that the loggers get better conditions than they are getting now. Surely he must be aware of what is going on as he is the representative of the A.N.D. Co. A man who came from the icefields the other day told me that he had been in the lumber woods all the winter; he told me that he and fifty others had been lying on boughs; he also said that they had to pay a doctor's fee every payday, although they never saw a doctor for the winter. Surely, this is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. Now with regard to inspectors; it is just as well to have hobos as to have the camp inspectors that we have today. Now, if it were one or two men who were making these complaints, one would be inclined to think and regard it as a personal matter. But the complaint is common; practically everybody comes back from the lumber woods with the same report. In 1924 a Logging Bill was introduced in this House and the members of the present Government voted unanimosuly against it. They had no respect for the loggers and no respect for the workngman. But next fall they will be going around posing like angels and plausibly telling what they are going to do for the fisherman and the logger, the sealer, and everybody else representing the working class.

It wouldn't surprise me a bit if during this summer or fall something

should be done by the present administration to try and get the fishermen's and labourer's vote. Someone might be sent up to investigate and come back and make a report on conditions and they try and bluff the people that the Government is trying to do something for the loggers. The Prime Minister in his manifesto bluffed the country before but he can't bluff them any more. It is disgraceful to see the way men have to live both at the icefields and in the lumber woods. In the course of the remarks of the mover of the address in reply yesterday he spoke about the icy winds from the North. I want to inform the Honourable gentlemen that I am one of those icy winds of the North and one not afraid of him or of anyone else in the House. The North has been scoffed at too often by members of this Legislature and to hear it from a man who knows as much about a codfish as I know about Windsor Castle doesn't go down with me. I am from the North and I don't care who knows it and represent an independent constituency of some thousand people and wasn't brought in on the tail of someone else's coat. I resent that statement from the Member for St. John's West and I hope he doesn't make any such remarks here again. He talks about a popular Government. I believe it is popular as far as he is concerned; very popular. Then he talks about the Monroe Government being elected back again next fall. Let him forget it and let every member of this House forget it right now. Governor Allardyce got some wonderful praise here yesterday in this House. I have nothing to say against Governor Allardyce and I certainly have nothing to say in his favour, not one thing.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—I don't want to interrupt the honour-

able gentleman but it is a principle of parliamentary practise that His Majesty's representative must not be made the topic of conversation.

MR. BROWN.—I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I would be out of order in asking the question why we have a Governor coming over from the other side of the water. If I am justified in asking that question I suppose I am justified in saying why not leave the man who is in the Governor's chair stay there; Sir William Horwood is a native of our own country; a better man could not be procured for that position than Sir William Horwood and it is my opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of many on this side of the House that the right man to fill that position is now in the chair, Sir William Horwood.

It is not my intention to hold up the House this afternoon because during this session I suppose it is just as well to let you go ahead and get on and finish as best you can. You will stay till the end of your term and then this manifesto of the Prime Minister will be read over you as a burial service. Mention was made yesterday by the Prime Minister of the International Paper Company, and again this morning I think in the Daily News, to the attitude the Opposition took in connection therewith. I wish to say I was one of the four men who stood on this side of the House and did not support the International Paper Company; and I am not a bit ashamed to admit it to-day; and if it came up to-day I would do the same thing with it. I opposed that Bill on principle, and it has been borne out to-day that I was right in what I did. You have no Gander to-day, have you? You are not likely to get it for a while, or at least until a Liberal Gov-

ernment comes in and gives it to you. As far as the Government is concerned I think the Government was trying to do a little bluffing last year and had to get that Bill through the House and got it through. I opposed it and I am not one bit ashamed or sorry and as I said before I would do so again to-day, and inside of ten years others will fall in line with me that I did the right thing, and I can state right here now what I mean when I say inside of ten years. It would be a good thing if the International Paper Company or some other company started that mill on the Gander. It is a thing badly needed in that district and other districts. It would give some employment; but the attitude of the International Paper Company from the beginning until the day that contract was signed or agreed to get that timber of the Gander and have it manufactured at Corner Brook. I saw that in the beginning and I opposed the move. As I said before I don't want to take up the time of the House, but there is one thing I will ask; what is going to be done in regard to the unemployment situation in this country? It is a question not only in the outports but here in St. John's. You are giving out the dole here and if the man in the North said "why are you giving out our money in St. John's?", what would happen? They could justly say so. We are not getting it in the North. I don't begrudge it to the men in St. John's but you should as a Government open some industry or give employment at some kind of work. I don't think the men want the dole; they would much prefer employment. In conclusion permit me to say to all the Government members: Get all you can and enjoy yourselves; you look as happy as larks over there every one of you; Get all you can during the next five months

and when you go to the country and vacate your seats wish them goodbye and ask for the Monroe Manifesto and let it be read over your political tombs.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker; In view of the fact that the order paper is not very far advanced today I think we might move the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow. I accordingly beg to move that this debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the Report was received, and on motion further debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

NOTICE OF MOTION

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) entitled "Of Certificates of Masters and Mates".

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the guaranteeing of a Loan for the Directors of the Church of England College.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; I beg to move that this order be deferred but I would like to make just some short explanation. There is a clause to be added to the bottom of the Bill "that a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions". The Bill will be ready by to-morrow. I want to explain that this is a proposition put forward by the Church of England College for a loan of \$80,000. The position is that the Church of England College raised an amount of something over one hundred thousand and have borrowed another hundred and twenty thousand to

be repaid by subscription for which they have guarantees from members of the public. They require another eighty thousand to go on with the building held up because they haven't funds to complete it. If they had allowed the workmen to go home they claim it would cost another ten thousand to have brought them back to continue the work. When they got into those difficulties they came to the Government to see if the Government would lend them the money and the Government said they would not but would guarantee bonds on condition that they would begin to pay the Bonds off at the end of five years.

During the first five years they are collecting in amounts that have been subscribed and don't expect to be able to create a sinking fund. They don't say definitely that they will create a sinking fund but they will take care of the interest in the meantime and create a sinking fund after the five years have expired.

Our Government felt that they could not afford to let the College go without being completed and felt that it was necessary to give the assistance that was asked for to complete the building. We have the college grants as security for it.

Other Colleges will be going to future Governments for similar assistance and we told the committee in the first place when they wanted the \$80,000 to multiply that by three and consider it \$240,000 because the other Colleges would be looking for the same assistance. So far the other denominations have not approached the Government.

These Colleges are a very great advantage to the educational facilities of the country and the out-port people

as well as the city people come to these colleges.

These are merely preliminary remarks to inform the House of the object of this bill and I would ask that it stand deferred until tomorrow.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—This is rather an unusual Bill to come before the House and I would like to ask the Prime Minister, for the benefit of the House, to tell us what security we have for this guarantee.

After all we are custodians of the country's funds and before we guarantee the payment of bonds it is only natural that some guarantee be held by the Government and I would like to have some explanation on that point.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The guarantee, I would like to reply to the honourable member, is the security of a \$300,000 building which is paid for in cash to the extent of \$100,000 and the amount actually collected and subscribed \$120,000 borrowed from the Bank on the security of the promises that have been made. So that if the \$120,000 is collected, and the pledges are considered by the various members of the Committee as fairly reliable, there will be \$220,000 security as against a \$300,000 building.

I would like to explain that the present Bishop Field College was in such a deplorable condition that the pupils were leaving it and the College was likely to go out of existence altogether and the Directors, (of whom I am not one myself and I am not claiming that they did the right thing, because I claim that they should have seen their funds before they started to build and come to the Government.) decided to build a new college.

And that is the position \$120,000 worth of promises, \$100,000 paid on the building in cash and \$80,000 is required to complete the building and then they have the assurance that they can establish a sinking fund to pay that back.

We must remember that the Government grants to the College are also security for this payment.

MR. HALFYARD.—How are you going to be sure that they will get the money to meet this expense incurred?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They claim now that the expenses of running the College will be very much less because they have a modern building with modern appliances and an attractive school to bring pupils and instead of the number of pupils decreasing they claim that it is going to increase and they will save instead of losing money as it was before the Board decided that a new Field College was necessary.

They claimed that repairs to the old building went to \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. It was a very poor and inefficient building.

I was acting on the Interdenominational Committee that was formed to consider putting through an Interdenominational Education policy and we got down a Committee from Columbia University to go through our schools and Colleges and I remember that the committee stated that Bishop Field College would make a very fine sugar ware-house but as a building for a school it was absolutely impossible.

That was several years ago.

Now I don't think there is any doubt about their having put up a very excellent and modern building but

whether the Government or the country should be called upon to guarantee these bonds members of the House have different ideas about.

The Government felt that it should not put the College to the expense of spending \$10,000 that appeared to be necessary if they were to knock off work and begin again. With the school grants as security we felt that we could undertake this.

As a matter of fact they have not got the money yet and it remains for this House to put the Bill through in order that the money be paid to them and for that reason they have asked us to put the Bill forward with a view to getting the money as soon as possible.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if I am correct when I say that the security is the Government grants and also the pledges that have been made towards the College?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—And the \$100,000 that has been actually paid on account of the \$300,000.

MR. GRIMES.—Can you say what the Government is.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think \$14,000 a year.

MR. GRIMES.—I think that it is quite likely that there will be other requests coming in from other Colleges before very long.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister, through you, just what the nature of the amendment to the Law Society Act, is?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Just a couple of short amendments in connection with Benchers of the Law Society and in respect of examinations.

NOTICE OF MOTION

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Mr. Grimes gave notice of Question.

Mr Halfyard 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 4th, 1929.

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

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Halfyard from Bell view re road.

Mr. Halfyard from Hant's Harbor re road.

Mr. Halfyard from New Perlican

re wharf.

Mr. Halfyard from Clarenville re road.

Mr. Halfyard from Hant's Harbor re road.

Mr Halfyard from Harcourt re Telephones.

Mr. Ashbourne from Kettle Cove re road.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to avail of this opportunity of supporting the prayer of this petition just presented by the honorable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard. In doing so, I would like to avail of this opportunity for once more pointing out to the House the absolute nonsense if I may so put it, in encouraging people to take around petitions in the various sections of the Island and going to a great deal of disadvantage and trouble in getting signatures for the various concessions and then for members of both sides of this House to be getting up here and using the valuable time in setting forth the requests of the petitioners, knowing full well that it is all an unnecessary waste of time. I have sat in this House for seventeen sessions, and if there is any honorable member who has been here during that time can point out to me wherein one request of any kind has been granted during the whole of that period, then I will be satisfied that the system now in vogue carry on. Is it not about time that this House of Assembly sincerely consider these matters. We all know that the allocation of public funds is done on the recommendation of the member for each district. Whilst it is desirable for members of both sides of this House to put forth, as the honorable member for Trinity has done, the requests of the people of the country, it is, on the other hand, very desir-

able that the people who take the trouble of compiling and bringing around and selecting and collecting the signatures to the various petitions be notified officially that it is a waste of time to send petitions to the House of Assembly when the matter can be conducted by private correspondence directly from the people to the representative. I suggested at several sessions, one after another, that on the opening of the House a committee be appointed to deal with petitions. I did receive a little support from both sides of the House, but nothing serious came of the matter; nothing serious will come of the petition presented this afternoon by Mr. Halfyard, though serious and honest enough he may be in his advocacy of the various requests made by the petitioners. The petition as you know well will be forwarded to the department to which it relates and there it dies, and nobody knows that better than the honorable member who has taken up twenty minutes making a nice speech on behalf of the men who signed the petition. I once more would ask that serious consideration be given to this matter, not only because the petitions are going to die as soon as they arrive in the department to which they relate, but also because the people have been fooled. I do not say by the honorable member who just sat down, but any member who encourages his constituents to hawk around petitions to be signed and presented to this House and knows that no good is going to come out of it he is only putting those people to a lot of trouble for nothing. I say let them present their petitions to their various representatives. All representatives should know the requirements of the district. As far as I am concerned, it is not necessary for a petition to

come to me from the people of my district, because I know the requirements of that district, and when the time arrives for the allocation of public funds I will see that they get their right share of what is going. I am very serious about this matter this afternoon, and I take this early opportunity of once more putting forth these views.

MR. HALFYARD.—I appreciate the remarks made by the honorable member for Placentia. I am sure that he and I are one in our opinion as to the futility of presenting petitions. I can conscientiously say that I have not encouraged any of my constituents to present petitions to the House of Assembly. On several occasions they asked me would they present a petition. I said that if the petition was largely signed it would anyway show that the people were desirous of having something done, but as to what effect the petition would have I did not know; but anyhow, I said, it would do no harm if it did no good. But I agree with the honorable member who just spoke that more serious thought should be given to the petitions when they are presented to this House. There should be some committee to investigate and consider them, and to report to the Department to which the petition relates, and then if any money can be found those requirements of the petition could be granted. As long as we are here as representatives of the districts, so long will we be presenting petitions. It shows to the Government, anyhow, that money is required, and whether it can be found or not is a matter for the Government. Put the money to the credit of Trinity District and try to meet the requirements of these people.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Speaker, I

would like to say a word in reference to the matter now before the Chair. While on general principles I agree with the suggestions made by my honorable friend that it is a waste of time to be presenting petitions to this House, when we as representatives of our district know very well that it is up to ourselves individually to endeavor to carry out the requests of our constituents when they appeal to us either for a wharf or a telephone connection or anything else that we should have to provide for out of our special grant. But there is an awful lot of time taken up here in this House presenting petitions. The people that come here want to hear something special that is for the general interests of the country at large, instead of listening to a petition presented by a few inhabitants asking for a telephone connection, or for a road or bridge, when we know that it is our business to attend to those things individually. It is proper and just for the members of this House to appeal from time to time if they have not sufficient funds themselves, to the Government of the day to a limited extent, by sending in a request in the shape of a letter pointing out the necessity of meeting those requirements. And we have many. You, on your side of the House, and we on this side of the House, have unlimited demands made upon us for repairs to roads, bridges, wharves, telephone connections, and everything of that nature. But I do not think that it is right that the time of this House should be taken up with those little petty things. When I say "petty" I mean petty to the general public.

MR. HALFYARD.—They are not small to the people presenting them.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—It only refers to our

own individual districts and localities. But why should the public at large be interested. Why should the time of this House be taken up? It is wrong. The system is wrong and the day will come when some government will alter that. I disagree with my friend when he states that if a petition relating to a telephone connection is referred to the department of Posts and Telegraphs to which it relates that it dies there. Oh, no. He made one mistake there. They don't die. They live there, on account of the activity of those members who presented the petitions, who continually ring up asking about those petitions. But I must say "I have no funds, Mr. Halfyard", if it happens to be the honorable member for Trinity that is ringing me up. Remember last year when there were great demands being made for telephone connections and extensions, I said to you that if you provide the necessary funds for all those extensions then it is only a pleasure for the head of the Department, especially myself, to authorize the necessary work to be proceeded with and the installation of the telephone to take place. Until we have the funds we cannot do it. I am endeavoring to point out the waste of time in this House in dealing with these matters, when the matter should be dealt with individually by the representatives and the different heads of the departments. If I were on the other side, or if in the future I am honored with a seat in this House strong appeals to the heads of the Departments and agitate that those requests be granted. But those petitions will not die. You send them to me and I will endeavor to do the best I can, but on general principles I say that the system is wrong and the time of the House should not be taken up with dealing with petitions of any

nature, unless it is a public petition that deals with something that affects the general interests of the country at large, or some vital matter that it is necessary that the Government of the country should take cognizance of.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, before these petitions are formally offered to us, perhaps I might clarify matters somewhat if I were to say a few words. Now I do not agree with what my two colleagues have said, in all respects. I think it really becomes a case of being honest with ourselves. As regards the presenting of a petition, it is simply a matter of a perfunctory discharge of an obligation. It is an obligation upon a member, when a petition comes from his district to present it. He knows well, as a matter of fact, especially the opposition members, that he has not got the advantage that a member on the Government side has. It is just as well to have that understood. He is further handicapped by the fact that the very best that he can hope for is the fact that if the district grants are going, they are divided pro rata. Then if the recommendations of the member are accepted, and they commend themselves to the Department that has the control of the grants, then the latter may be able to fall in line with the prayer of the petition. The Ministers of Agriculture and Mines and of Posts and Telegraphs are both right and both wrong. Both were adepts at presenting petitions when they sat on the other side of the House. They were finished artists. I don't think that I have ever heard more eloquent speeches than those made by these two gentlemen when they sat in opposition. They knew then, as they know now, the fact that, strictly speaking, it is a

question of "What your grants could afford." I think it is only fair to both these gentlemen to say this, that the reason why I am prompted to make these remarks is because of the two Ministers that have just spoken. Honorable members will agree with me when I say that if there are two ministerial heads who have got a soft spot in their hearts for the members of the Opposition it is the two members that have just spoken. The reason I say that is, because their words might be accepted as being against the presenting of petitions, and it is just as well to understand that they see themselves the farcical aspect of presenting petitions. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines cannot be accused of being opposed in any way to the petition because of the side of the House that it comes from, and for that reason I think that I should speak to this petition and in supporting the motion that it be sent to the Department to which it relates for consideration, I would subscribe to the idea that we ought to discourage the sending of petitions as much as we can. But we must also remember that sometimes it is very helpful to have a petition. There are times when if an expression of opinion can be got from a large section of the people as to their views on a matter of public interest, it is very helpful to have that expression of opinion.

I do not altogether subscribe to the idea that the amounts asked for in petitions ought be too large because it is throwing too much onus on the members. If a member gets a petition in his hands he has got to present it for what it is worth. Petitions can be gotten up for almost anything and nine-tenths of them are not worth the paper they are written on, for the reason that practically all the signa-

stories are in the handwriting of the man who goes hawking around with the petition. But there are times when a petition is helpful. I am not unmindful of the fact and I sympathise with the condition that prevails, namely, that because a man is in Opposition that he has to present all petitions that come along to the House. Most of the petitions that are presented here emanate from the Opposition side and the reason of that is that people outside got the wrong idea. I do not agree with the notion, however, that because a man happens to present a petition from the Opposition side that the petition will not get the same consideration as it would if presented by a Government member. At all events, that has not applied since this Government came into power. However, the real cure is for members themselves when they receive petitions to have them dealt with by the heads of the different departments, as I believe this would be a more effective way of having them dealt with. However, I merely rise to support the prayer of the petitions just presented.

REPORT TABLED

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER tabled the report of operations of the Newfoundland Railway for the year ending June 30th, 1927.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

C. of E. COLLEGE LOAN BILL

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the guaranteeing of a Loan for the Directors of the Church of England College.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker: Feeling that the question might be raised that this is a matter that might be dealt with by way of a private Bill in accordance with Rule 314 of the House, I would move for the suspension of this Rule and that this Bill be proceeded with as a public measure. I explained yesterday that the Directors of the Church of England College are looking for this \$80,000.00. Of this amount between \$16,000.00 and 17,000.00 has been already spent. The contractors are looking for payment to the Trust Company who have made some advances already, but they will not make any more advances until this Bill is passed and that is the urgency in making this Motion to-day.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker: I have no intention of retarding the progress of this measure, but why the necessity now for the suspension of the rule for the passing of this Bill when it will be only the matter of another few weeks and all the rules in connection with the transaction of business here will be suspended?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker: With regard to the position just raised, might I be permitted to make an explanation in support of the Prime Minister's attitude.

As to why we should proceed as the Prime Minister has moved I might say it was somewhat at my own suggestion the Prime Minister made this offering today. It was felt possibly the point may be raised that this might be regarded as a semi-private Bill. It is not felt to be a private Bill; as a matter of fact, though we don't like to think of it in that way, all our public educational buildings may be regarded as public institutions. Two-thirds

of the cost of upkeep is borne by the Government grants, and while it is perfectly true that the control of those institutions is vested in denominational boards, it might be regarded as the case here that the Government of the day more or less is responsible for their upkeep. Now the present resolutions that the Prime Minister is introducing that out of the grants in years to come for the particular college and they are allotted to it pro rata, there will be taken so much per year as security for advances. The money is provided simply in anticipation. The point raised by the Prime Minister in presenting the resolutions and having them considered in the nature of a public measure is only for the purpose of enabling the House to proceed with the resolutions and have the Bill enacted. I think it will be appreciated by those living in town that the building down there at an important season of the year cannot have the construction delayed, and we merely want to avoid the question being raised possibly that the Bill should be presented by petition with advertisement with regard to any other rights and so on. I don't suggest it is necessary but the point might be raised. As a matter of fact no institution can be allowed to go down under similar circumstances of any denomination.

MR. GRIMES.—I would like to be clear about the point raised by the Minister of Justice with regard to denominational schools being the property of the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No; I said that they might be said to be Government controlled; might be said to be like Government institutions in so far as two-thirds the cost of upkeep, cost of maintaining

them. comes from the Government through the educational grants. I don't raise the point of State control; no.

RULE IS SUSPENDED

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and pursuant to the terms of Rule 314, in view of urgent pressing necessity, the rules applicable to Private Bills in respect to advertisements and introduction by way of petition were suspended in relation to Resolutions providing for the guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College.

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 in relation to the guaranteeing of a Loan for the Directors of the Church of England College.

Mr Speaker left the Chair.

Mr Puddister took the Chair of Committee

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Might I suggest Mr. Chairmen that we read the Resolutions and then we might deal with them. I am suggesting that in clause 2 we should add a few words.

(Reads: Clause 2)

That in my opinion is not sufficiently protective for the Government and I suggest putting in the words "not exceeding \$125,000,00", that being the amount that the Church of England College have up to the present borrowed on mortgage from the Eastern Trust Company. They have already spent \$225,000., of which \$100,000. is cash that has gone in and \$125,000. cash borrowed from the Eastern Trust Company on

security to the Eastern Trust Company, firstly of a mortgage, but secondly the promises made in writing by various subscribers under the drive that was made some three years ago. Of this money there has come in so far two instalments, they have three more to collect and that is the reason they are ready to count on \$125,000. coming in. You will notice as we go on with the resolutions that they propose paying back the eighty thousand in sums of four thousand a year, not later than the end of six years after the raising of the loan. The point about that is for the next three years they will be busy getting in the amounts subscribed and this is about as much as the subscribers can afford, and the College say they do not want to be called on to find the capital amount to pay back for five years and the end of six years they will make the first payment of \$4,000. and they feel satisfied they will be able to do that. As I stated yesterday the Government grants to this college some \$14,000 a year and that money will be there for the security of the payment back of this money when the time comes. The argument may be urged if they haven't money for the carrying on of the college the college isn't very much good otherwise, but I have very little doubt but money will be found to carry on the college and even if the Government had to carry on it wouldn't be such a serious affair as allowing this college to be discontinued. I don't, as I said, hold any particular brief for the college; I do think they ought to have seen their finances better ahead than they did. I think it is very hard on the Government that they should come to them at the last moment and say if they don't get a certain amount of money next week they are in a hole.

I think they ought to have been able to see better ahead than that and I do not protect them in that respect; but naturally the Government had to give serious consideration to the matter. The Church of England colleges hold a good deal of property; they not only own Bishop Field College but they own the ground around it, and the British Hall, and Bishop Spencer Lodge subject to a mortgage. Altogether they have given me a statement in which they show margin of some two hundred and thirty thousand of assets over and above their liabilities and mortgage so that the security should be fairly good, and I shouldn't suppose that they would allow at any time their grants to be taken but they will find some means of getting the money for it. I suggest as I said adding the words to clause 2 "not exceeding \$120,000.00."

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he knows that there is no more than one hundred and twenty five thousand dollars mortgage on the property.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to the Hon. Member I might say that I asked that question this morning and I was told that positively there isn't more than one hundred and twenty five thousand but by having this clause put into the Bill they can't get the eighty thousand if there is more than one hundred and twenty five thousand.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to guarantee a bond or bonds. Are they issuing bonds for sale or giving one bond to a Trust Company or Companies?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We said we would be prepared to

guarantee bonds, and suggested as they had expected to raise money at 6% with the Government guaranteeing they ought now to raise it at 5 per cent or 5½ per cent at least.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Would it be possible to issue a bond to raise the money without a Government guarantee. Was it ever tried?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I understand the United College have already done it but under what system they proceeded I don't know; but one person a Member of the United College — — —, told me they didn't want any Government guarantee, I was very glad to hear that, and think it is gratifying to hear that that college is in a better position. It seems that the people from whom they could raise money are more numerous, and it is gratifying as I say if the other colleges are in a more independent position.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I might say the poorest people in the country the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation raised a bond. One reason I support this is I think what will happen is that all will be looking for the same thing. That is why I am supporting it. We have got lots of schools to build when we get a chance to raise more money.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I think the matter is a little more serious than that. No one questions the assets behind the Church of England school Board; but now that this thing is once commenced where is it going to end? If this Government is going to give a guarantee of bonds, a guarantee for the raising of money for building of one college, they certainly cannot stop at

one; if the Roman Catholic or the United Church or the Salvation Army colleges want money why then it is only natural that they are going to come to the Government for it and the Government will be expected to help them out. And it doesn't stop there; take all the schools round the country if you like and if the Government has an obligation in respect of the colleges in St. John's the same will be considered to apply throughout the country.

Without a doubt all the schools and colleges in this country are as much entitled to this assistance as any particular college in St. John's and there is just the same general obligation to keep up every small school in the smallest settlement as there is to keep up a school in St. John's.

To my mind the thing is so serious that it should be given very grave consideration. Once started where is it going to stop.

Now I have no intention whatever of putting anything in the way of raising money to assist an educational building of that kind because I know that it is necessary but I certainly think that these resolutions should not be passed through without very great consideration and discussion by every member sitting on both sides of this House because after all though in one particular case there may be sufficient assets behind them in the next one there may be no assets behind them at all.

While I agree with the Prime Minister when he said that even if the Government should be called upon to pay the interest it would not amount to very much, but I say that it would amount to very much if the Government was called upon to pay the in-

terest on one hundred of such guaranties.

I would suggest that every member of the House let us have his views on this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, for very obvious reasons I support these resolutions. I am not primarily connected with the Church of England but I support these resolutions wholeheartedly and honestly hope that they will benefit by them, because if I had my way I would give the same guaranty to all the colleges of the different denominations for I feel that any money spent on educational progress is well spent.

I know, as we have been told, that the other denominations will be coming to the Government looking for similar favours. I hope they do. That is a thing that has probably got to be faced and if any one of the different denominations needs a bond for the guarantee of \$80,000 and if they ask us for \$80,000 as security we have got to give it to them.

There is no use fooling ourselves. It is just as well to get the matter right. You cannot stop the wheels of educational progress.

There is no question here of any differences of opinion on either side of the House but we say to ourselves that we cannot afford it. We have got to afford it.

The point was raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to this being for one section of St. John's. The Church of England College is not only a St. John's institution.

And there is a difference to-day for the Education Act provides special school funds for building schools in the out-ports and as a matter of fact so far as St. John's is concerned, the Colleges are largely, but I don't say mainly, filled with out port students.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I pointed that out merely to make a comparison between the number of schools and colleges in the out-ports and in St. John's.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am not missing the point but I would retort that under the Education Act as it is to-day, there is contained a special provision in which money is set aside absolutely for building purposes.

MR. GRIMES.—Cannot they get the same in town?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No. it not only applied to the out-port schools.

This guaranty should not be required. I am not a champion of the Church of England College but whilst supporting these resolutions and when speaking for them I feel that I am speaking for all colleges. The point I make is that the Government cannot no Government can-afford to stand by and see a College of any denomination go down. You cannot do it, that is all.

Whilst it is preferable to let each denomination collect enough funds to look after its own affairs still when they are unable to do so and ask us to assist them, we cannot refuse.

And I must say, and it would only be fair to say and it will come better from an outsider, that the Church of England people of St. John's have, within the past couple of years, de-

monstrated a considerable activity in matters connected with their schools and educational matters generally.

To-day they find themselves with a load greater than they can bear and their experiences are probably the same as those of others who have passed through similar circumstances. That from that section of the country where most of the prosperity lies, the outports, they did not receive the pro rata share of wealth that one might expect. It so happens in most of the drives that take place, that St. John's becomes the recruiting ground

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, we should not lose sight of the fact that the outports of Newfoundland look to the colleges of the various denominations in the city to send their boys to in order to give them a "rounding off."

I support the resolutions not alone for what they contain but because they are the introduction to the larger dose that we will have to take later on.

It is just as well now for us to make up our minds as to what policy we are going to adopt.

We have got to arrange for some source of money for building purposes for all the denominations. I would add to the Government grants to the colleges a certain amount each year for building purposes. It is bound to come. You cannot close the schools. You cannot stop the chances of our children getting the best possible education in their own country. You cannot stop college expansion.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the resolutions.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with attention to what has been said by the Honourable Min-

ister of Justice and I believe that I have altered my views since he began to speak.

It just occurred to me that it might save time if the House were to get down to business and vote \$80,000 per capita to all the other denominations because it looks like we are going to have to vote three times \$80,000 anyhow.

I think that it might save time if we considered that proposition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I have some little knowledge of this matter and I might say that I disclaim any such position as has been handed to me by the Minister of Justice. I do not rise in any sense as a representative of the particular denomination that I belong to and therefore I disclaim any connection in that respect.

I look upon the whole matter in a broader way—as an educational question and I had something to do with the negotiations that took place with the Directors, the result of which is the Bill that is before the House.

It must be remembered that several years ago the Church of England people in this city started a drive and succeeded in getting very liberal promises from business men and others in this community at a time when things were prosperous and everything looked rosy. The first pledges were kept faithfully but then a change in conditions came and people who had made pledges found themselves unable to live up to them, and a great many could not fulfill them. In the meantime the Directors had made plans for the erecting of a school on the lines consistent with the amount subscribed at that time.

The matter was lying in abeyance for several years and eventually the conditions of the College building became so untenable that something had to be done. The old Bishop Feild College building was costing a tremendous sum of money every year to keep it in repair and large inroads were made on the funds that were collected for the new College.

It was eventually decided to have another drive, which took place last year or the year before. That drive had not the results that were anticipated and they were between two fires as to whether to recede or go ahead, and they decided to go ahead and started building at an estimated cost of \$300,000.00.

They collected, I think, in the neighbourhood of \$120,000 including the amount left over from the previous drive.

I think they have promises for \$120,000 more, which are redeemable within the next two years. The promises made in the last drive are very much more secure because we do not anticipate a repetition of the hard times which took place after the first drive. They assure us that they will gather in a very large part of the promises made in the recent drive.

In the meantime the College had raised money from the Eastern Trust Company, I think, on which they are paying an interest charge of 5 or 5½ per cent. I am not quite sure if that is exactly right. I know that they raised from \$100,000 to 120,000 and they cannot get any more money on the security of the College and they have their contractors here with the equipment on the grounds and the work is brought to a standstill by the lack of funds.

If the operations of building were to stop a serious loss would be occasioned by the directors because the contractors would have an action against them for breach of contract and if they remove the machinery and come back later, it would cost an extra \$10,000, so they conceived the idea of approaching the Government to see if anything could be done.

The Government, after they had outlined their story, could see no reason why assistance should be refused to a system that is absolutely necessary to this community.

Mr. Higgins pointed out that it was necessary to be prepared to swallow the pill, but I would not go as far as that. I would be long sorry for bringing this measure into the House if I thought that would be the result.

While the Government of necessity is prepared to assist them where it is absolutely necessary still there is an obligation on themselves and on the people whose children are educated there to see to it that every cent is paid, and that they themselves pay to whatever extent possible.

But the position as it stands to-day is this that this Government or the next Government or any Government are not going to lose a dollar. It is not going to cost a dollar to the Government because it was distinctly understood at the opening of negotiations that the interest charge on this money would be first charge on the college grants each year. And as I pointed out to the Committee that waited on me in reference to this that the \$4,000 or the \$4,500, whatever it might be, interest charge would be due on the first of July next when the college grants are issued if these resolutions are passed and then the Min-

ister of Finance and Custom's would collect that amount. It is to be paid in advance to secure the Government against any loss of interest on that account. Now in the meantime the Directors of the College have the assurance of the payments that have been promised under the recent drive which will liquidate that portion of the debt that at present exists on the college. And after that the college authorities have undertaken to pay a proportional amount each year extending over a period of twenty years, at the rate of about \$4,000 a year. That is the proposition. It is essentially businesslike. It does not involve the expenditure of one cent of public monies, and I have every faith that those interested will carry out the project and that in the future they will be in a better position to do so. The question was raised yesterday as to how they were going to get on without the assistance of their annual grants. I know this that I was Chairman of the Board of Directors at various times, and I know that it was a continual expense. Every year there were thousands of dollars wasted in trying to keep it water and wind tight. All that would be obviated in the new building. It will be capable of housing a hundred per cent more scholars. The staff will be increased but that increase will not be anything in proportion to the number of scholars that will be looked after owing to the facilities that the new building will afford. The expenses will not be anything like in proportion to the efficiency of the new college when it is completed. Therefore I submit that when this proposition comes before this House that it should not be looked on from any narrow view point. I would have the same feeling towards any other denominational school that

was placed in a similar financial position. And if it should happen in the future that any other denominations were to come to the Government for help under similar circumstances. I hope that they will receive the same sympathetic consideration. We cannot do without these colleges. They are essential in our life. It is the policy of all Governments as long as I have been in office, to assist education in every possible way. Past Governments have given a sympathetic ear to everything that is for the advantage of education, and I hope that to-day the House will view this in that light.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker; I just want to make it plain that we are only discussing this on a board principle and not with reference to any particular college. I have already stated that I am quite satisfied that there are plenty of assets belonging to the Church of England to meet all their obligations. Many of these I am sure could pay the whole amount, if they wanted them to. I just brought the matter up on board principles because this is a precedent, and the question that I did ask was "Had every effort been made to get this money without a guarantee from the Government. Now the Minister of Justice tells us that he is in favour of these guarantees, and that no school should go down. There are many carrying a heavy load. How many churches in the country are carrying a heavier load than they can carry? Churches are being built without collecting all the money that is necessary for their construction. If the proposition were made to the Government to-morrow for some Church that wanted so much money or else that church would have to close down:-

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not know but I would agree with that also. I would not like to see a Church closed down.

MR. HICKMAN.—I am not asking the Hon. member what he would agree with.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—You are asking me what I would agree with. I would not let any church go down.

MR. HICKMAN.—I think that makes the matter all the more serious. I do not think this is a joking matter at all.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am not joking about it either.

MR. HICKMAN.—After all we are here as the trustees of the people, and as the custodians of the peoples funds, and if the honourable member will go so far as to say that he would guarantee churches, schools, everything throughout the country, then I think he is taking a big responsibility.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—If we are not safe guaranteeing churches and schools, we are not safe in guaranteeing anything. That is my point.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody present in this House this afternoon would regard this matter in a narrow or sectarian aspect, and I do not think that any single member in this House to-day is prepared to put himself on record as being opposed to any reasonable assistance to any educational institution in the country. That is not the point. It has been the history of semi-public and semi-private institutions in this country, and I take it that most of

the colleges in this country, are of that type quite frequently to reach a stage in their existence, where they are not able to carry on under existing conditions, and with the resources at their disposal. Having reached that point the first avenue that opens itself up to them, is the Government of the country. In some cases I have no doubt these appeals are justifiable, and this particular appeal may be perfectly justifiable. I do not propose to discuss that at all except to point out that apparently the estimates of the Directors of this College, when they were about to construct this building, were a long way out. Be that as it may, they apparently need the money now, and I suppose it cannot be raised in any other way the country will have to give it to them. But I do want to draw to the attention of this House the extreme seriousness of the precedent which is about to be set. I would like to see every possible effort made by the directors and the authorities interested in this college to obtain this money in some other way, before they ask this legislature to guarantee a loan. It is not because of what I may term the paltry sum of \$80,000 for which they ask. I would take the same position were the amount asked for 80,000 cents or \$8,000,000. But it places the Government of the country in the position that whenever at any future time any particular educational institution in this country asks for any guarantee of money, within reason we are compelled to give it to them. In other words money will be provided by this Legislature and obligations which this country is to incur will be determined, not by this House, but by those who have no seats in this Assembly. Now if that situation is to arise, if that is to be the manner in which the affairs of the country are to

to be conducted then I say that it is most regrettable, and where the precedent is likely to end it is difficult for me to say. Now it has been said here this afternoon this guarantee, being given, there would probably be applications for further guarantees. Applications for further guarantees will probably be made from time to time, whenever the ideas of the directors of any particular college or school happen to be larger than their pockets. They will go ahead with their plans and then if they get short of funds, go to the Government of the day, and obtain a guarantee for the balance. And the Members of this House are in duty bound, in accordance with the precedent set here this afternoon, if these resolutions are passed, to provide that sum, whatever it may be. Now it strikes me that in adopting a principle of the kind you are destroying the very basis of a British representative Assembly. It is the absolute and inalienable right of this House to determine what money shall be provided for the use of the Crown. You are destroying the basis of the existence of this House of Assembly, and I do ask this afternoon, (and I am not going to vote against these resolutions) I do ask that the Directors of the Church of England College be asked to make every possible human effort to secure this money in some other way, before we are asked to do what in my opinion is the destruction of the basic principle of constitutional Government in a House of Commons, under the British Crown. I say it in all seriousness, and with the intention of voting for these resolutions if they do finally come to a vote.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker; I don't think that there is any difference of opinion

at all, in this House, on this subject. I think that there is perhaps one point that we might as well satisfy ourselves upon. Mr. Bradley, following the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition, has talked about the fact that tomorrow you may easily be asked to help all churches. I do not make any doubt about my position. I repeat yes, certainly". Without any hesitation at all I would help them out. But if such conditions should arise and we are faced with them under our system of Church Government in this country, then I think that whatever else we may fall out about, I think there is nobody but will agree that if we have to save any relic at all of hope for the people it is the idea of at least being Christianised. Now I say that quiet as seriously as the members opposite have been talking. I do say to-day that here in this country we are very fortunate that we have not been asked as a Government to undertake Church obligations. Perhaps it is as well that things are run as they are to keep the Churches going, than to have the State appealed to. One of the lucky things in Newfoundland is that we have not been faced with the obligations that other countries have been faced with in that respect. And we are certainly particularly fortunate in Newfoundland in a second respect as regards Educational matters, and that is that in a country where the people are allowed to carry on their own system of education under government supervision, it is a remarkable thing that we have not been approached with anything in the way of a general character. I say this advisably because I want to draw attention to the fact here that although this request on the face of it appears to be a request from a particular section of the

educational life of the community, in real truth it can be met in another way. In real truth the request that is before us to-day could quite as easily have come, in united front, under a general request from all the various denominations. It has not come that way at all. It has come as a candid admission here, of the people and I am reminded of this by the remarks of Mr. Bradley, when he asked that Trustees of the Church of England School be asked to try and seek the money elsewhere. I am satisfied that they have sought everywhere, and they cannot raise this money anywhere. And it must be understood that they are getting the balance under better terms financially than they could have got it any other way.

I am sure the Hon. member who has sat down will appreciate this as all other Hon. members will also. I am absolutely satisfied that the Government has not been applied to by the Church of England authorities on this matter. This request has been put into this form merely as a last resort. Now are we going to have Mahomet's coffin between Heaven and Earth or are we going to have educational advancement? Apparently, some members are alarmed because I remarked that this may be an introduction to requests. I do not say that it will mean an introduction on the part of the Church of England College, but an introduction for other people. I trust that at the next session of the House we will see other denominations coming along and asking for similar concessions as are being asked for today, because, after all, it would be an evidence of educational advancement. I do not think that the House's control of Crown moneys is going to be given away because of granting this reasonable concession that we are asked to

vote now, nor do I think that away down in our hearts we can take the attitude of opposition because these people are obliged to bring in the Measure in this form.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; In reply to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Port de Grave with respect to finding out whether the Board of Directors had exhausted all means of raising this money before approaching us, I would like to say that that was the very question we took up with them. We were not particularly anxious to give this assistance and we did not care to do it. When the Committee came to me as Prime Minister & Minister of Education, I told them definitely that I thought that they should first exhaust every possible means of raising this money. They said that they had done that and had found it impossible to raise any more money and that they came to us as a last resort. I take much the same views as the Colonial Secretary. We have got to consider very carefully before we lend money for schools of anything else. I think I spoke very pronouncedly in the Diocesan Synod on the desirability of having certain schools amalgamated. Nevertheless there is one feature about denominational schools that has its attraction and that is that the different denominations have built institution out of the money that they raised themselves whereas under the interdenominational system the country might be called upon to build them. The friendly rivalry that exists to-day among the different denominations is an incentive to getting funds for school buildings, etc. Why in this town to-day there are over a million dollars put into school build-

ings by the people themselves, and, perhaps, for that reason it is better to have the denominational system than the inter-denominational system. As to the question of security, I do not think there is any need to worry, the grants will be held to pay the interest charges in case of default. If that is what is called a precedent, I think that any other proposition of its kind from any other institution should be helped out, provided it can guarantee its bonds. In the present instance I feel that there need not be the slightest concern about the matter of security.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker: Evidently the question of security is uppermost in the Prime Minister's mind. May I say that it has not given me the slightest concern. I do not know nor do I care, whether the Church of England College pays back the amount or not. The security presumably will be upon the educational building; what would happen if you attempted to realize on that security; would it not hamper that institution? Supposing that interest or sinking fund on this debt was not paid by the Directors of the Church of England when due. By realizing the security you immediately make the operation of the school itself impossible and there would be a bitter outcry and justifiably so, from all over the country. So that it is clear the question of security cannot enter into the matter at all. The only question in my mind is how far this principle is going to carry us, because once you admit it there is no drawing back. Once this guarantee is granted you cannot deny similar concessions to any other school in the Island. I say, Sir, that this course takes out of the hands of this House its undoubted and inalienable and ancient rights. I say, Sir,

that it takes the control of the financial matters of the Assembly and places it in the hands of outside parties. For that reason and while I am going to vote for these Resolutions, I would like to see some delay and a further appeal made by the Directors of this College to see if in some manner they can raise this money by bond issue or otherwise.

I can see in the future request after request of this kind coming in, which we can't refuse, if we agree to this; and that as I say deprives this House of Assembly of its greatset privilege under the British Crown.

MR. W. J. BROWNE.—I have not had an opportunity to give these Resolutions very much consideration, but I have listened to the remarks of the honourable gentleman who has just sat down, and like him, I do not feel any alarm at the prospect of our ever being called upon to pay the amount of money required by the Directors in this instance. As a matter of fact this is not the first occasion on which the House has been called upon to guarantee loans. We are at present guarantors for many million dollars; and I don't see that it makes very much difference whether the guarantee is in connection with an industrial enterprise or an educational institution. We have guaranteed bonds in connection with the Corner Brook industry, the hotel, various docks around the Island; even in connection with a woolen mill we have been paying interest for several years and the industry is not operating at all. I do feel the Resolutions should specify the property on which the mortgage is held. That shouldn't be deputed to anybody outside the House but should be contained in the Resolutions themselves, and I feel that there should be a section

in the Resolutions to secure the grants of this Colony and provision in case of default of payment of the principal. I haven't the least doubt that the money will be paid; I have great faith in the people looking for these concessions but I think as a matter of security and as a precedent we should put it there. Mr. Bradley raised the point that he considered we would be bound to grant concessions to every school board looking for them after this. I don't agree at all. I think we can take each application on its merits. We don't have to give concessions unless the proposals are sound. This is a business proposition as far as I can see. Not only have we the security of the grants we pay to the Church of England College to fall back on, but we have the moral backing of the people themselves and I think every one will agree that it is worth more than the actual money we pay over to them; but I think we should have provision for default contained in the Resolutions themselves so that the same shall be done in the case of any similar request.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—We don't get a mortgage at all. The lender gets the mortgage. We only take his place. The banker looks after that.

MR. BRADLEY.—I don't care whether there is any mortgage or not, any security or not; I don't care whether the money is ever paid back or not; it doesn't interest me in the slightest. My contention is this that we are setting up a precedent which we in actual fact will never be able to avoid in future.

My learned friend, Mr Browne; suggested that there was no difference between a guarantee of this kind and one for industrial purposes. With

all due respect I say that he knows that is absurd. If the Newfoundland Government guaranteed bonds for a knitting mill that was a business proposition I presume, and no other knitting mill could come forward and say "you have given these people concessions and we want the same"! if you guaranteed the bonds to the Nfld. Hotel no other institution can come forward and say that having given that institution a guarantee we want the same. If they did it wouldn't be considered here. They would have to produce something better than that before a House of Assembly would consider it. But we have a number of institutions in this country we call schools whether colleges or otherwise I suppose there is a school for every Board and there are hundreds of Boards around the country. Every one undoubtedly will bear in mind the Church of England plan of today, and if every one who wants a new school or a better school or wants better conditions than existing ones we have to provide the money and in accordance with their estimates, nor ours. There is a vast difference between the guarantee of a loan to an industrial enterprise such as a loan to the Nfld. Hotel, the knitting mills or the Power and Paper Company, and a guarantee to schools around the Colony. We have peculiar conditions existing in connection with our educational system. In the first place it is denominational and as each Member of this Committee knows our educational grants are divided per capita and each denomination is entitled to its pro rata share, and if the Church of England, Roman Catholic, United Church or Salvation Army or any other denomination gets a dollar every other denomination is entitled to its proportionate amount in ac-

cordance with its numbers; if we set this precedent that we are prepared to guarantee amounts which are requested and which are recommended by Boards as amounts which they will require, then we do not know where it will end. No Member of this Committee at this moment can anticipate what any particular Board in any particular section or of any particular denomination is likely to ask at any given amount, and how is it possible, if that be so, for us to anticipate what the aggregate of the amounts we will be asked for is likely to be. It is not a question of considering these matters upon their merits at all. As I said before I don't propose to go into the merits of this question; whether the college needs money or not; neither do I care a rap whether there is security sufficient to cover in case of having to foreclose; neither do I care if they ever pay the money back; what I do object to is the setting of a precedent, morally and actually, if not legally, involving our acceding to any request of this kind that comes to the House for money which in the opinion of a school Board is required to complete some undertaking in connection with educational institutions which perhaps they have undertaken inadvisedly which perhaps they have begun knowing full well that if they couldn't complete the undertaking the House of Assembly would have to do it for them. That is my objection. I am going to vote for these Resolutions if they come to a vote but again I say that this particular institution should make every possible effort to devise other means before asking us to depart from the basic principle of the British Constitution.

MR. HALFYARD.—I do not intend, Mr Chairman, to delay for any great

length, the reading of these Resolutions.

The debate so far has been very interesting and I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Justice and the attitude that he took.

I wish to goodness he had been so enthusiastic about granting the Government money for the advance of education when we were considering the placing of seven or eight instructors in the outports to try and give the poor teachers an opportunity of learning how to teach properly.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I was equally so then.

MR. HALFYARD.—I could turn up Hansard.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Turn it up.

MR. HALFYARD.—I could turn up Hansard and show you that it was chiefly on your account and your speeches, conversations and attitude that caused the Government of that day to withdraw the bill that was being brought in with regard to sending these inspectors to the various outports.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I didn't think that I could run the Government; you do me too much honour and I thank you for the compliment.

MR. HALFYARD.—The Government of that day was known as the "obstruction Government".

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The Government.

MR. HALFYARD.—The Opposition I mean.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
They were a great old crowd.

MR. HALFYARD.—The same old crowd that is on this side of the House. I am glad that the Minister of Justice considers that the Government educational grants should be increased and that he is willing to hand out the Government money to encourage the building of schools.

We should be more united in our educational system and in our Churches. I wouldn't be a bit put out if some of them were closed up.

We are not united enough. We should be in the one fold together under the one shepherd. But I suppose we cannot help that it was only an accident of birth that placed us where we are.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
We are not half as divided as we pretend.

MR. HALFYARD.—Probably we are not, still in Church and educational matters we are cut in half. Instead of being cut in half we should have one big school undenominational, without being imposed upon for the building of educational institutions.

The Prime Minister in speaking on this subject tried to convey the idea that he felt that where there was interdenominational education less effort would be made on the part of the supporters of the school in providing schools for themselves and that they would apply to the Government more readily. By all coming together I believe that they would agree among themselves to work a great deal harder and put their hands deeper into their pockets.

The Prime Minister may be correct in his idea; I may be right in mine.

I am not one with him with regard to interdenominational education. I am very sorry that we have not got interdenominational schools and worked as one unit. If we were one, possibly one school could be erected so that the Church of England and United Church educational efforts could be amalgamated and we could have one large educational building and smaller schools built to take the grades of the small children in the East, West and so on.

I am sure that I am delighted to find that the Honourable Minister of Justice is willing to grant anything for education and when the estimates are brought forward, I do trust that he will use every effort with the Executive Government to increase the educational vote. If we have to borrow money, let us borrow it and provide sufficient money so that insolated places in this country could get schools and have teachers properly trained and every place in the outports provided with school facilities so that the parents will not have the opportunity to say that they did not have the chance to send their children to school.

This is election year and you would think that the Hon. Minister of Justice was on the stump.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
I can explain my attitude but I don't understand certain members who say that they don't like the resolutions but they are going to vote for them.

MR. HALFYARD.—I don't believe at the bottom of your heart that you like these resolutions, yet you are going to vote for them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
Yes I do, I love them.

MR. HALFYARD.—I do not like the position of things when the condition is such that we have to guarantee money to erect a school, even if that position is the result of hard times. Well as it is, we cannot help it now that they are building the school but it is the principle of the thing, as Mr. Bradley has already said, that I object to.

We would all like to vote for it for many reasons but it is establishing a precedent and that is the objection.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr Chairman; I am a firm believer in Education, but on the other hand, we cannot but realize that you are here creating a precedent.

The thought has occurred to me and I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not the Directors of the college would be justified in pledging, as security, in order to raise this money the annual grant that they receive from the Government and whether they would be within their right. I take it that the Government today is accepting that as some sort of security. Possibly the Directors would be able to manage to raise a loan if it was found that they could honourably pledge these Government grants as security. Probably they could float a bond, perhaps at a little higher rate of interest, if there was good security given such as the security of the annual grants derived from the Government. I thought that it was advisable to bring this to the attention of the Prime Minister as possibly it might be a way out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I would say no. I don't think that any company that places money on bonds will want to do so for a security of that kind.

They will take property and probably the bonds issued will be met.

The Eastern Trust Company have lent \$120,000 on security of the building. They have to pay that \$120,000 back again in something under three years and the \$80,000 worth of bonds to be paid up under another period of five years from date. They will lend money on that and the bond issue will probably be hypothecated for the property of the Church of England people but as to the grants that you mentioned as coming from the Government I think that they would not be inclined over a period of years on a bond issue to give any consideration thereto.

MR. W.J. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman; if the interest was to be placed at 6 per cent I think that there would be a number of investors interested when the bonds were guaranteed by the Government at 6 per cent. The Government bonds are only paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There is nothing compulsory about the 6 per cent.

If they can borrow it at 5 per cent they will do so.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair. The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions, with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 7th, instant at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY May 7th 1928

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr Brown from Botwood Re Road.

Mr Brown from Sunday Cove Island Re Road.

Mr Brown from Beaumont North Re Road.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Lake gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates' "was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR BRADLEY.—Mr, Speaker; We have arrived at the last hours of a dying Assembly and simply by the efflux of time will this Assembly expire on or about July 9th next. That Assembly is dying a natural death; it should have been executed years ago, for, if ever there was an Assembly in the history of the Colony of Newfoundland which failed to measure up, it is that Assembly composed of those of us here this afternoon. I suppose it is pos-

sible that posterity may hereafter hear of our death. Let us hope that they will not be too curious for it is impossible that we can hope that they would apply to our record the admonition De Mortis—and yet it is only by the utmost stretch of imagination that we can entertain the idea that will apply to us half that admonition De Mortis—. We have sat here now for four sessions and this is the fifth. We have accomplished little that can be regarded as of benefit to those who sent us here. In course of our careers we might have tried to do something to take this country out of the chaotic condition in which she was landed after the late War. I repeat that the most we can hope for is that a censorious public, a public which is rightly censorious, will throw over us the mantle of charity and let us die and be buried for ever.

But the curtain now rises on the first scene of the last act and I have before me here a Speech from the Throne. Past experience permits us to hope for very little and we can only pray for a minimum of evil. The first paragraph in the Speech can be dismissed with little or no discussion because it is the usual empty introduction which contains nothing more than a mere polite phrase; but the second paragraph in the Speech is a misrepresentation of fact and demands some notice. It says. "I congratulate you upon the marked progress the country has made during the Legislative term now ending, and especially upon the advancement during the present year". One could spend all 'oday and tomorrow and the day after discussing that incorrect statement, but it does not appear to me to be worth while in our dying hours to spend much time here discussing the past, and I only make reference to it

for the purpose of drawing the attention of hon. members to the fact that true to their instincts the Government is trying to bluff us to the end. Paragraph (3) in the Speech says "The prosecution of our fisheries during 1927 resulted in better returns to many of those directly engaged, etc.," Why, Sir I marvel that the present administration has the temerity to mention fisheries in this House. That statement they made is so grossly misleading as to be a reflection on their own intelligence even to imagine that we could possibly believe them. That statement in the Speech is one of those half truths which is a lie. It is quite possible that many people made profits out of the fisheries last year, but in what way were those profits made and who are the people who made those profits? Not the fishermen. Then again we are told that "shore fish sold at remunerative prices and stocks remaining over are smaller than for many years past, thus creating a healthy market condition for future operation". Again the Government are looking into the clouds, but I want to pull them to earth for a moment and ask them what profit the Labrador fishermen got when they were paid only \$3.60 and \$3.80 a quintal for their fish. I happen to represent about one-half of the stationary fishermen on the Labrador coast and I know what I am talking about. Fully half of those Labrador fishermen last year did not square their accounts after their summer's work and I know that several of them had fish on their hands all last winter and could not dispose of it at any price. Yet the statement is brought here that the condition in connection with the Labrador fishery is improving in order to induce us to believe that, whereas Labrador fishery conditions are get-

ting worse every day. The fourth paragraph in the Speech deals with the Sealfishery and tells us that, "The Sealfishery just concluding will show a larger catch than the previous year and the increased demand for Seal-skins has permitted the payment of higher prices with proportionate benefit to those engaged in this hazardous industry". Is it the ordinary sealer who got the benefit out of the increased price paid for sealskins or is it the steamer owner? I have been given to understand that exceptionally high prices were paid for sealskins this year, but I have yet to learn that any proportionate benefit went to the ordinary sealer. The profits this year will go to the owners of the ships and not to the men who were half fed as well as half paid at the sealfishery this Spring. There is an Act on the Statute Book which provides that the men shall be given certain and specific food throughout the voyage. I am prepared to make the statement here now that one of my constituents who was at the sealfishery did not have half the food of what the Act requires during the last few weeks of the voyage. Yet we are supposed to have Inspectors on all ships to see that the proper amount and kind of food is put on all ships. But it is like the Cigarette Law, the law is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Then we are told in the fifth paragraph that "The Pulp and Paper industry showed an expansion and the activities in connection with our mineral wealth give promise of marked development". Well I suppose we will have to admit that is so on the face of it. There may be marked development. I understand there is slightly more paper being produced at Corner Brook than there was twelve month's ago; but I understand that there is no

marked development going on now at Buchans Mine, and, if there is, it is not being carried on in the interest of the working man of this Colony because there is no provision made by which the condition of the workingman at Buchans Mine is improved. Surely it will not be seriously contended that the condition of the workingman is improved by paying him twenty-five cents an hour. There is a paragraph in the Speech which refers to efforts being made or about to be made by the Government to look after the interest of the miners at Bell Island by inducing the Company to let them in on a profit sharing basis. May I suggest that it may possibly be to the credit of the Government if a similar attempt is made for the benefit of the labouring man at Corner Brook and Buchans Mine, instead of as last year giving all our securities away in the first place and giving everything else that was left away in the second place. But, Sir, the expansion and the activities at Corner Brook and at Buchans Mine do not show any indication of any improved condition for the ordinary working man of this country. I have no doubt that there will be expansion and development take place at Corner Brook and at Buchans Mine, but I will hazard the opinion that that expansion and that development will be in the interest of and for the benefit of the International Paper Company and the American Smelters of the United States.

The sixth paragraph tells us that "The legislation enacted at last session, rendering it possible for new interests to acquire the paper-making enterprise at Corner Brook, resulted in the transfer of the property to other ownership early in the present year, and the new proprietors are taking the initial steps towards the advances

therein contemplated". That is something we knew nine month's ago, unfortunately. "The new proprietors". What does that mean? It is what an old Professor of mine used to term "dodging the devil around the stump." This paragraph ends by saying "On the other hand the Act designed to facilitate the construction of a mill in the Gander Valley has not been brought into operation, though it is possible that this step may be taken at a later date. It is very desirable that a mill be established there, and the owners of the property are hopeful about bringing about this result." The Government was warned last summer that 'here would not be any mill erected on the Gander and when the Gander Resolutions were going through I told the Government point blank that there never was any intention on the part of the International Paper Company to put a mill there and you will never see one there. That paragraph is nothing but the vague meanderings of the minds of those men who recklessly threw away our resources last year.

The seventh paragraph in the Speech tells of the visit of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress and of a proposed visit of the American Institute of Mining Engineers here in September next. I hope they will have good weather when they come and I hope the fishing they will have will be outside the waters of the Newfoundland revenue.

Paragraph eight tells us that we are to have new measures for the purpose of bringing our mining laws into conformity with the trend of similar legislation in other parts of the Empire. I suppose we are going to have copies of some more Canadian acts. It appears we are not capable in

this colony of making laws of our own. It is not possible to meet changing conditions as they arise with ideas of our own but we must run to our neighbor Canada and copy their legislation. That has been the history of the legislation of the Monroe Administration, continual copying of Canadian acts, many of which, as I can speak from experience, do not work in this Colony. The ninth paragraph I have already mentioned. It refers to an attempt of the Government to make an arrangement with the owners of the Bell Island Mine whereby the miners will share in the profits. I dismiss that Sir, with this statement that unless more ability is displayed in connection with that than there has been displayed by the Government in dealing with corporations previously then the workers on Bell Island have little to hope for from their endeavours.

Paragraph ten is of course the usual request for money, what is called "the customary provision." I don't know what that phrase means. I have never seen the same provisions twice, and on the occasions that I have been present when the Estimates were passed by this Government, the Estimates have always increased in amount. Next they tell us that the Government was able to negotiate the loan authorized at the last session on better terms than late issues, a fact which indicates the high credit enjoyed by the Colony in the financial world. It appears their latest efforts have been successful in getting more money to squander out of this loan than any other. Apparently the Bank of Montreal didn't get any slice in 24 hours like they did on the previous loan.

Paragraph twelve deals with the 1918 loan and tells us nothing that we have not known for years. It has to be retired in 1928. They tell us that a

Loan Bill slightly in excess of \$7,500,000 will be submitted to cover this. Why don't they give the excess.

Paragraph thirteen tells us that we are going to have a small deficit, a small deficit, I suppose they mean a smaller deficit of one million, a mere row of beans, doesn't amount to anything in a large wealthy and populous country like Newfoundland, a mere row of beans.

Paragraph fourteen deals with the Railway, and they tell us that we are within \$300,000 of the expenditure. Sir, judging from their dealing with the various matters mentioned in the various paragraphs of this Speech from the Throne, the very cursory information telling us about this particular deficit and the casual manner in which it is dismissed leaves room for some suspicion that there is something else behind it. What it is we don't know, but possibly before this House closes for the last time we will be in possession of information. I wonder in view of the fact that the diversion of the line will in all probability benefit that industry, will the Government suggest that those particular interests should in any way contribute to the cost of that Railroad, I wonder?

The next paragraph tells us that the Bills respecting various matters have been prepared by the Departments concerned and will be submitted to us. I wonder what that means! I have a recollection last year that there was a proposal in the Speech from the Throne to reintroduce the Income Tax. This House was in session practically four months but this Income Tax did not materialize because the Government were not able to put it through and knew perfectly well that the moment that Bill was introduced that their majority in the House was gone. Is it because some of that legis-

lation covered up in that particular way may cause further defections from the party and they want to find out where they are that they refuse to tell us what these Bills are?

The next paragraph tells us that there is to be a general election. Sir, the country heaves a sigh of relief and says thank God. If any self governing country was ever sick of conditions, ever sick of methods of government existing, ever sick of the administration which controls its affairs, it is this country of Newfoundland today. So, again, I say, the country says "thank God." The document ends with a prayer to the Almighty that "He may guide your counsels and endeavours for the promotion of the true interests of the country." We fervently echo that prayer, for during the past four years, this country has had no one to care for its interests except that Great Ruler of the universe, for government in the country we have not had. Now, before I sit down and I am not going to detain you much longer, I want to say that this Speech from the Throne foreshadows nothing whatsoever, contains nothing, not one tittle of anything that can ever materialize or be of any benefit to the country. It shows the Government has no policy except the policy of hanging on like leeches to the last minute. No attempt was made to do anything in the country since last year and yet they told us they did as well as anybody else could do. My learned and honourable friend, Mr. Browne and Mr Power, made excellent but abortive speeches here a couple of days ago in efforts to apologize for that they had so wretchedly failed to measure up, a failure never equalled in the history of the country. Mr. Browne, I think, did sing the song of honesty, a courageous effort and

an able one in view of the circumstances, but his natural honesty rendered his voice hollow, and nothing reached his hearers but a howl, and the Prime Minister with a look of pitiable concern and in the softest and humblest of accents, requested that his Manifesto be not again held aloft before him. I can sympathize with the Prime Minister under circumstances, but when I realize that the evils that have come on him are the result of his own faithlessness to the country, my sympathy is swallowed up in indignation for the people he betrayed. The Prime Minister and his associates, politically speaking, have sold themselves to the devil and they must accept the devil's pay, and it appears that those of exalted station in this House and in the councils of this Colony do not exclude the exercise under stress of affairs and political expediency of a sound and vigorous mendacity. Now, Sir, with the view of giving these gentlemen a few facts which perhaps they might consider, and perhaps would change the burden of their song, I propose to relate to the Government minstrels some of the instances of honesty of this administration. According to them there never was so honest a Government; there never was so straightforward a Government; there never was so capable a Government; never so paternal a Government; never a Government that looked so much to the interests of the people which it ruled as the present Monroe administration. Now let us examine that honesty for a moment. The first matter I want to draw to the attention of Honourable Members of the House is the attitude of the Prime Minister in connection with sessions of this Legislature. He was very strongly opposed to late sessions, very strongly opposed, and while his majority in the

House was considerable he opened the Legislature, in the first year, on the 18th of Feb., and in the second, on the third day of March, but when you came down to the House a year ago, it was not on the third day of March but the 11th day of May.

I have heard a great deal here about the interference with trade, of an election, and that sort of thing. That it is most injurious to the best interests of the country for any political turmoil to take place, and at that time of the year when we begin our industrial activities, you did not think that the 11th day of May was the wrong time.

You believed it in 1924, 1925 and 1926. Why the change of heart in 1927 and 1928? I will tell you. It was because the Prime Minister was not in a position to open the House because of his majority.

In 1927 he made an endeavour to increase that majority and on the 17th day of April, I think it was, he got a vote of want of confidence from one of the biggest districts in the country.

Nevertheless the Government came in here and brought no legislation that was of any advantage to the colony. They claimed that the Government could do nothing because its majority was not big enough, and refused to go to the country last fall and ask the electorate to put a strong Government here that could do so.

The same Government was strongly in favour of retrenchment.

But what did they give us? They have added to the burden of the Colony the sum of \$26,000,000 more to our national debt. A record not equalled by any previous administration.

The fisheries was also one of the burdens of their song.

We were told that the fisheries were to be encouraged.

This administration regarded the fisheries as the main-stay of the Colony, and not a single copper was spent during their four years of office to encourage fisheries but \$2,000,000 was spent that will always be a burden for the people and another two and a quarter millions on high roads that will also be a continuous burden. The Monroe Administration did nothing to encourage the fisheries of the colony.

I come now to the manner in which the honest Government dealt with the District of St. John's East. That seat became vacant in 1925, and according to the Election Act it should have been filled within six months, but the Government Jerry-mandered with it two years and it was only at the point of the bayonet that they were finally driven to open the seat, and when it was opened the people gave them the answer.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, that any Government that controls the destinies of a country should look after the interests of that country primarily and not worry about outsiders. It is shown by the concessions that were given to capitalist concerns by the present Administration, that the best interests of the colony were not considered.

An agreement was made here last year with the International Paper Company for the handing over of the complete interest in Corner Brook.

For that concern this country was liable in the sum of \$10,000,000 and held a second mortgage on the assets. To-day we are in the position of third mortgagees, \$15,000,000 more stepping ahead of us and all that done without proper investigation. On the floors of this Assembly last year I asked the

Government to have a proper audit made of the affairs of the International Paper Company. That was refused and the Government went ahead basing their actions upon the reports handed to them by others.

We were given to understand that it was a defunct concern. That there were no assets that could possibly be taken to cover our interests and that unless the people of the International Paper Company came that it would go into liquidation and we would be called upon for \$10,000,000.

Still according to the International Paper Company, they have made \$2,173,000 profit since they took over that dying bankrupt concern that we were glad to get rid of.

One would not mind if at the same time concessions, remission of duty, remission of royalty and authority to export pulp to other countries and bring in all sorts of goods free of duty, were not given to the same concern.

Earlier in the session they also introduced a Bill dealing with Buchan's mine. We were under no obligation in connection with Buchan's mine. The mineral was there. It was known to be there. Those who owned those areas admitted quite frankly that they had in view some two hundred million dollars worth of ore.

Why were they not told to go on and operate their claims if they wanted to. But no, they came to this House and demanded concessions and had concessions given them for practically everything under the sun for a period of twenty years.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines stood up there and with tears in his eyes told us that if these gentlemen did not get concessions they would run away and we would not

get the labour.

Mr. Speaker, we are too easily bluffed in this country. All that the Buchan's mining interests had to do was to tell us that they would run away and we swallowed it and gave them any concessions that they wanted.

When it was asked in the House last year that they let us have a list of all the concessions they wanted given in full they stated that they would not give it to us, that we were to put the Bill through and they would give us nothing.

They are getting all kinds of concessions from the country and are paying nothing into the revenue of this Colony. And we have to support post office, court house, build roads, etc., in this settlement, and our working men get 25c. an hour which is just sufficient to keep body and soul together, just making money for the Guggenheims and others.

The attitude of the Government on the question of taxation is also an interesting one.

One can understand the reduction of taxes which are to be of some benefit to the people, but just how the reduction of the Bank tax is going to benefit the people of this country is beyond me to understand.

That is what happened. The bankers of this Colony were relieved of the burden of some thousands of dollars, which is of no benefit to the country. The Income Tax was also deleted. The fairest tax known to public finance to-day.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction, that the Income Tax is the fairest known to public finance to-day. That was removed, not in the interests of the people of the country, the working men, but in

the interests of those who could well afford to pay. These burdens were removed and placed on the shoulders of those who carried them ever since the Monroe administration failed to live up to their promises made in 1924.

The Profits Tax was also removed. A tax equally fair as the Income Tax. What could be fairer than to ask a man to return to the country in proportion to the profits that he has made. What is fairer than to return a part of what he makes out the trade of the Colony?

These are a few facts which I suggest for the consideration of the Government members and if, Mr. Speaker, they have not diseased materially and will still look facts in the face I am satisfied that an examination of these facts will firmly dispel any idea as to the honesty of the Monroe Administration for ever. Honest administration! That is to acquire a reputation for honesty by singing loudly and that is the greatest piece of political petty larceny that was ever attempted in this Colony.

Now dealing for a moment with the subject of a spring election, which has been brought into debate.

I would say this that there are figures there that prove that you disfranchise more by a fall than a spring election. If you will look at the figures of 1909 and 1922 you will see that two thousand votes more in the spring than in the fall. So far as the interference with the workingman is concerned, I have to say this that it does not make a bit of difference whether there is an election or not. He goes on with his work.

I am speaking from experience now, I have fought two spring elections.

Now from the standpoint of trade, it has been suggested that a spring election is disastrous. In what way? In what way, I ask. We have never yet had a satisfactory explanation why this statement has been made, and it has been made often but there has never yet been an explanation of why that election would interfere with the trade of the Colony.

It cannot be on the score of tariff because no sane administration would ever interfere with the tariff once the year's operation had begun. It cannot be that the merchants themselves will not import the goods to prosecute the industries by reason of the fact that they fear a general election. Before that election is known, they have already ordered their stocks for the coming year, and once they have ordered them and they come to this country they have to go into consumption. My learned friend, Mr. Browne, quoted the resolution of 1861 in support of his contention that a spring election is detrimental to the best interests of the colony. The only answer that I have to that is, that that resolution was passed by a House of Assembly composed chiefly of merchants, and this resolution was passed in the interests of the merchants classes, they were not thinking of the interests of the colony. They were thinking of their own interests. As regards his argument that an election this spring is unnecessary, and by the way I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that his support of the party that brought on that election in 1923. He tells us that the Government ought to carry on, that there is justification for their carrying on with the minority in the House, and he cites as an illustration the case of the Younger Pitt and Ramsay MacDonald. I can give him two equally illustrious names

Sir Robert Peel and Disraeli, but neither of these gentlemen ever carried on with no House at all, and that is the position that you will find yourselves in on the ninth of July.

MR. BROWNE.—Sir Edward Morris did that in 1913.

MR. BRADLEY.—He did nothing of the kind in 1913. This House dies on or about the ninth of July, and we are told that Mr. Monroe intends to resign. When he resigns his administration must be formed responsible to nobody, for there is no House for them to be responsible to. They represent nobody, because they are not at the wish of the people, and the result is that we will have this country governed for a period of two or four months on a Crown Colony basis, and that in a country which the Prime Minister told us has equal status with the British Isles to-day. We are an independent nation within the Empire and we are to be governed for three or four months as a Crown Colony. Should any crisis arise there is no House of Assembly to call together and these nine or ten irresponsibles are there to do as they please. I say, Sir, that this House should have been dissolved long ago, twelve months ago. Mr. Monroe told us that he could not put through the legislation that he would have liked to put through. I presume that we are justified in interpreting that statement to mean this, that he could not put through that Legislation which he thought had to be put through in the interests of the country. If that was the situation, and legislation was needed which he could not put into effect, then if there was a spark of honesty left in him he had no business to stand in the light of this country. He should have gone back to the country to give the people an opportunity to put a govern-

ment in here that could put through that legislation which he was not able to do. He qualifies that statement immediately by saying, that no man could do better than they have done. What smuck self-complacency. If self-complacency were a virtue, then the Prime Minister is abundantly endowed, and we are now about to lose the services of these gentlemen, Mr. Monroe and his Government, the ablest and most upright administration procurable in Newfoundland to-day. Gentlemen if you have tears to shed prepare to shed them now. He tells us in another paragraph that he could not have been ready last fall, why ever not. Did he try to get ready for an election last fall knowing the conditions as he did know them last May. Did he make any effort to prepare for an election last fall? I am afraid sir that out of his own mouth he stands condemned. In view of the fact that he told us that he had a contract for four years and intended to carry it out, it is reasonable for us to believe that he never even contemplated, much less tried to bring about an election in the fall of 1927. The real truth of the matter is that he had no intention of bringing about an election in 1927, either in the spring or the fall, and that he had no intention of having an election in the spring of 1928.

The only idea of himself and his administration was, to carry on to the last minute, to hold on to place and power until it was taken out of his hands by law or by the people of the country, and during his whole regime of office the same situation has obtained. He has piled taxes upon the working people to the breaking point; he has strangled the main industry of the country, and he has relieved his wealthy friends of those burdens which they carried before. And to-day

we are faced with a situation in this country that is unprecedented in her history.

In spite of the fact that Mr. Monroe knew the conditions in this country when he came into power four years ago, in spite of the fact that he then believed that conditions were bad and would need the most careful management to bring order out of chaos, he drove the old ship in the teeth of a gale of depression, under the pressure of every square inch of canvas that he could find in the sail-locker of extravagance and reckless expenditure and now that old ship lies on a heaving ocean of dismay and uncertainty, and the captain is afraid to face his owners. He announces that he is retiring from politics. In the words of Calvin Coolidge, "he does not choose to run again". Why not, sir. Surely if he has managed the affairs of the old ship, and conducted her voyage as he ought to have done, he should be delighted to go back to the electors and receive from them the plaudit "well done my good and faithful servant". What is it that drives him back to the public life to-day, is it conscience? The most powerful, the most convincing, the most conclusive, I may say of all. It is conscience, Sir, that makes cowards of us all.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr Speaker; I would like to have a word to-day on this document known as the Speech from the Throne. I may say that I have listened with rapt attention to the Hon. gentlemen that proposed and seconded the Address in reply, and I have to congratulate the honourable member for St. John's West on his efforts, in bolstering up the cause of the Government, and making a very good, presentable address out of very poor material, and I also want to congratulate the honourable member for

St. George's. He also gave us some food for thought, in connection with his seconding the motion. The honourable member for St. John's West in the course of his remarks made reference to the maladministration of a former Government. I should like to know how he defines the term maladministration. He has boosted the government of which he is a member, and claims perhaps not in the words that I am going to use, that they have done the best that possibly could have been done by any group of men during the term of their office. As I said I was very much struck with and rather resented his using the term "maladministration". What is "maladministration"? I hold sir, that any government or any party representing any constituency or any country that takes control of government affairs and spends money like the present government has done since it came into office, without very much to show for what they have spent, are guilty sir, of mal-administration. Since the present government came into power they have borrowed large amounts of money. Some of the money that was borrowed was spent possibly in a way that they can rightly claim that they have something to show for it. They built a dock which cost two million. They built some tourist roads, and we do not know what they cost or what they are going to cost this country, because the upkeep is going to be such that it is questionable whether amongst other things the country is going to find the money to do it. They re-railed a section of the railway, they built the Caribou, I cannot say that I can congratulate them on the money that they spent on the Caribou. Possibly they may have got value for what they spent on the dock, but when we come to look for returns,

what are we going to get in return for the money we spent there. It may be claimed that it is necessary to have such a dock in this country. We will leave that anyway. But with all that expenditure amounting to some six or seven million dollars, and we have absolutely nothing to show for it. That money is lent to us and we have to foot the bill and find the interest on it.

And I claim, Sir, that that is maladministration, for any government that comes into the House borrows money and spends it recklessly and at the termination of its office has nothing to show for what it spent is guilty of maladministration. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Port de Grave and his reference to Buchans Mine. He said in effect that there was no need of having enacted any legislation for Buchans Mine and I heartily agree with him. People would eventually come into the country to work Buchans Mine, in spite of the legislation that the Government brought in giving that concern such tremendous concessions. I took the trouble to get some information since this House last met in reference to Buchans Mine and the figures I got in respect to the quantity of ore that is there are stupendous, in fact almost unbelievable. A gentleman who is a first class mining engineer told me that there are in that area one hundred and fifty million tons of ore in one mass. He gave me the figures in connection with the working of that ore and he claims that it is if not the finest easily the second of its kind in the world. Still the Newfoundlanders working there are not getting a living wage. The Company that is operating the Buchans Mine and that got such huge concessions from this Govern-

ment of ours will not import labour into the country for the simple reason that they cannot get outside labourers to come in and work for as small a rate of pay as they are getting our people to work for. And so I claim that all the legislation we had here last year in connection with Buchans Mine is futile and all the encouragement and concessions that were handed out to this Company amounted to a free gift. Take the Gander deal which was dealt with so effectively this afternoon by the member for Port de Grave. There is one thing in connection with that Corner Brook enterprise that is agitating the minds of a great many people of this country and that is the question of interest, which we are not going to find easy to get, and I consider that, with the outcome far in the distance and so uncertain, it is gambling with the future of this country for the Government to pass such legislation. Originally we were up against ten millions of dollars there and now we are going to be up against five millions more.

Just a word with regard to a Spring election. I do not know that I am in favor of a Spring election any more than I am in favor of a Fall election. At all events we will be faced with the position of having no Government after July 9th when the term of office of the present Government automatically expires. It is claimed by members of the Government Party that the Spring is no time for an election for the reason that trade is busiest at that time and people are preparing for the fisheries. Then why did the Government open the House on the second day of May when people should be occupied at their own business affairs? The member for St. John's West told us on opening day that there was a ruling made in the Legi-

slature in 1861 against the holding of Spring elections. But it might be recalled that there was no secret ballot in those days of 1861 and the holding of Spring elections might have some effect on the giving out of supplies to fishermen. In any case we have the law of the land unmistakably laid down for our guidance in regard to what we should do here and I take it that a Government that prides itself on giving a square deal to all should see that law carried out. Only last year there was a bye-election in the east end of St. John's, an election that should have been held two years previous, according to the constitution of the country. The law stated that when a seat was vacant for six months it should be filled, but the Government broke the law inasmuch as they did not open the district until two years afterwards. If another man and myself start a row on the street we break the law. We are brought before a court of justice and whoever is in fault pays for it; but a Government apparently, can break the law with impunity, continue in office to misrule and maladministrate the affairs of this country and continue in office after their term is finished and until such time as they see fit to have an election, because that is just what the present Government are doing to-day.

With regard to the sealfishery, I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his seat just now. When the Monroe Government came into power and Captain Winsor went in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries I really expected that something would be done that would benefit the men who prosecute the sealfishery and that some new legislation would be introduced to protect this industry. Seals are being killed indiscriminately and it is the opinion

of old and experienced sealing men that within a short time the herd will be so depleted that it will not be a paying venture at all for merchants to send out ships. In the fifties and sixties upwards of five and six hundred thousand seals were brought in for one spring and the country reaped a rich harvest from the sealfishery in those days. Now we think we are doing well with a catch of about two hundred and twenty thousand. This kind of talk may not be of much use in the dying days of the present Government, but it may be of some use to some future Government or to somebody who may be instrumental in having some alterations made to our sealing law. Long ago provision should have been made to protect our sealing herd, at least to have it hold its own, if not increased. In the United States legislation has been passed to protect the Alaska seal.

Scientists were set to work to make records and find out what could be done to increase the herd of Alaska seals, and in 1910 the herd amounted to 130,000 and since then laws have been put in force and scientists have been working on the subject with the result that last year the herd of Alaska seals amounted to over 900,000. There is no particular reason, sir, why the same thing could not have been done in connection with the sealfishery here. They know all about the seals; where they go; how far south they go in the summer; where they breed; they can count them and they know how old a female is when it can breed; they know the same of the male; in fact they have all the data that is needed to increase the herd. Now, sir, I hold the same thing could be done with our sealfishery. We know so very little about our seals; how they breed; where they go; what

is their age when they mate; that it is almost incredible to an outsider that we are so ignorant on this particular industry. The seals mate they tell us in respect to the Alaska seal in the case of the male when five years old and in the case of the female when three years, and they kill none but males of three years old, with the result that between 1910 and 1926 the herd increased from 130,000, I think is the amount, to 900,000. So I want to sound a warning not only to this Assembly but to the people of this country that there is an industry we have counted on all along right down thru the years as an asset that will soon not be an asset to this country. If the killing is going on as in the past few years indiscriminately shooting and killing we soon wont have any seal fishery. I think after giving due consideration any man of ordinary common sense will come to the conclusion that if you kill any animal on the face of the earth indiscriminately and kill all you can get of them, in time that animal is finished. I want before I sit down to say a word or two in connection with relief work in this country or in this city. In my opinion, sir, the giving out of monies without getting some return for it, no matter how, in some possible way, is a mistake. We have before us, of course we have been told of the fact that other countries have had to adopt the dole policy, and England is pointed to as one of the countries wherein that system has been adopted. But we are prone in this country to copy those things whereby in my opinion Great Britain is at fault and leave those things wherein we might with profit emulate them and thereby do some good for ourselves. But sir, this question of dole in my opinion should never be con-

sidered for a man who gets money no matter who from or in what way when it comes from the people of this country should be made work for it supposing it is only by taking bricks from one side of the street and depositing them on the other side. I do not listen to gentlemen talking about what is done in Canada and what is done in the United States. As I said before we might copy them in some respects. In this I hold that it is a very bad thing to take them for an example. Now, sir, before I sit down, there is one other subject I would like to touch on. Last year in this House when the legislation in connection with Corner Brook and the International Paper Company was before this House there was certain opposition to that legislaion going through. Some gentlemen on this side of the House were indifferent, some were not. Now it has been said to me, in my hearing, and I have been accused of getting out of this House when the International Paper Company legislation went through because I didn't want to be here, because it was suggested to me that I should get out. I want to tell this House that last year when there was an issue in this House on that International Paper Company legislation I wasn't here because I couldn't get here. If I had been here I would have voted against it and I am against it to-day. I want to make my position quite clear to the country, and my friends some of them who accused me of not being here when there was a division on that question, I was against it. I am still against it, and I want it known to my friends and the people of the country and to the constituency that I represent. One word more, I have been interested in reading the Daily News and Telegram during the past year when

references were made to the Prime Minister, and congratulations were given him, bouquets were handed out to him for keeping his party together under difficulties during the past few years. It is my opinion Sir, any Government elected to this House to represent the people should remain here four years according to law. They have got no business getting out before four years and when four years are up they should get out. That is my opinion. With regard to the defeating of Governments last year and the year before, I was not in favour of having the Government going out of this House to go back to the country for a general election, but now, sir, I hold that their time is up, and on the 9th of July we cease to have a Government, therefore if you are honest in maintaining that they should do what is right and "give a square deal to all" when their time is up they should get out. That may be perhaps a slang term to use in regard to their finishing up but it is effective I suppose. Now, sir, while I am on this I want to tell those who have in the past congratulated Prime Minister Monroe on keeping his party together under great difficulties that Mr. Monroe has to thank for keeping his party together the honourable Member for Carbonear, and gentlemen on that side of the House know very well that they have to thank the Honourable Member for Carbonear for keeping them together the past year and perhaps one or two Honourable gentlemen on this side of the House had no small hand in keeping them together, but for my own part I feel that now is the time when they should say they have finished up and lay down the reins of Government.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Speaker; Without wishing to delay the discussion on

the Address in Reply, I take this chance of making a few comments and in congratulating the Honourable Mover of the Address Mr Browne. I want to say I am quite in accord with what he had to say in regard to Sir William and Lady Allardyce. Sir William and Lady Allardyce endeared themselves to the people of the country by their kindly disposition and by the keen interest they displayed in the industrial as well as the social life of this country and I quite believe that when the time came to say good-bye their regrets at leaving us were as great as ours at losing them. At the same time we need not be greatly disturbed because we have not yet an appointment made to fill the Vice Regal position, because we have in the person of his Excellency Sir William Horwood a gentleman who is able to assume naturally and with dignity, the administration of this Colony. We are very fortunate in having a Governor at hand at all times in the person of Sir William Horwood.

The Speech from the Throne for this Session, as we have said at other times in the House of Assembly, contains nothing. Outside of the suggested revision of our mining laws, discussion of ways and means and the passing of supply, outside of that, I fail to see the use of calling the Assembly together, particularly so late in the year as the middle of May.

In these times of competition Governments should be on their toes at all times to do their best in enacting laws, progressive laws, to help out the possibilities of a country.

I was struck by a remark Mr. Scammell made in his remarks the other day when he was referring to the visit of Sir Halford McKinder, who came here to address us and find out just how

to help us with regard to our fishery products.

In his remarks Mr. Scammell mentioned that a suggestion of trade with Africa has been made. In reading a leading Canadian journal the other day I find that mention of trade with Africa is made there also (reads) and the article goes on to say (reads).

Now we have opened this House of Assembly when one half of the year is over. The Canadian Parliament has made agreements I believe, with European countries, Spain and Portugal etc., whereby reciprocal agreements were arrived at. We have a reciprocal agreement with Spain. What I want to point out is the necessity of the Government being on the job to assist the country to better its position in the markets of the world with the goods that we have to market.

The Speech from the Throne foreshadows nothing, as far as I can see, to be done for the encouragement of the fisheries. It is a very serious matter when the Government is "marking time". In these days of progress we should not be "marking time". We should be making for progress and in that connection I want to say a few words regarding a spring election versus a fall election.

Fall elections apparently have been taken as a matter of course but I have asked various people in different walks of life just what real reason could be advanced against a spring election and so far I have heard no serious reason against a spring election. The only reason against an election being held this particular spring was the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Ferryland Mr. Cashin the other day when he said that it might be difficult to refund the war loan due this June.

Apart from that, as I see it, the fall of the year is the worst time to have an election because the fisherman is very busy in the fall looking after his catch and he is far better and busier then employed in bringing his catch to market and trying to successfully market it. And the merchants too are all very busy looking after their customers requirements.

The fall of the year in Newfoundland is the big harvest-time when we have practically all the work of the year to do and we are far better off following our different avocations then than at any other time of the year than we would be electioneering. In the spring there is generally a let up in this connection and consequently more leisure.

Another reason why I consider that there should have been an election this spring is that the present Government has already had four sessions. Apart from that time the Prime Minister had made it understood that he was no longer going to remain at the head of Government. If that was a fact and he intends to retire at the end of the session it would only be fair to the electorate to go to the country last fall or this spring. And as my honourable colleague, Capt. Randall, just mentioned, it is just as big a waste of time to be here at this time as to be contesting an election. I quite agree that we should have had an election instead of opening the House of Assembly this spring.

Now as to what is contained in the Speech from the Throne.

If the Honourable Minister of Finance was in his seat I believe that he would agree with us when I say that he should compliment me on my foresight last year when I told him that he could expect an increase in revenue this year. I understand that there

is an increase of several hundred thousand dollars this year.

I will make another prophesy and say you can expect a still further increase this year. I have my reasons for saying that. As a business man I have my finger on the pulse of the trade of Newfoundland, more or less, and I know that we are not going back in our trading.

Mention also is made that the deficiency on the railway will be somewhat less this year. I give due credit there to the practical management. I do not by any means give credit to the Railway Commission who are not on the working staff.

The freight department comes in for special praise.

I have been in communication with the gentleman in charge of the freight department this past six or seven months and I know that they have been working overtime in an endeavour to co-operate with importers of this country and have been competing with foreign transportation companies, that is companies here that are not Newfoundland companies, and by competing with them have induced considerable number of merchants to send freight via Sydney and Port-aux-Basques.

I have routed from thirty or forty cars through Sydney and Port-aux-Basques myself during the last six months.

While there is that sort of co-operation in all departments we can hope and feel assured that the Newfoundland Railway instead of coming out year after year at the wrong end of the Ledger, will be self-supporting.

The suggestion of re-railing the road, I think it is, or at least diversion of the railway in around Buchans Mine and from the Topsails, at first sight seems a very sensible thing to

do, but looking at it from the point of view of an Opposition Member the thought comes that the Government is really trying to what shall I say, throw out a few efforts to catch votes by giving employment in re-railing the road, and so make it necessary that more money be expended.

I believe that the work should be done sometime but can it be afforded at the present time. We have lots of money to find for other purposes.

The Speech from the Throne also mentions that the Gander proposition is not an accomplished fact. I am sure that Honourable Members would excuse me in this connection, if I said, "I told you so".

I always felt that all the International Paper Company wanted the Gander areas for was as a source of supply.

I don't agree with Mr. Bradley when he says that there will never be a mill on the Gander. If the International Paper Company will not erect a mill on the Gander, there are other wealthy capitalists interested in power and the manufacture of paper and pulp that might be induced to take an interest in the Gander properties and build a mill there.

While in Canada this year I was in conversation with the head of one particular company and he was very interested and I believe that company could be induced to come here. In any case I intend putting them in touch with the right parties in this country to encourage them.

I take the same attitude this year regarding the outlook in Newfoundland as I did last year. I fail to be impressed by what a Government does or does not do. I refuse to be depressed by what pessimists urge. I believe that Newfoundland with its resources has a big future before it. I am great-

ly encouraged that there is a committee of American civil engineers coming here this year. I am encouraged by that because it shows the report of the Metallurgical Society that was here last year must have been favourable regarding our Mineral resources.

I think it is as a result of the report of the Metallurgical Society that was here last year that these Mining engineers are coming here this year.

It is a fact that the resources that we have been vaguely talking about for many years are being recognised in a practical manner by people who have the necessary capital, to turn those resources into a source of wealth and employment for our people. It is regrettable that the Government had not seen fit to open this House early, and that it had not seen its way clear to bring in legislation that would be in the interests of the people of this country. As it is now the man on the street cannot help wondering what is the good of opening the House of Assembly. No business is to be done here. It is a waste of time particularly at this time of the year.

I do not know whether I shall be contesting the election or not. The fall is a busy time to contest my district. But whatever government gets in and whoever is leader of that government, I hope he shall not make any mistake of opening this House of Assembly in the middle of the year, but get the House open as early as possible, get the business over so that business people and everybody in Newfoundland will know where they are for the rest of the year.

SECOND READING OF THE CROWN LANDS ACT

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.--Mr. Speaker; in

moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to point out that for a considerable period it has been well known to the members of this House and to the public outside that it is very desirable to have some amendment to the present Crown Lands Act. This matter was brought to my attention before the advent of the Monroe administration to power. Immediately after the present Government took office and I was appointed to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, the late Mr. Turner who was then the Deputy Minister and who had been in that office for about forty years, who had a very wide experience with regard to the working of the Crown Lands Act saw the growing necessity of revising the Mining Laws of the Dominion. Even before I went there my honourable friend, Mr. Halfyard, who spent a considerable time as Minister of Agriculture and Mines, also saw the desirability of having some change made in the Act. Unfortunately we were deprived of the very valuable advice of the late Mr. Turner, who when I assumed office was ill. During the entire period previous to his death, from the time I went to the office, I was practically deprived of his very valuable assistance. On the demise of Mr. Turner, Mr. Noel took his place. He also had considerable experience, and gave very valuable advice with regard to trying to make various necessary amendments to the Crown Land Act. I was deprived of his services after a short period, and consequently so far as I have been personally concerned, I have been labouring under great disadvantages. However before the death of the gentlemen referred to they had compiled sufficient statistics for the Government to be able to seriously take up the subject. But I would like to point out that like making repairs to an old

delapidated house, or a schooner, it is only when you start to tear down, that you realise what a serious proposition is confronting you. It was found when we went into the matter seriously that it would be desirable to introduce legislation that would be in my opinion the most important piece of legislation that could be introduced into this House. For reasons best known to this House this is not the session, this is not the time to introduce such a far-reaching piece of legislation. Consequently the Government acted very wisely in bringing in just the amendments that are required to carry on the work of the office for the coming few months, and the question of a new Crown Lands Act can very well be taken up by the new Government which will take office as a result of the general election that will take place this Autumn. For that new Government we have compiled down in the Department of Agriculture and Mines, I think, all the material that would be necessary to bring into force an act that would be desirable in the interests of the country, and the development of its natural resources. Coming into contact as I did last year with the mining engineers who visited our shores, as part of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress, I had an opportunity of being able to discuss with them what was desirable for a sane and intelligent development of our mineral resources. The Congress that visited here last year is now playing an important part in giving this country a place in the sun as it were, in advertising the mineral resources of the country. Notwithstanding the fact of anything that may be said by gentlemen on the other side, who were prepared to make light of the possibilities of mineral development, we are going to have this summer, a visit from the American

Institute of Mining Engineers, and when we remember that the Canadian Congress which came here last Autumn represented an industry in Canada of \$200,000,000 a year, the gentlemen coming in September, represent an industry that is worth to the United States six billion dollars a year. And they are coming to a country that nobody dare dispute the vast resources of. As I said on a previous occasion, when I was a boy, about forty years ago, it was my privilege to work as a "nipper", that is what the Advocate Newspaper so termed it. I am proud to say that I did work as a "nipper". I worked from the bottom to the top. Then there was the mining activity in Green Bay. But for the past thirty years, you scarcely hear the sound of a hammer in any part of the Island, and despite all that can be said about Buchans Mine, we cannot get clear of the fact that already three millions of American dollars have been spent there and one million of these have gone into the pockets of our own people, and although they may not be getting the wages that I would like to see them get, or the comforts that I would like to see them have, in what part of the world where pioneer mining is done, can you get all those desired comforts? All I have to say, and I say it for the benefit of the man who is likely to go up to Buchans looking for the same comforts that he is getting at home is that it is better for him to stay at home. If those men are not prepared to rough it as I did, and every other man twenty, thirty or forty years ago, then I say there is no hope. Now I do not want at this stage of introducing these resolutions, to launch out into a lengthy speech in connection with mining, but every man no matter what he may think, he will agree that I have an honest desire to see the con-

ditions bettered, for those who are engaged in the mining industry, and I have unbounded faith in the possibilities of Newfoundland. Only this morning I had a visit to my office from a very reputable mining man from Canada, who said that we ourselves do not now realise what the possibilities in Newfoundland are. "Why", he said, "If we in Canada had a property like you have at Buchans, the place would be over-crowded with prospectors

"What is the reason that the prospectors from outside are not coming in here". He asked. I said, I did not know. This year I expect that we are going to have a large number of people here as the summer opens up. At the present time it is almost winter weather in the interior. I would like to say in justice to those responsible for the work carried on up there, that I paid a visit there in Feb. I was sent by the Government in investigate just what the conditions were there. I went to Buchans and found it eighteen below zero. I visited the sleeping and eating quarters of the men. I went into the sleeping quarters, and I found the men actually asleep and woke them up. I discussed with them the conditions under which they were working, sleeping and eating. And I found men asleep under canvas, at eighteen below zero. That was not desirable. When I confronted the management with my complaints, I was promptly told that there were 250 surplus men last season, and the bulk of those men did not want to go back to their homes. The company could not possibly provide suitable quarters for them, and the men were prepared to take their chances, if the company would keep them on. Now any man in this House can readily appreciate what kind of return a man can give for the money he receives, with eighteen below zero weather. I refer to those men working

on the surface in that kind of weather. These men were kept on the whole winter. I reported my findings to the Colonial Secretary, and he in turn communicated with the management at Buchans and the matters that I referred to were remedied. Of course you cannot remedy wages. It is impossible for any Government to be able to decide what wage a man is going to be paid in any branch of industry. That has got to be absolutely controlled by supply and demand. You have conditions on Bell Island far different from what they were twelve months ago, and when Buchans Mine starts to produce which will be in the early Autumn, and we get five hundred instead of fifty working there, and when Pilley's Island opens, and one or two other industries sufficient to give employment to all, and there is no surplus of labour, then I for one am prepared to fight the men's battle for better wages with those who employ them, when I see the opportunity so to do.

The Amendment now before the House deals with only two or three aspects of the Crown Lands Act. Sections one to eleven deal only with the licenses of prospectors or what is known as miners' licenses. The reason for that is that previous to this any bona fide miner who spent his time prospecting in any part of the Island and discovered something worth while and who came to the Crown Lands office to take out his grant, but because of his inability to pay for his claim right away he would find that before he got home somebody from Water Street of somewhere else with the money would be after paying for the claim. Consequently, these sections are for the protection of bona fide miners or prospectors who go out to find minerals. In this Amendment we made it incumbent upon any per-

son who wants to search or prospect for minerals has first got to go down and obtain a miner's license for which he has to pay five dollars, We cannot accept any applications in the Crown Lands office only from those who are licensed. Sections twelve and thirteen and fourteen applies to division of areas. Sections fifteen refers to surveys and alterations of leases and section sixteen deals with sub-division of existing locations. At the present time the area of a location is three hundred and twenty acres. We are charging the same price and so are doubling the revenue. Section seventeen deals with fee simple grants. Under the present law any person who excavated a certain amount of earth could get a grant in fee simple; under this amendment prospecting has to be done according to the new methods that have come into being in this country. Section eighteen gives a definition of that and it is only those who are prepared to spend six thousand dollars during the first five years of their holding and who are prepared to prospect according to the methods who are entitled to get fee simple grants. I, therefore, have much pleasure in moving the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker; I am sure we all appreciate the remarks of the introducer of this Bill, but I would ask that the second reading be deferred. We just got the Bill placed in our hands and I feel that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will appreciate the reasonableness of the request.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I have no objection to having the Second Reading deferred.

LAW SOCIETY ACT

Second Reading of Bill "An Act further to amend the Law Society Act"

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr Speaker; Just a word in moving the Second Reading of the Bill. This is an amendment asked for by the Law Society, and, perhaps, would be more a matter of explanation in Committee stage, because it will be observed that one has got to follow the Law Society's Acts for years past in order to be able to appreciate the alterations. Shortly the effect is that the election of the Benchers shall be held annually instead of triennially. The other changes will be found on pages four and five where sections eleven, twelve and thirteen deal with the matter of qualifications of law students. They provide practically the same arrangement as before except that the extrantes examination now is the standard of the Memorial College, St. John's. Section thirteen deals with the qualifications of students before entering upon their articles. The present syllabus is Junior Associate, under the amendment the syllabus is Senior Matriculation Examination. I think with that exception and with the exception that our own University is recognized the Act remains the same as at present. When we go into Committee on the Bill if there is any particular detail asked for I shall endeavour to make clear anything that is required. I may say it is not a matter that the House could do more than accept as it is, as I give the assurance that the amendment is purely a request from the Law Society. I consequently, move the Second Reading of the Bill.

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 the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

SECOND READING LOAN ACT
CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGE

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to provide for the guaranteeing of Loan of the Church of England College."

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I would like to call the attention of honourable members to the fact that we have made a slight alteration in Clause two. You will remember in the original Resolutions I added the words "subject to any mortgages at present existing not exceeding \$125,000.00." We have since altered that amount to \$152,000.00. Might I explain that when I was asked the question the other day by Captain Randell as to whether or not there is more than \$125,000.00 mortgage on the property I said that that was the actual amount that was mortgaged on the College itself; but this mortgage is to cover all the property of the Church of England Schools and Hospitals and I have got here a statement showing the value of all their property totalling \$445,000.00. Then they have a mortgage with the Eastern Trust Company of \$152,000.00, leaving them a net value of \$303,000.00. Of course, the proposed Government guarantee has to be deducted, leaving \$223,000.00 of a surplus as against the amount they want to borrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Granting of a Loan for the Church of England College" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

til to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 8th, 1928.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Lake from Grand Bank re road.

Mr. Lake from Lamaline re road.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the following:

Public Accounts 1926-27.

Balance Sheet of Treasury Account for the year ended 30th June, 1927.

Statement of Public Debt to June 30th, 1927.

Statement of Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland for the year ended 30th June, 1927.

A deputation from certain unemployed appeared at the Bar praying for leave to present a petition relative to unemployment in the city. Upon motion, leave was granted to present the petition, which was read by the Clerk of the House. Upon motion the said petition was received and was ordered to be referred to the Department to which it relates.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few brief remarks on the question before the chair. I have no intention of prolonging this debate as I feel that the House of Assembly should have been in session three months before this date. This is now May 7th or pretty close to the date that the House opened last year. Viewing the Speech from the Throne, at the very outset I may say that it appears to me to be

a very barren, meaningless document, one which is not necessary to spend much time on. I repeat that this House should have been in session three months ago. It seems to me that the present administration are very zealous in connection with the trade of Newfoundland and gives that as a reason why they did not appeal to the electorate this spring; but they did not seem to be so much concerned about the trade of Newfoundland when it came to the opening of this Legislature. The fact that Mr. Jones would have to pay a visit to the Old Country or that Mr. Smith would have to go to the seafishery had more bearing on the opening of this House in the estimation of the Government than did the trade and commerce of Newfoundland.

It is always customary, and gracious too, I suppose, to say a complimentary word to the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply. Of course, any eulogistic terms that one might feel disposed to apply to these gentlemen is more or less contingent upon the amount of facts which they gave in their addresses. I am sorry that, if I were to judge the speeches of the two honourable members on that score, I would not be in a position this evening to congratulate them. I find particularly in the speech of the member for St. John's West nothing whatever on which I could congratulate him, nothing more than a political apology for a dying administration.

Of course there is another thing perhaps we should not leave out of sight; that is the fact that it requires considerable moral courage on the part of any man to stand up in this House of Assembly at this particular time in the spring of 1928, after four years of such Government, even to apologize. I do not know whether the

fact of Mr. Browne and Mr. Power being selected is a matter I can congratulate them on. Not every man would feel disposed to get up and make any pretense whatever to apologize for the present Government. However, they had sufficient courage to get up and under the circumstances, they did fairly well. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be a good thing for us to be in a position to recognize political valour of this kind, and if possible to have some form of decoration, such as a political Victoria Cross. I think the two gentlemen in question would have earned it, and I think you would be delighted to pin it on their breasts in consideration of the great feat they have performed. However, empty words don't mean much. I would repeat the words used in this chamber by an illustrious statesman who has passed out and whose name will be revered down through the ages. "By men's deeds you shall know them and not by professions and promises." That is a declaration that has come down through the ages, and by the actions of the Monroe Government will it be judged by the people of this country. The Speech from the Throne refers to the prosecution of the codfishery during the past season, and they say "the prosecution of this codfishery during 1927 resulted in better returns to many of those directly interested. Shore codfish received better prices and stocks remaining over were smaller, thus creating a healthy market condition for future operations." I do not know that there was anything in connection with the shore fishery any more than the Labrador that the Government has to congratulate themselves on. They were very careful not to put into this document any reference whatever to the Labrador fishery, and why not? The Labrador fishery, last year was absolu-

tely a failure, a failure from the standpoint of the prices. Men went down to engage in that industry after fitting out at an enormous cost and realized \$3.00 to \$3.60 per quintal, and some did not do as well as that, and then the Government comes in and talks about the fisheries. Take for instance the price of Shore Fish; that is a matter that has caused more discontent around Newfoundland than anything in connection with the fisheries in recent years. The market price for Shore Fish from September to November varies in the neighbourhood of \$3.00 per quintal, and you can go into various settlements throughout the country and find a considerable number of people who were victimised because of the difference. Very often men had to get rid of their fish early in the season and got \$6.00 to \$6.50 while later the price was as high as \$9.50 and I think in some cases \$10.00. That showed some people benefited; it certainly was not the fisherman. Those who were fortunate enough to buy up stocks early in the season, of course, made huge profits, and I think it would only be fair to the fishermen of Newfoundland who sold fish earlier in the season that those who purchased that fish should make up the difference. Now, what has the Government done, Mr. Speaker, to bring about that increased price of shore fish last year. They paraded it out in the Speech from the Throne, they want the country to know it and the world to know it because a little better price prevailed. If the Government had cut out the competitive system, that beggars your neighbours business that is going on, they might have accomplished something. We have talked in this House the past four years, and directed our remarks in this connection particularly to the Prime Minister, because he is one of the biggest of

our fish dealers, and we felt that he was sympathetic to the fisheries and the fishermen. But absolutely nothing has been done. The same old system prevails, and last year there was no question about it, but conditions, as far as marketing was concerned, were even worse than for many years past. I was sitting at a social function some little time ago and heard the Prime Minister make a remark which seems to give a little hope. I heard him state that the next three years of his life, I am open to correction, but I think this is what he said, the next three years would be devoted to the fresh fish trade. In that remark he struck a very hopeful note for Newfoundland. I have felt during recent years that if we are to preserve the codfishery in Newfoundland, then a substantial portion of the catch will have to be sold in the fresh state. The United States, naturally, would seem to be our market. I believe there is a wonderful opportunity for a man like Mr. Monroe, one of the biggest fish dealers in Newfoundland, a man who seems to be awake to the situation because of the fact that he has voiced his opinion in that respect, and I say, if he wants to do something for Newfoundland this is his opportunity. I understand that he is retiring from public life and no one can blame him in view of the record of the last four years. If I were in his position I would certainly devote the next three years of my life or the next ten years in trying to develop a fresh fish trade with the United States. During the last few years there has been a large and growing demand for sea-food throughout the great republic. There is no doubt in my mind but millions of families in the United States would use fish at least twice a week if they could secure it fresh, which they cannot do at the present time. We have the

supply; there is the market, our next door neighbour, and I don't see why with a little enterprise Newfoundlanders would not soon find a market for a considerable portion of the catch which would immediately lessen the amount of salt fish. Salt cod in my opinion is fast becoming a food product very little used. In a process of natural evolution it is giving way to the use of meats. We all know that against our codfish in many European markets meats, raised largely in South America sell in some countries at prices to let them compete favourably with Newfoundland salt cod; and it is only a matter of common sense for us to feel that if that condition of affairs continues within a very few years we will find people who formerly purchased fish will be substituting to a large extent meats. That is something we have no control over. People are becoming more fastidious with regard to what they consume. We must be prepared if we should lose our salt cod market to find some other market, in my opinion the United States forms that market for the disposal of our fish in a fresh state. Of course a great deal has been said with regard to markets and people much better qualified than myself have talked many hours in this chamber and outside, but with very little result. I feel a determined effort should be made and must be made if we are to get remunerative prices for the fishermen. It has been said and I think very truly that this country is at once the richest and the poorest in the world; rich because of its natural resources, its fishery wealth, the great wealth of its rivers, water power. The revenue from the fisheries properly developed it has been said and I think very truly would be sufficient to support a population of two to three million. But what is the reality. We are poor, because of

our methods. This country is poor because our first line of defence the fisheries has been absolutely neglected and left to take care of itself. There can be no doubt at all about that. Every person who has given the matter a moment's thought must agree that more could be done in the way of developing the fisheries than has been done in the past. When it comes to the eve of an election we all seem to wake up and realize that we have a fishery. We all realize then that something better should be done than in the past.

Consequently you get such documents presented to the country as that now very famous manifesto of Mr. Monroe's given in 1924. I have not been in the habit of waving that manifesto before Mr. Monroe because others have been performing that duty but I do feel that Mr. Monroe to-day has a moral obligation to perform to the country. I believe that when he wrote and broadcasted that manifesto he was very much in earnest but the trouble with him was that no sooner did he get into the Prime Minister's chair than he found that it was more difficult to carry it out and then he was satisfied to sit there and was prepared to let things drift and gave his attention to other matters as foreign to the prosecution of the fisheries as are the poles.

The responsibility for the present condition of affairs rests largely with the Government and with the Board of Trade as to trade generally.

At the present moment I am very glad to know that we have as president of the Board of Trade a very capable gentleman, whose heart is in the right place and who wants to do the right thing but he is going to have a very up-hill climb. I am not casting reflections on any of his predecessors in office. I am merely saying that his original step was in earnest and gives

an indication of what we may expect during his regime.

The Government must sympathise more with the Board of Trade, co-operate and not take the line of action that "it is none of our business; that is a matter for the Board of Trade". The Trade necessarily must be helped more. The Board of Trade should be able to feel that it has a sympathetic Government behind it. And they should be able to feel that any suggestion or scheme they might involve would be received and met with consideration by the Government.

We cannot put the law into effect without first having the legislation that makes it compulsory.

The people will not do the right thing themselves unless they are compelled to do so.

We are now and we have been for the past hundred years practicing the same cut-throat methods. The feeling exists that "my neighbour's success is my loss". Are we so much wiser than the rest of the world? In the making of their products in any part of the known world no such methods are practiced at the present time.

The Speech from the Throne also refers to the Seal Fishery.

It says that "it has just concluded and will show a larger catch than the previous year." It gives three lines to this Seal Fishery. It goes on to say "the increased demand for sealskins has permitted the payment of higher prices". It failed to state the higher prices — \$5.00.

The sealfishery this year was not remarkable for its great catch but for the dissatisfaction that existed amongst the members of the sealing fleet, because of the way that they felt that they were treated — the feeling that the merchants did not treat them right and fair.

It is stated in the Speech from the Throne that the sale of skins permitted the payment of higher prices. In the markets to-day seal fur is very high and in great demand. I don't think that I am wrong in stating that the price of seal fur exceeds that of fat.

It is not an equitable way to do business, to have the men go out and undergo the hardships in view of the risks incidental to the prosecution of the seal fishery and not participate in the profits but simply participate in a portion of the profits.

Why discriminate between the fat and the fur?

I don't blame the Government but it is a public matter and we, as public men, should be interested in it. I feel very justified in mentioning the matter here now because, not only are we interested in a public way, but we are interested because we have constituents prosecuting the seal fishery.

Last year we found that there was nothing but discontent amongst the sealing ranks. They tried to get a sealers' meeting at that time in order to ventilate their feelings and see if the merchants would come to them and do something. The sum of .50c. extra was given to them. The merchants knew that they were making a great profit on fur and the .50c. contented the poor sealers for the time being.

Next year there should be better understanding so that the sealers should derive a greater benefit from their work and participate in the price of the fur and skin as well as that of the fat.

The Speech from the Throne also makes reference, Mr. Speaker, to the Corner Brook agreement, which was made last year and also the Gander.

It says that "The legislation enacted at the last session, rendering it possible for new interests to acquire the paper-making enterprise at Corner Brook resulted in the transfer of the property to other ownership early in the present year, and the new proprietors are taking the initial steps towards the advances therein contemplated." There is nothing new in that for us. We know that already. The Speech goes on to say "On the other hand the Act designed to facilitate the construction of a mill in the Gander Valley has not been brought into operation, though it is possible that this step may be taken at a later date." That is very encouraging — at a later date, that may be fifty years from now, when we are all dead and buried and long forgotten.

I want to make a remark here Mr. Speaker in connection with this deal, the Humber Deal or the Corner Brook deal as it is called. The whole contract, in my belief, was a piece of deception. I don't think there is a gentleman on the other side of the House but will agree with me when I say that they themselves were deceived. There is no doubt about it.

It was a piece of deception in the first place — a piece of deception because the financial standing, the financial condition of the Nfld. Power & Paper Company was grossly misrepresented. There is no doubt about it.

In the second place the whole business was misrepresented in connection with the intention of the Company to erect a mill on the Gander. They had no such intention, in my opinion. And last year when this matter came before the House I expressed my feelings that the Gander Valley Mill was no more than a bait dangling before the Government for the purpose of inducing them to give concessions to the Company.

The Government spent three months in negotiations with the International experts and what was the result. The Prime Minister came in here and made a speech. He intimated that the deficit for eighteen months prior to 1927 was \$1,200,000 on the plant at Corner Brook. This was brought into the House for the purpose of showing that the company was bankrupt and that it could not pay the interest. The result was that Newfoundland had to be called upon to make good, on account of the guaranty in the sum of \$10,000,000.

Now what do we find? Only a few months have elapsed since that time and we find Mr. A. R. Grosell, the president of the company, stating that the financial condition of the old company as represented to the Government was undeniably misrepresented.

He says that the earnings of the Nfld. Power & Paper Company, available for interest, before purchase, amounted to \$2,179,340 for the twelve months ending Nov. 30th 1927.

Mr Speaker, I think you will agree with me in that case Newfoundland may be said to have been "spot of historical misfortune".

The experts down here last year dealt with the Government most capably in more ways than one and went so far as to secure an option from the Gander River Power & Paper Co. and I remember that was one of the arguments put up by the Prime Minister and other gentlemen last year in having the deal forced through the House. They pointed out that if we held it up too long the 15th of September would arrive when the option would expire and urged that the Bill be passed as quickly as possible.

All that was misleading. Surely the Prime Minister must realize that he was grossly deceived and it was just

this that "one was put over on them". I would like to know how the Prime Minister and his executive feels about that very great robbery. Just after the Executive Government were in negotiations with the International people, bills were brought in here and we were given a very short time in which to examine them. They were very voluminous and it would take very considerable time in which to examine them, and they advised us that we were too long in examining them, that the option would expire and the International people would go away and we would have no Gander.

They never had any intention of erecting a mill on the Gander. Why did he accept that offer? Why were they the whole summer negotiating with the Government, and no sooner was the ink dry on that infamous deed, I say infamous, because that is what it will go down in history as. The ink was no sooner dry when they discovered all at once that the Gander River was not a good proposition. How innocent they were. Did they not know that before, having all the facts and figures before them. One of the conditions supposed to be that they would erect a mill, would they not immediately start in to investigate whether that plan was feasible. The Government, sir, must realize to-day that if they had shown last year a little more backbone, and has been a little less gullible, that at least this guarantee of ten millions in connection with the Humber enterprise would have been written off, and instead of that we have a contract that makes the country's liability much greater than it was before.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable gentleman explain why the liability

is much greater than it was before.

MR. HIBBS.—I say because the securities are not as great. I do not think that can be disputed. I do not say that the amount of ten millions has been increased, but I do say that the securities have not been increased. However, as I stated a moment ago, this country has been termed, and rightly so, the spot of historic misfortune. Just a word now with regard to general economic conditions. I notice in the second paragraph in the Speech from the Throne that it is stated by the gentleman who wrote this Speech and placed it in the hands of His Excellency to read:-

Reads

I would wish for somebody to get up and show me where the advancement is, and where the marked progress is. I think you will want a microscope to discover it. There are certain directions, of course, where we have made some progress in.

I know that to-day in Newfoundland hundreds of people are receiving dole, and it is only pauperizing them. They should never have received it. I know people of my own acquaintance who have considerable means, and I know that they are receiving dole. I wonder did the Government make investigation and discover that they needed it or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, we did.

MR. HIBBS.—I agree that deception is practised often in matters of that kind, but I have been told that the Government sent to find out whether people in certain settlements alone required it or not.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Do you believe that?

MR. HIBBS.—I was told it by a man whose word I think I would rely on.

If I could prove it I would be astounded, I ought perhaps to give them the benefit of the doubt, and I hardly think they could do it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Do you mean Musgrave Hr. You are not referring to any fire claims that we investigated or things like that.

MR. HIBBS.—I presume that the Honourable Minister of Justice is referring to Carmanville. There was a very disastrous fire there, and I think it cost the Government a considerable amount of money to put it out. I dare say that some of the bills sent in were exorbitant.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It would have cost the Government considerable if they had not sent down and found that ninety per cent of the bills were gross frauds, and no money was paid out for ninety per cent.

MR. HIBBS.—I want to say to the Honourable Gentleman that I cannot accept that statement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I will prove that statement I made by producing the reports from the Magistrate.

MR. HIBBS.—I challenge the Hon. Member to produce the facts, and I state right here now that if he produces the facts it will be proved that you can reverse that, and perhaps ten per cent will be found to be exorbitant and that ninety per cent were paid. Perhaps there was some dishonesty in connection with that ten per cent. I know a few people that were not paid and were asking me to see if I could get them paid. However, that is not an answer to the past. The Minister of Justice is always an expert in drawing a red herring across the trail.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—You were breaking into our District, and I was just giving you a Roland for an Oliver.

MR. HIBBS.—I was referring to the dole which was given out by the present Government, and no attempt was made by the Government to get any returns. Right here in the City of St. John's, I am convinced that co-operation could be brought about by the Government and the Municipal Council.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We tried it last year.

MR. HIBBS.—And they would not co-operate with you. Well I say then that it is time to get clear of the Municipal Council. I think they will share the same place as the present Government when election comes around. You can walk around this City in any direction and you will find places that are very much in need of attention. Every day I pass down Military Road and I see that retaining wall that was started two years ago and it is in the same position now as it was at least eighteen months ago. It is not much credit to the people responsible. I do not know why that cannot be done by the people who are now getting dole, because last winter, with the exception of two or three weeks they could have been working on something of that nature. If we admit the excuse that the Municipal Council will not co-operate with the Government, what about the Road Boards. Surely you have some control over them. I do not see any reason why you could not get the Road Boards in the Outports to co-operate and you could send those men into the woods to cut timber for wharves etc. If you are going to make a line for the purpose of bringing the Railway

to Buchans, what about the ties that you are going to require for that? Surely you could have employed a thousand men to whom you are giving the dole this winter, cutting ties. The whole truth of the matter is that you lack enterprize, you have chosen the line of least resistance, and you are the very people that criticize the past Government in many of their actions. We did make some effort to get returns. I remember that the rock sheds was one of the slogans during the last election. Is it not better to have rock sheds now than to be giving the people something for nothing, or in order to show them that they cannot get anything in the world for nothing.

When you got men working in rock sheds I quite agree that you cannot get a hundred cents to the dollar return therefrom, but I do not agree with the Prime Minister's remark that not five cents returns were got. The Prime Minister's statement is absolutely incorrect. The Prime Minister at that time was too strongly opposed to the Liberal Government to appreciate the frightful struggle that people were up against and something had to be done by that Government to cope with the situation in order to keep people alive. In his calmer moments I have heard the present Prime Minister state that he had some respect for the people who were in office before him because he has realised from experience the difficulties that the person who occupied the office previous to him was confronted with. It is very easy to criticize and throw stones, but it is not easy to construct and I think the present Prime Minister has found that out. Now I understand from the Speech from the Throne and from the remarks of the Prime Minister that it

is the intension of the Government to make a diversion of the main railway line and to bring it into the town of Buchans. Would it mean that you will purchase the land from the Company to build that thirty five miles of road?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It may not be necessary to buy it; they may give it to us.

MR. HIBBS.—If they give it to the Government, it will be the first thing we ever got from them and I suppose it will be the last. However, the bill passed last year protecting that Company for the next twenty years and making it impossible for the Newfoundland Government to collect a dollar from them during the period must have prompted them to give this land. At all events that 35 miles of road is not going to mean much of an industrial proposition in my opinion. It was a bit of a surprise to most people when the Prime Minister stated on opening day that there were 300 men employed at Buchans and now I learn from him that there will be less engaged during the Summer. Well, according to that, Buchans is not going to be a source of much employment for our people the coming Summer. I thought the company would be employing more men this Summer and I told men who had been enquiring that they would. I thought there would be between six and seven hundred employed. I realized that in the initial stages of the operations of such a mine there would not be a large gang employed, but I certainly thought the Company would be starting to augment their staff now instead of decreasing it. When one looks at the railway map and imagines the main line being diverted in that way, passing through Buchans and running right up thru Howley one is prompt-

ed to ask has the Government gone into this matter as thoroughly as its importance merits. This diversion will cost about a million and a half dollars and it is a moot question as to whether it is worth while.

Regarding the financial outlook of the country, I am very pleased to notice in the Speech from the Throne that the deficit this year is not likely to be as large as what it was last year. That is a matter I do not propose dwelling upon at the present moment. Later on in the session when we have more information about our financial affairs before us I shall deal with that matter.

Before taking my seat I would like to say a word regarding an election. It has been stated by the Government that it would be disastrous to this country to have an election in the spring. Personally I am not in accord with that view. In 1923 we had a general election in the Spring and the Prime Minister and the member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne) says that it was the only unnecessary election that was held in the Spring. Of course, in their opinion, the 1924 election was necessary. That is only to be expected of them. It happens however that Mr. Browne was a candidate for that Party that held the Spring election in 1923 and I think he tried on platforms in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's to give good reasons why he was there and why the election was being held. My contention is that the last of April or the first of May is the proper and logical time to hold an election in this country because at that time trade does not begin to move to any great extent and most of the people are home preparing for the fishery, and an election could have been run off last month as

the weather was very fine and the fight could have been over by now. In talking against the holding of a Spring election the Prime Minister stated that considerable hardships would have to be undergone in canvassing the various districts. I disagree with him. I was one of three members who started in March 1923 and we had to travel over that district from end to end. I suffered no hardships, rather did I enjoy that campaign and, needless to say we emerged triumphantly. Now the Prime Minister knows to day that it is not because of any hardships that would be entailed in covering districts that there is no Spring election; but it is simply because he and his party were afraid to face the country to give an account of their stewardship. The Prime Minister knows well that "a bird in hand is worth two in the bush" and he knows that if he and his Government appealed to the electors of this country they would suffer overwhelming defeat. As a matter of fact, in the Spring election of 1923 there were ten thousand more people voted than in the election of 1924, which goes to support my argument that the earlier in the Spring an election is held the bigger the vote cast and the less chance there is of disfranchising any of the electorate. In the Fall of year we usually got poll booths in St. John's for the extern districts, but you do not have poll booths in certain other parts of the Island where they should be put and it is a well known fact that some six or seven thousand electors who are not able to reach their districts in the Fall of the year to vote are disfranchised as a result. Surely that is not a desirable condition of affairs. That does not happen with an election in the Spring when practically all the people are in their own homes. However, I do not feel dispos-

ed this evening to attack the Government too strongly and I am going to leave them to their political fate, which will happen this year. I do not see any use of "flogging a dead horse" or to "throw water on a drowned rat". I do hope however that if the Government has any industrial programme that they will lose no time in bringing it here, as I feel if it is sound progressing legislation that the gentlemen on this side of the House will assist in having it put through promptly because I am sure none of us want to be here all Summer.

When I came in this afternoon just looking at those people's faces was enough to convince me they had reason to come before this House to ask relief. It is an unfortunate situation, and it is our duty as public men to help them. I hope this thing is to come to an end; if we have to continue giving out dole; if we have to give hundreds and thousands of dollars and can't find employment for people in the country, the end is not far off.

MR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Speaker; I feel a great deal of diffidence in joining in the debate at this time, both because so much has been said on the subject by previous speakers and also because I cannot pride myself in any way on being an orator so that I might add to the attractiveness of what has been said or add to the matter brought before the Chair. Still I feel it is my duty to say something on public affairs and matters of public policy and for that reason I rise in my place to set myself on record with the other Members of the Opposition who have spoken. I do not expect or believe that anything I say will change the disposition of the Government, as to their public policy as to a general election or other matters of

moment, for early in its term when the Government began to depart from the set rule a warning was issued. These warnings were unheeded. The Government persisted in its own way to such an extent that quite a number of men crossed the House. Later on further admonitions were given the Government, pointing out the risk they were running and these were of no effect. Denunciations of the Government have taken place this session of the House and other sessions of the House still without effect, in persuading the Government to change its attitude or alter its course. We have come therefore Mr. Speaker to a pass where this Government and its Members in this Hon. House of Assembly are about to place their record, an account of their whole career, before the supreme tribunal of the electorate. The full bench of public opinion will try the gentlemen sitting in this House on their merits whether as Members of the Government or of the Opposition; and it is because I believe on the showing made, the electors will be as prompt to punish dereliction of duty on the part of the Government as they were to give the Government an opportunity to put a certain policy in force, I feel that my remarks would be superfluous and those of other Members of the Opposition should we go extensively into the case. Of course every gentleman rising in his seat on a matter of public interest has a perfect right to follow his own convictions on the lines he ought to take. Gentlemen on this side have spoken I believe because convinced it is their moral duty to speak as they have and the length to which they have spoken. Personally I think that in so speaking gentlemen on this side of the House have spoken seriously, meaning just what they said,

have spoken logically, and have spoken without passion or prejudice. As far as I am concerned, sir, I hope to maintain exactly the same attitude. I speak here in the first place as representing a district in particular. I am interested in everything that makes for the good of the people of that district and anything I can do to enable them to make their living easier and with better advantage to themselves, anything I can do to alleviate their hardships or advance their interests I hold myself at their disposal for. But in a larger sense I hold myself here as a Newfoundlander. After all we do not sit here distinctively; we do not sit as Government and Opposition but if we realise our duty in the true sense we sit here without class or distinction but as Newfoundlanders endeavouring to do their utmost for their country. Now, Mr. Speaker; it has sometimes been said that patriotism is the last resort of self interest. I don't think any man has a right to sit in this Honourable House of Assembly unless he is a patriotic Newfoundlander in the true sense of the word. Patriotism has been defined a love of country. It is something more than that something more than affection however sincere for that insensate thing we call country, something more than love for its landscape, its natural resources. Patriotism in its deepest sense involves a human interest in the human beings that make up a country, involves a deep affection and abiding interest in all that makes for their good; or otherwise, patriotism involves, sir, a concern in every class of people in that country whether fishermen pulling their oars, miners plying their picks and shovels, whether factory girls busy about their employment, whether labourers or artisans, or any class. A man actuated

by patriotism if he sits in this House as representative of the people is anxious above all things to co-operate on all occasions with all men, all classes of men, no matter what their political affiliations or other affiliations, in order to render assistance on behalf of the interests of all classes of people in that country. But even when a man has lived up to that high conception of patriotism even when a man has moulded his whole life and the whole of his actions to live up to that ideal of patriotism he has still to be put to a higher test. I don't think I can put that test in better words than those of an outstanding woman martyred during the war: "Patriotism is not enough; I must have no hatred and no bitterness towards anyone." So I say while opinions might differ as to what is the best form of public policy to take, as to what may be the best ways and means to be adopted for the common weal, as to whether a man does his public duty best by calling himself a Liberal or a Tory or affiliating himself with either one political class or another in the community, it doesn't make the slightest difference what form that man's activities may take towards the advancement of the common weal. We can agree to differ, therefore, because we can differ honestly, and our intentions may be the best, and there is no reason why any man should attack any other man with bitterness or prejudice; because if a man is directed by his conscience it is not for others to say whether he is honest or dishonest in the form his activities may take. So whether sitting here as a Liberal or Tory, Government or Opposition, I trust we are all united in that we have one common object—the benefitting of the people of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say with regard to the Address in Reply takes

the same general lines, and my attitude is the same thereon as that of the honorable gentlemen who have spoken from the Opposition side on the subject. The honorable gentleman who moved the Address in Reply was the member for St. John's West. He made out an excellent speech but yet he didn't appeal to me as being up to his usual good form. I had the pleasure of listening some little time ago to him making an address on a public occasion, when I thought he did a great deal of credit to himself and the association for which he spoke. I think the explanation may be fairly obvious as to why he didn't live up to his usual good form when he moved the Address on the floors of the House. The honorable member for St. John's West is, I think, inclined to be honest, is inclined to say what he means and mean what he says, but he did not find it possible to live up to that ideal of public speaking in his position as a member of the Monroe Government and spokesman for it, and I fear on that occasion his speech showed something very nearly approaching hollow pretence and insincerity. In spite of his undoubted ability and excellent educational claim he utterly failed to make out a case for his party along the lines he adopted. His claim, for instance, that during its course of office there has been sound, steady and consistent progress. Well, it must appear to any looker-on today that has followed the course of events the last few years, that the evidence to be seen is of anything but sound, steady and consistent progress as a result of the actions of the Monroe Government.

If the case were otherwise, why is there the need for almost universal charity; certainly charity that touches all sections of this Island home of ours. Why is there so much

resort to the dole? Why the expenditure of millions of dollars in public work, practically wholly and solely providing relief for thousands of peniless?

Surely under a Government characterized for its sound steady and consistent progress, such a policy would not be necessary.

The gentleman who moved the Address in Reply also advanced the position that the Government had restored order from chaos. Here we are up against a rather mysterious reference. It is quite true that the present Government has held on to office despite a great many difficulties. They have lost two out of three by-elections. In two out of three districts the people showed their hostility to the Government by electing members to sit in Opposition to the Government. During their term, the working majority of the Government, which was very considerable at first, has been so reduced that the Government could not effectively direct public business. During the past two sessions of the House the Prime Minister has had to admit that that is the position of the Government. How can a Government in that position give satisfaction?—a Government that is so ineffective that it cannot introduce any legislation of a contiguous nature. They cannot admit here legislation admittedly necessary to the country. How can a Government in that position claim to have restored good order to this country?

What does it mean, anyway? If you mean that the House has been well behaved or that the gentlemen who sat here have conducted themselves with dignity. Surely the Government hasn't got to set the example in that respect or to act as schoolmasters, apart from the respect for tradition and hereditary tendencies connected with this place.

Where the sense of the observation comes in I cannot say.

Where the Government claims to set up an orderly government where there was a government reputed to be disorderly, I cannot quite understand. And the honorable gentleman went right on, Mr. Speaker, and in his remarks claimed that the present government has restored honesty in the place of dishonesty in public work. There is no charge preferred or centered against anybody in particular. Perhaps the expression was qualified. I think the reference is to honesty of administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I can reasonably be permitted to enquire in what capacity, in what respect, along what lines has the present Government shown any more honesty in administration than has any of its predecessors in office. After all, Sir, honesty is a relative term. Honesty has something to do with modern relations. Honesty has to do with the relations between party and party; honesty has to do in this case with legislation as between the Administration and a past House as well as with themselves.

And now let us apply that touchstone. Let us apply that touchstone to the claim made by the honorable member for St. John's West on behalf of the Government he represented when he moved the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Let the present government, in this respect be judged by its deeds.

Now harking to 1924 and considering the pledges that were then given to the electorate in respect, for instance, to the reduction of expenditure, in respect to the lightening of taxes, in respect to the encouragement of the fisheries even to the extent of the payment of a bounty on fish, in respect to other general un-

dertakings for the greater good and benefit of the country. Can it be truly said that the Prime Minister and the Ministers and membership of the present Government have lived up to the undertakings made to the people—in other words, have they been honest to the people of this country?

Why, Sir, we get the reply to that even from the Prime Minister himself, because that gentleman has stated on occasions in this House and elsewhere that there are promises and undertakings made by election reformers during an election campaign that the practical politician finds impossible to put into force when he takes office and conducts a Government.

And then there was a further remark made, Sir, by the honorable member for St. John's West in reference to the substitution under the Government of law enforcement for law breaking, and it appears that this is also a relative matter. It appears that the test of law enforcement is, in the opinion of some honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House, to be applied in respect of minor offences when considered in relation to that breach of the highest law of the Empire or of any country, the law of the constitution. It is not legal, not lawful, in the opinion of the gentlemen on this side of the House, and not in accordance with the law of the constitution that this Government should continue in office and then leave the affairs of the country to be administered by a party or authorities that are not constituted as such by the vote of the electorate of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am more interested in the pronouncement made in the Speech from the Throne in connection with the fisheries than with any other subject there discussed.

The honorable member for St. John's West referred to these matters or matters connected with the fisheries, as did also the honorable member for St. George's, who seconded the motion.

Certain claims were made regarding the progress of the industries and the prosperity of some of those connected with it.

It is difficult to understand, Sir, why at this late date the Government has taken the trouble to mention the subject at all, because it can be very readily noticed by everybody who has read the Speech from the Throne that while it boasts about the mineral industries, for which the Government claims to have a large part of the credit, in connection with the pulp industries which they state they fostered the whole year round, in connection with the tourist traffic which they claim was to their credit, still they did not mention a single claim of policy operative for the prosecution of the fishing industries of this country. They made no such attempt because I claim that they have not made the effort and so they cannot take the credit to themselves. On the other hand, the Government has been greatly responsible for the condition of the present neglect of the industries that concern the bulk of the wage-earners in Newfoundland.

And why, why has that been the case? Not because the Government has lacked the means of giving material assistance to the fisheries. Not because the Government lacked the money necessary to apply any big premium to the fisheries and under which the fishermen could make profits more readily and work more efficiently. Because if those who are listening to me this afternoon will hark back over the record of the Government during the past four years they will find that the Govern-

ment has secured in the vicinity of \$10,000,000 to be expended on a dock, on high roads and for expenditure on almost anything they cared to take up and develop.

Nor can the Government claim that it was neglecting the fisheries for lack of knowledge of the fisheries themselves or the needs and prosecution of the fisheries. Why, the Prime Minister himself and the leading members of his party are well cognizant with the facts and have all the figures necessary to display the position.

Take the gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address in Reply, for example. One gentleman has during the last few months given intensive study and careful thought to the matter of the fisheries, going into the matter of the by-products of the fisheries and endeavoring to find out what other countries have done with what, in this country, has been waste product, and his articles in this connection have appeared in the local papers. Also, the seconder of the motion, the honorable member for St. George's, has practical knowledge of the fisheries. So many of his people in his district depend on the fisheries to make their livelihood on it and he could advise the Prime Minister and others on the matter.

And lastly, that one fact that at the last session of this House petitions were brought in signed by some thousands of fishermen throughout the country praying for the Government, praying that this House, to personally give them some practical help and do something for their relief and to help the fisheries and all connected with it.

But nothing has been done in the matter. Nothing of a practical nature has been undertaken; nothing is being proposed even to be done, of

any nature, that will be beneficial to the fisheries, and stated in the Speech from the Throne.

Now, Sir, as I said before, I am practically interested in this subject for a number of reasons. One is a district reason. I say that that section of the island commonly known as the South West Coast is perhaps the outstanding, almost the exclusively fishing section of the country. The people of Burin District, the people of Fortune Bay, of Burgeo and LaPoile, get their living by engaging in the staple industry of the country. And it is not surprising that I regard the subject apart from its general interest, as of outstanding importance, when I get up on the floors of this House to address this Assembly on anything. Then there is with me the further reason, as to the importance of the fisheries, that in that section of the country, as in all other sections along our coastline, I have the feeling that so many tremendous opportunities, so many chances of advantaging the fishermen, are being lost through lack of development of the fisheries along sane lines. We have on the South West Coast, in Fortune Bay, a herring fishery. It has been struggling along for years. Obstacles rather than advantages have been presented to the people engaged in that industry. It represents nothing today like the advantage that it might be to the people of that section. Perhaps its development might make the people of that section absolutely independent of all these efforts that the Government has to undertake so consistently and persistently to help the other sections of the country. Surely an industry that holds out such prospects, an industry that makes for the economic independence of the people, is an industry worth considering and worth fostering, even more than such under-

takings as the building of a dry dock, or a highroads or tourist policy.

Before I pass on this subject I want to refer to an observation made by the member for St. George's in connection with the highroads. He complained that his section of the country had been neglected in these expenditures. He said that he hoped that later in the season something would be done to make up for that neglect. He spoke as if he rather expected that something would be done. Now I want to be on record in this respect. If any more hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars are to be raised for public purposes, and if it is contemplated spending them on tourist roads either in his section or in any other section of the country, that it is unfair and absolutely unjust to leave a section like that of the South West Coast unprovided with highroads, to neglect our facilities for fishing, and yet to spend such a large amount of money on such luxurious undertakings as I think is contemplated.

Another reason why I am inclined to labor this fishery situation is this, because I believe that one of the tenets of true liberalism, one of the articles of faith of the man that is thoroughly liberal in his political beliefs, is that it is the duty of a Government to interfere under economic conditions which prevent honest industrious men, men eager for work, from earning their livelihood and maintaining their independence. It is the duty, in my belief, of any government body to so direct public affairs, so govern public policy, as to make it possible for men of all walks of life to earn their living, without resort to charity or dole. Because the obvious effect is to preserve the enterprise of the individual, as against the loss of that independence, which certainly results when a government has to pro-

vide dole, and provide charity for a large number of citizens of any country, as has been the case during the past few years. Now I know that in taking that attitude I am running counter to those who hold to the opposite doctrine of conservatism, that there should be no interference with the established order. No interference with what is regarded as vested rights and privileges. And I think that I am only speaking truthfully and in accord with the facts when I say this that in these respects the honorable, the present Prime Minister, has acted throughout his career in office as a conservative of the conservatives. In his Manifesto the honorable gentleman promised the uprooting of public abuses. Promised the abolition of public extravagance. He promised to do away with the wilful expenditure of money that was justified by nothing but tradition or usage. Surely it is obvious that undertaking has not been kept. Even to the payment of a bonus for the encouragement of the fisheries. And here again his true conservatism, his faith in non-interference, prevents him from putting these pledges into effect. Undoubtedly his faith that non-interference should rule was stronger than his sense of obligation to the people of this country who elected him to office on certain definite pledges to undertake in that respect. When we have come to the position where with the burden of taxation increased rather than decreased, with increased expenditure rather than diminished expenditure, where with the wage-earning capacity of the people further decreased, we have come to the position that is absolutely intolerable because unbearable as far as the people of this country are concerned.

Now if any government of any country is simply a system devised

by the people of that country for looking after the wants of the people of that country, then this government has failed utterly, because the governing power placed in the hands of those now representing the present administration, the governing power has not been used to the popular benefit and for the general popular good. What has been the record of that government? Is it not the case that it has seen the privileged relieved of extraordinary taxation, who could well afford to carry it, and has it not been the case that the taxation has been shouldered on the people, who are already taxed beyond their capacity. How else can we describe the Bank Tax, the Income Tax or the Business Profits Tax. Has not the present Government devoted itself to providing further encouragement and further protection for such undertakings as local factories. Is it not the case that the advantages of these industries has been preserved, and the benefits of these industries has been increased by the actions of the Government in office. Is it not the fact that the Government has shown more anxiety to bring to this country wealthy corporations and make liberal concessions to these corporations to induce them to operate here, than it has been to see that the ordinary working people of this country, by so protecting them, that in the future, if not in the present, they will get something commensurate with what the Government voted away on their behalf. That surely is the case in connection with Buchans Mine. It was admitted that the corporation had tremendously wealthy areas under its control; it was admitted that there was a huge demand for very valuable minerals, admitted that tremendous profits would accrue from the development and the exploitation of these areas, yet we proceeded to vote away

readily to that corporation all sorts of advantages and concessions, and the position today is that three or four hundred working men get their living there by the sweat of their brows. And there is nothing in the immediate future to guarantee that this country or the people of this country will ever receive advantages commensurate with what has been given away in the shape of concessions.

There is a matter on which I have been rather mystified, and that is the matter of the arrangement made in respect, first, to that Corner Brook plant, and next in respect to the Gander River Valley undertaking. I have been told that at the beginning of negotiations both of these undertakings were wrapped up, one in the other. In other words, if the Corner Brook plant were to be taken over by the International Paper Co., then the Gander Valley plant was to be coincidentally started, but that for some reason or other the Government divided one from the other and allowed them to proceed as independent pieces of legislation. That may or may not be true. If it be true, it appears to me that the Government made a grave mistake there, because while the terms of Buchans agreement may not have been advantageous to the Company, surely there was a chance of his altering it so as to make the arrangement as nearly perfect as possible, and so secure a double advantage to the country at the same time. If it be not true, then I think that the honorable leader of the Government in his subsequent remarks should make that plain to the country, because a great many unfavorable reflections are being made on his administration because of that reputed fact.

Another matter, Mr Speaker, that mystifies me, too, in common with

other gentlemen on this side of the House, is the reputed standing of the Corner Brook undertaking under the International Paper Company, as compared with the statement that was submitted to this House when that legislation was considered at the last session. There were certain documents, some of them confidential—and which I do not propose to discuss now—and some open to the general public as well as to members of this House, but all of them permitting to show first, that the International Paper Company was the only concern in for the acquisition of this property, and secondly, that if the the International Paper Co. did not acquire that property, then there was nothing left but bankruptcy ahead, and that this Government would not lose only on the bonds guaranteed, but also lose the interest on the bonds. Subsequently a statement was issued by the International Paper Company showing the exceedingly advantageous position of the Company and certainly showing nothing like the position as presented to this House by the Government at the last session of the Legislature. For the sake of the unrest that this has created in the public mind and for the sake of those in the House who facilitated the passage of that Gander measure, I think the Leader of the Government should make some extensive explanation of this phase of that matter later on.

The only other matter with which I would like to deal, and that very briefly, is the announcement as made in the Speech from the Throne that the Government are considering or have planned to undertake a diversion of the railroad line around the Topsails and at the same time to re-rail the western section of the line. The matter I would like to have cleared up in this connection is whether that undertaking is going to be made

at the Government's own violation or is it at the request of those who are contemplating mining operations at Buchans Mine. Are we to regard the diversion of the railroad there as an inescapable necessity or an act of further relief or charity, or as an additional concession to the Company who have already got some little concessions in respect to their operations at Buchans Mine. Now, if the Leader of the Government will satisfy our minds on some of these points I have raised in respect to Corner Brook, in respect to the Gander Valley, in respect to the diversion of the railroad at Buchans, and, very importantly from my point of view, in respect to the activities of the Highroads Commission during the present year, I think he will be doing a duty to the country and he will be making some very important issues clear to the people of the country.

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

COMMITTEE ON ACT TO AMEND LAW SOCIETY

Pursuant to order and on motion of the 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 Act."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddester took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I fear this is a subject that most honorable members cannot be very much interested in. As will be observed by those who have read the Bill, it shortly amounts to a substitution of a certain section of present Acts governing the Law Society. The Bill came into my hands purely pro forma and was not prepared in the ordinary way of submission by the

Government, as it was prepared by the Law Society. Perhaps it will save the time of the House if I should run through the Bill briefly before the sections are formally read. Section One provides that Section Five of the old Act be repealed. The words are exactly the same. The old section says. (Reads.) The only alteration made is that "Provided such ex-Attorney General or retired Judge shall be actually residing in Newfoundland." Section Two provides that Section Six of the old Act be repealed and that there shall be eight Benchers of the Law Society instead of seven. Section Three provides that Section Seven of the said Act be repealed. The idea now is that the election of the Benchers shall be held annually instead of triennially, and Sections Five and Six provide the method to meet the change and conditions for the holding of elections. Sections Eight and Nine are practically the same, except to meet the alterations from candidates and Benchers. In Section Ten the old Act is cut out by this Section Six and substitutes this new mode of election. The old section Ten under which Benchers held office reads as follows: (Reads). The new Section is: (Reads). The idea is to keep in office a set of Benchers who are familiar with the work and, on the other hand, it is felt desirable to have new members do their share of the work. Section Seven repeals Section Sixteen of the old Act, meaning that a person must have completed eight years at the Bar now, instead of five years, before he is qualified to become a Bencher. Section Eight is word for word the same as Section Nineteen of the old Act.

The only thing in connection with the whole matter that is any different is in the new qualifications. The qualifications for entrance at present is Junior Associate and that has been

made Senior Matriculation Standard, and as regards the Memorial College that is given the same recognition for two years' attendance as one year in other universities. A man gets the benefit of a year off from two years in the Memorial College. The old provision still stands, it will be noticed, for students attending Law School outside the Colony, and their service counts. Nothing of any importance practically is changed except the entrance examination, and the standard now of Matriculation instead of Senior Associate. I merely wish to say to the Committee that the object of this Bill is simply to endeavour as far as the Benchers of the Law Society are concerned to raise the standard of legal education. A particular interest in the raising of this educational standard was taken by the late Mr. Browning and that has been decidedly maintained by the present Chief Clerk and Registrar of the Supreme Court, Sir William Lloyd, who takes a particular interest in the students' work. He is one of those who in his capacity not alone as a Bencher but one who might be termed an enthusiast in the interest he takes particularly in the matter of legal education; and he is the one from whom I present these recommendations. I say that merely to show the purpose of the Bill, and I think I might say that in connection with any legal work that may be asked to be done on behalf of the public. I think it would be rather a good position to take. If the public some time may have to become the victim of lawyers, it is a good thing to see, as is done by this Bill, that the best possible service is supplied in return for fees charged, for that is the purpose of this Bill, to try and insure such services by maintaining a high standard of education.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent the said Bill was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE C. OF E. COLLEGE 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 Provide for the Granting of a Loan for the Church of England College."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I explained yesterday that an alteration had to be made in this Bill as compiled in the resolutions, in the second clause where we have inserted "not exceeding \$152,000 instead of \$125,000."

Capt. Randell was not here yesterday when I made the explanation. He asked that question as to whether \$125,000 covered the whole amount under mortgage. I had a statement showing me that they had \$125,000 borrowed on the College building but the property to be under mortgage is to be all Church of England property and I have had a statement prepared which shows that \$455,000 worth will have to be covered by the mortgage.

Spencer Lodge, purchased
from Mr Bowring, on Ren-
nie's Mill Road..... \$35,000

Spencer College, Bond St.....	50,000
Field Hall, Cavendish Square with equipment and site	25,000
The Site on Bond St., Carew St., with tenement houses....	50,000
Number of pledges for new Building	50,000

That does not place any value on the present Bishop Feild College, which is out of repair and it is needless to have it valued in this statement. But the value of the property is \$455,000, less mortgage for \$152,000 (that is \$125,000 on Bishop Feild College; \$12,000 on Spencer College, \$15,000 on Spencer Lodge). Deducting \$152,000 from \$445,000 leaves \$303,000 of assets, with mortgages deducted.

Now, if you take \$80,000 from that it leaves \$223,000 net assets, to which you have got to add \$50,000 which they have got to collect on pledges; so there is a balance of \$273,000 as security, counting \$50,000 which is to come to redeem pledges to the Eastern Trust Company.

The Eastern Trust Company is prepared to lend a further \$80,000 to Bishop Feild College provided it is guaranteed by the Government. I suggest that the Bill be read.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if he has received any protest from any gentlemen with regard to this Bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, not a protest; but I did have a letter from four gentlemen today,—Mr. McKay, Mr. Horwood, Mr. Emerson and Mr. Murray—in which they stated that owing to the importance of the matter they thought it might be delayed for a few days. I wrote them in reply this morning that they did not give any particular reason, and one of the signatories at least knew about the Bill a fortnight ago (Mr. Horwood) because he was dis-

cussing it with me. They did not say what their particular reason was for delaying this matter and I pointed out in the letter that I wrote to Mr. McKay this morning that the Directors of the College were urging us to put the Bill thru and unless they had some definite reason for delay, we could not accede to their request.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to have very much to say in reference to the reports that I hear on the street, but I have heard that there are some very prominent Church of England people who are very much against the raising of this money thru the Government. And a great many people are mis-informed as to the way in which this is to be done. I heard a report last night from a prominent citizen who had the idea that the Government were to advance the \$80,000 in cash and to keep back each year's contributions to the college to pay for that sum. I do not know what the letter of protest the Prime Minister received contained, whether it was a protest. I understand it contained a request to defer the Legislation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I simply said that owing to the importance of it, time had to be given to the consideration of it.

MR. HICKMAN.—Would the Prime Minister be good enough to tell the House who composed the Committee which waited on the Government to ask this loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Committee that waited on the Government consisted of Mr. Alec Winter, Mr. Leonard Outerbridge, Hon. Tasker Cook and Mr. Eric Bowring.

MR. HICKMAN.—It seems clause five leaves a lot of power in the hands of the Minister of Finance. I do not suppose that it makes much difference.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—The idea was merely to empower him to stop their grants.

MR. HICKMAN.—Before the Bill goes through I just want to put myself on record as being against the principle of the Government guaranteeing money for an institution of this kind. I am not voting against the Bill, but I am opposed to the principle.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and with unanimous consent the said Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SECOND READING OF BILL TO AMEND CROWN LANDS ACT

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the second reading of An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) entitled "of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals".

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, before this Bill goes to a vote on the second reading, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one feature, the expediency of which is not quite clear in my mind. In effect the Bill provides that only those persons who shall have applied to the Department of Agriculture and Mines for a licence and paid five dollars for such license are entitled to look for minerals. Up to the present every citizen of this country, and people outside of it, have had and exercised the right to search for minerals and

make application for mining locations. Upon what grounds is the change made. Why are citizens to be deprived of that right. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that I happened to be a man down in the bottom of White Bay and that in the course of my work I came across what I conceived to be a valuable deposit of mineral. Under such circumstances I am not permitted to make any application for mining location. The Act goes further. If I had actually seen the mineral on the ground, and I had struck that mineral with a hammer or rock or something of that kind, I am liable to a fine of one hundred dollars. Now it is quite possible, Sir, that the Minister may be able to explain this matter, but to me it seems entirely unjustifiable, particularly when that section which imposes a fine on the unfortunate man who discovers mineral and strikes it with a hammer to see what it is.

In the first place, I think that the principle of preventing the ordinary citizen from prospecting is wrong. Upon what grounds do you propose to deprive me and others of the right to search for any mineral in the country, and of the right to obtain a location under the Crown Lands Act, because I did not happen to have at the time, in conformity with your proposed mining law, the five dollars to pay for that right. There are a great many men in the country today who cannot afford five dollars, and probably would have to get their friends to put up the money if they had made a discovery and desired to take out a mining location. I think that we ought not deprive the general public of this country. Deprive outsiders if you like; in them I have no interest, but so far as the ordinary citizen is concerned I do not think it is consistent with fair play to deprive him of the rights that he previously pos-

sessed, and to impose upon him the burden of coming to St. John's and obtaining a five dollar license before he can look for minerals. So strong, apparently, does the Department feel on this matter that the Bill goes on to impose a penalty of one hundred dollars upon the unfortunate citizen who happens to run across something that appears to be mineral, and begins tapping it with a hammer or the heel of his boot, to ascertain what it is. I would like to have the Minister explain this to me. I plead ignorance, and I do not make these remarks in the spirit of unfair or biased criticism.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE and MINES.—Mr. Speaker; It would be readily understood, from listening to the honourable member who has just taken his seat, how impossible it would be, were the Government at the present moment, to introduce in here, and decide to make important amendments to the Crown Lands Act. It just struck me that if there were a large bill now before the House, about laws or lawyers, we have it passed in next to no time. The Minister of Justice introduced a bill here in five pages, concerning lawyers. The Hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made a few passing remarks on it. The Clerk read the bill the first time. The second reading was passed. The Attorney General took his seat and the Prime Minister asked that with unanimous consent of the House that the bill be read a third time. And it was read the third time.

This is a bill, an amendment to the Crown Lands Act. It is quite correct what the honourable gentleman said that has just taken his seat, that every citizen of the country under the act as it is now, is privileged to prospect for minerals, but where is the land to

prospect. Now the honourable gentleman should know that ninety-five per cent of the prospecting that is done is done down in the Crown Lands Office. That is where it is being done. May be there are a half dozen prospectors going around the various parts of the Island looking for minerals. Chaps nosing about the office and on the street know just where about the position of these prospectors is. When they arrive in town, and take out their claim, the next thing the ninety five per cent referred to, broadcast the fact amongst their friends, and gathering sufficient money, blanket the whole area in the Crown Lands Office.

MR. BRADLEY.—I did not know that.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE and MINES.—With regard to the fine of one hundred dollars imposed on a man that may accidentally stumble on mineral. No man would take that seriously.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It does not provide any such fine. That is the maximum.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE and MINES.—It is not correct that a man is going to be fined for having stumbled accidentally, as the honourable member put it, on mineral. Seriously speaking I think that it is very desirable to have these amendments. An attempt is being made seriously to try and make a search of the country by "bona fide" prospectors. Complaints are being made that money is being put in from the outside and from the inside, and our own people are anxious that this protection be given them. Since I came into this House this afternoon, I have received a telegram from an old school mate of mine, and an acquaintance of Mr. Ashbourne,

and Mr. Grimes and Mr. Brown. He is Mr. Armstrong of Little Bay, and he telegraphs to send him out immediately a license, and since the notice have been published in the press, we have issued probably 26 or 30 licenses to bona fide prospectors.

Now is it not right and proper to make a serious attempt to try and put the mining industries of the country on a sound and solid basis, as is done the world over? Some honourable member of the House said a day or two ago that we would have copies of the Canadian and American Acts dealing with mineral resources embodied in this Bill. Well, what is wrong about it, if we do? In the neighbouring Dominion of Canada they have an organization that have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in research work, an organization that we are deprived of in this country. Therefore, is it not natural to go and find out what they are doing there and to adopt suitable acts that have been brought about by men who have given a life's study to the research work of mineral discovery. When we go into Committee on this Bill there will be ample time to discuss the different matters to be brought up, but the legislation is not of sufficient importance to have the Bill held up, and I consequently move its Second Reading.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Grimes 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 9th, 1928.

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

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the following document;

Report of Comptroller and Auditor General.

Report of Comptroller and Auditor General under Section 33 (B), Audit Act.

Report of St. John's Municipal Council.

Report of Tourist Commission.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker; I have taken particular notes of the points I wish to deal with, and, if it is in order, I would like to read at certain junctures. I do not propose to delay the time of the House at any great length, but I merely rise to make a few observations on some of the principal points referred to in the Speech from the Throne. As I stated on opening day, I look upon the Speech from the Throne as merely a piece of red tape, just a ceremony which is performed annually by whatever Government may be in power, and I do not consider it of any value whatever in the interests of the country as a whole. In other words, it is just history repeating itself, and in spite of everything this annual ceremony must be gone through with.

There are two points on which I propose to make a few special remarks. Firstly, the mining situation on Bell Island; and, secondly the pulp and paper industry in this country. One of the paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne refers to operations on Bell Island being more regular and sustained of late, and it also refers to the fact that the Government have

opened negotiations with the proprietors of this property with regard to an increase in pay, something on the lines of the increase awarded recently by that corporation to the miners in Nova Scotia.

Reads

These are my principal remarks in connection with Bell Island and the paper industry, as it concerns us at the present time. There are various other matters that I have to speak on, but it is not my intention to speak at any great length, but I have here before me this circular of Mr. Hibbs in which he has done me the honour to include my name and consequently I feel that it is up to me to make a few remarks on some of the points contained in that Manifesto. I regret Mr. Speaker that my friend Mr. Hibbs has seen fit to associate me with what I term a bluff, and I regret that I am unable to offer my congratulations to my genial friend Mr. Halfyard this afternoon on being appointed Leader of what is commonly called "now, the circular party" noted for the circulars that some of its members are famous for sending throughout the country. At the same time I want to refer to a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne and to compare it with sections of Mr Hibbs's circular in connection with the fisheries, and in order to do that I just want to read something that Mr. Hibbs has written here in connection with the fisheries of the country, and then I will make a comparison of what this Government did and the Government which he was associated with and you will come to the conclusion that this thing is only a bluff, and steps should immediately in my opinion be taken to disabuse the minds of our people in the outlying settlements of our country, and to

persuade them to forget paying any attention to circulars sent around by job-hunting politicians. He talks about the party that was associated with him, being extremely active.

Reads

That is the fishing industry of the country. Now I claim that the Monroe Administration did nothing whatever for the fishing industry of the country. I claim that they went to the country and told the people and I was one of them that if we were returned to power we were going to give them a bounty on fish. They deceived the people of the country but here we are coming around to politics again and going to throw the same old bluff. The party with which Mr. Hibbs was associated with in 1919 came back from the country with a huge majority and, started what is commonly known as the Fishery Regulations, and though I agree to a certain extent with the Fishery Regulations I cannot, however, agree with the manner in which they were carried out. Why? Because they were carried out in order to permit the entry of those closely associated with that party. Prices were made in the foreign markets which is an absolutely idiotic idea, and anyone that could conceive it, I regret to say, that I could only consider him as an idiotic individual altogether. If I could be permitted for a few moments this afternoon to say to the people of this country, If I could get them here, altogether here in the House of Assembly, that I am not one that could write a flowery manifesto such as Mr. Monroe's Manifesto in 1924, or the one which Mr. Hibbs had written for him in 1928, that they should look to. If I were the leader of a party going to the country to-morrow, and I will not be, what I would do would be that I would write no

manifesto, because it is only a joke, an absolute joke, and Mr. Hibbs knew when he was writing that manifesto that he was stabbing his own colleagues in the back. I regret that he is not here this afternoon, because, while I may have many faults there is one I have not, and that is, that I am not afraid to say anything behind a person's back that I would not say to his face, and I think the Prime Minister knows me well enough to agree that what I say is correct, and Mr. Hibbs knows it too. Now I am going to tell Mr. Hibbs why we wanted a Spring Election, as contained in this famous document of his.

Reads

The legal term does not expire until the 9th of July, so he is wrong there,

Reads

So I say, that in order that some remedial policy be put into effect, the country has got to put Mr. Hibbs in charge of the affairs of this country.

Well I trust that the people of the country will have more intelligence than to listen to that sort of rot. Now I think, Sir, I might explain why Mr. Hibbs wanted a Spring Election, as long as things came down to personalities. Mr. Hibbs thinks that the Monroe Government are unpopular and I agree with him; but when Mr. Hibbs was strong on advocating a Spring election he had his own motives for it. Mr. Hibbs thought that if the Monroe administration were five or six months more in office they would do something that would make them less unpopular in the eyes of the electorate, and, if such a thing happened, it would prevent Mr. Hibbs' main object in wanting a Spring election. He was hungry for a job and he wanted to lose as little time as possible in getting it. Personally, while I feel that

the Monroe administration would have a better chance of being returned in the Fall and that there would be a chance of cleaning them up in the Spring, that does not mean that I should try and force an election in the Spring because there are two or three principal reasons, which I mentioned on opening day, for avoiding a Spring election. In the Spring preparations are being made for the fishery. People who have money to invest want to see how things are going to jump before they do invest in the fishery. On the other hand the 30th of June we have to redeem a loan of seven and a half million dollars, and I claim that if we had a Spring election that that loan would not be redeemed on the 30th of June and we would have people who are holding those bonds breaking down the doors of the Custom House looking for this money; but, I suppose, Mr. Hibbs would be able to raise that money on his own initiative.

MR. HALFYARD.—A temporary loan could be got from the Bank of Montreal.

MR. CASHIN.—If that loan was not passed by this legislature for seven and a half million dollars, the Finance Minister could not raise a temporary loan from that bank or any other bank to meet it.

A loan Bill can be brought in and passed and then the Minister of Finance can go down to the Bank and get the money, but without legislation he can't go down there and get it. I would like to see the day when any individual, no matter what side he is on in politics would be able to do that, and if the country were in such a predicament we would have a man who could go down to the Bank and say "We are unable to pass legisla-

tion; will you let us have this money on our own words?" and get the money. I would like to see the day when we would have men like that controlling the country, but I do not think that that day is very near. Mr. Halfyard knows perfectly well what I say is correct. He knows that Hibbs and those behind him in his manifesto wanted a Spring election in order to get government jobs. That was the great concern, and there are so many to look for that when they eventually get there, they will fight for them. As Mr. Hibbs has done me the honour of including me in this, I propose to make a few remarks on Buchans Mine.

Reads

The Prime Minister told us the other day that the most men that would be employed out there for the present would be three or four hundred. If all the information contained in his circular is as solid as that, it is only a natural conclusion to come to, he made a mess of it when he signed his name to it. In connection with a closed town.

Reads

Mr. Speaker; I know Mr. Hibbs is worried about the workingman. He looks like one of those individuals who would be worried about these poor individuals. The whole thing is politics; there is nothing sincere about it. Then he goes on to talk about the Labrador.

Reads

I am glad I am in a position to state that I opposed that Bill on principle. I knew certain individuals had a huge junk of land to sell, and had an option for two million, I think, but the people who held that option would not pay two cents, and it was not sold

so that portion of the Labrador will be there for Hibbs when he returns to power to see if he can do anything with it.

Reads

"The Liberal Party." That makes me sick, and not one of them can give me the meaning of Liberal or Tory. I have been told by politicians that the word Liberal means a lot in the northern sections of the country. Well I hope their intelligence is not so low that the word Liberal or Tory would sway their votes one way or the other. Why Mr. Hibbs supported a party himself with what he calls The Tories. In 1919 when I returned from France I found the section Mr. Hibbs operates with now supporting the Tories as he terms them. How can he be consistent?

I agree a General Election should take place at the proper time and the proper time in this country is in the Fall. Mr. Hibbs in another section of this circular says.

Reads

Who are the original Opposition? The original Opposition came in on opening day and broke up. I say the original Opposition came in on opening day and made a disgraceful exhibition on the floors of this Assembly. Everyone of them knifed his leader in the back. If the man with whom they went to the country in 1924 was good enough to go to the country under, he is good enough to stay in power another four weeks. I owe no allegiance to anyone in this House. I am in no party. I have a party of my own. Nine tenths or eight tenths of the original opposition came in on opening day and presented a memorial to the Speaker and the Prime Minister that they had formed a party of their own and in this circular Mr. Hibbs told

the people if they stood together they might break the Government, and the first thing they do is break their own party. In other words he made an idiot of himself politically.

Reads

Well, Mr. Speaker; I didn't offer myself to the Government and I suppose I may take the remarks of the Prime Minister when he said it would be hardly worth while as the Government had only three months to live, but at the same time I am opposed to a Spring election and always was opposed to a Spring election, and I say if a vote had to be taken on the matter I would vote against a spring election.

Now, I trust I have made myself clear in my last few remarks with regard to my attitude to Mr. Hibbs and I trust the observations I have made in connection with Bell Island and the Humber and the Gander will be taken by the Government in the same manner in which I gave them and if they can possibly do it they should take the necessary steps at once and see to it that a settlement is made between the Bell Island miners and Besco and that arrangements are made between the International Paper Company and the Gander Valley and the Government and by doing this they will now in their dying moments save this country from a disgraceful exhibition which shall be given in the Fall by having these matters made political catchcrys of by unscrupulous politicians unfit to govern or to sit in this legislature.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker; I intend to make a few observations on the motion before the Chair and in doing so my intention is to be as brief as I possibly can. I believe in speaking to the point. I don't believe in

wasting words or wasting time. I was sent here to voice the sentiments of my district and intend to do that. I would like first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for an Address in Reply presented on opening day. This accordingly gives us a chance of taking up some matters with the Government in the opening hours of the session and the remarks that I have to say will I trust be regarded by the Government as instructive and given with a sincere desire to be of interest to the country and the constituents which I represent. This is the fifth session of this Assembly. Three out of five of those sessions have been held in the summer and I would consider it is high time we got the storm windows off the House. I come from the North. I am the most northern representative that holds a seat in the House to-day. There are only about five representatives of outport districts who live in the districts they represent. I happen to be one of the five. I am a local representative and I rub shoulder to shoulder every day with the men of the North, and it is these men that I come in contact with daily throughout the year, when I am in the north. Therefore I believe that I am conversant with their needs. Now the men in my district most of them are fishermen and if I stress the fisheries unduly I trust that Members of this House will bear with me. Now I believe Mr. Speaker; that the amount of \$360,000 was voted in this House for the encouragement of the fisheries. How much of that has been spent by the Government on encouragement of the fisheries.

This morning I took up the morning paper and I find that the Maritime Provinces have had a Royal Com-

mission as regards the fisheries and I see that some of the recommendations of the Commission are as follows.

Reads

Now, I maintain, Mr. Speaker; that our fishery question is an important one and in my opinion should be treated by the Government as the major industry of the country. The prices paid for Labrador fish last year did not allow the prosecution of that fishery to advantage, to commercial advantage, at the prices that were paid last year and it is hoped that higher prices will be paid throughout this year and the coming years than were paid last year. On the other hand, we are told that existing market conditions show, at the present time, that there is not much hope of increasing prices this year above last year providing that the catch amounts to the same as it did last year. I think that future encouragement should be given to the fisheries and I would suggest that the Government give consideration to the removal of taxes, import taxes, on molasses and rubber boots and on dry batteries, as these three things effect the fishermen vitally.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that I want to take up, and I hope the Prime Minister will take special notice of this. The people of Twillingate, that I represent, don't want to work on Sunday. They do not want work on Sunday and I hope and trust that the Prime Minister and the Railway Commission will go into the matter of the coastal boats going around the country and calling at ports on Sunday and landing and loading freight. There is very little freight handled here in St. John's on Sunday. It is a particularly rare occurrence, so I understand, and if a

coastal boat arrives on Sunday it is not touched then, but if it arrives in Twillingate on Sunday the people are expected to take their freight or to ship it, and this is one point that I want to bring up to the Prime Minister for consideration of the Railway Commission. Sunday has been given to us as a day of worship and its sacred hours should be devoted to worship and such other occupations as are consistent with Divine Institutions. I do not think that there are any trains run in Nova Scotia on Sunday and I hope to see the time when all Sunday work is cut out in Newfoundland.

There is another matter that I want to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister. I have taken up that matter before and it is with regard to the placing of Lewisporte on the main line of railway. We have to-day in Newfoundland people who are looking for work and who are looking for employment and I think myself, that the Government if it went into the matter fully, should realize that the placing of Lewisporte on the main line would in time more than repay the cost of putting the line there. Furthermore, I want to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister the feeling, in my opinion, that the French Shore steamer, White Bay steamer, "Prospero" should call at Lewisporte going and coming every trip. I am very much of the opinion that a service should be instituted from Lewisporte to Cook's Harbor. I don't see why the steamer should be brought South of Lewisporte and the people down there get only fortnightly service when they could get weekly service. The places in South Fogo district are visited weekly by the "Home" and why should the "Prospero" be brought to St. John's each

trip when she could go to Lewisporte and make that port her terminus.

Now the people on the French Shore contribute to the upkeep of the railway but what service do they get from the railway? I maintain that if the "Prospero" went to Lewisporte the people from the French Shore could be landed there and could take a train to St. John's, mails could be landed and taken to the various firms so that they could be delivered in time to have the freight ready when the "Prospero" arrived here. But we find that these people come into St. John's and they cannot do their buying and get away by the return trip. We find that the coastal boats are filled up with a number of women and men travelling—more than the accommodation can provide for—and if there was a through fare made from the French Shore via Lewisporte to St. John's it would relieve the congestion on the coastal boats and help the people on the French Shore.

Now there is another matter that I want to bring up and that is with regard to the benefit of having a wireless station on Grey Islands. I believe that the Grey Islands is a place where there should be a wireless station. I think that the Honorable Capt. Kean, who is now present, will bear me out in saying that it would be an advantage to the sealing steamers in the spring of the year were a wireless station placed on Grey Islands. We find that these two Islands have fishing there during the summer time about twenty schooners and about twenty thousand quintals of fish are caught there. But we find now that the "Kyle", the coastal boat does not call there at the present time and only perhaps every second trip during the summer season, so that the people

who fish there have to get their goods from Conche to the Grey Islands.

My idea, Mr. Speaker, in bringing up these matters is to place them before the Prime Minister as I believe that is what we are here for. To give constructive criticism and suggestions and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to consider these suggestions of mine.

Now as regards to the Speech from the Throne.

It reads, "It is very desirable that a mill be established on the Gander," and I agree with that.

The people of the North want a mill on the Gander and I hope that when the mill is placed there that the timber from the Labrador will be brought there and manufactured into pulp and paper.

We are advised that there will be another loan raised and I trust that provisions will be made in the loan for a sinking fund and also that an opportunity will be given to people in Newfoundland who have money to invest to take up some of these bonds. In fact, the day that I left Twillingate, a man came to me, holding \$1,500 worth of the loan which falls due at the end of next month and he told me that he would be prepared to take an amount equal to the \$1,500 which he now has, in another bond, and as I understand a portion of that loan is held throughout the Colony, I trust that the opportunity will be given to these people who wish to reinvest in these bonds to do so.

We are told that we must expect another deficit. Deficits seem to be the "order of the day". The country goes in debt, the Government goes in debt, so what can you expect from the ordinary man. What is going to happen

to us if we continue borrowing and cannot pay our current expenditure. It is to be hoped that expansion in industrial concerns will make up the deficit in the future. But if we come in here, Mr. Speaker we must have the courage of our convictions. If we consider that the country needs cutting down of expenditure then we must have the courage to do that; otherwise what is the good of our having these convictions. I recognize that it is no easy matter. To run a Government is no easy matter. We want to try and build up and want to give credit where credit is due.

We do not want to follow the crowd but we want to lead them to the higher heights and the question comes to my mind as to whether or not we are united enough as leaders, for the good of the people. That is what we are here for—to be the servants of the people, to serve the people and to do at a profit to them and they will judge whether or not we have been unprofitable.

It is evident that some strong national policy is needed for the country.

The Spring has opened up already in the North and we trust that we will have a good cod fishery.

Twillingate, when I left it, was so to speak, a hive of industry, and with the natural arrival of spring weather I trust that the fishery will give good returns to the men who engage in it.

We have heard some discussion in the House as regards the dole and unemployment and to-day when I was reading a speech that was made in 1855, I read through the first Address—first Speech from the Throne—that contained this statement,

Reads

These problems have to be tackled by all Governments when they take office. If there is more people than there is work available for it is only natural to expect there is bound to be unemployment going to exist to a large extent. It has been stated that some of the people in St. John's to-day have come from the out ports. However, I trust that the Government will use every endeavour in order to provide employment for those who are looking for work. Furthermore, I trust that all legislation will be brought forward by the Government at this session at as early a date as possible. Last year the Estimates were not brought down until the end of June, so I trust that the Finance Minister will see his way clear to bring down his Estimates for this year within the next few days. The other points in the Speech from the Throne I intend to deal with later when the House goes into Committee on supply.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, having listened to the Speech from the Throne on opening day and to some views that were passed on it since then, I cannot help being reminded that it conveyed a lot of words that sounded like tinkling brass. That can be gathered from the way in which it reads. The very first paragraph says "I welcome you at the commencement of this, the last session of the present General Assembly, and I trust that the session may prove fruitful in legislation of much public benefit and advantage." Now, can any member tell me what legislation has come before this House up to the present time which is of much public benefit? It sounds very nice to read at an election time, and probably it is meant to hoodwink the people as to what has really been done at this session. We have not had one solitary piece of legislation which tends toward the

improvement of industrial conditions of this country and that is what the great mass of the people are concerned about at the present time. Only yesterday I received a reply from the Colonial Secretary in which he informed the House that during the past three or four months between 900 and 1000 persons have been receiving the dole in St. John's, and yet the Government has done nothing to deal with a situation of that kind. Compare that with a similar condition of affairs that prevailed in the Old Country where efforts were made by the British Government through various relief organizations in order to assist people to get from one part of the country to another and thereby find employment and be relieved of the dole. True it has not solved the whole problem of unemployment, but it has done something towards helping people in getting employment, people who would be getting the dole if it was not for the efforts of the Home Government. Only a few days ago a West Coast merchant told me he could employ fifteen men at the spring bank fishery, if he could get them. In other words, there was at least one section of the country where there was more employment than there was men to get. My point is that the present government should have kept into existence the Employment Bureau that was discontinued last year, and that bureau could have surveyed the whole unemployment situation throughout the country and make themselves acquainted with the actual conditions that prevailed and found out the sections of the country where employment could be obtained and thus found employment for a number of people who are still out of work. I do not believe that there is one man in a hundred that feels anything but pleased with getting dole. He re-

ceives it only because he is forced into that position. Why should a man be compelled to go down and get from six to ten dollars worth of goods every week for nothing. He is humiliated when he is getting it and he feels disgraced because he is forced into that position. The giving of dole is demoralising and it would have been better if the Government had found employment for the workless in the rock sheds whereby some returns would be got for the money expended. It is one of the easiest things in the world to pauperize people and after a man receives dole a couple of times he goes on getting something for nothing. Now we have had this experience for the past three years, and judging by the present industrial condition in St. John's and unless some new industries crop up to give employment to our people, the dole system is likely to continue. There is no hopeful outlook at present while you have 1000 men in St. John's obliged to receive dole. I say it is disgraceful for the Government being so negligent during the past three years and not making any attempt towards the solving of this unemployment problem. We heard here the other day some talk of the wisdom and unwisdom of copying laws of other countries suitable to our conditions. Well, we could have taken pattern from what Great Britain is doing today in endeavoring to solve the unemployment problem. Premier Baldwin stated in a speech some time ago that three thousand men were transferred from Wales to England at the expense of the Government, and this was done to relieve the unemployment situation. But what is the Government here doing in that respect? Simply nothing. And I say that the Government stands condemned today in the eyes of every worker of this country.

The second paragraph in the Speech from the Throne says: "I congratulate you upon the marked progress the country has made during the legislative term now ending, and especially upon the advancement during the present year." No doubt we have progressed very fast in increasing the public debt of the country. It has increased twenty million dollars within the past four years since the present administration took office. This in spite of the promises that were made to the people in 1924 that there was going to be a reduction in expenditure and a reduction in taxation. All over the country the Government candidates preached a reduction in taxation and expenditure and instead of that we have had increased taxation and expenditure on interest charges. Is that honest administration, may I ask the member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne) who told of the honesty of his Government on opening day here?

Reference has been made to the fisheries in the Speech. What has the Government done in that direction? My colleague, Mr. Ashbourne, has pointed out the results of the findings of the commission appointed by the Canadian Government regarding the fishing industry of the Maritime Provinces. They have spent two years already in that work; but the Government of Newfoundland of which a very large portion of the people are concerned in the fisheries, have had nothing done, altho they promised everything for our fisheries at the last election. I wonder what is being done by the Empire Marketing Board and how has the Government pushed the fishery industry in connection with that Board? Nothing, I understand, has been done by the Government. It is true that a suggestion has been made that the

Board of Trade is to concern itself with the codliver oil industry, but even that is not yet done. Three or four years have elapsed and no effort has been by the Government to increase the sales of fish in the markets where our fish is sent nor has any attempt been made to find new customers in other places where our fish do not go. Now I would like to draw the attention of hon. members as to what is being done in connection with advertising of the products of Australia. There is a large advertisement in the "Manchester Guardian" advertising Sultana Raisins, Butter and canned meats. We have had the same chance open to us, but nothing has been done in that direction. The Government of South Africa has a page of newspaper space devoted to the Empire Marketing Board advertising oranges and stating the seasons of the year in which they are obtained. Even the Dependency of Java had an advertisement in a similar way. Canada, I find, takes advantage of the same Board and advertises its products. This has also been done in Norway in connection with advertising their fisheries for a number of years. Now the Government of Norway would not waste money year after year advertising their fishery products throughout the British Empire and other countries if they did not find they were getting returns thereby. A short time ago the Norwegian Government had a supplement issued in the "London Times" advertising all the fishery products of Norway and featuring the different fisheries that were carried on by that country and what they could supply. In Germany the Norwegian Government advertises very largely in the newspapers and the consequence is that the Norwegians get something

like two hundred thousand dollars a year out of a by-product of their fish that they sell to Germany. That has been brought about only within the past few years since the Norwegians began to advertise their products extensively. The Fisheries Department of Great Britain last year took occasion to publish in a London circular some facts relating to the value of fish meal as a food for cattle. Now we are importing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of cattle feed into this country from Canada every year. If the Fisheries Department in this country had employed a chemist, the same as is done in other countries, we would have been able to find out how fish offal should be manufactured so as to make it a suitable feed for the cattle of this country. We have been wasting millions of dollars worth of fish offal that could be converted into feed meals. Nothing has been done by our Fisheries Department by way of investigation in the matter, and still we are told that we have a business Government, a Government of men who are deeply interested in the fisheries of this country. We ought to think of the industry as a national industry which the Government should assist and make that industry more valuable to the country than it is today. It appears that the Government are content to go along much the same way, feeling satisfied that the fishermen are making fair profits one year with the other out of the fisheries. The Speech from the Throne states that the fisheries were carried on last year more profitable than the year previous, but that does not alter the fact that there is more young men giving up the fisheries and going out of the country than ever before because they are unable to live on what

they get for their fish in their native land and are forced to give the product of their toil elsewhere. Then what is the future of Newfoundland and the fishing industry going to be? It is no use talking about the Board of Trade failing to do their duty. They have tried time and again to get the exporters to co-operate, but without success. With the result that the industry and all indentified with it are suffering to-day. In order to get over this and to try and foster and encourage the fishing industry I would employ a full page advertisement in in every newspaper and periodical in the country advertising the products of Newfoundland after the fishing season is over. The people of this country can better their conditions considerable if they buy more of their own products and less of the products of other countries. We should not import potatoes or other vegetables or canned goods, as there are plenty of substitutes to be found in our own country.

Now that is a condition which I claim can be remedied considerably within a year. If we as I stated before were to take our people into our confidence and fully advertise what can be done by using up our own products.

We import a large quantity of potatoes in this country. There are enough potatoes in the country to feed the whole of Newfoundland. Why should we import a single barrel? Why should we import a large amount of canned food when we have fish as good and better than canned foods that come into the country. I say if we advertised these things probably, stating the reasons why, advertising them and telling the people they can be better off if they use more of these foods produced in their own country,

there would be a great increase in consumption of our own products and great corresponding benefit. Nothing has been done about reducing taxation. I know it is an easy matter to criticise any Government about the reduction of taxation but I think this could have been done. You could have arranged your tariff in such a way that it would fall lighter upon the poorer classes of the country, but nothing has been done in that direction. There is one thing in which I join with the Government and that is in connection with the railway. It has been said by critics in this house and outside the House that a railway run by the Government of a country cannot be handled successfully. We have now the statement in the Speech from the Throne that there has been a reduction in the deficit of three hundred thousand and possibly within a year or two we will see the railway pay. So that is certainly pleasant news. We have a management up there in the railway with each of the departments all co-operating in the best interests, serving the country as best they can in order to make that railway pay and it is only a question I agree of a couple of years when the railway can be a revenue producer and I think the management and all concerned are to be congratulated on the efforts they have made in that direction. With regard to labour conditions I trust that the Government will succeed in getting the Bell Island Companies to place the men in the same position as are the men working at Sydney. If the Government is earnest about it they can accomplish something and we will wait and see how far they succeed in the negotiations. Now I want to speak about conditions that prevail at present at Buchans. Even the Minister of Agriculture and Mines himself admits

that he is not satisfied with the living conditions of the men up around Buchans, that he has made both the Government and the Company aware of the facts but nothing was done to improve present conditions. We had that statement from the Minister who visited the place on two different occasions. Isn't that a sorry condition in this country that men should be up there living under canvas through the winter season, in lodgings hardly fit for cattle, and the Government doing nothing to bring the Company to book after getting the concessions that they got during the last session of the legislature. I say it is a disgrace to the Government that they made no effort to remedy those conditions. A statement has been made; I give it to the House as it was told to me; that some were paid only twenty cents an hour and I would like for the Minister to note that and ask the Company if it is true that they only paid twenty cents an hour and have not lived up to their agreement for it was understood at least twenty five cents an hour was to be paid to labour. I make that statement as it was given to me by six men who said that was all they received. I say it is a disgrace because if the mercantile body of this town can pay twenty five cents an hour a company with the concessions they have ought to pay double. I submit that the Government should have seen that the Company made proper provision for lodgings.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They made accomodation for the men wanted. There wasn't accomodation for the men they did not want.

MR. GRIMES.—I can't see why any company operating couldn't have sufficient material. Why provide sufficient material for say two hundred

men when five hundred would be coming. The Government should have seen sufficient material was provided by that Company to accommodate what men were going up there for work during the winter season. Regarding the spring election, at first sight it didn't matter very much to me whether it was a spring or fall election, but looking at it again the way it appeared to me was this; if any Government can extend its life three or four months, what is to prevent it extending it twelve months. Governments can always find pretences once a precedent is established, and if we establish a precedent like that at the present time we are going to have some other Government come in and follow our example, perhaps go one better, and I think that matter should be considered.

Mr. Speaker; The curtain will soon ring down ; and the Government is in an unhappy position. They smile, but it is the smile of despair; and at the end of November they will be sadder and wiser men at the end of their four years experience.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Speaker; not having been here on opening day owing to causes of delay over which I had no control, I did not have an opportunity of hearing the Speech from the Throne, but I have a copy here before me and as far as I can see it is the usual program and there is nothing in it very much the subject for rejoicing. That is about as much as I can say on the matter. I cannot congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply as I did not hear their remarks and did not have time, being rather busy, to read them, but judging from what my friends on this side of the House said, I presume their speeches did not contain very much either. Personally, Mr. Speak-

er, I can't see what progress this country has made the past four years, except that through these four years the Government has increased the public debt of the Colony something like sixteen and one-half millions; that may or may not be critically correct. Is that anything for the Government of the day to rejoice over. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad state of affairs when a Government, under whose banner I was elected, and which promised this country so much in the reduction of taxation and cleaning up of things and the keeping clean of things and giving a square deal to all, borrows so much money and gives so little in return.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when you consider that you increased the public debt by sixteen and a half millions, it is, as I have said before, a very sad state of affairs and nothing that I can congratulate the Government over. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we have a dock that cost something like \$2,000,000, which will never pay for itself. We have certain highroads, chiefly around St. John's, as I said before last year, chiefly for the sports of the City of St. John's to enjoy on Sundays and holidays. But I don't see much that the producers of this country have received from the highroads.

A couple of days ago I referred to the District of Burin West, which is considered the greatest fish-producing district in the country, and there has never been a dollar spent on the roads in that district, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the day will see its way clear to grant the small sum of \$20,000 to try and put the roads in some decent shape in that district. Only today I received a letter from one of my constituents, a gentleman whom I sent at my own personal expense to travel over the road, and he writes me and tells me

that about five miles of that road is absolutely impassable for a horse and carriage. I ask you, is that giving the District of Burin a square deal—the square deal that was promised us at the last general election. No, Sir, it is anything but a square deal, and it is not fair to the greatest fish-producing district, that I have the honour to represent.

I find that \$16,500,000 has been spent, partly in re-railing the railway, which is an asset to the country.

Then we have the "Caribou." In the opinion of some the "Caribou" may be a very good ship, in the opinion of others she is what they term "just glued together," and a bad investment for the country.

I have not gone very far into these matters, as others on this side of the House do not wish to detain the session very long.

We were promised by the Monroe administration that we would have early sessions. The House was opened on the 15th of February in 1925; on the 7th of March in 1926; on the 11th day of May in 1927, and now on the 2nd day of May. If that is what the Monroe Government would call early sessions I would say that it is misleading. It may be that it was not caused by any intention on the part of the Prime Minister, but because of the depreciation in his ranks, and that others had held the gun to his head, so that he could not open before.

On notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne states "The prosecution of our fisheries during 1927 resulted in better returns to many of those directly interested. Shore codfish sold at remunerative prices and stocks remaining over are smaller than for many years past, thus creating a healthy market condition for future operations." I trust,

Mr. Speaker, that market conditions will be much better than they have been, but I do not think that the present prospects of the fishery are any better than they were a year ago, judging from what experience I have had in the fish game. As I represent the largest fish-producing district in this country I am sorry to state that the present Government has done very little for the fishery or the fishermen of the country. The only real thing that I know they did was to put a duty on lines and twines which were free before and now are taxed; also on fishermen's clothes, the cheap clothes that the fishermen wear; and while a certain amount has been specified in the different loans for the encouragement of the fisheries, I have yet to see, Mr. Speaker, what has been done with those amounts so placed or ear-marked.

I was assured in this House, Mr. Speaker, two years ago, that there was going to be a bait depot in the District of Burin and in other parts of the country, and other members of the Government were also assured of the same thing also, but, as I have to say again, nothing has been done to carry out that assurance, even though the Minister of Marine & Fisheries was sent to the South West Coast to select the site. Still nothing was done and I presume that nothing will be done during the present term of office.

The "Daily News" this morning has already been quoted by my honorable friend the member for Twillingate, who has referred to the statement as to what the Canadian people are doing on the fish Commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is something for the Government of the day, if they have not already done so, to take into very serious consideration, particularly that part of the article which states that very serious consideration

should be given before putting a duty against Newfoundland fish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House I would tell them that certain people of Grand Bank and Fortune were quite well aware of what they were doing not quite a year ago, because the people of that part of the country had marketed considerable of their fish at Halifax and created quite a discussion amongst our fishermen and merchants, so much so that we protested direct, and I do not think that when all is said and done that the Commission will recommend that a duty be placed on our fish. But if so, it will very seriously handicap us when some of our fish markets, or the fish market of the South West Coast at certain seasons of the year, is Halifax, to which place we ship a great deal of our codfish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government of the day should see to it that there are some negotiations made whereby there will be no duty placed upon our codfish in Canada. During a conversation which I had in Halifax last year with certain men from Lunenburg who were going to make application to the Canadian Government about this tax, I merely made the remark, "Well, if you put a duty on Newfoundland codfish, we will have to treat you in the same way as we treated the French many years ago and prohibit your getting bait on our shores." A word to the wise is sufficient; and as I may not be in the House again, and it may not make much difference whether I am or not, but I trust that some gentlemen within hearing of my voice may be here. If such a thing is contemplated by the Canadian Government, negotiations should be gone into whereby this may be checkmated in time. I merely say so now, because the curtain may ring down on my term of office here and may not ring up again.

Mr. Speaker, representing, as I said before, the largest fish-producing district in the country, it behooves me to say a little thing along these lines, and hence my remarks. No doubt it will surprise many in this House, and the country, that up to date in this district we have about twenty thousand quintals of fish landed and about ready for market, and another like amount aboard of the vessels on the Banks. Our fishermen have been fishing on the Grand Banks since early in March and have had very stormy weather. And I have not yet seen one step the Government has made in order to encourage the fishery in any way, shape or form since the Monroe Government has come into power.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, while standing in this House, I brought to the attention of the Government and suggested to my honorable friend now sitting opposite me, Mr. Chambers, the representative of the District of Burgeo, that they should put the "Daisy" on the West Coast to protect the lives of the fishermen, of which so many were lost during the previous two years. The Government did not see fit and the "Daisy" has been lying up all the winter.

Fortunately, during the past winter, I think there has been no loss of life.

But why, Sir? Not because you have had the foresight to see that, but because the ice conditions were such that the men could not fish from the middle of January until some time in April. I know whereof I speak because I happened to be on the coast and had a vessel tied up fishing part of the time.

But I think that it is a good suggestion and it was agreed to by my honorable friend, Mr. Chambers, who represents the District of Burgeo.

When I say, Sir, that 40,000 quintals of fish are already caught in that dis-

trict, I think that you will agree with me that a district like that is worthy of consideration from the Government. I have heard a staggering amount mentioned in this House of the amount of the dole which has been given out during the past year. Only yesterday did I see what is termed a bread-line at the door of this House. Such a condition of things in the eyes of one who is not used to seeing such things, is terrible in the extreme, and I would be glad were such not the case. I will not lay the blame upon the present government for creating such a situation, and I am not in a position to know what is causing such a condition of affairs. But I presume that if something were done whereby many of these men could be gotten away to the fisheries, if they would go, and I will add that qualification, I think the situation could be changed. But nothing has been done by the present Monroe Administration to encourage the fisheries in any shape or form. I know they have given a great deal of time to encouraging the paper industry at Corner Brook and the mining industry at Buchans. Personally speaking, I am opposed to the negotiations which were carried on last year and which were put through this House last year for Corner Brook. I was under the illusion, through my ignorance perhaps, because at the time that the Gander and Corner Brook affair were being passed last year, I thought they were practically one and the same thing. I say through my ignorance, as I was away a great deal of the time while this Bill was being discussed, through the illness of my family. As to Buchans Mine, I spoke so strongly against the Bill that I was considered to have insulted the Minister of Agriculture and Mines who was the father of the Bill, because I innocently remarked that he was so

aggressive in the matter that I stated that he must have had an axe to grind. I am sorry that tickled his fancy so much, but I think and I still claim that the Bill was a bad one for this country. I have this day received a letter from one of my constituents who had imported machinery for building a dory factory, and I was assured by the Minister of Finance and Customs on the floors of this House here, a year ago, that he would see to it that the man would be considered, and he would get the duty taken off. I received a letter today, as I said, saying that he has received correspondence from the Minister and the duty has not been removed. Nothing has been done for this poor man who has imported certain machinery for the manufacture of dories. That is from the town of Grand Bank. And when one takes into consideration that this Government less than one year ago gave free entry of everything from A to Z, practically speaking, of all machinery and everything else into this country for a period of twenty years, and then a man trying to get a livelihood for himself and his family, cannot get a reduction of duty if he wants to import machinery for the manufacture of dories, then I say that it is not good enough. And it is certainly not giving to the people of this country a square deal. And that man in particular told me that he had kept his son home, from leaving the country, so that he could try to make a livelihood. But, as he said, "What is the use for a man to try and help to keep this country afloat when the Government of the day will charge him duty and make him pay and give him no returns; but to the Buchans Mine and to big capitalists they can give everything." Only a year ago did we hear the Minister of Agriculture and Mines state that unless this and that were

done that Buchans Mine would not carry on. I say that anyone with one eye could have seen that Buchans Mine people had every intention of carrying on. They were importing machinery, I presume by the hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth, while we were actually discussing the Bill in this House, and while there is a clause in the tariff book which states that certain things could be got in duty free for manufacturing purposes, they were not satisfied with that, but they had to have everything which they needed, and they bull-dozed the Government into giving it to them. I say that is not giving the bone and sinew of this country the square deal that was promised by the Monroe Administration. I do not want to go back to 1924 and go through Mr. Monroe's Manifesto. That is not my intention. But I say, Sir, that we should try to encourage the people of this country to work in this country, as well as try to encourage the capitalists. Two years ago we had a heavy storm on the South West Coast which carried away a pier in my home town. I immediately asked the Government to give us some assistance. It was seen by my honorable friend, Sir John Bennett, who happens now to be out of the House, also by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who visited that shore, and I was given their assurance that something would be done. It is still in the same dilapidated condition, even though that is a large fish-producing section, and only today I received a telegram saying that one vessel arrived there with a thousand quintals of fish. And, by the way that vessel was taking a chance of going over the bar with no pier there though for the small sum of \$10,000 a pier could be erected, whereby the men who have to go out on the Banks for a couple of months could arrive

home in safety. That vessel arrived with one thousand quintals of fish, and these are the people that are doing the producing of the country, and from whom we must get our taxes and not from Buchans Mine. But I would venture to say that it will cost more to run Buchans Mine than will be got out of it, even though we get perhaps the labor for three or four hundred men at something like \$2.50 a day. Do you know, Sir, that in Grand Bank itself there are over four hundred men engaged in the Bank fishery, and, as I said just now, I could not get concessions for a dory factory, and I do not think that is giving them a square deal. I am sorry that Sir John Bennett is out of the House at the present time, as I would have liked him to hear those remarks. He happened to be in my town of Fortune when we happened to be trying to get a vessel out Sunday morning on the high tide, and he sympathized with us on the conditions under which we had to live, but still the Government does not see fit to assist us in any way whatsoever.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON CROWN LANDS ACT.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to give further explanation of these am-

endments. As I pointed out on the second reading it is merely an amendment of the Crown Lands Act. We found it impossible this session to bring in a new Crown Lands Act, so this legislation is only to deal with the position until such time as the election is over and the incoming government will be bringing forward a new act, when this legislation that we have here now will, I suppose, be rescinded. This is merely a temporary arrangement to cope with the situation until the next meeting of the House. It merely deals with the licensing of prospectors, and noting the changes which were taking place with regard to the size and area being cut in half, and it deals with fee simple grant. I think that the committee will agree with me that this is only reasonable, if we are going to spend large amounts of money in the way of up-to-date appliances, for making a search. I do not think that there is anything contentious about these amendments, but if there are any explanations required I will be only too glad to give them.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Minister why he says in the amendment "Over twenty one years of age". There are miners under that age.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—For the season that we took it for granted that there were not many miners under twenty-one.

MR. GRIMES.—There are not many, but there are a few who I am informed are eighteen years of age, and they would be interested in that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I see no reason why we cannot make that eighteen.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; I suggest to the Minister that he strike out the words "over twenty-one years of age", and leave the rest. The age does not matter as we are not likely to be bothered with children going out prospecting.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Mr. Chairman; For the future information of the committee I would like to give the section referred to by the Auditor General.

Reads

These are too sweeping powers for any Minister of Agriculture and Mines. There may be some reason why it might suit a Minister to lay off a large area and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is now only given power to lay off nineteen additional locations to discovery. There is a vast difference between twenty and one thousand.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I don't quite understand. The Minister can lay off you say nineteen locations? Nineteen and the original?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Yes; these can be applied for under the original discovery.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Nobody can take the surrounding locations?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I haven't power to lay them off.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Don't you figure on the Department losing considerable revenue?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—The very opposite. We may lose revenue from one section of the community and get it from a more desirable one; may lose

it from a section of the community that wants to take a chance on speculating and get it from the bona fide mining prospector.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—If a prospector can go out and take twenty why not give the public the other thousand.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I don't think the public has any right to have them if they don't think it worth while to go to the place.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Why should we prevent others from taking out those thousand locations?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—If you believe in speculation then wipe out all laws and have a lottery.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—If a man takes out a license and discovers a mineral he is entitled to nineteen. Why prevent the public from taking a thousand if they want to do it?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Why should I profit by the work of others. Why should I hang around St. John's and be good for nothing but living by speculation on other people's work?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The point is if any man goes out bona fide and stakes a claim any bona fide prospector can then go out on the same ground and make his stake and then he can get it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed 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 on to-morrow.

QUESTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted informally to ask the Prime Minister whether any action is being taken in connection with the unemployed in this city?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The matter is receiving the consideration of an executive meeting which is being held to-night.

I beg to move that the House now rising to adjourn until to-morrow Thursday at three of the clock.

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 10th, 1928.

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

Petitions were presented by

Hon. Mr. Long, from Marystown, re Drawbridge.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry."

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HARBOR REGULATIONS FOR PORT OF ST. JOHN'S.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, in in-

troducing these resolutions I would say that during the last number of years, during the past four years at any rate, there has been a great cry for the appointment of Harbor Commissioners for the City of St. John's, and personally I am of the opinion that the cry for the need of Commissioners is certainly a most justifiable one.

Under the old rules and regulations governing the duty of the Harbor Master of the Port of St. John's I have had a great deal of trouble in reference to keeping vessels in the different parts of the harbor for the safe navigation of ships coming in.

No doubt, Mr. Chairman, you, as well as others, can see at the present time in the Harbor of St. John's vessels that should not be moored there and that are a menace to the harbor and to those other ships passing, either coming or going, and also to the fishermen who come here in their vessels in the summer time.

During the last two years I have had many occasions where I had to send the dredge or some vessels to help the fishermen to get their anchor clear from some large chains put out by different boats and put out by steamers moored in the Harbour.

I have had various suggestions made to me that we could compel the people to remove their vessels and in some instances we have compelled them to remove them but others claim that the law is not sufficiently strong enough to allow the Department of Marine & Fisheries or the Harbour Master to remove these vessels.

We are all aware of vessels at the present time moored on the South side of the Harbour of St. John's. Last year one of these sank. These people were notified by the Harbour Master on two or three different times and were also notified by myself later.

That vessel sank, and I was told by the owners of that vessel that she was blown up afterwards, and what pieces were supposed to have remained after were taken out of the harbor and thrown away. Later on I heard indirectly that the vessel was still lying on the bottom. After getting a report from the owners that she was not there, I thought it was my duty as Minister of Marine and Fisheries to prove if she was there or not. I hired a diver to go down and make a thorough search and after he got back he reported that the vessel was still there, practically in the same condition as when she sank. Two of the spars were in her, thirty feet of one side of the vessel was blown out, but except for that she remained almost as intact as when she sank. After consulting the Minister of Justice and others, it was doubtful whether the law was strong enough to enforce these people to remove that vessel or any other vessel that would sink and was lying for ten or fifteen years in the Harbour. These resolutions call for the appointment of three commissioners. In the first place, it was suggested to me that three outside men should be appointed as commissioners, and the extra fee put on the different steamboats coming into port to pay these commissioners their yearly salary, or the sum that the Government may grant them. Personally, I thought that we could get out of it much cheaper financially, by making the Harbour Master one of the commissioners, and also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries one of the commissioners, and ask the Board of Trade to suggest some other man, so that the Government might appoint some man from that body. As you are aware that the Harbour Master receives his pay from the Government of

Newfoundland, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the same boat. Before I go any further, I do not want any one here in this House to think that I asked the Minister of Marine & Fisheries to be put on that Board, thinking that I would be there myself, but I considered it would be a saving to the country if the Harbor Master was appointed on the commission and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ex-officio, and one outsider. I notice by these Resolutions that my suggestion has been complied with. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government in power if these Resolutions pass, and a Bill is brought in and carried to appoint the Harbour Master, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and one outsider to make up the commission for the port of St. John's. The Bill is quite lengthy, and as it will go through the different sections I would be only too glad to give any Honourable Member of the House any information that I can on the different paragraphs, and any suggestion made by any member on the other side that I think would be beneficial for carrying out the duties of commissioners, I shall be only too pleased to coincide with it. As far as pilotage is concerned, all the pilots will be under this commission, as these Resolutions do away with the former act in reference to pilots etc. Therefore, these three men would have the control of the pilots, as well as seeing the different propositions carried out according to the law in reference to the port of St. John's. It is very necessary to do it. Some few years ago when the war ships came here, they told Capt. English to get a ship or two removed a certain distance to enable the war-ships to swing around the harbor, and, personally, I say right here without fear of contra-

diction that we have old boats in the harbor that should not be there. They are a menace to navigation, and more particularly to the fishermen that come in here in the spring, and moor their boats as the extreme end of the Southside to prosecute the fishery. Some of the fishermen lost as much as \$200.00 during the last four years that I have been Minister, by losing their anchors. These chains extend quite a distance from the quarters of the vessels, and when there is a very heavy gale blowing their anchors drag and get caught in those chains, and once that happens it is almost impossible to get them clear again, and so they have got to let their anchors go. As I said before, any amendment that I consider beneficial to these resolutions, I will be only too glad to act on it.

MR. HICKMAN.—I have not had time to read the Resolutions, Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that I have seen them, and it is very important that these should be drawn up to protect the Harbor Master of St. John's. I wonder if the introducer of the Bill would tell us if he had any assistance by practical seamen in drafting these resolutions.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Honourable Gentleman I would say, that I have received assistance in this matter from Captain Dalton and others. We have gone into the thing very fully, and as far as these resolutions are concerned, we have done the best we know of.

MR. HICKMAN.—What are the duties of the Harbour Master.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The duties of the Harbor Master, I may say, are to look after the Pilots, and to see that the Harbour Regulations are carried out.

His duties are something similar to what these regulations call for, but the old law as it stood did not seem to be strong enough in the opinion of quite a few lawyers in this town to empower regulations that we would like to have in force for the carrying out the rules of the Harbour Master.

MR. HICKMAN.—I understand that there is no funds at the disposal of the Harbour Master to do any work. For instance, if there was a vessel which had to be removed the Harbor Master would have no means to remove it. Is that correct?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN.—Do these Resolutions empower the Harbour Commission to be supplied with these funds.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—If a vessel is considered to be in the fair way, and the owners do not remove it, these Resolutions give the Harbour Master power to remove the vessel and then to take action in Court and recover the cost of removal.

MR. HICKMAN.—But does this Bill provide the funds for the removal of vessel until the action is settled in Court.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Funds are provided under the Bill.

I would like to suggest to the House, in considering this Bill to remember that so far as Pilotage is concerned, not to lose any time about it. We had merely taken the Pilotage Section in the old Bill, and put it under control of the Harbor Board. There is no change in the old law at all. The reason is, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has explained, because Pilotage has practically gone out of existence now.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber and Minerals.'" 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.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment of the debate yesterday, I was dealing with the matter of the fisheries and I was about to close with certain remarks, but owing to the absence of my honorable friend, the Colonial Secretary, and others on that side of the House, I deferred the matter until today. The matter that I was speaking about was Fortune pier. It was washed down three years ago and there has never been any attempt to rebuild it. I referred to this matter yesterday in order that my honorable friend, Sir John Bennett, as he has already seen this pier and the condition that it is in, and I trust that when this matter comes before the Government, that he will add his voice to mine and corroborate the statements that I have made to this House in this connection. Another matter which was entwined with the fisheries of the South West

Coast, and particularly the Bank fishery is the question of the Grand Bank Hospital. Now I have several times mentioned the matter in this House before, and I think that pretty well everyone agreed with me in that of the seriousness and the great necessity of this hospital in the town of Grand Bank, when you take into consideration, Sir, that out of the town of Grand Bank there are some four hundred fishermen prosecuting the Bank fishery, and in Fortune Bay there is a total of some eight hundred fishermen prosecuting the Bank fishery from Fortune Bay. Now, Sir, one who is not acquainted with the arduous task of the Bank fishermen can hardly realise what it means to have a hospital in Grand Bank with no equipment; no sewerage, no baths, no water, and no equipment of any sort except a half dozen cots.

I well know what people have to encounter up there and I know that in a great many cases patients have to be sent to St. John's for treatment and at much cost to the country. Yet this Cottage Hospital at Grand Bank is granted the princely sum of \$850.00 a year, and it is a wonder that it is kept open at all. I know that it is not in comparison to the St. John's hospitals or to the Memorial Hospital at Twillingate, but at the same time it does a great deal of good and saves the Colony thousands of dollars, so I trust the Government will see fit to grant an increase this year and thereby enable the Grand Bank hospital to carry on, otherwise it will have to be closed up. I just mention this in passing, as I hope to take the matter up with the Government at an early date and to ask their co-operation in the matter.

I do not intend to dwell at any length on the other matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I was going to have something to say

on the Corner Brook proposition which passed this House at last session, but the member for Ferryland dealt with that matter fully and effectively yesterday afternoon, and if Major Cashin had done nothing else since he has been on this side of the House, at least he has had his speech printed verbatim in the columns of the "Daily News." I know that Major Cashin has fought the "Daily News" when they did not print his speech, but I suppose now the man on the street will say that these are signs of the times. Before I entered into political life I often heard that the sealfishery question was one that used to occupy a great deal of the time of this House, but since I have been here I have heard but very little about it. Now I am anxious to learn something about it because I see no reason why the people of the South West Coast could not prosecute the sealfishery to advantage as well as the sealers of the North, and I hope that the day is not far distant when we shall have some say about it. But it seems to me that the time is opportune for this Government or some other government to take serious steps in connection with the sealfishery, as the question now is not so much of fat, but of seal skins. Probably this matter could be dealt with outside this House in a business way. I trust it could, but in any event something will have to be done on this question in the near future and remedial measures brought about.

However, the curtain will soon ring down and the members of the Monroe Government will soon be like the rest of us and before another year has passed I presume the curtain will rise on an entirely new scene. Some of the members of today on either side of the House, I suppose will be candidates in the election. I do not know whether I will see it or not because I

am pretty well disgusted with politics. I went into the Monroe administration with a policy to clean up and keep clean and to give a square deal to every individual. I am sorry to have to state here during the dying hours of the Monroe administration that they did not carry out the policy they went to the country on. That is the reason why I saw fit to leave that party and I have no regrets for so doing. The Monroe Government, in my opinion, was a Government for the classes and not for the masses, for one of the first things they did after assuming office was to remove the income tax, reduce the bank tax and place a high tariff on the shoulders of the producers of the country. Yesterday I remarked—and I am sorry that the Finance Minister is not in his seat in the House—about giving a rebate on machinery to build dories for the town of Grand Bank. The Finance Minister assured me a year ago that this matter would be attended to alright. It has not been done; yet this House consented to give Buchans Mine and those associated with it free entry of everything from soup to nuts of all imports into this Colony for a period of twenty years. If that is what the Monroe Government calls a square deal, I am glad I am not one of them. The Monroe Government never tried to clean up the mess that this country was in, therefore they could not keep it clean, and they never gave a square deal to the producers of the country.

I trust that when the curtain rises here again that a body of men will be seen who, at least, will have the well-being and interest of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders at heart.

MR. BROPHY.—Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations this afternoon, it is not with any intention of prolonging the business of this late session of the Legislature. Practic-

ally every member on this side of the House has spoken in relation to the Speech from the Throne and the Address in Reply.

In coming to this session of the Legislature it was far from my desire to stand up here to debate any matters, whether in conjunction with the Speech or the Address in Reply; but conditions have happened on this side of the House which made me in duty bound to rise on this occasion and express the attitude I hold at the present time. As I have already intimated, it is not my intention to criticise the Speech from the Throne or the Address in Reply in any way, because the helpful suggestions and the constructive criticisms offered by members on this side of the House last year received such little respect and such scant courtesy from the Government that I think it is unnecessary to waste any further time of the House, more particularly at this season of the year.

There is, however, a couple of matters contained in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to take exception to. Reference was made in the Speech in respect to the negotiations being carried on between the Company at Bell Island and the Government. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Government will interest themselves to far as is humanly possible to do on behalf of the iron miners and workingmen generally at Bell Island. Conditions on Bell Island amongst the laboring class of people are absolutely deplorable, and every other day we hear of men seeking insolvency because the rate of pay they get does not warrant them to meet both ends.

I trust that the Government will do their utmost on their behalf and if the Monroe administration never did anything of a worth while nature since coming into office, if they succeed in securing any gain or increase

for the miners of Bell Island they will have that much to their credit. I did not intend to make reference to the events of a day or so ago with regard to the unfortunate laboring men of this city. I trust that wherever the blame lies in regard to the attitude the Government thought fit to pursue in respect of the dole that they will receive their just reward. In speaking to the Address in Reply, I must certainly offer my sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder. Congratulations, inasmuch as so far as their speeches were concerned, they expressed belief in a magnificent outlook for the future of this country. I trust that their prophecies will be fulfilled, and that the nature of the country is one that will make it a brighter and happier land to live in. The opinion of the honorable member for St. John's West expressed that as far as the Monroe administration was concerned the people of this country are only waiting for an opportune time to bring them back into power again, is one I certainly do not agree with. Surely the honorable gentleman must not mix up with many of the people of this city or those who come in from the outports. The sentiment today is stronger against the Monroe administration than it was in the recent bye-election in St. John's East, and if one can form an opinion in regard to St. John's East, surely the result of that district in electing me against the gentleman who represented the Monroe administration must surely be convincing enough, when St. John's East was so loyal and gave such a wonderful vote to the representative at that time; and the Government must realise that the Island is just as much opposed to the Monroe administration as is the District of St. John's East. Probably, Mr. Speaker, some of the honorable members of the House may wonder at

my attitude on this side of the House. I feel the same today as I did when I stood for the district of St. John's East under the leadership of Mr. Hickman. I feel that the district which elected me under that leadership expects me to fill out my term as long as this Legislature is in session. What the future may have in store for me, Mr. Speaker, I know not, but when the time comes and I feel by taking the stand which it may be my lot to take that the constituency of St. John's East will be perfectly satisfied with the stand that I have taken.

MR. RUSSELL.—Mr. Speaker, I feel, too, that I should have a few words to say in connection with the Speech from the Throne, although I must admit that there is not very much in it from which one could make a speech or an address. The Speech from the Throne has to be prepared, printed and read. It is a formal thing, and it has been the practice to have it read ever since we have had responsible government, and I suppose it will remain an eternal matter. The first thing I noticed when reading the Speech, because of the fact that I represent a fishing district, was the lack of any reference to anything concerning the future of the fisheries. There is a paragraph in the address which refers to the shore fishery and the remunerative returns received from the prosecution of that fishery, but not a word is said in reference to the Labrador fishery, the fishery in which my constituents are chiefly interested, and not only my constituents, but those of a number of other gentlemen occupying seats in this House—members for Harbor Main, Port de Grave, Bay de Verde, Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay, etc. This is a pity, considering the result of the Labrador fishery last year and the small returns received

therefrom. The Labrador fishermen received only \$3.50 per quintal, less 25 to 30 cents freight, and in my own town and my own district there are numbers of men putting away their schooners, motor boats, traps and other gear who do not intend, if they can get any other kind of employment, to continue the prosecution of that fishery.

I remember well, as other members of the Monroe party remember, the night the Prime Minister brought before the party his proposals for the expenditure of two million dollars on highroads. A number of men in that party representing fishing districts, some of whom are with the party today, including myself, pleaded with the Prime Minister that if he intended to spend two million dollars to divide it up and allocate one million to be spent for the encouragement in some way or other of the fisheries and spend one million on highroads. Our pleadings were unsuccessful, and with the exception of two hundred thousand dollars voted last year—and I do not know how that was spent—nothing, to my knowledge, has been done to give encouragement to the fishermen or support the fisheries. I am referring now particularly to dry codfish. It was really a serious matter. I don't believe that anybody who took that stand at that time was playing politics. God knows there is enough politics played in this country to damn it. It is all very well to play politics up to a point, but when you play politics to the extent of damning your country you are not a man, you are not worthy the name. I know the game of politics as well as the next man. I know how to play it. I know how to work on the minds and feelings of the people if I were prepared to do so, but if I should try to play upon the feelings of the people because I wanted popularity or want-

ed votes then I am not playing the game a man should play. And, Sir, I believe when they made the plea that night, as nothing had been done up to that time to encourage the fisheries in any way, I believe every man who spoke and pleaded with the Prime Minister was sincere. Mr. Monroe made a mistake, in my opinion, because if I could read the Prime Minister's mind at the present time I think I would find that his opinion is that one million would have been enough to have put aside for highroads and one million could have been put aside for the fisheries. I come back to the point that I am very sorry to see that nothing particular was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in reference especially to the Labrador fishery or the encouragement of the fisheries generally of the country. I would also like to refer to Bell Island and the conditions that obtain there. Although I am not very well acquainted with living conditions on the Island, I am more or less acquainted with the conditions that obtain so far as the wages and work of the workingmen are concerned, because there are a large number of men from my own district who work there, and from what I can learn it is simply a back-breaking and health-breaking business with returns barely enough to keep body and soul together. We boast about our civilization; we boast about our improvements, about our scientific research, about this and that in connection with our present day civilization, but we give very little consideration, even when we can, to vital questions in connection with the workingmen of our country. I know there are times when we can't help very much, but there are other times when we can help, and we don't make any effort to assist the man who produces the wealth, and that is the man who

should be given the chief consideration. Anyway, my experience is that the average man down in the mine, in order even to get enough to keep body and soul together, without even getting enough to buy a few of the luxuries of life, simply has to work and break himself up in a few years and then he becomes a charge on the public funds.

That is my experience. The men who work on Bell Island expect help from the Government, and I would urge the Government, because this is an opportune time, to make an effort in that direction even before the election campaign starts. As Major Cashin pointed out last evening, the same company operating in Cape Breton has come to terms with the miners up there, and our miners are just as much deserving as the miners working in the mines at Cape Breton. So the Government should make an effort on behalf of these men who slave from morning till night, doing the hardest kind of work, to bring the company and the men together and do something for the men in order that they will get better wages than they receive at the present time.

We have only one life to live, whether we are wealthy or poor, whether a professional man or artisan or laborer; we are all trying to do the best and get the most out of life in an atmosphere which does not bring us in touch with the difficulties under which some people have to live. All we have to do is to walk through certain streets here in St. John's and look into the houses of some of the people and visualise the struggle and conditions under which they live. It is merely a matter of getting a bite to eat, a rag to wear and a bed to sleep on.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter that I would refer to and that is the broad question of outport rights.

I notice that when anything is started in the outports all kinds of meetings have to be held and all kinds of things have to be done in order to get the Government, the Monroe Government or any government, to see the needs of the people, and was glad to see recently the interest the Northern people, particularly of the District of Twillingate, have been taking in the hospital down there, and to learn that a deputation has recently come to the City, which meant business, and I was glad to hear this morning that when they presented their recommendations and requests to the Government the Government conceded all they asked for.

I am glad to see that for the outport people are just as much deserving of facilities as the City people in connection with not only hospitals, but with every other kind of public utility. The outports are handicapped by the distance from the capital city, in some cases hundreds of miles, and cannot appear at the public departments or before the Executive Government as frequently as the people who live in the city. They have to take the matter up by correspondence, and any man knows that writing a letter or sending a wire is altogether different from a personal interview. I am glad to be able to congratulate the Twillingate people and congratulate the Government because of the way in which the matter was dealt with. I hope, Sir, that will be the beginning of thought in the minds of legislators wherein they will give just as much consideration to any matter proposed by the outport people for the bettering of conditions in the outports of this country, just as much as if anything is brought before them in connection with the City of St. John's.

Conditions in my own district today are not bright so far as the fisheries

are concerned. I have had come before me a number of men who always prosecute the fishery and they hardly know what to do. I have had men come to me, some of the finest men over there, some of the finest fishermen, with splendid gear, and they have pleaded with me to get them some employment. They did not want to give up the fisheries, but they cannot continue to prosecute that industry at a loss as they have been doing for the past two or three years. I hesitate to encourage them to give up the fisheries because there are so many other men who cannot prosecute that industry who are looking for employment in other directions, and these men would take their places.

There is nothing more that I have to say except that I hope during the coming season we will see a number of industrial undertakings started which will benefit the country and I hope benefit the people. There is one thing in connection with the development in this country that I have never been able to understand and that is when development is brought about and money is spent the Government takes advantage of it, not for the purpose of reducing taxes, not for the purpose of removing burdens from the backs of the people, not for the purpose of making life easier, but to further increase expenditure which means increased taxation. They take advantage of it and raise five or six millions, and the benefit derived from industrial development is not received by the people generally. Politicians should remember the difficulties of life and turn these advantages to the people by the reduction of taxes. This would make living conditions better.

Too many speculative schemes have been adopted. In my opinion we have come to the end of our tether in this respect, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope,

with my friend, Mr. Lake, that whatever Government is given the power to run the affairs of this country in the future it will pay specially serious attention to all these matters.

We all know that the unfortunate part of it that a large percentage of the general public, taxpayers and citizens, do not give their support and encouragement to the public man who tries to do the best he possibly can in their interests. They expect the man in public life to shovel out public monies. They expect him to have a chest filled with \$5.00 bills, thousands of them, and if he is not shovelling it out right and left they consider they have made a mistake in electing him. Unless a change takes place in the minds of great and small alike in this country it will be admitted that no possible change for the better can be brought about.

Both politician, citizen and taxpayer are shareholders in the country and should all work together. But, what do we find? Every man for himself, Sir, every man looking for something personally, and the result of it is the country has gone down, down, down; whereas if all were working together with one object in mind we could have the best little country in the world.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I presume that it would be regarded as an act of discourtesy if I were to refrain, at this stage of the proceedings, from making a few remarks on the report of the select committee for the drafting of an Address in Reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be as brief as I possibly can for there is no reason why we should delay the House, in fact there is absolutely no point to be gained.

As I said at the opening of the Legislature, we were attending a

burial service or at a wake and the general aspect of things has not improved and, as I told you, there is no incentive to anyone in this House to talk this afternoon. Everything here is in keeping with regards to a burial or a wake. If anyone makes a gesture there is a cry of hush and quiet, remember the obsequies, remember the rules and regulations. That is quite right.

All the Government members attending the House no doubt at this session must be pleased with the manner and method of presentation of the remarks of those who have spoken from this side of the House. They have been very moderate in their criticism and to offer words of advice, and that of course, is in keeping with the ceremony that we are now witnessing. I must congratulate Mr. Brophy, the Honourable Member for St. John's East, on what may be regarded as his maiden Speech in this House, which showed the caliber or timber of the man. We are all differently constructed and Mr. Brophy has shown certain admirable characteristics which should stand him in good stead whether he remains in public life or resumes his business as an ordinary citizen.

The rest of the crowd are old politicians and accustomed to talking whether we are pleased to hear them talk or not and I have no remarks to make about them, but to reiterate what I have already said, that they conducted themselves at this session of the House in a most admirable and pleasing manner.

There is not much more than can be said and at this stage I suppose I will be pardoned if I reiterate what has been already said or make statements that savour of repetition.

The Prime Minister does not want to hear further about his manifesto. Well this is the termination year of the Monroe administration and it is only the deeds of the administration that will be reviewed and to get back to the figurative we must refer to first meetings and letters of the day that they appeared before the country in 1914. And then we ask ourselves has the Monroe Government been honest in their attempt to carry out their promises to the electorate. It is a matter of review. We are reminded of our sins of omission and commission, and if we are not reminded of them then we go on committing greater sin. Therefore it is necessary that we should be checking up on ourselves. And therefore we should take it as a favor from anyone who will take the time and trouble to remind us of our shortcomings so that we may try to remedy anything that we have done and should have been left undone, to make us a little more careful about our actions in the future.

Mr. Monroe when he appeared to the electorate in 1924 described the manifesto of those that preceded him as "sound and fury". He said---

Reads

Now if we had time this afternoon to review the pronouncements and the actions and results, I think that the pronouncements or the manifesto of the Monroe Administration in 1924 can be accurately described as that as "scund and fury," just as a previous manifesto had appealed to him. Any how the sound and fury did the trick. Was there any more than sound and fury in the pronouncement that a bounty should be given:-

Reads

That did the trick. Sound, noise and fury. The fishermen of course have been furious over the result of that

pronouncement, for a designing politician of years and years of experience writing the manifesto had phrased it so nicely that it would deceive the electorate into thinking that a bonus would be given on fish. The ordinary fisherman has not the time to analyse any sentence to find out its subject. All they gathered from that was that "we are going to get a bounty on fish, and we shall vote for Mr. Monroe".

Reads

"A fisherman's paradise". With regard to the liberty that the fisherman enjoys. He is his own master. He can run what risks he likes. It is an adventurous industry. He can stay out on the fishing grounds in the teeth of a gale, and run the risk as to whether he will get to shore or not. He can do what he likes. It is a paradise. There is no master over him. That is one thing that appeals to a fisherman. The adventure. The sporting characteristics of the fishing industry. You do not mind how hard you work as long as you have some idea of getting some results from your day's work, or your summer's haul. And when he beats to shore in a gale of wind his only regret being, especially if there is a half a dozen other boats, that he is unable to get to windward, and show himself the better sailor. And so the sport goes on. Therefore it is a paradise in that sense. But when it comes to actual return to living conditions, affairs get away from that sporting part of the industry to the actual work to try to earn something from the fisheries, and that it would be paradise to a certain extent, being better than under a boss working, on land. But I presume that the fisherman thought that it would have a different meaning with regard to being a paradise, by the actions of Mr. Monroe if he was re-

turned to power, and that conditions would be brought about so that the fishermen would be able to provide for the necessaries of their families. Has that been done. We could elaborate on this, at length. But these statements in that manifesto appealed to the electorate. And the fishermen by them were no doubt influenced to vote for the Monroe Administration.

Now what about the public finances. After several years of what was regarded as extravagant expenditure, the people were lead to believe that a new Government under Mr. Monroe would do something to affect a saving in expenditure. There would be a reduction in expenditure.

Reads

Has public expenditure been drastically reduced after four years of the Monroe administration. What has been done to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries with regard to the Customs Tariff. Has anything been done in the arrangement of the tariff so that the fishermen will be encouraged to prosecute the fisheries.

Reads

These are the questions that the electorate of this country are asking at the present time. Have you made good. Has the Government made good. Have they made it easier for the fishermen, for the working man or the labourer. In the Speech from the Throne we were congratulated:---

Reads

Marked progress in what. In the name of all that is honest, in what respect has the country made marked progress. I remember at the first session of the opening of this legislature under the Monroe regime, the member for Burin, Mr. Lake, either proposed or seconded the Address in Reply. At that time he was under the impres-

sion that the tide had turned in regard to unemployment in this country, and he conscientiously stated in the course of his remarks that no more dole would be given out.

MR. LAKE.—I reiterate that now.

MR. HALFYARD.—And conditions had improved when you took charge. The tide had been running adversely. Conditions had greatly improved. In 1924 and 1925 you had an increased revenue. But what has happened since. The tide has been running against you since. Large deficits, and what has the government done to try to stem that, and to do something to try and overcome it. Why cannot we be honest with ourselves and the country and not put the like of that in the hands of His Excellency the Administrator. In the Labrador fishery we cannot consider that marked progress has been made. The shore fishermen do not consider that marked progress has been made. They are deploring the fact that with regard to the position of the fisheries the cost of prosecuting the fisheries and supplying themselves with the necessaries of life was such that they could not make two ends meet. They cannot provide for themselves, and they are wondering "what are we coming to". There is nothing for us to congratulate ourselves on. We should be honest and say just what the conditions are. Marked progress, when \$160,000 has been voted by the Governor in Council on Executive Authority, from last April to the 4th of February. At the rate of \$20,000 a month and \$30,000 in one case. And here we have a petition presented here a day or two ago. This petition says that there are 200 men out of employment, and if something is not done starvation is staring them and those

depending on them, in the face in a great many cases. We are in a worse condition to-day with regard to unemployment than we were four years ago. You had the dock then, the re-railing of the railway, and you had one million or so spent on highroads. Well the money is spent in a great many cases on non-productive employment. It is gone. And now the Government if they were honest would say in this speech from the Throne, "that it may be advisable in the interests of transportation to divert the railway from Buchans to Humber Mouth, but we would prefer the incoming Government to handle that. We did not intend to handle it only conditions are so bad, with regard to unemployment, and will be so during the next three or four months that we have got to find employment and are going to divert the railway, or build a new line of railway, cutting out the Topsails". That is the very reason why this work is going to be undertaken this summer, and there is no other reason. We do not take it for granted that all the difficulties and expense will be overcome by the diversion of the line. As soon as you begin to build a railway especially if there are many cuts, there will be snow gathering. There would be no snow on the Topsails if there was no railway there. Another thing is that you do not own the railway to Buchans. You will have to buy that. What it will cost will be only known in years to come. There is good excuse and a good reason for the Government considering the building of this line. Because we have talked for so many years about the Topsails and the cost of shovelling snow there. Now in conversation with the manager of the Railway, he told me that there is just as much trouble with the snow, between Gambo and Millertown as

there is on the Topsails. It all depends upon the weather conditions.

You will have to put in your loan bill in a few days an extra amount an account of your railway deficit. "The cost of the public service is to be reduced" the present Prime Minister told the electorate four years ago in his Manifesto. Why that statement is enough to make one sick when you read the Auditor General's report and the financial report. Can you wonder that the junior member for St. John's East stated, and rightly so, that the Monroe Government is unpopular. The only thing agitating the minds of the electorate now is who they are going to support. The people of the country will not support the crowd that is in, and the only thing that is keeping you where you are today is your weakness with regard to leadership. The electorate will never support a party with a semblance about it of a Monroe regime and the members of which are now groping around blindly trying to get a way out. During the term of office of the Monroe administration \$1,100,000.00 in interest have been added to the public debt, besides another \$1,000,000.00 for extra expenditure. The cost of running the public service is more now than it was four years ago when the present Prime Minister promised to reduce the cost, if he was elected to office. Now I would like to know what departments of the Government have less officials in them than there were four years ago; but the irony of the whole thing is that the leader of the Government also stated in his Manifesto that the sessions of the Legislature were held too late in the year and were unnecessarily long. These are but a few extracts from the famous Manifesto and on which the Monroe Government will be tried and judged.

Take the pronouncement in the Speech from the Throne in the first session of the Legislature after the Monroe Government took office in 1924 wherein it forecasted the appointment of a commissioner to be brought from England to enquire into the affairs of the public departments. We have been looking for that Commissioner ever since. In other words, that pronouncement was never put into effect. Then again a Bill was introduced here for the purpose of reducing the cost of printing and stationery. That would have helped to reduce the cost of public expenditure if it had been properly enforced and if the Prime Minister had exercised a little backbone and a little stamina. Then we were also given to understand in the 1924 session of the House that we were going to have acts respecting the Gander River project and a Flour mill passed. These also fell to the ground. But, it is true, however, that the Government did do something by way of passing new legislation and that was the Alcoholic Liquors Act which gave the people of the country a bottle a day. Whether the Government will take any credit for that, I do not know; but I think that seventy-five per cent of the country do not agree with it. Last year the volume of business, according to figures of the Liquor Control Board, done amounted to \$1,073,088.15. The net returns to the Department was \$319,052.15. The Customs Department got \$447,245.32 making a return to the Treasury as profits on sales of liquor of \$776,297.47. The difference between that amount and the amount of business done went for overhead expenses. There were 3,903 bottles of liquor sold more than the preceeding year. The mail order department forwarded 103,952 bottles to the outports, but

this does not include the number of bottles of liquor that were bought here by outport people and taken home themselves. No doubt, there must have been some thousands purchased in that way. Now, Mr Speaker, what does all that mean. In brief, it means that the present Government is getting revenue from a source and from people who can not afford to buy this liquor. Surely the Government cannot congratulate themselves on keeping the country going on revenue they derive from such a source, which brings sorrow, discontent, dissatisfaction and even death in its train. Therefore, your sins of omission and commission are no credit to either yourselves or to the country.

In 1925 the Speech from the Throne stated that great carelessness had been displayed by those of previous administrations who prepared Estimates in that the expenditure exceeded the revenue. In spite of this statement the Finance Minister of the Monroe regime for the same year was hundreds of thousands of dollars expended in excess of his Estimates. Every year since the present administration came into power the Auditor General has been trying to keep a check on this practise, but without avail. Here are a few extracts on the subject from the reports of the Auditor General. Take the year ending June 30th, 1927. The Auditor General says that the revenue was \$8,932,435.-42 and the expenditure was over ten millions. The revenue was \$820,115.-82 less than the expenditure for the year ending June 30th, 1926 and \$668,241.53 less than the expenditure for the previous year. This is the sort of administration that was perpetrated by a Government that heralded to the world they were going to reduce expenditure and taxation. Why didn't

they live up to pronouncements of the Finance Minister made in this Legislature in 1925. There was nothing like that before; bad enough, but nothing like it in preceding years. Above ten per cent of the amount voted in the Legislature. But in 1925 you did something else, you repealed the income tax and reduced the bank tax and brought in a redistribution bill. Repealing the income tax and reducing the bank tax will never make this a fisherman's paradise. It didn't encourage the fisheries. It had no effect on the ordinary individual who has to get his living by the use of his hands and the sweat of his brow. People who should and could afford to pay a tax, people who had a certain income were relieved of that taxation. But, Sir, the Monroe party were not elected to this Legislature to repeal the income tax; they were not elected to reduce the bank tax, and will get no credit for having done so from the electorate. It was all right to have a Redistribution Bill, but you made a blunder in that respect. Instead of forty seats there should be only twenty. You have to provide money in this legislature and every succeeding legislature will have to provide sessional pay for forty men, whereas there need only be provision for twenty, and that would be a sufficient number for the administrative affairs, and in regard to a general election and the general public, they would be just as well served with twenty men as forty. I speak from experience. What is the good for me if I go to Trinity Bay next fall—North, South or Centre—and am returned. I am returned for that one section only and have only that one section to attend to; and I won't be able to do then any more than I can at the present time with regard to public monies. If we trebled the amount of money, then I would be

able to serve my constituents in Trinity Bay three times as well as before with regard to public money. Where is the money coming from to help any single district more than before? Another thing, you will have the work of the world to get forty men. I don't know about getting forty men, but whoever leads a party next time and happens to be returned will have his troubles greatly increased by the increased number of constituencies. Everybody can't be in the Executive Government; everybody can't have a Government job. Now you will have forty looking for Government jobs.

With regard to the Highroads Commission, I notice here in this report of the Commission that last year the overhead expenses amounted to \$97,916.95. That consists of

(Reads)

Anyhow our total vote for local roads is only \$75,000, and for main roads is only \$72,648, and there is a special vote of \$20,000 and the Highroads Commission spends for keeping in repair a couple of hundred miles of road more or less and for their overhead \$97,000. What about all the rest of the country besides those couple of hundred miles.

While the Highroads Commission are doing nothing but keeping things in repair they take as much as the vote for main roads and local roads throughout the whole country. That is the result of your Highroads Commission and highroads policy. Well, can the country afford it? I will show you, Mr. Speaker, that the country cannot afford it. We are like ostriches hiding our heads in the sand, and praying to God that something will turn up to relieve us from the burden we have to bear and the extra burden in the future. There is nothing but a cloud of depression staring this country in the face, with regard

to the ordinary man. Well, in 1925 you introduced an Act respecting Local Affairs and that went to the waste paper basket, because there was some opposition. Why in the world take the trouble to draw it up and have it printed and lay it on the table of the House, and then because someone said it wasn't all right, withdraw it? Is that good government? The idea would seem to be they could take it or leave it. If you don't like it throw it out; we won't bother about it if it is in the interests of the country, if it is in the interests of ourselves, we will. In 1926 you were very pious in a statement in the Speech from the Throne. You were going to do something of an international nature.

(Reads)

As soon as the Bill was put into print, possibly it was put into print, that which was an objection to "good conscience and prudence" disappeared, because certain interests and certain people said that it would interfere possibly with employment. There was certain employment in connection with the loading and discharging of steamers. All your pious sentiments went to the four winds of heaven. Were you conscientious when you wrote that? We, as a Government, were called incompetents, irresponsibles, by men who are supposed to be parties to any measure that is put in a Speech from the Throne since 1924. Both good conscience and prudence in this case, I suppose, had to be forgotten. Your conscience might rebel, but you smothered it; you took some kind of an antidote to keep it quiet so that you could sleep. In 1927 you came down with the Speech from the Throne and said the Income Tax would be re-enacted. What did you do? Because there was some opposition the income tax was forgotten. Which ever way you look

in the records of the actions of the Monroe administration you see that wherever there was necessity for initiative, ability or stick-at-it-iveness to get things through, it was forgotten, because you followed the line of least resistance, and you get no credit from your political enemies or political friends. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of Finance and Customs is here, and I know he appreciates every word I say. He knows that what I say is only too true. What is he going to do about it? I am not speaking for the sake of political effect. I have no newspaper and I know what I say is not to be printed for the sake of the people outside. I have never considered my statements and efforts made in this House with regard to publicity. I know certain things should be shown up and I show them up the best way I can, whether it is acceptable or not. With regard to the estimates, keeping expenditure within the votes, nobody knows better than the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs how he has failed in that respect; absolutely failed. He cannot do it, or did not do it, anyway. We have the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat (that is a phrase commonly used and I don't know who originated it) and we are piling them on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must stop. I know that it is not necessary for me. there is no point in going through this, for if I did I could stop here all the evening reviewing the sins of omission and commission of the Monroe Administration. If I thought it was any good I would continue.

Mr. Grimes, the honorable member for Twillingate, referred yesterday to the public debt and his figures were questioned. Now I wish to try and make a true statement with regard to the increase of public debt during the Monroe regime and my figures are

taken from the Loan Account. In 1924 there was a loan of \$6,000,000; in 1925 a loan, covered up in the St. John's Dry Dock, of \$500,000; in 1926 a loan of \$5,000,000 and in 1927 a loan of \$5,000,000, making a total of \$16,500,000. This year there must be a loan of two or three millions at least, for there must be \$7,500,000 to meet the loan that matures on June 30th. Well, allowing two or three millions for 1928, that will be \$19,000,000 at 5 per cent which gives an additional interest of \$1,100,000 added to the expenditure of the country as a first charge. Take only the interest on the \$16,500,000 at 5 per cent, which will be \$805,000, and divide that by four, which will give you \$205,000 annual increase.

And what have you got for it? You have got a dock, you have got the "Caribou," and you have got the railway re-railed. The "Caribou" is of questionable value. Of the dock, the contractor said that \$600,000 was spent that should never have been spent by workmen there under the influence of booze, inefficiency and political influence. So you cannot take wonderful credit for building a dock at such a vast amount. . We have got highroads which will mean an annual liability of \$100,000 and we have got to find money for it or all that has been spent will be lost. The rest of the country, where the fishermen are looking to you to make their home towns better, are running the risk of breaking their legs. It is a danger to life and limb to get to their ordinary places of work. You cannot get money to put the roads and bridges in ordinary repair. I want at least \$20,000 for marine works to repair wharves in Trinity District, but I cannot get it because we have not got the money.

Is that a creditable showing for any government, to have added an inter-

est debt of over \$1,000,000, averaging a quarter of a million a year, and not a productive work to show for it; not another industry to show for it? Unemployment is greater now than it has been for the past three or four years.

The Government had absolutely nothing to do with the operation of the mines from a Government point of view. The mineral was there; by the evolution of nature it got there and somebody found it and thought it was good and started in and got prospectors to come and prospect it.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to convey to the House with regard to the borrowing of money. This is not mine. It is from the Auditor General's statement. It says:

(Reads)

That is the statement of the Auditor General, who is supposed to be the watch-dog of the finances of the country, who gives that advice. There is nothing but depression and despair contained in that statement. He says we should not borrow any more money. We cannot afford to borrow for any purpose, but still we go ahead and borrow.

Is it not a deplorable state to be in? How can we say in the Speech from the Throne that we congratulate ourselves on marked progress. No, we are deeper in the mire of political debt and embarrassment.

Now, I must stop. Of course, when we get on finances we can review all this again and I hope we get some interest in this and raise up the corpse a bit so as to get a kick out of some of the members of the dying party

Now, then, I would refer to why we are here at this late season. Why are we here? Are we here in the interests of the country? We are not here in the interests of the country.

We have no legislation which is of any importance and I don't think we have any to introduce.

Mr. Speaker, here I charge the Government with this that they compromised with their political opponents in this House to avoid appealing to the country this Spring and I charge you with that. Your first consideration was to extend your term of control of Government patronage.

Mr. Hickman asks me to name those the Government compromised with. I will try to explain that.

I understand, and if I am wrong I stand to be corrected, that conferences were held, conversations were held with certain members of the Government and those who sit on this side of the House. It was not thought desirable by a great many to have a spring election but that was all right. then so that you could meet the House and not have a spring election you were not to bring in any contentious legislation. You compromised yourselves by not having a spring election and by saying that you would not bring in any contentious legislation. You talk about the law of the administration and being honest. Legislation in the best interests of the country! Referring to the dead past you were in this respect unfaithful to your trust.

You have sinned grievously against the interests of the people of this country, you did not do anything in the interest of the country, and still you opened this House at this time with the idea that nothing would be done and it is in the interests of the country that we are here.

It is not in the interests of the country that we are here.

It is in the interests of those who have Government jobs so that they

can hold on to them for a few months longer and for those who get Government patronage, but not for the interests of the country.

With regard to constitutional practices, so that the honour or our traditions shall not be in any way held up to contempt. The Prime Minister knew last year the condition that existed with regard to doing anything in the House. He knew that at the 9th day of July in 1928, there would be no House of Assembly after that. Why it was the duty of the Prime Minister to arrange in time so that there would be a properly constituted legislature to do business in the interests of the country.

Someone made a remark as to what would happen to the loan that is to be met on the 30th of June. The Government knew that this was falling due this year and should have arranged for it a year ago. There would have been lots of time to put the bonds on the market or arrange with the present holders to buy up the new bonds.

Now you have no time to do it. You are in the same position as if the House was not opened at all. You will need a temporary loan so that argument doesn't hold good. There should have been a House in February and all arrangements for the loan made.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker; I did not intend to have anything to say about the Speech from the Throne. On opening day I made a very few remarks and if I were to make a speech now, it would be going over the ground which we have gone over in the last four sessions, and I thought that it would be only tiresome to the House to be here listening to the same thing over and over again. It would be only taking up the time of the

House to no advantage. But Mr. Halfyard have made a statement regarding the Government and some of the members sitting on this side of the House. Now I want in the interest of the House and in the interest of the public to clear up the matter as far as I am concerned, and I want to say that I made no compromise with the Government. I presume Mr. Halfyard referred to me when he said that a conversation had been held between members of the Government and of the Opposition. It is public knowledge that the Prime Minister had a chat with me during the winter in reference to the opening the legislature. And I do not suppose that the Prime Minister would have any objection to my outlining actually what took place.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—Certainly not.

MR. HICKMAN.—He asked me if I would be prepared to discuss the opening of the legislature. He first said that his reason for so doing was that he did not want to have this country put to the expense of probably \$75,000 or \$100,000 or whatever it would cost for the opening of the legislature, and then for the Government to be defeated on the floors of the House, and an election held in the spring, and then to have another session in order to put through supply for the coming year at the cost of another \$75,000 or more. And he asked me if he could get support from the opposition to put through that necessary legislation that he had in view. He also said what I said on opening day, that the business of the country for the past two years has not been good. The outlook now is very good and the past few months things have improved and it would not be in the interests of the country to have a spring election which would more or

less unhinge the general business of the country I agreed with him in that respect and the conversation that we had was finished in just an argument of the conditions of the country. There was no compromise whatever made. Later on I had a second conversation with the Prime Minister and nothing at all transpired. We made no compromise. We made no attempt on either side to make a deal or agreement as to the opening of the legislature. The result was that the Prime Minister said that he would open the House with members that he had last year. The same number, with the object of putting through the necessary legislation. I did not tell the Prime Minister either before, at that time, or since that I would give him my support from this side of the House to put through any legislation in this House and I made no statement that I was against a spring election except on opening day here, when I made the statement that I was not in favour of a spring election, in the interests of the country's business. I want to make it very plain that as far as I was concerned there was no agreement whatever between the Prime Minister and myself as to any legislation.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Gave notice that he would, on Monday ext, move the House into Committee of the whole on Supply.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 11th 1928.

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

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines tabled the Reports of his Department for the year ending 30th of June 1927.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, now that every member on the other side of the House has addressed a few words at any rate, on the subject before the Chair. I do not know that anything of any vital importance has developed from their remarks, but I congratulate these gentlemen at any rate on one feature, and that is that there has not been any attempt visible to hold up the business of the House. On the contrary every member has said what he has decided to say very promptly and I have no doubt very effectively. The first gentleman that spoke on the subject of the Address in Reply, was the hon. member from St. Barbe, Mr. Scammel. And I first want this afternoon to try and show the House how erroneous one or two of the statements made by the honourable gentleman were. Firstlv he made the statement in this House that this government had borrowed more money than any administration in the past forty or fifty years. That statement was afterwards back-

ed up by Mr. Bradley and by Mr. Grimes, both of whom mentioned a figure of \$26,000,000 as being the amount that the present government had spent or were about to spend, or had borrowed on capital account or were about to borrow. Now either Mr. Scammel is very ignorant on his subject, or else he is attempting to grossly mislead the people of this country. And the other gentlemen that spoke after him had been equally deceived.

When I heard both Mr. Bradley and Mr. Grimes mention that figures of \$26,000,000 I knew exactly how their minds were running. They were perfectly aware that we had borrowed \$16,000,000. They knew we had to borrow in order to refund a loan that was falling due a further \$7,500,000 and they guessed that we would probably be looking for \$2,500,000 more to cover the numerous expenditures for the present year. So their minds dwelt on this amount of \$26,000,000. I could almost hear Mr. Bradley and Mr. Grimes reciting to the electorate that were supposed to be present in their mind's eye, this terrible Government that had borrowed this amount of money, and they knew perfectly well that seven and a half million of that was simply an exchange from one loan to the other, money that we will never lay a finger on and has nothing to do with the borrowings of this Government. Now, as to the statement made by Mr. Scammel that this Government had borrowed more than any other Government, the same statement that was repeated by others and also Mr. Bradley. I am going to give you some figures this afternoon, and I think that when Mr. Bradley and others digest these figures that Mr. Bradley at any rate, will have very much more difficulty in going back to the consti-

tents of Brigus or somewhere else and defending the expenditures of the Squires administration, than he did have at the last General Election in condemning the same.

When the Squires administration came into office they found a surplus trust fund left there by the Cashin administration, of three and a half million dollars. That, with the Surplus Trust Fund, which they had at their disposal when they came in meant \$21,000,000 and the Monroe administration has spent or borrowed, against that \$21,000,000 sixteen millions.

MR. HALFYARD.—Sixteen and a half, to be critically correct.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, because there is a Surplus Trust Fund of \$500,000 that the Monroe administration had at their disposal which would make it that amount. Now, it has got to be remembered that, out of the sixteen million dollars which we borrowed, we had to take \$2,000,000 the very first thing to pay off the debts which had been left behind by the Squires administration, so, from our sixteen million, you have got to deduct two millions (to make it fourteen million, and, to their twenty one millions, you have got to add two millions and make it twenty-three. So that actually the amount of money on borrowed account which the Squires Administration had the spending of and did spend, was twenty-three million dollars, as against our fourteen million, and yet the Honourable Member for St. Barbe says that we have borrowed more money than any administration for the past forty years? There is another statement has been made by that same member for St. Barbe District. I am sorry he is not here this afternoon, because I always like to have people here when I

am making any reference to any statements that they have made. He said there was no precedent for our handing over the Government, if I went out of power to-morrow, to any other member to form an administration. There again, either the Honourable Member is trying to misrepresent the people or else he is extremely ignorant. He has only got to carry his memory back to the very time when he and his colleagues banished their Prime Minister from office, brought out a Royal Commissioner to try him and elected Mr. Warren to take his place. Banished I say, that very same Prime Minister that they are to-day taking to their bosoms again. Mr. Warren carried on the administration of this country. He tried to meet this House. He did not stop long in session, but I think that all the gentleman that are now associated with the new party, the resurrected party I might call them, every one of them were prepared to back Mr. Warren in this House. Mr. Warren went over and represented the country at the Imperial Conference. He was the recognized Prime Minister of the country. Had he any more responsibility than Mr. Hickman, Sir John Bennett, Sir John Crosbie or anybody else that might undertake to form an administration if I went out of office to-morrow? Not a bit. As a matter of fact Mr. Warren never did go back to the country, and so that statement is entirely incorrect, and reflects considerably on the gentleman that made it. Now statements have been made in this House regarding Buchans Mine Lumber Camps and the fact that a sealing vessel did not have enough food. Although these charges have been made by members of the House, there has been no substantial proof brought forward, and I do not think

it is right for the members to say that a Lumber Camp was disgraceful or conditions at Buchans Mine were disgraceful, or that a steamer had gone to the sealfishery without sufficient food, without backing these statements up with facts.

MR. BRADLEY.—I offered you the facts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Honourable gentleman told me that he would give me the statement of a man that went out to the sealfishery, and no doubt that man will be able to tell me the steamer that he went in. The Honourable Gentleman has not yet given me the name of the constituent that went out to the sealfishery, and consequently it is impossible for me to find out what steamer he did go in.

MR. BRADLEY.—I did not think you wanted it, but you can have it whenever you like. I will give it to you this afternoon.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would not ask a question as to the name of the Steamer, if I was not desirous of finding it out, and I think that the Honourable Gentleman ought to have understood that, but I do think that if a charge is made against anybody in this House that these charges ought to have something more behind them, or else a substantial charge should be put in. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is desirous of finding out what steamer was charged with having gone to the sealfishery without sufficient food, because in his position he is just as desirous as any other Minister of Fisheries of seeing that the regulations that are laid down, are carried out.

Some questions were asked in this by the Honourable Member for Fortune Bay. He was desirous of getting a little bit more information about various things. First, as regards the

Gander. I think we tabled all the information that we had in respect to that. That Honourable Member for Ferryland gave us a lengthy address on the subject the other day, and he stated most of the particulars. He took the view that the Government should have forced the Reids to accept the agreement that the International and they had signed. I cannot agree with the hon. member. The Government took the only reasonable stand they could. They took the stand that if there was an agreement signed between the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company and the International Power and Paper Company that both Companies should ask the Government their approval of it.

MR. CASHIN.—What I tried to convey was that, if the International Company and Gander Valley Company did not agree, I felt that the Government should find out the reason why they did not agree and try and make them come together, otherwise the contract that was passed here last year was futile.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I quite understand the hon. member, but the Government was perfectly aware as to why the International and Gander companies did not agree. We know they had signed an agreement and we know that the Gander Valley Company, or otherwise the Reids, had more or less changed their minds and that they would rather not have the agreement carried out. But the position of the Government was that we could not force the agreement to be carried out. The Government, as a matter of fact, could have said to the International Paper Company when they came to us; "Yes, we will endorse this agreement, we will express our approval of it and give you a Minute of Council to that effect", but that would not be a right and proper

thing for the Government to do. I told the International people that not only would we not give them a Minute of Council, but that we would not consider the matter at all until the Reids came to us and we gave them the same blessing that the International asked for. Furthermore, we said that, if both companies did ask us to approve of it, we could not do so without taking it back to the House where the agreement was passed.

Information for Mr. Hibbs; the Hon. Member for Fogo, in the course of his remarks, intimated to the House that there never was any intention to build a mill on the Gander and that the Government should have more backbone and less gullibility. What that refers to I do not know. The Government had no more power to force that company to build a mill on the Gander than they had to force the Standard Oil to do it. The International Company came here and got an option and I am convinced, as a business man, that they had intention of building a mill on the Gander, if they found it feasible to do so. If that Company only put the proposition to us as a bluff, why did they spend \$50,000.00 for investigation purposes in connection with the Gander since this House closed last year? They spent that money on surveys, engineers' reports, and such like and I do not think these people are lying. Mr. Head told me that was the actual amount spent by the company since this House closed last year and I have no reason to doubt his word. Besides the investigation work done in the Gander region, they have had auditors and engineers going through the proposals in Montreal and New York throughout the Winter season.

There is a difference of opinion between those two companies as to whether a mill can be economically built on the Gander. Reids own the

limits and they want to see a mill there. The International have a mill at Corner Brook and they prefer to take the Gander wood to it. We as a Government are asked what are we going to do about it, and we say it is for the companies to settle the matter themselves. As far as we are concerned we always wanted to see a mill built on the Gander, and if a third party can be got to build a mill there, I say bring him along and I am sure the member for Fogo would be one of the first to jump down our throats if we said otherwise.

Reference has been made not only in this House but by Hon. Dr. Campbell in the Upper House, to a prospectus that was issued by the International Paper Company some time ago re the flotation of some first mortgage bonds at five per cent. A number of gentlemen, including some members of my party and several private citizens, came to me last Winter to show me this document, and the inference they deducted from that document was that the Nfld. Power & Paper Co. business had been a paying business and that this prospectus of the International people went to prove it. I have the prospectus here of the I.N.P. and P. Company and it will be noticed that under the heading of the earnings it says "earnings available for interest of Funded debt before depreciation and depletion amounted to \$2,179,340." The statement issued by Mr. Whyte of the N. P. & P. Company for 1927 also says \$2,179,340. So the two companies agreed on the gross earnings of the concern. The International in this prospectus says the annual interest requirement on this issue of first mortgage bonds is \$243,300 and the total annual interest requirements on funded debt PRESENTLY TO BE OUTSTANDING are \$1,229,575. You will notice that the interest charges in Whyte's statement is \$1,879,593, or

a difference of \$650,000. Now here is where the difference comes in. Everybody knows that the utility debentures were cancelled by the arrangements between the I. P. & P. Co. and the British Owners. Utility bonds were wiped out and consequently when the new company came in there were ten million dollars less capital than before and \$600,000 less interest to be paid. They had another half million on which 6 per cent interest was being paid. They raised a bond issue on their good credit, at five per cent and they saved \$50,000 on that. There is the difference of the \$650,000 and there is the difference between the N. P. & P. Company's figures and the I. P. & P. Company's figures. Besides the N. P. & P. people had to provide a sinking fund according to their agreement with the Government and they added \$434,354 to their interest charges. That left them a deficit of \$134,597. In addition the N. P. & P. Co. had 1927 instalments purchase of money mortgages to provide amounting to \$95,000. They had also expenses to meet for new construction to \$249,870, so that their actual cash deficit when they went to the International Company and when they made their statement to us that they could not meet their liabilities were \$497,467. This statement has been proved. Therefore, I say that it is all nonsense to talk about any company pulling the wool over our eyes or for any member of the Opposition to say that we have a greater liability than we had before, and how many will argue such a thing is beyond the bounds of reason. We have a company now that is paying \$650,000 less interest than the N. P. & P. Company paid. They have a market for their paper and they can hardly fail to make a success of it.

Now with regard to the subject of Bell Island. When I was in England

in connection with the Imperial Conference a few years ago I never lost an opportunity at any public function where business men or those interested in industrial interests were concerned in emphasizing the fact that Great Britain was buying her ore from Spain and Sweden while this old Colony of the British Empire was selling to Germany. I think I made an impression on several occasions because many big business men came and spoke to me about it afterwards. A short time ago we had to place an order for the steel rails to cover the section on the line from Humbermouth to Port aux Basques. When we made the purchase, we were advised if we delayed to take tenders, we would probably lose an opportunity, and I am perfectly satisfied to-day in my mind that we made the purchase at the right time. I don't think we could repeat it today. We took the opportunity to get a quotation from North Sydney and the price was considerably higher than it was from England. We made the purchase, I think, at a good time, and the company from whom that purchase was made also tried to emphasize the fact to their principles at home that they should use Wabana ore. I am glad to say whatever influence had the most effect, the effect has come **and the British interests have already given an order for the very first time for 150,000 tons of Wabana ore.** If those rails had been made at Sydney about 30,000 tons of ore would have been used from Wabana, and now about 150,000 tons are going to England. I am very hopeful if they change their furnaces in order to take care of the ore that they will be induced to take a great deal more and go on taking it. It is only right that ore in the British Empire should be used in the British Empire where it can be, and I trust the time is coming when that

will be done. I did not get a very good reception at Bell Island the last time I visited it. The people were not particularly pleased to see me, but I have always had a great interest in the Bell Island miners, and I have always taken the position that it is more important to this country to see those miners properly remunerated for their services than it is for this country to collect an export tax on ore. I think before we attempt to get an export tax for our general revenue, we have first to see that the miners, who certainly have a hard life underground, should be properly provided for. I don't say extravagantly, but properly. It has been thrown up to us that we have not looked after those miners, but the position is very hard. Put yourself in the responsible position of an Executive member and look at the Bell Island situation as we have had to. What we were frightened of all the time was that the mine might shut down and there would not be any work at all. Somebody says it would not be very much harm if it did, but I think it would be. What we did struggle for first of all and what we have got to-day, I think a greater degree than before, is uninterrupted work. When these miners, who have only got enough to keep body and soul together while they are working, are thrown out of work by the mine closing down, they naturally have the greatest difficulty in the world in catching up with expenses incurred in the meantime, so regular employment is a great help. I trust that we will succeed in getting more help and that the new company, with men at its head who are reliable and desirous of doing right, will treat the miners at Bell Island as well as they have the workers at Sydney.

I am accused in this House of doing nothing for the fisheries. I am a

merchant who was elected here with great expectations of putting the fishery on its feet, and I have done nothing for them at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have always taken the position in this House that it is not the duty of a Government to find means of running the fishery. The duty of a government is to give any assistance to any proposition respecting the fishery that may be brought forward, but, in my opinion, their responsibility ends there. The previous Government made regulations respecting the fishery industry, and when I found they were determined to do it, I, for one, went in and gave all the assistance I could because it was the law of the country; but it was not a success; in fact, it failed dismally and proved an absolute loss to the country. It would have been much better for the country if the fishery regulations had never existed and that the Government of that day had been as indifferent to fishery interests as it is claimed we are today. I believe there is going to be a development in the fresh fish industry. I don't know to what extent it is going to develop, but several firms are interesting themselves to-day; amongst, others, my own firm is doing so.

Fish, other than codfish, are going to be exported this year, but whether we are going to get codfish in a large way on the American markets and so take away a large proportion of our catch from other markets, is a question that cannot be definitely decided. I am satisfied in my own mind that it is going to be done, and that scientific development in recent years—recent months and days, I might say—is going to enable us to do it.

Bonus for Labrador fish. I am not going to dwell on that subject to-day, but as I have said already at a public function in this city, I am going to devote a lot of my time for the next

two or three years to those particular interests. I have been asked why we did not do anything for the Labrador fishermen looking for a bonus on fish when the price was low last summer. Surely if it was in the interests of anybody representing Bonavista Bay, it was to my interest to do something for these men. They contended that men who had got shore fish were well enough paid, but the men who had Labrador were badly paid, and consequently they should get a bonus. I think members on the Opposition side of the House sent some of those men down to me to say that they should get a portion of the \$200,000 devoted for the encouragement of the fisheries. I reasoned with the men, and, as I have always found the men of Bonavista, I found them reasonable. I pointed out that men on the Southern Shore and at other parts of the Island had shore fish that was through no fault of theirs sunburnt and when brought to St. John's they got something like \$2.50 or \$3.00 a quintal for it. I said: "Do you think those men should not get a bonus on shore fish while you got a bonus on Labrador fish?" I must say they saw the point of my argument and didn't push the matter very much further.

We are also asked why we did not build cold storage plants. It has been suggested that there should be plants at Burin and Bay Bulls. I have been opposed to them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent in recommendations, and I have been opposed to them. I am not ashamed to say it, because I believe, to begin with, it is very questionable if the fishermen would use cold storage plants. They did not use them in Petty Harbor, and I know Harvey's plant on the West Coast is very little used by fishermen. I know, as a matter of fact, if it was not for the bankers that go there to take bait, it would not be very much

value at all. Harvey's were very glad to make a sale of bait they had in that cold storage to North Sydney last winter and nobody protested. Then again there is so much development in cold storage plants that a plant built today might be obsolete tomorrow. So, I think, in regard to cold storage plants, we must go slowly. We might get some political kudos by building plants, but we have left that \$200,000 right there, and if another administration came into office tomorrow they would find it there.

Fish meal plants are about to be erected in this country, and the Government is giving encouragement to everybody coming here to erect fish meal plants. One man has machinery on the way out. I am glad to say he is a very type of Newfoundlander, a Mr. Sheppard from Harbor Grace, not a foreigner; one of our own men; one of the boys who went over and fought for his country, and when the war was over he felt there would not be much to do if he came back, there were so many to be repatriated, and he stayed on the other side and made a study of this question of fish meal; studied it for four years, and through connections of his wife whom he married over there, he interested some big capitalists in this thing, and now, with that knowledge and capital behind him, he is coming out to put up a fish meal plant in Placentia Bay at Harbor Buffett, and I hope he will be successful.

Other interests are starting fish meal plants. The Government is giving free entry to every fish meal plant that come along, and it is only right that they should. We want to give every encouragement to such propositions.

I would like to say a word or two about the dole because it has been referred to. It was referred to more particularly by Mr. Brophy. Mr. Brophy

was very careful. He said he hoped we would receive our just reward, but he didn't indicate what he thought the just reward was, and there, perhaps, was where he showed political acumen. The question is a very difficult one. I ask you to forget politics for a minute and consider that you have a hungry crowd coming around to look for assistance. What are you going to do? Last year when we had the matter to deal with we said "Don't let us have any politics in it". We gave the money to the Municipal Council and let them run it. They spent \$90,000, and we found that some of the money had gone to the clerks of the Municipal Council got out of it in city improvement Council and the actual value that the Municipal Council got out of it in city improvements was very little. I have tried to get the figures as to what was spent on rock sheds and what was got in returns.

I will likely get the figures to-day in respect to what money was spent on the rock sheds in the time of the Squires administration and what returns they got from this expenditure out of it. I think Mr. Hibbs said that he did not think they got full value for it and I said that they did not get five per cent of the expenditure. On that point, I would like to get the figures.

MR. HIBBS.—I was non-committal, but you stated the definite sum of five per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We have done the best we could to meet the situation. I don't believe in starting rock sheds and I don't believe that rock sheds do anything towards helping independent people that want to get work. They want the sheds and they do not work and I don't think that they were ever asked to work

and still were paid for it. Hundreds of people and many Barbados negroes amongst them, were drawing money for breaking rocks that they didn't break. Now, I say that it is a great deal better to pick out the people absolutely in need and give them free assistance. There is nothing for the people to do and we must give them the dole in the winter time. There is no work to put them to, the whole place is covered up with snow and there is nothing to employ at. In England they give out the dole and England does not have the conditions in the winter time that we have here.

We have had a police investigation of every case before assistance was given. Mr. Gerald Byrne, who is a returned soldier and whom you all know and is a very able fellow, took charge and had every case investigated. No single men were helped and the dole was only given to married men and if it had not been for assistance given to some of the women with small children in dire need of assistance, we would not have spent as much money as we did.

It is very easy to criticise. Sometimes our best friends and supporters criticise us and recently we have been asked why we have been giving out the dole. We have had to cut it out now even though there may be people starving.

Clergymen of every denomination have told us that if we had not given assistance to the people this winter there would have been a great many people who would have died, and I believe them.

Just a few words about the railway. I don't know if many have read the railway report which was tabled in the House. It is quite an interesting document. The railway is in a better

condition now than it has ever been, without any exception whatever, and it might astonish some of the members to know that with the funds collected by the railway we have during the last four years spent two and three quarter millions of dollars in ballasting and improving the railway. That is the money that the railway Commission has spent in the past four years in improving the line.

I am going to give the last administration credit for one thing and I am always glad to give them credit for anything when they deserve it and I now give them credit for the appointment of Mr. Russell as General Manager of the Railway. We have had several Canadian Managers, good men no doubt, and very expensive, but we have found at home a man just as good as any of them and I think a great deal better. Mr. Russell is most capable in his handling of his work and management of the employees and the whole service is running very smoothly. I feel that it is through his good management that we have the state of affairs that exists on the line to-day.

The Honourable Member for Fortune Bay asked me the other day if I would state as to whether the thought of the project for diverting the railway from the Topsails around by Buchans, came from the Anglo-Nfld. Development Company.

I have no hesitation in answering the Honourable gentleman positively no.

The railway Commission went out to see conditions along the line just after the frost was coming out of the ground. We went out to see how the line was looking. We went to Buchans Mine first from Millertown Junction and Buchans. We came back again

and went over the Topsails and found from fifteen to sixteen feet of snow in some places on both sides of the track. From that we went to Port-aux-Basques and there was no snow falling in the meantime, but when we came back we found a freight train buried in fifteen or sixteen feet of snow which had drifted over and engulfed it. That is the situation on the railway that has to be faced. It should have been remedied a long time ago. It would have been better for the country if some of the money spent in the past was spent to divert that line. That is what we propose to do now. I expect it will take some little time to figure out what arrangements can be made with the A. N. D. Co. and it will take some time to arrange the survey.

The suggestion is not with any political idea of spending money to get votes. It is purely a business proposition to save money for the country and it will save money for the country if it can be agganged on such terms and such conditions as I believe it can be.

It is rather amusing to see some of the gentlemen who have talked so desperately against the highroads policy making such statements as these gentleman have during the past week.

Mr. Lake has urged very strongly that we put a road in his district that will cost about \$20,000, if we put such a road there he thinks the duty on motor cars used upon it will pay for it in a very short time.

Then one of the members for Trinity, I think it was Mr. Grimes said that if we built thirty miles of a road in his district that it would pay for itself from tourist traffic in a very short time.

But if these same gentlemen would apply these arguments to the roads

around St. John's their views of other years might be changed. I am perfectly certain that there are more motor cars go over the roads between here and Placentia in one day than would in a year go over Mr. Lake's road if it is built.

Mr Halfyard had a few words to say yesterday about that obnoxious liquor board and he spoke of the number of bottles that were consumed and carried to the outports. Mr. Halfyard may possibly from some direction get sympathy and a suggestion that prohibition should be re-established but if Mr. Halfyard came into power, I don't think he would alter the present law. In fact, I am sure that he would not because he would become very unpopular if he did. Some amendments may be made but the existing conditions are better than when the men had to pay \$1.00 for scrips to build doctor's houses and got nothing in return. Men were made to be absolute hypocrites and were called on to go and say that they were ill when they weren't. Now the condition is much healthier and the people can get their requirements without making hypocrites of themselves.

I always believed in the saying "forbidden fruit tastes sweetest". If you tell men that they can not get liquor then it is the thing they want. It is better to say that the liquor is there and then move the Churches to talk moral reform to them and persuade them not to buy it.

If there are any gentlemen who are going to talk on the present liquor law I would like to refer them to Read Son & Watson's report and remind them that under the former management the Auditors state that \$200,000 of the increase failed to find its way to the Treasury.

I think that is all I want to say this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

The honorable leader of the "resurrected" party was very much taken on the opening day of the Legislature, with a cartoon that was suggested by the honorable leader of the Opposition which depicted the Government as a polar bear on a pan of ice drifting towards the Gulf Stream. I am going to paint another picture today, another cartoon to put alongside of it. I am going to suggest a cartoon showing a pack of hungry wolves gathered together under a cloak made of very fine quality of "Liberalism" and watching the Government chest, ready to spring for it when an opportunity is available.

I would suggest to the honorable gentleman that he might take those two pictures home and see which is the more suitable to hang over his sitting-room mantelpiece. For the summer months I might suggest the polar bear might present a cooling effect, and the other picture that I have suggested could be kept for hanging in the fall.

On motion the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was adopted, and it was ordered that it be presented to His Excellency the Administrator at such time as may be convenient to His Excellency.

BILLS RESPECTING MASTERS AND MATES

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, the Bill I am now about to speak on has reference to Certificates for Masters and Mates. During the last eight or ten years there has been quite a lot of comment in this country over men running vessels around this country, and also across the Atlantic, without a certificate. In spite of the fact that I have not the honor to be the possessor of a foreign certificate of any country, I have been told many a time that no man should be allowed to run

a vessel on any part of the coast without a certificate of competency or a master's certificate, or, as it is generally called, a foreign-going certificate. Personally I am a believer in any person that is running a boat either in this country or out of it, having a ticket. But I do not say for one moment that it makes you any more competent to take a boat around the coast of Newfoundland or Labrador, because it has been proven times out of number in this country that men who had not tickets have taken boats, both passenger and coastal, the coast of Labrador and been as successful in keeping clear of shoals as those who possessed tickets. But in the meantime I must admit that a ticket will not do a man any harm. On the contrary, it is a help to him. But for a man to take a boat around the coast of Newfoundland or Labrador he must have local knowledge. Some seven years ago I happened to be in Red Bay in a sixty ton fishing vessel, and I met there at that time a man whom some of you may know and most of you have read of, by the name of Doctor Amundsen, and a Canadian Professor of Ottawa who was amongst the bunch. I was there as an ordinary fisherman on the way to Labrador from the Straits of Belle Isle. We had no fresh meat for about six weeks and I thought it was a very good chance to get some. We went on board the vessel that was lying out in the Straits, and as glad as we were of getting a meal of fresh meat so were they also glad of getting some fresh codfish. They asked us if we could get some fresh codfish for them. I told them "yes." I went on board the vessel and brought some twenty or thirty fresh codfish, and in exchange they were going to give us some salt meat. Then I said that we had been eating nothing but salt meat since we had left home,

and I asked them if they would kindly give us some fresh meat in exchange which they did. But the point I was going to make was that after I had found out about these people and what their business was, I made it my business to go over and try to find out some person on board who was in authority over that scientific research of the fisheries and have a chat with him. Finally I came across the professor from Ottawa. I had a long talk with him and he told me what his business was. After he found out that I knew something about the Labrador coast, he asked me for some information. Just at the end of the chat I said "Mr. you cannot make a scientific research of the fisheries of this country without local knowledge." He argued that he could. I argued that he could not. Two years ago when I was sent by the Government of this country to go to Ottawa and represent the Government there, I met Professor Found. He was at the conference. I did not know the man and he did not know me. Of course he never dreamed, I suppose, that the very man whom he had met there in Red Bay seven years ago was now there in Ottawa as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, deciding on a question of some dispute between the Newfoundland fishermen and the Canadian fishermen. After two or three meetings, I happened one day to go down to inspect a cold storage plant in Quebec, with Prime Minister Taschereau. I also found that Professor Found was there too. We went back to the hotel, sat down, chatting and he said; "Capt. Windsor" I think I have met you somewhere before. I said "I cannot say". I have never been here, except once twenty five years ago. I asked him if he had ever been on the Labrador, and he said "yes". After a half an hour's chat he had found out that I was the man,

that told him in Red Bay seven years ago that he could not carry on a scientific research in Newfoundland unless he had local knowledge. He admitted to me that he had changed his mind since. He said that after he had got back that year he found that he should get a local man before he could make a success of it. If you go and chat with that man to-day, you will find that in every part of the world, where they carry on scientific research, you have got to have local knowledge, as well as scientific. The idea of all this talk is that I consider that in spite of the certificates that are given these men, no man can carry a ship around the coast of Newfoundland or Labrador Coast, unless he has got local knowledge as well as scientific. But to encourage our young men to look forward to a certificate of some kind, that would fit him better, even with other knowledge, would not hinder them, and in some cases would be a benefit. Therefore we find to-day in introducing into this House a bill asking for tickets to be given, as tickets of servitude and as tickets of competence. This bill if it passes this legislature will give to those in charge of ships as masters for one twelve months, previous to the passing of this bill, a ticket of servitude, in passenger boats. After that any man that is inclined to get out and take charge of a passenger boat in this country that is on our section of the Labrador or the Canadian Coast, has to go under examination. Syllabuses for these examinations is not contained in this bill. The Syllabus has been drawn up by Capt, Dalton, marine Superintendent and also by Capt. Major who was the Assistant Examiner of Masters and Mates, and who is known very well in this country. These two men are the first that drew up these syllabuses. Finally they were sent to

me and the three of us went over them. As far as my own knowledge was concerned I think that I had drawn it up in as fair a manner as possible under the circumstances. I know only one or two men in this legislature who have a fairly good knowledge of the sea. At most four or five. One of these would be Capt. Randall. There are others I know, equally as competent to voice an opinion. I intended before I would bring this bill before the House to pass it over to Capt. Randall and ask him to go over it and give me his opinion. And I might say that after it had been drawn up by Capt. Dalton, Capt. Major and myself, Capt. Randall went over it and he said that he does not see that there is anything wrong with the syllabuses as they are down here. Probably Mr. Speaker, it would be advisable for me to read these syllabuses as they are not contained in the bill.

(Reads)

RULING ON QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER.—With reference to the Notice of Questions just given by the Hon. Member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, I may say that I understand that last evening after the House had closed the Hon. Member contrary to procedure handed the Notices in question to the Clerk with a request that they be placed on the Order Paper for to-day. This was irregular, as the practice—specifically and definitely confirmed and continued by this House some three sessions ago—requires that Notice of Questions should be given openly during the Sitting of the House. I therefore issued an instruction that the Notices should not be placed on the Order Paper; and further asked the Clerk to inform the Hon. Member that I considered the questions proposed to be asked improper and that in any case I should

have to disallow them. This afternoon I privately advised the Hon. Member to a similar effect and told him that I should have to disallow the questions as in my opinion they were irregular. He asked if he might give Notice of his intention to ask the questions; and I assented—reiterating my opinion as to their irregularity—as I felt it my duty to again impress upon the House the undesirability of asking such questions and to express my entire disapproval of this type of interrogatory. Since I assumed the Speakership of this Assembly, I have dealt with and explained the rules governing the asking the questions, on various occasions. I did not suppose that I should have to refer to the matter again in view of my previous Rulings.

In reference to the first question proposed to be asked by the Hon. Member—as to the honour of Knighthood conferred upon a certain gentleman; This in effect constitutes an invasion of a prerogative of the King and seeks to exercise a right which no one possesses and which no one should have the temerity to attempt to set up, namely to enquire into the reasons which governed His Majesty in conferring such an honour upon one of His subjects. It involves as well interrogating the Hon. the Prime Minister as to the reasons actuating his recommendation to His Sovereign to confer such an honour; and contravenes the well established Parliamentary practice forbidding such questions. In May's "Law and Usage of Parliament" (13th Ed. page 241) it is laid down that "It has been ruled that the Prime Minister cannot be interrogated with regard to the advice he may be giving to the Sovereign with regard to the grant of honours". The impropriety of such questions is patent, and I trust requires no further comment from us. As to the other portions of the Hon.

Member's first question and generally as to his second question, I wish to again refer the attention of the House to our Rules—section 92 of which says; "QUESTIONS MAY BE PUT TO MINISTERS OF THE CROWN RELATING TO ANY BILL, MOTION, OR OTHER PUBLIC MATTER CONNECTED WITH THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, IN WHICH SUCH MEMBERS MAY BE CONCERNED"; and strictly no questions should be asked which do not come within the terms of that Rule. It is hardly to be imagined that questions could embrace as many objectionable points as the two questions now before me. Particularly is this so generally with regard to question number two. They are prolix and redundant; of excessive length; incorporate questions in questions, seek expositions or questions of law and hypothetical questions constitute matters of private research; seek to obtain information not readily within the province of Ministers and easily obtainable from ordinary sources; and are clearly frivolous. This House is supposed to be engaged in the all important duty of transaction of public business; and Ministers and Members generally are under an obligation—which I feel sure they rightly and fully appreciate of devoting themselves with the utmost seriousness to the performance of their duty in that respect. Neither the time of this House nor the attention of Ministers or Members is to be trifled with; and no member should make questions the medium of frivolity or levity, nor seek to exercise his right of asking questions except upon matters of public moment within the Rules of the House. I must therefore rule these questions out; and direct that it is to be understood that the questions have not been asked but that the Notice to ask them has been de-

finitely disallowed.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Speaker; If I might be permitted I just want to refer to a word said by Mr. Monroe at the end of his address wherein he made reference to "hungry wolves" on this side of the House "who under the cloak of Liberalism were in hope of high public station." I hold that is a reflection on the integrity and honour of the men who sit on this side of the House. I hold the Honourable Gentlemen on this side of the House are just as honourable and just as entitled to be called honourable as the men on that side speaking individually and collectively. Now, sir, I just want to ask Mr. Monroe to refer back a little, to recall to memory that he made the suggestion to at least one Member on this side of the House that he should have something out of the public chest and he didn't accept the offer.

MR. SPEAKER.—No Member is permitted to cast reflections upon any other Member. Will the Hon. Prime Minister therefore accord to the Hon. Member for Trinity, Mr. Randall, and the House and explanation of his remarks.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I wish to assure the Hon. Member for Trinity and the House that my reference to a cartoon was meant to be jocular, and in no respect did I intend to cast any reflections upon him or any other Member of the Opposition or of the House.

The remaining orders of the House were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I rise to move that the House do now adjourn until Monday next at 3 o'clock.

ST. JOHN'S WATER SUPPLY

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker; In rising to support the

motion to adjourn. I wish to say that there is a matter I want to draw to the attention of the House and I think it requires more than passing notice. I took up the morning paper this morning and read the proceedings of the Municipal Council, and I was struck, as every citizen of this community must have been struck, with the very serious condition of affairs existing with regard to the water supply of this town. I might say that probably I am more interested owing to the fact of my experience in the city council of twenty odd years ago when the present water supply service was inaugurated and constructed, when engineers competent to judge, capable men who constructed that water service were satisfied that there was no danger of any shortage of water in this community for the next fifty years. Since that time I naturally have had considerable interest in the consumption of that idea and last year when the first intimation was that a serious shortage of water had taken place in in Windsor Lake, being in the summer time and perhaps that was a dry summer I thought there might be no need to be troubled about a shortage at that season of the year, but last December just before I went away I took the trouble to go out and look at the Lake before the actual frost set in, and I was very much struck with the scarcity of water in the Lake at that time; but I contended myself with the idea that during the winter months with the snow fall coming and melting in the spring that it would be raised to its former height. But when I took up this paper this morning and read the statement of the City Engineer with regard to the water supply at Windsor Lake I was astounded to see that at this season of the year when every lake in the country is overflowing its

banks the main water supply of this city is seriously short and will be soon exhausted. I will read the paragraph; I think Members will agree that it is of importance to this House and to the Members for St. John's particularly.

Reads

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the amount of water wasted is not going to make very much difference in the length of time that supply is available. A certain amount of water is necessary for purposes of domestic use and industrial works and other different purposes in the community and I don't know that outside of the winter months when taps are left running on account of frost that there is any great waste; there is certainly no waste compared to what there was years ago; because Honourable Members will recall that all around the length and breadth of the town fountains were running full force without any restrictions whatever and still we had no shortage. What I contend is that there is something radically wrong. Last night I had the opportunity of talking with the Mayor about this and he thought the water shed was not being given an adequate supply. I am not prepared to accept that statement. The lake is no lower or higher than the day it came into existence, therefore there is no ground for such decision. If there is any quantity of water there this is the season of the year it should be there. After the summer with drought and no rains then we might expect to see a small quantity of water in the lake but I contend at this season of the year we should have an adequate supply. My reason for raising the matter is not to criticise the City Council but to let it be known that the Government were approached last year with regard to certain alterations, improve-

ments, additions to the present conduit which conveys the water supply. The Council asked for a guarantee for certain money which was given, Therefore that cannot be taken as an excuse for the delay in taking steps to avert the evil. Personally I am fully convinced that the trouble does not lie there. Something has gone wrong with Windsor Lake. That is the conclusion I have come to, and I want to give the advice now that the Government Engineer or Government Geologist should go and ascertain whether there is any change in the rock or ground surrounding Windsor Lake. We have an eminent geologist Dr. Baker whose services are available at any moment if those services should be any good. We have Mr. Hall, a civil engineer and every one knows of his competency; and we have yet to be asked to have an opinion from any of those officials. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of Members of this House to this matter, because after all the affairs of St. John's are more than ordinary Municipal affairs; they appertain to the whole country. Think of what would happen to this town if that supply of water failed. Think of the menace of fire; the danger of disease; things that we all would realise if by some unfortunate circumstance that supply of water diminished pro rata as it has during the last winter. If there is a shortage to-day in the wet season and after the winter snows, what is to happen after two or three months of dry and warm weather. Therefore I say this is very serious. It is a national matter. It is important to this House as well as the Municipal Council and I hope interest will immediately awaken and that no time be lost by those who have the direct responsibility to report to every possible means of obviating any serious out-

come in the near future.

MR. BROPHY.—Mr. Speaker; With your permission in reference to the water supply, there is no doubt whatsoever but the opinion expressed by the Honourable Minister this afternoon is certainly correct. As far as the Municipal Board is concerned they are doing everything possible to counteract the shortage of water at Windsor Lake. At the meetings held in the Council Chambers some members of the Board are under the impression that a break in the conduit may be responsible for the shortage of water, but the opinion of the Engineer is otherwise. The city has spent quite a lot, and with the wastage of water that has been found there has been considerable decrease in that unnecessary drainage of the supply. I think somewhere in the vicinity of one thousand houses it was found have allowed water to run freely. The Board realises the importance of the present low state of Windsor Lake and our engineer at the present time is considering some other means of supplying the west end of the city than from Windsor Lake. He is making plans of the waters on the South Side and possibly within the near future the water coming from twenty mile pond may be helped by water from the south side for the west end of the city. I assure every gentleman here that it is a serious outlook at the present time. Fearing that there may be anything wrong with the conduit at present we have negotiated with the Government for one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to lay pipes out there in order to see if possible if there is any fault with the present conduit.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker; I rise to support the motion for adjournment and I would like to thank the Colonial Secretary for mentioning the

matter in connection with the water supply. I agree with him that the waste of water in the city of St. John's has nothing to do with the present condition at Windsor Lake. The waste of water in St. John's ten years ago was a great deal more than it is today. There is something more wrong with Windsor Lake that the Municipal Council or any one else knows about. I believe it is the conduit—the whole bottom is out of it—and as the Colonial Secretary said, it is a very serious matter. I believe that the Municipal Council should certainly go a long way to fix up the matter.

I was out to Windsor Lake last year and went around the edge of the bank and I was astounded to see how far the water had gone down. It never came back and it is not back there now. I am quite sure that something serious is wrong and the sooner the Council and the Government look to the matter the better it will be for the city

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, in connection with the matter under discussion on the motion for adjournment, in view of the naturally serious nature of this trouble, I feel that some one should make a move and I would suggest that if the Council does not make a move to approach the Government with a view of obtaining some expert advice on the matter, that the Government should act on its own initiative. Two heads are better than one, and while Mr. Ryan, the City Engineer knows considerable about the water supply, if he had some other assistance he might find out something in addition to what we already know. So I would suggest—and perhaps by my suggestions in this House it might reach the Municipal Council—that if they do not follow any suggestion the Government arrange for Mr. Hall, the Government Surveyor, to assist

the Municipal Council, and for him to investigate the shortage in the water in Windsor Lake, and in addition to that Dr. Baker if he could be of assistance to them, and secure his services immediately, and if the Council does not take steps in a very short time I feel that it is the duty of the Government—for after we are here to protect the public and this matter reflects on the public as a whole—step in and send Mr. Hall and Dr. Baker to the site of the catastrophe, for that is all you can call it, catastrophe, to study out on their own, clear of the Council, and see what is actually wrong and which evidently the Council does not know and the Government does not know, and it is up to both to get someone to tell them.

The House on rising adjourned until Monday, the 14th inst., at 3 o'clock.

Monday May 14th 1928.

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

Petitions were presented by
Mr. Ashbourne from Cottel's re Telephone .

Mr. Halfyard from Hearts Content, re Public Wharf.

Mr. Halfyard from New Chelsea, re Roads.

Hon. Mr Sullivan from Great Bona. re Telephone.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the Customs returns 1926—27.

Mr Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and

Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman; In moving the House into Committee on Supply, I do not propose to go very minutely into the matter of explaining the Estimates this afternoon, except to state briefly the increases and decreases as the case may be. When the Estimates are going through the Committee stage, hon. members will have an opportunity to discuss them more particularly. To put it briefly, therefore, the House will be asked to appropriate the sum of \$10,476,682.51 to cover the current expenses of the Colony for the coming year 1928-29. This vote shows an increase over the original Estimates of last year of \$389,272.02 composed principally of the following terms;—

In the Finance Department there is an increase of \$253,635.06, and of this total increase the sum of \$250,000.00 is to provide the Interest on the 1927 Loan of \$5,000,000.00 at five per cent. The balance of \$3,635.00 is practically covered by the addition of new pensioners to the Civil List. All of them are extremely old officials of many years of service and now beyond their labours.

The only increase in the Colonial Secretary's Department is the amount required to finance the forthcoming General Elections which I do not think will need explanation.

In the Department of Justice, the salaries of the Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court, Mr. Butler, and the Clerk of the Peace, St. John's, are increased \$450.00 and \$500.00 respectively.

It was felt by the Government that these officials were inadequately paid for the very responsible duties devolving upon them and the increases granted are only commensurate with the importance of the work with which they are entrusted. The Clerk of the Peace has very frequently to act as Judge of the Central District Court during the absence of that official, and Mr. Butler has the care of many valuable securities, titles, deeds, and other documents of considerable importance.

In the Fire Department salaries, a redistribution has taken place whereby the number of District Inspectors increases from three to four; the Sergeants reduced from five to three, and one Fire Constable added to the Department. This readjustment accounts for a small increase of \$150.00 covering salaries account.

There are also added to the Pension list; one policeman and one fire man. These men are retired at the regular pension provided by the Police Department.

In the Department of Education: Honourable Members will note an increase in the vote for Council of Higher Education of \$3,000.00 and \$5,000.00 for places not listed in Census. The latter is principally to cover expenses to be incurred in the Humber area and around the Deer Lake section of the country which is now being populated and has to be provided with the regular educational facilities as in other parts of the country. The increase in the Council of Higher Education is necessary to cover the increased cost of examinations by that body. I understand from the Secretary of the Education Bureau that the vote was reduced one thousand dollars a few years ago and that they find it absolutely impossible to carry out

their work on the amount provided last year; hence the increased amount asked for to cover the expenses for 1928-1929.

The increase in the Public Charities Department amounts to \$35,608.90; sixteen thousand dollars of which is required to meet bills for medical attendance and conveyance of sick fishermen and sick poor generally in the Outports. The vote for emergency cases being found inadequate last year, has been increased from \$3,000.00 to \$5,000.00 and \$3,000.00 additional money is provided for the Relief of Fire Sufferers, Pauper Burials and other extraordinary expenditure of this nature. These particular votes have helped to swell the Supplementary Supply in years past and the aim of the increased vote is to cover all possible requirements in the original estimates. Our contributions to the Halifax Institute for the Blind and the Notre Dame Bay Hospital in responsible for the balance.

The Marine and Fisheries appropriation is increased by the sum of \$4,181.00 due to the establishment of new lights and the maintenance of same which may be referred to when the Estimates for that Department are being discussed.

The apparent decrease in the Agriculture and Mines Department is not really a decrease in the regular annual vote, because last year the usual of ordinary for Fire Patrol had to be supplemented by the sum of \$8,000.00 in order to cope with the extraordinary outbreaks of fire at Carmanville and other places. This special vote of \$8,000.00 had therefore to be taken to look after the expenses involved fighting fires. It may be said therefore, that so far as this Department is concerned the legislative appropriation required is the same as granted last year.

Neither can the decrease of \$6,074.97 shown in the Department of Public Works be called a decrease in the strict sense of the word as this would not have occurred but for the fact that we have relinquished control over the administration of Sudbury Hospital which has not been taken over by the Toc H. Organization. The appropriation last year for Sudbury Hospital was \$17,512.00 and we shall not need this money during 1928-1929.

In the Public Works Department salaries there is an apparent increase of \$371.00 but this is offset, by a decrease in the Contingent vote of that Department of \$1,000.00 due to the inclusion of Mr. Loveys a returned soldier who has been acting as Superummary on the regular pay-roll of the Department. He was formerly paid from the contingencies of the office. The insurance premiums of public buildings increases \$200.00 and the lease of the Militia Building having expired we have to provide an additional amount of \$237.48 for rent. In order to prevent over-lapping in the payment of accounts for the dieting of prisoners held for trial in the lock-up and to cover bills formerly paid by the Justice Department the vote for this service is increased \$350.00.

After consideration by the Government Dr. Parson's recommendation, were readjusted. This with an increase of \$1,000.00 on the maintenance salaries in the Hospital for the insane account gives a total increase for the Asylum of \$3,072.55. The General Hospital increases \$3,720.00 principally for supplies and the Sanitorium.

Maintenance vote increases \$4,580.00. These increases according to the Public Works Department are absolutely necessary in order to fill the requirements of these institutions. As I have already pointed out the Sudbury

Hospital appropriation is dropped for next year, and this decrease more than offsets the several increases noted. The remaining increases are for ferry services and will be noted as the Department is being reviewed.

In the Department of Post and Telegraphs there has been a general shake-up in the St. John's offices. Transfers from one sub-department to another and promotions of junior officials are the causes of the small increases noted here. The net result of these transfers, promotions etc., is an increase in the salary list of the postal of \$1,186.00. There is a net increase in overtime in the Postal branch and \$500.00 decrease in the Telegraph. In this Department overtime has been a recognised vote, as the officials have to work late hours during busy seasons and cannot be expected to do so without remuneration.

With regard to the Outport Postmasters; those increases which appear are for new offices opened in the places indicated and for offices which have been included in the Money Order system thus entailing upon them great responsibility and increased work. The decreases in most cases are the result of combining the postal and telegraph work and relegating it to one official and the service does not therefore cost as much as if two people were engaged. Wherever possible this is being done as there are very many places which cannot support a telegraph business solely, and where this occurs if it is at all feasible, the Postmaster is also the Telegraph Operator.

The net increase in the Post office Branch of the Department is \$3,880.58, which work out as follows;-

Increases in St. John's	\$1,186.00
Increase in overtime	2,000.00

Increases in Outport Postmasters	1,694.58
	<hr/>
	4,880.58
Decrease in subsidy to Postal Union	1,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$3,880.58

The Postal Union Subsidy is a contribution to the International Postal Bureau at Geneva and has been voted in the Estimates at \$2,000.00 per annum. During the past few years, no contribution has been made. However we may be asked to contribute at any time and I have left \$1,000.00 in the Estimates for the purpose.

In the Telegraph Department under the readjustment already referred to, the Day Messengers' vote is decreased \$960.00 and the overtime vote reduced from \$4,500.00 to \$4,000.00. This is offset in the increase in the Postal Branch of \$2,000.00. An increase of \$154.00 appears in the salary of the Battery Man, but this is to rectify an error which occurred last year when this man's salary was voted.

There are five new telegraph offices opened as follows:—Brunette, Buchans, Mine, Indian Islands, Pinchard's Island and Sagona, and Assistant Operators provided for at Come-by-Chance, Millertown Junction and Westport. Other small increases have been recommended by the Postal Telegraph authorities on account of increased business in the places indicated. Two decreases will be noted, one at Fogo for new appointment in place of an old official at less salary, and at Fortune, at which place the messenger relaces the Assistant Operator at a smaller salary.

In the Department of Customs there is an increase of \$3,500.00 for the printing of excise stamps. These stamps are required for the sealing of

tobacco and cigarette packages coming out of bond, and are used as a preventative against fraud and smuggling. These stamps are cancelled by the excise Officer upon payment of duty. The increased vote is caused by the fact that Customs duty is now collectible by stamp on all advertising and printing matter imported into the Colony through the Post Office as per Section 306 (f) of the Revenue Act. This of course means the printing of many more stamps and the additional vote is to cover the increased cost. There is a revenue received from the sale of these stamps and the proceeds are placed to the credit of Exchequer Account.

The decrease of \$7,820.00 in the Department of Tax Assessor is caused by the transfer of some of the officials to other Branches of the service and a reduction in the contingencies vote.

The Board of Pension-Commissioners Department shows an increase of \$11,000.00 due to changes in pensions caused by the operations of the Naval and Military Pensions Act.. Over four hundred and forty children have been added to the pension list as well as one hundred wives, meaning increased expenditure of \$15,000.00 and as against this increase there are decreases in the Royal Naval Reserve Pensions of \$1,000.00 and the Forestry and Imperial Pensions of \$3,000.00; making the net increase of \$11,000.00 as above.

It will be noted from the foregoing that with the exception of interest charge on the new loan of last year amounting to \$250,000.00 and the amount of \$85,000.00 which we shall have to provide to carry on the Elections next Fall, there is on the whole very little change in the coming year's Estimates. Those increases which have been noted are impossible to avoid but many of them have been offset to a large ex-

tent by reduction in other branches of the service. In connection with the total appropriation asked for, I might point out to the House that in spite of increased interest charges, the establishment of new services, the natural expansion of services already existing and increased educational grants, the expenditure estimated for the coming year which you are now asked to authorize is less than the amount actually spent in 1920-1921 by the sum of \$482, 626.39. I do not think there is any need for further comment and if the House is agreeable, I beg leave to move that this Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again tomorrow.

QUESTION OF SEED POTATOES

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; I will take advantage of the House being in committee to refer to the question of seed potatoes. I am not considering the vote for agriculture just now but in a great many cases in the district of Trinity, the people are greatly agitated as to how they are to get potatoes for seed purposes. In some places they have asked if they could spend the road money to purchase potatoes and have road work done. But before taking up the matter definitely to see what can be done, I would like to know from the Government if they can give any definite reply as to their intention to make a special vote for the purchase of seed potatoes or not.

The Minister of Agriculture & Mines referring to this matter stated that it would cost \$100,000 to \$150,000. Every now and then we are reminded of 1920 and 1921, and I think the vote then for 1922 and 1923 was \$35,000 and I don't know if any more money is being spent or not in seed potatoes.

This is not a matter that should be dismissed without some

consideration. It is a most important matter, a serious matter. We are giving out the dole in a great many districts. We have given it out during the last two or three years in very large amounts, up to sometimes tens of thousand of dollars.

Whether it is the fault of the people or not, and it may be in some cases, that they have no potatoes, as far as Trinity district is concerned it is a matter over which they had no control. It was an act of Providence, on account of weather conditions and their potatoes were blighted in August of last year as a result of the storm and whether there was one barrel or one hundred barrels in the ground whatever country the storm covered the potatoes were blighted and the industrious and those who were not so industrious suffered as a result.

If something is not done I feel quite sure that a great many people will be without potatoes next winter and I cannot see where their earning power will be increased so that they can purchase potatoes from the Maritimes, and if the House is satisfied and the heads of the Departments are satisfied that in the case of poverty and want of the future to give out dole all right, but I will not be a party responsible for that kind of policy.

It is no good to say that some were given out indiscriminately and that some went into the pot that should have gone into the ground, it is possible for someone to see that seed potatoes are provided when persons are under such circumstances that they cannot provide for themselves.

You can dismiss it and do nothing, not even take the trouble to arrange for the road grants to be administered in such a way that the people can get potatoes and give in return work on the roads.

I don't know about Trinity district, I don't know what amount of dole they got down there this year. I think somebody asked that question and it was tabled but the duplicate answer was not left on the table of the House. And that is another point, no reply is given to a member who asks a question unless a duplicate is left on the table of the House so that anybody can refer to it.

Large amounts of money have been given out in the different districts during last year as high reaching as \$3,000 to \$16,000 or \$20,000, and next year you can anticipate that unless some effort is made now to help the people to do what they should do and see that they use every bit of cultivated land they can to grow potatoes, you will need a good deal more.

Any how I would like to know from the Government what they intend to do, as the time soon arrives now for the planting of potatoes and there are schooners here now from Trinity on South Side and they want to get some on board to carry home with them if they are to be given out.

Otherwise we might arrange the matter of the road grants.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Mr. Chairman; I have no authority to speak on behalf of the Government but I want to say a word or two on behalf of the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

I would like, if I could to make out why in serious matters, certain members are prepared to play politics with seed potatoes as well as in other subjects that come before the House.

MR. HALWYARD.—I am not playing politics—a Daniel come to judgment.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—You immediate-

ly come in here and stand up and abuse the Government.

MR. HALFYARD.—I am not abusing anybody.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I have your own words. The Honourable Member for Trinity stated, I took down his words, that "you gave out the dole for the past two years". Is that the way, on behalf of the constituents of any Hon. Member, for him to get the House to assist him in any matter that is before the House? And the Honourable Member forgot to mention that the dole was not only given out for the past three years, but for the past six or seven years, from 1919 to 1924 \$600,000 of the public money was given out as dole during the period when he held an important position in the Government of the day.

During the past forty eight hours I had the opportunity of visiting a section of the Island, not my own district, and I found that my statement a few days ago when replying to the Honourable Member who brought this matter up, had been misrepresented. It was broadcasted that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines rose in his place and denounced the idea of assisting the various farmers by giving them seed potatoes to put in the ground.

I made no such statement. In reply to the Honourable Member who has just sat down, I stated that with my vote, which is now \$20,000 as compared with anything up to \$100,000 that other gentlemen that occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture & Mines, received, I could not respond to a general call for distribution of seed potatoes. How can any sensible man expect that I could respond with the figure at my disposal, to the request of the Honourable Member or of any other member in this House. I

found it impossible to respond to my own constituents and I told them so and I told them why. They were honourable enough and honest enough not to attribute any ulterior motive to my action. I pointed out that if the Government wanted a general distribution of seed potatoes you would want \$100,000 to pay such bills. It is easy enough for the members to get up and make all kinds of suggestions, but provide the wherewithal to pay for them first.

I am not a farmer and I took the very first opportunity that came my way to tell the country that I am not a farmer and I am satisfied to take the advise of the Secretary of Agriculture, a man the whole country has confidence in. Mr. Bayly advised me that there was going to be a shortage of seed potatoes this year and he asked me if I would recommend that the Government permit certified seed potatoes from Canada or the Old Country to be admitted free of duty. I instructed Mr. Bayly to write to the Minister of Finance asking his consent and as I had not sufficient time to wait for a reply from the Government as to whether or not they would let the consignment in without any duty, I told Mr. Bayly to take sufficient of the vote to pay for the duty. Consequently we have ordered a supply of seed potatoes to sell to the people who will need them. If the Government and the House desire it, to indiscriminately give out seed potatoes, I say that once you start you have to be prepared, no matter what most members would like done, the minute you open the door to give one man a barrel of potatoes you have to be prepared to give a barrel to everyone.

If that is the desire of the House there is nothing I can say that would alter that decision. I do not mean to

play politics with the Department, but I have from my place in the House advised against any such proposition. If it were possible to do something to assist those people who cannot buy and have no seed potatoes to put in the ground, I would be one of the first men in the House to lend assistance to supplying that particular man or woman, but if you are going to make available the funds of the treasury for supplying seed potatoes, you would be doing only what was done in the past, and if you are prepared to give a bag or a barrel of seed potatoes to every man or woman that applies for it from any part of the country, then I want to reiterate what I said on that occasion that a very small percentage of the free distribution of seed potatoes found their way into the ground. I trust that the Hon. Member for Trinity who brought this matter up before the House will in the future not try to play politics with such a serious proposition as he called it himself. It is alright for a man to get up here and speak on a matter that concerns his constituents, but I want to tell the Honourable Member I am just as desirous as the member for Trinity or any other member for that matter in this House, to do what I consider the square deal by the people I represent, but I am not prepared to sit idly by and see anybody trying to play ducks and drakes with the measures of the Government, or politics with any proposition that is brought before the House.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines with mingled feelings of pleasure and regret. I am glad that I have aroused some interest in the matter of seed potatoes, and to have gotten such a spirited reply from the Minister. Evidently he is not in favour of granting

any special monies for the distribution of seed potatoes this year, and I presume that he speaks for the Government as a responsible minister of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I would take that for granted,

So then I take it that it is settled, unless some member of the Government were to convey a different idea, that the Government is not going to give out any seed potatoes this year. Now I take exception to the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, that I have any idea of speaking to this subject for the sake of politics. I do not have to use the shortage of seed potatoes in Trinity District, or the necessity of supplying a quantity, in order to get elected down there. Politics was furthest from my mind, and just because I spoke of dole it was the realisation of what this country has been up against, and what this Government has been up against for a number of years. You know that our people get a large proportion of their living from their agricultural effort. Potatoes enter largely into the diet of Newfoundlanders. There are people in Trinity Bay and in other districts as well, I presume, who cannot get potatoes to put into the ground. And if you think, or if the House thinks that I am speaking of these conditions for political purposes, you are doing a grave wrong. As I pointed out when the Minister was speaking a few moments ago "a Daniel come to judgement". Those who visited this House when the Hon. Member occupied a seat on this side of the House, can certainly call to their minds how long he talked about certain things which the ordinary listener would attribute to politics. Whether he was talking for political purposes I do not know, but he was given the credit for it anyhow. Now I am citing what happened in the

past with regard to irregularities, with the idea that it might be an incentive to try to do better. But you can send your officials around Newfoundland, and talk to them about the scientific method of agriculture, but it will not put one potato on their tables next winter. It will not feed the poor people or the hungry children. And I consider it of more than passing interest. It is an important thing. And I am not speaking for political effect either. Now then, you have decided I presume, unless the Prime Minister wants to deny or confirm what the Minister said, that there will be no vote for seed potatoes this year, and the next thing that I have to do will be to take the matter up with the Minister of Public Works, and possibly with the Government and find out whether the road grants can be used this year for the purchase of seed potatoes. I would rather not have had to speak about it, because it only gives much endless trouble. But when I as representative of the important district of Trinity get letters from some of the most responsible inhabitants of various localities, pointing out that the people will no have potatoes to put in the ground, then it is time for me as representative to do something, when I have had individual requests for a barrel or a half barrel, requests from the representatives of the people, from the whole community, signed by Relieving Officers, Justices of the Peace, Chairman of the Road Boards, and others. And if you think it is politics to talk about it in the House I think that I would be derelict in my duty if I were not to make a strong pronouncement in connection with the matter, and try and get somebody to realise the situation. I have noted the requests and I have their letters and quite a number of these people who have written me say:-

Reads

That is all that I have to say about it. Of course with regard to our little talk here this afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and myself, I think that we understand each other. He wants to defend his Department and he is well able to do it. I must give him credit for that. But I know that in a personal conversation with him, he will say that both of us are right.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a little misunderstanding. The Hon. Member for Trinity has just said that I said that it is playing politics to talk of the need of seed potatoes.

MR. HALFYARD.—I did not say any such thing.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—Well, I think that the Assembly is the proper place to discuss such a matter, but it is the way in which the Hon. Member approached the subject, and the reference that he made to the handing out of the dole for the past two or three years that brought me to my feet. If that is not playing politics, then I as an old politician, do not know what politics is. The Hon. Member in referring to the dole given out by the present Government during the past two or three years, conveniently forgot that dole had been given out during the period in which he held a very important place in the Government of that time, \$600,000 was given out to break rocks, and the Prime Minister stated in this House the other day that the direct returns to the Treasury for the breaking of these rocks amounted to something over five per cent. When the Prime Minister made that statement he had not got the official returns. Shortly afterwards I

understood him to say that he had received the official returns, and that it was 6 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No. It was a little under one per cent.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Then that makes the case a bit worse. That was the portion of the member's speech that I took exception to. I am at one with him in trying to find means of helping the people in any part of the country, if it is done in a legitimate way. But the Hon. Member must hear his share of the burden. I am prepared to hear mine, and during the time that I had a seat on the opposition side of the House, if I did talk long and loud, I accomplished something by it. I think if the Hon. Member would take his mind back to the period to which I refer, it will be apparent that there is something radically wrong in the State of Denmark. He will remember that it was this very same Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who sounded a warning note from my place behind where the Hon. Member for Trinity sits now. I was the individual that produced a cheque, whereby a certain individual who had been using public funds, electioneering in St. John's West, was exposed. I am the man that named the individual, and that was the step that caused havoc in the ranks of the Government of that time, which only ended with their being driven out of office. There was something accomplished by my speaking long and loud, during the period that I occupied a seat on the opposition side of the House and since I have been on the Government side, any proposition that comes before this House, whether it was brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition, or the Member for Trinity or anyone else on the other side, I am ready and willing, and I always will be ready and willing to give my vote

and voice, in the interests of the people of this country.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, the last remarks made by the Hon. Minister are only adding insult to injury, I spoke of the dole that had been given out.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—During the past two years.

MR. HALFYARD.—And the past number of years as well. I make no difference of time. Conditions are no better. Prospects are no better.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Far better.

MR. HALFYARD.—And if the people have no potatoes to put in the ground, the demands for dole will be greater. That is the point that I was trying to make. And you by your own statement are a party to inactivity and inaction, and you talk about other Governments, and you do nothing yourself.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member is prepared to do for his constituents, what I have done for mine, since I have been a member of this House. My sessional pay is one thousand dollars, and for the past four years, every year I have spent a thousand dollars on my constituents.

MR. HALFYARD.—What is keeping your family.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—That is my business. You know well that my family does not depend on my sessional pay to keep them.

MR. HALFYARD.—Well, you gave away all your salary. What is keeping them?

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker, there

is a gentleman aspiring to the leadership of a party, and he is prepared to throw across the floors of this House the insinuation "What is keeping my family". During the whole period that I have talked, long and loud in this House, no other member could accuse me of throwing such a dirty contemptible slur across the floors of this House.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I only said.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Sit down and take your medicine.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, allow me to explain. I did not by my remarks, mean anything in the way of an insult to the Minister, and if I have hurt his feelings I withdraw what I have said. But I only asked him, if he gave away all his salary, what is providing for his family.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—I only said that I gave away my sessional pay. And the Member for Trinity know well that my pay as head of a department is not my sessional pay.

MR. HALFYARD.—The way the Hon. Minister worded his remark lead me to understand him differently. However as I understand him. I withdraw my remark.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—It is quite easy to drive in the dagger, but it is very hard to withdraw without taking some blood with it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I do not want this opportunity to pass without having a word or two to say with regard to the dearth of seed potatoes in certain parts of the Island. This morning the Hon. Member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, rang me up at my office respecting this matter and I told him

exactly what the position was. I might say that I have been flooded with letters from the district of Harbor Grace, the people there asking that some arrangement be made or that some means be devised whereby seed potatoes could be secured. I listened to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the other evening and I am perfectly satisfied that it is impossible to give out seed potatoes indiscriminately. We know what happened before when potatoes were given out in like fashion. People who never had a garden or who never had potatoes under cultivation went to the Department of Agriculture and Mines and got their quota of seed potatoes, and it is quite true, as stated by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the seed potatoes found their way into the pot. However, at the present juncture I do not say that there is no necessity for giving people relief to put seed in their ground. In the district of Harbor Grace, and pretty well all round Conception Bay, there is a marked scarcity of potatoes, and some of us who have been charged with the responsibility of those things have been very much exercised over the matter. Personally I sent out my district grant and instructed the Road Inspector to go around and in whatever places were available to give the people work so as they would be able to be in a position to earn sufficient money to provide seed potatoes for themselves. I think this is a more admirable way of coping with the situation, even though it may be frowned upon by some people, because I think we ought to get the people of the country to think and act more independently with a view to getting their sustenance.

Now with regard to the subject of the dole, which has been so much talked about. Usually the dole has

been cut off at this time of the year; but it cannot be cut off altogether. In certain districts there is always a certain amount of poor people to be cared for, or, as the Scripture says: "The poor are always with us." But the trouble about the whole matter in this community is that those who are not in need are preventing the government from assisting those who are in need. Everybody seems to want his share, those who are in need and those who are not in need. I know of a case in point in my own district where a delegation came to me a few years ago regarding the giving out of dole. They stated their case and I told them I would not be a party to the giving of dole, excepting to those who were hungry, because I knew the members of that delegation did not need government help. The result was that they went back very much dissatisfied, and eventually they smashed into the office of the Relieving Officer at Harbor Grace and assaulted him and six of them landed themselves in the Penitentiary. Now, if people were allowed to do that sort of thing, there would be nothing but chaos and disorder throughout the country. However, I saw these men at the Penitentiary and discussed with the spokesman of the trouble and found that the men were penitent and wanted to get their liberty. I saw the Judge and told him that the men did not want to interfere with the law, as they represented to me, and I suggested that, as the men were poor and their families were poor, there was no necessity to unduly punish them. The consequence was they were liberated under suspended sentence and bonds, coupled with a sound lecture that had a most salutary effect. That was the best day's work ever done in that district and there never was the same amount of

trouble in that district since, and not half the dole has been given out as was given out before. I consider, Mr. Chairman, that every poor person should be helped, but the trouble is that if you help a family, apparently, every other family want to get their share or what is going. I know of fifty poor men in Hr. Grace district that I would like to give a barrel of seed potatoes to, but if I did that one thousand undeserving people would be looking for the same concessions.

Therefore, I would suggest to the member for Trinity that he arrange with the Minister of Public Works to have the district grants go out as soon as possible and have the men work out the money so that they would be in a position to buy seed potatoes. Meanwhile, I have no doubt but that the Government will be giving some special grants this session, in order to offset any trouble that might ensue, to a number of people in the different constituencies who are in poor circumstances and who are short of potatoes. This I think would also be a more discreet attitude to take than to have them distributed wholesale. Now this situation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say with regard to the shortage of potatoes is not confined to the district of Trinity. The famine also prevails all over Conception Bay, and, I have no doubt, in the other parts of the Island as well, according to the representations that are put up. But I would like to point out that there is no such thing as a famine in potatoes existing throughout the country. There is any amount of them on the West Coast. This information was communicated to me by Mr. Bickerton, an English farmer of the West Coast, who was in my office the other day, and the same is true of other places in that locality, and I am given to understand that the whole situation

could be coped with if a little co-operation would take place.

However, personally, I am prepared to assist the heads of the different departments of the Government in connection with the giving out of grants in order to meet emergency cases.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

PETITIONS

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the electors of Cottle's Island in the District of Twillingate, asking for the allocation of a sum of money for the purpose of making a telephone connection between Summerford and Cottle's Island. I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be deferred to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs for consideration.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates', 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.

BILL TO REGULATE PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker. In rising to move the second reading of this Bill to regulate the practice of Optometry, I might say this Bill aims to put Optometry in the same class as the practice of dentistry and pharmacy. It is a well known fact that throughout the length and breadth of this country there are very many people who are not in a position to procure optical glasses and are

very often compelled to resort to very cheap means by which they can get glasses of some kind or other. This Bill aims to form a Board of Opticians who will be regularly registered and certified Opticians for the practice of Optometry. It has come to the knowledge of the authorities that certain people are going around the country practising optometry in a most dangerous and most undesirable manner; people who are claiming that they have the knowledge necessary to advise people as to the kind of glasses to be used and who test their eyes with apparatus not at all reliable. The unsuspecting people of the country are thereby led into a trap and use glasses not at all suitable to their eyes and possibly damaging them for life. The idea is not to curtail trade or interfere with legitimate trade but to protect the public to a greater degree than it has been protected before. It is proposed to form a Board of regularly certified and qualified Opticians who will have the management and control of optometry in the country. The Bill itself explains the regulations that are to be put in force and it will be noticed on page 2 subsection 3 that a Board will be appointed that will consist of not more than five duly qualified and practising Optometrists appointed by the Governor in Council. This Board will be appointed immediately after the passing of this Act and Members will be appointed for three years and will be eligible for reappointment as under the Dental Act and Medical Act and Pharmacy Act. The Board has certain regulations laid down which will be carried out under the Act. Provision is made for the appointment of a President and Vice-President and a Secretary-Treasurer and their duties are provided for in the regular way. There shall be a register of all practising Opticians and there are certain

regulations in connection with registration provided for. There is a section of the Act that will probably be of interest to the general public in particular wherein persons who sell glasses such as goggles used at the sealfishery and other glasses for the eyesight which are not sold with any guarantee but simply on their merits, may still sell, and if a person wants to go into a store and buy glasses let them buy at their own risk, but they are not to be deceived by being told the seller has any special knowledge of optometry. Therefore I think this is a very desirable act to have introduced. It not alone helps to protect those who are at the mercy of irresponsible dealers going round the country but provides also that any medical practitioner qualified to fit glasses is not to be interfered with. I don't know that there is anything more to say just now. When we go into Committee we may be able to adjust any little discrepancies that may appear. I would therefore move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of his Department for the year 1927.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; In moving the adjournment of the House I would like to table a statement from the Public Works Department in connection with relief work from 1922 to 1924. I thought the Honourable Member for Fogo rather doubted my claim that the returns from the rock sheds relief for

those three years was only about five per cent, but it appears I have exaggerated it somewhat. I got the figures from the Deputy Minister of Public Works and find the total amount expended January 1922 to April 1924 was \$675,968.49 and the returns from rocks sold were a shade under \$5,000, a little more than three fourths of one per cent. I beg to table this statement and I beg to move that the House now rising do adjourn until to-morrow Tuesday at three of the clock.

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 15, 1928.

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, His Hon. Mr. Speaker was appointed as Delegate from the House of Assembly in response to the invitation from the Canadian Government.

PETITIONS

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—presented a petition from the Wabana Light & Power Company praying for the introduction of legislation in the Company's interest.

On motion this petition was received and referred to a Select committee to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House in relation to Private Bills had been complied with.

MR. SPEAKER appointed the Select Committee as follows:—Hon. the Minister of Justice, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Browne, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Brophy.

Petitions were presented by
Mr. Lake from Lamaline re breast-work.

Mr. Lake from Lamaline re road.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Randall gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask somebody on the Government side to tell what the Government Engineer is doing to earn his salary. What duties does he perform? I understand his old duties in respect of the railway when it was run by the Reids are no longer part of his duties, and I would like to have a report telling us what he is doing to receive this salary of \$4,600, in addition to which we vote an amount for his expenses, and in addition to which he receives payment for his services in respect of the Highroads Commission. If he is not doing anything in connection with the railway why vote the salary?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We can have a report tabled.

HON. MR. SCAMMELL.—Does the Government Engineer ever inspect the road might I ask the Prime Minister?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No; unless specially asked.

MR. SCAMMELL.—If I take up the daily paper or the railway bulletin I see on various occasions that the Manager and his assistant, Mr. Joyce, have gone over the road to do inspection, so apparently the Commission are satisfied with what they see or do, and as the Prime Minister has said Mr. Hall only would go if specially asked, I take it he is not asked. It seems to me a fair and pertinent question to ask why we should be paying Mr. Hall this salary. Personally, I have not anything against Mr. Hall, and I suppose if the Government has an engineer he naturally has to be a high-priced official, but why if you are going to hand out a person his bread and butter, why also spread jam on it for him?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I might say the point raised by the honorable member is a pertinent one and I think it is quite right that the matter should be discussed. When the Highroads Commission was appointed and Mr. Hall was the one man we had in the public service competent to inaugurate such a commission and superintend the work, he was asked to undertake these duties in addition to the Government Engineer. It doesn't follow that the Highroads Commission as at present constituted will continue. It is very doubtful if the finances of the country will allow the following out of the programme of the last few years and it may be necessary to have the thing boiled down to more circumscribed activities, and then Mr. Hall may hand the administration over to some other official. Meantime, the Government Engineer's duties are wide and varied. It is quite true that prior to the Government's taking over the railway the duties of

the Government Engineer were primarily to watch the Government's interests as far as the railway operation were concerned. During the days of Reids regime Mr. Hall had to continually go over the line and inspect all bridges and all cars and otherwise inspect the line, and of course, that took up a great deal of his time. Since the railway is government operated that is not necessary. In fact Mr. Joyce may be considered the Government Engineer of the railway. As it is owned by the government now, it is not necessary to have somebody outside come in to see that it is properly operated. The position is changed and I think it is only due to the House that somebody explain the position. I know Mr. Hall has many calls on him as Government Engineer, superintendent of marine works and other duties of a constructive nature and his time is pretty well occupied, and of course his time is more than occupied by his duties as Chairman of the Highroads Commission. But that Highroads Commission may not continue in its present form very long and probably Mr. Hall will find himself Government Engineer again. I don't think there is any need for any anxiety in respect of the salary, because if we looked around to get a man of Mr. Hall's competency tomorrow we would have to pay a very much higher price than we are paying today.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, there is a pension here, Kenneth Parsons, Greenspond. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice how long Mr. Parsons has been jailer at Greenspond

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think he gets the maximum pension; quite a number of years.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Do you propose to appoint another jailer?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think not. To the credit of Greenspond be it said, I don't think they want a jailer. The position was held for many years and this man has now asked to be retired. We couldn't very well dismiss him.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit a general observation here. As regards these estimates and all the talk about reducing expenditure, we are here with this burden and we have got to face it and I suppose this will have to go thru and it will have to go on and we will have, I suppose some of us, to see still more additions to the present list of expenditures; but in voting for these we are not altogether responsible; so to speak, we are the heirs of those who first introduced these items of expenditure and they must be carried on and it is a very difficult thing for us to undo what is done, or for any government to set aside the appointments of certain items of expenditure of previous governments. For instance, I see here high salaries that ought never to have been voted; salaries too high when first placed in the estimates. Placed there not only by your government, but by others; by my own, the government whose party I was a member of. All governments have sinned in this respect. There are salaries here that are too high and ought never to have been granted, and we talk about using the pruning knife. But I quite agree that it is not a very easy task to undertake; but when there is an opportunity to use the knife to cut out some such unnecessary expenditure without doing any harm, we ought to do it. Now this present case is an instance. The jailer at Greenspond is being retired and there is no necessity for an appointment in his place, and we will not have to continue voting a salary

for that position, and if we carry that out likewise in any other cases as they occur we will probably find that we will have a greater decrease in expenditure than we think. The country will be saved a salary in this particular case and in similar cases arising, and in the long run there may be quite a substantial decrease. I think this is the only way in which any big reduction in the expenditure on salaries will be effected and I advocate the carrying out of such a policy in every case arising similar to this to which we are referring, and I think if we address ourselves seriously to the thing, in the long run we probably shall be able to effect a substantial reduction.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—With regard to the House of Assembly, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that it should be forty members, \$36,000.00, that is, \$900.00 each.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, I might suggest that in these cases where there is no change, that the totals be read so as to save time.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that with regard to the Colonial Secretary's Department, there is not any change whatever, and the only thing is the General Election cost which amounts to \$85,000.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, there is only one question I would like to ask in connection with this Department. It appears that there is provision made for four clerks and I understand that there are not four. Is that correct?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; yes, there is a vacancy there, which I might say I find very difficult to fill, as I have explained to the House before. It is very difficult to get a suitable person and this past year, one or two years,

I have put extra work on the other officials. But I don't want this vote removed, as this year, with a general election coming on, we will probably require a fourth clerk.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask a question or two in connection with page 21, the Marine Disasters Fund, page 21, second item, Government contribution \$5,000.

The observation I have to make on that is this, a number of persons requiring money at different times in the district of Fortune Bay applied to the relieving officer of the district and he refused to give relief to those getting assistance or to supplement other relief. Where the assistance given by the Permanent Disasters Fund is not sufficient, relief from the other fund has been given and very considerable help has been involved.

I would call the attention of the Colonial Secretary so that he can take up the matter with the Department of Public Charities and adjust it so that there will be an understanding that they get all from one fund or the other. My information is that this fund was given to supplement the relief of a case coming under the Marine Disasters Fund. Where it seems to be necessary they receive assistance from both ordinary relief and under the Marine Disasters Fund.

This was brought to my notice partly by the recommendation in the estimates for this vote.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; In reply I may say that I have never yet had a case come under my notice, of that nature, though I can quite see the possibility.

When the Marine Disasters Fund continually sent out allocations of course it does not follow that the person is getting the other relief at all. Very often it happens that the person

would not be entitled to ordinary pauper relief. Now there may be some cases where the relieving officer feels that he is justified in sending public funds indiscriminately, and if the Honourable Member will send along the names of the parties to me I will see that they do not suffer.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; I would ask the Honourable Colonial Secretary if he will tell us if that \$3,000 for bonus on exported cold storage fish was all paid.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think we have given out more than \$3,000 in bonus on fish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that question has been brought up because I think the matter should be given some consideration. It has only lately come to my notice that there is likely to be an export of one and three-quarter million pounds of fish this year.

There are two or three firms that are getting export bonus on the fish on account of having cold storage plants by arrangements made with them. I think the time has come when the Government should give some consideration to discontinuing this paying of a bonus on export salmon because the return is sufficient now and they can afford to do without it.

MR. GRIMES.—Does this bonus refer to codfish?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No. We are under agreement with Hudson's Bay Co. and Job Bros. Ltd. and Harvey & Co. and these of course will have to stand. I think it is time the Government took steps to have this bonus removed, because it was only put on to encourage it in its initial steps. It was only to encourage the export of fish that the bonus was given, and I don't think that it is necessary to continue this bonus.

MR. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman, is it on codfish that the Prime Minister expects the one and three-quarter million pound increase?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Other than codfish.

MR. BROWNE.—With regard to the Hudson's Bay Company, are they affected by the new condition of affairs, i.e., the new arrangement made with Job Bros. Does it affect the rights under the old agreement?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think not.

HON. LEADER OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I don't think that the time is opportune to discontinue the bonus, though it might be withdrawn as the cold storage companies are exporting fresh fish in large quantities through being encouraged by the bonus on salmon and fish other than cod.

If the statement just made by the Prime Minister is correct that during this year one and three-quarter million pounds of fish is being exported, I think that that will be a help to the fishermen by selling their fish on which they have had no labor, only catching, and until the industry gets well under way, and it will if they have a bonus to encourage them. I think the bonus should be continued, because we will get it back.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not here when the discussion on bonus on fish took place.

I would like to ask if this applies to codfish.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Not to codfish; to salmon, smelt, carp and other fish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I would like the Hon. member to know that this does not apply to fish packed in boxes and shipped from Bonavista and other

places but only applies in cases of agreements with the Government and certain companies who put up plants under the agreement with the Government that they get a bonus on their exported fish.

People exporting fish as they do in Bonavista and other places do not get this bonus.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; a thought occurs to me and I give it out for what it is worth. You say that \$3,000 is being paid by virtue of agreements that are in existence. No doubt when this bonus was first agreed I suppose it was necessary to some extent to encourage the industry in its experimental stage.

I know for a fact that they have gone beyond the experimental stages and presumably they have made a success of it. So even despite the agreement, I do not see how in fairness to those who have come into the business within recent years, those bonuses ought not to be discontinued. If I start into a plant to-morrow and collect and export salmon, I am not doing so in competition with firms that are perhaps bonused under this agreement, and now that the export of fresh salmon and other fish of a like nature, as an industry is gone beyond the experimental stage, if it possibly can be done the bonus ought to be withdrawn as being unfair to those who have gone into business within recent years.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the position to-day as regards these bonuses?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member I may say that the position is this, that under the law governing the codfishery, any person undertaking to put up a cold storage plant can make a contract for a period of years not

exceeding ten. Under this act these contracts have been made, and the point made by the second last speaker, the difficulty is that those are matters of contract and can not be cleared off now. I subscribe to the point made by Mr. Scammell, just now that there is no occasion now for further continuation of them. But the trouble is that we are the heirs of contracts which have not run out. Some of them have four or five years yet to run.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I think that there is one aspect of this matter that has practically been lost sight of. It is an important one, and one of the reasons why these contracts were made, that clause in each contract whereby certain space was to be set aside in those premises for the storage of bait for fishermen. I think that the trouble has been on both sides with regard to that. I think the fishermen did not avail of it, if the bait was there. The fishermen never seemed to require it. One of the ideas of introducing those cold storage plants, was to facilitate the fishermen in procuring bait when it was not otherwise procurable. Therefore they received the assistance of the Government to the extent of a bonus in lieu of a subsidy. Though it has evidently been of little use, and therefore it is no argument in favour of continuing those bonuses.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman might I ask if the Government has considered the erection of bait depots. If I remember rightly, a couple of years ago the Hon. Member for Burin made a strong plea for a bait depot for the South Coast. I thought that when \$200,000 had been voted for the encouragement of the fisheries, the Government might have in mind the erection of a bait depot on the South Coast, or where a bait depot might be considered necessary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member was absent the other day when I spoke in closing the Address in Reply, and dealt to some extent on that subject, and said that whilst the members for Burin and Ferryland were both arguing that a bait depot should be put in their districts and particularly recommended that it be put in the district of Ferryland, at the time I opposed the matter right through, and I oppose it still, because I have very great doubts as to whether the bait depot would be used. We have had experience in Petty Harbour and in other places, where they have not been used. The bait depot that Harvey and Co. had on the West Coast was very little used and that firm were glad to sell their bait last winter to Cape Breton. The people did not raise any objection and did not seem to want the bait. We have the experience here in St. John's at least that while these cold storage plants are bound under their control to take care of bait for the fishermen, on the other hand the fishermen have not been sufficiently interested in it to look for the bait there. That point together with the fact as I said the other day that cold storage systems are so changing from time to time that a plant that was entirely modern a couple of years ago was almost obsolete to-day, and a plant that was modern last month might be obsolete next month. Anyway those aspects of the development of those plants, makes me feel that we ought to be a little bit cautious. I remarked in the House the other day I don't think the Hon. Member was present at the time that that vote of \$200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries is practically intact to-day.

Mr. Chairman, a deputation from the Educational Department waited on

the Government, and particularly pointed out that it was impossible for them to carry on unless they got an increased vote and I think everybody, teachers and pupils alike, especially in the outports, put particular value on the Council for their examinations, and I do not think that any Government could dispense with them. The increased number of pupils is the only reason for the increased expense. There has been no extravagance in connection with the Department, and I can bring down statements to show that the whole management is conducted as careful as it possibly can be.

MR. SCAMMEL.—Mr. Chairman; I think that if there is ever going to be any more money spent by the Educational Department in Newfoundland, they should concentrate on the outport schools. You have spent enough money for Higher Education. There are thousands of children throughout the country who are depending for their education on private schools. In future if consideration is given to educational grants, they ought to go for elementary education. I think we have gone far enough as regards Higher Education.

TWILLINGATE AND GRAND BANK HOSPITALS

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Government has decided to allocate another \$8,000 which will be voted for the Twillingate Hospital and in doing so we are giving them this grant in order if possible to save money by not having the patients come into St. John's. I understand that Fogo and the other northern districts are interested, and I am quite sure that this is agreed to unanimously by the Whole House. It really means that we are granting \$28,000 instead of \$20,000. That is the explanation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement the remarks of the Finance Minister on that subject by saying that we made the stipulation with the Twillingate Hospital Board that they must provide another doctor for that eight thousand dollars. The position is that Dr. Parsons is the only surgeon in the district and, if he got laid up, the Hospital would be confronted with difficulties, so that is the reason we made the stipulation that there must be an assistant surgeon attached.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, before the votes for public institutions are passed I would like to endorse the remarks of the member for Burin a few days ago in respect to the Grand Bank Hospital. Personally, I would like to see means and facilities afforded outport hospitals in view of the high cost of getting patients to St. John's from the different outports and the very high cost of treating patients while they are here. I think there are a great many minor surgical cases brought to St. John's that could be very well treated in smaller institutions and at much less cost, and I think that the appeal of the people of Grand Bank on behalf of the hospital there ought to receive more consideration than it has been getting at the hands of the Government. From all over the district of Fortune Bay as well as from the district of Burin there is a large number of seamen who prosecute the bank fishery, and all sorts of emergency cases arise from time to time and, as a matter of fact, numbers of bank fishermen are brought to St. John's for treatment and who should be able to get first hand treatment in that Grand Bank hospital; but as far as the information I have at my disposal goes, the Grand Bank hospital is in a tumbling down condi-

tion, the nurses are inadequately paid, no sanitary appliances are there and no instruments or supplies at the disposition of the doctors there. Now in Grand Bank you have a couple of medical men of first class standing, men who are quite capable of treating a variety of surgical cases as they arise from time to time, and I think the Government would be very well justified in doing something more for this hospital, because it would involve, as in the case of the Twillingate hospital, a large saving in the expenditure of transportation alone, not to speak of the valuable time lost in having patients brought on here. However, I am very pleased to see that vote for Twillingate hospital largely increased.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I may say that the Government decided a few days ago to increase the vote for the Grand Bank hospital from \$800.00 to \$1500.00

DR. MOSDELL.—I take it that that \$1500.00 is for maintenance and salaries and putting the building in repair, but that amount will not get very far when it is considered that there are no supplies at disposition of the doctors and no sanitary arrangements at that institution. I think it could be very easily arranged to have the medical adviser of health supply drugs for that institution and for the Government to make provision to supply surgical appliances for the management of that institution.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The people of Grand Bank are perfectly satisfied with this extra sum of \$700.00, according to the representations put up to us. We never had any complaints from these people before and they never had any difficulty to run that hospital on account of the people who contributed so gen-

erously towards it; but now they find it necessary to ask for more help.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that that \$700.00 was the amount the Grand Bank people asked me to get for the hospital, and I think with that they can carry on until such time as they can raise sufficient funds to build an hospital. I might say that the reason why this extra vote of \$700.00 was asked for is that the Grand Bank people have a very large debt on their school buildings which cost \$60,000 during the war period. Owing to the passing out of Samuel Harris the hospital has been deprived of his generous support as well as that of his son, George, with the result that the people of Grand Bank have to contribute more for the upkeep of the hospital in addition to helping to pay off the large debt on their school buildings. However, I am thankful to the Government for this vote of \$1500.00 towards the Grand Bank hospital and I feel sure that the people of Grand Bank greatly appreciate it.

LOBSTER FISHERY

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, at the present time I am not in a position to say whether those fishermen suffered any setback or not, as I was given to understand by the Acting Deputy Minister that no setback occurred. I might say, however, that I have received no communication from anyone in Fortune Bay asking for an extension of time for catching lobsters. On the contrary, last winter when the rules and regulations were being drawn up regarding the lobster fishery, people in most parts asked for a shorter season instead of a longer one. At the same time there may have been a few places late in starting on account of ice conditions. Meanwhile I will take

the matter of extension up and see what can be done.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, While on the subject of lobsters, I am reminded of an item that appeared in one of our daily newspapers charging that lobsters were being sold in the neighborhood of St. John's contrary to the rules and regulations; that is some cases they were too small and in other cases lobsters with spawn in them, or what is known as "berried" lobsters, were offered for sale. I would like to know what steps have been taken in the matter, have there been any infractions of the law committed and have the guilty parties been punished?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I might say that I read that item that he refers to. Ever since the first of the lobsters appeared in the different stores in St. John's for sale, I have had two men going around, but up to the present time I have no report from these men of any under-sized lobsters or any lobsters with spawn in them offered for sale. Therefore, this morning I wrote to the Editor of the "Evening Telegram" to give me the name of his informant so that I can trace the matter. Up to now we have no regular lobster inspectors as we have no money to pay them until this vote goes through. The inspectors we had in the past before the close season on lobsters are now engaged in other departments of the fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the delay in connection with these embossing machines: When these rules and regulations were first passed and called for embossing machines for every packer who was going to pack lobsters, I took the matter up with a firm importing these embossing machines and I found they could

not be got less than five dollars. I thought that pretty expensive, and I got in touch with a firm in England and found they could be got much cheaper. They took some time to get out and that caused some delay, but now I think, on the boat arrived yesterday, there are about 518 of them, and on the next boat I feel sure another quantity of these machines will be sent out. For those who have been unfortunate enough to have been delayed, I am very sorry, and I am prepared to do anything for them provided it doesn't affect the lobster fishery.

SALARIES MARINE & FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the honorable Minister for his courteous reply. I didn't intend any reflection on him in respect of the opening of the fishery. I know these delays were unavoidable and because of acts in good faith for the good of the fishery and I want to say that I have always found the honorable Minister ready to co-operate in any proposition with regard to the advancement of the fishery or fisheries in my own district, and it is only fair to say that. Now I am confident he will be glad to co-operate in the event of any loss through delay in opening the lobster fishery. There is a further question I would like to ask in connection with the salary on page 5. There is no Deputy Minister in the Department and there hasn't been one since the death of Mr. Goodridge some time ago. I presume the staff down there is carrying on in Mr. Goodridge's place and I would like for the Minister to explain the position and tell us what happens that salary and what remuneration is being paid for any extra services of the staff for the Deputy Minister's work.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND

FISHERIES.—I may say that Mr. Badcock has been acting-Deputy Minister since Mr. Goodridge's death and he has been helped by Miss Calpin and they have done most of the work. Up to the present neither has received any remuneration. I have asked the Executive Government for some remuneration for these two parties but up to the present time I haven't received it.

MR. GRIMES.—I would like to ask the Minister what saving was effected by the purchase of those embossing machines in England.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The price from England was \$3.85.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, In respect of the question just asked by the Hon. Member for Fortune as to who was acting in the place of the late Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries the minister offered the reply that Mr. Badcock and Miss Calpin were doing the work. In the report of the Auditor General we find G. Badcock \$550.00 and I thought I saw somewhere in the contingencies vote under the Colonial Secretary's Department Miss Calpin \$300.00, I presume these are the remuneration for their services?

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I may say in reply to the Hon. member that those extra amounts to which he refers to for Miss Calpin and Mr. Badcock were in the case of Miss Calpin for the handling of war memorial medals; she had all to do with the handling of war memorial medals and up to this year continued the work. I think that \$500. for Mr. Badcock would be what he received as Secretary to the Fishery Board. Mr. Chambers was appointed and received \$250. for six months and then I suggested instead of bringing in an outside man we would ask Mr. Badcock to take it for \$50.00 a month.

DR. MOSDELL—Is it the intention of the Government to remunerate those two people for their extra services? I understand that in similar cases in other departments payment was made for extra services required and it would seem only fair to do so in this case.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I may say for the information of the Hon. Member that some little while ago the Prime Minister gave me his word that if convenient the recommendation with regard to Mr. Badcock and Miss Calpin would be granted. I am prepared to state that Mr. Badcock for the past eighteen months has put in from eight in the morning until eight or ten at night practically every day in the year. He has his own work to do that he did before Mr. Goodridge died and he also has a good part of the Deputy Minister's work to do, and I feel sure no man in the public service deserves to be remunerated for his service in addition to his salary more than he. A man is not supposed to have to stay on in the office after five o'clock when all the others are gone until eight or ten without being remunerated and I feel sure that any amount the Government may see fit to allocate to Mr. Badcock he will have well earned it.

THE LOBSTER FISHERY

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, as regards the appointment of lobster inspectors, the Minister has given us the information that there are not any lobster inspectors appointed but he has a couple of men who have been lobster inspectors in the past and we infer from his remarks he proposes later to have them again as full fledged lobster inspectors. I notice here cod liver oil and herring inspectors. I don't see why cod liver oil inspection should be confused with herring. Why not have these salaries put down se-

parately so much as contribution towards the man's salary for his services as herring inspector and so much for services as cod liver oil inspector. I propose to table a question to-morrow to try to get some information further than appears here about herring inspection. Now the lobster seems lately to be a very popular subject of discussion in this Chamber, almost as much as the beaver some time ago. On the whole the district of St. Barbe is prepared to respond to the new regulations. Some packers in the district have formed an association and have drawn up rules and regulations governing their own conduct which later they hope to submit to the Fishery Board and ask that they will work in co-operation with them. The regulations require that the rules of the Fishery Board be carried out and from time to time suggestions for alterations or addition may be made to the Board. I trust that when that association does submit recommendations to the Fishery Board and the Executive Government will be prepared in return to give such recommendations very serious consideration. As regards the lobster fishery from that section of the coast from Cape St. George to Flowers Cove, when the regulations were first proposed last year I suggested that there was really no necessity for a time of opening as the date of opening would look after itself. The date set down was the 20th of May with a closing date of the 20th of July. My constituents in the particular section of the district have asked that the season opening be set back to the 20th day of May and that they be permitted to take lobsters until the end of July. There was not sufficient time after the recommendation came into effect to take the necessary steps to have the alteration made, but the matter is looking

after itself because they are blocked by the ice and I fear it will be some time before the men can get down to St. John's Bay where most of the lobster fishing is done. Those people are going to be handicapped in that they are not going to be able to begin the lobster fishery as early as they would like to, I think they ought to be able to have an extra ten days at the end of the season provided the lobsters are not deteriorated and in a condition to be canned. I think this is a fine spirit to find in an association to be ready to get together and co-operate with the Government. Now at the re-opening of this industry we are all watching it jealously and want to see a Number 1 article turned out. It is customary sometimes for the Government to send out a man from here to do inspection or some political heeler from another district and the argument may be used that it is not much use in appointing an inspector in his own district for knowing all the people and being directly in touch with the carrying on of the industry he might find it difficult to properly carry out the duties of inspector. I don't altogether concur with that. There are men in my district well qualified to be inspectors and who are experienced. They may not have, it is true, a course at the Memorial College; but I want to say now that when inspectors for lobster packing are to be appointed I stand four square for the appointment of the men in the district.

I just want to say these few words, Mr. Chairman, on this vote and trust that the regulations will be adopted to work out harmoniously and be able to realize for lobsters the very splendid price that the member for St. George's told us would be the case a few days ago.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.

Mr. Chairman, before the vote passes I think Hon. Members are overlooking the main point arising out of the lobster fishery, which is with regard to the appointing of inspectors.

That has been the trouble with the lobster fishery in the past, and on the part of those who catch the lobsters. If the laws in force had been carried out there would have been no lobster pots used under regulation size.

It should not be necessary to have a close season on fish and you very often see a tin of lobster, a tin containing twenty to twenty-five lobsters.

Now if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries allows the fishery to be carried on without inspectors to see what kind of traps are being used and find how they are being applied, in a few years the same thing will happen as a few years ago, and we will have another close season. If we have no system that will be the result. We find now that in a great many places where lobsters are packed the places are not healthy, nor are they fit places for lobsters to be packed.

The same thing happened in connection with the cod liver oil. It was only when proper inspectors were appointed that the cod liver oil was brought up to a standard whereby it is now able to bring in higher prices than any other cod liver oil in the world. Before, the Norwegian oil was better. The Newfoundland oil was worth a great many dollars less than the Norwegian oil and now it is the other way about and I think the same thing can be applied to lobsters, and I think it would pay the Government to have proper inspectors to see that lobsters are properly put up and not caught under size, and it will mean a great deal more value to the country in the way that

the buyers of Newfoundland lobster will know what they are getting, and I think that this is one thing that the Department should pay a great deal of attention to and do so immediately, that proper inspectors oversee the packing and catching of lobsters of regulation size.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the House any longer than is necessary, but I would like to explain in connection with lobster inspectors, that at the present time although there are no regular lobster inspectors appointed up to the present we have herring inspectors around the country, and these people were all notified by letter that they were to pay attention to the lobster just as much as to the herring, and we also have in the section of Placentia Bay, West Coast, at present two fishing inspectors that we kept on through the winter, and I told these men to pay particular attention to the packing of the lobster. I don't think anybody need worry, because everything that can be done has been done.

The Honorable Leader of the Opposition has mentioned the cod liver oil industry. All that I have to say in that regard is that I think it was under the Monroe Government and Winsor, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, management that the refined cod liver oil was brought up to the standard that it is at the present time. I don't take any credit and I do not want any credit for anything I do in that Department. I think, as I stated before, a good deal of credit is due to the late Deputy Minister of the Department and I feel safe in saying that if you will give me another four years I will see that we do the same with the lobster fishery.

MR. MOORE.—They say you are pretty safe down there.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I will make you the same challenge, Mr. Moore, that I made here last year, that I will go down there and fight any member on either side of the House and any party and be elected.

With reference to the course in canning referred to by the honorable member for St. Barbe, I would say that it was not the Fishery Board nor the Government that recommended a course of training at the Memorial College. It was the Board of Trade. Perhaps it would be a good thing; I would not say that it would not be.

There is another thing that he said. He stated that political heelers were appointed as lobster and herring inspectors. I think any member from the other side of the House with any common decency will say that I have treated them square, if I have ever had an appointment in their district. I always asked the man no matter what side side of politics he was on, if I wanted a man for a lighthouse or inspector I generally applied to them and I generally relied on their belief that as an inspector he was a good man.

It was only a year or so ago that I appointed a man named Mr. Whelan as an inspector in one of the districts. I have never seen him. I only know that he went on the other side and fought during the Great War and I say that he now stands second to none as a herring inspector and he is a man who is doing his duty to the people of this country as he is doing his work. It was only the other day that I got a letter from the Magistrate at Bonne Bay saying that he was glad that I had again appointed Mr. Whelan as fishery inspector, as he felt sure that in Whalen we had a good man and we would hear from the district as to how he was doing his work. If I am in power, and he continues

to do his work as he has done it during the past two years, he shall fill that position for the next five or six years.

There was a certain amount of money left over from last year's vote and with that I sent out some men last year to inspect the factories.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to ask the Minister a question. When the inspectors come, do they take the trouble to see how the salmon is being packed, or do they just inspect the herring and lobsters?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—They inspect salmon in the same way.

MR. GRIMES.—Do any of them inspect the place where the salmon is packed?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—They have this year.

MR. GRIMES.—You say you have given instructions?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The same as the lobster.

MR. GRIMES.—I think the salmon inspection is very important, for you find some cases coming into town that seem very much stained and open and loss of sale results, and if any were shipped across would have a damaging effect on the salmon canning industry of this country. I think it is very important that we have inspectors this year.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the members that the salmon canning wants to be watched a little more than the lobster canning.

We got a lot of salmon caught in this country this year for export and these salmon that get soft for export purposes are packed.

Last year if it was found that they were not firm enough to be frozen and sent away, they were packed, and were of course inferior, and I advised the Board to get the salmon watched as well as the lobster.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Hon. Minister if they are going to appoint fishing inspectors as last year, and if so, is it part of their duties to inspect lobster factories?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, that is the intention of the Department. A recommendation was made to the Board that these fishery inspectors that we had on last year, we know they are good men, and to make the same appointments as lobster and fishery inspectors all in one. It will save expense, I think, for the fishery inspectors to do the work as lobster inspectors as well. At any rate, that is the intention of the Board.

PUBLIC CHARITIES

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me to refer back to the Public Charities; I am sorry that I was not here when this was discussed.

The Public Charities come in for a lot of criticism because under the head of Public Charities the dole system subtends, and referring to the Auditor General's report we find that the sum of \$150,000 was voted from April 22nd to February 4th. My object in speaking of this is to refer to what the Auditor General has to say about it.

(Reads)

That is not mine That is the statement of the Auditor General with regard to the condition that obtained over the year that we are reviewing.

If there was any department of the government that was going to be cleaned up and kept clean it was the Public Charities. You appointed a

set of Public Charity Commissioners. They were appointed and paid salaries; large expense was incurred in connection with the commission to try and remedy the thing and put it on a better footing, and it is just the same as it was years ago.

I don't know what explanation the Colonial Secretary can give for this statement of the Auditor General. Have you absolutely given up all hope of ever bringing about a better condition of things with regard to the Department of Public Charities.

The Commission made a report, but whether the report has been given any attention yet or not, I do not know.

But the thing we have got to face is this statement coming from the Auditor General himself.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can give any explanation. I think every member of the House is aware of the conditions existing in this country for the last few years as I am. But in my reply to the honorable member's suggestion "Are we to give up hope," I say "No, we are not," and I hope that in the future we will see very much better efforts to cut down expenditure in this direction. As I pointed out yesterday, the ones to put themselves up as an example are the members of this House, and if we co-operate and not make politics out of the distribution of poor relief, I think that it would have most satisfactory results. I hope the day is not far distant when all the members of this House, both sides, will be able to get together, forget our political affiliations, and make common interest for the country's good. I have no desire to impose a hardship on those unfortunate people that are sometimes deprived of the necessaries of life. On the contrary, I would rather

do more for them than has been done. But the trouble in this country today, in respect to poor relief, and I say this advisedly, is that the people who do not want the relief are preventing those who want relief from getting treated right. It is a crying shame, the continual doling out that is taking place in St. John's and other parts of the Island for the past few years. And any government will have to tackle this proposition, and the way to tackle it is that every person that has the opportunity, whether in Church or State to talk to the people on their duties as citizens. The country is in an unfortunate condition. The people now are making use of things that our forefathers would have been ashamed to use. In my time a man that worked on the road was looked upon with a certain amount of disapproval, because he had no greater ambition than to go to the government to get a day's work. But today our competent, intelligent, strong men have no hesitation whatever in going up to the relieving officer and getting a dole ticket and going down and bringing home relief.

That is the unfortunate condition in a country such as we have, that our people are drifting into that unfortunate state. Let us make a concerted effort in some direction. We have resources in this country today lying dormant, and every effort should be made to develop them, and it is only by finding employment for the people, because that is the greatest need in the country today, and when we can be in the position that industries are going out looking for men, then Newfoundland's salvation is come. But while we have to go around Newfoundland begging for employment and prepared to take employment at any price and under any conditions, then we have got to have a continuation of these unfor-

tunate conditions. There have been hundreds of cases where people have demanded a share of what is given out by the Government to the indigent poor, because they say that it is government money and we are entitled to our share. I join with the honorable member in deploring the continual vote every year for this able-bodied pauper relief, and I trust when this House meets again, and that will be inside a year from now, and some of us may be here and some of us may not be, but let us hope that at the next opening of this Legislature that those who have seats in this House will have a common interest in that direction, at least to raise our people above the unfortunate condition which they have been allowed to drift into for the last few years. No man in this world today can excel the Newfoundlander when put to his own resources. He can go out and make his way as well as any man in it and he can make his way in this country if he is industrious and inclined to work. At the same time I admit there are exceptions. "The poor we have always with us," and it is the duty to us all to look after those who are unfortunate through stress of circumstances to see that they do not unduly suffer, and when the need arises to perform their duty to those depending on them.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to hear an old experienced member of the House like the Colonial Secretary say that he still has hope that we shall be able in the near future to devise some means to obviate this wholesale relief business so prevalent in this country. I have been a member of this House for eight years now, and I do not know of any task that I have had to perform in the course of my duties more distasteful than the task of writing specially to the Colonial Secretary as

regards the relief in my district. I am glad to say that I have not had occasion to do so very often, but on the occasions that I have had to do it I have found it a very unpleasant job. I would like the Colonial Secretary to know that on such times as I have had occasion to write in connection with these matters, I have absolutely been compelled to do so, and the task has been distasteful to me in the extreme. If you receive a telegram from a man in the extreme portion of the country, like Flower's Cove, telling you that he has got a big family and needs relief, there is no way for you to get to that man and find out his circumstances. During the past winter I have telegrams from one man on two occasions, and on each occasion I telegraphed to the Relieving Officer to the stock of his circumstances and relieve him. I took it for granted the Relieving Officer did so, as I have not heard from the man since. Now I may say that I do not like to be imposing upon the Relieving Officer. Probably however, there are times, exceptional circumstances, when a lot must be taken for granted. Now I am up against a position such as this. The Colonial Secretary will recall this incident. Last month a lumber man in White Bay got very sick. It was late Spring. The man was brought up to the Twillingate Hospital, but they could not do what was required to be done there, and efforts were made to get him to St. John's. However, he died within twenty-four hours of getting here.

The man that came with him had no chance of getting back immediately to his home, and the woman where he stayed could not afford to be out by the amount of his board, and I was obliged to ask the Government if they could not compensate her in some

respect. Then I received a telegram when I was in Port Union saying that the man was dead and asking what steps were going to be taken with regard to the coffin. The body could not be got home until the Prospero was ready to sail. I wired back that the authorities would have to take care of the man, but this very day I received a bill from the mortuary man here who coffined the body. I am not responsible for it. But I just cited that instance to show how we are placed as members of this House. I quite agree that probably members on both sides of the House could help a great deal to obviate a lot of this that is going on. For my own part, I never intend to play politics with Poor Relief. I remember the day when it was considered disgraceful for independent men to be seen working on the roads. I believe that the Colonial Secretary has said something at the close of his remarks about the duties of citizens being preached from the pulpit. I quite agree with the suggestion, and I hope and trust that we shall never again have to face such conditions as we have faced in recent years in connection with relief, and that a way will be found to put machinery under way that will inculcate a more independent spirit into the people, and that the Auditor General will not be obliged to bring in a report such as Mr. Halfyard read here this afternoon in this connection.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to find that there has been so much relief given out last year in this country, because any time that I applied for relief, even for disabled people in my district, I was turned down. I got a message from an able-bodied man in

my district asking for relief. The only answer that I sent was that he had to go into the lumber woods, or else he would have to starve.

The last session of this House I was hounded about the ten thousand dollars that was spent on the north side of Bonavista Bay, but I do not see any outport member getting up here now and hounding down the members for St. John's about the hundred thousand dollars that was given out that winter. This is the last session that I hope I shall ever attend here, but I want those words of mine to reach the people of this country through the reporter's box, that while members are ready to howl about relief for my district, when it comes to the city of St. John's they fail to get up and say a word about it.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I made reference to the distribution of able-bodied pauper relief throughout the country and I referred to the amount of \$86,000 distributed in St. John's. Owing to the prevailing conditions in St. John's you have a large number of people coming into the city from the outports during the last eight or nine years, and they are coming faster than there is labor to give them. The consequence is that the majority of men can only find work for four or five months of the year. I think the suggestion thrown out by the Colonial Secretary is a good one and would tend towards the solution of the difficulty. I have been speaking to several outport people who are now domiciled in the city. They told me they had their own homes, their own land, and could have lived more comfortably in the outports than they are living in the city. So I think, if a little more information was given to outport people as to the real conditions prevailing in St. John's, you

would not have them floating into St. John's as we have had them the past eight or nine years. The Colonial Secretary has also pointed out that if a little more industry was displayed by people in what they have around them that there would be no necessity for able-bodied relief. Now I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary to explain why it is that in the district of Port de Grave only \$360.00 was given out for relief during the past year, whilst in the district of Harbor Grace for the same period the sum of over \$9,000.00 was given out. The districts are only a few miles away from each other and the prevailing conditions in those places are similar. Then again we have \$8,500 given out for relief in the district of Bay de Verde. One naturally asks the question how this could happen when so many people go out of Bay de Verde every year to Canada and the United States to work.

MR. CHAIRMAN.—The amount given out for poor relief in Bay de Verde is not in the section where men go away from; it is in the fishing section.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—You might also refer to Trinity.

MR. GRIMES.—Yes, they got \$7,000.00, and the district of Placentia and St. Mary's got \$16,000.00. However, I quite agree with what has been said here about the necessity for co-operation amongst all members of the House with regard to the money spent in this manner, and in order to get this amount for able-bodied relief reduced considerably you got to have co-operation.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there is anything to be gained by talking about this matter now, because it was talked about, preached about and criticised during the years 1923 and 1924. Everybody knew about the abuses when the

new Government came in power in 1924; and I really thought the Colonial Secretary would try and defend his sub-department somewhat, but evidently he has got to swallow what is contained in the report of the Auditor General who terms it "a reckless method." Now we had a new government come into being and filled up with the reforming zeal that was going to bring about a better condition of things. Still four years have passed and we are no better off with regard to that administration, having in mind the financial position of the condition as compared to what it was from 1919 to 1923. And then we are asked to blame ourselves for any extravagance that has taken place under the present administration. Personally, I do not take any blame for any reckless expenditure that has occurred in Trinity district because I was not a party to it. The only thing I am guilty of is for recommending passes for men who came here to look for work and failing to get any, wanted to get home again. Some were deserving cases and perhaps some were not. I may be guilty of giving some persons notes to take to a relieving officer to get relief. We have two or three relieving officers in Trinity district and they have gone to the extreme of not helping people who were in dire need. They would allow people to starve; which is a wrong thing to do. Others went to the other extreme, and how to get at a happy medium I do not know. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that we should all preach the gospel of independence to try and get our people to refrain from appealing to the government for help. Whether we accomplish anything or not in that direction, I reiterate that I am inclined to give up all hope of expecting any attempt being made by the

present government to remedy matters.

If I remember rightly, I think it was in the year 1926 that \$11,000.00 was given out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the north side of Bonavista Bay, and I think if the matter was investigated thoroughly we would have a report similar, if not worse than the rock shed one. Now I do not want to be personal, but Capt. Winsor knows that he had no right to go down there and give out orders for poor relief to the extent that he did than the man on the street had, and if every other head of a department in the government did as he did the amount given out would be about \$200,000. The necessity for this relief was in Trinity district just the same as it was on North side of Bonavista Bay, but I dare say that if I was head of a department in a Government the Executive Government would not indemnify me like they did Capt. Windsor. However, I congratulate him on having the influence with the Executive. With regard to the army of inspectors you want to get for lobsters and salmon, if you get money enough to pay them, no doubt you will be elected again.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.— That statement is incorrect. The Colonial Secretary authorized me to go to the North side of Bonavista Bay and give out this work on the roads to improve present conditions. We had to relieve the people.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— Mr. Chairman, I may say that I did authorize the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go down there. The case was represented to me to be very serious and I think it was with the co-operation of the Government Engineer that the Minister went down. I remember also there were represent-

ations made to try and get most of the men in the lumber woods to work.

In reply to Mr. Grimes, he possibly had an object in referring to my remarks when he pointed out that the district of Hr. Grace got over \$9,000.00 in poor relief and the district of Port de Grave got \$360.00. Well all I can say to that is that I congratulate the people of the district of Port de Grave on their independence and I hope that every other district will be in the same category before very long; but I also want to remind the Honourable Gentleman that what I preach I practise. The first year I was in Hr. Grace I found there was \$27,000.00 given out for relief the previous year and, if it has been through any effect of mine, although I do not claim the credit for it, that amount has been reduced to one-third, so that I think we are on the high road for better things. Mr. Squires the relieving officer in Hr. Grace, is about the best man in the country for the job as far as public funds are concerned. He does not give out one dollar's worth more than is necessary. In fact sometimes he is too harsh, and, therefore, errs on the right side; and I may point out too, the people of Hr. Grace are better off now than when they were getting \$27,000.00 a year relief.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.— Mr. Chairman; On the subject I have one word to say. We get a lot of talk about the dole and it might seem that if the Members from town didn't say a word it might be imagined that we were all conscious of some terrible wrong being done. If Honourable Members on both sides of the House want to accept the opinion of one born in the town and having kept close to the situation about a practical way to cure the difficulty, there is no movement I know more likely to change conditions than for you outport men

to make a movement to get pour people back to the land, get them back home. Though I suggest it in a somewhat jocose way, I want to suggest it seriously about St. John's. St. John's under normal conditions could handle a certain amount of labour and during war time when conditions generally were prospering there was a sort of general movement towards town. Take the West End, it has almost entirely been built up in certain sections in the past fifteen years and we have a condition of affairs in town we can't have in any outport because to-day the town is over populated. Also labor has been taken out of the town, steam boat work in spite of the continual increase of steamers coming here is decreasing, if anything in the opportunities it gives to provide labor for the reason that a certain quantity of such work is now done in the outports, I say therefore solemnly but regretfully that I don't see any hope of a change of conditions in St. John's unless one of two things happens. Unless the people move out of town or unless some industrial work starts to give employment to the people. When you talk about the dole in St. John's I say it must be remembered that it is not alone St. John's people who are getting the dole but those who have come into St. John's and are to-day out of employment. I admit that there are a certain amount of people who are not as thrifty as they might be, I admit that, but I say you have a state of affairs that is only going to be relieved if you get people back to some industrial work, the fishery, or their homes. I don't say you should tell them to get out; you can't drive them out. But other places around the country Placentia, Bonavista and other places have not got people piling in on them from other places around, and the position in St. John's

to-day is that if you advertise for a stenographer for example you will have a tremendous response. Outport people have come to town and to their credit be it said they have educated their families and every kind of work is over supplied clerical and otherwise and particularly labour. I don't say this from the point of view of blaming them but I say that in talking about the dole in St. John's it should be remembered that really outport men are receiving relief in St. John's.

MR. W. J. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman; I should like to say also that what the Honourable Minister has just pointed out is indeed the case. The observations made apply more particularly to the West End. It seems that those who come in from the outports build there rather than in the East End of the town, and unfortunately the people who come seem to be mostly illiterate.

When I go down to my office in the morning and see there all the people looking for relief or work it is surprising the number of lame and aged and deaf and dumb and all kinds of people who really shouldn't be working at all, don't know where they all come from; many of them are outport people who have recently come to live in the City. I certainly would recommend that a good portion of the money now being spent on dole should be spent on railway fares to send them back to the outports and even give them a grant of land and perhaps some seed potatoes as well.

A number of conditions have combined to bring about this state of affairs. I do think we should give serious consideration to the stopping of the dole. We are ruining the morals of the people of the country by continuing this system of relief. It is now regarded as the regular thing to do every winter in the second week of

January. I remember before I was a Member of this House a former Minister of Agriculture and Mines told me that the second week in January the clamour would begin for relief; and I know there were great difficulties to contend with. The past four years have convinced me of that and if a lot of money has been spent it was not because there was not hard conditions; but I do think if more direct thought had been given to the settlement of the problem at the beginning it would now be much easier of solution. Personally I am not in favour of dole. I like to see people encouraged to get work or assisted to earn a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received intimation from His Excellency the Administrator that the address in Reply would be received on Friday 18th instant at half past three in the afternoon.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 16th, 1928.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of Question.

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

Department of Finance	\$4,463,369.10
Department of Colonial Secretary	213,409.00
Department of Justice	371,137.12
Department of Education	932,027.35
Department of Public Charities	540,642.16

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. The Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

CARIBOU CLOSE SEASON

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote, I would like to discover whether there is anybody on the Government side that can tell the House when we might expect to have the Caribou season open, and why it is being tied up at this present time. I am faced with this position, that down in St. Barbe District last winter people were practically starving, and yet there were cases of men being hauled before the Magistrate and fined for killing caribou at the ruling of a crowd of gentlemen here in St. John's known as the Game

and Inland Fisheries Board. We have a close season for three years on Caribou. And why do you put it back any further, unless it is to cater to the few dozen sportsmen that come here. When are we going to have done with this nonsense?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to the Honourable Member. I would like to point out that if the lot of the Caribou had only been left to the sportsmen, we would never have had to put on a close season in this country. I remember when I came to this country first, the first duty I had in the office of M. Monroe was to make out account sales of hundreds of carcasses of caribou, being sold for four cents a pound. That is the first job I ever did in the office of M. Monroe. The carcasses then coming in from Burgeo and LaPoile were piled up from Templeman's right down to Bowring's on the sidewalk about three high. Now I am not supposing because that happened at that particular time that it is going to happen again, but I would call the attention of the Hon. Member to the fact that it is not the sportsmen that have killed out the caribou in this country. Personally I think, that the close season ought to exist until such time as the Government has fairly good information that the caribou are sufficiently increased to justify opening the season again.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman; I sincerely sympathize with the Hon. Member for St. Barbe. I was, and I believe I am still a member of the Inland Fisheries Board, but when I left the ranks of the Monroe Administration I did not attend any more of its meetings. I took an interest in that Game and Inland Fisheries Board up to that time, but never when I was at a meeting were there any laws passed for the closing of, the Caribou Season

that I know anything about. I think that it is a very hard case where the Hon. Member for St. Barbe cites here, that if a man wants to kill caribou for his own private use, that he cannot do so without being hauled before the Magistrate. I do not think the law intends to go as far as that, and I am sure the Hon. Gentleman has my sympathy, as a member for that Board. sympathy, as a member of that Board. that passed such stringent laws as that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; The law is not that, and the Member for St. Barbe knows that the law is not that. The Game and Inland Fisheries Board have nothing whatever to do with the law. The close season for Caribou is made by this Legislature, and the law today is, that if a man can show that he has killed caribou for food he is not convicted, and the case that the member refers to was not a case of food. I know all about that case. It was a deliberate violation of the Game Laws, and the offenders were probably convicted.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is this, that if the season was closed by Act of this Legislature, I would like to know how it is extended. The extension is not now legal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The season is closed until it is opened. I was answering the question of the Hon. Member with regard to the point raised here. The Hon. Member has apparently been misinformed. I ought to say that as a matter of courtesy. The case of the man at Bonne Bay was a flagrant violation of the Game Laws, it was deliberate and as such was treated. It was not a case of people in want, and I wish to God I could say the same about many cases in this town.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Justice will take notice of my point.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Certainly.

MR. SCAMMELL—I had not seen in the papers the reports about that particular case, but it was brought to my notice this winter. I happen to know one of the chaps involved in that case. He was a returned soldier, in a very delicate state of health, and he was unable to get a pension from the Board here. I know it is useless for me to stand up here in this Legislature and expect consideration for this man.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—He is not half as innocent as he looks. He carried home the caribou in his valise. If he was hungry he would have carried it home on his shoulder.

FUNK ISLANDS LIGHT

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; while we are on this subject I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has considered the subject of putting a lighthouse on the Funk Islands? In my opinion there should have been a lighthouse there long ago and I think it would be a reasonable and justifiable expenditure on the part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries if they did put a lighthouse at that place. I would like to hear what the Minister has to say on that matter?

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES.—

Mr. Chairman; I am glad the Hon. Member for Trinity has brought up this matter. Within the past four years since I have been in the Department I have been besieged by fishermen from all parts of the country about getting a lighthouse and a fog alarm on the Funks. Most of the sealing captains and a great many of the fishermen claim that there should be a Marconi station there as well. Know-

ing conditions as I do, I contend there should be a lighthouse and other aids to navigation there for the past twenty five years. There is no island in Newfoundland or Labrador that has got half as many shoals around it, without their being shown on the chart, as has the Funk Islands. I am giving to the House the word of five or six different men who went to the Funks for thirty years practically all the month of August and sometimes in September. You might have noticed a letter in the "Evening Telegram" a few days ago from Mr. Joseph Kean, of Flowers Island, Bonavista Bay who now lives at Brookfield, B.B. I know of no other man in Newfoundland who knows half as much about this subject as Mr. Kean. He told me several times that he has fished on over 100 different spots of ground in 2½, 3, 5 and 15 fathoms of water, although there are only eight or ten of them marked on the chart. If there had been money enough in the department I certainly would have recommended to the Government long ago to allocate at least \$20,000 for the erection of a lighthouse and a fog alarm on the Funks; but I quite agree with Captain Randell that the time has come to have provision made for the proper lighting of these islands in order to help mariners going to and fro.

I have had several communications on this same subject since the seal-fishery closed and I understand that the S.S. Eagle had a narrow escape at the Funks on returning from the seal-fishery. Some of the crew of the Eagle told me about it and later Captain Blackwood of that same ship called on me and asked me to do my very best to try and get a lighthouse and a fog alarm and, if possible, a small Marconi station at the Funks. I advised him to go and see the Prime Minister

and some other members of the Executive fearing they would think that I was asking for these necessary aids to navigation for my own political advantage.

I give my strongest support for the erection of a lighthouse and fog alarm and Marconi station on the Funks. I understand a Marconi station for a radius of 100 miles would cost \$1000,00. Well the Marconi station at Fogo is only 23 miles from the Funks so that the cost of a station would not be very much. Therefore, I estimate that for the sum of \$25,000 a lighthouse, fog alarm and Marconi station could be erected at the Funks. Of course, it must be remembered that to do concrete work off from the land would be more expensive than under more favorable conditions; but at the same time Mr. Kean states in his letter that at any time in reasonable weather landing can be made on the eastern side of the Funks. In my opinion that is correct. On the north east side of the island the land juts out and is in perpendicular fashion.

Without delaying the House any further on this subject, Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that I give Capt. Randell's suggestion my very strongest support.

DEPARTMENTAL DEPUTY HEADS

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to get an opinion on the work performed in the various departments where the Deputy heads have dropped out. Is the work going on just as satisfactorily? Is the public getting just as efficient service? Is it necessary to appoint any deputy heads any more or should we cut the salaries out altogether? I would like to get an opinion from the heads of the departments with regard to the work of their departments as a result of their being short staffed having lost their deputies during the last few months;

and would they recommend the filling of these positions immediately or not filling of them at all?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; As far as the Department of Agriculture and Mines is concerned the work has been considerably disorganised owing to the illness and death of two deputy heads. It can't be expected that the department be in a position to be working as satisfactorily as far as I am personally concerned and probably as far as the public are concerned as prior to Mr. Turner's illness who had spent forty years in the office and knew all to be known about the clerical work and general work. Mr. Noel who succeeded him didn't enjoy his position very long either; and consequently it will be readily understood that the position of affairs is somewhat disorganised, but I don't think the general public have seriously suffered. I want to say that Mr. Hart who fills the office at the present time has given me entire satisfaction, and I haven't heard any complaint by the public with regard to the conduct of the Department. With regard to the intentions of the Government in making an appointment, I haven't the slightest idea. A number of applications came in to me, all of which I have forwarded to the Executive Government for decision.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; following up that I don't know whether it is in the public interest or not to ask the question, but might I ask when does the Government contemplate filling these positions?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I don't know that the Government is called on to name the exact time when they are going to fill vacancies. I think we have to give due consideration to the getting of the right men to fill them. The Fishery Department

is a very important department, and I think the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries is one of the most important deputies required in the country, and up to the present I don't know of a man I could suggest for the place, and I would like to find a suitable man. In the meantime I think they can go on as they are doing.

MR. MOSDELL.—Is there any necessity for an assistant Government Analyst. On a number of occasions the Government Analyst has been able to go away for some periods of time to Geological Conferences, Fishery Conferences and otherwise, so it appears to me that a high priced assistant might be cut out. I am not trying to find fault with the Government Analyst or the Assistant Analyst, but it appears to me in this Department a saving might be effected. There is at the Memorial College an expensive Laboratory. and another in connection with the Public Health Department, and the Government Analyst is also kept up. Is there no way of co-relating the three and taking advantage of arrangements at the Memorial College. Perhaps more effective working might be brought about at less cost.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I might say the Government gave consideration only last year to the question of doing away with the Department altogether, but decided after considerable discussion to keep it on for the present, and I think the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has already tabled the report of the Government Analyst, I think any Honourable Member looking through it will see just what the Department has been doing, and can decide for themselves as to whether that Department is benefitting the country or not. We have considered the matter of combining the Laboratories, but I think it is generally recognised that the

Memorial College must have its own Laboratory, I really don't see how you could work a Government Laboratory in conjunction with a College. I think they have to stand separately.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to say that in my opinion if ever there was a time when it was important to have an analyst whose service could be placed at the disposal of the mining public it is just now. There is a great deal of mining activity and as pointed out last year was the busiest year Mr. Davies had since he became an employee of the Government. I think the Government should be very cautious before deciding to make any change with regard to the work done by Mr. Davies, in the staff required or as regards joining of the Department with the Memorial College or otherwise.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr Chairman; that reminds me, speaking of surveys, can the Honourable Minister of Agriculture & Mines give us any information with regard to surveys of timber areas on the Labrador — any information of any value respecting the timber areas on Labrador.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; I think some Honourable Member asked a question addressed to the Hon. the Prime Minister to which I am not sure if the Prime Minister replied or if it is being prepared, but it contains information that will answer questions such as asked by the Honourable Member.

DEBATE ON SUPPLY

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; why do we find supplies to Government laboratory, \$1,000 different from that \$6,850 to Government Laboratory which is given in another place? Supplies, apparently, to Government

Laboratory \$1,000, so the vote for Government Laboratory is really \$7,850? Then what would be the nature of supplies for geological surveyors \$6,000, or is that the vote given each year and allowed to stand as the approximate cost.

I would like to ask the Minister what would be the nature of supplies for geological surveyors totaling \$6,000, or is it the ordinary vote that is allowed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; that amount is required to pay for supplies, assistance, camping outfit etc.

DR. MOSDELL.—It might be a number of things apart from supplies?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Food and labour, assistants, cooks and labourers are all paid from that fund.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; the Minister will pardon me if I ask for any information that has already been given, but with regard to the extension of time given to licenses held of timber on the Labrador in compliance with the terms of the agreement, have any of the license holders done anything with regard to erecting mills to conform with the terms of the agreement?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—No, not anything that I know of. I have no knowledge that they have or have not.

THE LOGGING ACT

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; with regard to the vote for inspectors under the Logging Acts, a serious question arises. Some people, I think, offer the opinion that the Loggers Act with regard to the inspection of camps are not expressly carried out. I mention this question merely if there is anybody who can enlighten us on the subject because there are certain re-

ports being circulated which are not—well, some of us would rather not hear them.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; as far as I know there have been no violations of the Logging Act, only in one or two cases where various contractors did not comply with the Act, and I instructed the inspector making the complaint to see to it that the contractors preformed their obligation or for the inspector to take action immediately and have them brought to Court. The result was that the act was carried out.

With regard to the general complaint with reference to the condition of the men's work and lives in lumber camps. During the past two or three years I have made a point of visiting various series of camps. I went to Millertown and went to several camps in the vicinity of Red Indian Lake, thirty miles inland, and visited eight or ten camps. I made it a point when visiting the camps to tell the officials of the company who were with me on the visit that I wanted to have private conversations with the various men in connection with logging. I went into the quarters where the men were and told them that I was there in their interests and was instructed by the Government to see what the conditions were in connection with work and how they were being treated, I told the men that if they had any complaints to make, not to be afraid of any injury or trouble with the company.

I must say that I came back with not a single complaint made to me by any individual man and I talked with several hundred men.

I went and visited the Deer Lake section and the various camps in that section, with practically the same result. There were trivial matters that

in my opinion would not warrant any Court action, to be taken. The men pointed out to me in some cases where the covering of the camps became torn and in some cases the water was dropping down their backs. I drew the matter to the attention of the official of the company and he had it attended to.

In several other places where the windows and doors of the camps might be better than they were I needed only to draw the matter to the attention of the official and when there was any suggestion for the benefit of the men, it would be attended to.

I just want to say one word about one camp on the shores of Deer Lake that I went to. About seven miles inland North of Deer Lake I visited a camp there that is owned and operated by Goodyear Brothers and I was greatly surprised on breaking out of the forest in the vicinity of the camp to find a plot of land there. Mr. Goodyear told me that they grew sufficient vegetables there to supply all the workmen for the logging season. I visited the camp and found a carcass of some kind of fresh meat inside one of the camps on some planks and I remember that I was under the impression that they had been doing what the Honourable Member for St. Barbe referred to and had violated some of the Inland Game & Fisheries regulations, for I thought sure that they had a moose or a caribou and were getting it ready for food. I was agreeably surprised when I was informed by an official of the camp that it was a carcass of native calf that was taken in there by Mr. Goodyear and raised seven miles in the country at the logging camp. The calf had never seen the waters of Deer Lake as far as I could learn.

Such independence and ambition of men of the Goodyear type should be

given every encouragement by this Government or any Government. I merely wanted to give the House this information without any intention of holding up the proceedings.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Mr. Chairman; before the vote is finally passed, there is a matter that I would like to dispose of with reference to the question of Buchans Mine.

This morning the Member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, telephoned me that there were some men at Millertown Junction, marooned there and could not get employment, and were in dire circumstances. This matter is one which concerns almost every member of the House with regard to men in his district going to Buchans Mine, so I wired the Magistrate at Grand Falls, Mr. Fitzgerald, with regard to this matter and asked him to give a full report as to how the matter stood and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read the message that he sent which I think, clearly shows that it is futile for any more men to go down there expecting to get employment. There are a lot more men there now than they have employment for.

We endeavoured all through the spring to discourage men going down to Buchans Mine, particularly after having visited the place two or three weeks ago. Still men will go down there and unfortunately spend whatever they have to get there and have nothing but disappointment, inconvenience and suffering in some cases, and they have to be brought home again — unnecessary expense. If the advice given to them had been listened to they would not have gone. We instructed railway agents to discourage men going down unless they had some guaranty with them that they were to get employment.

The situation is just as bad as ever and Mr. Fitzgerald sent this message this morning in reply to the message I sent him.

Reads

Mr. Fitzgerald has been of great assistance, to particularly myself, in looking after these cases down there. He has been assiduously endeavouring to procure employment in the first place for the men, and where that failed he looked after them and sent them to their homes, but of course, the Hon. Members who recently expected me to be able to get employment at Buchans Mine, will realize now how clearly impossible that will be.

We have not up to the present issued a single pass to any man going to Buchans. It must be realized that there is no discrimination to be used. I have had hundreds of applications from men asking for passes to get to Buchans, men from my own District, but I have refused them owing to conditions there. I just say this so that in the near future if any members have applications of that nature coming from their constituents they will know how to advise them.

BAY D'ESPOIR WATER POWERS

MR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; on the Order Paper to-day is question I gave notice of yesterday.

Reads

The reply I got to-day.

Reads

Now I have in mind a statement that I think the Hon. Prime Minister made on the opening day of this House, that there had been a transfer of very important water power in Bay D'Espoir from Harry J. Crowe to the International Paper Company. It is that that transfer took place before the closing of the last session, or did I address my question to the wrong quarter to get the necessary inform-

ation. Then I had in mind the advertisements that had been appearing in the Royal Gazette making application for water power in Fortune Bay, and if these water powers had been granted. These applications have not been dealt with. I only would like to know on what grounds they would be granted. Because if these have been granted in the district of Fortune Bay, then every water of any importance is tied up, to the parties making the application, and that is the position against which I want to protest. Because if I understand the development right, as a result of the survey of the South West Coast particularly around Bay D'Espoir, the International have decided that there was not sufficient timber in the locality for independent operation, that would take place upon the water power in question.

Now I am keen on knowing for what purpose they propose to use it, how they were holding it and why. I have in mind the same question in regard to those water powers which W. I. Bishop had been given, and that he was applying for water power in the district of Fortune Bay, because he had an application covering important water powers in that district. Those are water powers about which the Minister of Public Works should interest himself. And I think that as far as the water powers in Fortune Bay are concerned, I would like to know why these water powers are being held over and on what terms.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to say that the Department knows nothing about the transfer of water powers from Harry J. Crowe to the International Paper Co. That is purely a private matter. We only hear of it from the various parties that are interested in selling and buying. As regards the development of water pow-

er as I stated in the House it is a matter for development over a course of years, and while I quite agree with the honourable member that the International had found that there was not sufficient timber in that locality to build a pulp mill, they contemplate developing water power for other use, and that emphasises the fact that the International Paper Co. are just as much interested in the development of power as in the manufacture of paper. Their business is to develop power and then sell it to some industry that will use it. And no doubt after spending \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 to develop that power, they will find the industry to go alongside of it, or else they will not develop it. But they have bought the power from Mr. Crowe who has deposited \$130,000 in lieu of the development which he should have made according to the contract with us for the development of that power. The Government said to him "If you are not able to develop those water powers now give us the cash and put it up as an assurance for the work that should be done". That is the position.

Concerning the other application regarding Bishop, he has made a proposition to the Government that he will pay so much a year for the option to water power of Grey River and he will see whether there is sufficient horse power there to develop.

That is in the agreement, I am prepared to table it in the House if anybody want to see it.

MR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I do not want to trouble the Prime Minister unduly, but in respect to the Bishop application the Prime Minister referred to the Grey River only. I notice that the application covers three very important water powers, in Fortune Bay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—That is the only one for which we have given any contract.

OUTSIDE HOSPITALS

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I just want to say a word or two in connection with this department. They just occurred to me while the Minister was reading over the votes in connection with the hospitals. I am not quite certain the money for these outside hospitals is paid through the Public Works Department or the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—They are paid through the Commissioner of Public Charities. Of course that is a sub-department of the Government.

MR. CASHIN.—I am one of those individuals who visit these institutions frequently and I regret to say that these hospitals clear of the General Hospital, are absolutely disgraceful. I want to say here now that the patients go into these hospitals, and the doctor comes about once a week, and he may not call there at all. As a matter of fact this had come home to me very much of late. I happened to have a friend of mine in one of those institutions, as a patient. I happened to call in Sunday and he told me that he had only seen the doctor once in two weeks. He asked me to try and get him into the General Hospital. The point that I want to make is that the Government would be justified in making an expenditure on capital account and putting one or possibly two wings on the General Hospital for the general welfare of the country, because the money that is expended out of the Charities Department for these outside hospitals, and for a doctor, would be sufficient to pay for the construction of two wings, or at least one on the General Hospital

here. The only persons presumably that these places can benefit, and I feel that I am in a position to speak, and I am not trying to do anyone out of a living, but when a person, sick, comes into town, and goes into a hospital seriously ill, the least that same person can expect, is decent treatment, and that he does not get. I do not care whether I am hurting anyone's corns or not. Because they are thrust in there at the mercy of nurses who cannot do anything in the way of general doctoring. All these hospitals are there for, is for a few doctors who may be in good graces of the Government of the day. No doubt if an addition is not put on the General Hospital, these hospitals will continue under the next Government, and that Government will do the same as the present Government. Therefore I hope that when the new loan bill is introduced, that the Government will consider the country's interests, and a certain portion of that loan, will be devoted if available, to the construction of a new wing on the General Hospital, and obviate the necessity of poor patients having to be thrust into these slums of hospitals in the city at the present time. It is an absolute necessity and I feel that the health of the people would be considerably improved. When you go into the General Hospital we all agree that you get decent treatment, and that the doctors there give the patients every possible help they can to bring them around, from Doctor Keegan down, but in the other hospitals, whoever the doctors may be that are in charge of them, I feel justified in saying that these doctors, only find these hospitals useful in getting money out of the Government. The poor patient fares so badly there that his health is not restored as quickly as it would be in the General Hospital, where he receives

decent treatment, but he receives very indecent treatment in those outside hospitals.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Mr. Chairman, in rising to reply to the honourable member for Ferryland with regard to the medical service today in this country, it is indeed in a deplorable condition. Anyone who has not had an opportunity of being in an official position in the Government can hardly realise the trouble and worry that it costs through the improper administration of medical service in this country. This country is paying very heavy bills every year for medical attendance on the sick and needy. And they are not getting value for it, nor sufficient returns for the money that is spent on hospitals in this country. I quite agree with the honorable member that if there is not the proper care of patients outside of the General Hospital, then the only one solution that appears to honorable members in this House that have studied the matter at all, and that it, as the honorable member has suggested, to build a wing on the General Hospital. You want a pavilion there to take care of the paying patients, and make the people that can pay, pay their full amount of the cost of the service that they are getting there. I cannot understand why any person that can afford to pay would go down there and receive medical treatment, board and lodging, nursing and everything else, for a dollar a day. If they go down to the Newfoundland Hotel they have got to pay five dollars, without nursing or medical attendance. Still they expect to go down to the General Hospital because it is a government institution and get everything that they can for a dollar a day. This state of things does not exist in any other part of the world. Why if you

told a doctor in any other part of the world that conditions such as this exist here, he would laugh. If you have patients coming in down there, and if the man showed that he could afford to pay, he should be made pay for the services rendered, and made pay to the limit. And another part of the hospital should be kept for those that cannot pay. They should not all enter by the one door. Because the trouble to-day is that the poor man is being made the goat for the deception of those who can pay. And then people with fat bank books, are placed in the ward next to those that have not got a dollar, and they make a lot of fuss and get exactly the same attendance. I think that I have already stated in the House, that a case came before my notice last year of a woman that had come in here from one of the outports and went into a certain store on water street, and gave the man in charge of that store a cheque for \$2,000 and then went down to the General Hospital as a pauper patient.

Now this thing is becoming intolerable and it is degrading to people who get away with that sort of thing. There are some people to whom shame means nothing, who have no self-consciousness about them and who are mean enough for anything; but if they were put in a ward that would be called the pauper ward then their pride would be touched and they very soon would open their purse strings to get in a private room. I know of several cases at the Grace Maternity Hospital in which women took beds at \$1 a day, but after being there a few days they found that other women friends of theirs were paying \$4 a day. Immediately the pride of those who were paying \$1 a day was touched they called the Superintendent to tell her that they were prepared to pay \$4 a day

and they wanted to get in private rooms.

I hope that the day is not far distant when a building, a pavilion, at the General Hospital will be an accomplished fact because I do not know of any investment on the part of the Government that will effectively remedy the present situation and give better returns than the building of a pavilion. You can put a pavilion there for about a half million dollars. The Royal Victoria at Halifax cost one million dollars and that pavilion pays for itself and besides has a surplus every year and helps to pay for the maintenance of the General Hospital there. Now if we decide to erect a pavilion of a half million dollars, with interest at about \$25,000 a year, I have no hesitation in saying that we will save \$100,000 a year, through the fees collected.

With regard to the medical service and the smaller hospitals in St. John's, I might say that some of the buildings were never fit to put patients in. I know of one which is operated over a garage. Supposing a fire took place at night time there, what a calamity there would be. One is likened to St. John "crying in the wilderness" in discussing this matter and I am surprised that this matter has not been accentuated more. I have endeavoured to interest the present and past Governments about it, but whilst I do not say that everything can be done overnight, I would like to see other members of the House take a keener interest in this matter and express their opinion thereon. Then again I say that there should be a medical controller over the whole service.

The medical service of this country can be organized in the same way as the police force is organized. You have an Inspector General over the police force. He gives orders to men of all

ranks. His word is law and his orders are carried out. The same can be done with regard to the medical service. You want to have an Inspector General of medicine to give the orders, and, if necessary, you can have your advisory board as well, and I believe with that condition of affairs established there will be better treatment and better returns all round.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Chairman: What is the cause of all this trouble now about the hospitals in St. John's? Is it not rather late in the day for members to realize what has been going on? Only yesterday I had quite a job to get \$650.00 for the Grand Bank hospital. I had been agitating for this for the past two years and for the same period the Prime Minister has been opposing it, despite the fact that Dr. MacDonald came here from Grand Bank last year and showed the Prime Minister how justifiable the expenditure was.

Now look at the record of the South West Coast and see how many pauper patients come to the General Hospital. Who gets the money from the Poor Commissioner and who are the members that are encouraging this sort of thing? I have not seen the records of the other districts, but I venture to say that the people of the South West Coast did not get one-quarter of what other parts of the Island got in the way of treatment of pauper patients. I remember travelling on a coastal steamer not long since and on board were six people from the South West Coast who were coming to St. John's for hospital treatment and only one of them was a pauper patient. Now, if that sort of thing continues and is encouraged by members of this House it is bound to end disastrously. It has been stated here this afternoon in very strong terms that there is no hospital

in St. John's, exclusive of the General Hospital, fit for people to go in. Well, Sir, I think that, generally speaking, it is a disgrace the way outport people are treated, although outport people were blamed here yesterday for getting most of the able-bodied pauper relief in St. John's. It was also stated here yesterday that St. John's had become over-populated on account of so many outport people coming here. It may be that they are the sons of outport men and I would like to know how long they were living in St. John's before they got pauper relief? I do not claim to live in St. John's and I do not want to live in St. John's, but I want to say that the outport people are no more paupers than the St. John's men are. Look at the hospital records and see how many pauper patients are St. John's men; whilst I have been two years trying to get from the Government the paltry sum of \$650.00 towards the maintenance of the hospital at Grand Bank where today there are supplied some 800 fishermen who have produced already this year from the bank fishery 40,000 quintals of fish. Still these producers of the country have to go on their knees and beg and pray to get anything done for them and the Prime Minister sneers. Now I do not care what government is in power, whether I am a member or not, that road between Burin and Grand Bank will be completed inside of two years from now and I intend to fight until I get it through. Two millions of dollars were spent by the Highroads Commission in and around St. John's on roads, and we cannot get \$20,000 for a district that produces 170,000 quintals of fish annually. The Colonial Secretary was in the District of Burin two years ago and he then stated that no place in the Island was so productive from the standpoint of the

fishing industry as the district of Burin. So I think, Sir, that the way the people of the South West Coast are treated is rotten. Perhaps I may be here again, but whether I do or not, I intend to fight for the rights of the people of Burin District just as hard as I have fought the Monroe administration. I do not want any job in this or any other Government, as I can very well live out of my own business; but I want to say in conclusion that I do not want any member of any Government to sneer at me because I ask for the legitimate rights of, and a square deal for, my constituents, who sent me to this House to represent them.

CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this discussion about dole, I would like to make a few observations. I came to St. John's to live at twelve years of age. I do not know now whether I am a qualified citizen of St. John's or not, but I do say seriously that from my experience in St. John's what has caused the labor trouble is due to so many people coming in from the outports looking for work. This city is not able to employ the number of laborers that are here. When I first went into the fish exporting business practically all of the fish that went out of the country came to St. John's to be handled. Since that time conditions have changed considerably and a great deal of our fishery products is shipped direct from the outports, and in consequence there is not the same amount of work for the laboring men as there was before. Today steamers that come from Halifax are landing freight on the South West Coast, freight that used to pass through St. John's before. The same applies to Corner Brook with regard to freight.

Regarding the dole situation in St. John's, I do say that the immigration of people from the outports has been the cause to a great extent of the dole situation in St. John's. The outport people here are the people who got most of the dole, and I make this assertion here now—and I represent the outports as well as St. John's—that in conversation with a clergyman in connection with the giving out of dole in St. John's he told me that seventy per cent of those who get relief came from the outports.

I am not saying anything about any particular section or district or any particular people. In my humble opinion, however, those people coming in from various outports would do much better outside where they don't have to find coal and taxes and everything else, and they would be much better off back in the outports without these extra expenses and doing a little fishing as they did before and living in homes much better than those in St. John's, in many cases not fit to live in. I want to state this in defense of the laboring man in St. John's. He hasn't the opportunities the laboring man in St. John's did have, and unless some new industrial work something like Buchans Mine, is found to give employment, we will have to give the dole. That is the difficulty.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; There are a couple of persons referred to in the Auditor General's report as employed by the Public Works Department "permanently employed but not confirmed by the Governor-in-Council". I would like to ask if these people are permanently employed why they should not be included in the estimates. Evidently the Auditor General considers they are permanently employed. I would like for the Minister to give us some explanation of the matter.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—What particular persons do you refer to?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; As the matter is one that has reference to several departments I take the liberty of answering for the Minister of Public Works. In such cases the men employed have merely a weekly contract and so if they are not necessary they can be dropped. If they should be appointed by the Governor-in-Council as Civil Servants not alone do they automatically become yearly servants and entitled to a month's notice if it should be necessary to dispense with them, but they also become entitled to the benefits of the Civil Servants Retiring Act. I think such a policy is better in the long run than to start to load everything on the Civil Servant Act. We consider it a better policy to allow ourselves to be in a position to lessen the number of such employees if unnecessary at short notice and employ them in such cases merely as weekly servants and not as full fledged civil servants entitled to the benefits of pension and so on.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I see some reference here to clocks in public offices and I would like to call the attention of the House to the appearance of the Court House clock. For several years past one would want a searchlight or a pair of binoculars at a hundred yards distance to see what time it is by that clock. And if the Government is paying for the upkeep of the clock somebody should be looking after it and it is somebody's business to see that it is looked after, and the clock which is supposed to be seen can be useful; I dare say it keeps time all right but you cannot see the time by it. It is properly camouflaged just as camouflaged as it can be. The hands are

painted grey, I think. They look grey anyway and I think the Department that this comes under should take some steps to see that the clock can be seen anyway. In my opinion it is disgraceful.

MR. GRIMES.—I quite agree with what Capt. Randell has said when he made reference to the Court House Clock.

I have occasion to go down Water Street often and unless you go up close you can never make out what time it is. Crowds of people passing have the same trouble. The hands of the clock are grey, as Mr. Randell said, and the face of the clock is grey and you can never discover until you are very close, what time it is.

If someone is paid to keep the clock in repair for the guidance of the public he should make sure that any body can see it at some distance.

I think the Minister of Public Works would be well advised if he would look into the matter.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I promise to see that it is looked into.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is anybody in charge of the Clock. The trouble is that there is a chimney right alongside of the face and it is blackened almost as soon as it is cleaned.

I quite agree that it is time to clean it again.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, I remember that clock four or five years ago and it was painted and there was a light inside and everything was going fine until the present Government took charge. I am not blaming the Government, but the clock looked all right and it is only since the present Government took charge that it has got into its present condition. I think it

should be given some attention and cleaned.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he made any recommendations with regard to improvement of the hours for the turn-keys at the Penitentiary? Last year the matter came up and he was going to give due attention to it, but there has been no mention of it. Men of that kind who have to deal with all classes of criminals should be given decent hours. The gentlemen, I believe, working down there have to go to work day and night, and they cannot be in very good condition the following day to take up their duties as they should be. Their hours are very much longer than in other institutions.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, in reply I would state that last year I endeavored to get an additional turnkey or two. I hope this year to make arrangements for a temporary warden. At any rate, this matter is receiving attention, and, as a matter of fact, is before the Public Works Department now.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works with regard to the broom department, what arrangement has been made with regard to fixing a price for brooms. I understand that last year an arrangement was made with persons making brooms whereby they were to have a fixed wholesale price to everyone alike. That, I understand, has not been kept and the trouble is going to be that about two dozen men employed in the broom industry here in the city will be put out of work because of competition coming from the other institution which is subsidized by the government and use the subsidy to give lower prices to drive the others out of business.

It can hardly be the intention of the Government to give a subsidy to an in-

stitution in order that private individuals who are making their living by making brooms are to be put out of work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word to say about that. I was concerning myself about this matter the day before yesterday.

The position was that there was a Mr. Hookey making brooms, the Penitentiary making brooms, and then again there are the Blind Boys on Springdale Street, making brooms.

We arranged to get these three parties together and make a uniform price so that there would be no competition and so that the various interests could sell brooms at the same price. We did not get satisfaction for some considerable time from the Blind School. The manager who was in charge seemed to want to go his own way, but there is a new manager in charge now, and under an arrangement for uniform prices, I think everything will run along smoothly now.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I have often wondered when going thru the estimates, since I have been a member of this Assembly, why is it that nurses at the General Hospital are paid less than a stenographer. I cannot understand that, because a stenographer can learn pretty well all that there is to know in eighteen months, while nurses have to study for about four years, or something like that. In the General Hospital I notice that nurses according to their years of service are paid \$243.75, which in my opinion, is a very small salary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They are fed as well.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—These are probationers, not nurses.

CAPTAIN RANDELL.—Probationers mean that they have got three years to serve?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Yes.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Well, then I think that when she is finished her three years nursing that she is more entitled to \$720 than a stenographer. I would like to bring the matter to the attention of the House that girls are not properly paid for nursing. I think that there are other members in the Assembly that will agree with me.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; I think that the consideration of Capt. Randell ought to be given some consideration by the Assembly. There is no comparison whatever between the work done by a stenographer, and even a probationer in a hospital. The latter have to work longer hours, and not only that but their work entails a greater strain on their physical energy than that of a stenographer. They have more hard work to do. They have to deal with all classes of patients. And anyone that has visited the hospital can see for themselves how incumbent it is upon the nurses to carry on the work that they have to do in these institutions. If a person is to be paid according to the value of the services that they render, then I think that the nurses ought to get greater consideration at the hands of the hospital authorities than they are receiving to-day.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman, another aspect of this matter that just struck me while the Hon. Member for Trinity was speaking was whether under the present pay can we retain the best class of nurses. When I say that I do not mean to reflect upon the nursing profession. But it is only natural when a nurse is paid such a small salary to go outside where she will get more remuneration. The tendency is to go to New York, Montreal or some other city, where she can earn more

money. I think that is a very serious aspect of the matter.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
As a matter of fact in every walk of life the payment outside is a great attraction.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I do not believe that you will be able to find many public officials in this country, that are so poorly paid, as the nurses, and I believe that is the opinion of a great many people now. Not only must they have a good education, but they have to learn a lot that a stenographer never dreams of learning. They have to take a course in anatomy. They have to know a considerable lot about drugs and I claim they should be paid a salary equal to a stenographer's anyway.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
Mr. Chairman; I do not think there is any difference of opinion on this matter on both sides of the House. There is an expression that we hear much of late, that "gentlemen prefer blondes". There is much discussion as to why men's taste should differ. Some men have a taste for stenographers, and other men for nurses. My own preference would be in favour of nurses. I think that the point raised by the Hon. Member for Trinity should be taken exception to. I want to say that I think that we all agree that we are certainly not what you would call over paying the nurses. The trouble I see about it is the point raised by the Hon. Member for Fogo, when he suggests and it is a fact that the result is bound to be that the nurses will be going to other countries, because there are bigger attractions for them, in the way of pay, outside their own country. It is just like the running of all other public institutions. If you are going to staff them as they ought to be staffed, you will have to double and treble up the expenditure

However I think that there is no difference of opinion in the House as regards the point that has been raised.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; under the heading of ferries I would like to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister that Trinity District with regard to the motor transportation has been handicapped, greatly handicapped, during former years. After the service that had been given in Bonavista Bay by the Prime Minister we thought in the summer of 1924 or 1925 that a ferry service would be installed on the North side of Trinity Bay and possibly on the South Side but that did not materialize.

My reason for bringing this up now is that I had a communication from a resident of Trinity and he said that he was considering running a motor ferry service from Trinity to Clarendville for four or five miles and he asked whether the Government would consider allowing him a small subsidy. I will take the matter up with the Prime Minister or Minister of Public Works if they think there is any chance of consideration being given to that, and find out what the man would do and what service he would render.

It would be greatly in the interests of the people of that district and of Trinity and Clarendville to have this ferry running there and the cost to the Government would be considerably more if they had to keep up a steamer service.

That is my object of speaking now. I can give the Prime Minister or the Minister of Public Works full particulars on the matter if they offer any encouragement to me at the present time of considering the matter.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; this proposition that has been put up by the gentleman that communicated

with Mr. Halfyard in the district of Trinity seems to me to be a thing that would be a great advantage to the people of that district between Clarendville and Trinity. Now the train does not touch anywhere between Trinity and Shoal Harbour and those people would be benefited to a very great extent by having a ferry service there. They have done without it for years, no doubt, but that is no reason why it should not be considered. It would be a great benefit all up and down that section, as well as having the doctor or clergyman or man of that kind to help them or call on them and sometimes they could not get along otherwise. So I would like to support the proposition that the Government should consider it seriously, as a ferry service would be a great benefit.

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 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. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that I would like to ask some information on.

A few days ago the Public Accounts were tabled in this House. I am not able to find them. I would like some information about the matter. While these accouns are tabled for the information of the Members I understand that they should not be taken from the House.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER.—I distinctly remember stating that such documents were not to be removed from the precincts of this House.

The Clerk will institute an immediate enquiry and report to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker; I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister when we can expect the educational report.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; I am very much put out that the educational report has not been tabled already, I told the Secretary of Education that if the Telegram Office, where it is being printed, had not got it printed by to-day that he must give me his typewritten report and I could table that in the meantime. I hope that the report will be ready by to-morrow, if not the typewritten report will be tabled.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 17th, 1928.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

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

Department of marine & Fisheries	\$96,866.00
Department of Agriculture & Mines	117,130.66
Department of Public Works	956,386.00

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

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

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker; I crave your permission before proceeding with the Orders of the day to make reference to a telegram which I received just as I was coming into the House this afternoon. It is from Sop's arm and refers to the "Kyle" not having gone up there on the return trip. I would like to read the telegram, with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

Reads

Well I do not think this is good enough, if I might be permitted to comment on it. If there is nothing to prevent the "Kyle" from going there she should not have avoided this place. I want the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to take this matter up with the Railway Management, and give me some satisfactory answer, because if the Members of this House are going to be placed in the position where they have got to be continually taking up every matter of this sort, and go chasing around, trying to straighten out errors of judgement, mistakes and omissions of those people who are in charge of the public services in this country. Captain Kean should get his knuckles rapped, unless he can give a satisfactory explanation of his conduct. I think the Prime Minister should take the matter up with him, and if he has a good reason for not going there I am ready to accept it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I would be glad if the Hon. Member would give me a copy of the message, so that I may inquire into it. I may say that when the "Kyle" was going north several men had gone astray on the ice, and as the Hon. Member probably knows that delay to the "Kyle" was caused by having to take those

men off Gull Island where a boat had to be sent in to take the men off. That may have had some effect on it, but I will inquire into it.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

MR. MOORE—I thought a Deputy Head in every Department got \$3,600.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; he should be paid the same as a Deputy Head in any other Department. I think he is the busiest man in any department of the Public Service. Not only does he work in the regular hours but he works after hours, and I may say like myself he has to go back sometimes on Sundays, when he cannot do this work on Mondays or Saturdays. I have a letter in my pocket now that I have received asking that something be done in this matter. Increase his salary or else put him on a level with other deputies. I think it is only fair and square. Mr. Hodder is a most competent official and he is paying continual attention to his work. I am satisfied and, if the House is satisfied, I strongly recommend an increase anyhow, and if you do not give him the full amount pay him something as recognition for his hard work.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman; I do not see any assistant deputy in any of the other departments excepting the Colonial Secretary's Department. The Justice Department, Marine and Fisheries and Public Works Departments have no assistant deputies. The only department that has an assistant

deputy is the Post and Telegraphs Department. This really means that it costs about \$6,300 to do the same work as is done in the other departments for \$3,600.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; with regard to the question asked by Mr. Hickman, with respect to Mr. Hodder, I have a letter here which explains this and sets forth the work of the different officials. With your permission sir, I will read this letter and also table it for the benefit of the House.

(Reads)

It has caused no increase in the total salaries of the Department. It only means dividing up these two salaries and it will satisfy a number of men in the Department. I would also like to say for the information of Mr. Bradley that these two salaries have been divided up between twelve men denominationally.

MR. HALFYARD.—Is Mr. Bursey included in that?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—No. When I took charge of the department Mr. Bursey was engaged running the mail van four years ago, he had little or nothing to do and I put him on the floor as an assorter. I did not consider him worth an increase. On Thursday, May 10th, Mr. Halfyard stated in the House "What department has less officials to-day than it had in 1923"? Well, we have eight officials less than when I took charge in 1924. The total number of officials in the General Post Office in St. John's when I took charge was 226; this year there are 218. We have curtailed not only in our staff, but in our expenditure as well. Last year Dr. Mosdell asked me the duties of several officials of the department. I have had a statement prepared defining their duties and which statement I have much plea-

sure in tabling for the information of the House.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; With regard to this evening up of salaries among officials doing work of a similar nature, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to the fact that for some years there has been a considerable difference in the salary paid the mail officer on the northern route than has been paid the official on the South west route. In other words, the clerk on the "Prospero" has been paid less than the man on the "Portia". I do not see how that ought to be because if you were to enquire into the statistics and the turn over of work you would find that the man on the "Prospero" has as much, if not more, work to do than the man on the "Portia". In any case, if you are adopting the policy of evening up salaries among officials who have work of a like character to do, there is a case you might direct your attention to. I have no doubt that during your term of office this matter has been referred to you before and I am at a loss to understand why you have not considered the matter.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; The answer to the Hon. Member for St. Barbe is that the northern mail boat only does service during the summer and autumn seasons and is laid up during the winter. The boat that plies west and south is continually on the service and the mail man north when the S.W. coast boat is laid up perhaps has to change, but I do not know, although I understand sometimes they make a change to give a rest to each other.

The Northern-man Mailman's earnings would be continuous. However, I am not sure on that point. However,

that is the explanation to me that the boat is laid up in the winter time, and I have no doubt but that the mailman is laid off too during a certain period. It may be necessary to give the man on the West Coast a rest or he may be sick or something, and these men may have to change. If that ever happens he certainly would be paid for his services, but under the circumstances as I understand it, the Northern man is only doing duty summer and autumn, and the western boat is on duty all the year round, so it is only fair to assume that the mailman on the western boat would earn more.

MR. HIBBS.—Are the monthly salaries the same?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I cannot say that definitely just now.

MR. SCAMMELL.—That is what I am asking you. If it is the case that one salary is larger. I have been informed that one gets more.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Before the House closes I will find out and tell you.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; In reference to assorters salaries the Minister has tried to explain the reason why there is a change in salaries and has said they are making changes to try and even up where there was a difference between persons giving service some time. Now I hope there is nothing to cause the Minister to treat any one in his department other than fairly and honestly, and judging from the standard of length of service and efficiency. Now I would like to know in connection with the adjustments made whether Mr. Bursey was considered in the evening up of salaries.

MR. MOORE—Who fills that position?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—That is Mr. Jen-

nings, and I don't know of a more hard working man in the Department. It is no sinecure of a job with the handling of all those stamps, because he has to check up all the stamps that he has to send out to all the offices throughout the country, to Postmasters and Postmistresses, asking for all kinds in amounts from \$20.00 to \$100.00 and \$200.00, and they sometimes fail to send in returns, and then he has to get after them immediately demand the returns, or else no more stamps will be sent out. We are making that a hard and fast rule since I took charge, and the Prime Minister might be blamed for that. I want to announce to this House that the Prime Minister over and over again has given good advice to the heads of all the departments to endeavour to to run their departments as if they were running their own private businesses. That is a pretty hard order to carry out in connection with a public department because all departments are run to a certain extent politically. Take the Charities Department; that was overdrawn last year and this was because the poor we have always with us and because you have to veer and haul and some will try and find a soft spot in the Minister's heart and he may give a little more in charity than he would otherwise.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I understand that these rearrangements have taken place in the salaries and I hope and trust that no petty prejudice has caused you to overlook Mr. Bursey. It was not his fault that we had a motor van there to take the mails; we did it in the interests of the service, but when you came in you did not think that it was necessary. Mr. Bursey had given good service and the salary he received was \$1200 and from the way he talked about it he must have been expecting an increase, and I think

that you should make his salary the same as he got years ago. No doubt where you are giving increases to those others you are making their salaries better than they were years ago.

Mr. Chairman; I hope the Minister will look into the matter. I clearly appreciate that you do not understand everything. It is impossible for you to do so. You need advice from those who have been in the service for years and years and govern yourself accordingly. I hold no brief for Mr. Bursey but he happened to be an employee when I was there and his salary is less now, I think, than he was getting then. I would like the Minister to consider it.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; I don't know the gentleman at all. He never applied to me, he did not write me, he did not ask me. All the others applied to me for an increase. I think Mr. Bursey must be well satisfied to be on the job and getting the salary that he is getting. I think there is something radically wrong that I cannot express now. At the time that he was a chauffeur and in charge of the motor van he spent most of his time picnicing around. Some other Minister of the Department employed this motor van, but it was only used once or twice in twelve months. Probably the intentions of the Minister were honest enough when he purchased the motor van and placed Mr. Bursey in charge of it, but whatever his intention was, it failed. It was extravagant.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to enter into a controversy with the Hon. Minister on this point because nothing is to be gained by it. I don't think the Hon. Minister is in a position at present to give a proper explanation anyway.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; I will do the best that I can as far as Mr. Bursey is concerned. I will give the matter the best consideration and endeavour, if I can, to do something for him. He never applied to me. All the others did. The Hon. Member for Trinity will understand, as I have already stated, that all others came to me and applied for increases in their salaries, whereas Mr. Bursey never approached me.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman, I notice by the report given by Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to His Excellency the Governor on page seven, section fourteen, he says
(reads)

In this connection I want him to bear in mind the request that I have from the Postmaster at Twillingate. I find that the salaries voted for him and his assistant amount to \$780.00. He points out that on account of the hospital being there it has increased the mails considerably and that he considers himself underpaid. I trust that the Hon. Minister will take note of that and look into the matter and increase the salaries if he can find it at all possible to do so.

Furthermore, I want to bring to the attention of the honorable minister the fact that Twillingate receives only one mail per week by the S.S. Clyde.

I also notice in the report by the honorable minister that branches now served with a tri-weekly mail service will by means of the new railway coaches receive a daily mail.

(reads)

I also noticed yesterday in the House that the vote for the ferry service from Newtown to Gambo was increased from \$3,200 to \$3,500. A few years ago it was \$4000. I want to bring to the attention of the honorable minister and the Prime Minister

that we have no ferry at Twillingate running to Lewisporte or Exploits, and if people or passengers want to get up there when there is no steamer connection they have to use their own boats or else charter one. My object in bringing up this matter is in order to get from the honorable minister a vote so that the mails could be despatched by the "Clyde" from Lewisporte on Mondays to Exploits with the result that we could get two mails a week and I think the total cost would not exceed \$350.00.

That would give us two mails a week, and I consider it my duty to bring up this matter on behalf of my constituents as this service is much needed in that vicinity.

Furthermore, I would like to bring to the attention of the honorable minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs the fact, as I understand, that at present all parcels that come into this country by mail at Port aux Basques are hauled across country to St. John's and sent to the various outports afterwards.

I would suggest to the Honourable Ministers that that might be changed in that the parcels be sent to the different outports which have sub-collectors. A man in Channel who gets a parcel from Canada and who expects to get it with as little loss of time as possible, would probably be quite annoyed and naturally when he realises that his parcels if they come to Port-aux-Basques are hauled to St. John's and then hauled back again and delivered to him at Channel with consequent loss of time. This also happens at Corner Brook, I understand. We have customs officers in various outports and I would suggest that these parcels be dispatched from Port-aux-Basques to the various ports, thru the country, at which there are Customs Officers. It would probably be a

more convenient way of handling the parcels and should help considerably the people having parcels coming that way in that there would not be such delay as at present.

There is another matter that I want to bring to the attention of the Hon. Minister and that is the placing of a wireless station on Grey Islands, as I mentioned previously in this House. I hope and trust that the Hon. Minister will take notice of this matter and have it done.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; in reply to the Hon. Member with regard to parcel post, I might say that this matter was taken up by the Government at a very early stage and it was found that it was practically impossible to change the present system and I think most of the Members of the House will agree with me that if we deliver parcels to the different deputies who know nothing about valuation, we would suffer very greatly. The only other alternative would be to double our staff at Port-aux-Basques, and while I quite appreciate the objection of the Hon. Member to bringing parcels to St. John's, still we must have some head quarters because collectors in the outports are not capable of doing this work.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; I intended to say a word or two with regard to the matter that Mr. Ashbourne referred to, the matter of a wireless station on Grey Islands. I think that I have a petition somewhere in my possession to present to this House on the matter and I trust that the Department will try to give this wireless to the people of Grey Islands. It is not so much that Grey Islands is a residential centre in itself but that its chief importance is that it is very much frequented by fishermen who come there in the summer-

time and it is one of the largest producing fishing grounds on the Treaty Shore. They have people down there from all the Northern Bays and other parts of the country as well and I trust that I know something about the business of this country and I know that an office there would be very convenient for those doing business at Grey Islands in the fall of the year. The Minister of Finance knows how very difficult it is to do business there now. Schooners go down there during the fall of the year trying to get fish out of it and you never know where they are - they may have left and gone ashore and your fish may be lost. A wireless station there would be a tremendous assistance. The outfit does not cost more than \$700 and I believe that the revenue would pay for the upkeep of it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; I quite agree with the Hon. Member with regard to the wireless station on the Grey Islands. I know some of the fishermen that go down there and they are a very good class of men and I was going to bring this matter before the Government to see if we can do something to help them out.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; now that we are getting near the end of the vote for administration. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the matter of appointing a travelling auditor for the outport Postal Telegraph offices is being considered. I notice here that we have \$2,000 for an inspector. What work that inspector does I do not know. I realise that the post office above all other departments has such a system as that introduced in connection with the management of such a large organization, that nobody would suggest that anything was not right. We have a very expensive department. I congratulate anyone that

has made an effort to reduce expenditure. According to the report of the Auditor General there is recommended a travelling auditor of accounts for the Postal Telegraphs.

(Reads)

Now you have down there an army of officials and among that army you will find some that do things in their own interests and not in the interest of the public. Therefore they make mistakes. And your efforts to remedy abuses have not met with a hundred per cent success. People seem to sin through ignorance, and the most valuable official you can have down there would be an instructor to instruct the postal officials as to how they should perform their work. They sin very often because they do not know the difference. But some are vicious and intentionally sin. This is a matter I do not doubt has been referred to the Executive Government. I presume that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs being a member of the Executive has brought it to the attention of his colleagues. I think that if you have men over that should do the work and are not doing it. Dismiss them. Do not allow them to remain there. But if you have men there that are doing their work satisfactorily, keep them there. Do what the Auditor General recommends. Have a properly appointed official in the outports that would instruct the officials in the outports as to what they should do. The inspector should be a man experienced in the Postal Telegraph work combined and if you had a man going around who understands everything about both services, he would be a great assistance to the officials and also to the other services. The Auditor General recommended the appointment of an inspector when I was there. To tell the truth I could not get what I considered a properly quali-

fied man. I trust the Minister will try to get the official as qualified for this work as suggested by the Auditor General. Now we will give credit to the department for trying to keep the expenditure within the votes. Some of you officials may be criticising you there for doing that. But you will have some that will be criticising when you try to do things right. Now the department presents a very good showing. Still we know that in 1926 we borrowed money on capital account for the building of branch telegraph lines. Previously we got the money on capital account and had to credit it to that department. That would make some difference in your report. Another thing. The department of Post and Telegraphs would not build any new lines. If a man wanted a mile or two of telephone line, the Minister or his deputy will say "We have not money for that but if you put the money to our credit from your district grants we will build the line. The Postal department is not doing that work, and we are trying to blind ourselves to the fact that we are not charging it up to the proper account. We are charging to the Public Works account what should be charged to the Postal Telegraphs account.

Mr. Chairman; It was not my intention to speak this afternoon on the department of Posts and Telegraphs, but I have come across a very valuable report. The report cost the country a considerable amount of money, and the persons that got up the report paid a lot of attention to it. The report is signed by R. Gushue, Secretary of the Finance Commission. I think that the work was done by Mr. Morine and the Secretary put his ideas into the writing. I wonder whether the Government gave a second thought to that report once it was tabled or presented to the Execu-

tive Government. Somebody will have to give a thought to the ideas expressed in this report.

(Reads)

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; While on this subject of outport Postmasters I would like to call to the attention of the Minister to the fact that the lady operator at Port Rexton is paid \$450 an an operator, but to my personal knowledge she has handled all the mails at that office within the past four years and has not received one cent for it. I referred to this same matter last year and I would like now for the Minister to give an explanation why this lady does not receive any remuneration for handling the postal matter?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman; From the standpoint of economy where we consider an operator or postal official is not over burdened with work, such as at Port Rexton, we make it a combined office. We have many such offices around the country where we have been endeavouring to cut down expenses.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I do not know if the lady in question is receiving a minimum salary or a maximum salary as an operator; but in my opinion this is rather an important office because there is probably a much larger population at Port Rexton than there is in other places around the country where offices are combined and I think some consideration should be given to the case I referred to.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, so far as the district of Fortune Bay is concerned, it appears to me that the Estimates regarding the paying of postmasters and postmistresses and the mail service generally need reorganization. There are places where there are too many officials who are

overpaid, whilst there are other places with not enough of officials and who are underpaid, and the necessary service is not given in justice to the size and importance of the various places. I am not on my feet for fault-finding purposes, except to point out the necessity of having a systematizing of the service generally. I have always found the officials in Fortune Bay ready and willing at all times to do whatever they possibly could to help along the system; but the fact remains that a very large number of places in that district are isolated and without the very necessary mail and telephone and telegraph service which such an important fishing district as Fortune Bay warrants.

I have in mind the situation on the south side of the Bay where there are but one or two harbors for a stretch of several score miles of coast line, and the Glencoe is supposed to do the service on that Bay, but frequently when the boat comes to some of these places where there are no harbours they have to skip them and get to the places where there are safe harbors. The people then have to do without the mail. Now the point I want to call to the attention of the Minister is this, that when this skipping of ports happens in various cases the postmaster or postmistress has undertaken to send a boat to the nearest place where the steamer can call. The postmaster contends that before that is done a telegraph message should be sent to obtain permission from the authorities. But in those places there are no telegraph offices, and the man is sent and when he gets to the place where there is a telegraph office and where the mail is delivered he thinks it is hardly worth while to telegraph and takes the mail since he is there, without telegraphing. So, men going as temporary couriers in this way have put in bills

for \$3.00, \$4.00, \$5.00, having taken a trip of 18 or 20 miles in rough weather, and because the ordinary procedure has not been carried out, has been disregarded through stress of circumstances, the General Post Office has refused payment of very moderate and reasonable bills. I would like to suggest to the honorable Minister that some latitude should be allowed under circumstances of that kind. People should be put in a position where if the boat cannot call in the ordinary way the postmaster should be permitted to engage some courier to send, so that places be not cut off from communication from ten days to a fortnight, as happens, and so that where men have to be sent for the mail that there will be no difficulty arranging payment properly. Another matter I want to refer to is the matter of the telegraph service. As the Minister knows, numerous complaints have been made with regard to the lines through Fortune Bay. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Department by business men in the city, who have branches on that coast and found it impossible to do business regularly and satisfactorily, by business men in the district, and by myself as representative of the district. The lines for some reason or another work very badly, particularly in damp weather, and business men have been very seriously handicapped. The whole matter, I believe, was gone into by Mr. Veitch, who is an experienced and practical man. Mr. Veitch's explanation is that the lines are being gradually added to until they are straggling all over the place and there are perhaps two hundred more miles than are necessary of telegraph lines on the coast. From information submitted to me in reply to a question, I learn that Mr. Veitch recommends that the department undertake to cut

out about a hundred and fifty miles. This would reduce the cost of upkeep of wires and poles and be generally of advantage to the telegraph service. There is no question but business men are losing and people generally are suffering through interruption in communication and the Department itself must be losing a very considerable revenue because of the failure of the line on that coast. It is not my intention to ask for any undertaking regarding the matter from the Minister; that is I know a matter of ways and means with him, and I simply want to make a few remarks on the subject to bring the matter officially before the House and I do trust that the honorable gentleman and the Department will find it possible to carry out the very practical suggestion of Mr. Veitch with regard to the telegraph service along the South West Coast generally at a very early date.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the Government of Newfoundland or the Railway is in receipt of any subsidy from the Canadian postal authorities in respect of the Caribou carrying mails?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That matter will come up when the Budget is brought in. I might say that during the past month I have been in communication with the authorities at Ottawa with regard to the matter. Formerly when the Reids' Company operated the service they received a subsidy for two ships and when the Government took the service over they cut out the subsidies. It has been the subject of much correspondence and last year I communicated with the Minister of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa and when I was at Ottawa I saw him in reference to it and I have now an as-

surance that when the Budget is put through by the Canadian Government a subsidy of \$35,000 will be granted.

MR. MOORE.—Might I be permitted to ask how long is it since we lost that subsidy?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—About four years.

MR. MOORE.—And it hasn't been troubled about since?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I have been troubling about it for two years but I never got any satisfaction until I went personally to Ottawa and saw the Minister of Trade and Commerce and Mr. Robb, the Minister of Finance. I represented to them, I might point out, when they gave the excuse that they had subsidized the Clark Steamship Company, that the very fact that they had subsidized a line, a Canadian line, operating in opposition to the Government of Newfoundland, was anything but a friendly act to the Government of Newfoundland. A large proportion of passengers and a considerable freight go over that line that might otherwise go over the Government line. I said, therefore, we ought at least have a subsidy for one steamer for the Government. He said he hadn't looked at it in that way; and I have got an assurance that a subsidy will be granted.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the regular subsidy the Clark Steamship Company had was increased when they started running to Corner Brook?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I don't think. I think two new ships were built by the Company on that service and when they were made I understand it was on the understanding that they would be subsidized, and that the subsidy was, as at the present time, forty or fifty thousand. That is largely for the Canadian coast.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I know for a fact that previous to the time they ran to Corner Brook they had \$50,000 for the North Shore route and \$60,000 for the South Shore, but whether it was increased for coming to Newfoundland or not, is what I would like to know.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—In reply to the honorable member, Mr. Chairman, I might say that when I was in Quebec this winter I discussed this matter and I was told that they received no subsidy for coming to Corner Brook, and if they gave up coming to Newfoundland tomorrow the Clark Steamship Company would still get the same subsidy that they are receiving from the Canadian Government.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to ask the Chairman of the Railway Commission for some information as to the intention of the Commission in respect of the branch lines; is it their intention to use steam coaches on these lines for passenger purposes or is this merely an experiment now instead of the ordinary trains. There are so many stories prevalent that I would like the honorable Chairman to give us some idea as to the present position.

HON. THE.. PRIME.. MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in replying to the honorable member, two coaches that we have operated have proved successful and economical and have given every satisfaction and we feel that it would be very economical to have coaches on the various branches and our intention was to put one on the South Shore branch, one on the Bay de Verde branch and another on the Harbor Grace branch, to begin with and see how they would work out. The new coaches are, of course, better than those that we already have and can

*carry a certain amount of mail and luggage and I have no doubt will prove of tremendous value and save considerable expense.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Prime Minister in reference to coaches, as I understand it, they have a coach running as far as Brigus Junction but have no coach running from that to Carbonear.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I think that only runs to Brigus Junction on Saturday nights.

MR. GRIMES.—But why not run right to Carbonear?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—There is a train leaving there every Thursday night.

MR. GRIMES.—I can quite understand that, Mr. Chairman, but we have quite a number of people in the fall and spring, and even summer who want to come into the city three and four times a week and it would be a great assistance to them if there was a coach running between Carbonear and Brigus Junction.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—This is only an experiment.

MR. GRIMES.—When the coach arrives at Brigus Junction is there connection with a train?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—No

MR. GRIMES.—Well if you had a coach running there I think that quite a number of people would take advantage of it. I think it is a matter that the Government or the Railway Commission should consider because if you find that the coach is going to bring in revenue to the Railway you should try this experiment between Brigus Junction and Carbonear and find out how successful that would be.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; I might say in reference to this matter that this policy of

coaches at different places is simply in an experimental stage. In some places it has been eminently successful, such as that service between Humbermouth, Corner Brook and Curling, which has been wonderfully successful and has paid over and over again.

I quite agree with the idea in the mind of the Hon. Member because a coach running to Brigus Junction looks as if it is running to a blind end. The suggestion was made yesterday, I think by Mr. Duff, that the coach go as far as Brigus and that would bring it in direct connection with the road system of Conception Bay, and that suggestion will be considered by the Railway Commission very shortly and possibly will be adopted.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman; The reason I put the question to the Hon. the Prime Minister whether the new coaches are more powerful than the old ones is that I have seen the previous ones in the valley and not able to get out. They had to stop, draw the fires and clean the tubes before they could get up the hill. I hope sufficient care has been taken in buying these new coaches. I don't think that these coaches have been as successful as the Colonial Secretary suggests. There have been a lot of repairs needed and I think the Commission was more guided by what Mr. Ross, of Wm. Hemp & Co., told them than anything else. There were no figures taken and I think that Mr. Ross put one over on the Government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I have never met Mr. Ross in the matter. It was simply a question of policy that we get these new coaches.

MR. MOORE.—There should have been figures put in.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the

Government and particularly to the attention of the Railway Commission, and that is the possibility of placing a sleeping car on the Bonavista branch. At the present time the line is in an awful condition. You leave here on the one o'clock express and take a branch train at Clarendville at one o'clock or midnight. The train is handling freight all along the line throughout the whole night and it practically takes twelve hours to get down to Bonavista, and we have suggested that it would be a good plan to put a sleeping car on this train or get an old dining car and dress it up a bit and you might run a counter there to sell refreshments, not a heavy dinner, but something in the way of a light lunch, and I believe that it could be made to pay. People taking the train at Clarendville for Bonavista would engage the sleeper, people further up would not need it, of course, and I think that if the government would do this that it would be a paying proposition and the lunch counter would bring in something. We would be able to get to bed and instead of arriving down there all beaten up, we would be in somewhat better condition. I would not advise a sick man to go down along that line as it is today. The only solution seems to me to be that a sleeper be added to the train or that they stop handling freight. I see no reason why the Railway people could not fix up an old diner and I would like to hear a word or two from a member of the Commission now.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to the honorable member, Mr. Chairman, I think that a great deal has been done by the Railway Commission in an endeavor to give a better service all over this country. The latest improvement has been the addition of a diner to the shore train and this year two new sleeping cars

are on order and that will mean that there will be two of the older cars over. I shall have great pleasure in bringing this matter to the attention of the Commission and if there is any merit in the matter consideration will be given to it.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, what speed can these coaches make?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I cannot tell you.

MR. BRADLEY.—If they are capable of the speed of an ordinary train they should get people to Bonavista by midngiht or one o'clock.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Sullivan tells me twenty-five or thirty miles.

MR. BRADLEY.—Then we could get to Bonavista by twelve or one o'clock.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the sugestion made by the honorable member for St. Barbe.

If you are going by rail to any place on the Bonavista line, to Port Rexton or beyond, you have to make up your mind to undergo a lot of discomfort and loss of sleep and if anything can be done to improve the service on the line I trust that the Commission will do it.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me how that vote of \$1200 is expended? How many camps are there?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—I cannot say how many.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, the reason why I asked that was because between Millertown and Little Bay there are about twelve camps and the present conditions in these camps are anything but what they should be. Several of the camps are very leaky. I think that during the winter the Minister of Agriculture and Mines happened to be up in that section, and

he has informed himself as to the conditions of the camps, and I think he will bear with me that these camps are in need of repairs and new stoves, and for that purpose I think that there ought to be an increased vote or else they ought to see that the repairs to these camps are finished before the next winter comes on again.

Then in reference to the matter that was brought up here by Mr. Ashbourne, as to the need of a ferry service between Exploits and Twillingate. That is a very important matter, and I trust that the Government will give some heed to the suggestion that he has made. It is not only Twillingate that is interested, but the settlements of Moreton's Harbor and Herring Neck. These people have quite a lot of business to do during the summer season. That service will be of great advantage to the people down there. It is not a large amount to ask for and I hope that the Government will provide the necessary funds in order that a ferry service may be started there.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in support of the plea put up by the honorable member who has just sat down, on behalf of the mail couriers over the route referred to by him. On several occasions I have gone over that route myself, and I have spent several nights in various camps. As stated by the honorable member, during the winter I had occasion to visit Millertown Junction, and I happened to be there when they were loading mail for Notre Dame Bay. I discovered that conditions had changed considerably since the time I went over that route. I found that they had a tremendous mail. They had a team of dogs, but they would never have been able to get that mail along unless the men got out in front and hauled it along with a rope,

in snow sometimes knee deep. When they arrived at their camp sometimes well after night they found no stove and and you can imagine what kind of a night they spent, after working hard ten or twelve hours. They have to earn hard every dollar they get in the performance of their duties. I feel sure that the sympathy of the Ministers will go out to these men, and I hope, as the honourable member has suggested, that before the season comes around, better overland mail service will be inaugurated and every consideration given these couriers.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, it is always pleasant to listen to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines speaking on any subject. How eloquent he can grow over a courier's camp. I would like to explain that these camps are built by contract, and that they are furnished with all necessary equipment, etc., and no request that I am aware of has been refused in our department as far as stoves or any other equipment for those camps are concerned. The couriers themselves may be to blame, but I do not suggest that it is necessary to have an inspector go out and inspect those camps. But as far as I know, from all the information that I can get, those camps are supposed to be kept in fairly good condition for the monies that are sent out. We always sent them out everything they asked for. The couriers themselves do the work very efficiently. I do not know that we have a better class of men in the service. They have to put up with a lot of hardship no doubt. We have provided them with all possible comforts and have refused them nothing. If I had known the conditions were such out there I would have gone there myself to see them. This is the first year, I may say, that the service has been extended to Millertown Junc-

tion, and I think it was upon the request of my honorable friend, Mr. Brown, member for Twillingate, that I extended it there. But I have heard no complaints whatever.

MR. GRIMES.—There were two letters sent in by the couriers early in the year.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—They did not come to my notice. They were probably dealt with by my deputy. Now, in reference to the request of my honorable friend, Mr. Ashbourne, for the extension of the mail service down to Exploits. Was that the same service that you made a request about on another occasion?

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman, I may say, in explanation, that I made both requests to the department. One was that the regular mail service which was continued throughout the winter would be continued for another week until the Clyde arrived on the route. I was successful in getting this mail from Lewisporte for one week. What I want now is to apply to the balance of the season. I would like to have an assurance from the Minister that that will be granted.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I may say that I will give special attention to it.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the examining of goods, I think that the government has been very lax in not making some extra provision for the examination and marking of goods, as at the present time the accomodation is anything but ample for this work. There is no question but that the revenue of this country has lost considerable money by not having goods sent to the examining store on a larger scale than what is being sent now; but it is im-

possible to do it owing to the lack of accommodation and the small staff engaged there. There are two good men there, but they are not able to keep pace with the despatch of business and give an expeditious service, and very often goods are held up there for quite a while, but through no fault of these men. A conservative estimate of the loss the Government has met with the past four years on account of this poor accommodation and small staff to do the work of examining the goods, is in the vicinity of \$200,000.00. To my mind it would be economical and a protection to the revenue of the country if some provision was made in the Estimates for an addition to the examining rooms. Besides there is no secrecy in the examining rooms at the present time. There is always about half a dozen men around there when invoices are being presented, and I ask any business man in the House today if he is satisfied with a service of that kind. The Government has got to increase the size of the rooms and the size of the staff if you want to add to the revenue of the country. Supposing there are twenty cases of seasonable goods go there to be examined. What time have two men got to go through them? The result is that the goods are held up for a considerable time. Now you cannot hold up business people like that; so I think the Government would do well to adopt the suggestion I put forward whereby there would be a proper examination of goods and less delay, and I venture to say that you will get an additional revenue of between \$50,000.00 and \$60,000.00 a year as a result.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the lack of facilities in connection with the examination of luggage of passengers

by the Red Cross Line steamers. I happened to be a passenger on two occasions on one of these steamers coming to St. John's, and the conditions under which luggage is examined is deplorable. People were pushing, people were knocked down, and it was almost impossible to do anything except to wait for a couple of hours and avoid the crush in order to get one's luggage examined.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to Mr. Grimes I wish to say that there is nobody in the House more strongly in accord with what he said than I am. I quite agree that the space in the examining rooms is inadequate for efficient work, and not only that, but the whole Customs building, in fact, is a disgrace to the Colony. The officials in the Custom House are running over each other and the Minister has got a little office in the corner of the building where anybody can come in and attack him. Now as far as the examination of goods go, my experience is that if you brought the Angel Gabriel and asked him to take charge of the examining warerooms somebody would fool him overnight. Why, half of my time as Minister has been occupied in settling disputes. In fact I have been asked to put a value on goods, and I know as much about that class of work as I do about Timbuctoo.

Now in connection with what Capt. Randell says about the examining room at Furness Withy and at Harvey's, I have fought that the last three years and I have got slight improvements and not near what is needed. The Furness Withy is improved no doubt because they have built a shed and the passenger walks right in and out. However, it is no odds who you send or what you do to get the examining done you never please anybody. We made changes

at the post office in connection with the examining, and I believe the revenue of the Post Office must be greatly increased by the number of letters of complaint I have received. Everybody says they are being robbed and I suppose if I received one letter from Mrs. Jones or Mrs. Brown I received fifty; something cost \$6.00 and was valued at \$10.00.

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 tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following communication from His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, which he then read, as follows:

The Administrator of the Government has the pleasure to communicate to the Honorable House of Assembly the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 Cap V, Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved on the 11th May 1928.

(Sgd) W. H. HORWOOD,
Administrator.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
17 May 1928.

Certified Copy of Minute of the Honourable Executive Council Approved by His Excellency the Administrator on the 11th May 1928:

May 10th 1928.

Under the provisions of Section 4,

Chapter 7, Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, it was ordered that the following gentlemen shall be the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:

The President of the Legislative Council,

Hon. F. C. Alderdice,,
 Hon. S. Milley,
 The Speaker, House of Assembly,
 The Colonial Secretary, and
 The Attorney General.

(Certified true copy.)

(Sgd) FRED. M. STIRLING,
 Asst. Deputy Colonial Secretary.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Report of Highroads Commission for the year ending February 29th, 1928.

Hon the Prime Minister tabled the following documents;

Report of Superintendent of Education, C. of E.

Report of Bureau of Education.

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 18th 1928.

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

At half past three of the clock Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House to present the Address in reply to His Excellency the Administrator, and being returned, Mr. Speaker reported that His Excellency had received the Address, and had been pleased to make the following reply;

Government House,
 St. John's Nfld.

May 18th 1928.

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.—I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) W. H. HORWOOD.
 Administrator.

PETITIONS.

Petitions were presented by Mr. Grimes from Brighton, re Coastal Steamer.

Mr. Grimes from Shoe Cove, re Road.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

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

Department of Posts and Telegraphs, \$1,220,912.73

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if the Government have taken any steps or intend

taking any steps in connection with these offices that cost so much more to operate than the revenue collected. I just received this list from the Minister in answer to my question, and I notice that in a great many cases the salaries paid are a great deal in excess of the revenue.

(Reads)

In addition to this, there are in some of these places, tidewaiters, etc., not included in the expenses. I have not had any time to go over them yet, but it looks to me that it is false economy on the part of the Government to pay a man \$1,100.00 to collect \$100.00. You have to pay that extra amount out of the Treasury. It is far better to have no office at all if it costs as much as that to collect these small amounts. Better not to collect anything at all than to pay out the funds of the country for no purpose.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; following after the remarks made by Mr. Hickman in reference to the collection of duties in the different places that I mentioned on the list, I notice in the report in the Canadian House of Commons they were considering the same question, and the conclusion they arrived at was, that it was better to cut a number of these offices and save considerable expense to the Dominion of Canada, and where we have been talking considerably about economy in connection with the conduct of administration, it seems that it is a saving should be effected. I am not asking for the dismissal of anyone that is employed in these places to-day, but when a vacancy occurs it should not be filled. I think that ought to receive the attention of the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, sometimes a matter is clearer to anyone that has no close connection with it than the Minister himself. I think it is only fair to say

that the point raised by the honorable member for Twillingate does not quite tally with our position here. The position raised in Canada was rather the idea of limiting the ports of entry. On that principle I think even here it has a certain amount of application, but the statement that has been read by the Leader of the Opposition just now, in my opinion, ought not to be viewed altogether from the idea of returns, because the great bulk of offices in certain parts of the Island are in the nature of prevention, not for the sake of collection, and you cannot fairly assess the value of the service merely by the fact of the returns that have been reported to the Customs in that locality, because, as a matter of fact, the proper exercise by the preventive officer of his duty means that a man cannot come in there with valuable goods, and as a result he comes along and enters the goods at the proper reporting place. It has been raised frequently, for many years, and I wish to say that there is nothing that can be suggested as being novel about the point raised, to the present Finance Minister. What prompts me to speak is that I think there is no application at all about the point that was raised in the Canadian House of Commons. There is the further point also that I do not think that there is any comparison in the world between the coast line of Newfoundland and Canada in the sense of smuggling operations. I think we easily have an outstanding world-wide and notoriously remarkable coast line, in the sense of opportunities for the man who wants to smuggle.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not purpose to make any lengthy remarks in connection with this at this juncture, but I would say in connection with the remarks of the Leader of the opposition as regards sub-col-

lectors being appointed in the various sections of the country, and only turning in a small amount of revenue, that whilst a great number of these collectors are there for preventive reasons, we must not lose sight of the fact that this government and the previous government have appointed them during their years in office for political reasons, only both of them have duplicated those that were already there. There are sections of the country today with two men doing one man's work. There are two collectors of customs in one port, and that is the case in not one section of the country, but in several sections. The point is this that in my opinion it does not matter what government is in power, and while there is a continuation on similar lines as this government and the previous government, well the Minister knows, as well as I can tell him, what is going to happen. That as long as he is in power he will have his few cronies coming along looking for a job, and I am in power I will have my cronies looking for jobs. We are debating the Estimates here today and there are people in the Civil Service that can be done without. There is no doubt of that. I do not begrudge a man a job in the Civil Service, a tide waiter or a custom House officer, but I do object to his job being duplicated, by the past Government and this Government. Consequently, I cannot get up today and say that people are appointed for particular purposes only. I make the charge that they are appointed for services rendered to the present Government and to the past Government. That is all there is to it. I do not care what government gets in tomorrow, the same thing is going to continue. That is the situation that exists in the country today. When the Budget comes before the House I intend to have something further to

say with regard to the expenditure on Public Service. Monies are thrown away, if you look at it from a business standpoint. In some instances we are paying out double what should be paid out. None of you, and I am not saying but I might be in the same position, none of you have the pluck to say "we have got to cut it out." Not a man on both sides of the House ventures to say anything.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, When I spoke a moment or two ago I asked a question and I would like to have an answer from the Minister. Has the Government taken into consideration the re-adjustment of the Customs offices that cost so much to keep up for the small revenue collected?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the Opposition had spoken I did not think I was going to have a bodyguard in the person of the Minister of Justice, who, I may say, has very well explained the circumstances; but as the mouthpiece of the Department of Finance and Customs, I would point out that this matter has been dealt with by the Government, and when I took charge of the Department four years ago I could not understand why men were paid salaries of five or six hundred dollars a year in certain offices around the country when we were getting only about one hundred dollars in return from each office. I talked the matter over with Mr. LeMessurier and others and I discussed it with the Executive Government. It is true that there are a lot of men in the civil service, especially in connection with the Customs, whose salaries are treble of what they ought to be, but there are districts where smuggling is rampant and customs officers in these places, if they do their duty, earn their salaries as preventive offi-

cers, whether they collect or not. I agree with what the member for Ferryland has said as to the cutting out of jobs, but it is very difficult to carry out that policy. The conditions that prevail at the Customs House were there before I arrived on the scene and they will be there when I am gone. The whole trouble is to find a man or a government who will say "NO," because since I assumed office as Finance Minister practically my whole job has been to receive visitors constantly at my home as well as at my office, looking for government jobs for services rendered some politician or other. With a view to curtailment of expenditure, I have had some offices vacated in some places, but I have not re-filled them. Meanwhile, you are not going to be able to protect the service in this Colony until you got as protective and preventive officers a staff of young men who will do their duty fearlessly and who will be clapped on the back for so doing.

Yesterday Mr. Grimes stated here that about \$250,000.00 was lost to the revenue within the past four years in connection with the Customs appraisal of goods. If the honorable member will tell me privately the name of anybody who got away with anything I will get after that party tomorrow morning, but I do not think the honorable member meant it in that way.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, what I meant when I made that statement was that you have a tremendous lot of job line goods, perhaps, manufactured at a cost to the country of \$2 and they are dumped in this country at 15 cents. Now the consumer does not always get the benefit out of that low price and the seller get a very substantial profit. Besides you have very little room for the examination

of goods coming in and you have not got the staff to scrutinize the invoices showing the prices on them. If you had these two essentials you would get a great deal more revenue than you have been getting. Supposing that it was brought to your attention that an article that cost \$2 manufactured in the United States was dumped into this country at, say 20 cents, would it be fair to the country or to the revenue to allow that article to pass at 20 cents when you know that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of goods are coming into the country every year in that way at a considerable loss to the revenue. Then again you want to be fair to the trade and to the country with regard to the examination of goods. An importer wants to get his goods a week or ten days after they arrive, but that cannot happen under present conditions owing to lack of space at the warehouse, and very often now a man has got to wait as long as three or four months before getting his goods. That is why I say that the revenue is losing considerably by not having examinations of goods take place promptly.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman, so far as the dumping law is concerned, I agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Twillingate. Until you have a government that is prepared to make a proper warehouse and is prepared to get the right man and pay him a big salary, matters will drift along as they are. You cannot get the right and proper man for \$2400 a year. In order to get a thoroughly qualified man for that work you got to pay him a princely salary and he will earn it ten times over. The difficulty is to agree to give that man a big salary. If you pay a first class man, perhaps the first place one will get a shot from for doing so will be from the ranks of

the Opposition, but I do not think that anyone who understands the necessity of such an appointment would hesitate to put a man there. However, much of the trouble that has been referred to has been removed, but not near as much as I would like it. All sorts of practices are resorted to to defraud the Customs and some of the cases are very difficult to trace. We have a concrete example before us now. We have been chasing a man for a long time. By accident this man was run down as he was looking for a clearance to go to the Banks and I was looking for a document for him to go to jail.

The main trouble in the Custom House is that there are many old men there who should be pensioned and younger men put in their places. I know of a department in the Customs where the average age of the men is 75 years. Well we all know that it is only exceptional men can do work at that age. Some of them have grown old in the service and we do not like to pension them; others were old when they went there and we do not like to put them out and have them go home and worry their lives away. What is really needed is the introduction of young blood into the Customs and all appointments made upon the system of competitive examinations irrespective of the church a man attends. I would support any government that would bring in such a policy. In the British Custom House there is no man can get a position there unless he has passed a creditable examination, and when somebody adopts that system here he will have done the best public service in my time. Half of my time in my office I have to listen to clergymen of all denominations beseeching and appealing for positions for people. Why, the Customs House is looked upon as a place of rest and members on both sides of

this House are aware of that; but, as I have already intimated, until test examinations become the rule you are not going to have Customs affairs properly carried out in this country.

MR. HICKMAN.—When the Minister refers to smuggling does he mean St. Pierre or from abroad?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—We get the liquid and tobaccos and such like from St. Pierre, but we get other things from Canada and the United States, and if you knew as much about the Custom House as I do you would realize how much stuff is smuggled from the United States and Canada and you would be surprised to know the methods employed in smuggling. For instance there are people doing business here that import goods to an address in one of the outports. Later we find that the goods are delivered by express to a man in the city and the Customs officials know nothing of it. It is very difficult to trace such things and the Deputy Minister or any other official cannot be expected to know every little detail.

Unless you have men qualified to look for these things it is very difficult. Quite a lot passes through our officers. Most of the reports we get come from outside. You can't expect a collector of customs to know everything and the man has to attend to everything and he is trying to look after every little detail. We have a statistical department and a department for the outports but lots of things pass through, and no Minister will know what is done unless he will absolutely allow nothing to be done without consulting him; and no Minister is going to try and enforce that policy. I think, however, if you look up the reports of the Customs House for the past four years you will find amounts have been collected that were never intended to be paid. The whole

story some day will be known and I think members of this House will be satisfied an attempt has been made to collect what the Colony is entitled to; I know a lot has gone clear; I don't say we have collected all the Colony is entitled to; but it is utterly impossible to get it all. If a man is taken up for smuggling you are accused of being harsh taking everybody but the right man. In luggage duty the amount collected in 1926 amounted to \$1000.00 and last year I think the amount collected was somewhere about \$12,000. for the port of St. John's. That is a big change in that one item alone, and I think considerable passes thru still. We have two very good officials attending to that and they are trying to do their best and I believe it is having a good effect. Still some people will beat the Customs and get ashore and not content with that will boast that they have beat you. If a Customs Officer tries to do his duty he is blamed very much; but for my part I praise him as he deserves for doing so.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I gather from the remarks of the Hon. Minister that these officials in the outports do not prevent smuggling; if goods can be got in without examination and shipped to St. John's?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I want to explain. You will understand I am right in that. I will say without hesitaton that 95 per cent of the collectors in the outports who are appoined as sub-collectors are not qualified. do not know one thing about examination of dry goods and that is where the difficulty arises. They let people pass entires and get away with transhipment to St. John's because they are not qualified to examine. They haven't the experience. That is the difficulty. We have good men to do certain works but when it

comes to examining or appraising they are not in it. We tried to get over it in Corner Brook and have saved a lot; possibly they may be getting lax again. The same difficulty has been encountered in other places; we don't always get it appraised right.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, The point I made when first speaking was that we are paying away a lot of money for salaries and getting no returns and I think the Government should take it into consideration. For example there is one on a certain part of the coast in the proximity of St. Pierre that cost the last fiscal year \$1132. and collected \$97.92. There certainly must be importation in that place. Garnish.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; For the information of the Hon. Member I may say we realise that Garnish is not a place for a sub-collector. I think Mr. Brazil there was paid \$900.00 and I don't think there were any importations for a while came in there; done through Grand Bank and other places. Mr. Brazil has since passed away and I told the Member for Fortune that I intended closing the office; but after consideration of the whole thing it was thought that if we have a man there in a Government job receiving another salary it would be sufficient to pay him say \$100.00 and the people would have the office still for clearances etc., after having it so long. That is a place where I think a saving can be made and that is what we have decided to do.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Lawn cost \$1300. and collected \$106.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think it was the man in Lawn who captured a vessel with 15 caddies of tobacco, 13 jars of rum and some cases of whisky, I think six cases

of dry goods; altogether quite a valuable cargo. He really is a preventative officer and right around that coast I don't think you need worry about them being paid as protective officers.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask why there is a difference in salary between the collectors at Corner Brook and Grand Falls and the collector at Buchans?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—That matter did come before my notice and I don't think that the collector in Corner Brook nor do I think the collector in Grand Falls is paid enough and if the same duties devolve on the man at Buchans as on those two men I think they ought to have been increased. I have had a lot of applications from Grand Falls as to why the man is entitled to an increase of salary and I think he should get more but the matter was brought up before me. If you do this you will have to raise the salary of every outport collector. Meantime I agree about that, at least the Corner Brook salary and Grand Falls salary should be made equal to Buchans Mine. I will make a note of that; and that will be effected.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, Do I understand now that all anyone has to do is to refer to the maximum salary and the Minister will agree that the salaries be levelled up?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I knew that was coming.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, if this is reported to the collectors in Trinity District: "Why didn't you speak about it?" But if the representative of one district can say there are two or three offices and they deserve an increase, if you are going to do it in one case you have to do it in every case.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; In reply

to the Hon. Member I would like to say why I say the man in Corner Brook is entitled to more. He collects \$217,000. in duty. The man in Trinity collects \$3384.33.

MR. HALFYARD.—What is collected at Hearts Content?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—\$3710.79. The man in Grand Falls is a man who has been there for years; a man whom I think is a very good official. There is no comparison in the salaries; no justification at all that these men should be at the same salaries.

MR. HALFYARD.—I appreciate what the Hon. Minister of Finance says as regards to the collection of revenue in outport customs offices but salaries are not granted in proportion to revenue collected.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—They should be.

MR. HALFYARD.—According to that some of those places on the south coast should receive no salary.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—You can't take Buchans Mine and Grand Falls and those places and put them in the same category as Lawn and other places.

MR. HALFYARD.—Where there is a customs office and a post office too the offices could be combined, that is what should be done and a saving effected in that way.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I regret that the possible discrepancy in the estimates, the difference between the salaries of the collectors at Buchans Mine and Corner Brook and of the collector at Grand Falls, took on the line that salaries should be paid at various places stated here in accordance with the amount of revenue collected. That we have to appoint certain collectors and officials for protection and protection only and

that they should receive certain salaries is an accepted fact and the natural conclusion that any sane individual will draw is that a man who performs a considerable amount of official work from which a considerable amount of revenue is derived should consequently be paid in proportion to the revenue that he collects certainly seems fair to collectors in common where large amounts of revenue are collected, in such places as Buchans Mine, Grand Falls and Corner Brook and certain other places throughout the country.

That bears out the point that I made here a short while ago about this Government in power now and the Minister says that they should do it. Another Government that has been in power when they started to die said that such and such a thing will be done and the crowd that are going to come in the next time when they are going out will have the same old story and the result is that the people that talk that way, when they have the opportunity of doing these things do not do it and that is the history of public life in this country since responsible Government.

Consequently I feel that when a matter of importance especially of the nature of this kind arises, where the salaries of competent officials are concerned, I say competent because officials that should be appointed in prominent industrial towns should be competent, should be paid according to the work that they perform.

It is all very well for Mr. Halfyard to furnish references down in some part of the Labrador and say that this man should get as much as another man in another town of the country when he doesn't collect any revenue but is there for protection. If they claim that the protection these people

give is on a par with the amount of revenue collected in the other various industrial centres, that is if the man in Forteau or the Straits of Belle Isle saves \$200,000 a year on smuggling then I claim that he should get the same amount of salary as the collector at Corner Brook. But, he does not do it. May be he uncovers a couple of bottles of rum and a few caddies of tobacco, and possibly he saves his salary in that way.

My point is that there are jobs duplicated.

The old Government and this Government that is dying now and the next Government that comes in, are not going to remedy it, but they get up here and play politics and act as hypocrites. The whole crowd of us are the same and for years have been playing the hypocrite.

Mr. Chairman; In connection with this department there is just a little information I would like to obtain from the Hon. Minister. Just what duties are performed in the Assessor's Department, may I ask.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—They collect the fire insurance tax, the bank tax and attend to various smaller matters.

MR. CASHIN.—In other words, we are paying \$5300 a year for doing a month's work. The Bank tax is nothing; the Insurance Tax is the toughest part of it because there are seventy odd companies doing business in this country. The Bank tax is a very small item and what I contend is this. No doubt, they have considerable money out-standing in this Department for old income taxes or business profits tax and if there is money owed to this department and it is being wound up, as it should be, I would suggest that the money owed to them for profits tax and income tax, that

these amounts should be handed over to the Department of Justice for collection and that other amounts such as insurance and bank taxes should be handed over to the Deputy Minister of Finance's Department for collection, because prior to that there was no such thing as the Department of the Assessor until the Income Tax came into force, I don't think there was but I regret that I am not able to say who collected the bank tax prior to that time. I expect that it was collected by Mr. Keating's supervision. Consequently, as there is no income tax, the bank tax and the insurance taxes should be handed over to the Finance Department under Mr. Keating and the clerks in his Department and that this Department should be wound up and the amounts outstanding in this Department should be handed over to the Department of Justice for collection.

That is my suggestion.

Some of these gentlemen that occupied positions have been taken out of this department and put in some other department have they not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Yes.

MR. CASHIN.—For instance the Travelling Auditor. What job is he holding now.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—You mean Mr. Galway. He is in the statistical department.

MR. CASHIN.—What job has he in that department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—He is a special clerk.

MR. CASHIN.—And is that man pensioned that was there before.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I cannot tell you that now.

MR. CASHIN.—Now there is another man, getting \$1800. he is gone. What job is he taking.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Do you mean Mr. Griffin.

MR. CASHIN.—I do not know his name.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—The only one that I moved was Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Galway. The stenographers are also gone.

MR. CASHIN.—Then there is the second clerk. Where is he gone.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I think that is Mr. Griffin.

MR. CASHIN.—It seems to me that there is some difference in opinion on this vote. And that there has been some manouvering regarding it. And I would suggest to the Minister that we consider it so to speak passed, and that he would let us have the necessary information on Monday. Where these people are, what they are doing, and what position they have been appointed to. For instance the Travelling Auditor is getting \$1800, and the First Clerk has gone down to the Statistical Department, we are told, and the job there is slated at \$1600, therefore he is gone to a lower position, and the accountant has been promoted to \$2200. One man goes down and another man goes up. Why not both go down or both go up. One man may be better than another, but I would like to see a fair show. I say that that department ought to be cut out of the estimates altogether. I would ask the Minister to consider that, and give us the necessary information on Monday.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; I agree with the remarks made by Major Cashin. It is just as well to wipe that department out of the estimates altogether. In fact we are saving nothing as it is by this Department.

MR. CASHIN.—If we had the amounts collected just to see how

near their salaries are to it. They may have earned their salaries. I have no doubt but they did.

MR. HALFYARD.—It seems the Statistical Department has received the assistance of two of these men who have lost their positions in the Assessors Department. And they are taken now at reduced salaries. Is that the point.

MR. MOORE.—One is gone up and the other gone down.

MR. HALFYARD.—Is there any change in the accountant.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—No. It is the same person, Mr. John Sinnott.

MR. HALFYARD.—Then there is a misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Moore. He thinks it is a new appointment. Of course if that is the case it is worthy of investigation. I do not think that anyone interested in these officials need worry. I notice in the Auditor General's Report of 33B that two of the men in the Assessor's Department got \$400 each for extra services. What extra services they did in that Department I do not know.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—They may have assisted in another department. Perhaps they were sent out to Corner Brook to hold an investigation.

MR. HALFYARD.—But conditions obtained in this department a day or two previous to the making of these estimates under which their services could be done without. Then if there was nothing for them to do why could they not be sent to Corner Brook or anywhere else. Why did they want to be paid for that. But still because they are sent out there, you not only give them their salaries, but \$400 besides.

MR. MOORE.—Mr Chairman; I may be able to throw some light on this. When the Assessors Department was

made a special department in the Custom House, Sir Michael Cashin appointed Mr. Galway as second in command with Mr. O'Reilley. Mr. Galway received a first class training which fitted him in Sir. Michael Cashin's opinion to be able to do the work that was necessary. Or in other words that office could not function unless Mr. Galway was there. Five years ago Mr. Sinnott comes in. He was put in the office there as Second Clerk, Mr. Cahill died and Mr. Galway was made Accountant and Cashier, and got the \$400 extra. Here now we find that Mr. Sinnott is after taking the job, and Mr. Galway is put down stairs, at a reduced salary, of \$1600. We do not consider that fair. And that is the reason that I take the interest in it and I ask that the vote stand over until Monday.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman my colleague Mr. Moore is just a little out. I think he will remember that the Assessor's Department was organised some ten years ago. Inspector O'Rielley was appointed Assessor, Mr. Cahill was Accountant and Cashier. Mr. Galway was appointed Travelling Auditor. Four or five years ago Mr. Sinnott comes in Mr. Galway after Mr. Cahill had died would naturally go up to his position and now we find that he comes down and goes \$200 below what he was getting, and the other man goes up five or six hundred dollars. I do not know the qualifications of either one of these gentlemen, neither do I care at the present time. But I say that we ought to know if either is more competent than the other. And if one is bad fire him out. But I think that the proper thing to do is to wipe out that department altogether. It should not be there at all. Inspector O'Reilley is a gentleman that has been in the Civil Service for fifty years and he is deserving of a pension. He has given good and faithful service, and

now I think, that considering his age, and the fact that he has not been well of recent years, he will be prepared to take it. The other staff, cut them out. Or else forget doing things in a business like way, as regards cutting down expenditure or anything else. We are only making fools of each other. Now I would make the motion if I am in order that that department be wiped out. It should be. And the duties that are being performed in that department be handed over to the Finance Department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; I may say that after hearing Mr. Cashin, and I believe he is serious, I think that I should consult the Government about cutting this department out, and we could pass this vote here. But I promise him that it would please me very much to see this department go, I think the arrangement could be very easily made, to put it under the Finance Department. I think that the Government will accept my advice on that matter. The vote could go into a drop balance.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I submit, Sir, that you cannot put it into a drop balance, because, if you do, either this Government can play with it and can have it to give to some of their friends; or, possibly, the next Government might want to enforce Income Tax again. I move that the vote for \$6800.00 under the heading of Assessor's Department be wiped out. It is understood of course that, under the present law, the chief of that department, Mr. O'Reilley, will receive his pension which he is entitled to, in view of his long service to the Colony.

Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that last year when the vote for the Pensions Department came before the House I drew attention to the fact that there was an old lady at Cape

Broyle who had lost two sons in the war and her pension was cut last year some ten or fifteen dollars a month. The reason given for the cut was that she had an unmarried son who was out of the country. Even if he was out of the country, I know to my own personal knowledge that he never contributed a cent towards her support for the past ten or fifteen years. In fact she hardly heard from him at all. There were some technicalities about cases of this kind and last year we were told that something was going to be done to effect a remedy with a view to seeing that dependents of deceased soldiers would be treated decently. I do not know what has been done since in connection with this matter by the Government; but I do know that the old lady in question, who is 75 years of age, has not received what she lost of her pension. I would like to hear what the Colonial Secretary has to say on this subject?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I have no distinct recollection of the incident referred to by the Hon. Member for Ferryland, but it must be understood that I have no jurisdiction over the Board of Pension Commissioners. They operate under the Pensions Act and they adjust all matters that come before them from time to time and they have not referred anything to me. For instance, I have a case myself now in which an old man living in the West End of St. John's who was getting a pension all along and recently it was suddenly cut off. I asked Dr. Parsons for an explanation as to why this old man's pension was stopped and I am waiting for a reply. In every case that is brought to the attention of the Pensions Board they will tell you that, under the Act, they were compelled to make an alteration in a pension.

When cases are brought before the Board, such as the one referred to by the member for Ferryland, they usually make enquiries as to their merits and they never make a decision without having thoroughly investigated the surrounding circumstances. The case cited by Major Cashin escaped my memory, but if he wants me to take the matter up with the Pensions Board I am satisfied to do what I can, if he will let me know the name of the woman.

MR. BROWNE—I would like to know if the Board of Commissioners submit a report annually, because I notice increases this year in the amounts to be voted?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Of course we gave the soldiers an understanding that we would make our Pensions Act a facsimile of the Canadian Act. The Canadian Act has been changed considerably and we had to make our Act in conformity with theirs. In recent years children who are born from the mothers of deceased soldiers get a benefit under this Act and this made the necessity for increasing the vote.

I have not received any report thus far from the Board, although there probably will be one. However, I do not think that beyond a statement showing how the money is spent and the amounts paid to the doctors for holding boards, etc., there would not be much else to report.

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 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.

HARBOR REGULATIONS PORT OF ST. JOHN'S.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to "Harbour Regulations and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the resolutions now before the Chair, since the last time the resolutions were before the Chair there were some slight alterations made. I just want to explain these few alterations. In the old resolutions it was said there was to be a Commission of three persons, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Harbor Master and one person connected with trade and shipping. Now it is to be:

Reads:

There is also a change in connection with pilotage to be paid. The old resolutions said it was to be paid gross. Since that time I found out from the pilots that it is always paid net therefore it will be paid on net tonnage in the future. Also another paragraph which stated pilots had to pay \$50.00 for their appointment when they got it first and \$50.00 each year afterwards. That has been altered. I understand it was a misprint and it has been altered to \$5.00 per year instead of \$50.00. That is on page 9.

Reads:

I understand from the pilots they never paid \$50.00, the most they ever paid was \$15.00 each year.

Section 26 page 9 reads:

"No steam or sailing vessels, etc."

Reads:

As the old law read you were supposed to pay \$80.00 if it should be the

maximum amount, for a vessel going out and coming in; although it has been overlooked by the pilots the past fifteen or twenty years. The pilots didn't know themselves they could collect \$80.00 from such a steamer coming in and also going out. The present law as it stands they will collect for steamer over 2800 tons \$80.00 coming in and ten per cent. on going out. Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the collection of pilotage I understand from pilots in the past if a ship came into port, pilotage for coming in was paid as soon as the boat got in, as soon as possible to collect it, but for the ten per cent. on going out they had to wait probably a week, a month, or in some cases six months, before they could get the pilotage paid for going out. Take the case of the Edmund Donald which has never gone out. Now, every ship that comes into the port as soon as in berth the pilot can collect the full amount coming in and going out as well. There are no other changes in these resolutions. The pilotage paid under these regulations is the same as the old; with the exception as I explained under the old law they collect for coming in and going out, but they never did and you can't do that now.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, as I read this Bill on the Harbour we will not have any more improvement in the Harbour than at the present time. The Harbour Master has no more powers under this Act than under the old. He has power to go and shift a schooner but who is going to pay for it. The man who owns the schooner will come along next thing and take the schooner and away he goes with it. Consequently he is coming in to anchor and is going to be a burden on the taxpayers so to speak. There is nothing in the Bill to give money to shift schooners and collect it from the people who own the schooner. This

Commission has to be composed of amongst others the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as Chairman. I am not alluding to the present incumbent of that office, but supposing the holder of that office should be at some time the Member for the North Side of Bonavista Bay, and I belong to Bonavista Bay and I come along and anchor here in the middle of the harbour, in the fairway, and the next thing I know I am up against it, the Harbour Master is after me and I am going to be told to move the schooner, and if the Harbour Master moves it and I am told to pay, well if I can go to my Member and possibly get out of paying I am going to try and do it. That is what is going to happen and therefore I feel in regard to the clearing up of the harbour and making it some way respectable as far as the shipping is concerned there is nothing in at all. It is a mere joke; but first of all there is going to be political pull; and there are going to be no grants under the control of the Commission as regards the shifting of schooners and charging it up to the schooner, the schooner man will come in and take the schooner and go away with it. That is what has happened in the past and I think that is what is going to happen in the future. It is about time that something was done to clean up the harbour. We have two or three eyesores at the present time; and I regret to say one is anchored off our wharf, "The Edmund Donald," a nuisance absolutely in the fair way; and the Harbour Commission whoever they might be have done nothing to move it; and when this Bill is through they will do less; and possibly there are other obstacles in the fairway. These things are badly in need of cleaning up; but as I said this Bill has nothing in it; not a thing; a lot of work in it no doubt, drafting it and so on, but it will accomplish nothing, as far as fix-

ing up the harbour is concerned; not a thing.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member for Ferryland I may say in all fairness to the Harbour Master that he is not to blame, for I know several occasions when the Harbour Master went to move vessels and knew that they should be moved and on going to go about it he got legal advice and was told that the Acts were not strong enough to compel people to move their vessels and bill them for the expenses. I am not a lawyer but I am told by the legal fraternity if put into effect this Bill will enable the Harbour Commission to move any vessels and collect expenses from different vessels.

MR. CASHIN—Supposing for argument's sake, a vessel is in the way opposite my premises and I object to the Harbour Commission and they tell me "alright go ahead and move it." It is going to cost \$25.00 say to move, well, who is going to pay it? Where is the money coming from?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—These resolutions say the man who owns the vessel has to pay.

MR. CASHIN—That is the point. The man who owns it will say he is not going to pay if he can use any political influence to get clear.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Political influence may be used but as far as I am concerned I say it won't. In any case there will be two other commissioners besides the Minister of Fisheries, and three is a quorum and if two decide against the Minister well he is overruled. As far as I am concerned we were very anxious and Captain English was very anxious to move vessels and we were told if we moved them and it went to Court the Government would have to pay. The law wasn't strong enough

and we were powerless. Only yesterday a vessel went over to the south-side to get salt and got the salt aboard and got its chain caught on an old hulk, and before it was possible to get clear it lost 15 fathoms of chain and anchor.

Personally I don't think that state of affairs would exist provided there were two good men with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If two good men were appointed surely the Bill, as I am told by legal authorities, is strong enough to let the Harbour Master take charge and remove a vessel. Surely the law of this country would give a decision in favour of the Board.

As far as the fishermen are concerned I know that there is very little trouble to get the various masters to move their vessels. Captain English has told me that he has asked various masters to move their vessels and they have moved without any trouble. There was a vessel in the way when the "Nerissa" was coming in to-day and we asked the Captain to move a few hundred yards astern and he hoisted his anchor up and let his vessel drop astern. The trouble is not with the fishermen but with the owners and merchants of St. John's, who have vessels anchored here and that we would all probably like to see removed. We have tried to move them but Captain English has been told by several legal people that he could not force them to move.

I am quite certain that if these resolutions are made law the conditions will be very much improved and of that there is no doubt whatever.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I would like to bring to the attention of the House and the Hon. Minister. I have discussed the matter with him already and I would like to bring it before the

House this afternoon, I refer to the amount to be paid the Board of \$500 to be divided up amongst three for their services in connection with the Harbour, and they could do any amount of work in the Harbour if they only cleared it out.

I think the sum is a very small amount to be divided up amongst three men.

I just mention it because I think it would be well for the House of Assembly or the Government to consider something more in the way of remuneration.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the Hon. Member for Trinity I must say that I am of the same opinion. I think the amount is very small. The Government thought probably that it was the best that they could do and I have been told that people are prepared to take it for no pay, but I say it right here now that the time is coming in this country if you are going to have a Board for any purpose whatever it has got to be paid or it is just as well not to have a Board at all. And, personally as far as I am concerned I think the day has arrived when you have got to pay them or they are no use to the country.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is ex officio Chairman of the Board, should not be paid for his services and I think the amount should be divided between the other two.

I don't want to deprive the Hon. Minister sitting opposite me now because he says himself this afternoon that he might not be there. But I think that the money should be divided amongst the other two.

Anyway I don't know if the Minister can receive it.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman; I don't know I am sure.

I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whoever he may be, who comes down some night for four or five hours on Commission meeting, out of line of his regular business. I don't see why he should not be paid for it.

MR. LAKE.—He is paid for it.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No he is not. He is paid to work from ten o'clock in the morning until four in the afternoon.

I don't consider, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister of Marine & Fisheries gets a salary as all other people, when he is working after hours for other purposes than his regular business, I don't see why he should not be paid for it as well as the others.

DR. MOSDELL.—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there is any provision made for the payment of Ministers in a capacity such as that of a member of the Board. Is there any disability upon him or do these provisions protect him from that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; It does not effect him because the Minister automatically is precluded. A minister is under exemption and any further salaries do not in any way interfere with his status. Because a minister in addition to his work performs any other duties for which he is paid, does not warrant forfeiting his salary. You might say that once whitewashed he is whitewashed for all he can grab.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; Do I understand the Hon. Minister to say that the Minister had power to pursue other duties that bring with them other payments governed by a general arrangement such as this.

Does not that throw the doors rather wide open?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the point I made is this, the only general principal is that the idea may be known that the man is under pay; that is the whole idea and that is the reason why, so that prevents somebody from having several jobs and what otherwise might be called a sub rosa situation. Of course here, the Minister would not be receiving the public funds unnoticed.

That is the whole point that it should be known at large that he should be paid as a public servant.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is nothing different here than in the case of myself and two or three other members who receive \$5,000 a year for sitting on the Railway Commission, while we draw our other salaries.

MR. BROWNE—But is there the same amount of work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They will not have the same amount of work. I have no doubt that they will have very little work to do and probably as little as the directors of a local company would have. Generally they would have six or seven directors of a local company and they are probably paid \$1,000 to \$1,200 between them for sitting at a meeting once a month, and while there may be a little extra work in making resolutions in the early stages of its existence, I think that the Commission will have very little to do if they have a good Harbor Master who is alive to his work. They only need make enquiries that he is alive to his work and probably meet once a month and that will be the work of the Commission. We have had a Pilot Commission in St. John's—Mr. Job, Mr. Shea and somebody else—but they have never met for years, and as a Pilot Commission it is simply absurd.

I think that they should get two good men with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, men who take an interest in the harbor, and if they take an interest, to see that the Harbor Master is doing his work well, and if there should be any complaint from the trade particularly, they should get the Harbor Master and have the matter decided.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, before the Prime Minister spoke, I was just going to say that this Commission would probably have one meeting a month and \$500 would give them \$14 for each person each meeting, and a man who gets paid \$14 for a few hours work is doing very well.

I am very glad to see the Minister has changed the original resolution and taken the Harbour Master off the Commission. I suppose the Harbour Master is now a servant of the Commission to carry out their instructions.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an explanation from the Minister as to what would be included in the phrase "connected with trade and shipping." The reason that I ask this is that the Minister in the course of his remarks this afternoon stated that the city merchants are the people who give the most trouble, and they would hardly be suitable persons to put on the Commission if in fact they were the most troublesome.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Member it is hard for me to say just what that would be.

I think it would be taken for granted that the Board of Trade would be asked to nominate a couple of men and then it would be up to the Governor in Council if they would accept them or not.

MR. BRADLEY—The Board of Trade doesn't appear in the matter at all. I would like to know what is the width of the phrase "trade and shipping."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would say that the proper type of man to get there would be an ex-master or any man who has a general working knowledge of the Harbour. He need not be in business or anything of that kind at all.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I would like to comment on.

The Honourable Minister in his remarks in connection with this Bill has told us about the trouble that masters of schooners had in the Harbour when their anchors get caught in the chains of vessels moored around the Harbour.

Then again I know that it is a very difficult thing to shift a ship down the Harbour at night, more especially during the winter when the schooners are anchored in every part of the Harbour. And that is one way in which the Bill will be a great benefit for the people shifting vessels here. Not only are the fishermen benefited by not having their anchors caught in the chains of the different ships moored around the place, but there will not be so much difficulty in the Harbour for the larger ships. I remember when the "Metagama" came here a few years ago. They had very great difficulty in getting her up the harbour without hitting some of the vessels that were in the Harbour anchored and beating in the Narrows. And that is why I hold that the men acting on the Harbour Commission should be given the broadest powers to do anything they like in the Harbour, because of the difficulty that people have in getting around. And I consider that the pilots are going to benefit considerably by having a clear Harbour

more or less, when moving big ships around.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Does the Honourable Member think that this Bill does not give them as much power as they should have.

CAPT. RANDALL—I think it does if they can only enforce it.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman; I may say that I do not want to be misunderstood, in saying that these resolutions are brought in more for the benefit of the fishermen than the trade. I did not intend to convey that. It is not because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, that it should mean that. That does not make very much difference. But certainly I do agree with the Hon. Member that it is quite a problem for any man to get a ship of any size up or down the harbor even in the winter time. If this bill is not strong enough it is not my fault, because I asked the Minister of Justice to make it as strong as he possibly could. Hitherto we had no power to remove vessels that might be moored in the harbor, and I felt that the Minister who might come after me should be given a chance instead of my being blamed, when I was not responsible for it. I had no power.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the Resolutions.

On motion this report was received and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Harbor Regulations for the Port of St. John's" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that that said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. The Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would, on Tuesday next, move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 21st instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 21st, 1928.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER presented a petition from the Northern Products Co., Ltd., praying for the introduction of legislation in the Company's interest.

On motion this petition was received, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Select Committee to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House in relation to private bills have been complied with.

MR. SPEAKER appointed the Select Committee as follows:—Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Hickman, Capt. Randell.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Government has given any consideration to the petition presented to the Government about the time the House opened, by the Trinity Bay Mining and Development Company, Ltd. These people claim that they have a large deposit of coal in Trinity Bay, and I understand they petitioned the Government asking for some assistance in the way of development for the purpose of seeing if

the coal is there in commercial and workable quantities. The mine is situated in Earle's Cove, Trinity Bay.

I think some consideration should be given to the petition, at least Dr. Baker should go over the property, if he hasn't done so, to see if the property is valuable and is worth the consideration of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In reply to the honorable gentleman, the Government haven't given any definite decision on the matter. I wrote a letter to these people myself telling them that my view was that while the Government was giving money to St. George's Coal Fields to try if there was coal in that particular section and to try and develop it, I didn't think they would be likely to branch out into any other assistance to mineral development at the present time, because I fancy if the Government is to be looked to for the development of mineral resources wherever reported as regards coal, we would be asked to do it for every mineral in the country. We have encroached, and former governments have encroached, in making an attempt to help out privately-owned enterprises in certain cases, which in a sense sets a precedent, but I don't think the Government should go further. However, I don't think there is the slightest objection to having Dr. Baker see if there is any coal on the property and if he should report favorably the Government Geologist's report might be of some value to these people. That is what we are trying to do in connection with Dr. Baker's work.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, if anything can be done to start an industry in Trinity Bay it would be a great benefit to the people who reside there and also indirectly to the coun-

try at large. With regard to any possible coal areas at Earle's Cove, Trinity District, I think the Government would be doing what is expected of them to ask Dr. Baker to investigate and make a report.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled:

Report of Tourist and Publicity Commission.

Returns of Insurance Companies for year ending December 31st, 1927.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925."

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 Highroads Commission Act, 1925."

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 85 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series).

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

Department of Customs	\$552,546.00
Department of Pension Commissioners.....	629,550.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF WHOLE ON PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; When I introduced this Bill for the second reading, last week I explained as far as possible the object and meaning of the Bill.

In submitting the Bill to the Committee there are one or two slight alterations that I would suggest as we go along.

The first of these is in section 4 sub-section 3, which provides for the

payment of registration fees. There is no amount mentioned in this section but I intend to suggest that this amount should not exceed \$10.00 per annum.

Section 5 which refers to persons eligible for registration states that certificates shall be granted to those who hold a diploma from any recognized College of Optometry and who have practiced optometry in this Colony for the period of three years next before the passing of this Act. I propose to ask the House to change that three years to two years as it is considered that there are some qualified optometrists who have not been in the country more than two years.

Then Section 16 refers to persons convicted in any Court of Justice either in this Colony or elsewhere of any indictable offence shall forfeit his place upon the register. To make that expression clear, because persons may be indicated for an offence not of a criminal nature, for instance, under the Highroads Act any person may be indicated for accident or something unforeseen and in that way these persons practice of optometry may be damaged. So we propose to add the words "involving moral turpitude, in the opinion of the Board". The Board will be the judges.

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman that this Bill be now read.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; In reference to this Bill I am very glad personally to see that there is a movement being made in this direction because in very great many cases and particularly in the outports, where the people have not the opportunity to come in contact with or avail of the services of a thoroughly trained optometrist, the people are being imposed upon by all kinds of quack doctors selling cheap glasses and cheap tests, and one way and another

are doing more damage to the people's eyes than good.

There is more damage being done to the people's eyesight generally than good. Nevertheless while I am on this point I may say and that was my purpose in rising, that I find it difficult to see where in this Bill that is going to be stopped. Those of us in the Outports know that never a mail comes into the Outports, but that so many pairs of glasses come in from somewhere in the States or Canada, and a measuring rule to test one's own eyes etc. I do not want to see any hardship imposed on people in that respect. If a man wants to buy a pair of glasses he should be free to do so, but I would like to know where this Bill takes cognizance of this situation. I just repeat what I said in the beginning, that I believe there are a great many quacks imposing on the people, and that there are a great many in the long run worse off after they have spent their money on glasses. That is a thing you are up against.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The point is well taken by the Hon. Member. It is quite true that a great deal of damage is being done people who are unsuspecting victims of all kinds of quacks going around the country pretending that they can fit glasses, and that is the man that this Bill aims at. It is to stop people pretending they know something they do not know, but there is nothing to prevent a man going into a store and buying a pair of glasses if he wants to. The main idea in introducing the Bill is to stop people who are using all kinds of devices in order to deceive the public.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I want to congratulate the Minister on having charge of such measure as this, which I regard as a step in advance. I would like the Hon.

Member for St. Barbe to know that a great deal of imposition is being practised by ignorant people who are going around representing themselves as being able to examine eyes, and fit glasses, and in this way doing a great deal of damage to the eyesight of those whom they are attending. A few weeks ago I got in touch with a friend of mine in Southern Ontario, and thereby I got a copy of the Ontario Optometry Act. So strongly did I feel about this matter, and after mentioning the matter to the Minister of Justice, he informed me that the Colonial Secretary had such a Bill to introduce into this House. From the standpoint of injury done to people, I have in mind the case of a fisherman in the District of Fortune Bay who a few months ago told me that one of these gentlemen representing themselves as being an Optometrist had been in that District, and had recommended to him a certain pair of glasses he had, and had sold them to this man for something like \$18.00. He had taken the money from him and had left these glasses with him with the result that some weeks later I had to get the man down here and have his eyes tested and proper glasses fitted. I think that sort of practice should be stopped. I look upon this Bill as going a long way towards stopping this practice, and for that reason I give it my heartiest support. There are some amendments to some of the sections that I would like to make, and when we come to those sections as the Bill is being read I can then make the suggestions .

Mr. Chairman, in sub-section 3 of section 4 there is set down the maximum fee as regards registration certificates and so on ab initio. What would be the position as regards renewal? The annual renewal of certificates?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is what that means. I take it that is what is meant: (Reads: "Fees for——Said fees shall not exceed.")

DR. MOSDELL.—Fees for examination and registration in respect of the Medical Board come to something like \$30. or \$40. but the annual fee for renewal once one has passed examinations and become registered in only \$5.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I see what you mean. It would provide for a renewal or annual fee not exceeding \$10.00. A man who pays \$20. when granted his first registration and gets certificates and so on, should on the annual renewal of these certificates pay say \$10.00.

DR. MOSDELL.—The point I made is very practical in view of paragraph 10, under which if a man doesn't pay his annual fees his name can be stricken from the register; just as if he had been guilty of what the Colonial Secretary has referred to as moral turpitude. So the question of what should be paid for certificates year by year is a very important point.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I think the point is well taken because the addition is not sufficiently explanatory. The section as it was originally provided for paying registration, certificates and examination. Supposing we say that no charge be more than \$10. for registration and in addition they cannot charge more than \$10. annual fee.

DR. MOSDELL.—In the Ontario Act the fee for examination and registration is set down as \$50. and the fee for annual renewal is one fifth of that amount. Perhaps we might strike the same balance or a little more; even if it was made 50 per cent; the yearly fee not to exceed \$5.00.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I suppose that the Board will have expenses, advertising, making reports, and other things and we don't want to limit them to insufficient funds to carry on. I say the registration fee might be \$20.00 and the annual fee \$10.00. That is not exceeding \$20.00 for registration and not exceeding \$10.00 for annual fee.

DR. MOSDELL.—Does not section 10 rather clash with 4. I think as a matter of fact that the whole of section 10 is objectionable. There may be circumstances under which a man may unavoidably get in arrears and he then immediately forfeits his rights. The word used is the imperative "shall". Why not put it at the discretion of the Board to dismiss him if in arrears and say that on payment of arrears he "shall" be reinstated.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

(Reads section from Bill:)

He has a comeback if the Board desires him; but you must penalise people if they don't carry out the terms under which they are made members. Falling into arrears doesn't entail absolute dismissal because a man has an appeal and he may be reinstated on payment of his fee if the Board accepts them. I think it is in the interests of the Board and desirable to have that section.

DR. MOSDELL.—I don't see the force of making it imperative. A man may be absent from the country a day or a week after the time to pay his fees and by reason of that forfeit his rights to practise. Even if he does come back and wants to pay up, the Board if it likes can refuse to restore him. I submit the sub-section be changed to read.

(Reads)

That gives the Board a chance to go into all the circumstances but members shall be replaced on payment of

arrears of fees. If there is no other charge against a man why shouldn't it be incumbent on the Board to restore that man to the right to practise if he pays up his arrears of fees. It has been suggested that the right may never be exercised but if you can make an Act as right as possible why not do it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

A man in town in a society, in any old thing at all loses his rights if he doesn't pay his fees. If a man has the right to practise why not pay fees.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; Suppose for the sake of argument, that a person who is duly registered here, leaves this country for four years and then wants to come back again. Would he have to pay four or five years arrears?

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Surely this clause would not give the Board power to compromise the matter of arrears, in the face of that.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I expect it would.

Surely a man who has been here practising under this Act should not be compelled to pay when he is out of the country.

Suppose he is not doing very well and thinks that he will do better in Nova Scotia and he goes there and after a while he comes back here again to Newfoundland, he would be in a bad position if he was not allowed to practice until his arrears were paid.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; that is just the point that I referred to.

By the reading of the section 10 it makes it imperative for the Board to remove members names from the register for non-payment of fees and the Board must act at its discretion as to whether they will restore the name when the fees are paid.

MR. W. J. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman; Might I suggest that you alter this section to read "shall be liable to forfeit his place on the register".

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I suggest that the section read "may, at the discretion of the Board forfeit his place on the Registrar, but the name shall be placed on the Registrar on payment of arrears".

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 on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Harbor Regulations for the Port of St. John's," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Petition of the Wabana Light Company, Ltd. as follows:-

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited, beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and find that the rules of the House respecting notice have been complied with, and recommend that leave be given to introduce the annexed draft by way of Resolutions by a Committee of the Whole House.

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS,
W. J. BROWNE,
G. F. GRIMES,
W. J. WALSH,
W. E. BROPHY.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

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 respecting the Wabana Light & Power Company Limited.

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 22nd 1928,

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

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Speaker; I have on my desk here quite a number of petitions from the residents of various settlements in the District of Fogo asking for the sum of \$5,000.00 for the deepening and widening of the canal at Fogo. This matter is so very well known to Hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House particularly those who represent northern constituencies that it will be hardly necessary for me to dwell on the matter, if it weren't for the fact that not only is the district of Fogo interested but this canal really takes on a national complexion; it is a public utility that will serve not only the District of Fogo but Twillingate and Bonavista as well. I don't suppose there is a fisherman along the whole of that northeastern fishing coast but would give his influence and vote to bring about the construction of that canal.

I want, Mr. Chairman, to be clearly understood, that this is not purely a district matter. It is a matter in which I think the Government should interest themselves not merely from the standpoint of some local benefit to the people of Fogo but the whole of

the fishing population of the North who at some time or other have to pass through that canal. As it is well known. Fogo is situated in the neighbourhood of some very fine fishing grounds. Take for instance Little Fogo Islands, where we find people from all along that section fishing, and they have found it very difficult to come around Fogo Head because of the reefs there and the shallow water and in stormy weather it is very difficult for small boats to negotiate this very dangerous situation and consequently they go into Fogo Harbour and wait until the weather moderates sufficiently to allow them to go on. I think that I am safe in saying that thousands of dollars worth of fish are lost annually to the fishermen of the district of Fogo and the adjoining districts because of the fact that they have not been able to get home with their catch whereas they could go on if they could go through the passage of the canal. I have been there in Fogo myself when I have seen as high as fifteen boats that have been forced to remain there for safety waiting for an opportunity to get around the Head. It is a very boisterous section. I passed down there last fall in a motor boat from Change Islands and I shall never forget the sight. The whole section was alive with seas breaking around everywhere and I am sure that if any members of the Executive Government had been in that boat they would have been better able to see for themselves the great necessity of building that canal to avoid going around the Head. That is exactly what the canal stands for. As a matter of fact the necessity is wide-spread. It is most general. I understand that there are petitions coming in from Twillingate, Lewisporte, Fogo, Greenspond, etc. I have been asked to present these

petitions and I understand there is another one from Herring Neck making the same request.

The history of this canal dates back for many years. I cannot tell the date exactly but it must be over thirty years ago that an attempt was made to deepen that canal to allow fishermen to pass through the channel. As the boats passed through the canal it was found that it was necessary to put a draw-bridge there to accommodate the boats with spars. The canal when widened and deepened first would only permit very small fishing boats to pass through at highwater.

Since I have had the honour to represent the district of Fogo, I have persistently asked the Government of the day to widen the canal to permit larger boats to pass through, and same time in the summer of 1923 in the regime of office of Mr. Grimes as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the sum of \$10,000 was voted for the completion of the canal.

The last Government went out of office in the spring of 1924 and I understand that the present Government then undertook to spend that money. A marine superintendent was sent down and under his supervision between \$4,000 and \$5,000 (I stand subject to correction) of the \$10,000 was expended in the summer of 1924, largely in building two wharves and providing certain timber and lumber. Very little was done with the canal itself. The other \$6,000, I suppose must have been expended on marine works in other sections of the country.

All that the petitioners are asking for now, Mr. Speaker, is the return of the money that was taken from the district at that time.

The petitions which I have before me at the present moment are largely signed by the residents of Change Islands, Great Harbour, Joe Batts Arm,

Clarenville, Greenspond and Fogo. The petition from Fogo has about three hundred names. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that the request is a very reasonable one.

I think that in the district last year expenditure amounted to about \$16,000. We took from that about \$5,000 and that is now deposited in the Bank of Nova Scotia in Fogo to the credit of the canal. All that is required is another \$5,000 to complete the canal. I have here a map that I have taken some trouble to obtain, which is a diagram of the harbour and which also shows the canal and gives approximately the amount of matter which must be removed, amounting, according to the map, to forty thousand cubic feet, in order to make it possible for the ordinary fishing boats to pass through, particularly what is known as jack boats.

Now if the Government would take \$5,000 of the grant, and I would like the Prime Minister to bear this in mind, because I feel sure that he will be sympathetic to it, and place it to the credit of this project, which is not only serving the district of Fogo but also the district that the Honourable Prime Minister himself represents and the district of Twillingate. I think that it is only fair that the general public of the country should at least contribute another \$5,000. This project is just as country-wide and national in character as public wharf at Grand Bank, which was necessary and which the Government spent considerable money on. They did not apply the grant of that particular district to the building of the wharf because the project was too great. The same applies to the breakwater at Twillingate. And I might name some other similar projects around the country which were not built out of

the district grant. It was quite impossible.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—Does the Hon Member think we would be justified in taking this money out of the grant for the encouragement of the fisheries?

MR. HIBBS.—I think so. These people are down there working and fishing and doing their very best to produce something and to help themselves and I think that at least they should get some encouragement. But I would for a moment call the attention of the House to the fact that Fogo district has made an honest endeavour to be independent. I think that everybody will agree with me in that respect. Looking under the Public Accounts for the year 1926-27 I notice that taking all the districts in Newfoundland you find that the amount paid out during that year in able bodied relief amounted to something like \$15,000 for the districts. Out of that Fogo got \$188.00. I find again that during the present winter since the first of January, according to information tabled in this House in answer to a question, the amount of money expended for the districts for able-bodied assistance amounted to \$8,000, out of which the sum of \$7.55 went to Fogo district. While, as I said before I don't want to go on to that matter, I merely quote those figures to show that the people there are working and trying to support themselves and should be given some consideration when asking for a public utility of that kind.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we do not benefit by the railway in the district of Fogo. If there is any district that is absolutely isolated it is the district of Fogo. We do not benefit by the high roads because we don't regard the district as being a tourist attraction.

When taking these facts into consideration I think that it will be generally agreed that this summer, the project should be advanced.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to take up so much time but the importance of this matter is my apology for delaying the House so long and I thank you very much for your courtesy. I have had quite a number of messages from all over the district. These messages were sent to me urging me to place the matter before the Government in the strongest possible manner and endeavour to get the money granted in order that the work could get started at the earliest possible period of the year so that the people would be able to benefit by it.

According to the diagram, which I will place in the hands of the Prime Minister and the other members of the Executive Government, so as to give them a better idea, the exact situation will be seen. Capt. Windsor being a seafaring man knows that place very well and I feel sure will be very glad to give the matter his support because he knows the value the canal will be to the northern people.

My Hon. friend, Mr. Long, who is associated with Fogo in a business way, has first hand knowledge of the necessity of that project and I feel sure that he will be very happy to support the matter. I am looking to him and trust that he will not fail me in doing his very utmost because it is to his interest as a business man down there to have the canal put through.

Mr. Speaker, in giving this petition my very honest and hearty support I ask the Government to give the matter their immediate attention because its very nature demands that it should not be put off too long. By and By we will have the fishery and we will have the same trouble as last

year. There is \$5,000 on hand and with another \$5,000 we would be able to get the canal going and it would be of great benefit to the fishermen during the fishing season.

HON. MR. LONG.—Mr. Speaker, I, also, wish to add my support to the prayer of this petition. Members of this House cannot fully realize the worth that this canal is to the people of Fogo and the adjacent settlements. I just want to throw out a suggestion to the Hon. the Prime Minister, that, as there is a vote of \$200,000.00 for the improvement of the fisheries, I do not think that it could be expended in any better way than if the Government were to allocate \$5,000.00 of that \$200,000.00 towards construction of this canal. The proposition affects the whole northern coast, in fact, all around the whole of Fogo Island, and I hope that before the summer commences some effort will be made to complete this canal. The honorable member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, has already deposited in the Bank of Nova Scotia \$5,000.00, and I agree with him that if we had another \$5,000.00 that canal could be put in condition so that the boats, at least the fishing boats, could pass through in safety, instead of going around Fogo Island. I trust that this petition will not be overlooked, and I hope that the members of the Government, especially the Executive, will give it their consideration when it comes before them.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I, also, wish to associate myself with the honorable introducer of the petition and the Hon. Mr. Long. The necessity for a canal to be made at Fogo for fishing boats that pass through there and other boats that have to do business there, has been so exhaustively and so clearly dealt with by Mr. Hibbs, that it is unnecessary for me to use any words to im-

press upon the Government the necessity of something being done. I feel quite sure that with the support of the Hon. Mr. Long, a member of the Executive, that something will be done so that the work can be undertaken in the near future.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the prayer of the petition presented by the honorable member for Fogo. And I have just been asked to present a similar petition signed by the residents of Herring Neck in the District of Twillingate. Now, I agree that allocations from votes such as the vote for the encouragement of the fisheries, would be very wisely spent in this manner, not only in connection with this particular canal at Fogo, but there are two or three other canals down in that vicinity which need a certain amount of money, in order that they can be fixed up, particularly the canal at Pike's Arm and Twillingate proper. I hope and trust that the Government will see its way clear in order that the canals may get certain sums of money that will help the fishermen to use these canals daily.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word to say in reference to that canal. Of course it is well known in this House that I am always in favor of anything for the benefit of the fisheries. But this canal, with one or two others in the country, should have been built years ago in my opinion. I have listened to Mr. Hibbs speaking on behalf of this canal and I am glad to know that he is so well informed in reference to the difficulty that fishermen have in getting to and from the fishing grounds. The people around Change Islands and other parts of the Bay that could go through the canal, especially in the month of August, would be saved a lot of expense, therefore, when the

Government has money to spend on the improvement of the fisheries, I consider that that is one of the best ways that they can spend it. Other canals in the country are equally badly needed. I, therefore, strongly endorse this petition and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to allocate this sum.

SCHOOL REPORTS.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Superintendents of the United Church Schools, and also the report of the Salvation Army Board of Education.

I want to say, at the same time, that I am sorry that up to the present the Educational Report is not in printed form. However, I hope to have it here by Monday. I think that when honorable members read the Educational Report they will find that it is the best Educational Report that has probably ever been made in the history of the country. I want, also, to say to the House, and I take this opportunity of making the announcement, that as a result of the efforts of the Bureau of Education, we have persuaded the Carnegie Institute to increase the donation from fifteen thousand to twenty thousand for the next two years. It will be remembered that the Carnegie Institute gave us towards the Memorial College an amount of \$15,000.00 per year for five years. We have been keeping in very close touch with that Institute, and I think that probably the country does not realize the great work that the men who composed the Bureau of Education have done for the last few years in the way of approaching and gaining the sympathy of the Carnegie Institute in all they have done. I think that if the benefit of that College to this Island is proved, that at the end of five years they are

likely to get a capital sum allotted to this country of four hundred thousand dollars, the interest on which assisting the work of the Memorial College forever. I would like to remind the House, also, that by the efforts that have been made by the Superintendents of Education, we have in the last two years, or within a year in fact, got a further amount of five thousand dollars from the Carnegie Institute for a circulating library, and there was four thousand dollars given by them last year for the conduction of a Summer School. The honorable member for St. Barbe said the other day, and I very much sympathize with his remarks, that he hoped that if there was any more money to be voted for education, that it would be devoted to elementary education. I am very strong in favor of elementary education, and I will give it every assistance I can, but I do not think that anything could benefit elementary education more than by bringing teachers here to St. John's to be educated in the art of teaching, and that is what the Summer School and the Normal School stand for. I do not think there is any question of the great benefit to school teachers from the Outports effected by putting them in contact with the very excellent and capable teachers that we have in the Memorial College today.

I hope it will be possible for us to continue the Summer School for all time to come, and I feel that the Colony owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Carnegie Institute for what they have done for us.

Mr. Raymond Gushue, Solicitor, appeared at the Bar of the House and asked leave to present a petition on behalf of the Labrador Marine Shell Company, Ltd., praying that the petition of the Northern Products Co., Ltd., for the passage of a Bill grant-

ing certain exclusive rights on Labrador may not be granted. Permission being granted, the said petition was read by the Clerk, and on motion, was received.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

BUDGET SPEECH.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman—When last addressing the Committee of the Whole House on Ways and Means, I took opportunity of making a complete review of the financial activities of the Government since its inception to office in 1924. My speech this afternoon will therefore be much briefer, inasmuch as it will be confined to those fiscal matters which have been the subject of the Government's care during the past fiscal year 1926-1927, the operations during the current year 1927-1928, and our anticipated requirements for the coming year 1928-1929.

Public Accounts 1926—1927

An examination of the public accounts for the financial year 1926-1927, which were recently laid on the table of the House, will show that the estimates of revenue and expenditure appearing in my last Budget are substantially correct; and it will be remembered that I assured honorable members that these Estimates had been prepared with the same particular care which had marked the figures of the two years preceding. The result of the year's operations has been that the anticipated deficit of \$1,751,000.00 predicted by me as likely to accrue, has been reduced to \$1,600,975.41, a difference of approx-

imately \$150,000.00. Further, if we deduct the sum of \$30,719.55, which was included in the 1926-27 account by reason of the omission from the Supplementary Estimates for the previous year, the actual deficits will be reduced to \$1,570,353.86, or \$186,000.00 on the right side of our Estimates. It will thus be seen that I have tried to follow to the best of my ability the extremely safe practice of estimating current revenue collections as somewhat less than the possible, and departmental expenditures at the maximum figure. As a matter of fact, the 1927 Budget estimated the Revenue for that year from all sources at \$8,853,000.00, but the actual revenue received amounted to \$8,932,435.46. We had allowed for our principal item of revenue the Customs, a total of \$7,300,000.00, whereas the sum collected by the Department was \$7,321,512.52, a signal proof of the fact that conservative methods were employed in the matter of estimating revenue. A comparison of actual receipts with those sums estimated last year, shows that we really received \$106,678.34 more revenue from certain sources than was forecast in the Budget, and that the net result on all hands was that we collected \$79,435.46 more than was anticipated.

Reviewing the estimated expenditure for the fiscal year 1926-1927, we find that on this side of the account a similarly fortunate condition of affairs exists. On page 4 of last year's Budget it will be noted by honorable members that the estimated expenditure on current account was \$10,604,000.00. The amount expended when the Colony's books were closed in October last amounted to \$10,533,408.87, a sum less by \$70,591.13 than we expected to have to pay for our annual requirements. While this amount may appear insignificant when

the total expenditure of the Colony is considered, yet it seems to me a matter for congratulation that the expending departments continue to evidence a careful supervision over the growing expenditure by curtailing everything that savors of extravagance. Adding the amount short estimated in the revenue (\$79,435.46) and the sum saved on current expenditure (\$70,591.13) to the amount omitted from previous year's Supply (\$30,719.55) we arrive at the sum by which the 1926-1927 deficit was reduced, or about \$180,000.00.

While we may congratulate ourselves that the revenue and expenditure statements for the fiscal year 1926-1927 have resulted so favorably as compared with the prospects outlined last year, yet on the other hand a careful study of similar comparative statements for some years past, as contained in the Appendix to this Speech, should be a matter of concern to honorable members and ought to tend to discourage extraordinary public expenditures of any kind that are not of a productive nature. Take, for example, the year 1925-1926 as compared with 1926-1927. In the former year we collected from all sources the sum of \$9,752,551.28. During the fiscal year 1926-1927 the total collections amounted to \$8,932,435.46, a decrease of \$820,115.82. On the other hand the current expenditure increased from \$9,865,167.34 in 1925-1926 to \$10,533,406.87, an increase of \$668,241.53. The decrease in revenue received on account of Customs, as compared with 1925-1926 amounts to \$469,022.10, as compared with 1924-1925 the shortage is \$675,460.03. The following are the actual figures for the three years from 1924, together with the estimated Customs Revenue for 1927-1928, viz:—

Customs Revenue

1924-1925	\$7,996,972.55
1925-1926	7,790,533.62
1926-1927	7,321,512.52
1927-1928 (estimated)	8,500,000.00

As I have informed the House on other occasions, the accounts for 1924-1925, and part of the fiscal year 1925-1926 have included many thousands of dollars which were credited on account of revenue from previous years, and this of course in a large measure accounts for the shortage in revenue for 1926-1927. It is very gratifying, therefore, to note that the present year's collections (1927-1928) show an increase of nearly half a million dollars to February 28th without the addition of other than ordinary current business.

	1925-26	1926-27
Import Duties	\$7,602,451.25	\$7,235,675.82
Light Dues	40,562.53	39,912.94
Harbor Dues	1,146.00	1,157.00
Miscellaneous	146,151.84	43,222.72
Export Duty	222.00	1,544.04
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total for 1925-1926	\$7,790,533.62	\$7,321,512.52
Total for 1926-1927	7,321,512.52	
	<hr/>	
Decrease	\$ 469,021.10	

It will be seen from the above that there was a large falling off in importation during the fiscal year 1926-1927. The subhead of miscellaneous Customs Revenue also shows a decrease, due to the fact that old arrears due in revenue were credited to the fiscal year 1925-1926, and those of course were not available for 1926-1927.

Decreased revenue was also received on account of Liquor Traffic by the Board of Liquor Control. These profits dropped from \$410,276.95 to \$350,000.00. Estate or Death Duties showed a decrease of \$59,468.83; but

The principal items of increase in the Revenue for 1926-1927 were Postal Revenue \$18,207.47, due principally to increases in stamp sales, increased delivery fees on dutiable parcels and the introduction of the Parcel Post Insurance scheme, the fees for which are paid in stamps; and \$54,347.40 on account of Business Profits Tax, being payment of arrears due the Assessor's Department.

The largest item of decrease in the Revenue as compared with the previous year (1925-1926) was the Customs, and the following comparative statement shows the several heads under which the collections were made:—

this it will be readily seen, is a fluctuating source of revenue and one that cannot be closely estimated during any year. However, as will be noted from the amounts for 1927-1928 with which I shall now proceed to deal, this condition of affairs is much improved. Importations have increased in volume and value, with the consequent result that our current revenue for the fiscal year 1927-1928 will be very much greater than the amount collected during 1926-1927.

Revenue 1927—1928

I estimate that the total amount that we shall receive from all sources

for the fiscal year ending June 30th next, to be the sum of ten million, two hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars, made up as follows:—

Customs	\$ 8,500,000
Postal Revenue	380,000
Telegraph Revenue	190,000
Crown Lands Revenue.....	170,000
Inland Revenue Stamps.....	50,000
Board of Liquor Control....	360,000
Fines and Forfeitures.....	5,000
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	3,000
Taxes and Assessments.....	70,000
Fees from Public Institu-	
tions	45,000
Death Duties	50,000
Bank and Trust Companies	73,500
Landed Estate Tax from	
Assessor's Department....	5,500
Fire Insurance Tax.....	15,500
Business Profits & Income	
Tax Arrears	14,500
Miscellaneous Revenue	300,000
	<hr/>
Total	\$10,232,000

As has been the case with the Revenue Statement for 1926-1927 just referred to, the above figures for 1927-1928 are closely estimated, and if our collections on account of import duties keep their present upward tread, it is not at all impossible but that they will be better than at present anticipated. The statements supplied me by the Deputy Minister of Finance to the end of February show an increase of roughly over half a million dollars covering an eight month period of this estimate, and it is therefore not too much to hope, in view of the usual heavy spring importations due to arrive, that the above figure of \$10,232,000.00 will be reached if not exceeded. For my part I shall not be surprised, as all Estimates of Revenue appearing in the Budgets since 1924 have been a little on the short side.

The Public Service Act submitted to the House last year provided in original estimates the sum of \$10,087,410.49 to meet the current expenses of the Colony. Honorable members will be asked to supplement this appropriation by the sum of approximately \$540,000.00, thus providing for a total expenditure under legislative votes of \$10,627,410.49.

To this total legislative appropriation must be added a further sum of \$185,000.00 which it is estimated will have to be spent under Special Warrant on authority of Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act for the relief of destitution throughout the Colony, bringing the gross total of current expenditure under all heads to \$10,812,410.49.

To arrive at a more exact figure, however, we must make allowance for the usual credit balances or unexpended votes surrendered to the Treasury at the close of each year. Last year these surrendered balances amounted to \$235,677.77.

Estimating these balances which will be dropped during the current year at \$220,000.00 (a figure which might be termed the average), we arrive as nearly as possible to the actual total expenditure on current account for the fiscal year 1927-1928, or about \$10,592,000.00, disbursed by the several Departments indicated as follows:—

Finance Department	\$ 4,300,000
Colonial Secretary's	160,000
Justice Department	360,000
Bureau of Education	930,000
Public Charities	620,000
Marine and Fisheries	465,000
Agriculture and Mines	140,000
Public Works Dept.	950,000
Posts and Telegraphs Dept.	1,195,000
Customs Department	655,000
Assessor of Taxes	7,000
Naval and Milit. Pensions	625,000
	<hr/>
	\$10,407,000

Adding to this total of \$10,407,000.00 the sum of \$185,000.00 expended on the relief of destitution by the Department of Public Charities the total estimated expenditure for the fiscal year 1927-1928 is found to be \$10,592,000.00 as above. With the total Revenue at the estimated figure of \$10,232,000.00, and the current expenditure as just estimated, our operations for the year ending June 30th next will result in a deficit of \$360,000.00, or about five hundred thousand dollars better than we expected to do a year ago.

Current Account 1928—1929

Hon. Members will have noted from the Estimates already tabled during the present session when in Committee on Supply that the House has been asked to vote the sum of \$10,468,682.51 to meet our obligations during the coming year. Increased appropriations have been asked for by the Department of Finance to provide the interest on the 1927 Loan of five million dollars (\$250,000.00) and for the inclusion of several new pensioners to the Civil list, and the sum of \$85,000.00 is allocated to the Colonial Secretary's Department to cover cost of the General Election next Fall. In the Department of Justice, there are two petty increases on account of salaries to court officials, and a redistribution has taken place in the Fire Department in the way of promotions etc. involving a small increase of \$150.00.

In the Bureau of Education, provision has to be made for increased grant to the Council of Higher Education. The Public Charities grant increased \$35,608.90 to cover increased grant to Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital and bills for Outport medical attendance and conveyance sick poor etc. Salaries and Maintenance Accounts of new light-houses are responsible for the increase of \$4,181.00 in the Marine and Fisheries vote, and

the Printing and Excise Stamps for tobacco etc. covers the increase in the Department of Customs. Decreased votes occur in the Department of Agriculture and Mines on account of Forest Fires. The taking over of Sudbury Hospital by the Toc H Organization and sundry petty changes show a decrease in the Public Works Department, and the transfer of certain officials from the Tax Assessor's Office to the Department of Customs reduces the vote in the former office.

These votes have been carefully considered and from the information supplied me by the expending departments as well as my own experience during the past four years, I feel satisfied that the requirements for the Public Service for the coming year have been fully supplied by the legislative appropriations granted a few days ago.

With regard to these increases which Hon. Members have noted in Committee on Supply, they were absolutely necessary and if not brought forward this Session, would have to be provided for in Supplementary Estimates next year.

The Auditor General has been continually protesting against expenditure incurred under authority of the Governor-in-Council necessitating huge legislative indemnities in the Supplementary Supply for services which ought in the ordinary course of events have been foreseen. I note from his reports that during the 1919 to 1923 period, the Legislature had to support original estimates by the sum of \$5,603,117.13. During the four year period last past, this item has been reduced to \$2,567,309.64.

I am sure Hon Members will appreciate that while it is frequently urgent and therefore unavoidable to supplement original estimates voted by the House, yet it is neverthe less

a very distasteful item in the Budget system. However, so far as the current Estimates which you have just considered are in question, a reference to the supplementary votes for the fiscal year 1927-1928 will show that these increases which appear in the 1928-1929 Estimates, with the one exception of Interest on Public Debt, are for the most part not increases over the previous year. The supplementary estimates to which I refer, amounting to approximately \$540,000.00 when added to the original appropriation, will also prove that the decreases which occur in the Departments of Public Works and Agriculture and Mines are, as compared with the votes for 1927-1928 real decreases.

The following statement is submitted as evidence of the good faith of the Government in the matter of seeking legislative indemnity for post expenditures. I cite first the period from 1919-1923, giving the amount of Supplementary Supply asked for in each year;-

1919-1920	\$2,412,219.00
1920-1921	1,364,961.83
1921-1922	771,196.53
1922-1923	1,054,739.77

Making a total for the
four years of\$5,603,117.13

The total Supplementary Estimates necessary by the present administration found necessary by the present administration since its inception to office, including the amount to be granted during the present session, was \$2,393,669.72, chargeable to the fiscal years following, viz:—

In 1924-25 Supply required was	\$505,905.51
In 1925-26 Supply required was	532,657.67
In 1926-27 Supply required was	815,106.54

In 1927-28 the amount asked for is approximately 540,000.00

\$2,393,669.72

It will be noted from the foregoing, that the amount for the four year period of the present administration is less than the indemnity asked for during the one year 1919-1920 by \$18,549.28. In the comparison above quoted I have left out the Supply required for the year 1923-1924, as the accounts for that year closed on June 30th, and we did not assume office until after the close of the fiscal year. However, in order to make a fair comparison, I have used a four-year term for each administration.

I submit, Sir, that this is a significant comparison and one which clearly manifests that when this Administration has asked the House for Supply, not only have the full requirements of the Service been subjected to careful and minute research, but that the administration of the public funds generally have been conducted with prudence and discretion.

Moreover, when I took office in the month of June 1924, the expenditure for the previous year on current account was \$10,022,137.45. For the year 1920-1921 the current expenditure amounted to \$10,951,488.90, while last year our total expenditure on current account was only \$10,533,408.87, or about \$418,000.00 less, in spite of the fact that we had to take care of additional interest charges on over \$11,000,000.00 expended on capital undertakings.

What this means, Mr. Chairman, is, that although confronted with increased interest charges, despite the fact that we have raised the Education Grant from \$836,361.03 to \$932,027.53 since coming into power, increased our annual contributions to-

wars Outport Hospitals and the Public Health service as well as establishing new services and providing for the expansion of existing services, yet we have so conducted the administration of routine affairs that a considerable saving has been effected under the other heads of current expenditure.

I assure you, sir, that the task has not been by any means an easy one, and I am sure you will appreciate that it would be utterly impossible to accomplish this without whole-hearted and excellent team work as between the Executive Government and the expending departments, and for this excellent spirit of co-operation I here take the opportunity to offer my very best thanks.

Here I should like to add a brief word of appreciation of the work of the Prime Minister. During the past four years he has been untiring in his efforts to restore the Colony's affairs to a position of strength and stability after the regime of extravagance and squander-mania which preceded the advent of the present Government. I was one of those largely concerned in inviting him to enter political life and take control of the country's affairs, and it will be a satisfaction to me for all time, as I know it will be to others associated with us, that, thanks to his unselfish efforts and honesty of purpose, so much has been done towards the attainment of the object to which he set himself when he sought the confidence of the people.

When he retires to private life, be it early or late, he will have the satisfaction of knowing that he has done good and faithful work for his country and that he has left the foundations for a continuance of the same in future years.

Estimated Revenue 1928—1929

Attention has already been drawn to the decline in collections on account of Import Duties during the fiscal year 1926-1927. This was due in a large measure to the poor returns from the fisheries of last year as well as the non-inclusion of Customs arrears. Neither will those post duties be available for the coming year 1928-1929.

Despite this fact, however, it gives me great pleasure to report to the House that the outlook for the fiscal year 1928-1929 is very reassuring indeed. I have anticipated the Customs Revenue at \$8,500,000.00 and with the development of mining and pulp and paper activities progressing steadily, we may look forward confidently to a proportionate increase in the General Revenue during the coming year 1928-1929. The possibilities for the future are tremendous and, in my judgment, with honest, capable and firm administration of the Colony's affairs during the next ten years, the country should be in an absolutely independent position with regard to its fiscal problems.

Estimated Revenue for 1928—1929

I estimate the total Revenue on current account for the year ending June 30th, 1929, to be the sum of \$10,200,500.00, made up as follows, viz:—

Customs Revenue	\$ 8,500,000
Postal Revenue	390,000
Telegraph Revenue	200,000
Crown Lands Revenue	170,000
Inland Revenue Stmaps	55,000
Board of Liquor Control	
Profits	400,000
Fines and Forfeitures	5,000
Broom Dept. Penitentiary....	4,000
Taxes and Assessments.....	70,000
Fees from Public Institu-	
tions	50,000
Death Duties	60,000

Bank and Trust Companies	75,000
Fire Insurance Companies'	
Tax	16,000
Landed Estates Income Tax	5,500
Miscellaneous Revenue	200,000
	<hr/>
	\$10,200,500
	<hr/>

The above figures have been checked carefully and in my opinion the estimate of \$10,200,500.00 is a close one.

The position of the current account of the Colony at the end of the fiscal year 1928-1929 should therefore be as follows, viz:—

Estimated Expenditure	
1928-1929	\$10,468,690.51
Estimated Revenue 1928-	
1929	10,200,500.00
	<hr/>
Estimated Deficit 1928-	
1929	\$ 268,190.51
	<hr/>

Trade of The Colony

The usually accepted measure of a country's prosperity is the condition of its trade, and judging from the statements submitted to me by the Deputy Minister of Customs I cannot but feel optimistic with regard to our material progress in this respect.

From the latest figures available I am very glad to be able to report to the House a Trade Balance in favor of the Colony of \$5,025,988.00.

The total value of the Imports during 1926-1927 amounted to \$25,813,871.00, while our Export Trade reached the sum of \$30,839,859.00, making a total trade for the year of \$56,633,730.00.

The value of our Exports exceeded the previous year's mark by the sum of \$3,276,646.00, due principally to the operations at Corner Brook where expansion in the export of paper was very marked.

Item	Increased
Fresh Halibut	732,600
Pickled Herring	13,644
Fresh Salmon	1,022,413
Seal Oil	1,080
Seal Skins	42,134
Cod Liver Oil	106,628
Paper	64,928

In addition to the above, increased export value occur in connection with Whale Oil, despite the fact that the quantity of this commodity exported was less than the previous year by twenty-six tons. This is a condition of affairs exactly opposite to that which occurred in connection with our codfish exports and one which would have made a considerable difference had it applied to the staple industry.

I regret to have to report decreased Cod Oil and Pickled Salmon exports during 1926-1927. The former dropped in value \$30,921.00.

Had fish prices been firm this export trade would have been much larger, as the 1927 fish exports surpassed those of 1926 by approximately 220,000 quintals. Exports of the Colony have increased steadily year by year since 1921, when their total value approximated \$19,500,000.00 and the following statement taken from official sources shows the gradual upward curve these exports have taken from 1921-1922 to date:—

1921-1922	\$19,478,417
1922-1923	20,956,863
1923-1924	21,071,571
1924-1925	23,590,186
1925-1926	27,563,213
1926-1927	30,839,859

The following extracts from the trade statistics contained in the Appendix to this Speech will show the principal items of export to which the increase of three millions of dollars is to be attributed, viz:—

Quantity	Increased Value
Lbs.	\$ 82,658.00
Brls	203,084.00
Lbs	145,644.00
Tuns	124,935.00
Skins	75,419.00
Gals	130,879.00
Tons	4,134,343.00

We exported less bulk herring by eighteen thousand barrels, valued at \$37,513.00.

Cod Fishery

Although the catch of the Labrador fishing fleet for 1927 showed such a substantial increase over that for the preceding year, the price realized was so low as to leave very little margin of profit after paying for supplies for the voyage. The results of the Shore fishery showed an average catch, but a lot of the fish became sunburnt. This fact, together with the keen competition encountered by the large Iceland catch helped to lessen prices in the fish markets abroad.

Such an unfortunate condition of affairs in the main industry of the Colony was very naturally reflected in its general trade, especially in those other branches of industry dependent upon the ability of the fishermen to buy. I am glad to be in a position to inform Hon. Members that the catch, having all been marketed, the prospects for the present year are brighter than for years past, and I am fully convinced from present available information that the price of fish will open much higher this year. From my own knowledge, there will be quite a demand for new fish as practically all the old stocks held by our merchants are depleted, and this fact of course means that the price will be higher than anticipated.

As always, however, the chief obstacle in securing good prices may be traced to quality, as good fish is

like water, and it will always find its level in the matter of price and when unseasonable weather for curing strikes our shores, this fact is unpleasantly forced upon us.

The annual catch of codfish runs from 1,200,000 to 1,500,000 quintals yearly, two-thirds of which is shore fish, and on principle that price follows quality, the matter of curing such a huge quantity of fish should receive the serious attention it deserves. Equally important is the necessity for more co-operation as between those of us who are engaged in the business, and this is an economic fact which is forcing itself to the attention of Fish Exporters every day.

I am extremely glad to note the increase in exports of fresh halibut and fresh salmon. These with the re-opening of the lobster fishery and the interest displayed in the canning industry, are items that should mean many thousands of dollars in the pockets of our fishermen during the approaching season.

What has been said with regard to the question of codfish certainly applies with equal if not greater force in the matter of canning industry, and with the exercise of proper care in the export of such items as lobster, fresh salmon and the like, it would be hazardous to estimate the value of this industry once it becomes firmly established in the Canadian and American markets.

Grave consideration has been given to the matter of re-opening the Lobster Fishery, and every precaution taken to see that this lucrative industry does not revert to such a condition as prevailed in 1924, when the establishment of a close season became imperative if we were to save the lobster from total extinction.

Every effort has been made by previous Governments to retard the de-

cline of the Lobster Fishery, and it will be remembered by the older members of the House that some years ago, a sum of money was voted by the Legislature in order to afford some measure of conservation. At that time certain parts of the Coast were reserved and a bounty of ten cents paid our fishermen for every spawning lobster caught and placed in these reservations. This being ineffective, upon strong recommendation to the Fisheries Board, this embargo was lifted on November 21st last, and certain rules and regulations promulgated in connection therewith. In order to keep the standard at its highest, rigid inspection is provided for, and every one engaged in the industry must secure a license from the Department. The times of catching lobster vary according to the different parts of the Coast and the exigencies of the different zones. In addition a small fee of twenty-five cents per case is imposed to cover the expenses of administering the rules and regulations to which I have referred.

In 1921 the summer catch of lobsters amounted to six thousand eight hundred and ninety-one cases, which averaged 184 lobsters to the case, while the fall pack of lobsters that year totalled one thousand five hundred and eighteen cases averaging as many as 217 lobsters to the case. The special permission given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for a fall pack in 1921, while it may have been helpful in relieving the distress which prevailed amongst our fishermen, is believed to have hastened the depletion of the fishery.

The last three years the lobster fishery was prosecuted the catch was as follows, viz;—

1922	8,539 cases
1923	5,582 cases
1924	3,302 cases

I should like here to add a word of congratulation to those firms engaged in the introduction of our fresh fish to foreign markets. I appreciate the difficulties which they had to overcome as well as the expenses involved in breaking practically new business ground, and I am sure I express the hope of all Honourable Members in wishing them continued and abundant success.

COD LIVER OIL

It is gratifying to note the steady increase in the export of medicinal Cod Liver Oil both in quantity and value. During the period from 1921 to 1924, this industry suffered a marked decline. From an annual average production of 250,000 gallons it dropped to the low figure of 50,000 gallons per year.

In 1925 consumption and prices began to climb. That year 77,484 gallons of oil were rendered out of the livers and in 1926 the quantity manufactured more than doubled. Prices were not only maintained but substantially increased, and it is an encouraging augury to observe that still further progress is reflected in the trade figures for 1927. The advance of approximately 92,000 gallons over the Exports for 1925 reported last year, has increased almost 200,000 gallons during 1927. In view of the extensive advertising given our medicinal oil and the irreproachable testimonials as to its vitamine values, we may look forward to the steady rise of this valuable by-product. The advancement of this industry is the fruit of many years of Government encouragement supported by competent scientific research combined with good marketing methods. Strict official inspection of the product is not only encouraged by the manufacturers but demanded and the consequent result spells success.

Improved methods have been adopted in the manufacture, in order that the oil's superior flavor may be retained and all fatty acids eliminated. The ammonia process has also been substituted in many cases for the old salt and ice method of freezing.

This industry, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, affords an object lesson of what can be accomplished in the matter of marketing our fishery by-products under rigid Government inspection when supported by private enterprise.

SEAL FISHERY

I am glad to be able to report, also, that much better success attended the labors of our Seal Fishery during 1927, the quantity of seal oil exported as compared with the previous year increasing from 1,860 to 2,940 tons, the price advancing approximately \$125,000.00 while 42,000 more skins were marketed. The official catch for the present season (1928) up to date of writing shows a still further increase over the 1927 fishery, (I estimate it at over 240,000 seals) and there is not the slightest doubt that this Spring's sealing operations will result in brisk business for the trade generally.

A noteworthy feature of the Spring's sealing hunt was the venture made by the Schr. "Young Harp". The success of this venture is not at all phenomenal when it is remembered that in years past much larger catches of fat were taken when wooden ships of comparatively small tonnage were solely engaged in seal hunting before the advent of the large ice-breakers. I trust that the luck which followed this courageous venture will inspire similar projects in the future and I cannot but think, Mr. Chairman, that such enterprise were it more general would reap a commensurate reward.

The other fishery items—the exports of which advanced considerably during 1927, such as Fresh Salmon (in-

crease over one million pounds), Fresh Halibut (increase about seven hundred and thirty-two thousand pounds), Pickled Herring (increase 13,644 barrels) account for an increased export value of over \$1,080,000.00.

THE PAPER INDUSTRY

I feel that Honourable Members need little information from me with regard to the progress of this rapidly growing industry. Time and again during the past year the Press has contained reference and news items covering practically every phase of the situation. The fact that the export of paper increased approximately 65,000 tons last year, representing a money value of \$4,124,000,000? is eloquent testimony that the industry is in a very healthy condition.

Owing the fact that its initial growth was not forced and its development was based upon wise, economic principles, the Harmsworth interests at Grand Falls have met with eminent success, and I might add that it was largely due to the courageous pioneer work undertaken by them at a time when the interior of the country was practically an unexplored wilderness that the attention of the outside world was directed towards the dormant possibilities of Newfoundland. Had the group of Companies connected with the construction and initial operations at Corner Brook shown equal foresight, the deplorable situation which confronted the Legislature two years ago would not have existed.

Arising out of the unfortunate position with which the original owners were confronted, the International Paper Company took over their liabilities, at the same time reducing the mortgage debt of the old Company from forty-one million to twenty-five million first Mortgage Bonds, consisting of five millions prior lien bonds due the Bank of England; ten millions in "A" debentures guaranteed by

the British Government and ten millions of dollars in "B" debentures guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland.

The new Company is limited to the issue of four million pounds sterling in first Mortgage Bonds, the proceeds of which must be spent on the purchase of new properties and to provide for two additional machines of a working capacity of not less than one hundred tons daily, and in return for this the Company has the right to export from its own limits one-half cord of pulpwood for each tons of paper produced in excess of one hundred and twenty thousand tons a year at the rate of one dollar per cord. After a certain period in the event of the price of the paper advancing, a readjustment of this royalty will take place. This permit to export pulpwood is automatically cancelled if the mill operates at less than eighty per cent. of its capacity in any year.

This means that the Company must add at least one machine before a cord of pulp-wood may be exported, that if and when they do export, they must pay \$1.00 per cord or upwards, and that no matter how many machines are added, they must be worked to an 80 per cent. capacity.

Another attractive feature of the new Agreement as compared with the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company Act, is the fact that more specific terms are contained in the former Agreement in relation to the collection of Customs duty. In this respect the Company now operating is obliged to pay, specifically on food, clothing, hand-tools, stores, lumber and innumerable other items, the prevailing tariff rates at the time of import, and in the case of replacements, renewals and spare parts, a special tariff rate of 25 per cent. for forty years. Finally, in all other things used in the Com-

pany's business not specially enumerated they are obliged to pay the existing tariff rate for twenty years; provided, however, that for a second term of twenty years this existing tariff rate shall not be increased more than an additional ten per cent.

Then, again, the Company so far as is reasonably possible, must use Newfoundland labor in the development of the enterprise, and that this has been sympathetically considered is evidenced in that several young men are being sent to Canada and the United States in order to study the technical end of paper making on the Company's own initiative. This is a step in the right direction and one that should commend itself to the House, and it is gratifying to know that in the near future Newfoundlanders will be qualified to fill any or all of the lucrative positions at present unattainable.

From every present indication, therefore the great danger to which I have referred has been averted. The Corner Brook industry is now emerging from a position which, not so many months ago, appeared to threaten the future of the enterprise. The machines there, originally designed to manufacture 400 tons of paper per day, are now averaging a daily output of 425 tons and have at times reached the 450 ton figure. It is hoped very soon to raise the daily production another fifty tons, making a total of 500 tons.

The cruisers who have surveyed the property on behalf of the International Paper Company, the new owners, report very optimistically on the quality and quantity of the timber and consequently the most essential factor governing the successful conduct of such a huge enterprise, the raw material, is no longer problematical. The timber is there at the present time and

far more than will be needed for the next fifty years even with double the present output.

I have already referred to the progress in production and the fact that such a Corporation as the International Paper Company, with its ramifications all over the paper making world, has undertaken to carry on this great enterprise should tend to reassure Honourable Members that not only has complete stability been attained, but that the paper industry at Corner Brook has turned the corner, leading to many years of prosperity.

RAILWAY

From the detailed statements submitted by the Railway Management referred to in the Appendix hereto, it will be noted that the position of the Newfoundland Railway from a financial viewpoint is decidedly improved. The earnings for the fiscal year 1926-1927 increased by the sum of approximately \$50,000.00 i. e., from \$3,009,290.19 to \$3,057,809.88. On the other hand the expenses were reduced from \$3,753,087.57 to \$3,675,485.44 a saving on this side of the ledger as compared with the previous year of \$77,602.13. This works out as follows:

Increased Earnings	\$48,519.69
Decreased Expenses	77,602.13
	<hr/>
	\$126,121.82
	<hr/>

which means of course that we have been \$126,121.82 better off in Railway results for the year ended June 30th, 1927, than we had been the previous year.

From the latest figures to hand, the improvement is even more marked this year. Up to December 31st last, we lost through Railway Operations \$193,133.56 as compared with \$322,302.30 for the corresponding six months of 1926-1927. We accumulated a profit on Steamers of \$181,639.57 and

a Dry Dock Profit of \$7,889.64. The net result is that we are better off by the sum of \$239,604.24 for the six months as compared with the same period of the previous year. In other words, the improvement of 1926 for the full year has been continued and nearly doubled in the six months of 1927-1928. In a report submitted to me by the General Manager under date the 23rd of March last, he estimates the maximum deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1928, to be \$300,000.00. This is the outside figure and there is every indication that this amount will be considerably reduced.

In connection with Capital expenditure on account of the Railway and Steamship Service, many improvements have been effected. The track has been relaid with 70 lb. rails from St. John's to Clarenville and last year this was continued from Clarenville to Bishop's Falls. The coming season the heavy rail will be laid from Port aux Basques to Humbermouth leaving only 175 miles from Humbermouth to Bishop's Falls with the old 50 lb. rail. During the year many new sidings have been constructed, old sidings lengthened and ballasting operations pursued with energy. I may say that the total amount spent on these ballasting operations last year was \$110,000.00 and was taken care of in the Operating Expenses. Many bridges culverts and concrete abutments have also been constructed, as well as freight sheds, offices, etc.

With regard to continuing the re-railing over the Topsail Division the Railway Commission, after survey has been made, will consider what recommendations are to be made to the Government with regard to the diversion of the main line to an alternate route via Millertown Junction and Buchans. At the present time the Railway Management is of opinion

that such diversion will eliminate most if not all of the snow difficulties encountered on the Topsails during the winter season. This particular division is the source of continual trouble and enormous expense caused by snow fighting with resultant delays and the necessity of hauling short loads.

Below is given the yearly losses on Railway Account since the Government has been connected with the operation of the road, via:

1920-1921	\$1,758,000.00
1921-1922	953,000.00
1922-1923	593,000.00
1923-1924	6,000.00
1924-1925	358,000.00
1925-1926	743,000.00
1926-1927	617,000.00
1927-1928 (estimated)	300,000.00

The very slight losses sustained during 1923-1924 and 1924-1925 were due to the fact that construction on the Humber was in full blast and freight earnings were abnormal. The expenditure on Capital Account for last year amounted to \$959,616.59 as follows.—

On Rolling Stock	\$103,490.03
On Re-railing between St. John's and Clarenville....	1,037.33
Additions and Improvements	46,971.81
On Re-railing between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls	773,154.83
Bridges and Culverts	25,277.01
Improvements Dock Premises	9,520.38
New Machinery for Dockyards	165.20
	<hr/>
	\$959,616.59
	<hr/>

In order to reduce expenses of operating the Branch lines an order has been placed for three additional Steam Coaches, an improvement on

those already in use, to serve the Heart's Content, Trepassey and Bay de Verde Branches. These cars will handle Passengers, Express and Mails and it is hoped by this means to give good service at a very much reduced cost.

The Railway is easily the heaviest problem with which the Government has been confronted. Ever since it was taken over from the Reid Newfoundland Company, we have had to face annual deficits connected with its operation, and it is all the more encouraging to find these deficits decreasing year by year there appears to be every sign that within a year or two the annual railway deficit will be entirely eliminated.

I am informed by the Auditor General that the losses sustained are no larger than those incurred when the road was operated by the Reid Newfoundland Company, and I am pleased to note in his Report that so far "Government ownership has not meant increased deficits."

While the interest on the purchase of the Railway has not been charged to Railway funds, yet it is borne on the current account of the Colony, and it is mainly through Railway construction and operation that our Public Debt Interest is at such a high figure

DRY DOCK CONSTRUCTION

The final statement of Receipts and Expenditures submitted to me by the Auditor General shows that the total construction cost of the Dry Dock including the new Freight Sheds and the extension of the "Desola" jetty, was \$2,016,374.07 made up as follows, viz:

RECEIPTS

From Newfoundland Government:

Loans 1924 and 1925	\$1,175,000.00
Loan 1926	800,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,975,000.00

From Cash Sales of material sold	76,148.86
	<hr/>
	\$2,051,148.86

EXPENDITURE

For Dry Dock and Pump House	\$1,837,305.82
For Freight Sheds	148,248.18
For "Desola" Jetty	30,820.07
	<hr/>
	\$2,016,375.07
Returned to Exchequer	34,774.79
	<hr/>
	\$2,051,148.86

It will be noted from the above that the cost of the Dock to the Colony, including Freight Sheds and extension of the "Desola" jetty, was \$1,940,225.21, after due credit is taken for unused material sold and cash returned to the Treasury of \$34,774.79. If our position geographically did not call for this modern dock and I for one have no doubt on that point, then its delapidated condition certainly demanded the immediate expenditure of an almost equal amount. We were told by experts brought here specially to examine the whole structure, that it was an absolute menace to the West End of the city, and I can personally vouch for the state of disrepair into which the Freight Sheds had fallen. Moreover this was capital expenditure of a productive nature and very effective in relieving the distressful conditions prevailing at the time. Finally, the Steamer and Dry Dock branches of the Railway business are very profitable and help substantially in decreasing the general loss sustained by the Road. During the period ending December 31st last, the profits from Steamers and Dry Dock aggregated \$190,000.00.

PUBLIC DEBT

The funded Public Debt of the Colony at the close of the fiscal year 1926-1927 was as follows:—

At 3%	\$ 1,581,666.66
At 3½%	18,905,546.65
At 4%	8,925,865.64
At 5%	13,561,453.32
At 5½%	15,500,000.00
At 6½%	13,543,400.00
	<hr/>
	\$72,017,932.27

To this must be added the
5% loan raised last
year, amounting to 5,000,000.00

Making the gross Public
Debt\$77,017,932.27

From the above amount of \$77,017,932.27 must be deducted the following amounts, viz:—

Amount owed the Govern- ment by the St. John's Municipal Council	\$1,901,698.22
Amount paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund	1,461,6325.3
Imperial Treasury Bills and Cash held by our Bankers in London for further Bond redemp- tion	290,571.80
	<hr/>
Total deduction	\$3,653,902.55

This will leave the net Public Debt of the Colony as on June 30th, 1928 at the sum of \$73,364,029.72.

On the 1st of July next "Victory" Loan Bonds will have reached maturity and the House will be asked within a few days to authorize the raising of a sum of money to retire these debentures, and for other public purposes. The sum of the debentures to be retired is \$7,543,400.00 bearing interest at six and one half per cent. The annual interest borne by the Colony on these bonds amounts to \$490,321.00 and at the very lowest estimate, we should save at least one hundred and thirteen thousand dollars per annum

in interest after raising the new Loan. In other words we should gain at the very lowest one and one-half per cent. in annual interest. The fact that this is not altogether a real increase in our annual interest should go far to enhance the value of our Bonds when placed on the market.

BUCHANS MINE

I should like here to refer to a development which has attracted considerable attention from outside sources, and that is the opening up of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development's zinc lead mine on the Red Indian Lake near Millertown. In conjunction with the American Smelting and Refining Company, they are now busily engaged in exploring this property. Metallurgy has so developed within recent years as to make the proposition of immense commercial value. Perhaps the most satisfactory feature is the fact that the Company's success has brought attention to our possibilities in this respect. In the ordinary course of events the good fortune which attended this venture should lead to further developments with a consequent much high earning power for Newfoundlanders. The reports received from time to time through the Government Geologist are of the most encouraging nature, and as a result the Government is using wise discrimination in the issue of Crown licenses. Honourable Members will have noted the amendments of the Crown Lands Act introduced a few days ago and I am sure all will be in accord with the spirit of these amendments.

COAL FIELDS

Another item closely allied to the above department, and one which has engaged the Government's attention for some time past, is our coal mine development. After careful consideration the Government decided to de-

vote a sum of money towards the development of the St. George's Coal Fields. According to Dr. Baker, who I am sure should be qualified to know, there are two hundred and ten million tons of coal in sight. Drilling operations have been carried on and I understand the borings have been most successful. The coal samples are of a very superior quality, and with the increased cost of mining coal in the United States and Canada, during recent years, cheap water transportation to the markets, together with an abundant supply of labor, the future of the industry appears to be exceptionally bright. It is estimated that the cost per ton F.O.B. Port of Shipment will not exceed three dollars, and this figure based on the wholesale price of coal in the United States should leave a profit of roughly \$1.20 per ton. Our annual imports of coal averaging three hundred and fifty thousand tons, there should be no difficulty about the local marketing, especially in view of the mining, paper and general development taking place in the interior of the country to which I have made reference. And I understand from official reports that there is sufficient coal to supply the local needs for generations.

In this connection, I am sure the House was glad to learn that the International Paper Company, Ltd., were interesting themselves in the St. George's Coal Fields, and this together with the encouragement given by the Government should result in the development of these coal fields at last.

I am convinced that we should take a hopeful attitude with regard to our coal from the fact that successful mineral activity depends largely on a supply of cheap coal, and having the coal and the minerals, we should look bravely to the future, as the day may

not be far distant when we will be in a position to hold our raw materials for manufacture on Newfoundland soil.

LOAN EXPENDITURE

The following statement shows the position of the several Loan Accounts at the end of the fiscal year 1927, viz:

LOAN ACT, 1921

Balance in Bank June 30th, 1926	\$14,174.63
Expended during 1926-1927	10,751.96
	<hr/>
Balance to Credit of Loan	\$ 3,422.67

Of this balance \$3,422.67 the sum of \$404.18 has been allocated, leaving a balance to the credit of the 1921 Loan of \$3,018.49 not appropriated for any specific purpose.

LOAN ACT, 1922

Balance in Bank on June 30th, 1926	\$37,598.50
Expended during 1926-1927	31,650.45
	<hr/>
Balance to Credit of Loan	\$ 5,948.05

Of this balance the sum of \$3,879.32 is earmarked for special purposes in the Department of Public Works, Marine and Fisheries and Public Charities, leaving a balance of \$2,-068.-73 still remaining unallocated.

LOAN ACT, 1923

At Credit of Loan June 30th, 1926	\$5,719.66
Expenditure 1926-1927	925.40
	<hr/>
Balance to Credit of Loan June 30th, 1927	\$4,794.26

There is only the sum of \$19.37 remaining on account of this Loan, the balance of \$4,774.89 has been allocated in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

LOAN ACT, 1926

At Credit of Loan June 30th, 1926	\$3,535,114.60
--	----------------

Expenditure during 1926- 1927	2,915,535.36
	<hr/>

Balance to credit of Loan \$ 619,579.25

As this Loan was raised and allocated by the present government I beg to submit the following summary of allocations for the information of the House, viz:—

ALLOCATIONS FROM LOAN 1926 DURING 1926-1927

Railway	\$1,061,370.19
Highroads Commission ..	340,000.00
Part Payment Dry Dock	800,000.00
Balance owed on Pit Prop Account	201,639.63
Burns & Berrige @ Labrador Boundary	97,159.51
U.S.A. Pecuniary Claims..	21,491.57
Admiralty for Old War- ships	77,906.32
Expenses S. S. Earl of Devon	16,608.39
Balance of Old Road Commission @	13,842.68
Salary and Expenses Geologist	7,790.00
Publicity Scheme re Tourists	7,500.00
Printing Bonds, etc., for Loan	5,903.91
St. George's Coal Fields ..	7,199.50
Visit Empire Mining Con- gress	500.00
Fisheries Commission.....	3,500.00
Addition to Sanitorium....	5,355.67
Roads and Bridges and Public Works	60,622.00
Marine Works, Break- waters, etc.	30,950.00
Public Buildings	4,407.62
Sundry Expenses	86.87
	<hr/>
	\$2,763,833.86
	<hr/>

There is a balance remaining unallocated on account of this Loan of \$519,154.46 which is to be distributed as follows, viz:

For Railway Capital Ac- count	\$ 82,550.19
For Re-railing	60,000.00
To Liquidate Militia Bal....	90,000.00
Investigating Minerals ,etc.	156,804.51
For General Purposes.....	85,155.43
Addition to Sanitorium.....	44,644.33
	<hr/>
	\$519,154.46

LOAN ACT, 1927

The five million dollar Bond issue of last year was sold at \$98,513 realizing the sum of \$4,925,650.00 and the following is a statement of the expenditure of same up to February 28th last, viz:—

Deficit on Current Ac- count	\$1,600,973.41
Railway Deficit	617,675.56
Highroad Commission	227,067.08
Roads and Bridges and Public Works	260,750.09
Marine Works	82,825.91
Lighthouses	1,502.87
Labrador Boundary	29,314.05
Marconi Stations	503.70
Telegraph and Telephone Extension	9,041.22
Expenses Raising Loan ..	2,783.55
	<hr/>
Total	\$2,832,437.44

The balance remaining unexpended on account of this Loan as at February 28th last was \$2,093,212.56.

On reference to the Loan Bill as passed by the House last session, it will be noted that we had allowed for the deficit on Current Account for the fiscal year 1926-1927 the sum of \$1,750,000.00. An amount of \$760,000.00 also was allocated for the deficit on Railway Account for the same year.

The actual amounts found to be required to liquidate these deficits were:—

For Deficit on Current Account 1926-1927	\$1,600,973.41
---	----------------

For Railway Deficit 1926-1927	617,675.56
--	------------

This means that there is available for re-distribution the sum of \$291,351.03 the total amount not required for the services indicated.

An amendment will therefore have to be made to the Act during the present session to provide for the re-allocation of this money. A further amendment will be necessary to cover the transfer of \$750,000.00 appropriated last year for the Gander Railway, as under the terms of the Act the Governor in Council is not empowered to divert any of the 1927 Loan from the special purposes specified therein.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the House that the present administration has done everything possible to see that our capital expenditure has been of a constructive nature. We have endeavoured in every way to promote productive enterprises, and I submit, Sir, that the result of all our enterprises on capital account may be seen in such assets as the railway, the highways, the dock at St. John's, lighthouses, permanent bridges replacing obsolete wooden structures, public buildings, and telegraph and telephone extension. The re-railing of the railway alone is a tremendous asset which cannot be chargeable to any one year as the benefit will be enjoyed for the next twenty or thirty years.

Then again, there is the publicity campaign connected with our tourist policy carried out by a body of men absolutely without charge. These gentlemen have undertaken to advertise Newfoundland and thereby encourage visitors to our shores. From their report I notice that we have had as many as 6,067 tourists last season and from information supplied by the shipping offices, an equal number have

been turned away due to the fact that accommodation could not be provided. The expenditure entailed on account of this publicity campaign is in the neighbourhood of six thousand dollars, but against this expenditure the report of the committee states that our tourists spend at least six hundred thousand dollars.

They arrive at this figure by averaging the spending power of each tourist at one hundred dollars, a very low figure indeed as compared with the American and Canadian average of \$300.00.

For my part I am inclined to think that the Committee is altogether too modest, I would place the amount spent by visitors to this country last summer at over a million dollars.

To provide for this influx, roads and highways as well as hotel accommodation had to be provided and I merely refer to such a small item of capital expenditure in order to show a few of the benefits derived for the money spent on Capital Account.

Yet with all undertakings capital expenditure for the four years is less than the previous administration covering a similar period by over four and one-half million dollars. Included in our Loan expenditure, also, is another two million dollars representing bills of the late Government presented to us for payment, so that as a matter of fact the Monroe Government spent less money than its predecessor by the sum of six and one-half million dollars approximately.

I attach here for the information of Hon. Members the following statements, viz;-

(1) Comparative Statement of Revenue for the five years from 1922-1923 to 1926-1927;

(2) Comparative Statement of Expenditure for the year 1925-1926 and

1926-1927 showing increases or decreases (as the case may be) in the Departments indicated;

(3) Comparative Statement of the Trade Statistics of the Colony from 1922-1923 to 1926-1927 (inclusive);

(4) Comparative Statement of Savings Deposits in Newfoundland as at December 31st each year from 1923 to 1927 (inclusive);

(5) Statement showing Life Insurance Premiums paid by policy holders in Newfoundland, giving value of new Policies issued and the total insurance in force each year for the years 1924, 1925 and 1926;

(6) Comparative Statement of the Earnings and Expenses of the Newfoundland Railway for the years 1926 and 1927;

(7) Comparative Statement of the following items from 1910-1911 to 1926-1927 (inclusive);-

(a) Original Estimates and Supplementary Supply.

(b) Expenditure under special Warrant (Section 33 b of the Audit Act.)

(c) Revenue and Expenditure showing surplus or deficit, as the case may be.

(d) The Public Debt and the charges paid for Interest on same.

I beg permission to propose the following resolutions, viz;-

RESOLUTIONS

Resolved that the Act passed in the fifteenth of the Reign of His Majesty King George V. Cap. 34 entitled "The Revenue Act 1925" and the amendments thereto be further amended in manner following;-

Add to Section 24 as follows;-

"(2) It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Council to extend to any country within the British Empire any preferential Customs Tariff treatment which may be accorded or granted by Treaty or otherwise to any foreign country."

SCHEDULE "A"

- Item 153 Substitute for "comma" between Plates and Rivets in first line a "hyphen."
- Item 222 Add (a) Cloth, known as Glass Cloth, when imported by Agriculturists for their use alone — ad val 10 per cent.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

NOTICE OF MOTION

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Highroads Commission Act, 1925" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 85 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated

Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates' was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Harbour Regulations for the Port of St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and it was ordered that, with unanimous consent, the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Harbour Regulations for the Port St. John's" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Russell gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that, when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon next 28th inst. at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 28th, 1929.

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

Petitions were presented by—

Minister of Agriculture and Mines from Argentina re roads.

Mr. Brown from St. Augustine's re telephone.

Mr. Scammell, from St. Barbe, re Court House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Northern Products Company, Ltd., as follows:

May 28th, 1928.

To the Honorable the House of Assembly:

"The Select Committee having considered the Petition presented by the Northern Products Company, Ltd., for leave to introduce a Private Bill beg to report that the Rules of the House relating to Private Bills have been duly complied with, and that leave be granted to introduce the Bill prayed for.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
A. E. HICKMAN,
W. J. WALSH,
I. R. RANDELL
J. R. BENNETT."

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

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 the Northern Products Company, Limited.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Loan upon the Credit of the Colony for certain Public purposes.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend "The War Pensions Act, 1922."

WABANA LIGHT BILL

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 respecting the Wabana Light & Power Company.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman: As the Resolutions were only just tabled, I do not propose to ask the consideration of them by the Committee this afternoon. Shortly I would like to explain the reason why they are before the House and the reason why I propose that the Committee should have an opportunity of studying them before being asked to give an expression of opinion on them and the Bill to result therefrom. It will probably be remembered that there was some talk at last session, of the House being asked to consider Resolutions along these same lines, but the pressure of time in clos-

ing the House compelled the matter to be held in suspense. In the interim the Company now seeking the concessions asked for here have been operating on Bell Island, and to that extent I should like to say to the House that they are considering the request of, or what probably might be termed the granting of a franchise to people who have been supplying their power for the last twelve months on the island and taking their chances of being reimbursed. I think it is only right that I should mention this in fairness to the people who have been supplying the light, although it will be appreciated that honorable members are free to take what position they like on the subject. The history of this matter briefly is that some years ago on Bell Island people who were not recognized as high officials by the mining companies had no private lighting at all. The companies generated their own power and they lit only the houses of chief members of their staffs. Arising out of that, the position grew that a number of the people of both companies formed themselves into a co-operative company who entered into an arrangement whereby they bought electricity from a generating company and retailed it to the people on the island. That co-operative company had a franchise from this Legislature, and they carried on lighting houses and stores on a co-operative basis until they went into liquidation a few years ago. Then this franchise went out of existence and the situation on the island was that a number of people had their houses and stores wired and there was no one to supply the light. The mining companies, however, were good enough not to shut off the light, but continued to supply it and nobody was asked to pay for it. Then certain people got together and formed

this idea of taking over what was left of the old franchise and formed themselves into a new company. They did ask in the petition that I presented here recently for a fifty years term. Speaking on behalf of the Select Committee, I anticipated that term would be too long and so it was cut down to a twenty year period, as will be seen by the Resolutions. The Select Committee also had to consider certain other interests referred to in the Resolutions and we have endeavored to provide for that. But broadly speaking, the position is that certain property of the defunct co-operative company was bought out by these people who have got together and called themselves the Wabana Light & Power Company, Limited, and they have entered into an arrangement with the people who are operating over there and supplying the light. I would like to say to the House, that I have not received any evidence of opposition to this measure from anyone now residing on the island this year. Last year there was a very natural desire to have the company generating the power to supply the light, as they could give a cheaper light to the people. The company declined to do it, and we were not able to make them do it. They say they are quite prepared to look after their own buildings, but they do not want to be mixed up with the idea of retailing out light. They do say, however, that they are prepared to enter into a contract with the Wabana Light & Power Company to supply light in conformity and to the extent of the franchise now given here. Your Select Committee in recommending these Resolutions took into consideration certain protest from the Newfoundland Light & Power Company and from the United Towns Electric Company; but not from the Conception

Bay Electric Company. Paragraph Four of the Resolutions protects the rights of the protesting companies. (Reads paragraph). As is well known, there has been for some time a lot of talk by the United Towns Electric Company and more or less by the Conception Bay Electric Company, and more recently by the Nfld. Light & Power Company, about transferring their power to Bell Island. That matter has been discussed and this measure does not prevent them from doing so, but merely stops the idea of getting down to peddling out light.

In Clause 8 we give them the privilege of free entry for 20 years for transformers, machinery, outside transmission wires, etc.

MR. SCAMMELL.—What is outside transmission wire?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The ordinary wire that goes along the street; the heavy wire that takes the power from the generating plant of the company to a man's house. The inside wire going into a man's house would not be given free entry. I would like to say in connection with that point that this section is made in conformity with the section for the Bay of Islands Company, limiting concessions to outside requirements so as to avoid the idea of having inside fixtures for houses coming in free of duty. We give them free duty for 20 years; secondly, we give them a franchise for 20 years, the exclusive right to supply electricity on a retail basis for lighting and heating and power purposes, and we give them the ordinary attendant to a franchise, the right to enter upon lands. Under Section I: (Reads).

I may say that I think the Select Committee has gone a step forward in connection with bills of this kind in the insertion of this Clause 9. It has

not been submitted to the Company; we feel that they cannot object to it. (Reads Clause 9). In other words, we want to be in a position to be able to see to it that the people on Bell Island who may have their houses wired and fixtures installed and are dependent on this supply will have the protection under this Clause 9. If the mines close down or some such thing and the company said that they were not going to give the people light, then if someone else is in a position to supply light, he can come in in place of the Company and the franchise ends.

Under Section 10 the rate shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It is not suggested we can possibly do more than let it be felt that there is some sort of check, some Board of Appeal if rates are excessive. I don't think it would be fair to ask the Committee to consider these resolutions to-day so I merely commend them now to the favorable consideration of the Committee. I speak from a particularly intense personal knowledge of Bell Island and what it needs, and I think despite the fact of some jealousies that may appear and despite the fact that I realize that there may be a certain amount of local possible antagonism to a measure like this, I am satisfied that under all the circumstances this is in the best interest of Bell Island, and I don't think we need fear that the people being given these concessions and who had enterprise enough to take on the proposition trusting that they would be able to get those concessions are going to become millionaires on the strength of it, and at the same time I think there is sufficient protection for the people of Bell Island. The objection last year when rival petitions were presented in connection with this has not now

to be considered, and I can offer these resolutions with a genuine recommendation of them, and I think we ought to support people who have had enterprise enough to go ahead and carry this thing through in spite of the fact that they could not get a Bill through last year and who took the chance of getting this protection which, if they did not get, they might be faced with a possible position of embarrassment. For those reasons I commend those resolutions to the House with all possible earnestness. I don't see that there are any possible interests effected and I think they are going to be a great advantage to the people of Bell Island.

MR. CASHIN.—Might I ask what is the position with regard to the petition presented last year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Last year the position was this, a relic of the old co-operative company remained and it was apparently felt that they as share holders should have the benefit of any survival of rights. We had rival petitions and the thing was in a state of suspense and the lights were going on and it was uncertain how long the companies were going to run and as a matter of fact the companies notified that they were going to shut off the lights, and these took a chance and brought the property and went on with the lights and now we are faced with the position we have not heard anything from the other people and there is not the objection to-day that there was last year and it is only fair to those who have taken up this thing, taking a chance that if the legislature did not give them a franchise they would be subject to anybody coming in and getting it and that is something in their favor.

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 Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Provide for the Guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College" 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 it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; What is that for?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That Commission was appointed three years ago, I think, to enquire into the Public Service.

MR. BRADLEY.—Have we had any report from them?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; In reply to the Hon. Member I would say that they have not finished their work yet.

Mr. Morine was a member of that commission and his going away made a vacancy there and the other two

members have not done anything since.

The idea of the commission was to investigate into the Public Service and bring in recommendations in respect of same. They have made certain interim reports in connection with certain departments.

I don't know what the policy of the Government will be in the future. The incoming Government may take it up or may do otherwise.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; Do I understand that this is to pay the salaries of the Finance Committee? Who are they?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—There were three, Messrs. Morine, Sullivan and Cramm.

MR. SCAMMELL.—This \$2,000 does not govern all the payments, does it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I don't know of anything more paid. That is the total amount as far as I know.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, there were more expenses in connection with that than \$2,000. I have not seen the Public Accounts but I understand that here is an amount in the Public Accounts to pay the Members of the Commission. Is this to pay the people working for the Commission?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—There were two or three people working for them compiling statistics, etc.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask if there was any report made by the commission on the matter of the amounts given out by relieving officers in the different districts of the country. I understand that was one of the main things for which it was appointed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman; They did make a re-

port on the Public Charities. They went into the subject pretty thoroughly with regard to payment of relieving officers, regarding the matter of services and other matters, but as I have said already, the whole thing is incomplete and I don't think it can be put into operation until they go into it. I have no report. This commission was acting entirely on their own. I have no control over them.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I was going to suggest that it would be a good idea, for the information of the House, if the members of the commission who are here, Hon. Mr. Sullivan and Hon. Mr. Cramm were to give us some outline of the work they have done, for which this money is to be granted.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman; For the information of the House I might say that the information was tabled in this House last session and since that time the commission has not been acting. They have not met since to my knowledge.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; The commission has finished its work. The committee was appointed by the Government two years ago to go into the matters of public consequence and make recommendations for the Government regarding the cutting down of expenditure and the only thing they have accomplished is that they increased the expenditure in something like \$10,000 and decreased it nothing.

That is the result of the Finance Commission and the work of two years ago. They made recommendations to the Government that were never carried out and received salaries for that. It cost the colony from \$8,000 to \$10,000 to appoint that commission for which it received nothing. They were appointed to give some

men a job, for which they accomplished nothing.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to know the position of the commission now, is it still in existence and under any further obligation to the Colony?

HON. MR. CRAMM.—Mr. Chairman, I might say that as far as I am concerned, I am under no further obligation to the Colony and the Colony is under no further obligation to me, because I have resigned from being a member of the commission.

With respect to the remarks of Mr. Cashin, the Member for Ferryland, I wish to say:-

If there were no results from the work of the Commission that is not the fault of the Commission. There were certain reports made, but whether or not the Government put the work of the Commission into effect was not the business of the Commission. Now there was a difference of opinion as to what course should be followed in connection with the work that was being done. When a certain department was investigated into, and certain recommendations or interim reports were made, they could have, if the Government felt like it, been put into effect, but the Government felt, at least the majority of the Government felt that the reports covering the entire civil service should be in their hands before anything was done. What I want to say is this, that I very involuntarily became a member of that Commission, and the point that I resent with respect to the Honourable Member's remarks is that the Commission was formed particularly to give some people jobs. It was not formed to give me a job, and while I went on it, after giving the matter serious consideration, it was only because I was asked by the Government to do so, and I felt that I could be of

some service to the Colony. I am absolutely satisfied that if such a Commission goes about its work seriously which I think this Commission did, and if it performs its work well, and if its report is put into operation by the Government, then I say that a very substantial result can be obtained by the work of such Commission. It is not the fault of the Commission, no matter what the Commission, if its work is not put into operation. As a matter of fact we do not need a Commission at all in this country today to be able to point to certain things that can be remedied. The present Government has not felt like remedying them and other Governments have not felt like remedying them, in fact we have found very few Governments that are willing to touch any of them, and the reason for it is this. There are lots of people crying for economy. The whole country is crying for economy, but the very moment that you touch economy at such a point where it effects any individual, you hear that individual crying out in connection with it. A particular case in point was the one referred to by Mr. Halfyard this afternoon, where one of his Relieving Officers had his salary cut the amount of \$17.00 and he thought that thing of such importance that he brought it up here in the House of Assembly. Now when the cutting of \$17.00 off the salary of a Relieving Officer is considered of such importance that it has to be brought up in this House of Assembly, what would happen if we were to cut off \$1,700.00 or \$170.00. Of course, in the particular case that Mr. Halfyard has mentioned, it only happened that there was a change there at the time. It was not that the salary was cut. If I remember the circumstances, that particular man's salary was not cut at all. There was a change made there and when the commission had

been doing some work and had practically reached the point of making a report on that particular phase of the Public Charities Work the person who had been holding office there, had resigned or died, and when a new man was appointed, his salary was put on the basis of the interim report. That is what actually happened. There was really no cut in the person's salary at all.

This Finance Committee did considerable work, and considerable important work, and I think that when you find the Government with the courage to put the work that has been done with the work that is still incomplete into effect, that considerable benefit will accrue to the Colony, and the amount paid to the members of the Finance Commission plus the expense of the clerical work, will be well paid for.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, with reply to the honourable member in regard to the Finance Commission, I may say that I take it he is trying to justify the existence of that commission, appointed by the Government a few years ago and theirs is the responsibility for the non carrying out of the Commission's recommendations to the Government.

HON. MR. CRAMM—That is not true.

MR. CASHIN—Yes it is true and the honourable gentleman should not forget that three of the members on that commission were closely identified with the Executive Government, and it has been said that one of them was the man supposed to control the Government of this Colony. And I take it that this was a case of going to law with the devil and holding the court in hell. Because here is the position. This Economy Commission made a report to themselves, in as much as a third of the Government

was that Commission, and the only thing they accomplished, as Mr. Halfyard says, was the saving of seventeen dollars, by a cut in the salary of a Relieving Officer in Trinity Bay. And it cost eight thousand dollars to save that seventeen. That is the point that I was getting at. If this Commission that was appointed seriously meant what they said, they would have forced their recommendations down the throats of the Government, or got out.

MR. CRAMM—We had people trying to do that before.

MR. CASHIN—I was one of the people that they tried to do that to before. The present administration tried to force the 1925 Tariff down my throat but it would not go down.

HON. MR. CRAMM—We did not succeed, no.

MR. CASHIN—But I succeeded as the backer of a party in a bye-election in defeating the present administration.

HON. MR. CRAMM—That was not your fault.

MR. CASHIN—If it was not my fault it was your fault. Here is the point. All that this commission did was to give three or four individuals a job. And then the Honourable member gets up and tells us that they made recommendations to the Government, and three of the individuals on that commission were in the Government. They went down to the Finance Department or the Charities Department and wrote out a report, and sent it up to the Justice Department, and then they go up there and they say "no, we will not have it." In one office they say one thing and then they go back to another office and they say another thing. I do not want to get up here at this late period of this session and make trouble, but I hate to see stuff pulled off, of that calibre. I hope I

will not have to say anything more in this respect this session.

HON. MR. CRAMM—So far as I am concerned I do not want the honourable member to withhold anything that he might want to say, with respect to this commission or anything else. I rather invite his criticism.

MR. CASHIN—My criticism is free and frank, and I do not care who hears me saying it.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Nobody cares what you say.

MR. CASHIN—Possibly they do not, and I care just as little for what they think. But there is this much about it. I have not recommended anything to myself at one end of a line and go to the other end and turn it down like this commission did, and then they shove in a bill for four or five thousand dollars each. Mr. Morine was going away and he had to have his money a year ago. That gave other members a chance to put in their bills. Mr. Chairman, the story of this outfit is never going to be told. We are discussing Supplementary Supply and here is \$500,000 added on to the original votes, and then we talk about deficits.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the medical attendance on paupers costs something like \$40,000, and whilst I am on this subject I may add a few words to what I have already said in relation to putting a wing or two on the General Hospital. I do not think that the Finance Commission mentioned anything about that. The other day the Colonial Secretary in reply to me spoke of his endeavouring to forward a movement to erect a pavilion for paying patients at the General Hospital. I have since discussed the matter with one of the leading medical men in Newfoundland. I do not propose at this juncture to mention his name in the House. And he be-

lieved that a pavilion for paying patients, while it might be O.K., he did not think at the same time that it would pay. He felt that there would not be enough paying patients to go in and pay their private fee. But he did advocate strongly the erection of a wing or two to the General Hospital, and the abolition of the outside hospitals now in existence in this country. He told me of doctors resigning from the Board of Health, because they could no longer stand the stench of the graft that was going on in that direction. I think the Colonial Secretary knows that himself. Now the loan bill will be introduced to-morrow and no doubt the Government has already made up its plans as to how that loan is to be spent, and I feel that in the interests of the Colony as a whole these outside hospitals should be abolished. And if there is any spare money in that loan that it should be used for the erection of a wing or two on the General Hospital. Because at the present time numbers of outport patients are coming into the city and they are thrown, that is the word, they are literally thrown, into old boarding houses in this town to suffer there, and sometimes they are not discovered for two months. This particular doctor told me himself that he had a patient come into town, and it took him six weeks to find him. He found him in a attic in one of the old houses that are used by the Public Health Department for putting sick people into when they arrive in the city. Therefore I feel that something should be done in that direction. It is just as well for this Government to do it as any other Government to come in and do it. Whilst I am speaking of hospitals I may say that we have gone so far now that we have established them in the outports, and in one of the districts represented by one of the members

on this Commission. I mean Mr. Sullivan, the member for Placentia and St. Mary's. In Placentia there is an old tumble down shack, which is used to put the sick people in that are brought up from the bottom of the Bay, and the Government pays a dollar a day to a man to look after them and give them a dose of salts.

Now I hope that this recommendation of mine will not fall upon deaf ears. I know from an ordinary business point of view that it is a step in the way of economy, so I think that the Government—before we say Amen to the present administration—should take this suggestion into their serious consideration and put an amount in the Loan Bill for the building of a wing or two at the General Hospital. Dr. Keegan is in charge of that institution and I think the Government realises that he is one of the most efficient and ablest in his profession in the country; but I may say that he was never at any time consulted by any department of the present administration on any matter up to a couple of weeks ago, when they had good reason to appreciate his worth in connection with some ten or fifteen children.

I trust, however, Mr. Chairman, that any remarks of mine will be taken seriously, as they are not meant in any spirit of obstruction.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think this Committee is entitled to the particulars of the \$2,000.00 paid the Finance Commission. I presume it is from the Commissioners. Last year the public accounts showed that only one Commissioner, Sir A. B. Morine, got \$1,000.00 up to that time. Mr. Morine has since left the country and it looks as if Hons. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Cramm will be presenting bills for payment. Really I would like to know what the Commissioners

got for the valuable work they performed?

HON. MR. CRAMM—The amounts will be found in the public accounts.

MR. HALFYARD—Is that Commission still in existence and is there any part of that \$2,000.00 for secretarial work?

HON. MR. CRAMM—No.

MR. HALFYARD—Then do I understand that this \$2,000.00 is not for payment of any Commissioners at all? Or did the Commissioners get \$2,000.00 each?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I got \$2,000.00 and I consider I earned it in spite of the remarks from the other side of the House.

MR. HALFYARD—Then, in my opinion, the man who did the work, Sir A. B. Morine, who made out that report, which is a good one, is only half paid. He is gone away with a paltry \$1,000.00 whilst his colleagues got \$2,000.00 each. The Hon. Mr. Cramm states now that lack of courage prevented the recommendations of the Commission being carried out. Well we would like to have some excuse for the payment of the services of three Commissioners. I cannot see where this country benefitted one cent for the \$10,000.00 spent on this Commission because their recommendations were not acted upon. I fear that it was a sheer waste of money to have that Commission function at all when their recommendations were not to be listened to and carried into effect. I think it is a deplorable state of affairs when a Commission is appointed by the present Government at the cost of a tremendous sum of money to the taxpayers of this country and no returns are forthcoming for such an expenditure. The Government will not be putting the recommendations of the Commission into effect and we are

told by the Commissioners themselves that it will take more courage than the present administration got to put such recommendations into effect. I am sorry that Mr. Cramm and Mr. Sullivan were not in a position to give better service, and that their colleagues were so weak as not to back them up in their efforts towards carrying out the reforms they recommended; but I hope that these two gentlemen will be with the new Government and then they will have an opportunity of seeing their recommendations put into effect.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I am tired of hearing about what should be done by a government. The trouble is when is the country going to get a government that has the courage to do what they know ought to be done. The Hon. Mr. Cramm tells us this afternoon that we don't need any commission to bring about economy in the country. What is the reason the commission is not functioning today? There was need for it at the time it was instituted and why has not it brought forth some fruit from its labours? What the country wants today is people who will go in and run the country and do what they believe is necessary and right for the country. The country elected a Government that was going to retrench and instead of retrenchment they got increased taxation. Do you expect economy along these lines? No wonder faith is lost in governments and politicians. I hope, Sir, that the time won't be long before a government will be elected that will have the courage to go in and clean up every department in the Public Service and run the country as they believe it should be run. I think, today, if the Prime Minister got on his feet and I believe some word should be forthcoming from him as to why the recommendations of the commission were not carried into effect, I think he

would acknowledge that deep down in his heart he feels that the Government has not economised as it might have. What is the use of appointing commissions if you are not going to put their recommendations into force? It would be better that they were not appointed at all if there is going to be no fruit from their work.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on what I may term this notorious Finance Commission. According to Mr. Cramm the Commission has finished its labours. He has resigned and it is no longer in existence. As far as I can recollect last year we were trying to get some reports of the work of the Commission, and the reports given were termed Interim Reports; that is, the Commission functioned and presented reports as it went along. Now, I feel if the Commission is finished we are entitled to hear, either while the committee is on these votes or in Ways and Means, what is the final report. If the Commission has done a job of work and have been paid for it, we are entitled to a full report; secondly there seems to be a difference of opinion as to what was paid commissioners, and I think we ought to have detailed statement as to what was the total cost of the Commission showing what each Commissioner received for his services. If these two things are forthcoming, I think a good deal of the difference of opinion and of misunderstanding that has occurred here this afternoon would be cleaned up. It is regrettable that one member of the Commission has had to stand up and admit his Government did not have the courage to carry the resolutions into effect. I say the report should be tabled and some government some day may have courage to tackle the job which you have very well done but were not strong enough to carry into

effect. Of course it was an abortive commission; it did nothing. I am not going to say whether the Commissioners should be paid or not; the only thing is in 1924, when this Government was attacking its predecessors at the polls, they let the people believe almost that they were prepared to work for nothing. I would like to ask the honourable member where a question should be addressed in connection with these matters.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—I think it should be addressed to the Colonial Secretary. It is in his department.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Would it be out of place to ask the Hon. Member if there is such a thing as a final report in existence?

HON. MR. CRAMM.—I don't think there is.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Then the job is finished.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—That may be your idea. I finished the job I had in hand. If you want to take it up and carry it further you can do so.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; With regard to this vote for the Bureau of Education might I ask the President of the Bureau if the Bureau of Education has given any consideration to the consolidating of the vote for the augmentation of teachers salaries. I know that there may possibly be a difference of opinion as to what should be done but some of the superintendants have expressed very clearly and lucidly their idea that there should be one vote and then there should be no rebate, no refunds. As it is, if there is any shortage and one denomination gets \$1,000.00 every denomination has to get a proportionate amount and they may not require it, according to the grading of teachers.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—Up to the present there has been no

suggestion from the Bureau of Education on those lines. I know it has been commented on but there has been no suggestion.

MR. HALFYARD.—In connection with the Hospital an attempt has been made I presume to collect fees from those patients who have the means of paying. Speaking the other day on the Public Charities vote I said I was inclined to give up all hope of anything being done to reduce expenditure on account of Public Charities, and it seems we have to vote large amounts for supplementary supply which confirms me in the opinion if the present Government could not get better results from their efforts that I do not know that anybody else can do anything more than they have done, that is if they have been honest in their attempt. A new board was formed, the Public Health Board including some of our best citizens, doctors and others and it seems that the results of their efforts were so disappointing that I understand they resigned and now there is only left running the Board the Secretary Mr. Rennie and Dr. Brehm. That is a matter, of course, which is causing anxiety to the Colonial Secretary's Department and I can somewhat sympathise with the Hon. Minister. He said the other day he had given a great deal of attention to the Public Health Department and he didn't give up hope; but it is a deplorable condition of affairs, and whether anything can be brought about I don't know. Of course our people are poor; but some get fees paid by the Government who should not get them paid. An attempt should be made of course to try and lessen the expenses. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that all representatives of districts should assist as far as they can and get people who can pay

to pay, and not to try and gain political popularity by encouraging people to get clear of paying their legitimate bills just to get votes. That kind of thing may obtain to a certain extent but we should all try to discourage it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Mr. Chairman; I want to take the opportunity to emphasise the serious expenditure that is going on in connection with this matter. I made a suggestion to the House the other day with regard to what I thought was the remedy to be adopted for the considerable amount of unnecessary expenditure that is going on and this afternoon we had a demonstration of how even a suggestion of that kind meets absolute opposition. The Hon. Member for Ferryland, unfortunately he is not here just now, said this afternoon that he was in consultation with an eminent doctor here who absolutely disapproved of the idea and thought the hospital should be enlarged. So it shows the difficulty of getting people to think on similar lines. I don't think it is good enough for any medical man to say that is the wrong remedy but we should put additional wings on the hospital. With all due respect to that gentleman I say that that would only make confusion worse confounded. It would only add to our difficulties; and I think that is a reasonable position; and I still maintain until we have a properly organized medical service under the direction of some strong man with organizing ability and back bone in charge of the entire medical service of the colony, possibly with an advisory board, but he would want to be somebody in a position the same as the Inspector General who has control and who would take control and see to it that not alone patients but doctors are disciplined, because I

think there is more discipline needed amongst the doctors than amongst the patients.

That is my position and I will stand by that position in season and out of season. There is a case in point, and Mr. Bradley is, I think, in a position to corroborate it, because he visited the place a short time ago. In Halifax they have a private pavilion attached to the Victoria General Hospital which not only pays its own way but helps to pay the expenses of the General Hospital for non-paying patients. Mr. Bradley has been up there and he can bear me out in that, and what I stated last year, I stated this year and I will state again, in spite of the fact that some medical men have different opinion. I will never be one in a Government and I hope no Government that comes in will add public wards to the General Hospital. I hope it will be a private pavilion and let those who want hospital treatment pay something for it as if they were staying at the Newfoundland Hotel, and not expect to be treated for nothing. That idea seems to be premeated in the minds of the people of this country.

It is not necessary because it is a Government institution that it should be a pauper institution. Why should not a Government institution, subsidized by the Government, be self-supporting. Why should medical men, nurses, medicine etc. be provided for people, who can well afford to pay, for it, and who go there and get free treatment. It is a disgraceful charge for a man who can afford more, \$1.00 a day, and that including food as well as treatment.

The thing is preposterous and I think that somebody should take hold of it and arrange to have something done.

I say that that vote should not be there at all.

MR. HALFYARD.—What does that mean, Mr. Chairman?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is the discrepancy between the cost what is really paid. The cost to get to the Labrador is I think \$6.00 a head, whereas it costs something like \$20.00 a head. They have to be fed and all that sort of thing.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—The cost last year was about half the cost it was before because they got the large steamers to transport them.

Mr. Chairman; I would like to say a word on behalf of the suggestion that Mr. Halfyard has made because he seems to indicate that we should, in many cases, carry people over the line free when there is work to be got and back again when they cannot find work.

We have had a great deal of difficulty in the last four years in connection with the matter of transportation of people when they want to get work and transportation of the same people back again when they cannot get work.

There is a shelf of messages two feet high in my office from people that asked me to get them passes. They told me that they were destitute and wanted to get home and I replied in every case that the law of the country did not permit the railway to give passes over the line and they could not get passes.

We have heard about the serious situation in Millertown recently. A number of men that were there for a long time were in a destitute condition, according to their report. I took the matter up with the Colonial Secretary and he suggested that we get Mr. Fitzgerald of Grand Falls to make an investigation of each case and help

only the destitute, and Mr. Fitzgerald did that.

Now the other day I got a message from three men saying they could get no work and wanted passes to St. John's. As Mr. Fitzgerald was acting for us we sent the telegram to him asking him to investigate the three cases and only relieve in case that they were absolutely destitute. Mr. Fitzgerald telegraphed that he was making investigation but was led by inquiry to think that these three men were already back in St. John's by instruction of the Poor Commissioner. He made further enquiry and telegraphed me on Saturday that these three men had been brought back by the Poor Commissioner on recommendations made by the Member for Ferryland, who undoubtedly made them thinking that the men were really destitute. Those men, we found on investigation, had been paid off at Buchans Mine with \$138.80 and they had quit work voluntarily when they could have continued to work. Those three men came back and are somewhere along the south coast and I feel that they should be prosecuted.

I just point out this instance to show the Hon. Member that his suggestion to carry men over the line without investigation of circumstances would be against the interests of the country. People do not think there is any harm in getting money from the Government for nothing, and that is something that has to be checked.

I have mentioned this because I don't know whether it was on account of Mr. Halfyard's remarks the other day on seed potatoes, when he raised the question of some people getting seed potatoes for nothing and working it out on the roads, that I was getting messages from all over the Island asking me for seed potatoes, to be sent them.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, there is one point that the Honourable the Prime Minister made that I would like corrected.

I think he stated that my idea was to give transportation without any investigation. That is something I do not want and I think the Department of the Colonial Secretary will bear me out in that.

I have received numerous messages from people all over the country stating that they were destitute, no work, arrange for passage home, get job or food, or something like that, and I, last year, referred the messages to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, to Mr. Stirling or Mr. Mews. The Department of the Colonial Secretary at that time received so many messages of that nature that they were inclined to dismiss the matter right off and say that they were all right.

My idea was this, that at every industrial centre there should be some responsible official, a relieving officer or customs official or somebody and when there was no relieving officer or customs official there should be somebody representing the Government to whom the Colonial Secretary could refer to find out the circumstances. That is what I suggested to Mr. Mews at the time. I said the last time that if I was there—I know who I was talking to—if I was there I would work it to send messages to a man at Millertown Junction or elsewhere and find out the circumstances of these applicants and if they could get along without Government help well leave them alone.

So about four weeks ago I received a message from some men asking for money. The contractor, knowing the request, wired me that the men were paid off, which confirms the statement made by the Honourable the Prime Minister that in some cases people try and get something for nothing.

My idea is that an investigation should be required of each one where you don't know the circumstances of the man.

When anybody applies to me saying that he will die if he doesn't get some money and I don't know if it is a correct or not I always get someone to investigate and find out.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, because it is absolutely unwarranted. I do not know what took place between you and Mr. Mews, but I do know that I did not turn down an application with regard to people in need. I investigate every case. I think that honourable members will realise that when they have asked me to have constituents of theirs who happened to be marooned up the country, to get them home, that I get the railway or someone close at hand to find out whether these people are in need. In no case have they been turned down. But I want to say about this pass system that in the public interest it should not be permitted. It is two years ago since I took this matter up and tried to formulate some system. I found it was impossible without the co-operation of those employing men. I got in touch with the Buchans people to know if we gave permission to the men to go up there seeking employment, whether they would co-operate with the Government and collect the price of their passage out of their wages as they earned them. They absolutely refused to have anything to do with it. The other companies did not find it satisfactory and they would not do it. The position would be that if one man got a pass and went up there to-day, fifty would go up to-morrow and instead of having to bring one man back you would have to bring fifty who could not get employment. I think the outcome has justified our action in the matter because it would be unkind, it would be

improper for a government to induce people to seek employment where there is none to be had. That is what would happen. I have had to particularly arrange with Mr. Fitzgerald the Magistrate at Grand Falls, a very competent and energetic man, who leaves no stone unturned to find out whether a man is deserving or not. In every case that a man applies from Millertown Junction I have referred him to Mr. Fitzgerald. I have left it very largely to his discretion as to whether a man is entitled to be sent home or not. This case that has just been referred to by the Prime Minister was not referred to Mr. Fitzgerald, and when I was shown the message this morning it was the first I heard of it. This was done directly by the Poor Commissioner. It is very unusual for Mr. Brownrigg to do anything off his own bat in that respect. However, in this instance these men were sent home by him. Therefore I am not accountable for that. But with regard to refusing passage home to anybody marooned up country, or caught out in a storm and cannot get home, I say that if it was done it was done not with my knowledge or consent.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, it appears that we have the black sheep in our district. I can assure the House now that neither myself or my colleague were a party to anything of that nature. We have very few men going to the woods or the mines looking for employment. These three men if they are guilty of the actions, as Mr. Fitzgerald has reported them, I can assure the House that both myself and my colleague will leave no stone unturned to bring them to justice.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the question of men being sent home on passes I think most of this trouble is around Millertown Junction. Men who went in there this

spring without a promise of work, thought because they worked there last year thought they would have had no trouble in getting their old jobs back again this year. This did not happen because the company had refused to take on extra men and those who I am referring to had no guarantee of work before they left to go there. Yesterday I was informed that the company is not giving any work until men are supplied for the fisheries.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—If they are doing that, they are doing it off their own bats. I do not think that the Government has anything to do with that.

MR. BROWN—Now with regard to getting men sent home on passes. And I must say this in favor of the Colonial Secretary, I had several messages this year from that part of the country from men who could not secure employment and wanted a pass home. I took the matter up with the Colonial Secretary. I had no trouble. He was very courteous. He did all that was necessary. He got in touch with Magistrate Fitzgerald, and had the men sent home. I must thank the Colonial Secretary for that. Not only for that but in every other matter that I have had dealings with the Colonial Secretary, I found him straight and above board.

Now, there is one matter that I would like to mention before I sit down, and that is with regard to the transportation of men for Labrador. Last year I came south from Twillingate to Catalina on the Meigle. That was I think her last trip for the year bringing up crews. I may say that the state of affairs was disgraceful. I went down into the steerage and saw the condition under which the men, women and children had to live. There was at least half an inch of mud and

dirt on the floor. This should not be allowed I think it can be remedied, as in this age people should not be treated as cattle. I now ask the Railway Commission to take this matter up and see if possible that that does not exist any longer, and that this year there will be better accommodation provided for those people that have to go to Labrador by that boat.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in connection with this transportation question, and particularly in reference to the people going to the Treaty Shore by the Prospero. It has been a difficult matter trying to keep track of the Railway Commission changing the passage rates in connection with the Prospero during the last four years. Today there is a six dollar ticket for a fisherman going down from Conception Bay or other places. That man is supposed to find himself. If he wishes to avail of that system that is his own business. But now we come to the French Shore Boat. We find that there is a considerable increase in the second class passage rate on boats going to the French Shore as against last year. You have up there this year a similar arrangement to that on the Labrador boat. The fisherman buys a six dollar ticket goes on board and he has to find himself. I contend that is an arrangement that is unsatisfactory and unnecessary. Now what are the actual facts of the situation. I make the statement here now that the Railway Commission is able to take a man on board the Prospero and give him good fare for \$10.50 and lose no money by the transaction. The fact that every man is his own cook and doing everything that has to be done is the cause of all the uncleanness. We find that in the lumber woods a man can be fed for sixty cents a day, and if you give him the

same substantial fare as he gets in the lumber woods, at \$10.50 a ticket, you could have a good profit. What do we find on that boat. We find that the cooks are derelict in their duty. It is surprising to note the amount of food that is dumped overboard. However, I know that it is a very tough proposition. It is as hard to deal with as the question of poor relief. I realise that it is not an easy matter also, to outline a rate for transportation of fishermen to the French Shore.

DR. MOSDELL—The Prime Minister referred the other day to the inadvisability of men going to Buchans Mine and other industrial centres looking for work. I would like to know if the Government took any steps advising them not to go, and, if they did, what methods were employed in that respect?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, through the daily despatch and by notices posted up at the railway stations around the country.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to know where Dr. Baker is likely to be sent next to do survey work?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I think in the vicinity of St. George's Coal Fields.

MR. HICKMAN—What is this \$700 for not provided in the Estimates?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—One of the officials in the office has been transferred to act as secretary to Dr. Baker and the official who replaces him is now getting the same salary as the one transferred got.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Finance Minister what ruling has been made by his department in connection with goods imported from Great Britain that show on the invoices a drawback? I understand now that people must pay a

duty on the drawback as well as on the invoice because it seems to be the rule at the Customs that the price on the invoice is not the same as the market price. It happens that there are a number of business concerns and a number of concerns in Great Britain who understand each other, and that the drawback is not shown on the invoice with the result that you are getting false invoices. Now there are some British concerns who are not going to "doctor" their invoices in that way and the consequences is that they will purchase their goods in other countries. We talk about trade within the Empire and you have trade being diverted from within the Empire to other countries because of the practice that is going on, and I think the department of Customs should give some consideration to the point that I make. I understand that in Australia, South Africa and New Zealand people are allowed the drawback without having duty collected on them, and I would like to know what our Government proposes to do in the future?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— I know that it has been a bit troublesome in the department with regard to exchange. It is not trade within the Empire that the Hon. Member speaks of, as a lot of the goods he refers to are bought in foreign countries but; if the Hon. Member will see me at my office to-morrow morning I will explain the whole matter fully to him.

MR HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject I would like to make a few remarks. I think the whole system of Customs entries is a muddle. I venture to say to-day that there are hundreds of entries upon which people are not able to pass their invoices. There are so many costs and taxes to be made up that it takes a clerk at the Long Room a

whole day to fix up a single entry. There are hundreds of outstanding entries left in the Customs to-day. This is a very great delay to people importing goods and it is not good enough to have goods held up through no fault of the importer, but because they are not put through the Customs in time. I suppose the Minister understands what the rules and regulations are, but it appears that there must be some other way to facilitate the business community in the passing of Customs entries.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is very annoying and very inconvenient to have goods held up any length of time, but it is the experience of both myself and Mr. LeMessurier that there is no other way to get over it, if we are to get at the true invoices. However, with the exception of a few odd cases, I have never heard the system bitterly complained of before.

DR. MOSDELL—There seems to be some change in the Pensions vote. Would that increase be because of increased applications?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— This is only the carrying out as the Colonial Secretary described the other day, of a promise given by a Government long ago that our soldiers would be treated exactly the same as the Canadians and a man's family are taken care of until the children get to a certain age.

DR. MOSDELL—My understanding is that the ordinary provision made for military pensions is according to the Canadian scale so I am asking why is there this \$14,000 extra. .

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— It is the result of the application of the Canadian Act. The Colonial Secretary it may be noticed gave here the yearly notice of a Bill for the ex-

tension year by year of the bonus system and under this bonus system amounts per year cannot be estimated. Last year shows additions by marriages, additional children and so on. It is the working out of the Act and for some years to come until the production of children ceases, there, will probably be an increasing amount.

DR. MOSDELL—Last year I think notice was given that the time for application for pensions was to be extended. The reason I ask was to discover whether the increase is due to extra number of applicants.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

HIGHWAYS TRAFFIC ACT

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—

In asking that the Bill be read the second time I may say that I don't think that there is anything of a contentious nature in the amendment. It is principally technical and the details of it can be taken up as we go through it in Committee. No one will disagree with the principle of it. The amendment to the present traffic Act is the result of observation during the past couple of years. Members will not find much satisfaction until we take up the matter in Committee and take it section by section. Shortly the House may accept my assurance that there is nothing at all in the Bill except what might be termed a technical amendment as a result of the handling of the traffic situation generally and particularly motor vehicles. There is nothing in the whole Bill that spells any radical departure; in

other words in accepting the second reading the Committee is not accepting anything at variance with the present law or the more general practise in regard to the matter of motor vehicle traffic. The only thing that might be said to be novel at all is on page 2. There is the provision made to control registration in the Customs Department, to protect people in the use of their cars and making it possible to follow them and to get the benefit of this temporary commission while they are in the country. The remaining sections of the Bill are merely as I say it as submitted by the Highroads Commission with the idea of improving conditions on behalf of the safety of the public, and in particular on behalf of the safety of the public which is mainly concerned namely those who do not own motor vehicles.

I beg to move the second reading.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highways Traffic Act, 1928," 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.

HIGHROADS COMMISSION ACT

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—

I beg to move the second reading. It is a very short Bill. It is introduced as the previous one is introduced at the request of the Highroads Commission to enable them to be in a position to protect certain interests of the people and the Colony. Again it is as the result of experience. Under the Highroads Commission Act, 1925 certain powers are given, and though I speak merely from memory I think the particular section 22 is a section to enable them to protect highways where people interfere with trees planted along the highway. It is now suggested that; (Reads):

I may say shortly that the origin of this addition of power is that it has been found in certain places where the highways travels along the beach or any Crown property of a similar character, people go in and dig out quite close to the edge of the highway and there is no power to control a situation like that. Parties have taken the position that as far as they are concerned they are under no obligation to take any care not to interfere with the highway in this way. The effect of this is to give power in cases like that, the ordinary remedy may be taken and a man can only interfere in excavating close to the highway provided he can show that he is exercising the reasonable enjoyment of his own property. We find ourselves in the position today of advising the Highroads Commission, that at present they have not that power to remedy those conditions under the Old Act as they will have under this section if brought in.

It is in line with legislation elsewhere, I beg to move the second reading. I would like to repeat that the matter originates at the request of the Members of the Commission as a result of their own experience in keeping highroads in repair.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act, 1925," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

The remaining orders 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.

TEUSDAY, May 29th 1928.

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

PETITIONS

Mr. Scammell, from Bonne Bay re Road.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented a Petition from Edmund Hanrahan of Harbour Grace praying for protective legislation for the establishment of a certain fishery industry.

On motion the petition was received and it was ordered that it be referred to a Select Committee to report as to whether the Rules of the House respecting Private Bills have been complied with.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows; Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Randell, Mr. Moore.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Report of Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, Dec. 31st 1927.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole relating to the disposition of balances remaining out of the Loans raised under the Act George V. Cap. 18.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of Question.

RESOLUTIONS RE NORTHERN PRODUCTS CO., LTD.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the

Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Northern Products Co. Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to consider these resolutions, I think that the House should be aware to some extent of what led up to the resolutions that are before us this afternoon. It is known I dare say to some of the members of the House that the Messrs. Reids had claims for these shells on the Labrador for a great many years. Mr. Chalmers was working for them, and at the end of a number of years they more or less abandoned their claims and, I think, made over nine claims to Mr. Chalmers for work done on their behalf. There seems to have been very little progress made in this connection and Mr. Smythe in conversation with Mr. Chalmers came to the conclusion that he could do something with the proposition and interest capitalists in the United States or elsewhere in this connection, and he made a trip to the United States and he interested a great many influential parties who told him that while they were getting their shell food in the shape of oyster shells, they were very much impressed with this product he brought up and they would be inclined to drop the oyster shell business altogether if they could be perfectly certain of a very large and certain supply of the other product which they claim is superior to the oyster shell, and on which they were prepared to take the risk of exporting from the Labrador, because at the time and up to the present the cost of exporting that shell is a very indefinite quantity. Mr. Smythe came back and first interested a number of share holders. He got

150 share holders to subscribe and made another couple of trips to the United States to further his plans and he succeeded in engaging the services of a Mr. Collins who was employed in going around with samples of shells and further demonstrating to interested purchasers what could be done. He then came back and in September 1926 he came to the Government. I happened to be away at the time at the Imperial Conference, but he approached the Prime Minister of the day, Sir John Bennett, and he brought the matter before the Government as to whether they should be given a right to search for these shells for one year with a view to the getting grants for such properties on such locations as they might be able to find during that period. I was not here at the time, but if I had been, I would most certainly have taken the same position as my colleagues took on that particular occasion because I would have recognized, as I think the House might realize that while monopolies are dangerous and objectionable in very many respects, there are times when monopolies are necessary, and, in my opinion, this is one of the occasions in which a monopoly is necessary. To ship this shell up in small quantities to the United States, they can't compete with the oyster shell, and it can't be made a profitable business. I think that was clearly demonstrated by the Products Company who are the principals in the Bill, having sent a hundred and fifty ton schooner up last year and sending a cargo in small quantities to various dealers throughout the United States. I think that little proposition probably cost the Company somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10,000. Mr. Smythe's trips have cost considerable money, and the retaining of Mr. Collins for two years has cost the Company considerable

money, and, as a result of the \$60,000 subscribed by local share holders, there is practically nothing left. It has cost the Company between \$50,000 and \$60,000, so I say the the monopoly was necessary in this respect. The Bill would have been brought before the House last year but owing to the lateness of the session and the desire of members to get home and get the House closed, we had to postpone it, but after the House closed we gave Mr. Smythe an understanding that this Bill would come before the House at the next session, and we confirmed an agreement with him whereby he would have five years from 1927 or four years from now in which to ship these shells. The proposition of course as you will see by the resolutions simply embrace that he has the exclusive right to ship any shells, with and exception in favour of those having claims prior to the time we gave this blanket to the Northern Products Company. It further provides that while Mr. Smythe in 1928 can export his shells without paying anything to the Government; in 1929, 1930 and 1931 he has to pay twenty-five cents a ton for every ton that he exports. Now I have no brief for Mr. Smythe, but as I said I believe this thing can only be done in a large way, and by assuring the American capitalists and the Company generally that they would have a sufficient supply to hold the trade for a number of years, and the exclusive right over those areas to export the shells.

What I am particularly interested in, as I say, I hold no brief for Mr. Smythe, is in seeing revenue obtained for the Colony. Now there are a great number of people who will laugh at the idea of 75,000 tons of this shell being shipped away in a season. You will notice in the Bill that unless the Company ships seventy-five thous-

and tons in one year, they lose the exclusive right to ship. If the Company does not ship seventy-five thousand tons, it does not get any monopoly, so there is not much cause to be alarmed about the monopoly part of it. If they do ship seventy-five thousand or a hundred thousand tons as they expect to do, then the Colony gets \$25,000 in every year they ship that out, and surely to goodness it is worth while to take the risk to get \$25,000 in direct revenue to the country, and at the same time give labour on the Labrador coast which must be involved in getting that amount of shell together because while it is mentioned abroad, I have heard it argued by members of the Opposition that this loading of ships would simply be done by suction pumps being brought along and pulling up the shells, anybody who knows anything about shipping business knows that the shell would have to be accumulated in certain spots even if they are taken on board by suction pumps. But however, the Company has undertaken to ship 75,000 tons every year, and I do not think anybody need be in very much alarm about the monopoly. Now we had a petition presented to the House by certain other parties. That petition wanted to protect in the first place those who had claims before we gave this concession to Mr. Smythe and his company. In the second place I think it wanted to protect those who have taken up claims since we have given this concession, and leases which were only taken up with the full knowledge that the Smythe company had got the exclusive right of export subject of course to ratification by this Legislature. It is for those reasons that I have no hesitation at all in bringing the matter before Hon. Members with full confidence that the Company has been honest in its proposition. It has

150 share holders who have put their money in it in the best of faith, some of them almost their all, and none of these share holders as far as I know of have any great means. It means a deal to those share holders that this proposition goes thru. If it doesn't go through I think it would be a reflection not alone on the Government of this country not alone the Legislature of this country, but would create a doubt in the minds of capitalists abroad as to whether the contracts of Government can be relied on under any circumstances.

I am prepared this afternoon to give an explanation in connection with any clauses of the resolutions and I suggest that the resolutions may be read through and if any member desires that the Committee rise, I have no desire to press the matter this afternoon but I am ready to answer questions in this respect.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; The subject matter of these resolutions confers an extremely important right and I don't think we should be called upon to discuss them until we have had time to consider the resolutions, I would suggest that the Prime Minister move that the Committee rise and we can discuss the matter tomorrow when we have had time to consider it.

It is not only what it conferred in this particular bill but the principles underlying the situation that will be created if the bill passes and becomes law, are extremely important.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; Before the Committee rises I would like to refer to the petition that was presented to the House some time ago against these Resolutions going through. I would like to know from the Prime Minister, the introducer of the resolutions, the pre-

sent position of the petitioners. Have they asked to be presented here

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I might say that one of the petitioners came in and saw me the other day and I think he was perfectly satisfied with the Clause that is in the Bill now. I could not say definitely but he gave me to understand that he was satisfied with the Clause in the Bill, which was put there since the presenting of the petition and is to the effect that those who held claims prior to the concessions to Mr. Smythe would not be excluded by this Bill.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Does that petition come before a select Committee?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It comes to a select Committee at the second reading stage.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Prime Minister introducing these resolutions of the Northern Products Company Limited.

I would like to know in whose interests this Bill is being put through.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In the interests of the country.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Is it for the good of the country or in the interest of the shareholders who invested their money, not for purposes of what the Colony would get out of it, but for the same purpose as any man invests in any Company, to profit by the earnings of that company.

Now I cannot see where there is very much labour going to be given and as there are other people who have raised that point I asked that question with reference to the petition. I was here on the day on which that petition was presented but I would like to know something further about it so that we can know what the petitions require.

I have no arguments against these resolutions. I cannot very well discuss it at the present time and I would suggest, with the member for Port de Grave that we have time to think the matter over before the Resolutions are passed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; In reply to the Hon. Member I repeat again that I have no interest in the shareholders of this company. I am interested solely and simply in order to get from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year for the Colony for the revenue of the country and to give labour to the people of the country, which I believe will be done to some extent and start a new industry for this Island that may or may not be profitable.

I said just now that I have no desire to press the House, I want to give the members time to give these resolutions every consideration and then take it up and take as long as you like to discuss it, we can spend a night at it if you like. There is not very much in the resolutions that I see, that one does not almost see at a glance. The Bill is not very a long one and will not take very long to read and understand.

I would move Mr. Chairman that the Committee rise.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman; Before the Committee rises I would like to say that I am certainly one of the members of the House opposed to granting rights to one company, but I think the speech of the Prime Minister this afternoon seems to satisfy me on one thing, but I would like to know from him now with regard to the company that had claims previous. (Mr. Chalmers) that was there before they set in.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As previous they have the right to export them.

MR. MOORE.—Then I have no further objection to the bill. A friend of mine was connected with the old company that had claims there previous to the company of Mr. Smythe's and I was wondering if they were to be stopped from exporting from their claims.

Now there are many other people who came in since Mr. Smythe has worked it up. I have no sympathy for them whatever and if the company that had claims there previous to Mr. Smythe are satisfied, then I am perfectly satisfied.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Clause 8 protects them, it reads as follows: (Reads).

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I think that what the Prime Minister is trying to convey and what my colleague wants to get, is that people who had claims on the Labrador before the Northern Products Company Ltd. were given concessions are allowed under this Act to export shells the same as the Northern Products Company, but anyone who came in since and got claims since they were given concessions the Government looks upon them as coming in and acting as hold-up crowd.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We don't say that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; There is just one word that I would like to say. The Prime Minister drew your attention to Clause 8. There is a further point that I propose to suggest to him which he will take up the next day. In the meantime I would like to suggest to the House are regards to points raised from the opposite side of the Committee with regard to the petition that is before the House, that it has nothing whatever to do with the matter at this stage at all.

We are simply submitting the general policy involved. Variations may be wanted and changes may be made as a result of any comment that may be brought before the House when we come to the second reading stage.

I think in the meantime, the Hon. Members can all feel positive, that any proper protests submitted will receive consideration at the proper time.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Chairman; I presume that nothing in the Bill will hinder the fishermen on the Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Section 5 was especially drafted to protect them.

MR. LAKE.—Being of a selfish turn of mind I always have Burin District at the back of my mind; and when I heard that the tax would be something like \$25,000 it occurred to me that it was something like the amount that I asked for the other day for roads in that district.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; before the Committee rises I would suggest that we should know just where the Northern Products Company's claim exist at the present time.

They have certain claims I presume in the Agriculture and Mines Department, and I would like to know where.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They have the right to take up claims for two years.

MR. SCAMMELL.—They have areas on areas. What we want to know is where. They have been experimenting what areas? Are they operating at the present time? That is the first thing and secondly we would like to know what guaranty have we that they will be in a position to carry on operations here when this Bill is passed and not have to go to the United States to find more funds. Are we go-

ing to legislate for an American Company or a Newfoundland Company?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—If they are to depend on Newfoundland for their money they have got a pretty poor chance.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I have heard you talk like that before; that is the kind of faith that you have in the country.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am not talking about the country; I am talking about the investors.

MR. SCAMMELL.—I just threw out that hint to the Prime Minister, for there is no Bill going to pass unless we have all the information that is deemed necessary for an intelligent discussion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I shall be only too glad to give all the information that is necessary and I will bring down a map to-morrow that will show the various locations on the Labrador. As regards the financial position of the company I have seen letters from Mr. Eugene Outerbridge, brother of Sir Joseph Outerbridge, in which he expresses astonishment at the class of financier that are buying this stock that Mr. Smythe is interested in. I don't think we need doubt their being able to go ahead. I saw a telegram only the other day asking what was the delay, what was the trouble because they are ready to send their first ship down now.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Prime Minister what was the date of the original agreement?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The original agreement — the original minute of Council relating to this was dated 27th of February 1926.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; I notice that in reply to Capt. Randell with reference to the original agree-

ment the Prime Minister referred to a minute of Council. I would like to know if there was any agreement entered into between the Government and the Company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—There was an agreement but it has been altered and modified so much since that it is not the same agreement.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker; I would like to ask just what is the character of these amendments?

C. of E. COLLEGE LOAN

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to provide for the guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College" 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 agreed to without amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; Section five of the Bill reads "If His Excellency the Governor in Council shall be called upon in any year to pay the interest on the said loan by reason of the default of the Board of Directors, it shall be lawful for the Minister of Finance and Customs to deduct the amount so paid from the grants for the Church of England denomination for College purposes for the then current year." The amendment made by the Upper House strikes out the words "It shall be lawful for" and makes the Finance Minister collect it whether he wants to do it or not.

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 further to Amend the Law Society Act?" without amendment.

WAYS AND MEANS

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had 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 notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922." was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Supplementary Supply \$544,950.98.

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

Second Reading of Council's Amendments to Church of England College Bill.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker; I would like to know what right we have to mortgage the general grant for educational purposes for the Church of England. Now I am going to be bold enough and say that I am totally opposed to this whole proceed-

ing, and I hope the records of the House will carry that statement. Had I been in the House when the matter first came up I would have made more extended reference to it, because I unhesitatingly oppose the principle of this Bill, and I regret that I was not here to associate with those who expressed themselves along similar lines.

ADDRESS ON THE BUDGET

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I listened with very much discomfort to the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance delivered on Tuesday last.

I pictured to my mind's eye the great differences in the interest taken here on Budget day and the interest of the people in England when Mr. Winston Churchill, the Chancellor of the Exchequer presented his Budget to the House of Commons in April. The House of Commons was over crowded and large numbers were waiting outside the Parliament for the arrival of Mr. Churchill. I saw a picture in the "Daily Mail" of the Chancellor approaching the House of Commons followed by a large number of people of both sexes. When our bold Chancellor presented his Budget there were three people in the gallery, eleven on the benches outside the bar including the reporters, and if Mrs. Julia Salter Earle and Mr. M. Condon had not been here, there would have been not one visitor inside the bar of the House. Three Members of the Opposite Benches enjoyed a refreshing nap. How many were asleep on this side I do not know. The lack of interest on the part of the people and the Members of the House was because they expected nothing, and those who listened got nothing. Is there any better evidence of the unpopularity of the Government than the fact that no one came to listen to the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister?

We have come around again to the passing of the Estimates, and the appalling fifth effort of the Finance Minister to deliver his Cold Storage Budget.

It is disheartening to know that the country is still in the position where we cannot pay our bills without having to borrow money. There has been an increase in each year's Estimates, and the cost of Government is heavier every year. We are not able to live on our income which is no credit to the present Government or to the Finance Minister. The whole trouble is that we are paying away money for service which give no returns. There are too many people living off the rest of us and doing nothing. If I were a Finance Minister and had to borrow every year to cover deficits, I would be ashamed to have the people of this country to be aware of my inability to handle properly the country's finances.

This Budget we have listened to bears no stamp of originality. It is the drone that has been in evidence since the days of the defeat of the late Sir Robert Bond. It is well known that no spectacular reduction of taxation is within the Minister's means, nevertheless, the uneven burden of Taxation is badly felt. Not since the Minister accepted the Portfolio of Finance and Customs has he made an effort to adjust the Tariff. 1923-1924 Estimates \$8,994,124, Public Debt \$57,976,694. In 1923-24 the Estimates were \$9,256,153.37. The total Estimates for 1924-25 were never given to the House and they were also left out of the Journal of the House for that year, 1925-1926 \$9,608,971, 1926-27 further increase \$9,773,619, 1927-28 further increase to \$10,087,410, 1928-29 further increase \$10,465,682. The increase over 1923-24 when the present Government came in power

to date is \$1,212,529 which means that it costs more to run our country today by one and a quarter million dollars per year than it did when the Monroe Government took office. Then there is the additional estimates which is only a blind to cover up the real cost of the country's administration. You can see by answers to my questions since this Assembly opened in reference to cost of collecting Revenue that there is no supervision over the country's affairs. Systems which have been in vogue the past fifty years are still unchanged. To bear out my statement I will read what the Auditor General says in his reports:

POST OFFICE INSPECTION

Again I have to warn the Government that unless a travelling Auditor of the accounts of Outport Post and Telegraphs Offices is appointed, losses which are constantly occurring and which are due to negligence, ignorance, and too frequently dishonesty, will continue to the serious detriment of the revenue. My Auditor says "The Audit of Money Order Accounts at Head Office consists of the checking of balances shown by Money Order Offices, after necessary correction of errors has been made by the Money Order Staff." Beyond permitting the Auditor to keep track of such Offices as are backward with their accounts and remittances, this process is of very little benefit. It can never put him in the position of knowing how the accounts of any Office stand at any date within a month prior to such Audit.

This position is a very unsatisfactory one for the Audit Department and can only be overcome, and the Audit made of practical value by the appointment of at least one travelling Auditor, whose duty it would be to check office accounts at their source. These re-

marks apply with equal force to all Outport Offices collecting Revenue. Under existing conditions my Department cannot be held, and declines to be held responsible for breaches occurring in Outport Offices the accounts of which cannot be audited effectively except at their source.

A perusal of the report of the Assistant Auditor General on the audit of the Department of Public Charities will, I think, satisfy any person who is of the opinion that travelling Auditors are not necessary, that he is mistaken in his opinion. In some accounts that were investigated it was found that families repudiated the fact that they had received relief, others that some goods had been delivered to them. It was also found that relief had been given unnecessarily, some of the recipients having had Electric Light installed during the period in which they had been receiving relief.

EXPENDITURE BY ORDER OF COUNCIL

While I am glad to say this irregular mode of expenditure has not been so pronounced during the past year. I have to report that it still prevails to a considerable extent. Some of this expenditure is due to unforeseen circumstances calling for prompt action on the sufficient remains of an irregular nature, to warrant my disallowance of such payments, as, for instance, permission to overdraw Legislative Votes. This permission should not be given unless the cause was very "Urgent" and the expenditure immediately required for the "Public good." In this case recourse should be had to the 33rd (b) Section of the Audit Act. Further, the promise contained in Orders in Council, granting this permission, that "Supplementary Supply would be taken to cover the expenditure at the next Session of the Legislature" does not render valid the action of the

Government. In this subject contained in my last year's report:—

“Expenditure by Order in Council has a tendency to weaken the salutary effect of pre-audit. When such an Order, directing a payment not authorized by the Legislature is issued to a Department, the accounts of which are pre-audited, it immediately antagonizes the Executive Government and the Auditor General, creates unnecessary friction and prevents them from acting as they should, in unity in the best interests of the Service. Would it not be well for the Executive to warn each Department that the Votes of the Legislature are its income and that the Executive Council cannot be expected to and will not take upon itself the responsibility of authorizing an over-expenditure. The Government has always the 33rd Section (b) of the Audit Act and the annual General Contingencies Vote of \$90,000.00 to fall back upon in cases of extreme emergency.”

INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT

Of prime importance in its relation to the Colony's finance is the rapidly increasing annual interest due on borrowed money. This has increased from \$2,148,795.36 in 1919-1920 to \$3,358,785.22 in 1926-27, or at an average rate of \$151,248.73 per annum.

The interest on our Public Debt at the date of this report amounts to nearly forty per cent. of the Colony's Revenue; a revenue which is derived from a taxation which, in my opinion, has reached a point beyond which it would be a financial error to force it. Under these circumstances we cannot afford to borrow for productive objects, much less for non-productive ones.

RAILWAY

Among our most pressing financial

problems is that of the Railway. The system has cost the Colony some 37¼ million dollars, half our Public Debt. The interest on this is not charged to the Railway, it is borne on the current account of the Colony. Even the interest on the purchase money (\$2,061,000.00) is paid from current revenue. Since the Government acquired the system the following yearly deficits have been incurred, viz:

1923-24	\$ 11,646.34
1924-25	357,145.26
1925-26	745,318.58
1926-27	617,675.56

The cost of administration is too high. It costs too much to collect the revenue and certainly it is bad business to spend two dollars to collect one. How long would a mercantile business be kept out of the Bankruptcy Courts if it cost two dollars to make one dollar profit on a turn over of merchandise. In England last year a survey was made of Public Departments, with the result that eleven thousand clerks and office hands were dispensed with. Here again we have exhibited the incompetency of the Finance Minister. He has made no effort to reduce overhead, but he has on the contrary saddled us with a further overhead. I have no hesitation in stating that the Minister should have at least balanced his Budget in 1926-27 and 1927-28.

The British Government and every British Dominion is striving to reduce its National Debt. It is not an easy matter to buy a new government bond in any British Dominion unless it is a refunding loan, they are not raising money. We will just take the British Government. Let us refer to the Budget Speech of Mr. Winston Churchill delivered on April 24th. It is considered a very courageous Budget. It made a real and valuable effort to remedy unemployment and

promote industry. It had an original scheme. The striking feature is the relief given to Agriculture Lands and to Factories and Productive Works, such as Coal Mines, Cotton Mills, Woolen Mills, Shipbuilding Yards, Iron and Steel Works. Like our Fisheries they have been greatly handicapped, but now they have been greatly relieved. By further provision of the Budget Railways have been relieved with the understanding that they pass the relief on in the form of reduced rates to Agriculture and the great productive industries. The Budget is claimed to be a Budget of employment. The efforts made are vital to the nation.

Our Fisheries are vital to our country, but nothing is done to encourage them. The Prime Minister told us that \$200,000 voted last year for the encouragement of the fisheries is still to the credit of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, not spent. The fisheries are yet the mainstay of this country, and will be for some time and every encouragement should be given. It is pleasing to know that there are Cold Storages being built for the preparation of fresh fish for export. This should be encouraged as well as the salt fish trade. It is the heavy duty on our fish going into foreign markets that helps to keep the price down and every effort should be made to make reciprocal treaties where possible, Jamaica and the West India Islands have given a preferential tariff to Canada. You have made no effort to get the same concession for us. You have made no effort to have the duty taken off of our fish going into the United States and into Porto Rico. You have made no effort in any other market.

There has been a real effort by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer to reduce the national debt of Eng-

land. Last year the debt was reduced by eighty million pounds. Canada and all the other British Dominions are striving to reduce their debt while ours is piling up. What a great pity. I might almost say a calamity, that the Monroe Government did not have a capable, practical Minister of Finance and Customs during the past four years, so that we might have for the coming year a hopeful Budget.

Last year the Government of England began an extensive economy campaign in all Departments, thereby saving over fifty million dollars and a still further economy is estimated for the coming year. No attempt has been made here to start an economy campaign, on the contrary it has been a campaign of expenditure. We are a top heavy country. The public services are breaking down from delapidation and lack of repairs. You cannot conceal the fact that the country is in the throes of a very serious economic and financial crisis. You put on a glitter which from afar has the appearance of strength but on examination there is the effect of stress and strain. There is the poverty of the masses. There is an atmosphere of suspicion and mutual distrust amongst our outport people. The Minister of Finance and Customs, skilled in the art of bluff is trying to impart semblance of efficiency to the demoralized condition of the country.

Current Revenue for 1926-27, amounted to \$8,932,435.46. The current expenditure \$10,533,408.87. Balance of expenditure over revenue \$1,600,973.41. What a public disgrace. The revenue was \$820,115, less than in 1925-26, and the expenditure \$668,241 more in 1926-27. Ten per cent. more money was spent than was voted in the estimates. How does he account for a falling off in the Revenue 1926-27 of \$820,115.

There can be no doubt of the unfavourable reception by the country of the Minister's new Budget. There is no hope, no remedy for present conditions. Our public debt is now over \$72,000,000. The amount you propose to borrow will probably add another two and a half million to our debt and ten million obligation on the International Paper Company Plant, makes a total of eighty-five millions. I think I am justified in adding the ten millions of International Paper Company to the national debt. Last year you extended the maturity date of these guaranteed bonds to 1972. How much wood do you think will be available for the manufacture of paper by that date 1972. There is no doubt that by the maturity date there will be no paper manufactured from wood. Something else is bound to be discovered. As the International Paper Company in this country is a foreign concern, it is an easy matter for them to pull up their stakes and get out, leaving this country to take care of its obligations, which this mentioned is one.

The Minister states in his Budget that the International Paper Company has turned the corner leading to many years of prosperity. Apparently he has not much hope himself that they will operate until 1972. This extension was one of the serious blunders of the present Government. Instead of the Colony remaining a guarantor, the International Paper Company should have been compelled to raise an additional ten million dollars on the security of their property and relieved us of the responsibility.

You have certainly dug deep into the "Chest" for money to play with and squander. You spent and squandered one million dollars in 1926-27 more than you received in Revenue. If you will look up the Report of the Board of Liquor Control you

will find that a profit of \$319,052 was made on the sale of liquors over the counter, and four hundred and seventy seven thousand dollars paid to the Finance Department for Import Duties on liquors makes a total net revenue to the Colony on rum and spirits in the vicinity of eight hundred thousand dollars. The ordinary individual does not care to get his revenue or income from such a source. A drink bill of one and a half million dollars is too much to waste out of the earnings of our small population.

We are told in the Budget Speech that the earnings of the Railway have increased fifty thousand dollars during the past fiscal year. The earnings of the road would be much greater if a strict observance of the Customs Act was adhered to by not allowing Canadian Trading Steamers to land merchandise without being passed through the Customs. Importers in St. John's are compelled to land dutiable goods in a Sufferance Warehouse. Whereas in Outports the goods are landed on a public wharf without duty being paid. Furthermore public wharves are used by Foreign Trading Steamers without any charge bringing in merchandise that should come over the Railway. The Government is encouraging competition to take business from the Railway system.

The attempt has been made by the Government to give a fast passenger service daily to points in Conception Bay, and allowing the passenger traffic to go to motor cars. If a sane and business like effort were made to meet competition in passenger and freight traffic, I have no doubt but that the Railway would be self supporting. The building of the "Caribou" in Holland when British labourers were walking the streets of England following the war was a gross blunder which can never be forgiven.

Nothing is said about agriculture. When it is known that we are not an agriculture country, we can raise the finest crop of vegetables of any country in the world and encouragement should be given to make us self supporting in vegetables. Two dollars worth of vegetables raised is as good to Newfoundland as a dollar's worth of fish. There is room for improvement by instruction and by inspection and grading of potatoes and other vegetables to enhance their value.

I listened with very great attention to a speech delivered by Mr. Cashin, member for Ferryland on Wednesday the 9th. That speech contained some practical suggestions and sound advice for the Government. He makes the statement and I presume he has grounds for making it, that Besco has been making a net profit of one dollar per ton on ore mined and shipped from Bell Island. If these figures are in the knowledge of the Government they have been amiss in their duties by not demanding for the labourers on Bell Isle a very much better wage, and a step should be taken at once to make some arrangements with the newly organised Company to give our men a better deal. Industries are no good to a country if the people employed get only a starvation wage. If it is true that supplies of ore from Sweden are cut off from Germany, and the latter country has to contract with Bell Island for her full supplies it should enhance the value. I must add a word to what has been said by the member for Ferryland in reference to the Gander Valley project. I am inclined to believe like him that an effort should have been made to straighten out the misunderstanding. If the Government were invited to check up the figures and plans of the International Paper Company, also those of the Gander Valley

Power and Paper Company, with the consent of each and have a decision as to whether a mill on the Gander is feasible or not. They should have done so, if it cost too much to develop the water power the country should know it and make some other arrangements. You have done nothing to cut down expenses. The Minister even now thinks it right to pay out \$1,132.00 to collect \$97.00.

There are very few sub-collectors who have a balance left for the funds of the Colony after deducting salaries and expenses. Take the case of Lamaline where there was collected last year \$2,942.20, but the office had to bear the following expense: Salaries, sub-collectors \$1,150.00, expense \$219.-46, salaries to two tidewaiters \$1,648.-00 making a total of \$3,017.00. This is more than absorbs the Revenue Income. This has been cut out in England, it must be cut out here.

More attention should be paid to our mineral resources. In cases where there are good indication of mineral something should be done towards further prospecting to ascertain if mineral is available in working quantities. It took many years of persistent boosting and advertising to get anyone interested in Bell Isld. There are other deposits in the country if we can find them. If the Government cannot help why not obtain assistance from some other source.

I do not know if the Government is aware that there is a source from which assistance can be obtained to establish industries. There has been formed in England a company with an extremely large capital to promote and assist industries. It is headed by Sir Alfred Mond, and on the Directorate are men connecting with companies all of which are millions of dollars of capital. One of the Directors is Mr. Schwab of the

Bethlehem Steel Company. A letter to the High Commissioner would no doubt bring all the information required. Our coal fields and other labour giving industries might be operated by this Company, and the matter is well worth looking into.

The only change in the Tariff is as follows: Item 153 substitute for Comma, between plates and rivets in the first line a hyphen. Item 222 add a cloth known as glass cloth when imported for agriculture for the use alone ad. val. 10%. When hope to hand out for encouragement of trade and commerce. What encouragement of the fisheries and agriculture to have practically the only change on the Tariff is the substitution of a hyphen and comma.

The curtain is soon to be rung down on the 5th act of the Monroe Administration. There has been much good and bad acting. Some of the actors of both roles left the stage before their contract had expired.

When we assembled here in 1924 out of the thirty-six members who took their seats in the House, eighteen, exactly half were not here the previous Session.

When the curtain rises again there will be many faces missing and there will be new faces occupying the benches.

I sincerely hope that the next four years will see much improvement in the financial conduct of the Colony's affairs.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Chairman; I have no intention of entering into a debate but there is one point that I think I would like, as Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to seek a little information on.

Some days back on the Address in Reply, during the debate the Hon. Member for Ferryland, Major Cashin,

in making what I consider a well deserved criticism of the various actions of the company operating on Bell Island, made a statement that he had reliable information that this company was making a profit of \$1.00 per ton on the ore mined and sent away from Bell Island. During the course of the debate I made a note of the Hon. Member's statement and now, this afternoon the Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes reference to the same subject.

Just at this particular moment I think all the members of the Assembly as well as most members of the community and country at large are particularly interested in operations on Bell Island. The Government has opened negotiations, through the Prime Minister, with the new company now operating Bell Island for the purpose of trying to get increased wages for those who have to secure their livelihood from that source.

I think that if the Hon. Member for Ferryland has any information — I have interviewed the various members and none of them seem to have had any information with regard to what profits the Bell Island company is making.

I want to say here now that if the Bell Island Companies are making such profits, and that information is in the hands of any member of the House, or any member of the country, I would like to have it, and I think the Government will be glad to have it. It will strengthen the hands of the Government in the efforts that they trying to make to bring about a better condition of affairs for the miners on Bell Island. I understand a Conference has been called, and the representatives of the Companies are on their way, if they are not already here, to meet the Delegates appointed by the miners, to discuss with them

the ways and means whereby conditions could be bettered. I had no desire, and I did not intend to speak at all until the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition brought the matter up. We are after hearing a statement from the Member for Ferryland. It would be desirable, I thought, that if that information could be had that it should be placed in the hands of the Government, so that it could be brought up at the coming Conference.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, when I brought that matter up about three weeks ago before the House with regard to the situation at Bell Island little did I think I would be brought into the matter personally. As a matter of fact, about ten days ago I was asked to go to Bell Island by the miners themselves, and here is where the thing starts. The miners asked me to go over and try to assist them in some material way to get an increase of pay. I went on Thursday week last. When I arrived on Bell Island I discovered that the settlement was that the men were going to strike on Friday morning. However, we held a meeting on Bell Island, and if I do say it myself, I feel that I had considerable to do with averting the strike on Friday morning. I told the men that I did not think that at that period they would get anything by a strike. I made a couple of suggestions to them, one was that they should write the officials of the Company a letter, and the other that they should write the Government a letter to the same effect, enclosing a copy of the letter which they had written to the Company. I acted as the mail carrier in this instance, and brought the letter to the Government myself. The Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary and myself met, and the Prime Minister wired the President of Besco who was out of Canada at the time. Afterwards he

wired the President of the National Trust Company.

I understand that the Vice President of Besco, the President of the National Trust Co. will be here on Thursday morning. With regard to making this statement of a dollar a ton profit, as the miners had asked me to help them in their negotiations with the Company, I would much prefer to withhold that statement, and tell the officials of the Company to their own faces that they have been making a dollar a ton, and furthermore, since I have been brought into this matter that I have discovered that they have been robbing the miners on Bell Island more than I thought they were. I understand from the men working there that they go down into the mine at twenty-five cents an hour and if they shovel twenty cars a day they get a bonus of forty-five cents, or they make three dollars a day, but if they shovel twenty cars for four or five days, and on the sixth day they do not shovel as many cars, then they do not get any bonus for the other 5 days. In other words the Company have been robbing them of about \$3.00 a week in that respect. I do not consider that is fair, but at this period of the game, I do not propose to discuss that matter any further. However, it is knowledge to every man in this House, and every man in this country, and every man in the present administration, that we have been bluffed by this Corporation during the past four or five years. Statements have been tabled in this House recently in reply to questions asked by me, where we have been shown that this corporation is in arrears down at the Finance Department for Business Profit's Tax. They failed in some instances to present their Annual Balance Sheets to the Government. No action has been taken

by this Government or the previous Government with regard to that matter.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I hold considerable money in hand from them now.

MR. CASHIN.—But the point I am making is this, that if a man failed to make returns under the Business Profits Tax, he should have been hauled up before the Court. No action was taken in that respect either by this Government or any other Government. In 1921 the Bell Island people came down here on the matter, and made a wonderful contract with the previous administration, of twenty-cents a ton export duty on ore, and ten cents a ton on ore going to Canada or any part of the British Empire. In return they were going to erect a smelter. That Bill has not been carried out, and neither this Government or the previous one ever attempted to make them carry it out. Because they come down a year or so after and plead poverty. But that poverty was not brought about by the miners on Bell Isld. It was brought about by the operations of the other branches of the business in Canada and which in some instances they were incapable of handling. Fortunately probably for the miners on Bell Island another company has taken over the operations of Besco. As I said in my previous remarks to-day that company has been noted for making a success of everything that they have taken hold of. They have taken over this company and I feel to-day that only for this company having taken over this corporation of Besco, those two individuals on their way now, to Newfoundland to try and straighten out the situation at Bell Island, would not be on their way here under the old organization. But the people who had charge of the op-

erations on Bell Island were selfish and did not want to see the miners on Bell Island get a fair rate of pay. Furthermore I feel that when those individuals do come and we meet them here, that they are going to plead poverty again. They are going to tell us that they have not got any ore sold for next year. Has the Prime Minister any fish sold that he has not caught yet. The argument is the same. And he does not reduce the pay of any of the men on his wharf, I mean the man wheeling the barrow, because he does not get his price for the fish. He has got to pay them the same. I hope that when the next Government comes in, as this Government fell down on their job this year, they should represent to this crowd the needs of the miners on Bell Island, and that they should say to them "What about a half decent rate of pay for the miners on Bell Island". The ordinary pick and shovel man on Bell Island does not get a decent rate of pay. The Government during the past three or four years have not taken the matter up seriously. But thank goodness the time is arriving now when there will be a show down. I feel that. And whilst I do not want to see a strike and I hope there shall not be one, yet I am afraid if those people who are coming here to-morrow or the next day, are not prepared to make a settlement, and give those poor individuals on Bell Island a decent show for their living, then there may be trouble, in the way of a strike. There is not a man in Newfoundland to-day that wants to see a strike, because it upsets the general welfare of the country. I do not want to effect the country. And for another thing that company has contracted for over one million tons of ore, and up to the present they have only shipped 138,000. And I feel that under

these circumstances, when these gentlemen arrive, and talk business in the proper manner that they will see the wisdom of our words, and come across with a fair and remunerative rate of wages.

I have not prepared any remarks in connection with the Budget but whilst I am on my feet now, there are one or two things that I would like to refer to. We have been wondering why we cannot balance our accounts. Personally, if my opinion is of any value I make the statement here that the moment we introduced the revenue bill of 1925, we increased taxation somewhere in the vicinity of twelve or fifteen per cent, that immediately we paved the way for a deficit. Why? Because the cost of living went up and the people who had to purchase these necessaries were unable to earn sufficient. And consequently the revenue went short by that amount. But even if you had left the tariff where it was, and had not increased taxation, our people's earning power would have been sufficient to buy more of those necessaries of life such as clothing, and various articles of food etc. And consequently the revenue would be higher than it is at present, and then there is another thing. I notice that the Minister remarked in one part of his speech;-

(Reads)

In other words he exported somewhere in the vicinity of five million dollars worth more than he imported and which would leave the ordinary individual to think that the people of Newfoundland during the past twelve months have earned this five million dollars and placed it in the banks of this country.

Take the paper industry. There is approximately two hundred thousand tons of paper exported in one year. I estimate that \$25 per ton on that

200,000 tons, which amounts to five million dollars, goes out of the country. Consequently, that trade balance is finished.

Then again there was one million tons of iron ore exported from Bell Island at a profit of \$1 per ton. That is another million dollars that went out of the country. Three or four years ago the Company operating at Corner Brook were exporting hardly any paper; but the situation is that we are in debt to day after last year's business and that is the point I have been endeavouring to make. Here is another instance where nearly a million dollars goes out of the country and does not come back. There is \$1 per quintal paid to Norwegian tonnage each year for carrying our fish to market. I was always a strong advocate of and would like to see the trade of the fishery held in our own country. To day we are paying out close on a million dollars to outsiders for the transportation of our fish. This did not exist thirty years ago and our fish was carried by our own sailing vessels, and, if we had our sailing vessels to-day the fishermen of the country would be much better off than they are under present conditions. We all realize that shipping fish by steamer floods the market, because two sailing vessels can leave here with cargoes and may not reach their destination within thirty days of each other, whereas two steamers would leave here and reach across within twenty four hours of each other with a consequent flooding of the market.

Mr. Chairman; It appears that when one is talking on behalf of the miner or the fisherman members of either side of the House seem disinclined to listen. Therefore, any remarks I had to make are made, and I have come to the conclusion that, in view of the

way debates go on in this House, nobody cares, and, consequently, so far as we are concerned the whole thing is farcial.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Hickman that the optimism of the Finance Minister does not show up so well when you make a careful persual of his Budget Speech. He has stressed the fact that a great deal of income was derived by increasing taxation and the benefit given the revenue of the country; but when we are reminded that the earning power of the people today is no better than it was five or six years ago, it is not a very commendable thing to say that this one and a quarter million dollars increase in revenue derived by increased taxation, particularly in the light of the fact that this money has been squeezed out of the fishermen, miners and laboring class of people generally. The earning value of their dollar has been considerably decreased by that tariff and the consequence is that you have a large number of people left the country and others are finding it very difficult to exist at all. Large numbers of our people are unable to get employment of any kind during the winter season; industries are so saddled with taxation that some of them cannot carry on business because they are unable to pay the workingman the wages they might pay, and surely the Finance Minister cannot say there is anything very bright or optimistic about a condition of things like that in the country.

Reference has been made to the conditions that prevailed on Bell Island and I can quite sympathize with what has been said this afternoon regarding the wages paid to miners there. One has only to remember the many notices that have appeared in the public press from time to time during the past year or so showing how miners were

praying to be declared insolvent. These miners were unable to provide themselves and their families with the common necessaries of life and were unable to pay their bills. When we know that condition of things as compared with the statement that the mining corporation is making a profit of \$1 per ton on iron ore, it shows the need of steps to be taken to remedy that condition, and whoever has to do with improving the working and living conditions for the miners on Bell Island are deserving of the congratulations of every member of this House and every citizen of the whole country.

Now with regard to this question of increased taxation which has burdened the people and lessened their incomes. I have taken the trouble to go through the Customs returns which show that the value of goods that entered this country for the fiscal year 1926-27 is practically the same as in 1924-25, but there was one million dollars more collected by the present Government because of the increased taxation that was put through here in that year. Manufactured goods that come in were valued at \$400,000 practically the same as they were valued at in 1924-25. Yet the duty collected in 1926-27 was \$392,046 and in 1924-25, under the tariff of the Liberal Government, the duty collected was \$301,875. In other words, there was over \$90,000 less collected on cotton goods by the Liberal Government than there was collected by the present Government. Now what are those manufacturies of cotton goods? They are mostly materials used almost entirely by the poorer classes of the people of the country. It is not the wealthy people who buy shirting or dress material; but it is the poor and needy who have to make up garments for their families. On the manufacturies of woolen goods there was \$728,061 imported in the year 1926-27 a little more

than was imported in 1924-25. I think the difference is four or five thousand dollars. The duty collected by the present Government in 1926-27 was \$365,303 against \$280,303 collected under the Liberal Government, or a saving to the people of the country by the Liberal Government of \$83,727 and on the same class of goods that is used almost solely by the poorer class of people, because it is not the wealthy class of people who buy the ordinary cloth materials because they go to the tailors to get their clothes made to order. Now on ready-mades there was collected under the present Government in 1926-27 \$321,738.95 on goods amounting in value to \$494,983; under the Liberal Government for the year 1924-25 there was collected on goods to the same amount the sum of \$245,016 or a saving to the poor class of people of \$76,732. As I have often said before in this House, who buys ready-mades anyway? Is it not the fisherman, the miner, the labourer and the workingman generally. That class of man and his family had to pay his proportionate share of that extra \$76,722 that was squeezed out of him in the year 1926-27 on account of the increased tariff and class legislation that was imposed by the present administration. On leather boots and shoes the Monroe Government collected \$20,528 more in 1926-27 than was collected by the Liberal Government in 1924-25 and \$2,000 more was collected on waterproof clothing than should have been collected, and under the Liberal Government the duty was 40 p.c. plus 10 which made \$102,291 or a difference of \$20,250.

Rubber shoes were increased from 40 p.c. plus 10 p.c. to 55 p.c. which made a difference of \$13,471 more collected by the present Government than under the old, and the people had to pay that much more, and their earn-

ing power was lessened to that extent.

The duty on hats and caps imported into this country increased from 40 p.c. plus 10 to 55 p.c. and that made a difference of \$19,000 more collected by the present Government than by the Liberal Government for the same amount of hats and caps.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The tariff was made by your Liberal Government.

MR. GRIMES—The recommendations of the Commission that drew it up were never adopted.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You had to draw up that tariff with increased rates because you weren't able to meet the deficits you were having every year. You appointed the Commission to find a tariff that would cover your deficits.

MR. GRIMES—It was never put into effect.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You had it ready to put into effect.

MR. GRIMES—There have been reports brought in as by your own Finance Commission that have never been put into effect. I think the Minister must admit that if recommendations were brought in by that Commission that they would have to be submitted to the party, and it doesn't follow that the party would put into effect the recommendations of the Commission.

We imported into the country for the use of the people for medical purposes, linens and other things needed for household use to an amount of \$191,645. The duty was raised from 30 p.c. under the old tariff to 40 p.c. and that meant that this Government collected from the people using these things \$13,450 more. Tea was increased 5c. a pound to 7c. a pound. There was 1,488,606 pounds of tea imported

in 1926-27 on which a duty was paid of \$104,488. Under the Liberal tariff of 5c. a lb. plus ten there would be a difference of \$22,611, that would be saved to the people had that tariff remained in force. On molasses \$580,111.00; the duty was increased 5c. to 7c. and that means that the users of molasses had to pay \$9,160.00 more.

Now take tobacco there was imported into the country for the same year 301,650 lbs. at a value of \$165,311.00. The duty was increased 40c. a lb. to 48c. a lb. plus 10 p. c. and that meant \$58,975.00 more collected on tobacco imported into the country than was under the Liberal tariff. In the way of excise on tobacco manufactured in the country 548,000 lbs.; under the Liberal tariff it was 34c. a lb. and under the present Government it was raised to 40c. a lb. which meant that the consumers of tobacco had to pay \$33,000 for tobacco manufactured in the country more than they would have paid if the old Liberal tariff had remained in effect. Now, lubricating oil enters into the fisherman's occupation. There was 179,103 gallons imported into the country 1926-27, and the duty was raised from 8c. a gallon which prevailed under the Liberal Government to 11c. a gallon. Three cents a gallon more had to be paid because of the increased duty than under the old tariff and that meant \$14,000 had to be paid by those using lubricating oils, the greater part fishermen of the country. There were imported into the country stoves to the value of \$40,702.00 and the duty was raised from 35 p.c. plus 10 p.c. to 49 p.c. and that meant out of about 1,200 or 1,400 stoves \$14,231.00 more was collected. Now anybody today know that that is an outrageous and exorbitant tariff, to raise the duty on stoves from 35 p.c. plus 10 p.c. to 49 p.c. Axes, which have to be used by people living in the outports, saws,

hammers, used by mechanics in the city as well as by people in the outports was increased from 25 p.c. plus 10 to 35 p.c. and we took off the people who used these articles another \$8,000. Hardware of various kinds, cutlery, had a total value of \$176,250.00 on which duty was collected of \$875.56. If the Liberal tariff of 35 p.c. had remained in force the people of the country who used these articles would have been \$20,000.00 in pocket and would have had that much more to spend. People have to use cups, saucers, plates and all sorts of earthenware. The duty was raised from 40 p.c. plus 10 to 55 p.c. and every person who uses earthenware, plates, cups, saucers has had to pay more than they did under the Liberal tariff. Take common window glass, everybody has to use it, particularly people in the outports, and the duty was increased on common window glass from 30 p.c. to 45 p.c. on a value of \$11,505.00 imported into the country 1926-27, and the duty was increased \$1,400.00 on that same valuation because you increased the tariff 30 p.c. to 45 p.c.

The duty on granulated sugar was raised from $\frac{1}{2}$ c. to 2c. a pound. There were 15,419,259 pounds of sugar imported into this country during the fiscal year 1926-27 and the duty collected was \$309,163.12. If the Liberal tariff had remained in effect the save would have been \$54,745.00 on sugar.

With regard to pickles, thirty thousand dollars worth of pickles was imported into this country for the same fiscal year at a duty of \$15,000.00. If the Liberal tariff had remained in effect it would have been \$11,552.00 or a saving of \$3,450.00.

Sewing machines, etc., which came in under a duty of 25 p.c. plus 10 surcharge under the Liberal Government was increased to 35 p.c. and that meant that a tax of \$3,700.00 more was

collected than under the Liberal Government.

The tax on leather and shoes was increased from 40 p.c. plus 10 surtax to 55 p.c. and the duty collected in 1926 was \$122,819.00. If the Liberal tariff had been in effect the duty would have been \$102,190.00 being \$20,529.00 less than is collected today.

The duty on raisins and currants was increased from 3c. and a surtax to 5c. a pound. There were 1,173,163 pounds of raisins and currants imported for the same fiscal year requiring a duty of \$58,449.00. Under the old tariff of 3c. and surtax it would be \$38,314.00 which leaves a balance of \$19,135.00 collected more than under the Liberal tariff.

Now fruit, which everybody says is a necessity and people should be encouraged to buy more.

MR. BROWNE—Have you not forgotten the 25 p.c. surtax?

MR. GRIMES—That was dropped the year before the Liberal Government went out of power. That surtax was removed, then there was a surtax of 10 p.c. when the Liberal Government went out of power in 1924.

Well the duty was increased on fruit from 15 p.c. plus 10 surtax to 25 p.c. That meant that \$12,583.00 more was collected on fruit than would have been under the Liberal tariff.

Instead of encouraging people to eat more fruit you discourage them by charging so much.

The duty on apples was increased from 50 p.c. to 70 p.c. a barrel. You collected \$6,000.00 more on raw apples than would have been collected under the old Liberal tariff. There were 119,777 barrels of apples imported into the country during the fiscal year 1926-27 and the duty was increased from 2 to 3 p.c. on a barrel. That meant that there was collected some-

thing like \$1,000.00 more on dried apples.

I have only just picked out those items which are in daily use by the people of the country today, and the result is that there is \$800,000.00 more collected by the present Government on these articles alone than would be collected if the old tariff had remained in effect.

The people of the country would be \$800,000 better off. They would have had that much more to spend and the revenue of the country would be that much more.

I don't think the Honourable Members for St. John's West will deny that. If \$800,000.00 saved in duties does it not stand to reason that the people have that much more money.

MR. BROWNE—How are you going to pay deficits?

MR. GRIMES—By cutting down expenditure. There is considerable saving that could be effected in this country if any real desire on the part of all governments to do so.

There is this to be said in favour of the last Government that they never attempted to put tariff into effect like this Government did.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt the Honourable Member, but the Honourable Member was a member of the late Liberal Government and I was not and he may be able to explain what the Tariff Commission was formed for.

MR. GRIMES—For revision of the tariff.

MR. MOORE—They made recommendations and we took it up and put it in force since, and you say that it was not put into effect.

MR. GRIMES—It was the present Government who adopted it. However, that does not alter the fact that the revenue today is too high for the

people of this country and that no serious effort was made by the present Government to reduce taxes. You went to the country with that cry. They were hoping for relief from the burdens of past governments and when you came into power instead of reducing taxes you went and increased them to the extent of \$1,125,000.00.

Now Mr. Chairman we have talked a great deal of prosperity of this country and it will be agreed by all that if we want to encourage growth in this country we must lessen taxes. No one will despise that. And this applies particularly to the fishing industry. Everyone knows the position of the Labrador fishery today.

Every effort should be made to get the fisheries back to what they were in former years, when people were delighted to follow the occupation, instead of everyone trying to get out of it and into some other occupation. I would like to ask the Prime Minister now, if he does not think that there are a number of ways in which we can reduce expenditure, that have not been carried out. He had in mind himself years ago what saving could be effected in the carrying on of Government. There is no question in the minds of honourable gentlemen in this House to-day but that you have got to do all that is possible to keep the fisheries going. It is the chief industry of the country. An industry that creates more independent men than any other industry in the country. If you do not foster that industry what is going to happen. If the Labrador fishery is the same as last year, will anyone go to that fishery again. With an industry in the serious position the Labrador is in, something must be done and it is no use your saying that "your government did not do anything." That is no way to answer a question. This Government

has been in power four years and many of the members of this Government are identified with the fisheries, and they know the condition under which the fishermen have to live. They know that many have had to leave the fisheries, and they also know that ways and means must be devised whereby the Labrador fishery will be placed in a better position than it is at the present time.

Now the Minister of Finance estimated the revenue for 1928 and 1929 at \$8,500,000.00. And for 1926 and 1927 his estimate was \$7,321,512.00, or an increase of \$1,200,000.00. I would like to know how he made that up. I would give the man credit to this extent that his activity in getting after people that were getting in goods under a low valuation, has accounted to some extent for the increased revenue, the past year or two. But that does not alter the fact that it is not because of the increased earning power that we are going to get that \$8,500,000.00. It is because you are squeezing them of that extra amount by your tariff. Buchans itself did not exist two years ago, and that industry today would only offset the falling off in connection with the fisheries. So that stands about where it was.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The total catch of fish during the last two years was greater than any time during the war, and if a correct value was put on the fish would have a credit, but it is very difficult to get that.

MR. GRIMES—But I think that the Minister will admit that so far as the Labrador Fishery was concerned that a great many fishermen sold their fish at a loss last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I only speak for those I supplied, I know they all had a profit last year.

MR. GRIMES—There are a large number of Labrador Fishermen, and I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will bear me out, who did not square their accounts last year. And when you put that industry with so many people affected in that way, up against your Buchans industry, and the loss that they have met with in their earning power will not be compensated by the increased employment at Buchans. So that I fail to see where the Minister can expect to get \$8,500,000.00. I could understand it if there were industries in a well-developed state in this country, if the fisheries were profitable, if there was a good outlook for the Labrador Fishery, and greater returns could be expected than last year. But this estimate is only a mere guess. You have a class of exporters saying that the price of fish will be good up to September and after that they don't know where they are going to be. How many fishermen will be effected by the good price of fish that will only prevail up to September. There is a strong opinion among fishermen of this country that a remedy can be found if the Honourable Minister with other exporters will get together, by regulation of shipments and standarization of fish.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not agree with that at all.

MR. GRIMES—Is it not a fact that the pool of wheat in Western Canada has meant a stabilisation of price.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I do no agree with that at all.

MR. GRIMES—I would like the Minister to explain the difference. Anyhow there is this fact staring us in the face, that unless the fishery comes back within the next two years it is going to be a thing of the past, and unless the Government themselves do

more to help out the industry, we can say good-bye to it until such time as conditions abroad warrant increasing the price, so that it will pay those that are engaged in it.

Now I would like to ask the Minister this question. Does he think that the present tariff is a satisfactory one.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There are slight changes whereby it could be remedied.

MR. GRIMES—On what class of goods?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I could not say that off-hand.

MR. GRIMES—Could you not make some changes whereby the tariff would bear less heavily on the common people.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think it bears fairly easy on the common people today. The fishermen pay approximately twelve per cent. If you figure out the duty on sugar, tea, molasses it would come to about that.

MR. GRIMES—But it is not only sugar, tea and molasses that the fishermen are interested in. They are the very common necessaries of life. People have to wear clothes, boots and shoes and everything else, and here the duty bears heavily on them. And so far as affecting the general earning power of the people, it is practically the same as it was a few years ago.

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. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if we are going to have a copy of last year's Hansard given us this year, as it is only useful when the House is in session?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member I might say that I was astonished when the first meeting of the Internal Economy Commission was held this year to find that the Hansard was not ready, because it is an utter absurdity to have a Hansard distributed when a House is going out of session. What is the cause for it, I do not know. One person blames the other and who is to blame I do not know. But it is a fact that the Hansard is not here for the present session and I do not know if it will be here.

A few years ago I tried to do away with Hansard, but the Opposition at that time objected. I consider it is a horrible waste of money to have a Hansard at all because I think that the reports in the newspapers containing a synopsis of the speeches is the proper thing to have, and because it is a true report; whereas with the other process the members have every opportunity to revise their speeches how they like. I think that the publication of a Hansard is an absolutely useless thing and at the next session of the House whoever is here that they will do away with it.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Hon the Colonial Secretary tabled report of Permanent Marine Disasters Fund and report of Weights and Measures Department.

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 30th 1928.

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

Petitions was presented by:

Mr. Scammell from St. Barbe, re Destruction of Wood.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Edmund Hanarhan, as follows;-

The Select Committee appointed in connection with the Petition of Edmund Hanarhan beg to report that the Rules of the House respecting notice have been complied with and beg to recommend that permission be given to introduce Resolutions in accordance with the prayer of the Petition.

May 29th 1928.

(Sgd.) W. C. WINDSOR,
W. J. WALSH,
C. J. CAHILL
P. F. MOORE,
I. R. RANDELL.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions in relation to the encouragement of the Shark Industry.

Mr. Scammell gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to con-

sider Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Loan upon the Credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

LOAN BILL RESOLUTIONS

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; In introducing these resolutions, as will be seen from the copies already laid before the members, the amount the Government proposes to borrow is \$10,003,400.00.

As you are fully aware there is a loan that comes due on the first of July of \$7,543,400.00 which amount will have to be redeemed at that date. That amount will be required. There is naturally on that amount a saving to the colony of the amount of interest being the difference between the amount paid on the 6½ per cent loan amounting to \$490,321 and that paid under the proposed loan; the retiring of this loan will mean a saving of \$113,151. If we increase this loan to \$10,000,000 at 5 per cent. which we propose to do, it only means a charge to the colony of \$9,679.00. I mean by that that it does not increase the indebtedness by raising this loan to \$10,000,000. The reduction in the 6½ per cent loan allows us to have this raised.

The proposal of the Government to have this loan raised is for the following purposes.

You have heard, I think, discussed in this House and possibly heard it elsewhere, that a great deal of money was being expended on diverting the railway from over the Topsails from Millertown Junction to Howley via Buchan's River. To do that the Government proposes to raise an additional \$500,000.

I might point out that a survey of the railroad is taking place now and when they hand their report to the Government this will be brought about.

Now then the rerailing of the main line from Humbermouth to Port-aux-Basques. If the International Paper people are going to make Port-aux-Basques their shipping port it will be very essential to have this put into effect, to have the road re-railed and we propose to raise for this purpose \$800,000.

Number three, the highroads and extensions thereof. It is proposed to complete the roads which are already started. Then we intend to raise \$250,000 for special grants for Public Works.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Hon. Minister in connection with the Highroads, to what extension does he refer?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think they have a report to make. At the present time, I think, they are completing some bridges that have to be built. I have one in mind now, the bridge at South River, and there are others of that nature — there are considerable bridges to be fixed like that, and the extensions are really the completion roads already commenced to make the connections. I think therefore you will be given a report of that — possibly we can get that from the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Is there any explanation as to where the extensions are to take place. It is at Placentia or somewhere else?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—There are different places I think. The road at Bay de Verde is not completed; there is a part not

completed in Trinity Bay — —I am only giving this from memory, of course — and there is the road thru Victoria Village, near Carbonear.

MR. BRADLEY.—What loan is to be retired, is it the loan of 1918?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Yes. Then there are special grants for Public Works, \$250,000. The Government feel that they should raise this amount as everybody here, both members of the Opposition and Government alike, are looking for money for their districts for certain work which they say is essential to be done. We put this amount down as \$250,000.

Number five is the deficit of the current account for 1927, \$360,000, and number six the deficit on the Railway Account for 1927, \$300,000.

That means that we are raising, outside of the amount to pay off the loan, the sum of \$2,460,000.

As we go along if there is anything that the members would like explained I shall be glad to do so.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; There is one thing that I don't like in these resolutions, and that is the rate of 5 per cent.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I might say for the benefit of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he will notice in the Resolutions, "which sum together with interest thereon at a rate not exceeding 5 per cent." We cannot exceed 5 per cent, but we intend to ask for a four and a half per cent loan, which the resolution gives us the power to do.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I said that because the Hon. Minister made a statement that he was going to get a loan at five per cent, and he figured out the additional cost to the Colony by raising \$10,000,000 at 5 per cent.

There is no necessity to put a loan on the market at 5 per cent, there are provincial loans in Canada put on the market at 4 per cent. and the Canadian Government put bonds on the market for 4½ per cent which are selling at par. Is there any reason why Newfoundland should pay 5 per cent.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; I might say in reply to the Hon. Member that we have had application for 4½ per cent bonds; we are asking for two tenders and then we will decide which is the best for the country.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; Before voting, or probably debating these resolutions, I would really like to know if there is any urgent necessity for loans for highroads and extensions and \$250,000 for the department of Public Works, and also for any items mentioned there. I would like to know what balances of loans we have to the credit of the colony now and I would like to be shown, to bring the evidence, for the necessity for the House to borrow any more money than is absolutely necessary to carry on the affairs of the country. Of course we must meet the bonds, but if it is possible to get along without borrowing the \$2,460,000 cut out the whole lot of it or cut out as much as you can. Our loan bill should be at the very minimum to meet the requirements during the next fiscal year.

The balances to the loans according to the Auditor General and the Budget speech are as follows;— the loan act 1926 there is a balance of \$619,579.25 and in 1927 there is a large balance there.

I presume there are other balances too. I would really like to know for the information of the Committee and the House just what these balances are, what obligations we have to meet, and to find out if we can do without

borrowing this large amount of money. Possibly the Finance Minister can give us some good reason why this amount is put in the Loan Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; For the information of the Hon. Members, I wish to say this, you see there the loan for 1926.

(Reads)

Now take the loan for 1927.

(Reads)

The \$500,000.00 for the diversion of the Railway from Millertown, thru Buchans to Howley would not at all finish that. Therefore, we intend in the next Resolution coming here to get the consent of the House to divert that. From what we can judge, it will take two and a quarter millions to complete that diversion.

CAPT. RANDELL.—What is the extra mileage?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think it is about thirty-two miles. And then we have the two hundred thousand for the encouragement of the fisheries, still intact. We cannot touch these amounts. You remember the act last year by which we cannot transfer any of our bills. I do not suppose we would if we could. Then there is \$136,000.00 for public buildings, and the \$195,000.00 voted here for the Labrador survey and which the Government has some intention of using. Now this is what I propose doing in the next Resolution which you see there. Take the \$147,000.00 and the \$149,000.00. I am going to ask the House to grant me permission to put them into a Trust Fund to stand there for any deficit that may occur for 1928 or 1929. I think that is the proper place for it to go.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of

Finance now if he would raise the Committee and go on with his Resolutions. I do not want to put it off indefinitely, but I would like to have the information with regard to the disposition of the balances.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; The disposition of the balances, of course, will come first. We will go into that and then drop back again.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Charman; I do not know what the intention of the Government is in closing this House, but if we continue putting off bills we will be here for a considerable time to come. Personally I would like to see this House close very soon, and I would suggest to the Government to have a Night Session and to continue the business of the House until we finish it, because if we begin putting off bills from day to day we are going to be here indefinitely. I do not see any reason why we cannot go ahead with the Loan, and if we do not want the money, cut it out. If the country wants the money then go ahead with it. I feel that we all know the disposition of the various balances here.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; I absolutely and positively disagree with the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Ferryland. It is indecent for us to be here, and we are only adding to the indecency if we rush through the business of the country. The business is here, and what authority have we to say what the policy of the Government shall be with regard to the administration of affairs.

MR. MOORE.—You have as much authority as we have.

MR. HALFYARD.—I quite agree to a certain extent. What benefit do we get by trying to put on some semblance of doing something anyhow. Take the whole Budget, what is the good of it all? It is just as well to

publish it in the newspaper and for it not to come before the House at all.

MR. CASHIN.—I did not make the Budget. I have my opinion.

MR. HALFYARD.—If any member wishes to get out of the House, he can stay out of it, but I do not agree with his stand. Suspending rules railroading bills through, and closing the House.

MR. MOORE.—It is not the first time it was done.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I did not intimate when I rose to my feet a few minutes ago that I wanted Legislation railroaded through this House, but before I was a member of this House I knew of a Government that was in power that faked the records of the House, and the Hon. Member was one of the principal members in it. They came in here and were supposed to pass the Estimates to the 30th of December, and after the House was closed they faked the journals of the House and the estimates went on. A man with a cork eye can see that the Loan Bill has got to go through, whether we like it or not. If we do not want \$250,000.00 for the Highroads say so, and I have no doubt but the Government will cut it out. We know what the seven and a half million is for. The balance of five hundred thousand dollars is for making a curve around Buchans. If you do not want to say so.

CAPT. RANDELL.—We want the particulars.

MR. CASHIN.—What particulars are there to it?

MR. HALFYARD.—If you are going to defend the Loan Bill, go ahead.

MR. CASHIN.—I am not going to defend the Loan Bill, but I am getting fed up with members trying to fight the Government and they do not know how to fight it. I have my opinion and I do not want to go down

to the "circular party," and ask them who I have got to vote for I have a certain amount of decent independence in this Legislature. And my policy is not dictated by some outside individual.

MR. HALFYARD.—I disagree with your judgement. Confine your remarks to me, and no one else. It is your opinion against mine.

MR. CASHIN.—And my opinion is this. We all know that we have to pay the seven and a half millions. Of the two and a half millions extra, seven hundred thousand of that is to be used for the diversion of the railway. It is not a difficult problem to figure that out. We are going to re-rail the railway between Humber and Port-aux-Basques. They have it down here at eight hundred thousand. It will be more like a million. That is another one and a half millions. That would make nine millions under ordinary conditions. They have five hundred thousand here for the diversion of the railway around the Topsails. I do not know whether the Hon. Member is in favour of diverting the railway around the Topsails or not. He may not have climbed the Topsails so frequently, and does not know the opposition that the railway has in going over it.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I resent the remarks of the member for Ferryland in respect to my policy being dictated by someone other than myself while in this House. I do not give two cents for anyone inside or outside of this House. Now with reference to this Loan Bill I want to know as well as any other member why we are going to spend \$250,000 to make those highroads and \$500,000 in connection with the diversion of that railroad. I have not yet seen any figures yet as to what is the difference between operating that

railway over the Topsails and operating it the other way. I would like to know where the saving is going to be and I would like to be enlightened with some information in connection with that expenditure of \$500,000, and I do not propose to sit down and vote for these Loan Resolutions unless I know the particulars of this railway expenditure. The member for Ferryland said a moment ago that the re-railing of the railway line from Humbermouth to Port-aux-Basques would cost \$1,000,000 instead of \$800,000 as stated in the Resolutions. Well that is another reason in itself why we should have some detailed information before us before we vote for this money.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; I want to say that I feel that I am as much entitled to consideration and courtesy when I make a request to the Government as any other Member of this House. I represent twelve thousand people and I have the honor to represent them for the past eight or nine years, and the mere matter of fact of any one member in this Chamber not wanting to be particularly careful in any one proposition that comes before the House does not constitute a reason why any other member should see eye to eye with him. I quite agree with the suggestion of Mr. Hickman, namely, that these Resolutions and the next motion on the Order Paper relating to the disposition of balances of loans should go in conjunction, and that the formality of raising this Committee should be gone through now. Furthermore, even if we were to ask to have these Resolutions now before the Chair, deferred until to-morrow, I do not see anything wrong about it because there is enough of other Bills on the Order Paper to take up our time until midnight, if any Hon. Member wants to

have a night session, so that we are not going to lose any time by having the Loan Bill deferred until we get the information that we are entitled to have. We are asked to vote \$250,000 for the Highroads Commission but we do not know what that Commission's programme is and it is only perfectly reasonable that we should know. Then again we are asking the Finance Minister to table for the purusal of members a statement of the balances on loans as they appear at the present time. If you want your Loan Bill to go through, it will go through, but tell us what balances are in the bank, how they are earmarked and how free you are with the balances. I am not going into technicalities in discussing the diversion of the railway or anything of that sort, because I have no information before me to intelligently discuss such matters at the present time. I have been over the Topsails last winter with a dog team, so that I have a fairly good idea of that territory; but you take the Highroads proposition. Last year they spent \$300,000 and they spent \$40,000 north of Baccalieu, although the people of that section represent forty per cent of the people of this country. I do not know how long the Highroads Commission expect that condition of things to continue, but I do not know that the day is coming when the people of the north are going to get their share in full. I wonder will the Highroads Commission give a proportionate part of this loan to complete the road that I asked for yesterday and I wonder will I get that \$40,000 to construct that bridge at Bonne Bay that I have been asking for so long. If not, what is the use of putting forward any reasonable proposition for one's constituency.

However, I ask the Prime Minister now a fair proposition, namely, that

we ought to have a statement of the bank balances showing what you are committed to do for any special purpose you like, and we ought to have a report of the Highroads Commission, such as the Prime Minister might make. I do not want to rush business here because we got some very important business to deal with now. We have got along very well so far without night sessions and we have not attempted any hold up tactics.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I have no intention of adding any fuel to the fire this afternoon, but at the same time I feel that I ought to add a word or two to what has been said by members on this side of the House in protesting against any attempt being made to rush business through. I think it must be readily admitted on all sides that considerable progress has been made and considerable business has done since the House opened. Supply and various other legislation have been passed and we have got a long way through the Ways and Means Committee and I do not see any reason at all why there should be any desire now to rush business thru. Last year's session lasted four months and everybody seemed satisfied to remain here. This afternoon we have suggestions for night sessions and I do not see any reason for night sittings at this session. I have my business to attend to and I want to have some time to attend to it, and I do not think it fair to ask any member who has other duties to perform to come here afternoon and night. As to the question of rushing legislation thru the House, I submit respectfully that we ought to have the information asked for by the Hon. Members for Trinity and St. Barbe before being asked to vote on these Loan Resolutions. There are balances from loans on the hands of the Government and

it may be possible that the brains in the Opposition benches might offer suggestions to the Government to deal with those balances in a way that may not obstruct the mind of the Finance Minister or any other member of the Government. Therefore, before we can judge the true financial position of the Colony we should surely have all the information available before us, so that, after all, a great deal of this discussion thus far this afternoon is totally unnecessary. We have lots of time I submit. Let us go along without any great hurry and without any undue delay, but taking all precautions to respectfully and reasonably obtain any information that is respectfully and reasonably asked for.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words, more in particular in respect to what has been said by the honorable member for Ferryland who suggested that an hour or two in the afternoon is not enough to deal with legislation here. I suggested to the leader of one of the parties in the House yesterday that we might sit all night and he thought it better not to do so. I am inclined to agree with the member for Ferryland that when we have any important business that calls for any considerable debate, we should continue our sessions at night. Last year the member for Twillingate (Mr. Ashbourne) was asking for night sessions, and I think the members of the North generally were anxious to sit at night. Now, there is no desire on the part of the government to rush business through the House, but at the same time we cannot do an awful lot of business in the afternoon and I think the time has come when we should hold night sessions in order to put the remaining business through and get out of the House.

I would like also to say a word or two in reply to the member for St. Barbe.

Just a word in reply to the honorable member for St. Barbe. I think I am just as deeply interested in the people in the north of this Island as he is. I represent a northern district exactly the same as he, and I recognise that the north has not been getting its share of money that has been spent, and the north has not been getting the value out of the money spent for highroads, but it must be recognised that the highroads had to begin somewhere, and you can't conduct a highroads policy by building one small road from Bonne Bay and another around Green Bay and another around Bonavista and Trinity Bay. We had to begin somewhere and extend from there. We built highroads mainly on the Peninsula of Avalon, and the money that is required is for the extension and upkeep of those same roads on the peninsula of Avalon, and it might be said to me, "Why do you, as member for Bonavista, support any such expenditure?" My reply is this: That there are 300 new cars coming into this country this year; if we don't have highroads, if we don't have good roads, they would not be coming in. Three hundred cars at an average value of \$1000 and duty at 60 p.c. means \$180,000, or more than is wanted for the upkeep of these roads. You may say that cars are wanted in Bonavista and if you make roads down there you would have cars there, and the same with other places. Well, we are trying to get to that, and it will come in time. Meantime I do consider that if there is any further money voted for public purposes more consideration out of the general grants should be given the northern districts that don't get assistance towards their roads from the High-

roads. I agree, as it has been suggested, that these two Loan Bills should be taken together. First of all because the first Resolutions go to show a balance of \$300,000; we don't propose to make that a slush fund for some political party coming in to use it perhaps for political purposes, but we come in and say we propose to put that in a Trust Fund and keep it there as against any possible deficit at the end of next year. I think that is the best way to use it. It might be said that we could use it for paying off the deficit on the Railway and borrow \$300,000 less, but it hardly seems worth while cutting the \$10,00,000 loan down to \$9,700,000. We say put in in a Trust Fund so that nobody can use it unless it is required to pay off the deficit on the Railway or some such thing at the end of another twelve months. The \$800,000 for the re-railing of the section of the line is there plain to be seen. The honorable member for Ferryland says it will cost nearer a million, but we know from figures tabled in the House that last year it cost exactly \$173,000 for the labor in re-railing, outside of the cost of rails, from Clarendville to Bishop's Falls, and we got back \$53,000 for the old rails we took up and sold and so the cost was \$120,000 net to re-rail that section excluding the cost of rails themselves. It is very easy to figure the cost of rails, knowing the number of miles that have to be done, and add a little more to expense for the larger distance and you have figures I think that will approximate \$800,000; but we can get the figures in more detail if required. As regards the payment of the deficit, of course that is an item nobody requires any explanation of. \$500,000 is taken and added to the \$750,000 to make a million and a quarter for the purpose of extending the line by

Buchans. We cannot give details to the House now as to what it is going to cost. We have first to see the A. N.D. Co. and we have got to find out what conditions can be got from them, whether we have got to buy the line or whether we can get it for nothing; whether they are going to pay certain rates going over the line or what they are going to do; and we don't exactly know until a survey is made what excess of thirty miles there is to be done.

We don't know if we have to go to Howley or if we can go short a bit. But if it is not a business proposition any reasonable government, I take it, is not going to do it. We know what it is costing to go over the Topsails and we feel that it is going to be a reasonable proposition and rather than wait until next session of the Legislature, we are asking for money for the purpose now. Because we ask for the money doesn't mean necessarily we are going to spend it. Some gentlemen rather complained because we haven't spent the money we borrowed. We borrowed \$200,000 for a survey of the Labrador and we spent \$5,000, and I may say I believe that was wasted. I don't believe we got any value out of the survey except that we satisfied ourselves in respect to a certain area where we were trying to find if there was any timber. We have spent practically nothing of the two hundred thousand for assistance to the fishery. We have the money there and somebody complains why hasn't it, or part of it, been spent. We have lots of people looking to spend it, but we want to conserve it. Surely to goodness, nobody is going to blame us for that; and that is the position. We asked for money in order to use it if a good opportunity offered; and if we can put a railroad round Buchan's this summer, and do it ad-

vantageously and economically and find we can make a satisfactory agreement with the Buchans Mine people to do it, then I think this Legislature ought to give us authority.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have any objection at all to moving that the committee rise. I can quite appreciate that the honorable member for Ferryland wants to get through. I think I want to get thru myself, but I could not bring this legislation in before today, and I am quite in accord with the fact that full information should be given to every honorable member. The Leader of the Opposition has asked to raise the Committee and go back to the other resolutions and explain certain parts and I have certainly no objection. I simply say in reply to what has been said that as the Prime Minister has said it is a very difficult thing for the Finance Minister or anybody else at the present moment to be accurate as to what the cost of a railroad around Buchans Mine will be.

What I have understood for years and years is that one big factor contributing to the losses of the railroad was going over the Gaff Topsails in winter and I would like to ask Mr. Halfyard if when he was on the Railroad Commission there was not discussion for the diversion of the line from the Topsails if it were possible at all. Do you remember that Mr. Halfyard?

MR. HALFYARD.—That is the reason Argentia was made a terminus.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—But you can't cut off Corner Brook and these places. That is obvious. With regard to the railroad we have to take experts' advice, but I think myself we are going to save a great deal of money going thru

Buchans Mine and I think it will be worth doing. We are all crying out in this House for labour. If we can spend this money on capital account with good value to the colony saving money to the railroad I think the quicker we get at it the better. I would like to ask the Chairman to raise to the Committee and we can go back to the other Resolutions.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
Mr. Chairman; Before the Committee rises, for the purpose of letting Hon. Member know that when we go into Committee again on this Bill we may have something definite to consider; it appears to me that there is very little difference of opinion in the House on what has been said this afternoon, methods may be somewhat different but I think ideas are the same. If we take the entire Loan Bill and go by a system of elimination I think we can get it boiled down to a narrow margin. First there is 7½ million that must be procured for the purpose of paying off the old loan; then we have the deficit on the railway and the deficit on current account this year, coming to some six hundred thousand. That, it goes without saying, has to be paid. The next item may be contentious. I don't think it can be settled under the circumstances we find in this House to-day, that is the re-railing of the road from Port-aux-Basques to Bay of Islands. It is not possible at this juncture to give a definite estimate of what that will cost. Some say it will cost a million but information has been given from reliable authority doing that work that \$750,000 to \$800,000 is ample. With regard to the 1¼ millions. That is merely an estimate; as a matter of fact the survey is not yet completed but the survey may not be completed until some time after the House is closed. If the money is borrowed and

the provision is made in the Loan Bill the money is there for that specific purpose. There is \$130,000 to the credit of public buildings repairs in the bank; that is the balance left of \$160,000 which was raised I think in the last loan. That money cannot be spent for any other purpose but for public buildings. There is also the amount for assistance to the fisheries. A large portion of that amount is still there to the credit of that purpose, and I have in my mind's eye requests of Honourable Members in the House for portions of that money for the purpose of benefit to and protection of the fisheries, and I have no doubt but the Government when the time comes will consider these and will give favourable consideration in the great majority of cases. Every amount voted in that Loan Bill is earmarked for a specific purpose and cannot be disposed of for any other purpose. Last year we borrowed \$500,000 for public works. That \$500,000 was administered through my department practically. As a matter of fact I had control and the administration of that money. We had a Committee of this House or a committee of the Government and every member irrespective of his position in the House was given an opportunity to make recommendations; if he wanted anything for his district, a wharf, a bridge, or anything else in the way of improvements he made an application, and I think without exception, in very rare cases if any, these applications were agreed to, and the money was placed to the credit of the district in the Public Works Department or Marine & Fisheries. I think Honorable Members will agree that it worked well. I have yet to know of any dissatisfaction. Every district got its proportionate amount and representatives in the House got an opportunity to make recommendations. This \$250,000 I

know will be spent in like manner. At present it may be said that the situation is somewhat changed because the House of Assembly dies on the 9th of July and there are no Members in this House. There is another aspect, we have new districts. The redistribution Act has somewhat changed the aspect of the districts in the Island and therefore the same allocations are not in order.

Therefore the same allocations will not be in order and there may be some difficulty with regard to the administration of that fund this year, and I take it, Mr. Chairman, that some ways and means will have to be devised by the districts, and I say that ways and means will have to be devised by the districts because we cannot consider members when there are no members, whereby they will be treated as I think and hope they were treated in this regard last year.

We come down to the only other amount that is in the loan, being \$250,000 for the Highroads Commission.

Now the Highroads Commission have submitted somewhat of a preliminary report or suggestions with regard to the expenditure of this money, and it has been considered in a limited way by the Government, giving as much time as possible to it, and some of the particulars they have not agreed with. Personally I objected to some cases where it was proposed to put very large and expensive concrete bridges in districts, while it was very desirable and very necessary to have to get a substantial bridge over a precipice or deep chasm that some bridges have to span, but we could not afford it. We are like the man getting a motor car, if he cannot afford a Rolls Royce he must buy a Ford. We cannot afford a concrete bridge so we must put up with a wooden bridge. I certainly ap-

prove of building concrete bridges because I believe they save their own expense, they save the value of themselves in a few years because they are permanent and need no repairs, and those who in the past have had the worry of keeping up a number of wooden bridges know what that means. Still we cannot put up concrete bridges and make such heavy inroads into the public money. I mention this as I desire to say that I consider that it is not a proper way to use this loan, by building concrete bridges, and spend from \$10,000 to \$15,000 on a bridge, when there are so many cries asking for the placing of wharves, brest works, etc., in the different settlements. When you consider that so much crying is made I feel that we should see them attended to first, at least, at the present time. I don't say this to be hypocritical over it. I expressly refused to give my consent to such action. Mr. Hall showed me the programme I said that I would not subscribe to such a plan because I did not think they should ask the Government to grant any more money than absolutely necessary to maintain and operate the work already done.

Outside of the roads already built it is going to cost a considerable amount to rebuild some of the roads around St. John's and vicinity. We have, for example, the Topsail Road, which was torn to pieces during the past twelve months, the reason was because it was not properly protected.

The Highroads Commission have gone very carefully into consideration of statistics with regard to the number of cars passing during a day over that road, and I think that they have figured that fourteen hundred cars passed over Manuels bridge in ten hours. So you must appreciate the tremendous traffic on that road and not being a tarvia road or anything

like that but merely clay the road demands consideration, and in windy weather tremendous amount of matter is blown away in dust. I have heard that the Highroads Commission have decided to import a road material called calcium chloride, I think, and they are going to cover the roads with it. The roads in the vicinity of St. John's where the traffic is greatest are going to be covered. This calcium chloride is said to be the last word in road material that is being used almost exclusively in the United States and Canada.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman the debate on this loan narrows down to a very small amount.

The Buchans Mine Railway is merely an estimate. If we don't find that it is practicable to build this railroad that money will remain there in the Bank and it will be there when the House meets again. If we don't think that it is necessary to re-rail the road, which we will probably have to do, because of the fact that the International Paper Company have already made arrangements to build a shipping port at Port aux Basques for trans-shipment of large quantity of paper during the winter season. It goes without saying that if they are going to produce paper from that mill in the large quantities that they contemplate they cannot possibly fill their store and go on manufacturing paper during the winter season when navigation is closed. It will be essential to get a winter port and they intend going down to Port aux Basques with their paper and will ship it from there, and the railway is going to get a considerable amount of work. The railway has already made an estimate of what it is going to carry the paper for, and they have to be paid by the International Paper Company and it will be a great benefit to the Railway and help to reduce the deficit that we

yearly have to face. The building of that road down to Port aux Basques is experimental and the \$800,000 is only an approximate estimate, and must be accepted without much difference of opinion as to what it is going to cost.

I think, however, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Members are perfectly right and I sympathise with them, with every member of the House, for it is not his job to come in here and swallow the thing wholesale because the Government proposes it, because the Government brings in a loan and says "we want you to vote this thing and the other." They have a perfect right to criticise and get all the information necessary, but at the same time I think that it will come down to one or two items in the entire loan here, and that they may ask readily for information and if I can give them any information I shall be only too glad to do so.

MR. RANDELL —Mr. Chairman, there is just one thing before the committee rises, that I would like to say. In all this talk I have not heard an answer to my question in reference to what would be the difference in expenditure and the advantage of having this railway moved from over the Topsails.

It should be an easy thing to obtain an estimate and figure out what a certain section of the railway now costs with the same elevation as the proposed section.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think we can get some figures for you to-morrow which will give a very good idea.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON LOAN BALANCES

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the disposition of balances remaining out of the loan raised under the Act 18 George V., Cap. 18.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, these resolutions are very simple. I don't think there is very much to worry about in them; they have already been partly explained.

It simply means this, that the balance of \$750,000 granted for the Gander Railway, we propose to take and place with the \$500,000 for the construction of the railway line, as already stated, from Millertown Junction to Howley, which will make the necessary amount estimated to build that line, \$1,250,000.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I understand that you are not sure of building yet, not until you have made a survey.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—If it is impracticable, naturally we would not build it.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—What happens to the money then?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The money is actually there and if it is not used it will be required for other purposes by other Governments, but if it is found essential it will be used and that is what the resolutions really mean.

Sections 2 of the Resolutions reads:

What the Government proposes to do, and I don't think anybody can object, is to put this money to a special trust fund in the Bank of Montreal and have it there for 1928-29 for whatever Government that may be in power in order that they may use it for their deficit. I don't think there is anything objectionable about that.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Suppose there is no deficit.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Well if we don't we will find some account to settle.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the Railway Commission has gone into the matter of retrenchment up at the railway. I would like to ask him also how many meetings the Railway Commission has had during the year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member I may say that the Railway Commission meets once every week, and its whole time is taken up in considering economy on the railway. I am perfectly satisfied that the capital expenditure made under Railway Account for the re-railing the sections that have been re-railed, has been well worth while. When you come to think that in 1922, there were thirty-seven derailings, and only three or four last year of express trains, you can understand what that means to the railway. The Honourable Member has got to remember that when this railway was taken over by the previous Government it was in a deplorable condition. It was not ballasted. It was practically a mass of junk. The Railway Commission of that day had to spend a lot of money as was shown in the House, the very first year that they were operating it. It cost one and three quarter millions to operate the rail-

way then. They cut it down in their time, and I want to give credit where credit is due. The fact was that during their regime they had it down to \$700,000 in Humber construction year and then it went up again. And now we have it down to \$300,000. And in my opinion as soon as they are moving some of their concentrates from Buchans Mine and at the same time moving a large amount of timber from one section of the line to the other, and as soon as we get the new line from Corner Brook to Port aux Basques and the International begin shipping paper via Corner Brook in the winter time, and wood in the summer time, then you are going to find that the railway will be a paying proposition. I do not say that it will be a paying proposition if you charge it with interest on capital expenditure, but if you are going to have a railway at all it has got to be a fairly decent one.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I think it was a matter for regret that the Government did not have the foresight last year when the Buchan's agreement was before the House, to have taken up the matter of changing the route of the railway around the Topsails instead of going over it. As far as I can understand, with my limited knowledge one of the reasons that the snow rests on the Topsails is on account of a well known law. You may see that when the wind, blowing at a great rate strikes a forest or a mountain or a cliff, the air rises and naturally carries the snow with it. Perhaps that is the reason why there is so little snow on the bottom of the Topsails as compared with the top. On the other hand this year, members know that we had a very small snow fall throughout the whole country I believe. I remember hearing the Prime Minister say that when he went out on the Topsails this year, and went

down to the bottom he found very little snow there. And I think that perhaps it would be an easy matter to check that up, not only this year but other years. The Commission no doubt would be able to give some idea of the snow fall this year as compared with other years. I think myself that it would have been better for the Government when they came into the House to have given the members some idea of what it was going to cost. To-day we do not know what arrangement can be made with the A.N.D. Co.

MR. HALFYARD.—Could the Railway Commission give us any idea of the cost of snow fighting?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, it is not only the cost of snow fighting, but the cost of operating this part of the Road, which is very excessive, that has to be considered as well. Owing to the fact, that the line of Railway from Mary March's Brook to the Topsails has a long two per cent grade and the same thing applies from Kitty's Brook to the summit, with a rather heavy curvature on the latter grade, so that when the question of diverting the main line of Railway was being considered, the question of the easiest obtainable grade and easiest curvature was given first thought and consideration. As naturally, the lighter the grade that can be obtained and the lighter the curvature the less the cost of operating will be. At the present time, the grade from Kitty's Brook to the Gaff Topsails is practically a two per cent grade for a distance of nearly seven miles. But if the proposed diversion will give the road that it is anticipated, then a much easier grade can be obtained, especially, when it is anticipated that the summit on the new diversion will be, at least, four hundred (400) feet lower than the present

summit, and furthermore, there will be a much better chance of getting an easier grade down to Howley from the new summit, owing to the fact that there will be a greater distance to drop down to Howley, which would naturally give an easier grade, and we hope an easier curvature than the present location through Kitty's Brook Valley.

The Member for Twillingate (Mr. Ashbourne), stated that the Government was short-sighted in not having provided for this diversion last year, when the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited were getting concessions. I cannot agree with him. The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Ltd., and the American Smelters, were prepared to build a line into Buchans Mines at their own expense, and if we eventually, build the line from Howley via Buchans to Millertown Junction, we will have saved interest which we would have been paying if the Government had built the line last year to Buchans Mine.

As to the Hon. Member's statement regarding the Government and the concessions they gave the Buchans Mining Company, again, I cannot agree with him. With the demand for labour coming from all parts of the country to-day, and at the time the concessions were given any Government would be justified in giving concessions to a Company, such as the Buchans Mining Company, that would provide employment for (800) eight hundred or (1,000) one thousand men. As to the concessions that they were given, it was only in connection with the importation of machinery and equipment for their mills for a certain period. On the other hand, other Companies are free from Income Tax or business profit Tax should such tax be imposed. The Buchans Mining

Company, is not free from Income Tax or business Profit Tax, and furthermore, it pays a royalty of 5 per cent on its net profits, Which no other Company is doing in this country. The Monroe Government did not grant the land concessions to the Buchans Mining Company. These concessions were given by the Government of the "Late Sir Robert Bond." in 1905.

The Government is hopeful that no obstacles will be found in the way of building the diversion from Buchans to Howley. Mr. Vatcher is now in charge of a survey party, and we hope to hear in a very short time the result of his trial line.

Should the new line turn out as we hope, the cost of operating will be considerably reduced per train mile. Should this line not be built, then the Buchans Mining Company, can run out their own ore, probably, 70,000 or 80,000 tons annually to Millertown Junction, on which our railway will get no freight over the Buchans railway. The Buchans Mining Company would also get all freight and expressage from Millertown Junction to Buchans. While the Newfoundland Railway would be running over a non-productive road from Millertown to Kitty's Brook — a distance of thirty six (36) miles. Furthermore, it is not expected that there will be any snow fighting on this line—that is in comparison with the snow fighting over the old line.

MR. SCAMMELL.—There is one point, the Hon. Member for Placentia, (Mr. Sullivan), did not make quite clear. You are not sure of driving a good bargain by making arrangements with these people to build the Railway because they have fifty pound rails.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—It is quite true that we have seventy pound rails on two divisions of the Newfoundland

Railway, and will have seventy pound rails on the Western Division by the end of this season. Between Bishop Falls and Humbermouth there is only fifty pound rails. On the new line from Howley to Buchans it would be advisable to place seventy pound rails. Probably, it may not be necessary to re-rail from Buchans to Millertown with seventy pound rails this year, as fifty pound rails might do for a couple of years. I can assure the Hon. Member for St. Barbe's, that unless, reasonable terms can be arranged between the Buchans Mining Company and the Government that this line from Buchans to Millertown will not be taken over. The Government has no reason to suppose but that satisfactory arrangement to the Government and the Company can be arrived at.

The Prime Minister has notified the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. Ltd., that the Government proposed making this diversion, and permission has been asked for Surveyors to pass through their territory, which was freely granted.

MR. HALFYARD.—I think the point raised by Mr Ashbourne is a good one. I understand you are going to re-rail that line with seventy pound rails, and if that is so the Company will have to be compensated for the rails which will have to be taken up, and the country will have to pay the bill. If you had to anticipate this last year, you would have saved the cost of labour in taking up these fifty pound rails any how?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—At that time, there was no talk of diverting the Railway, the fifty pound rails may not be taken up for a few years. If they have to be taken up we can certainly get more for the old rails than sufficient to cover the labour in taking them up.

MR. BRADLEY.—I understand, that snow conditions similar to now existed thirty years ago, and if it was easier then to go via Buchans than over the Topsails why was it not discovered before?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—The reason the Railway was built over the Topsails by the "Late Sir Robert G. Reid" was because, of the fact that after trying a line out to the North and South of the Topsails they found they could not get over the summits. It was in 1906, when I made a survey of the Water-Shed for the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd. that I saw the possibility of getting thru Hind's Valley, with the Railway, instead of going over the present summit. Had the Survey party which tried the line when the actual survey was made to the North and South of the present summit, started their survey where Millertown now is and gone down Mary March's River, and thence, on the present route of Buchans Railway they would have cut thru Hind's Valley with probably four hundred feet lower summit than the present one. Again, the whole character of the country is changed since then, not in the region between Millertown Junction and Topsails but in other sections. Take for instance, between Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls. It is much easier to locate the line now as the country is all burnt. If, when the first survey was made, they knew as much about the country as they do to-day, they would never have gone up from Bishop's Falls to Grand Falls via Cruisers Brook, because, by going this way they struck a line of heavy rock work and a long two per cent grade. Had they gone from Bishop's Falls, following the Exploits River, they would have gone up there with very light work, very little curvature and one short piece of two

per cent grade. The country was heavily timbered in that section at the time.

I am strongly of opinion that if we get an easier grade over the summit on the new diversion on both sides. This, with the lack of snow fighting that will occur on this diversion will save a very large amount of money annually to the Railway.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask just now what position do we find ourselves in. We are going through the Loan Resolutions and the Finance Minister has not given us the information we are looking for. What about the Highroads Commission report? The Colonial Secretary has referred to a report that the Highroads Commission made; some programme they intended to put into execution and that he was not in agreement with. It would be quite alright for us to have that. I am taking a deliberate stand and I say I want some consideration given to the District of St. Barbe out of this highroads grant; I don't care whether I come back as member for St. Barbe or not, or what government comes back. The time has come to see discrimination against the northern districts cease. I would like to see the government accept the proposition that the Bonne Bay road should be finished. The Prime Minister makes some very sneering references at times that I don't like. He speaks about the local road around Bonne Bay. This is no local road; it is a matter of connecting up the road at Bonne Bay with what is already a very good road and connecting up the entire country. I would like the prime minister to go down there and take a holiday there for a while, and come back and say he sees the position in a very different light.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I know the value of the road, just as I know that of a road from Catalina to Bonavista.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Well, take the road from Catalina to Bonavista. That is in a bad condition and cars are imported by the people up there, more would be imported if the roads were in a better condition; and if you are going to spend \$250,000 a good deal of it will be new work. All that won't be upkeep. And if you are going to vote \$250,000, why not put in an amount for the completion of the Bonne Bay road, and also give us the bridge that I am always talking about. It would not have to be a concrete bridge. As long as the girders would be steel the main part of the bridge could be wooden. The bridge was put there 25 years ago and has fallen into disrepair. Today with better knowledge of bridge-building we might be able to make a better job of it and it would not be necessary to go to the expense of making it of concrete. I put these two propositions to the Government and I hope that some money can be devoted to these two improvements in the district.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I want to tell the honorable member that any vote for highroads will be used only on roads taken over by the Highroads Commission.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Well, let the Highroads Commission take that over and make it "a highroad." It is a highroad.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I was speaking about the road between Botwood and Point Leamington. There is a road now from the bottom of Halls Bay running to Badger, and by opening up the road between Badger and Bush Point and completing the road you would then have a motor road extend-

ing about one hundred miles in length and that would be an attraction to anyone visiting the interior of the country. It may require about \$20,000 or \$40,000 to build that road. There are about eight miles between Badger and Bush Point. You would then have a hundred-mile road and I think members will agree as to the attractions there are in that part of Twillingate District. People can come in, get a good hotel at Grand Falls and go to Hall's Bay or Point Leamington on the other end. If tourists are coming into the country in the numbers we are told, that section, the same as other sections, will attract a great number because of the great field there is for getting all the sport they want.

It would only require about \$40,000 to open up the road, and, as I stated to the House the other day, we would get what we spent in that way in the course of three or four years back into the revenues of the country, assuming of course the truth of all that is said about the benefits of the tourist traffic coming to the country the next three or four years. Because if there has been \$600,000 spent last year in this country by tourists, and we have that as an added attraction, and have additional tourists coming here and going out there, it is only natural to expect they will spend a proportionate amount in that section, and you will get it back in the revenue, which will help to offset what expense is incurred in building that road. I submit that the Government ought to take this into consideration and I trust that the Highroads Commission will be instructed to give attention to that particular part of the Twillingate District.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman, there is the matter of the special grant for public works. I would like to understand whether that is going

to be per capita. That is the only proper and fair way for the distribution of grants, and with a lot of other expenditure, if done per capita there would not be so much discontent as there is.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It was last year.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—I hope and trust it will be this year and I would like to have an assurance from the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I can't give an assurance. I won't be here to look after it.

MR. HALFYARD.—I think that is a matter we should consider more seriously, and also that, as the Colonial Secretary has intimated there is now the Redistribution Bill to be considered, and there will be practically no one responsible for the allocation of money after this House is closed, and I suppose the Colonial Secretary is going to shoulder the whole thing. I think he should consider this position very fully.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, just to bear out what has been already said, take the recommendations that have already been made in connection with Public Works. In certain districts members have suggested the allocation of amounts of money and the work has not been finished that the money has been granted for. There may be \$200 needed to complete a wharf, say. Well, if members are not going to have anything further to say possibly nothing more might be done with that public work.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I might say that this matter is coming before the Council tonight for consideration as to what will be done.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the Resolutions.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Disposition of Balances Remaining out of the Loan raised under the Act 18, Geo. V. Cap. 18," was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

LOAN RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the raising of a Loan upon the credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

WABANA LIGHT AND POWER RESOLUTIONS

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 respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, just before the Resolutions are read, I think I explained to the House last day certain particulars and said all that is required about these Resolutions. There is only one thing that has occurred since and that is in Clause 4, which reads: (reads). To that we want to insert the words "or Public Service Electric Company." There is a fourth company over there that should get privileges that we are giving to the other companies. The effect of this is that if any of these people desire at any time to supply power on the wholesale basis in average blocks of not less than ten thousand kilowatt hours per month, they shall do so.

There is just one other thing that occurs to me. It was in 1919 when the original agreement was made out and it was under the Bell Island Electric Service Act that the Co-Operative Company got the right. This position is even an improvement over that situation. At that time the franchise was given them for thirty years. We are making this twenty. They had a franchise of a general nature for lighting and power and now it is simply a franchise, it will be noted, for twenty years, to supply electricity on a retail basis only. That makes a clear distinction that there always was but that was not drawn attention to.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, can the Hon. Minister give us any information of the rights of the Bell Island Transportation Company?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—There, again, is a case. The Bell Island Transportation Company gets \$1,000 a year for running the tramway

system, which is the method of getting from the Beach to the town. This does not affect any rights they got. I take it they think it is only right they should have lights on the tramway. That section is the same as when the original agreement was given.

Mr. Chairman, the object of putting in that clause is this: The Company only loses the franchise when they cannot supply, or refuse to supply, the power, and to enable any company to do so, that might come forward and say "we are prepared to supply the power." In other words, this clause really protects the residents of the Island. In view of the fact that this Company does not generate their own electrical power, but takes it from another company, we have to protect the people of Bell Island who own a considerable number of stores there. And if this Company ceased for any reason to operate, it would mean the closing down of the stores there, and as in that event if the St. John's Light and Power Co, or the Conception Bay Co., say "we will send across power to light your stores," they ought not to be held up. It is really put in in the interests of the people of the Island. I do not think that the people themselves can take any exception to it at all.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended 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 Wabana Light and Power 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.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

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 Highway Traffic Act, 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—Mr. Chairman, about the only way in which the House will be able to follow it that we take it in sections. I might read the sections that were amended so that the members may be able to follow the amendments.

As I intimated on the Second Reading of this bill, these amendments are solely the experience of a couple of years, and requests mainly of the High Roads Commission. Let us take the first section. Number one clause should read:—

Reads:

Section J defines "Parking."

Reads:

It is now suggested that we add to that to include under the definition "Parking," "and such vehicles, etc.:—

Reads:

We find that the object of that section is to make sure that where traffic regulations are made, that cars that are standing shall be subject to the traffic regulations. In other words that a car that is parked shall be subject to getting out of the way under certain conditions, the same as a car that is in motion. The road act reads:—

Reads:

The object now is to have this thing uniform, and the High Roads Commission shall be the controlling body, as to what is a parked car.

Section 2 reads:—

Reads:

Section three of the Act Reads:—

Reads:

It is suggested now that the words be amended by adding after the words "such motor vehicles," "and such charges as the Commission may put in," and by adding at the end of the section:—

Reads:

I understand that the object of this is that under the old section a lot of motor car owners were paying the Commission fees for number plates. And that it should be regarded as a charge and not a fee, as distinct from "license fee." The last part of the section is to prevent people from registering cars before arriving in Newfoundland. The idea of that is that the Commission has been faced with requests from people to have the license issued before the car arrives. And it is felt that the car should be here, and it should be inspected the same as any other car before a license is issued. In fact the suggestion has been made that people wished to have Newfoundland number plates sent abroad for use elsewhere. It was felt that those number plates ought to be put on when the car was actually in Newfoundland.

Section (3) amends Section (6). Sub-section (b) by striking out the words "Owned by him." It means that no person now whether he owns a car or not shall be a party to defacing or transferring a number plate.

Section (4) amends section (8) of the old act by adding after the words "false pretences," the words "or a demonstration number plate which is being used contrary to any regulations made under section (52) of the act." I am told that the reason for this amendment is that demonstrating number plates that have been used for

genuinely demonstrative purposes to facilitate business people, have been used for general driving and totally unconnected with the purpose for which they were intended.

Section (5) amends sub-section (a) of Section (9) of the act by adding at the end of the words "And the licensing or registration of the operator thereof;" also the said section is further amended by adding the following sub-section (h) which reads as follows:

(Reads Sub-section h.)

The idea is that where a tourist brings in a car and claims the right to drive it he got to show two things first, namely, that the car is licensed and that he has got a driver's license to drive it. Section (6) is amended by adding in sub-section (a) after the words "One on each side of the front." This is the provision about lamps. The practice has been prevailing here of dispensing with head lights and running on beacon lights. There are occasions when that practice is not dangerous; but there are also times when it is dangerous and in future a man shall at least be obliged to keep on his dimmers. In addition we now have suggested a new sub-section (f), which explained means that people got a habit here of leaving their cars out all night unattended and only recently the fire department very narrowly averted a bad smash-up. A man now cannot abandon his car between 12 midnight and 6 a.m. and can only be considered an attendant, if he is able to shift his car out of the way of traffic. Of course, this does not apply to medical men, but the whole idea of the sub-section is to stop the practice of indiscriminate abandoning of cars.

Section (7) makes it uniform with the municipal law that cars shall not run in the city at a greater speed than 15 miles an hour. It is suggested to

make it 20 in ordinary settlements and town as Harbor Grace and make it 15 in St. John's where there is more traffic. I think 15 miles along Water Street or Duckworth Street is fast enough. There is a distinction drawn between St. John's and other towns. We have more traffic here and I think in the interests of traffic round town and in interests of the pedestrian there ought to be a separate and more restrictive law.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Sometimes it is necessary to go more than 15 to get out of the way.

MR. BRADLEY—I think it is a matter that ought to be left to the discretion of the police. There are occasions when it is very difficult to go less than 20. If a man is going up a grade unless he is prepared to change into a lower gear which isn't always very pleasant he has to go over twenty. After all I think the purpose is very well served by leaving it to the discretion of the police. I know they are pretty efficient in this respect. I think it is a better policy to aim at bringing to book those who drive at a speed dangerous to the public.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that is all the greater reason why it should be put back to 15. If you leave it at 20 the crowd feels they are going to go 20 anyhow. The police are not going to jump on people slightly exceeding 15 and the heavier traffic in St. John's is reason for having a lower rate.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—When traffic is heavy you have to drive faster to get out of it and get ahead of street cars and so on. I think that is a retrograde step. I don't think you will find any city in the world with a rate of speed as low as that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think in Halifax not so far away from us the rate is 10. My point is

this that you ought to have a lower margin of speed than outside. If I had my way I would get it back to ten. I know ten wouldn't be kept up; but my experience is this that when a limit is set like this you don't find people going less but they go at least that. 15 is fast enough for an ordinary rate of speed and I think Members will find me adamant on that point in this Bill. There is another point must be considered seriously not alone are motors increasing in number in the country but the number of incompetent drivers is increasing and for that reason you must be very careful of the protection of children and grown up pedestrians also and encourage a lower rate of speed.

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.

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 31st, 1928.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Dr. Mosdell from Fortune Bay re Mail Service.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend

Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Customs."

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

SHARK INDUSTRY RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions in relation to the encouragement of the Shark Industry.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in introducing these Resolutions I may say that it is a private Bill, and the Company has no guarantee or anything whatever from the Government. This is the first time in this House that a Bill was introduced or proposed to be introduced for sharks in the sea, and I have the privilege of bringing in the first Resolutions, and I hope some day to have the privilege of bringing in a Bill for sharks on the land as well. The idea of these Resolutions, as will be seen from reading them, is to try and bring into this country another industry. I understand from Mr. Hanrahan of Harbor Grace that quite a large quantity of sharks have been caught on the coast of Norway, but up to the present time no attempt, whatever, has been made to see if there are any sharks in the waters around the Island of Newfoundland and the coast of Labrador. Personally I have seen quite a few sharks out at the seal-fishery, but in consultation with Mr. Hanrahan, I may say, that I find that the sharks that are caught over there are very much larger than the sharks I have seen in the waters around the coast of Newfoundland. He tells me

that they vary in length from eighteen or twenty to thirty feet, but what sharks I have seen are no longer than twelve or fourteen feet. These Resolutions I may say ask for a monopoly of three years. I have no doubt there would be no contention whatever as far as these Resolutions are concerned, only the asking for a monopoly. I may state right here that personally ever since I have had the privilege of sitting on the floors of the House from twenty-three years ago I have been against monopoly, and no doubt it is common property that I have been against bills that are likely to come before this House or are on the Order Paper now, with reference to giving monopolies to persons unless there is some reason why we should grant it. In this case, up to a few days ago, I never heard anyone in Newfoundland mention that they were going into the business of catching sharks, but during the last two or three days I had a petition from Mr. Job objecting to the Resolutions, because of the Clause with regard to monopoly. It appears to me that as soon as a pioneer man enters into any business, and spends a certain amount of money, then everyone is after him.

We all know what happened to the Whale Industry in this country some twenty odd years ago. It was started by some firm, and as soon as they were making fairly good money everybody went into it without any restriction, and consequently in a few years the people lost all their money and the fishery died out. Mr. Hanrahan of Harbor Grace who is a Newfoundlander, and I understand went through the Great War, went over to Norway last summer and spent most of the summer over there and studied the shark business, and he made up his mind when he came back that it was possible for sharks to be caught around the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, and

he decided that he would ask for a Bill to be put through this House granting him a monopoly for three years for catching sharks. At the present time Mr. Hanrahan nor anyone else knows whether there are any sharks in our waters today, and of the quality and kind that they catch in Norway. I have been told by him that his Company would spend at least ten thousand dollars this year to buy a boat and trawls and find out whether there are any sharks on the shores of this Island and Labrador or not. If they find sharks in any quantity around the coast of Newfoundland or Labrador, it is their intention to put up a plant next year where they can manufacture the liver into oil and for other purposes. But Mr. Hanrahan points out to me that if they have got to go to the expense of ten or twelve thousand dollars to try and locate sharks, and if they do not happen to locate any, it is their loss, and if they do locate sharks, and if they have no monopoly for at least three years, the chances are then that it will turn out something like the whale business in this country. Therefore, the expenditure of ten thousand dollars that they are about to make this year is for experimental purposes, and I consider that it is only right and fair, as he is a pioneer in this business, that he should be granted a monopoly of three years. They do not ask for free importation of machinery or any concessions whatever, and I think the request is very reasonable.

To my mind Norwegians at the present time have very large floating factories in Norway. I know to my own knowledge this year there are two very large steamers employed as floating factories on the coast of Norway catching halibut and codfish. They have four hundred motor boats, two hundred on board of each, employing eight hundred men, and I have been

told by Mr. Hanrahan and other parties that a Norwegian firm is thinking very strongly of fitting a floating factory for the coming year to put upon this coast and prosecute the shark business. Therefore, I claim it is far better for us to grant the request to a man who is a Newfoundlander, so that he can make a start with this shark business, and see if anything can be done, and give him a chance to make a living and employ Newfoundlanders, than it is for a Norwegian Concern to come out here and catch sharks. These sharks are very seldom, if ever, found in less than one hundreds fathoms of water, generally one hundred and fifty or two hundred is the best place. Therefore, I argue that it is our duty as Newfoundlanders to do all that we possibly can for any Newfoundlander who is starting in as a pioneer in any business in this country. I asked Mr. Hanrahan what amount of labor this industry would give to Newfoundlanders, providing it turned out successfully. He tells me that about six motor schooners, taking ten men each will be employed at that business. I also asked him what foreigners he would need to carry on this business. He said for the first two years he would need two foreigners probably from Norway, as that is the only country who has taken up the manufacture of sharks at the present time. He said he would want no more than two men who will be foreigners in the business, and after two years he would dispense with these two men and Newfoundlanders could do all that was necessary.

I consider that everyone should give this Bill earnest consideration. As I said before I am against monopoly when there is no good reason for it, but surely if Mr. Hanrahan is prepared to spend at least ten thousand dollars in getting motor vessels and trawls and try around the coast of New-

foundland and Labrador to see if there are any sharks there, I certainly think that it is only right and fair that if he finds sharks there after first starting and going to expense when he does not know whether it will be a paying proposition or not. I think we should at least for three years give him the monopoly, so that he may have the chance to get back the money he has spent in trying to prove whether there are any sharks here or not, in preference to those who may wait until they are there and then go in at the last moment.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some information from the introducer of the Bill. Supposing a ship come from Norway, is there anything to prevent her from fishing in the three mile limit. Is there anything to prevent the ship from entering St. John's as a port of refuge or for supplies, and then going outside the three mile limit and fishing.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—There is nothing to prevent him from entering here, but if he broke the Fishery Regulations he could be arrested of course, but I do not know if there is any law in reference to the shark business.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—This Bill only deals with the manufacture of sharks.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Hanrahan then could have competition from the Norwegians in fishing.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes, but the Norwegians would have to go clear of the country to manufacture within our three mile limit.

MR. HICKMAN.—Where does Mr. Hanrahan propose manufacturing the sharks that he may catch this year? He is going to operate this year, is he not?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—He is going to make an

experiment this year, and if he catches any fish he is only going to manufacture the livers.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman; I think a provision should be made in the Resolutions for the protection of fishermen who should happen to catch sharks in their nets. It very frequently occurs that fishermen catch sharks in their nets and under this Bill the fishermen cannot manufacture the liver.

HON. MR. DUFF.—Anybody can catch sharks under this Bill sell them to this Company who have the exclusive right to manufacture.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—I would like to ask the introducer of the Resolutions what shark oil is worth a gallon, and, furthermore, what is a shark? Would you call a dogfish or a pothead a shark, because they are of the shark species? And could Mr. Hanrahan assign his rights to any outside Norwegian firm?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—In reply to Mr. Ashbourne I think his point is well taken and I think a clause should be inserted in the Bill protecting the fishermen and give them the right to manufacture the liver of sharks that they catch in their nets. Regarding the other part of Mr. Ashbourne's question, I think shark oil is about equal to refined codliver oil.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman; I cannot see any objection to this Bill going through the House, because, after all, the proposition involved is of very little interest to us. I know what sharks are, and when I was fishing on the Pacific Coast I think I brought as many sharks to the surface as any man here; and if any young man has the courage to start an industry of this kind, I say let him kill out all the sharks within our waters, because sharks do not protect us even if we fall in the water. As far

as I am concerned I have no objection to the Bill and I think every facility and every encouragement should be given the promoter of this new industry.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Chairman; With regard to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Twillingate (Mr. Ashbourne), I think last year we had a provision in the Whaling Bill protecting fishermen who came across potheads and porpoises in their nets, and I think the following new section will meet the situation respecting this shark Bill;

(Clerk reads Section)

MR. HALFYARD.—If the skin of the fish is valuable don't you think that it is a waste that should be avoided throwing the skin away this year?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—They can't manufacture the skin until they got the plant and nobody in the country ever fished for sharks or caught any.

MR. HALFYARD.—Could not they be exported?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I don't think you will find they will throw the skin away if it is of any value.

MR. BRADLEY.—In connection with the point raised of the disposal of all that might interfere with the fishery. I would like to say the matter may be, as the Minister of Justice suggested, that these carcasses being manufactured in whale factories, but what is going to happen when the company are using their own factory? I think that section should be put in.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Last year we put in in respect to the manufacturing of whales this section.

(Reads)

We might put in that section substituting words to make it suitable to this industry as follows;—

(Reads)

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER.—I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Bill for the Encouragement of the Shark Industry is a private Bill and must be referred to a select Committee after a second reading. It is for the House to say whether there is any urgent and pressing necessity for the relaxation of the rule.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, This is a matter which I understand is not likely to cause any opposition. There appears to be no other parties particularly interested, and it does not seem likely than any petition will want to be presented or any protest made to the Select Committee, and if that be so, and I suppose the Minister can give us information, it would possibly be just as well to waive the Rules of the House, because, after all, it is only a matter of delay. If there was any really good sound reason for sending it to a Select Committee, I would certainly demand that the Rules of the House be carried out, in this particular instance, I have no objection under these circumstances, and I think the Rules of the House might be waived.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only right that I should read a letter that I received just as I came into the House from Messrs. Job Bros. Ltd.

(Reads.)

I may say that when this shark proposition came up before the Gov- only a short time ago they were asking concessions for six years for exclusive right to catch sharks. I objected personally to the length of time and I told the promoters of this proposition that I would not be satisfied to give them more than three years. I certainly think that anybody promoting an industry and doing

pioneer work in connection with an industry of this kind is entitled to some consideration, and I don't think that Messrs. Job Bros, or anybody else, is hurt very much by having a three-year period given to these people that are going to \$10,000 expense in fitting up a boat proposing to search the shores of the Island around to see whether sharks can be profitably manufactured or not. They are undertaking a good deal of initial expense and whatever the result of their pioneer work maybe, somebody else gets the benefit of it; and I always think that pioneers in cases of this kind should be given some consideration.

For that reason I think they should be given three years and I don't think that anybody will be hurt by giving them that time; but at the same time I do think that in view of a protest of that kind from a responsible firm of the city, should be considered. We might, at least, give them twenty-four hours to consider the matter, and I would suggest that a committee be appointed.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with a good deal of what the Prime Minister has said. The situation is somewhat altered now by the fact that this protest is before the House and I don't think that we should proceed with this measure in any other than the ordinary constitutional way. Consequently, I feel, so as to conform with the regular routine that a committee be appointed and the Rules of the House be fully enforced.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Encouragement of the Shark Industry" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent the said Bill 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;— Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Moore, Mr. Randell.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, the total amount of the Supplementary Supply for 1928 is \$4,818.63.

You will notice that we are voting to the Magistrate of Bay of Islands the sum of \$1,095.63. He practically gets that now and when you consider that he has a very important position at Corner Brook you will readily understand what work he does.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.— Does he get a salary besides?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—He gets a salary of \$1,000. This brings his salary up to \$2,500 out of which he has to pay his traveling expenses. I understand that it is equal to the amount he gets.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.— What is the extent of his jurisdiction?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—From Bay of Islands to

Deer Lake. He is easily the busiest magistrate outside of St. John's. We are shifting him into Corner Brook because Corner Brook is the most important part of his jurisdiction and it has been arranged for him to go in there to live.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
Is the Government building his house?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Yes, we have the plans ready for building his house now.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
Is his house free?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Certainly.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
How much was he paid a day for travelling expenses?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—\$5.00. I think the Minister of Justice could explain the situation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that Magistrate Vatcher gets a voted salary of \$1,400 and in his case, as in the case of most other magistrates, there are certain allowances made for going out of their territory, or as they call it, going out of their jurisdiction.

He has been living at Curling and the major part of his work is down at Corner Brook.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
How far is that?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
Three miles. With the result of course that allowance for going down there has amounted in the course of a year to something in the vicinity of \$700 to \$800.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—
How much does a magistrate get?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
He gets five dollars a day and he has to pay his expenses out of that.

MR. HALFYARD.—Are his trips limited?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—
In Corner Brook, as a matter of fact, I think there are two sittings a week in addition to any extra business that has to go on. I want to say here as I have been recommending for some time and repeatedly said to the Government, that in the case of the Magistrate at Corner Brook, he is practically as important as one at St. John's. His calander is certainly as great as the calander of any magistrate in the country. He has more work to perform in the actual holding of courts than practically ten average magistrates put together if not more than that.

Corner Brock is really the greatest town in his district. It really is a case in which matters have got to such a stage, the place has grown to such an extent that the magistrate must be actually on the spot and we are making plans that he should live in Corner Brook. We are making plans that he should be there in the chief town and the idea is to legalize the payments.

We feel that there should be a salary separately in line with the importance of the district, in other words we are making his salary, a salary of \$2,500 a year.

I would say that I don't know a magistrate to-day who is a greater asset, to say the least of it, than Magistrate Vatcher. For a layman he is a remarkably able man and one would expect from the manner in which he does things that it was the result of professional training. I don't know where it would be possible to find a man to-day in any part of the Island able to fill the position as well as he does at Corner Brook.

He has a very onerous job and from that very district they have collected

more from that place in fines, general customs prosecutions and other things that take place, I think more, much more, than would pay for any consideration given him in a financial way.

MR. HICKMAN.—Does he get paid to travel from there to Deer Lake?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—This only becomes effective from July. My suggestion would be to stop this thing. After all there will be no longer any occasion for it, because he will be living at Corner Brook.

The object of making this amount here is to enable us at any time of being in the position to concentrate at Corner Brook. I think if all is totted up, it only amounts to a couple of hundred dollars difference from what it was last year.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I have considerable knowledge of the duties of the Magistrate at Corner Brook. I have done considerable work out there during the past few years, and I can vouch for the accuracy of the statement of the Minister as to the importance of the Magistrate there. I do not know Mr. Vatcher personally. I never had the honor of appearing before him, officially or otherwise, he is extremely competent, and is one of the best if not the best magistrate in the country. For that reason I feel justified in supporting this increase, but at the same time I would like to know just what it means. I understand that his salary at the present time, his voted salary is about \$1,400. You propose now to bring it up to \$2,500. Now a man in his position was paid in the past at the rate of five dollars a day for outside work.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think that Mr. Vatcher told me that his outside expenses last year amounted to nearly a thousand dollars.

MR. BRADLEY.—What is the salary of the district Judge at Harbour Grace?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—His salary is \$1,720.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to see Mr. Vatcher get something more. I do not know whether it would be wise to increase his salary above what the district Judge of Harbour Grace gets. You see they are both lay men, and if Mr. Vatcher happened to have any legal standing at all, he might conceivably be justified in expecting more. In fact I do not think you would get a legal man for that salary at all. In all these increases I understand that the Government merely takes into consideration the deserts of the particular individual to be affected.

Personally I am in favour of giving him an increase, and I would suggest to the Government that he ought to take into consideration the fact that there is no person occupying an equally high position, because he is the judge of the district court. While that does not amount to anything, yet it gives him some standing to make demands upon the Government for an increase of salary, when he is appointed, whenever that will be. It is true that the Judge of the District Court of Harbour Grace has a statutory salary. I just suggest these things for consideration, but at the same time I wish to say that I support an increase in salary for Mr. Vatcher. I know the arduous nature of the duties that he has to perform, and also from the reports that have reached me from those who are acquainted with him, I am satisfied that he is a very competent man.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; I just wish to say one word. I appreciate the suggestion that have been made by the Hon.

Members, but when increases like that are made I would like the Hon. Members to bear in mind the general position. Personally I know a number of other magistrates that I have been endeavouring to persuade the Government to give increases to. But what I would like to say with regard to Corner Brook is this. We are proposing this year to recommend to the Government, to create Corner Brook into a District Court. I think in actual fact that to-day, under charged conditions that it is more important to have a District Court at Corner Brook than it is at Harbour Grace. And I think that the day must come when some Attorney General will carve out the country in a way that will give a good deal of satisfaction, and at the same time not materially increase the cost of administration of Justice. But when he does start to do that he will have to be prepared, and his Government will have to be prepared to look after the number of magistrates that have been a long time in the public service. Some gentlemen have been in it for thirty years. I have in mind an old gentleman that has been something like thirty seven years a magistrate. He cannot afford to retire now because at the best he would only get two-thirds of his salary. Take the case of the Magistrate of Springdale or a similar case. Someone will have to come and simply eliminate a number of the magistrates, and create areas and follow the line just now of making for practical results, giving a reasonable salary to a high class man and creating the area into districts courts. In the long run I think that it will give more satisfaction than the present method. I just take this opportunity of saying this, and I want it also to be understood that I have every sympathy for the other magistrates in the Island. I only regret that

it is not possible to get the Government to increase the salaries of a number of them. They are certainly very much underpaid in the sense of enabling a man to keep up to his position. But Mr. Vatcher was sent from Bay de Verde with the assurance that he was going there. He was the best man we could get and that is why he was sent to Corner Brook.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman; I do not know whether Mr. Vatcher is worthy of an increase of \$1,095 a year, but one thing I do know is that it has been the policy of the present Government since they came into power of piling up salaries and expenses with the result that our estimates have increased largely during the last four years. Sometime this has got to stop and the whole system has got to stop

This Government cannot carry on by increasing salaries and giving pensions to people who are not at the age when they should get a pension. We see many of them around the country. A large number have been given pensions during the regime of the present Government, and I must say that it is a bad policy to be piling up the burden of expenses by increasing salaries.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; Before the fisheries vote goes through I would like to bring to the notice of the Government the case of the gentleman that fills the office of Mercantile Marine Supt. or who occupies the position commonly known as Shipping Master. I think everyone knows that he is a very efficient man. What perhaps a great many men in this House do not know is that he is not paid a salary. This is not asking the Government to increase his salary, because he does not get a salary from the Government as far as I know. He only gets the fees that he collects for making out articles for ships. A few years

ago when we had a considerable lot of foreign shipping Mr. Carter was probably well paid. But now we have got to the point where we have not got a half dozen foreign ships sailing from the harbour. While there is work in connection with the coastal boats in the early part of the season, that is all that is done in connection with them until the pay off at the end of the season. Years ago I understand that he was paid by the Imperial Government. I do not know how long ago this was discontinued. I believe that it is a fact to-day that he gets nothing but his fees. I think that the Government would do well to consider that case. Before this vote goes thru I would also like to remind the Government of a plea that I made here sometime ago in connection with a Light House on the Funks. I know it is necessary and any seafaring man will bear me out in saying that it is really necessary there, and as Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself said, there are more shoals around that place, uncharted, than a great many people know of. I think that the Government would do well to consider the case of Mr. Carter and also this question of a light house on the Funks.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman; In reference to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Trinity Capt. Randell, I want to say that I back him up in what he says. I have been connected with Mr. Carter during the past four years and I consider that he is the worst paid man in the Island. I think that it is a crying shame that this man has to do the amount of work that this man has to do down there, and not getting enough to exist on. If the Government does not come to his assistance sooner or later, he will leave, and the Government will have

to get an official to do that work, and I think that it is admitted by all concerned that Mr. Carter is a good official down at the department. I therefore heartily support the member for Trinity in praying the Government to do something in the case of Mr. Carter.

With reference to Capt. Randell's request for a lighthouse on the Funks, as I have said here before, there should have been one there long ago. A couple of years ago two vessels left here for Fogo for cargoes of fish. One of them had a Newfoundland pilot on board and arrived there after eight or ten days. The other vessel had no pilot on board and never turned up. In the face of that and seeing that hundreds of our vessels have to pass between the Funks and Cape Fogo and in view of the fact that there are hundreds of uncharted shoals in that vicinity, I think that it is up to any Government to see that a lighthouse, a fog alarm and a marconi station are put on the Funks, where at present there is no aid to navigation. No doubt this will be my last appeal on this subject and I hope that the present Government before going out of office will allocate a sum of money for the erection of these very necessary aids to navigation.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; I feel that the remarks of Capt. Randell are very appropriate. Like Capt. Windsor, I have known Mr. Carter for many years and to-day he is doing the work of the Colony for next to nothing. I do not know what his real position is as regards to his appointment or his salary, but I will promise the Hon. Member for Trinity to bring the matter before the Government. Possibly Mr. Carter may give up the position, and if he does, you got to get a man to fill his place, and I fear you will

not get a suitable man to replace him. As far as I can learn, when he took office his appointment was not a Government one, so that really he is not termed a Government official. When this gentleman took this office he had a large number of vessels to collect fees from, but not so to-day, when you have got only a few vessels to collect from.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman: It appears that the tendency is not to agree but to even up. We take a certain position and then you got to increase every other time. Speaking of the Ferry service from Trinity Bay. The steamers were taken off Trinity Bay and the service was solely confined to Bonavista Bay. We protested last year upon the policy of the Government in that respect, but seemingly it had no effect. Last year the matter of a motor ferry service on the north side and possibly on the south side of Trinity Bay would be considered, but nothing has because of them yet. Later some man of Trinity said he could put on a motor passenger service from Trinity to Clarenville via intermediate ports at a subsidy of \$3000.00 a month, where the service of a similar character contemplated in 1924 would cost twice that amount. When I spoke of this the other day the Finance Minister said that he had received a letter on 'his same subject and that he would bring the matter before the Executive Government for consideration. Now in the absence of the Finance Minister I would like to ask the Prime Minister what he has to say on this subject?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Executive are considering the matter now, but they have not come to a decision about it yet.

I was hoping that when the additional estimates came in that the Government would have decided, have

come to some decision one way or the other and a vote would be passed if you decided to do it so you would not have to pass Supplementary Supply for it next year. Anyhow, it is deserving of consideration and if the Government can see their way clear, I think the service would be greatly appreciated by the people in Smith Sound. It is worth consideration, considering that nothing has been done in Trinity Bay with regard to local steam transportation during the past few years. The Finance Minister, Sir John Crosbie, has the matter in hands, and it is worth consideration, and I will say no more just now, but if possible do it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I feel it a duty on me to say a word or two on the Resolutions now before the Chair, not because the Resolutions in themselves are of very much importance, because in the Resolutions we are not making any great change in the Tariff, but rather because the opportunity is one for passing in review on the general finan-

cial situation of the country as we find it today. To all intents and purposes the Finance Minister has delivered his last Budget, his fifth and last Budget, and we are now in a fair position to calmly review the Government's financial record during the four years it has been entrusted with the transmission of our financial affairs. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is for those particular reasons that the present Budget ought to be given some consideration. We all very well know that the financial policy of the Government was the greatest plank in their platform in 1924, and if there was one subject more than another that the present Government concentrated on in the condemnation of their opponents and in promises for the future, it was on the matter of what they proposed doing as regards the financial affairs of the country. We were told that drastic reduction was necessary, that the pruning knife had to be applied rigorously, and that a wise policy of economy had to be enforced, and the present administration, when they took office, was going to see that that was done. We have had four years of financing, or more correctly, five, because you are financing for the coming year by the present Government, and I repeat, therefore, that we are in a fair position this afternoon to take stock of their record and decide and see for ourselves as to how far they have attempted to live up to the promises they made in 1924.

There is one thing written all over this Budget Speech and that is failure. If the Budget presented by the Finance Minister here on the 22nd day of May tells one story more than another, it points to the fact that the Government has absolutely failed to improve on the financial position of the country. In 1924 it was argued that the financial condition of the

country was bad, and no end of noise was made in the precincts of this Chamber because the present Government had taken office and found a deficit of \$1,600,000. Last year it looked as if the present Finance Minister had beaten the record, if that were a record, and it looked as if we were to have a deficit of \$1,750,000. Fortunately, we are told, that it is not so bad as it was thought it was going to be last year, an instead of a deficit of that amount, it is only \$1,600,000.. In any case, the Government is just as bad in its dying hours as it found its predecessors when it took office, and consequently, they have not improved on the situation one little bit. The Government and honourable members opposite and the Finance Minister himself time and again refer to the record of the past administration, but they forget that they were placed in power by the people of this country to do better than the past administration had done and to improve on conditions. I think, in reviewing the record of the years, it is seen that you have failed miserably to improve on the record which you have decried, and if anything you have gone one worse. It just goes to show, at the same time, that we ought to be very careful in making criticisms of those entrusted with the responsibility of office, and it is not always so easy to put things in practice as it is to outline what would be a good thing to do for the country. I said that this Budget showed failure, and that is there. The proof is that this administration has failed to do anything to put the affairs of the country on a sound financial basis. The Finance Minister was frank; I will say that; he was brutally frank, and admitted that he had not been able to carry out the job as he would like it to be done, and as he promised to do in 1924.

Now, Sir, I have stated before that it is not a very easy matter for individual members of the Opposition to bring forth a complete array of figures and be able to deliver what I might term a logical, well-reasoned address and draw from it logical conclusions. It is the job of somebody to do so. As for myself, I have not gone into the figures; I have not had the figures before me, and consequently I shall content myself with a few general observations on the Budget Speech we have before us now. The act which the Government will be most condemned for in their financial record, of course, will be the tariff brought in here in 1928. And why was that tariff brought in? I want to answer some observations of the Finance Minister made here the other day. He referred to the report of the Tariff Commission appointed by the previous Government and said that his Government had practically adopted the report of that Commission, and the report of that Commission had been prepared by the previous Government in order to be put into effect to meet the deficits which we knew we were going to have to meet from year to year if we continued in office. My contention is that that had nothing at all to do with the situation. If the present Government came into power and found the report of that Commission there they were not obliged to adopt it, and it was the last thing in the world they should have done if that report was to increase taxation to the extent the 1925 tariff did. My contention is that if this Government had let well enough alone they would not have found it necessary to have adopted the report of that Commission at all; and it does not follow that because the previous administration asked that report to be prepared that they were going to adopt it holus bolus; it doesn't

follow any more than the present Government has not adopted the report of the Finance Commission, which, according to the statement here cost the country \$13,000, and the recommendations of which, according to one member, the Government had not the courage to adopt. Some time ago in this House we got the impression that only two members of the Commission were paid, and now when information is tabled, we discover that three members were paid, and that the total cost was \$13,000. The previous administration was no more bound, and no more likely to put into effect, the report of that commission the Finance Minister referred to, than was the present Government to accept the recommendation of the Finance Commission. Therefore, it does not necessarily follow because the Commission was appointed by the previous administration that that administration intended to adopt its proposals in globo, which the present Government practically did. I contend that there was no need for the Government to bring down that tariff.

If they had not come in here and lessened the taxes from the shoulders of the wealthy people of this country there would have been no necessity for them to throw the extra burden of taxes on the shoulders of the common people. They removed the income tax, the business profits tax and reduced the bank tax, and, consequently, denied themselves the sources of revenue which possibly in the aggregate amounted to \$400,000 or \$500,000. Speaking generally, you reduced the taxes from the shoulders of the people who were well able to pay them and consequently you met with a serious situation, and in looking around to re-establish yourselves you conceived the necessity of putting taxes on articles of everyday use and

they were increased from 10 per cent to 15 per cent and the main burden fell more heavily on the shoulders of the people who were not able to pay it. These matters have been stressed before in this Chamber and I have no intention to emphasise them further, but the Government should have let well enough alone. There was really no necessity to bring in that tariff or to have anything to do with the report of that commission at all.

Now, this Budget Speech is a very long document, and to expedite matters as far as I am able, I have divided it into paragraphs and I shall go over some of these paragraphs and make some reference to them as I go along.

In the first instance, the Finance Minister deals with the public accounts for the year 1926-27, and he congratulates himself that this did not turn out as badly as he predicted in the year previous. But then he talks about the expenditure, that the expenditure had been kept fairly within the limit. But he goes on to tell us that it is necessary to come in and ask for a supplementary supply, which we have passed here since the Budget came before the House.

In another paragraph the Finance Minister tells us that— (Reads).

Well, Mr. Chairman, the last man in the world that I would expect to talk about expenditure or productive expenditure is the Finance Minister of the present administration. I fail to see where the suggested productive expenditure is. You state this and you tell us that we are to congratulate ourselves upon the enormous increases that are going to take place and the fair outlook in respect of the paper manufacturing industries, but you have no cause to congratulate yourselves, but rather your predecessors, for having brought that in. You

came in here and you gave us to understand that you were going to add to our industries a mill on the Gander. I said in 1924 that there would never be a mill on the Gander while the present administration was in power, and now you have come to the end of your tether and there is no activity there. I make bold to say now, that you will not be out of office twelve months before the wheels will be turning over and arrangements will be considered for getting the project under way. It seems to me that the present Government has blundered all through the very tenor and your manner of dealing with this matter, and there has been something wrong with the attitude of the present government since it has been in power. I don't think you have assiduously endeavored to get this mill on the Gander, and I reiterate that twelve months after you are out of office some visible signs will be there and I trust will be pushed to a successful conclusion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—What guaranty will the Government give?

MR. SCAMMELL.—According to the remark that the Prime Minister has just made he must have some idea that somebody is looking for a guaranty. I have no knowledge of anybody going about the proposition in that way whatever.

Now, there is one expression in another paragraph on which I would like to make a few remarks. He says on page 4 that the present year collections—J (reads). I cannot quite see how he expects to get a revenue next year of \$8,500,000. He says that the present year's collections up to the 28th of February show an increase of \$500,000. Well, February 28th will have taken us along to about eight months of the present fiscal year and

we have only another four months to run. He says that during eight months the revenue shows an increase of \$500,000, I fail to see how he figures out that during the remaining months we are going to get sufficient to bring it up to \$1,200,000. My contention is that you cannot possibly do it, and that you will not realise a revenue of \$8,500,000, and you are expecting to get \$1,200,000 more on current revenue than is shown by the accounts of the year ending June 30th, 1927. In my opinion, in this respect your estimate is out. You will not get this \$1,200,000, even admitting there will be some increase of importation. The figures up to February 28th show an increase of \$500,000, allowing another \$250,000 for the next four months, that makes \$750,000; as much an increase as against last year as you can expect. You have written down a deficit here as \$360,000; you possibly will have a deficit of \$800,000. In my opinion there has not been sufficient increase in importation to warrant the Finance Minister stating that he is going to raise the revenue from the customs to a sum of \$8,500,000. He only raised last year the sum of \$7,320,000. He therefore expects to get \$1,200,000 more in the present year, and my contention is that it is not going to be realized by as much as half a million dollars.

Now we were told, I notice here in passing, that the Finance Minister refers to the matter of supplementary supply. We were told in 1924 in the first Budget that the present Finance Minister delivered that it was going to be the policy of the present administration to keep within the limits and avoid supplementary supplies, but now we find that they have made a practical necessity of it. They try to justify themselves by drawing comparisons between what the pres-

ent administration is doing as against the past government. I contend that is no excuse for the Government. The fact that the past administration came in every year and asked for a large vote for supplementary supply does not in the least justify the present administration in doing the same thing, because the present administration was an administration that was going to come in and create a new condition of things. So it is a sorry form of excuse. They are not one bit better than their predecessors. They are worse, because they boasted very loudly that they were going to do so very much better.

Now I notice here that the Finance Minister made some passing reference to the cod fishery. (Reads).

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have lost all hope that the present administration is going to do anything to improve the present condition of things as regards the fisheries. Suggestions have been thrown out here that certain policies ought to be adopted and the Finance Minister remarked the other day that if such policies were employed he did not know where it was going to land the country and what was going to be the outcome of it. He refers to the matter of co-operation amongst the fish exporters. He said (Reads). Mr. Chairman, we have been here for a long time now and that necessity for co-operation has been expressed many and many a time, but I would like to see when there is going to be some practical steps taken to bring about co-operation in a practical way. I agree with the Finance Minister that the need is very great for co-operation amongst the fish exporters and I believe that if the fish exporters would make an effort to co-operate some method could be devised which would go a long way towards re-establishing our fisheries and bring in

better prices than we are receiving at the present time

I think that most of the men who prosecuted the Labrador fishery last year have gone down to the Labrador again this year; but, of course, they go every spring. They are living in hope that things will be better than they were last year. We all know the history of the price of Labrador fish; we know that there was a difference of 70c a quintal last year than what was paid the previous year. I think that the Labrador fishermen that are leaving for the fishery are going out in the hope that they are going to realise something like \$5.00 a quintal for their fish this year.

Now we have heard of a couple of suggestions made, amongst others it being suggested that we are selling too much Labrador fish of recent years—this applying particularly to fish caught on the Treaty Shore and in the Straits. I am inclined to agree that a great deal of that is true. I believe a great many fishermen have been advised in that instance and that they are going to make an effort to carry out the suggestion in that respect. I believe, and I have always contended, that if the exporters and the merchants were to get together and try to handle their end of the business in a little different manner, that their co-operation would result in a better price, and more stable markets would be obtained. However the time is gone now. We have for twelve months included in the estimates \$200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries. The Prime Minister stated here yesterday that he had been asked to spend the money. Well, I think that that money ought to be spent on what it is intimately connected with—the fisheries. We do not want to be spending it on bridges, wharves or marine works. I hoped and believed that some fishery policy

would be evolved, and until such time as that is evolved that money should stay where it is. If I had been in power I would have been inclined to pay a bonus on Labrador fish. The government did not think it wise to pay that bonus and there the matter rested. The fishermen had to be content. But every industry in this country has received encouragement except the fisheries. I pointed out as clearly as possible when I spoke to the Address in Reply that the fishery must be the mainstay of this country, and that it is on the fishery that our economical stability must rest. You may have your pulp and paper mills, your mills and your mines, but there is nothing that will bring in returns or wealth to the country in the long run like the fishery. And according as we build up other industries in the country and men keep on deserting the fishery, the worse we seem to be getting. The latter end of the Budget Speech I consider ridiculous, in reference to the Tourist Bureau. (reads)

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I wish when the Finance Minister was writing that Budget that he had not put in, because I consider that the most ridiculous statement that has been made in any budget that has been brought in since he has been Finance Minister. Nobody today knows what these tourists have spent. But if there were any way of getting at the truth, you would probably find that an average of ten dollars would be nearer the truth than one hundred.

Now there is not very much more that I have to say. I want to repeat what I have already said, that this is the fifth Budget of the present Finance Minister, and the last of this administration, and it shows not only how much they have deceived themselves but how much they have deceived the electorate with their promises, re-

sponsible in the long run for putting them in, that they were going to embark on a policy of retrenchment and to cut down expenditure and all that. There is no evidence whatever that this Government has made the slightest attempt to carry out the promises that were made in 1924. It may be that it is impossible for you to do better than you have done. It may be that you have found by experience that you were up against a far more difficult proposition than you had bargained for when you sought the support of the electorate four years ago. Mr. Grimes came into this House the other day after spending a lot of time and trouble compiling some figures. He is a man that has had a great deal of experience in connection with invoices, etc., and he is a man who is in a position to know what he is talking about. The sum total of his findings was to the effect that the difference between the tariff in 1924, taking into consideration some of the principal articles such as the necessaries of life, and the previous one, was \$790,000 in revenue. There is no need for me to any further labor this question. I trust that if the time comes and a finance commission is appointed to go into the financial condition of the country as regards expenditure and revenue, that if they make a finding that we shall have a government in power with courage enough to give consideration to some of the recommendations of this commission, and that it will not have to be said that some of the members of that commission will have to come to the House and stand up here and say that the Government had not the courage to put these recommendations into effect. I do not believe that the gentlemen that stood up here in this House in 1924 and said that they could with one stroke of the pen cut down expenditure 25 per cent. knew what

they were talking about. If I knew a man today that could cut down expenditure by 25 per cent, and still give us an efficient public service, I would be glad to see him in the chair occupied by the present Finance Minister. If you cannot increase the earning power of the people, you cannot carry the burden. If you cannot reduce expenditure you cannot reduce taxation. My contention is that supposing that expenditure is not going to be reduced, then you should try and increase the earning power of the people, and try to increase the value of the fish and get more fish into the markets to be sold. As far as I am concerned, and as far as having anything to say about the financial affairs of this country, this is my valedictory address, and I trust that we will profit by any good that you have done and that we shall try to avoid the mistakes that you have made. And I am going to say now to the Finance Minister that I believe that he has at least done one thing that his successors can emulate, and that is that I really believe that he has made an honest attempt to collect the revenue due to the country. I wish he had collected more. And I do hope that whoever succeeds him will follow in his footsteps in that respect. But I also hope that we will have a Finance Minister here who will do much better as regards the general financing of the country.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I realise that my words in this Assembly may be likened to the voice of one crying in the wilderness. That is one of the conclusions that I have come to after having sat in this House for five sessions. What this country wants to-day is home truths. Whither are we drifting. Every year we come in here and borrow more money. This Government went to the country on a cry of retrenchment. Evi-

dently that is what the country wanted. They returned you on your manifesto and here you have borrowed eighteen or nineteen millions in four years, that you have been in office. I want to say that that is a very disheartening state of affairs. When other countries are making surpluses we are continually making deficits. What is the solution to this problem. Cannot we get a government that will come in and rectify this thing. If we are afraid to tackle this problem we have no right in this Assembly, if we are afraid to conduct the affairs of this country as they should be conducted. Is the country ready for the knife. It seems that it is not, but the time will come in my opinion when it will have to be used.

It is a wrong basis of comparison in my opinion to compare any government with the past government. The only fair basis of comparison is "What we as a government are, and what we could and what we should be." That is the only true basis of comparison. Not what our predecessors were. Are we passing problems on to others that we fear to face ourselves, and try to find the solution. Have we not the courage to carry out the plans of retrenchment that we consider necessary for the country. Money has been spent by this Government just the same as it has been spent by past governments. I do not say that there have not been good returns given for some of the money that has been spent all the same. No mention has been made of the \$200,000 that has been voted for the encouragement of the fisheries. And as I have endeavoured in this Assembly to make my remarks of as constructive a nature as possible, I deem it my duty in that regard to try and build up, I would like to point out to the Prime Minister for what in my opinion the most of the money in that vote for the

encouragement of the fisheries might be spent.

There are fishing banks off Notre Dame Bay between Fogo Island and Cape John, and I think it would be money well spent to investigate in the summer time and see whether or not those banks are worth while prosecuting on a larger scale. Now the problem of trap fishing in this country is a questionable one inasmuch as too much time is wasted in waiting for the fish to come to the land to be caught in the traps, instead of going out in trawlers to where the fish are. Personally, I believe that deep sea trawling by the shore fishermen would be the means of increasing their earning power very considerably, and to that end I would like to point out that it would be money well spent if the Government undertook an investigation of the waters of the banks off the north east coast of Newfoundland.

Another thing the country should have, as I have already stated in this House, is a political economist. I think that, if some arrangement could be made with the Memorial College, it would be to Newfoundland's benefit to have a political economist who could advise us as to the real value to Newfoundland of her various industries.

I notice that the Budget Speech speaks of the matter of last year's codfishery in that a large quantity of our fish was seriously sun burnt on account of the climate, and in this connection the Government should give some attention to the advisability of the encouragement of dryers. The drying of our codfish is a problem that should receive the serious concern and attention of any Government that is interested in the fisheries, and as I said before the fishermen as well as the exporters of fish should be given some encouragement and some advice

by the Government, through the Marine and Fisheries Department, as regards the possible erection of dryers throughout the country. Then if you meet bad weather in the summer time, instead of a large quantity of your fish being sun burnt and slimy and sent to a West India market it could be cured by artificial drying and shipped to any foreign market.

Another matter that I would like to refer to is the matter of encouragement for fish meal plants and herring factories. The herring fishery in Newfoundland is practically gone and what is the present Government doing about it? Apparently it is causing them no concern; and not only that, but thousands of barrels of herring that are taken from our waters in the autumn season are sent to Gloucester and other places, and are cured by smoke and are made into bloaters and kippers, whereas this country should be smoking our own herring. The same applies to salmon, halibut and other such fish that are to be found so numerous in our waters, so that the Government would be well advised to take those matters into serious consideration. Another matter should receive the encouragement and support of the Government is that of the installation of refrigerators as regards the fresh fish industry.

Now the fishermen of the country have to bear their proportionate part of the interest on the millions of dollars spent on tourist roads by the Highroads Commission, and I consider that motor car owners should have a tax imposed upon the gasoline they use to help keep up the repairs that are necessary from time to time for the various highroads throughout the country. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the fishermen are discouraged when they find millions of dollars spent on highroads, the interest on which they are called upon

to pay and the benefits of which they enjoy practically nothing.

I would like to know from one of its members if the Finance Commission went up to the railway when they were investigating?

HON. MR. CRAMM—No, I do not think so.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Yet I see by the Finance Minister's Budget Speech that "the railway is easily the heaviest problem which the Government is confronted with." Yesterday we were called upon to vote one and a quarter million dollars for the diversion of the railway around the Topsails. No figures were forthcoming as regards the cost and certainly members of this House are entitled to information where such a large expenditure is involved. Surely we are not a bunch of sheep here; but the trouble with Government of this country is that the cost of administration is too high.

MR. BROWNE—Didn't you want a diversion from Lewisporte?

MR. ASHBOURNE—I maintain that the diversion in that way would save money for the country. The Government has done nothing about that, they have not even asked how it could be saved by that diversion of the railway. Thousands of tons of coal are brought into Lewisporte every year and hauled to Bishop's Falls and other places, whereas that coal could be left at Lewisporte, if Lewisporte was on the main line. Now I am not in a position to say that the expenditure of that million and a quarter dollars referred to may not eventually save money, but my point is that I am expected to vote that money away, without a little information of what I am voting it for. I have heard it said that instead of building the railway around Buchans to extend it to the north side of the Topsails, if satisfactory arrangements could be made by the

Railway Commission, because you could then bring a branch line to Hampden and link up Hall's Bay.

I agree with what the Prime Minister said in that the north of the country has not received its share of the money expended on highroads; but seeing that they are called upon to pay their share of the interest charges that accrue from those loans, I think it is only right and proper that they should get their proportionate share of the money that is spent on highroads. Now I would like to suggest to the Highroads Commission that they send out circulars to the various Road Boards around this Island giving instructions how to build good roads, because in my opinion a lot of money is wasted through road building in small localities because the people do not seem to understand the making of good roads. I might mention, however, that the Highroads Commission built a bridge at Twillingate and no one has as yet been sent from the Highroads Office to inspect it.

I maintain it is a good bridge, but I consider that it is poor policy for the Highroads Commission to build a bridge and not send down to have it inspected. With regard to canals, Mr. Hibbs presented a petition with regard to the Fogo Canal a couple of days ago. I also have a couple of canals in Twillingate District, at Herring Neck and Twillingate Proper, and I believe that the Government Engineer or some engineer should make plans of these canals and should estimate the cost and they should be repaired, and even though it did cost a little extra I believe it would be money much more wisely spent to spend it in a lump sum as has been done with concrete bridges, rather than spend \$500 this year and \$500 next year and \$500 the next year, with

the result that the money is practically wasted. As regards the Labrador—it is an asset to Newfoundland which I hope will be used to the benefit of Newfoundland. We remember that Alaska was sold to the United States for little over \$7,000,000 and we are told that Alaska has already produced over a billion dollars. So I hope and trust that Labrador will be used solely for the benefit of Newfoundland. In my opinion what I would do if I owned it is that I would keep it and develop it, because I am perfectly convinced that Labrador in a few years to come will be worth much more than at present. Only this morning I was talking to a cooper in St. John's and he said that in his opinion in a few years we would have to be looking for timber for our fishery interests. The interests of the fishery are sadly neglected as regards the timber supply in Newfoundland. But what about it? Are we bothering about it? Are we coming in here contented, satisfied, the worst state that we can get in. As regards other problems of expenditure. Take for instance, the fire brigade in St. John's, which I have spoken about before, paid for out of the general revenue of the country, when it should be a tax on the people of St. John's or the Municipal Council of St. John's. Is that a square deal? As far as I am concerned, I don't approve of the policy of getting more loans in this country. More loans mean increased taxation, and the sad thing about it is we can cut down our cost of administration, but the only way we have of cutting down our interest charges is by paying off our debt, and if we cannot pay the interest and cannot run the country without meeting deficits in years when there are good fisheries, when there has been employment on the dock, employment building hotels, and other industries

going through, what are we going to do when we get a couple of bad fisheries. We can't expect the fishery to be good every year and our duty is to build up reserves in the good years in order to take care of the deficits in bad years. I recognise that it is not an easy matter to govern a country well. In fact, the government often times and the members of the government come in for a great deal of abuse and the wonder is why men tackle the problem at all, and the only thing is they have the satisfaction of doing their duty and doing what they know to be right, and that is a satisfaction which counts most to the man who has the interests of his country at heart. No man can do more nobly than to serve his country. As regards the codfishery, I consider that the Labrador catch should be pooled, and then from the Labrador fishery we could, if it was a success as I have no doubt it would be, we could extend to the shore fishery. More co-operation is necessary as regards the marketing of our codfish and getting it ought to increase the earning power of our people. Do we realise that there are fishermen throughout the country who don't earn any more than a few hundred dollars a year on which to keep their families? Has there been any reduction in the Civil Service since this Government came into power, and is there any less number of government employees since this government took hold? I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the country has borrowed its last loan and that from now on ways and means will be devised for her to pay as she goes.

I advocated, when speaking on the Address in Reply, that there should be an item in the Loan Bill that a sinking fund should be established in order that a certain amount would be forthcoming from the country's rev-

enue in order to go against the loan, in reduction of the loan, but I see that there is no provision made as regards having a sinking fund for that loan. Furthermore, some opportunity should be given to local people who want to take up part of that loan to be able to do so. I have no doubt but half a dozen men could run Newfoundland. If we could get a half dozen men of ability and brains to come in I think the chances are that the country might be pulled out of the position we are in today. We want men who have the interests of the country at heart. Somebody asked me a few days ago whether or not a crowd of women up here could not do as well. As far as I can see there has been no serious effort on the part of this Government to reduce taxation. As it is now half-past six, I beg to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, In connection with this Highway Traffic Act which has been in the hands of honorable members some days now, as I explained yesterday going through it, it is practic-

ally a case where we can't do more than take section by section. I think we brought it practically up to Section 7 with regard to speed limits. As to the remaining sections, No. 8 is reducing the rate of commercial vehicles allowed to be run on highways. In Section 9 the word "not" was omitted by mistake; and power is given for the closing of roads by the Highroads Commission in respect of roads under their charge, and the Minister of Public Works for other roads to close them when soft in the spring. It will be remembered it is found necessary on occasions to close highroads to heavy motor traffic under certain weather conditions. Section 10, in respect of permits issued under the Act is now changed to "approved by the Commission."

Mr. Chairman, Section 11 reads as follows: (reads). The first part of this section gives persons driving on the highroads the right of way over those in the intersecting roads; the other additional two sections are simply with regard to improving the traffic conditions.

Section 37 of the Act at present reads: (reads). It has been found that when coming down the street with horses that people get the full glare of the headlights and as a matter of fact they have had some pretty close calls with these bright lights blinding them for a while. This section will not allow these search lights and they must see that they dim their lights.

Section 12 provides improvement in connection with stopping when a street car is stopped to let passengers off or on. The idea is to bring them a little further away than the Act requires at the present time.

MR. BROWNE.—Does this not go further than is necessary? Does it not make motor cars stop on both sides of the street car?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The idea is to stop, anyway. It has been found that people going around the back of the cars have been in danger of being knocked down by the cars driving past the opposite side. It has been felt that for the safety of the people it would be better to make it a general rule that they must stop where the street car is stopped.

The next section 13, is that with regard to the point that I made yesterday about terminus numbers. The words "Manufacturers' Agents" are substituted for the word "salesman." The idea is to limit them to bona fide agents.

Section 14 is inserted because the Highroads Commission does not get the necessary information within ten days especially when the matter takes place in an outport. Section 59 of the Act reads: (reads).

Of course there are many cases in which it would take the best part of six weeks before the necessary information could be obtained. This section will give them three months, and where they want to take proceedings they will not be tied up as they are now. I may say that in many cases before it was not possible to take proceedings in the ten days that were allowed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, unless there is anybody who desires to read these all through, we might accept them as having been read. I have nothing further to add. I am, of course, prepared to answer any questions that might be asked.

MR. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman, does not the honorable introducer think that Section 12 is rather severe and will create a difficulty on Water Street? It says now that a motor car will be compelled to stop when a street car is stopped.

There used to be two tracks on Water Street; now there is only one,

and that is very near the North side of the street. On the South side of the street there is a considerable distance from the street car track to the sidewalk and I really see very little danger there.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It was on Water Street that the complaint was made. I don't remember distinctly, but when the Bill was drafted we were told that there was danger and it was actually Water Street that was mentioned.

I think that the honorable member for St. John's West can take it for granted that this is done in the interests of the safety of the public. I feel sure that there is going to be a lot of trouble but it is made really with the idea of trying to protect the public, and if we find that the traffic regulations are interfered with, well, we will cross our bridges when we come to them.

I think it is in the interest of the general community that this rule should be made and it is a sound basis to go on. If there is a little inconvenience it should be suffered by the motorists rather than by the general public.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message

requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HIGHROADS ACT

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Section 22 which this Act amends is the section which contains powers to protect trees that are planted over certain sections etc., sub section (a) and (b). This is to be added as sub section, (c) to that section. I have nothing further to add to my remarks on the Second Reading.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; just one point in connection with the circumstances that occurs to me as being unreasonable.

In the third line it reads "anything which in the reasonable opinion of the Commission."

Surely that constitutes the Highroads Commission as a judge and jury.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Read further on.

(Reads)

MR. BRADLEY.—After all the reasonable opinion of the commission does not amount to anything. If it means anything it is unfair to constitute the Commission judge and jury and that is the position you have got; if it doesn't mean anything there is no need to have it there.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The point is that if they acted in a reasonable way they are not liable to damages, if their action is reasonably justified.

MR. BRADLEY.—I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if this gives any indemnity

for anything unreasonable they may do.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The court decides whether it is reasonable or not.

Suppose in accordance with this section the commission stops me from doing something I will go into court and the commission goes into court and in order that I may recover damages I must show that they did not act reasonably. In other words, they will be upheld by the court if they were acting reasonably, if they were reasonably justified and the court will be governed accordingly because in this section it says that they have got to act in a reasonable manner.

The Highroads Commission would simply stop it. It does not go into court first. It is only in case the owner of the property decided to take action, then the Highroads Commission would have to show that they acted in a reasonable manner in order to escape damages. This point was raised and a lot of thought was given to it. The object of putting that word in there is to give power to the Commission to take upon itself the initiative instead of losing time notifying people by which time the Highroads might be destroyed. We say here.

(Reads)

If the Commission stop any person, then in order to escape damages they will have to come in and satisfy the court that they had reasonable grounds for so doing as my Hon. friend will appreciate the value of it.

MR. BRADLEY.—The question is what is the reasonable enjoyment of property. If it is the personal enjoyment of property under the law that exist to-day, and if a man uses property reasonably then why should the Highroads Commission be permitted to come in and prevent him for any

period in the reasonable enjoyment of his property.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is one of the penalties of our civilization.

MR. BRADLEY.—It would depend entirely on what the Law is, but I just want to say this, to empower this commission to go and object to a man doing this, that or the other thing to his own property is absolutely illegal. If you want to protect this Commission from any action there is a straightforward way for you to do it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It is not a matter of protection, we are trying to give the Highroads power to deal with savages who destroy roads. No man who acts properly has got to fear that act.

MR. BRADLEY.—Supposing there is a certain opening on my land and the Highroads Commission comes in and stops it in the interests of the Highroads. Now if I am not indemnified as a result of that, and yet what I am doing is a reasonable usance of my property that the Highroad's Commission escapes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, it does not.

MR BRADLEY.—Well, what I am objecting to is this, that this Commission is given the powers of discretion, even to the extent that this particular section goes so far as to give them authority to interfere with a man's private rights. And even with that interference may be reasonably be necessary to protect the road, then even that may be a gross interference with the rights of private citizens and he has no recourse.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—You have got to have some confidence in the discretion of the Commission. I have to assume that it is a Commission made up of common-sense men.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act, 1925" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Central and Harbour Grace District Courts" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently.

Whereupon (with unanimous consent) the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Central and Harbour Grace Districts Courts."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; This is a Bill making statutory the salaries of the Central District Court in St. John's, and of the Judge of the District Court of Harbor Grace. Those Judges, through the series of changes down through the years, have never been properly protected under the Salaries Act. What we have done is to repeal the old salaries.

(Reads)

And we have substituted the salaries as actually voted to-day.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Central and Harbour Grace District Courts" 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 Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I may say that this act provides for the payment of bonuses of soldiers following the Canadian Act. It is merely a temporary Act and is renewable every year.

Whereupon (with unanimous consent) the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Disposition of Balances Remaining out of the Loan Raised under the Act 18 Geo. V. Cap 18" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon (with unanimous consent) the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Disposition of Balances Remaining out of the Loan Raised under the Act 18 Geo. V. Cap 18."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act Re-

lating to the Disposition of Balances out of the Loan Raised under the Act 18, Geo. V. Cap 18" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. The Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company Limited" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon (with unanimous consent) the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited" was read a third

time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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 Regulate the Practice of Optometry" without amendment.

Mr. Scammell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Brown gave Notice of Question.

The Minister of Agriculture & Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Wild Fruit."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that the Rules of the House be suspended in relation to all business now before the House or to come before it.

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, June 1st 1928.

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

PETITIONS

Mr. Brown from Beaumont, re Game Laws.

Mr. Hibbs from Change Islands, re Well.

Mr. Hibbs from Frederiction, re Telephone.

Mr. Hibbs from Seldom Come By, re Canal.

Mr. Hickman from Blaketown, re Road.

Mr. Scammell from Wild Cove, re Coastal Service.

Mr. Scammell from South West Arm, re Coastal Service.

Mr Scammell from Jacksons Arm, re Lumbering Operations.

Mr. Brown gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Hibbs gave Notice of Question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Asked leave to move that the Rules of the House be suspended in relation to all business now before the House or to come before it.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker; This is a most important motion, and one which I think all the members of this Assembly should carefully consider before taking vote upon it. It proposes to do away with, for the balance of this session on the rules which both the British House of Commons and our own legislature have in their experience of hundreds of years imposed upon us for the proper conduct of public business. Now I know perfectly well that it is usual at the end of a session when everything of importance has been dealt with, in a thorough manner, and an opportunity has been given to everybody to understand thoroughly the purport and the public effect of such legislation, to suspend the rules of the House for the purpose of permitting the House to clean up these unimportant matters with which the session usually ends with as little delay as possible.

Whilst the procedure is justifiable when it is used for the purpose for which it is intended, it is entirely unjustifiable and indecent and scandalous when an attempt is made to rush through such legislation as we have to face at the present moment under suspended rules. I say Sir, that it

would be to the everlasting disgrace of this Assembly were we to suspend the rules of the House on all matters now to come before us or at present on the Order Paper. We have not up to this moment finished with the financial bills, which this House has under consideration. And I Sir, for one consider it extremely improper to deal with questions involving millions of dollars for which this country will be responsible, under suspended rules. We have yet to deal with a bill commonly known as a Shell Bill, and which at the present moment is only in its Resolution stage, and which purposes sir, to give the whole of the Labrador coast to a corporation, in so far as the collection and the exportation of these shells is concerned. Now not only is that the case but this bill itself interferes with already vested interests on that coast and yet we are asked to come in here and tamely submit to rushing that monopoly thru this House in the interests of certain parties.

Now we have not yet had a very long session. We have not yet been in the House one month. And as I pointed out here a couple of days ago we stood a session of four months last year, and I do not know that any of the members are any the worse for it. I do not think that it can be conceived even that the opposition this year in any way at all attempted to obstruct public business. On the other hand, it must be admitted that we have done everything possible that could be expected to facilitate matters. All the matters which are not of grave importance have been permitted by us to go through here very rapidly and those who sat in the House yesterday know that that is correct.

Then why this sudden desire to suspend the rules of the House and close the Assembly within the next

two or three days. That desire is sudden sir, to my knowledge. It did not come to the knowledge of the opposition until two or three days ago, and then only by an industrious canvas on the question. What is the cause of it. Why is it that we are asked to close off the proceedings of this Assembly with as scant courtesy as possible. Is it in the interests of Mr. Thomas Smythe and his associates, or is it in the interests of the country. We are not here to in any way care for the interests of Thomas Smythe or any of his associate in the Shell company. We are here to protect the interests of this country and to see that it is not sacrificed in the interests of monopolists. And I for one strongly oppose any suspension of the rules, either on any matters that are now before the House, or to come before this House, or in connection with a Shell Bil which proposes to give thousands of miles of coast line of Labrador to a private corporation.

Now I have in my hand here, an issue of a Government organ, and I want to read it if I may be permitted to do so, for the edification of this House, the opinion of that organ as to what will be done by the Government. It says;-

(Reads)

And yet we are asked to do that work under suspended rules, in order that the Government may rush everything through this House as unceremoniously as possible.

(Reads)

Now we are told by this Government organ that the record of the Monroe Government makes it certain that no controversial matter will be hurriedly rushed through the House, and yet that Government comes in this afternoon and demands that we put through a bill that is very controversial, concerning which a petition

has been presented in this House, which Bill interferes with private rights and proposes to deprive the citizens of this country of the rights which the Government itself has given them, and we are asked to do that under suspended rules. I consider it indecent and disgraceful in the highest degree. I oppose the motion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker; I would like to say in reply to my learned friend who has just sat down that for one of the junior members of the House I can quite make an allowance that he certainly endeavours to believe what he says.

MR. BRADLEY.—You need not make any allowance for me at all. I am not asking leeway from anyone.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Now, there is no occasion to get in any undue state of excitement about this matter at all. The building is not being burned down, nor the country being shifted overnight. There is nothing remarkable about the whole proceeding at all. It is rather interesting to discover the extraordinary dread that people get that this government is able to browbeat the distinguished members of the opposition. He has too much respect for the intelligence of the honorable members of the opposition to suggest that

My learned friend suggests that he is surprised to discover a desire on the part of the members to close this House, and he suggests that the opposition have been industriously canvassed to that extent.

MR. BRADLEY.—I am not.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I was going to say that I do not know who was doing the canvassing. But I do say this with perfect candor, that I have distinctly understood that my interests were being canvassed in the hope of the Government trying to

close the House, by honorable gentlemen opposite, who are trying to get back to their business. If the desire was to camp out here all the summer then I apologise. For the ten years that I have been in this House I have never seen yesterday's record equalled with regard to the despatch of business. Bills yesterday went thru all their stages with the unanimous consent of the House. And I say this to the credit of the members opposite, that it showed an honest desire on the part of those members to get the business out of the way. And for that reason it is surprising now to hear the honorable member mention that there is anything remarkable about this motion. Notice of motion was given yesterday, and I do not think that the Honourable the Prime Minister or any member of this side of the House is in any way concerned about asking the House to accept something that they do not want. You would imagine from the remarks of the honorable member that under the suspension of rules, once a member opens his mouth on any bill, that therefore all hope of the country is gone; that if a member gets up and says "I introduce a bill," that everything on that bill goes thru and there is no appeal from it. Of course, the situation is this: Honourable members will appreciate that the object really of bringing in the suspension of rules is to permit expedition in regard to the stages of the bills. It has no reference to discussion on any particular bill. If my honorable friend has any earnest desire about any particular bill that is to come before the House, he need not worry about the suspension of rules. I can talk just as long and as effectively under suspended rules as if I had May's Parliamentary Practice by my side. The suspension of rules has no relation whatever either to the powers of debate or to the powers of

amendment. Not only that, but if we do not like a bill it goes out under suspended rules much more quickly than otherwise. One advantage of suspended rules is that you can get at the contentious matter in a bill more quickly than you otherwise could. The bringing in of the motion is merely the interpretation by the Leader of the House that it is the desire of the members to clean up matters and to avoid undue delay. There is nothing unreasonable about the whole thing. I do not think that the Government has the powers that the honorable member gives us credit for.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Speaker, as one who has not been canvassed, I would like the privilege of saying a few words. I understood yesterday that the House was about to close next Wednesday. I did not get that information from any member of the Government. I received that from Mr. Halfyard. He said that there was no necessity for a night session tonight as the House was not going to close until next Wednesday. Then I am not at all surprised at the Leader of the Government asking for a suspension of the rules this afternoon. I am after being in this House for twenty years and I have seen this House closed in pretty queer ways I can assure you. I remember a colleague of mine standing in this Chamber, speaking, and the Usher of the Black Rod came down to the door of the House and closed the House while he was speaking. I do not see anything wrong with the motion of the Prime Minister this afternoon, and if that motion is going to the vote I am going to vote for it, and I will be prepared to go back to my constituents and answer for it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, I would like to

have a word to say and especially in reference to the remark of the member of the opposition, Mr. Bradley, who has said he was industriously canvassed about the closing of the House, by a member of the Government. I assume that responsibility and I accept it, and the honorable member for Port de Grave quite agreed with me.

MR. BRADLEY.—I did not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—That statement is so absolutely correct that it was followed out on the lines suggested to you. I appeal to Mr. Halfyard if what I am saying is not correct.

MR. BRADLEY.—I told you I did not desire to hold the House up. That I wanted it closed as soon as possible consistent with the protection of the rights of the people of this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I appeal for my verdict, and to be cleared absolutely in this position, to the Hon. Leader of a party, I will call him the Leader of the Circular party if I may. I ask you if Mr. Bradley did not agree with me yesterday when it was suggested to close the House on Wednesday.

MR. BRADLEY.—I did not agree that the contentious measures should be rushed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I ask Mr. Halfyard if that is or is not a fact that that happened to me yesterday afternoon.

MR. HALFYARD.—That is correct.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I thank you very much. I have nothing more to say.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker; I have only to say in reply to the Hon. Minister after hearing him speak a moment ago, that my position is quite clear, that I was prepared yesterday afternoon to pass through this House

as quickly as possible, any unimportant business without rushing the contentious measures, and that I would do my level best to facilitate matters in that regard. I mean to do the same this afternoon and to-morrow afternoon and any other day. But when one measure that is now before the House is proposed to be submitted to the suspension of the rules, and when that measure, which is objected to by citizens of this country, and against which a petition is being presented to withdraw these concessions and as these individuals have a right to be heard before a Select Committee of this House and have seven days from the appointment of the Committee in which to prepare their case. I submit that we have no justification here this afternoon in view of the shortness of the session to deprive those people of that right. There are private interests involved here and we have no business to ride rough shod over those people.

I am prepared to deal with the matter exactly as I dealt with the non-contentious matters of yesterday; but as regards the interests of the persons involved they have a right to be heard in this House and I see no reason why they should not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker; I beg to say a few words in reply to the Hon. Member for Port de Grave. Ever since I have been in the House my experience has been that generally when the House has been within easy closing distance the suspension of the rules have been moved with regard to all the material to come before the House. I take great exception to Mr. Bradley because he seemed to throw out an insinuation that because I am in charge of a certain shell Bill that I am the spokesman and defender of a gentleman named Smythe, who is trying to do

something wrong and that I was suspending the rules of the House in order to put through some legislation distasteful to the people of the country. I think I have shown since I have been in the House a disinclination to do anything that did not savour of fair play to the members of the House generally and I had no idea that in making this motion for the suspension of the rules that it made any difference as to the treatment of the shell Bill or any other Bill under suspended rules. If we are to have legislation to get through with, and I take it that the members of the Opposition are just as anxious as we are to "transact business" with as little delay as possible and to get out of here, I do not see any harm in moving the suspension of the rules, because of Hon. Members are not agreeable to the motion I made. I can assure every member of the Opposition that he will be given ample opportunity to discuss the shell Bill. The Hon. Member for Port de Grave read an article from the "Daily News" pointing out that important legislation had got to come before the House; but we can debate that important legislation just as intelligently and just as fully under suspended rules as otherwise. It does not mean that because the rules are suspended that everything will be passed in ten minutes or so, but it does mean that the proceedings will not be longer than is necessary, but as regards the shell Bill or any other Bill on the Order Paper and I can promise all members that they will get the fullest opportunity of expressing their opinions on the shell Bill under suspended rules.

However, in deference to opinions of the other side of the House, I may say that there is no desire on the part of the Government to rush this matter at all and I would therefore move

that it be deferred for the present.

RE RETIRING ALLOWANCES

Pursuant to Notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances." Was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BRADLEY.—Are all these retiring allowances based on a percentage as per the Civil Service Act.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Yes.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I make no objection whatever to the amount paid but I would like to ask the Minister of Finance an explanation of the amount for the Magistrate and Collector at St. Mary's. It must have been quite a large salary to total that amount, or he must have been there a very long time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—He was both Customs House official and Magistrate and he was there for a very long time. He was thirty five years in the service. All of these are absolutely based on the Pensions Bill passed in this House.

MR. HALFYARD.—Is it the policy of the Government to pension all op-

erators that retire after a certain number of years and Post Masters. I notice quite a number here.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—The reason is I think that post masters retiring have always been pensioned; it is not a new rule at all.

DR. MOSDELL.—Doesn't this constitute a recognition of these men as Civil Servants? The pensioning of these mail couriers for example?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think if a man has served the Government all his life in one of those positions he is just as much entitled as a man in my Department, say.

DR. MOSDELL.—Well I had a couple of cases and found that the men didn't come under the Act because they were not Civil Servants. I am not objecting to those here.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Well the whole matter will have to be settled sometime but even if it is definitely settled to-morrow that no pensions be given except in certain cases or in the case only of regular Civil Servants you would still find that an Executive Government or a Government, if they knew that a man had given his whole life to the service like John Joe or the man from Placentia here, you would find that the Government would consider that these men after all even if they did not come under the regular rules having given their whole lives to the service are entitled to consideration.

MR. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman; Is not the position this that these post office officials not appointed by minute of council do not come under the Act, but if the Executive Government in the exercise of the wide discretion which they have decide that a pension be given in consideration of services

that these officials rendered, that is done; and it is a matter of grace merely. It seems only fair; and looking back over the estimates I find that couriers have been receiving pensions although they were never civil servants; and it is a matter of grace on the part of the Government.

MR. K. BROWN.—I consider if a man has given 20 or 30 years service as a mail courier he deserves a pension just as much as any man in the Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Retiring Allowances" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Customs" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Customs" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Customs".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. W. BROWNE.—Mr. Chairman; I happened to be concerned as a solicitor on that case and I might explain the position.

There were two sections which appeared to conflict. It appears to section 232 that persons have right of appeal against any judgement or conviction of a magistrate provided that notice is given to the convicting magistrate. Notice that expression "Convicting magistrate".

Section 249 seems to make provision for appeal also. The judges held that "convicting magistrate" implied that there was only a right of appeal where there had been a conviction and therefore the Customs had no right of appeal.

Section 232 is now struck out, and section 249 is struck out and this section dealing with the same thing is substituted.

Now you can appeal from the decision of a magistrate whether the person is convicted of the breach of the case is dismissed.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend

Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Customs" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; The Minister of Finance has asked me to explain the object of this bill introduced by him in connection with his Department.

I intimated the other day in giving notice of motion of the introduction of this bill that it intended to give to the Customs itself the right to appeal the same as is given to a convicted person. In other words, the spirit or the intent of the bill is to enable either side to appeal in the event of judgment. In a recent case it was decided that the words of the Act did not bear this construction and that the person could only appeal in the case of a conviction, and not in the case of a dismissal. What we are doing is to make it law that both parties have a right of appeal and if a case is one dismissed when the Customs takes action they have the same right to appeal as a convicted person.

AN ACT RESPECTING WILD FRUITS

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Wild Fruits" was read a first time.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—Mr. Speaker; I don't think that the Committee will consider the Bill contentious and with the unanimous consent of the House I would like to have the second reading now.

However before asking for the Second Reading, I think perhaps I ought to explain what led up to this

Bill being introduced. This is the result of investigation made by various people interested in gathering and exporting of wild berries and it only follows out the legislation passed here in 1914.

If I remember rightly the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, when representing the district of Bay de Verde introduced a bill here which had for its object the protection of partridge berries. The Bill was put through in 1914 and during the past two or three years there has been a great increase in gathering of blue berries and bakeapples and the present bill is merely to include these berries.....(reads sections 1, 2 and 3).

Section three is an exact copy of the 1914 Act dealing with partridge berries. The rest of the sections are the same as the 1914 Act with the exception of Section 6.

Since asking permission to introduce the Bill it has been brought to my notice that it may be possible for berries picked this year after the Act is introduced but may not be put on the market because of the condition of the market and may be held over to next year.

In order to protect these people the section which I mean to place in the Act will be additional section 10 and we will call section 10, 11. The additional section reads as follows;—

(Reads)

This will protect those who may have berries held over from season to season.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Wild Fruits" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Wild Fruits" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Wild Fruits".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; what about berries kept for domestic use.

Bakeapples can be kept in water for a long time, for example, and if you are putting in a provision to protect those who have berries for export, I think you should put something in to protect the people who have berries in their possession that were picked the year before.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Section 8 covers that.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman; Section 8 doesn't cover all that is necessary. For instance, there are large quantities of bakeapples packed every year in one pound tins and very probably blue berries will be put up in large tins in the future. Stores of berries are carried over from one year to another and are in the possession of grocers and wholesale dealers. Perhaps the products in some years are slow in selling and they are to be carried to the future season.

They have them for sale and I think that you should alter section 8 to protect them.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—We are putting in this additional section, which will cover that — berries for sale or export — is included under that section.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; I suppose the object of this Bill is to prevent the destruction of berries taken before they are ripe and not fit for market.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES.—And to arrange for regulations for providing for the proper marketing of the berries.

MR. HALFYARD.—I think that the Bill is a good one and a proper Bill to introduce. Our berries are becoming more valuable every year. I understand that for the first time last year \$5,000 was paid out to pickers of Blue Berries alone. I think that must help considerably, and be an encouragement to the number of women and children who have no other means of making a living. There are very many enquiries this year for blue berries particularly from United States. They have brought up a great deal and it occurs to me that this berry industry is some day going to be worth something to Newfoundland provided everybody is satisfied to see that they are properly put up and exported.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Wild Fruits" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported cer-

tain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows;-

Additional Estimates, \$4,818.63.

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund" in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund".

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 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals." with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the said amendments were read a first time.

With unanimous consent the said amendments were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and

Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman; I have just a few brief remarks to make on the Budget Speech. In these days when the country is making large expenditure on capital account I was wondering whether or not the Government was giving any attention to the question of immigration; whether any serious thought had been given to the encouragement of other people, outside people, coming into the country in order to develop our industrial resources; and in this regard I consider that if the Government had a strong agricultural policy we would have a means of encouraging people to come to Newfoundland and a certain amount of farming and stock raising could be done. There is another matter that I want to bring up again and that is the question of Sunday work on the Coastal boats. As I have said before earlier this session the people in the outports do not want to have to handle freight on Sundays and I sincerely trust that the Railway Commission will go into the matter and see whether or not they can't hold up the coastal boats from midnight Saturday until midnight Sunday, in order that the people who are working on these steamers will be able to enjoy their Sunday as well as the week end. The men on the railway coastal boats work hard, day and night, and I feel that they are entitled to have their day of rest; they are entitled to have their day of rest as any other person. In St. John's practically no freight is handled on Sunday. There are no local trains running around the Bay to Harbour Grace and Carbonear Sunday. No

freight train leaves St. John's on Sunday, and quite rightly too, and I hope and trust that the Railway Commission will take up this matter of Sunday work. Men in the outports working six days a week do not want to work on Sunday. They want their Sabbath day so they can have it as a day of rest and day of worship and as I said before I maintain that men on the coastal boats from the Captain down to the sailor need a certain rest as well. I sincerely trust that the Members of the Railway Commission will take up this matter and will give some serious attention to it.

As regards retrenchment I asked here in the House a question on the tenders which were asked for, for the boiler in the insane asylum and I received the reply as follows:-

(Reads)

One of these tenders was accepted; and the Hon. Member for Ferryland says that he applied for the specification and could not get them and the tender which was accepted was greatly higher than the lowest and there were two tenders below it. What encouragement is there for people in this business to go and tender. One man here tenders over \$300 less than the tender accepted. Is that the way the Government is cutting down expenditure. I trust Mr. Chairman that as regards the borrowing of more money we have come to a halt. I think we are taking a long chance in further increasing our national debt, and I sincerely trust from now on the country can get along with the revenue that can be raised from year to year.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask Major Sullivan, as Member of the Railway Commission, if they ever considered the question of avoiding Sunday work when it is possible to do so? Take for instance the coastal boats arriving in St. John's

they can always lay up until after Sunday. Why single out St. John's? If they arrive in the outports Sunday they have to work the same as any other day. Why make a difference in respect of St. John's so far as Sunday work is concerned?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—I might say that the coastal boats with the schedules they have now have to keep continually at it, or they will be unable to make their ports of call, and additional ports of call are being put on, and unless the people will be satisfied with a fortnightly service instead of a weekly, that will have to be continued or more boats will have to be put on.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Why is it that the Home is despatched on Friday's. It may be despatched on Monday.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I would like to say a few words on this subject brought up by Mr. Ashbourne. I happen to be owner of the contract as President of the Newfoundland Produce Company and I know that if you are not prepared to work on Sundays you cannot possibly carry on a weekly service. If the boat leaves Monday morning it may be delayed by fog and may be caught over Sunday. Leaving Tuesday we had to work all day Monday up to twelve o'clock in the night. You cannot possibly get a coastal service where you lay up all day Sunday at one port on the coast. It would not be a regular service; it would be all mixed up and you would not know where you were. You cannot run that coastal service and expect to make time leaving out Sunday. If you leave here Tuesday it may be alright fine weather but if you strike any fog the boat is held up and you are going to strike Sunday somewhere. When that was done we found we could get along in the summer and arrive here Saturday night but it

could not be done in foggy weather; it would be Sunday and sometimes Monday when it arrived. It is absolutely impossible to expect the coastal service to run unless it runs Sundays. They have to work all they can to get the boat to give a fortnightly service.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Are the wishes of the people in the outports to be ignored?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I know the Fogo crowd better perhaps than you do, from Change Islands right here to St. John's and in my time there never was a request for that except one in Greenspond and when the unreasonableness of the position was showed we never heard a word since. We have not heard a request since as regards Sunday or Monday as long as they get their service. I would like everybody in Newfoundland to have Sunday for a day of rest; but if you lay up that service Sunday you hold up the whole thing; and I am quite satisfied my honourable friend the Member for Trinity opposite will agree with me.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; It is not my intention to speak at great length but I suppose it is the duty of those who occupy seats on this side of the House to give expression of opinion on the Budget.

Those who have already spoken on this side of the House have covered the subject matter of the Budget very accurately and interestingly and there is not much more that I can add in the way of undue criticism. It sufficeth to say that we did hope that before the Government would go out of office that some attempt would be made to lessen, if possible, the burden of taxes that the country has to bear. For one reason and another the Government has done nothing in the way of making an attempt even to reduce taxation or to reduce expenditure. We

have to admit that expenditure has increased during the last four years. It has increased in the administration of affairs of the country — I am speaking of that from a departmental point of view — the expense in running the Government is greater now than it was four years ago. There is no saving effected with regard to administration, with regard to salaries of officials or the number of officials.

I am sure the Prime Minister must realize the difficulty of putting into effect what he thought was necessary and possibly might be done when he consented to lead a party to the poles in 1924, and if he chooses to resign the premiership will go out of his hands in a short time and even if he changes his mind and contends the country again, which I understand is not his intention at the present time, but you never know what can happen, I think that Mr. Monroe will not occupy the position of Prime Minister anyway after October or November.

He will then be a wiser man and perhaps sadder to some extent. Sad in the thought that he thought to accomplish something of real advantage to the country but in his own heart he must admit that he failed in that respect.

The Budget each year shows increased expenditure and unfortunately show deficits and the only way we can cover up these deficits is by borrowing more money. That is a most unfortunate condition for a country or business to find itself in.

With regard to the statements of the Finance Minister in his Budget I would try to follow his statements as nearly as they are stated as much as possible.

First the Finance Minister makes a weak apology for having deficits and tries to make those who read the Budget that he was fairly accurate in

his estimate of expenditure and revenue for the fiscal year upon which the country had entered when he tabled his Budget and his estimates. The year before last he estimated a surplus deficit of \$650,000 so he was out in his estimate about three quarters of a million dollars.

At the time, if I remember correctly, when the Finance Minister was studying closely the question of what had taken place the year previous to see what the estimated revenue would be, I told him then what difference did it make whether he estimated within a dollar or a million dollars of the actual expenditure and revenue at the end of the fiscal year. What I mean by it is that it had no effect on the policy of the Government.

We went on spending in the same way, calling on the same old tariffs, used the same means to get revenue. Therefore whether having a deficit or revenue made no difference and had no effect on any policy of the Government.

So the Budget that we have before up now may be called a "hum-drum" Budget.

I got that idea from the statement made by Stanley Baldwin on the Budget that was presented by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, at the last House of Commons. He said.

(Reads)

They tried to work out something to relieve the over-taxed people of Great Britain, as far as possible. They brought in a resolution which reduced to the amount of over twenty million pounds, taxation. Our Government as a member of the Executive said the other day did not have the courage to tackle the question and therefore they were going on in the same old hum-drum way. Whenever the question of increased tariff has been raised we have been told, that the present Gov-

ernment only accepted the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, appointed under the old Government, and that is the reason why the increase in taxation is such at present. Now it has been said by those who have spoken from this side of the House that it did not follow because the recommendations were made that the Government was supposed to adopt it. Those associated with the Government never considered the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. And before it was put into effect intimated that some changes would be made. Anyhow it is not for us to beg the question. We have to take our share in the praise or blame of a Government with which we are or have been associated. That reminds me of the item I saw in the paper to-day I happened to be there but I had nothing to do with it, because at the time I did not happen to be Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, but Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and when I saw that in the paper to-day it was the first intimation that I had of any such irregularities. Anyhow I will not have to take the blame or praise for the policy of the Monroe Administration, whether they participated in the policy or not. Now the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech says;-

(Reads)

Evidently there is a very large deficit and it would discourage anyone in expecting the Government to do anything which would cause any further expenditures of money. I fail to see where the Government in the spending of such large sums of money in the last few years have created labor giving industries, of a productive nature. You have tried to keep the public service going with regard to transportation. Take the railway. You spent large sums of money on the railway but that did not help it. It

did not increase the earning power of the people to any great extent. You made the general passenger service perhaps, a little more comfortable and cheap. And perhaps you facilitated the transportation of freight. The difficulty with regard to railway transportation is that there is not enough freight carried. The dock had to be built but with regard to the earning power of the dock with its increased capacity and facilities still we do not earn any more there. With regard to the highways it will be a long time before we see any appreciable revenue returns for them. The other industries of the country outside of the fishing industry help the people to seek out an existence. Take as an example the mines at Bell Island. The conditions under which the men have to work over there are anything but desirable, and the ordinary labourer over there has to work for very little. Take Buchans. Conditions there are anything that is desirable. And even after the mine is established there it is questionable whether our men will prefer to go there. I believe that they would prefer to be fishing every time. It is healthier, freer and more acceptable to our people from the living standpoint. These industries do not increase the earning power of the people compared with the fisheries. They do not give the returns in labor or money or from the salary standpoint like the fisheries. But if there has been any effort made on the part of the Government with regard to any increase for labour in these particular operations, the Government can take very little credit for it. It is true that the Government facilitated the American Smelters and the A. N. D. Co. in getting that industry going, but I believe that if you had given them the ordinary statutory concessions they would have gone ahead just the same,

if the mineral was there of such a value, and in such quantities.

From the statement made in the Speech from the Throne and the statement made in the Budget we have thousands of people unemployed in this country. Lots of poor people are really in a state almost of destitution and the Government has got to help them. That is a fact and they cannot get away from it. Only this week Magistrate Fitzgerald sent me the names, ages and addresses of fifty-nine men, who were stranded at Millertown and had to be sent home. I get letters from the relieving officers in the district of Trinity. One Relieving Officer wrote and asked me "Can you get work for eight men". If no work is found I cannot see what the people will do. The Finance Minister spoke of an improvement in the trade of the country. Well, with regard to the imports and exports of course there is an improvement in the trade. But in 1924 and in 1925 the trade improved considerably, and we had a fairly good year. But then we went back again. Conditions are not good, and if we meet a bad year, we will have to borrow money to keep things going and where that will end I do not know. I referred to what the present Government has done with regard to labour giving industries. I fail to see where we have got any wonderful returns from the big amount that we had to borrow during the last four years. What the country would do without the Humber industry I do not know. You may say that the past Government blundered guaranteeing ten million dollars so as to get those to take their share in the construction of such a vast enterprise, but if we did not have that Humber industry I do not know what we would do. And I am convinced from an old clipping that I took from a paper perhaps

twelve months ago, written by the President of the International Company and which I happened to have in my pocket. It says;-

(Reads)

Now if we did not have that industry and we all must agree with that statement I have just read what it means to the country. Under the circumstances, we must admit that it was a bold policy, but I think it was a wise one and I trust that under the new management that we will never be called upon to pay the interest charges on that ten million of dollars

It is unfortunate that the codfishing industry is not giving remunerative returns to those engaged in it, particularly as regards the Labrador fishery. This country has been built upon the fishing industry and every effort should be made to try and put that industry in such a position that our men will be encouraged to remain at it. We cannot deny the fact that thousands of our men have given it up and gone to foreign countries to try and eke out a living for themselves and their dependents. These men could not make two ends meet on what they were producing in their own country on account of the low prices given them for their products, so there was nothing left for them to do but to go away and produce for other countries. These are some of the conditions that we have to meet and every effort should be made to put the fishery, our banner industry, on a basis that would encourage men to prosecute it, as our people are more happy fishing than they are at any other form of employment. Therefore every effort should be made by our fish exporters and in fact by all engaged in our commercial pursuits to make the codfish industry remunerative and to encourage our people to remain at it.

I suppose being an old sinner in past Governments, I think I should try and defend the expenditures on supplementary account of the previous administration. The Finance Minister made a comparative statement showing the money that was not voted by this House but was spent on Executive authority:-

(Reads)

The Minister of Finance stated that the reason he left out the year 1923-24 was that his Government was not responsible for that year. Well why did he include the year 1919-20. It would be just as reasonable for the last Government to say we were not responsible for the bills on Supplemental Supply for that year. But, of course, the Finance Minister was just trying to paint a picture as black as he could against the Squires Administration. We were not responsible for all the money bills of 1919-20 and nobody knows that better than the Finance Minister and the Minister of Justice. In making this comparison I do not think that it was altogether fair on the part of the present Finance Minister. If he had left out the expenditure for the year 1919-20 as well as he left out the year 1923-24, he would have done himself more credit.

Why I bring the point out is this, that we cannot gain much by referring to the policies of past administrations, and the only thing is that if they make mistakes we should profit by their mistakes and try to do better in the future, and I trust in that way the blunders, mistakes, irregularities, whether inadvertently or accidentally committed or whether the result of wickedness or viciousness, which have occurred, I hope in that way will benefit whoever will have to take charge of the country's affairs in the future and they will profit by them. With regard to the loan;

the present Government borrowed 16½ millions up to the present date and the Squires Administration borrowed I think 17½ millions. How I got at this is that I simply subtracted 16½ millions from the gross public debt when they took charge.

Since 1919 the Squires Administration including the year of the Warren Administration when 3½ million were borrowed, borrowed loans amounting to 17½ millions. Out of that 17½ millions there was 2 millions went absolutely for the railway. We had to guarantee railway bonds and it has gone into the Public Debt on which we have to pay interest and as I said before large sums of money, as for example I notice here for the railway;-

(Reads)

That comes to \$3,950,000, just for that alone; in 1922 it comes to a big sum of money; and also rightly or wrongly \$250,000, on fishery guarantees; then the St. John's Municipal Council, \$464,828 we had to give them, that has gone on capital account; all these large sums of money went in that way. You can do anything with figures if there is time to go into them. I quote from the Auditor General's report on the yearly increase in interest on the Public Debt.

Now then I will take the amount of the loans of the Monroe Administration 1924-25 to date, which amounts to, leaving out the Loan Bill we have here now, \$16,500,000. These are actual figures as I quoted here once before. There was in 1924 a loan of 6 millions, in 1925, \$5,000,000, that took \$500,000 and in 1926 and 1927 loans of five millions each totalling 16¼ millions at 5 per cent which gives an increased interest on 16½ millions at 5 per cent of \$825,000. Divide that by 4 to get the average annual rate of increase and

you get \$206,250. Well on the face of it from that statement you have borrowed comparatively more money; the annual interest charge has increased more during the period from 1924-25 to date than during the period of the Squires Administration if the statement is correct. Then if the Finance Minister says we spent more on capital account surely it is even so on current account. So that is what figures show. Now then if you are to add the \$2,460,000, say 2½ millions in the new loan, of course it will make it so much more than \$825,000, but we will leave that alone; that will do for the present. In the Finance Minister's estimates for 1928-29 I hope he will be correct. I hope business will be such that whoever is here next year will find out that he made a fairly accurate statement and I hope it will be much better. With regard to the paper industry, he refers to it and points out what the Humber industry means to us and there is increased output at Grand Falls and we hope success will attend these companies. With regard to the railway in 1923-24 we had a deficit of \$600,000 and we may say the Humber saved us a further \$600,000; so it means a wonderful lot to the country.

With regard to our coal fields I regard this statement on the coal fields as political window dressing; to look at it everything appears nice but when you go inside the shop very often you find it difficult to get the samples in the window; I hope he is right there but we have heard so much about the prospects of coal in this country all we do is hope for the best.

(Reads from Budget:)

I hope that some capitalist with money will read that and will fall for it and come down here with a few million dollars to try and get that coal out.

Mr. Chairman; I wont delay much longer the discussion on the Budget. This House very soon will go out of existence and after two or three more sittings here I suppose some of us may never have the opportunity of speaking here and it may not be much loss to ourselves or the country. I hope whoever comes here next time, if we have to take a back seat, that it will be to the benefit of the country for a new man to take our place.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, arising out of Mr. Hibbs' remarks there is just one question that I would like to ask, that is, whether the Government has given any real financial assistance to the development of the St. George's Coal Fields. I think that it is a fact that we have spent some money along the lines of development in the St. George's Coal Fields and have arranged, or are more or less compelled, to spend more. I would like to know just how much it has cost.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I might say that we have spent \$10,000 up there last year and we are rather committed with some other financiers to put in another \$20,000. That is the limit.

LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Will you get stock?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Yes, we will take stock in the company on behalf of the Government.

MR. SCAMMELL.—You have gone in to the extent of \$10,000, you are committed for another \$20,000, making a total of about \$30,000. Have you got somebody there to represent the Government?

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Just at present we have only spent \$10,000 and Dr. Baker, our geolo-

gist is there to report to the Government.

It may be possible that the Government may not be called upon for any of that \$20,000 whatever.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is it true that the International Paper Company is interested in St. George's Coal Fields?

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes it is true; it is possible that they may take them over; I would rather see the Coal Fields in charge of the International than of the Government.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, my object in asking this question is this, that the Government all through has been able to find considerable sums of money for industries other than the fisheries. Here we have a case of \$30,000 to be spent on a speculative venture in order to discover coal. The Finance Minister's own statements here this evening go to prove that it was a speculative venture and if I came in here and got in your position or any other gentleman from this side of the House and spent \$30,000 from the standpoint of the fisheries on speculative ventures, we would be very much criticised.

I am going to give you a warning that if that situation should occur where some future Government should possibly experiment to the extent of some \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000 in connection with the fisheries, you cannot have very good grounds for criticism of any expenditure that is made in that direction, taking into consideration the importance of the industry to this country.

The Finance Minister knows, that the members of the present administration know, that you will not realize much from a coal industry. I am not criticising, I do congratulate the Government on spending a little on the coal areas in an endeavour to discover

what is there, but when you come to talk about the big things, there is the fishing industry.

Here in this House of Assembly, constituted as it is today, there are men on the other side of the House as much interested in the fisheries as I am myself. Surely the Honourable Members can speak and let us hear their opinions as to what would be good for the fishery. There are some Honourable Members who spend their lives supplying for the codfishery, and then again when the codfishery has been discussed and processes in relation to the encouragement of the fishery placed before the House the Honourable Members cannot get up and vouchsafe any opinions on what ought to be done. When they sat on this side of the House they had some opinions; I don't see why they should not hold any opinions now, why they don't have something to say about the financial affairs of the Government. Not because they are members of the executive government that their tongues should be tied. I don't know why it is that Honourable Members opposite don't have anything to say, surely it is not because they are on the Government side of the House that they are devoid of opinions. After all it is rather imposing on us to only hear opinions expressed from the opposition on the budget. I don't know if I was on the other side what I would do, but I think I would like to express my opinions on the budget. When I was there I think I did.

I don't know why Mr. Duff hasn't had something to tell the House as to why the codfishery is in such a rotten state, supplies are curtailed and the outlook for the fishery is so bleak and so rotten. He is a business man and has supplied for the Labrador fishery and the shore fishery, and I believe that he has some strong opinions and

I don't know why he has not vouchsafed them in this connection. I don't think that it is quite fair to throw all the burden on this side of the House.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is much to be said about the fishery because Mr. Scammell and Mr. Hibbs have covered the ground pretty thoroughly.

There is one thing that I wish to speak on, Mr. Chairman, and that is the highroads for the country.

In 1924 there was a vote of \$2,000,000 for the highroads. We have spent according to their own figures something under \$2,000,000. Now I want to ask the Government how much of that highroads money has been spent in the north? Why is the north not as much entitled to \$2,000,000 for highroads as is the Avalon Peninsula. You haven't got highroads, you have boulevards up here south and we have what are known as corduroy roads down north and we are tired asking for money to put these roads in better condition.

Our national debt today is approximately \$78,000,000 and we are adding to that every single year, and the Monroe Administration, the Government, has borrowed since coming into power about \$17,000,000 not including the seven and a half millions that it now has to borrow in order to pay off the loan that is due.

I have a statement here before me which shows that the Government intends to spend \$312,000 this year on highroads. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister or somebody on that side of the House is in a position to tell me how much money will be spent in the North on highroads this year. That is a reasonable question and as a representative of the North I am entitled to the answer, and I ask why are we staying in this House and allowing legislation to go through and

allowing money to be borrowed, and getting nothing for the northern districts while the south gets it all.

There is soon going to be a day of reckoning, Mr. Chairman, and very soon you are going to see a representative from the north, whoever he may be, come in here and demand just rights and liberty for the north of this country, and instead of things as they are in this country you will see two parliaments, because the people of the north are not going to stand for the way that they are treated. Here the Government has got the dole and poor relief in the southern districts and in the north if the people are in need you have trouble to get anything for them.

MR. MOORE—Not in all the districts.

MR. BROWN—Perhaps not so much in Ferryland district; but notice up in Harbour Grace, not so much now as it has been in years back, but in Placentia, when the member for Placentia has got the chance to put all the men he likes to work at Grand Falls, Buchans Mine or Corner Brook. Here we have got to get \$12,000 or \$18,000 in able bodied relief in that district. It is disgraceful. I suppose when the member is in the Executive Government they get it whether they need it or not.

I am coming back to the question of highroads again. What I want to know is if it is the intention of the Government to spend any money in the north or not. We are not asking for highroads but we are asking for money to put the so called roads there at present into passable condition so as a horse and cart can get over them. If the south can get boulevards we should get roads in the north that a horse and waggon can get over. How much money is going to be spent in the north for road improvement out of the \$312,000?

It is going to frighten the Board what they are going to have. They are going to have \$215,000 to use how they like.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Where are they going to get that.

MR. BROWN—Out of the loan to be used on the highroads and you have got \$2,000,000 in the bank now.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No loan until the Bill passes; that other money cannot be touched. That is placed in a trust account.

MR. BROWN—We shall see what will happen when a new crowd comes in.

I will leave that point and come back to the highroads again. After all it is not right that the south should get \$2,000,000 or so for roads and the north get practically nothing, and I would like to say that if there were two parliaments in this country it would be better for the working man and the fishermen principally. If this Island was divided up from Baccalieu on the north side and the south side, the north would live in luxury and the south would starve. That is about the long and short of it.

With all the money that the present Government borrowed there is not one thing that has been done for the fisheries, the main industry of the country and today we find schooners laying up in the various harbours. The skippers are not going to prosecute the fishery, they cannot get the men, they can't square their accounts. There is something wrong somewhere.

We hear a lot of talk about Buchans mine, but what is the working man getting out of it. Just the little revenue that might be collected from those companies that is all, and we are getting nothing from their importations. Every thing is duty free as far as machinery is concerned, and material for equipping the plant. The

working man is getting twenty-five cents an hour out of it. That is some pay, is it not? They have got some help from the Government that came in and promised them a square deal? Fair play and a living wage, and we are getting it are we not, but if a foreigner comes in he can get a good wage and they will not come in until they get a good wage, whether they are skilled or not. Buchans Mine so far is no good to this country, and I doubt whether it is going to be a paying proposition for this country. It is about time that the present government did something. They cannot do anything now because they are going out of office, I hope never to come back again.

Take the logging business in this country, it is a disgrace. Where a man goes in the woods and sleeps under canvas during the three or four months of winter. Who is responsible for that. We have a man in the Executive that should know better and should fight against conditions as exists there and have existed during the past four years. But the company is put first and the working man last. Logging conditions in this country are disgraceful. Such conditions would not be allowed to exist in any other civilized country in the world. Then there is the sealing industry. A few years ago a bill was brought into this House and put through by Ccaker and his associates, giving the sealer fair play, gave him decent food while at the sealfishery. The food was handled right, cooked right and there was plenty of it. And what is the state of things today? It is worse than before the sealing bill was passed. This year sealfishery conditions were rotten. It is a disgrace for a government that came into power pledged to a Square Deal to All." You borrowed money and used it on roads and everything else. And by the way, before

sitting down I cannot but speak of the Caribou, I was aboard that ship on two occasions and I say that it is a disgrace for a ship that cost as much money as that ship cost. I presume to know a little about ships, I spent some years on them. There are the very cheapest kind of fittings on that ship, her ceilings and walls with the boards opened up in parts. Would anybody tell me that that is a fit toy to come out from Holland and to cost \$400,000. If it had been built in the Old Country it would have been 85 p.c. better than it is. I heard the Prime Minister state in 1925 that he could sell the Caribou and get what it cost for it. You and your government will never sell the Caribou and get half what it cost. All the fittings are of the cheapest kind. I was surprised when I got on board, knowing what she cost to see the fittings. I say that is at least \$200,000 thrown away. If I was purchasing the ship to-day I would not give \$25,000 for the Caribou. That is the truth and I know what I am talking about. And if Capt. Randall had gotten the information that was due him when he placed a question on the table, there would have been more talk about the Caribou, but he did not get that information in answer to his question.

Now before I sit down and as it is likely to be the last chance that I shall have to speak to the Government about the Northern Coastal Service. I want to ask the Railway Commission during the coming fall not to send the Meigle on the Green Bay service. The captain and the crew are alright and they can do their work whatever service they are on. As far as the captain is concerned he is one of the finest men on the coast, but the ship is not suited for that service, but the people are protesting against it. I would like for the Railway Commission to consider

this suggestion. There is one boat that is giving the service down there, and that is the Home. Take the Sagona and put it on the Home's route and send the Home on the northern service.

I ask in conclusion that the Government will give me the assurance that Twillingate district will get its proportion of public monies. Mr. Monroe cannot get up here and tell me that the north will not get its share of the public monies, but if reports are correct he going out when this legislature closes, and if he makes a promise I would take it that it is going to be alright. But when you close the House that is no good. But to the man that is going to take charge of the ship of state, I ask that that be given due consideration, and that this year the north be given due consideration, and that this year the north will get its fair proportion of the public grants out of the money that is about to be put aside for public works.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman; I was glad when I arrived in town and found the legislature open tonight, and whilst the debate is on the Budget, the subject matter has reference in a direct way with the revenue and consequently I feel sure that any remarks that I have to make will not be out of order regarding ways and means.

It has been common talk recently and I think an item appeared in the press this morning to the effect that the representatives of Besco had arrived in Newfoundland and were going to confer with the miners on Bell Island regarding an increase of pay. Some short while ago the miners on Bell Island invited me to go over there and try to show them a way out of the situation, which I did. I think I explained the program a few days

ago in the House. The miners elected me as one of their committee. The Government received a communication from the miners to the effect that they desired the Government to nominate a representative to be present at any conference between the representative of the companies and the miners. These individuals arrived here yesterday. They had an interview with the Prime Minister, and I understand that the Government had appointed the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to represent the Government at the conference. It seems now that they have decided that there would be no Government representative at the conference. Well now Besco refuses to confer with these miners if I happen to be on their committee. I advised the miners then to go back and talk to them and ask them if they were prepared to give them a raise in pay. To this they replied that they did not know how much it was going to be yet. These men did not understand the way to talk to those individuals, and I feel that the Government were weak in not sending a representative to Bell Island to see that the interests of the miners were looked after, because the men are miners and they are not able to talk the situation over with men of high calibre and understand them. I am glad now having this opportunity of bringing this up in the legislature. I would like to have a pronouncement from the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to send a representative to Bell Island, on Monday if that is the day that they propose to meet the miners again, and take an interest in it. Possibly the Prime Minister may reply to the effect that this is a difference of opinion between the employers and the employees, and that the Government should not interfere.

I claim that these Companies are debtors to the Government of this country. They are practically subsidized, so to speak, because they are not paying one cent to the country. Rather have they defaulted in every way they could, and I feel that the Government should send their representative to Bell Island on Monday morning to discuss and confer with those mining representatives.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman; I would like to say a few words on this subject because I had an interview with the mining representatives, not of Besco, but of the National Trust Company, who are in charge of the interests at Bell Island at the present time. Besco has nothing whatever to do with Bell Island at present. The affairs over there are being conducted by the National Trust Company of which Mr. Magor is representing the President. About six months ago Mr. Magor came to see me. He told me at that particular time that his main effort was to get regular employment for the men all the year round. I told him that that was of first importance because if the men were without work for a couple of months of the year that they so fell into debt that they found it almost impossible to pick it up again. Mr. Magor said he was going to the other side of the water to try and arrange for the sale of ore for the next twelve months, and until he could see what could be done on the other side he could not make any promise of increased wages for the men, but he promised that he would be back in the early part of the year to take that matter up. He came back the other day and he told me that he tried to interest the President of the British Board of Trade and made a big effort on behalf of the steel interests of Nova Scotia to get the British Trade.

He told me that he was very much disappointed and I am afraid that the statement I made a few days ago that Bell Island had placed an order for 150,000 tons of iron ore with British interests is not correct. At least, Mr. Magor does not know of it up to the present time. Mr. Magor told me that he had prepared a brief in connection with the interests of the steel works of Nova Scotia and that he had at his disposal one of the particularly higher up men in the British Board of Trade to take this matter up and to circularize the entire British steel trade, and although he remained six weeks he got only two replies. One was from a personal friend of Mr. Magor, who came away extremely disappointed after all that has been said and done about British interests not giving more encouragement than they have.

With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Ferryland about this Besco situation, I may say that when Mr. Magor came to see me yesterday he said he was going over to Bell Island to have a conference with the miners and he thought he would be able to straighten up the matter to the satisfaction of the men, but he pointed out that he did not want to have any political interference and he was quite prepared to give me, as head of the Government any information we require. I told him of the statement that was made in the House to the effect that the Company was making \$1 per ton profit on the ore. He replied "Do you think it likely that the bondholders would be prepared to go without their interest on the bonds if we were making \$1 per ton on ore"? Mr. Magor went to Bell Island yesterday to have a conference with the mining men. Now the member for Ferryland stated here this evening that the miners are not able to talk

for themselves and that they require somebody in the Government to take up the cudgels for them. Since I have been in office for the past four years I have had occasion to meet a number of deputations, but I do not think I ever met a more intelligent or reasonable crowd of men to present their case than the deputations of mining men from Bell Island, and so do I say that it is absolutely incorrect that these men are not able to look after their own affairs. They can put their case before the Company or the Government or anybody else intelligently and I am perfectly satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will agree with me. I do not think it is necessary to have a representative of the Government at the conference and it is time enough for the Government to interfere when negotiations give signs of breaking down. I told Mr. Hickey, the Secretary of the miners' deputation this morning that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was not going over to the conference, as I did not consider there should be any Government interference while negotiations were pending. That is the position we take tonight and that is the position we will take tomorrow, and I am satisfied that the people of Bell Island are well able to represent themselves at this conference.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Chairman, I fear the Prime Minister misunderstood my remarks. I don't mean to convey that the miners of Bell Island were anything but intelligent. I agree with the Prime Minister that they are intelligent, but it is difficult to expect the ordinary workmen of any community to be able to talk finance with experts in that line and that is practically what the conference will be about. The men of Bell Island know their own affairs best and

can talk on them perhaps more intelligently than any member of this House can. Now up to last night Besco reported 300,000 tons of ore since the beginning of this year, and this is the banner year for shipments thus far because they have orders on hand now for 800,000 tons, and possibly if they had got that 150,000 to England they would have been that much in excess of the 1,100,000 they have already sold, and I am not far out when I say that this is going to be a record productive year for Bell Island. Now I am the individual who made the statement that the Company makes \$1 a ton profit, and I make the same statement again now. If they say they are not making it, let them produce the proof by laying on the table of this House the contracts they have made. They may talk about the bondholders looking for interest on bonds, but we must remember that Bell Island Mines are owned by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company who have many irons in the fire. Consequently, they may make ten millions on Bell Island and lose fifteen millions somewhere else. The first mortgage bonds are guaranteed by the D. I and S. Company and they are responsible for the interest on these bonds and they can take their proceeds from Bell Island and place them to their credit in the banks in Canada, and when they sell a cargo of ore the money is not transferred from Germany to a bank in Newfoundland and we do not know what the Company is getting for the ore.

However, the Prime Minister has seen fit to lay down the gauntlet and tells us that the Government is not going to send a representative to that conference. Well, I suppose that ends it. I feel I have done my duty in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government and I probably

helped to avert serious trouble. The Government, in my opinion, should take more interest in this thing because it is a national matter and it is to the Government that everyone looks, in the event of a strike happening, for a solution.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, I suppose it would be somewhat in the nature of a discourtesy towards the Finance Minister if I did not make a sufficiently reasonable criticism of the Budget, at least from the standpoint of quantity and quality. At this stage I do not propose to go into the Minister's figures. That has been done by the two speakers who have preceded me and that is the reason why I shall not deal with his figures tonight.

Yesterday some reference was made here to land sharks and there was an innuendo thrown out I think that some of them were in this House, and as honorable members know the particular brand of shark that was referred to in the notice of petition brought before the House in connection with that Shark Bill is of the sleepy type, and I have no desire to even insinuate that members of this House in any wise might be termed somnolentus microcephalus. We have reached the closing time of this Legislature and it may be that a thorough review of our financial affairs might be to advantage, but I am not satisfied that I am sufficiently competent to give that financial summary to impose myself upon your time for such a period as would be required to do so properly. There are, however, one or two items in the Speech of the Finance Minister to which I would like to make reference. As I said before, I do not propose to deal with figures. The history of this administration in respect of finance is simply one of taking in money thru

the Custom House or other revenue and Loan Bills, and paying it out; taking in, in my opinion, more than you should, and as is the case with all governments, spending all you can get in and more besides. It is the sort of policy that might be likened to a cashier and cash box, simply receiving money that comes into the office and handing it in at the end of the evening. I do not suggest that there is any possibility that the present Government has fraudently misappropriated any of the funds that may be entrusted to them, but I fear they are open in many cases to a charge of misappropriation, although not fraudulent perhaps.

Reference is always made particularly upon the Budget Speech and Supply to the codfishery of this country and I feel that whether the criticism be good or bad, whether just or unjust, whether it is adequate or inadequate, nevertheless, criticism is always justified when dealing with matters which pertain to the staple industry of the Colony. We have large industries such as Bell Island, which has been referred to here tonight, and I may say in passing, as I understand the position on Bell Island today from the very brief remarks of the honorable member for Ferryland and the remarks in the reply made by the Prime Minister, my idea as to the course taken by the Prime Minister is that it is absolutely correct. I agree with him that interference between employer and employee is really unwise until it has been found that they cannot reach an agreement between themselves, and I have the temerity to make this statement here tonight, young and inexperienced as I may possibly be. I think under similar circumstances I would have taken exactly the same position in connection with the Bell Island situation at the moment as the Prime Minister has

done. If it be found at a later day that the miners and the National Trust Company cannot come to an agreement there would then be a cause for the government to step in, but first let them try and settle their own differences. Now to get back to the question of the fisheries. I feel that the Government is open to a justifiable charge of failure to deal with the fisheries of this country. I admit, of course, that it is not at all easy to formulate a policy in connection with the fisheries that is certain of success. I remember some years ago an attempt was made by an administration to deal with the standardisation of codfish and to deal with export. I believe that if that scheme had been carried out as to the standardisation of codfish it would have been of advantage to the Colony. I believe that the Act under which these fishery regulations were passed in 1920 was a step in the right direction. The regulations made under the Act were possibly not all they might have been. In fact, I make the statement now that they were not. I have sufficient knowledge of political economy to make the statement that it is utterly useless to attempt to interfere with the law of supply and demand. No set of men in the world, no legislators, unless they control the supply can regulate the price. But that attempt, while unsuccessful, was nevertheless a courageous attempt to do something, and even if no good accrued from a financial standpoint, we at least got that much experience. I believe the one mistake was the attempt to fix the price, and I had something to do with breaking the regulations and I believe the one substantial mistake in them was that I do believe that these regulations were well-intentioned and I believe that the Honorable the Prime Minister is of the same opinion, as I

understand he was associated with them himself, and that he eventually saw light and saw that they were wrong is apparent from the fact that he subsequently disassociated himself from them; and even if you look at it from the worst possible standpoint, if you say they utterly failed, which I am not prepared to admit, there was anyhow an attempt to do something, and, after all, they tell us that it is better to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all. This Government, I say, has not even made the attempt. If they had made an attempt, and made it honestly, they could come into the House and place their cards on the table and say, we did our best, possibly we have not had sufficient brains to develop the best scheme but we used what we had and the fact that we failed is no evidence that we were not doing our utmost for the country. But that you haven't done. Though you promised to do it, you have made no attempt whatever to improve the fisheries; and the Government knows that no industry in the country, not even the industry on Bell Island where the miners are so ill paid, needs attention to try and improve it in every possible way more than the fisheries of our country. I speak from my own knowledge in reference to the Labrador fishery. As the Honorable Minister of Finance knows, the fishermen from my district constitute practically half the stationers on the Labrador, and I know their experiences the past couple of years; terrible experiences; very few have squared accounts and I doubt if any of them made any money. I say, therefore, that the Government have failed and failed miserably, for they have made no attempt whatever to do anything. I withdraw that statement. They did do something. They provided in the Loan Bill last year the sum of \$200,000 for the en-

encouragement of the fisheries and that I understand is still in the Treasury, and the codfishery meantime is left to get on in the best way they can. As to the paper industry the only remark that I have to make in that connection is that the undertaking which was entered into on behalf of the Colony last summer in connection with the International Paper Co. has not yet arrived at fruition. I very much feared that. I voiced my fears in that respect last year. I took the position that we were entering into an agreement too hastily and that we were not justified on the face of things in making such a sweeping agreement and placing our security in an inferior position. I still believe I am right in that respect and I still believe in regard to that, that the effect of the agreement will not be seen for three or four years yet.

Now just a word or two as to the Railway. I believe that the Government was compelled to expend considerable money on the railway the past three or four years. There was nothing left for them to do and I agree that they have improved that railroad considerably, but when the Prime Minister says that the deficit on the railway this year is only \$300,000, he is telling something that on the face of it is true and in reality is not true. It must be remembered that every dollar expended by the Colony on the railway has to have interest paid at the rate of 5 per cent, and whether you pay that out of the resources of the railway or whether you charge it to the railway account or not, it is nevertheless an expense of the railway and therefore you cannot say you have a deficit of only \$300,000, while you have got to pay out of railway resources not merely running expenses on the road but you have got to pay railway capital account charges as well. It makes no

difference, I admit, in the long run where you charge it, but if you want to see where the railway stands you have got to make your charges to accounts so. It is all expense of the railway. There is no question at all about that. Buchan's Mine is referred to in the Speech. I cannot do much more than repeat myself last year in that connection. Buchan's Mine is likely to be a very large industry. Buchan's is expected to be a tremendously profitable industry. The Company are unable to estimate the profits that must accrue to the shareholders.

I pointed out here last year that according to the report of the company itself at that time their holdings down there were of tremendous value. They made application to the Legislature for sweeping concessions in the nature of tariff reduction and free entries, and I repeat again that we were railroaded through. With fear of losing labour in mind, these people were given the concessions for which they asked us. On one occasion, when certain information was asked for from this side of the House and the company was applied to, I understand that those seeking for that information were told bluntly and brutally that the information would not be given. We were told to put the Bill through as it stood or not at all. I am not much of a gambler but I have played poker and I know a little of the game of bluff and from experience I thought the Finance Minister would know more of it than apparently he did. I feel that the Government was bluffed out on that occasion. I am satisfied that if he had refused the concessions for Buchan's Mine they would nevertheless have continued and developed the areas. Not only is the original site a valuable one but thousands and thousands of acres have since been taken up around

there and the new licensees and today endeavouring to develop these as well as Buchans Mine. I am satisfied that if we had told the American Smelters people that if they wanted to develop the mine they could go ahead and do so as long as they carried out the Crown Lands Act, they would have carried out everything satisfactorily. If we told them that they could go out there and go ahead and develop the property it would have meant a considerable amount to this colony. As it stands to-day, the colony gets nothing except what is called the 25 cent labour. Yet we have the expense of maintaining order in that section; the expense of keeping a Court House out there; we will have to keep a Magistrate, and there is a Police Constable there. The Finance Minister has already got a Customs Officer there; there is a Post Office there and a Telegraph Office. All additional overhead expense added to the concessions that Buchans Mine has already got and the only thing that we get in return is whatever duties may be collected at Buchans Mine.

As to the coal fields, I would like myself to be able to say that I am hopeful but it is just as well to be honest, I am not. We need three hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal. There is supposed to be forty million, eighty million, one hundred million tons of coal there — it will make very little difference to the cost of transportation. It must be remembered that that coal is inland. It has not only to be lifted to the head of the pit, be loaded on railway car but it has to be transported to the sea and again loaded. It cannot help costing more and just how is it going to compete with North Sydney. Now if our consumption is only three hundred and fifty thousand tons that is only a part, what are we going to do with the

rest of the output? Where are we going to sell it? You are not going to sell it in Cape Breton nor in the United States. You are going to send it to England or Wales, for that is like the old story of "carring coal to Newcastle". Where are you going to dispose of the surplus quantity of coal which there will be if you are going to produce coal in any quantity at St. George's. I hope that the hopes of the Minister of Finance will be verified but to be honest about the matter I must say that I am very doubtful.

I have only one other matter with which I would like to deal for a moment and perhaps as it is the only portion of the few remarks that I have made here to which the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs might take objection. I would draw his attention to me in order to give him the opportunity of answering me if what I say is incorrect.

He tells us.

(Reads)

I ask the pardon of the Committee for quoting those figures but that is my only reference.

The Finance Minister in this particular case has fallen into the error which came to several of his predecessors, and I want to tell the Finance Minister here and now that his trade balance is entirely ineffective on account of the fact that it is not the slightest evidence of the condition of the colony's trade. It is not of the slightest value as a test of whether the country is prosperous or otherwise. And in a short time I will prove to the satisfaction of the Minister himself that what I say is correct.

In the first place it is a notorious fact that the value put by the Customs Department upon export entries is not always accurate. I think it will be further admitted that the tendency

is to raise the value above the real worth than to place it below.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I might say that the opposite direction is the case.

MR. BRADLEY.—Experts tell me that is not the direction and I see no reason why these experts should be wrong. It is your word against the word of some gentlemen that I have no reason to doubt, for they are persons of account. While I admit that now they are not agreed. In my opinion exports which go out of the country set at a certain value do not return into the country at the same value at all. It is the same thing exactly as paying interest on your loan, just exactly the same thing in the long run. The money goes out.

If the industries of this country are held by foreign capitalists, living in foreign countries, responsible to and being a part of foreign corporations, whatever profit may be made will not go into the coffers of Newfoundland but into the coffers of the parent company in the foreign country.

These industries were manufacturing here but the Finance Minister was very dense when he said that the International Paper Company exported some millions of dollars worth of paper last year. That was not an advantage to the trade of the country because that concern is controlled by the International Paper Company of New York and the bond holders are foreigners and a good deal of the money which apparently belongs to the trade of the colony and returnable to the colony as such really went into the pockets of foreign companies and shareholders and not back into Newfoundland at all.

From that standpoint a great deduction must be made in the amount of export trade before arriving at a

true estimate of what that export trade really is.

Now in the next place, and this is really a more serious matter, the difference between import trade and export trade takes no account whatever of local production and local consumption, and I want to say this, that where there is a good local production and local consumption that provides further for increased importation, and do you mean to tell me that profit made from local production and local consumption is to your detriment? I cannot submit to that. If in the course of trade \$100 is made by a man while out of the country. He comes back to the country with his money and it is considered a loss according to the system of the Finance Minister, but the man has made \$100. Local production when there is local consumption is going to swell the import trade and it is this advance of importation over exportation which the Minister of Finance and Customs regards as a calamity.

Now there is another point, which after all will resolve itself into a very simple illustration or a couple of illustrations to show the absolute falsity of arranging the profit over revenue in connection with the foreign market, that because of the fact that exporting more than importing it is of doubtful possibility.

Let me give you an illustration. In the case of the Finance Minister himself. He is an exporter of fish and we assume that he has in his store on Water Street some ten thousand quintals of fish. Ten thousand quintals of fish to sell here or in the foreign market. The value here is \$5.00 a quintal, so in the city of St. John's his fish is worth \$50,000. He decides that possibly he would do better in the city of New York and he sends it there, and through his skill,

and I understand that he is a skilful exporter, he obtains \$6.00, in other words, for the whole cargo, \$60,000. Instead of bringing that back in cash he decides to bring it back in goods and he brings into this Colony \$60,000 worth of goods. According to the Customs returns this Colony is \$10,000 out and he had made a profit of \$10,000.

Now to make it worse, suppose that you put the goods on a vessel and forgot to insure or take the risk on it and the export vessel is lost. Your goods are gone. According to the Customs returns goods have been exported at the value of \$50,000. That \$50,000 is profit to the credit of the Colony's trade, and the Colony is \$50,000 better off, according to your principle. The country is \$50,000 better off and my honorable friend here has lost \$60,000. But I am just putting that hypothetical position to you to show you your unsound position. The whole position is unsound and the balance of trade is no index of the conditions of the trade of the country, and I understand that Water Street is supposed to be dead today. Why, sir, I do not think that this question of trade balance has even its usual effect in this case. Ordinarily speaking, when a trade balance favors a country, it has an effect upon currency. In this country we have no currency at all. Our currency is Canadian currency, and the value of our coinage is decided purely and simply upon the value of the Canadian exchange. In other words, so far as we are concerned, is dependent upon the trade balance, not of Newfoundland, but of Canada. I made those few remarks in connection with this trade balance, because I am sick and tired of seeing the same old fallacy trotted out year after year.

Now I can not congratulate the Minister on his handling of the fin-

ances of the country during the past four years. That his figures are correct I have no reason at the present moment to doubt. At least he ought to have made an endeavor to reduce expenditure in the country. I regret to say that in place of reducing expenditure, every single supply bill has meant an increase not merely from the standpoint of capital expenditure but also in the ordinary business of the country. It is a notorious fact that this country has not been able to stand these increases. No effort has been made to bring about any decrease. No effort has been made to place us in such a position that we might be remunerative to the staple industries of the country. No effort has been made to reduce those overhead expenses which the country suffers under today.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking on this Budget, but listening to some of the remarks that were made in connection with some of the subjects that were brought up, I decided that I would give my quota towards the general debate. First of all as I have stated in this House before on one or two occasions, I am not a supporter of the policy of borrowing money. Instead of borrowing, we should worry along without it as long as we could. Goodness knows we have cause of sorrow for the borrowing that has been done for us in this country. It may be considered by a great many that we have the right to borrow, but morally, anyhow, I question whether we have the right to saddle future generations with a millstone round their necks. It is a bad policy in a country, no matter what is being done in any other country of the world. Now it might be right enough to say that we must borrow and spend on capital account and that the Government cannot be

carried on without borrowing money on certain occasions, to find the wherewithal to carry on the civil service of the country. Personally I would say that it would be better for this country if we had no capital. I am of the opinion that it would be better if we had no government as long as we had a police force. And I am also of the opinion, sir, that if this state of conditions continues, we will have a Mussolini come along to take charge of affairs.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—He cannot come too soon.

CAPT. RANDELL.—It has happened in nearly every country of the world. There are moments in the history of most countries when a Mussolini is due. He is about due here. It is right enough to spend money if you had it to spend, but to go ahead and borrow money on a visionary policy is not good business. We speculated on tourists coming in here and bring a lot of money into the country. We spent two million dollars on highroads in the hope that they might come along and give us something to pay the interest on those highroads. I have heard a member during the course of his remarks make comment on the fisheries of this country, and also on the fishery regulations. Now during the five years that I have been representing a district along with my colleagues, I felt on several occasions the necessity of giving my views of the fishery regulations. The fishery regulations, sir, have been blamed for a lot of money lost and failures in this country. Of course, it is easy to blame, but in my opinion the fishery regulations, in some parts anyway, were a benefit to the country. These regulations were instituted, I think, in the early part of 1920. I happened to go to Brazil to represent my firm there, and not the government, as I

have heard it stated. I happened to live in Brazil for about ten months during 1920 and 1921 and I knew just what went on there in connection with the fishery regulations of this country. The price of fish as stipulated by the regulations went up that year in Brazil at the opening of the season to one hundred shillings a drum. The opening price, as was told me by several buyers in Brazil that season, would be about eighty-five shillings a drum. And I do believe that if it had not been for the regulations no more than that would have been paid. The honorable the Prime Minister and the Hon. the Minister of Customs know what I am saying is about correct. Now, then, up to about February there were about ninety thousand drums sold in Brazil, and even a little later than that, at one hundred shillings a drum. So that meant a difference of about £75,000 of a gain we obtained in that market over what we would have had otherwise. That is what happened in Brazil. About March the regulations were raised, and the price was then stipulated to be less. Now I have heard people talking in this country about failures being due to the regulations. Well that may be. And they also claim that the regulations were a failure. It is a fact that nearly every merchant on Water Street the first time that those regulations were brought into force, were in favour of them, with the exception of perhaps three men.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think these three men were Mr. Hickman, Mr. Grieve and myself.

CAPT. RANDELL.—The institution of these regulations was favored by the merchants on Water Street with the exception of a small minority. The price stipulated was claimed to be the cause of the failure, but there

were other factors that came in to bring the regulations into disrepute and to limit the price of fish outside of the regulations altogether. One of the greatest factors in the failure of the regulations was the dropping of the exchange with the different countries. In Brazil, about July or August, of that year, I think the exchange was about sixteen pence. In February it dropped down to about twelve. That meant, of course, that the buyer had to pay about 30 per cent more in his own money than he otherwise would. And, of course, the consumer could not afford to buy as much as formerly owing to the lessened value of his money.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You and I agree upon that. You cannot force the consumer to pay a price that he is not able to pay.

CAPT. RANDELL.—But people in this country must not forget that it was not altogether the regulations that were the cause of money being lost. Not only did that happen in Brazil, but I heard people say that they could have got sixty shillings for their fish and the regulations would not allow them to sell, but they would never have been offered sixty shillings had it not been for the regulations. I think that the Minister of Finance and Customs will bear me out in what I am saying.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I think I know something of what you say. But I know of a firm that had two cargoes in a country and was offered eighty shillings for them. But the regulations would not allow him to sell under eighty-five. These two cargoes of fish closed that firm up, and the name of that firm was Harris.

CAPT. RANDELL.—I dare say that is correct. But at the same time you must bear in mind that he would

never have been offered eighty shillings if there had been no regulations stipulating a higher price. Now I believe that the Minister of Finance will agree with me that had the exchange gone the other way in that country that the fish regulations would have been alright. They would have been the best thing in that respect ever introduced in this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—You can never fix the price of an article in a foreign country. The law of supply and demand governs the price of every commodity in any country today.

CAPT. RANDELL.—I think that probably my honorable friend is correct, but still there would have been more fish consumed in those cases that I speak of if the exchange had gone the other way, and consequently the price of fish would have been lower. Now, sir, I will drop that subject to just make reference to one other subject before I sit down. Although I am aware of the fact that though I may talk on the budget, there is nothing that I may say that is going to have much effect, regarding borrowing or otherwise. I would like to call the attention of the Government to one thing and that is the wages that the men are paid on Bell Island, Buchan's Mine and also in the paper industries of the country.

In reference to the wages paid to the workmen at Bell Island and at Buchans Mine. On account of this cheap rate of pay you are not likely to have outside laborers come into the country to work at those industries, except you get them from Europe. You cannot get them from the United States or Canada for \$2.50 a day, and as I think that \$2.50 a day is altogether too little for our people to be paid at Bell Island and at Buchan's Mine because I know that these concerns can pay more if they

want to. I hold the opinion now that our Newfoundland workmen engaged in the industries referred to are the lowest paid in the whole Western Hemisphere.

I listened with interest to the Colonial Secretary in connection with the money voted for highroads the coming year and I think it is about time for the Highroads Commission to take into consideration some of the places north where the people not alone suffer from being without any means of communication, but they are without roads or the facilities to get around. It was lately brought to my notice that in British Harbor, Trinity Bay, a horse while walking along a main road went thru a bridge and was so injured that it had to be shot. Similar conditions obtain in other places and poor people are continually losing their horses and cattle on account of bad roads and bridges. There is a section of road between New Hr. and Heart's Content that I think the Highroads Commission could very well turn their attention to. When Dr. Anderson receives a call he has sometimes to take a motor boat to get up to Hearts Content on account of the impassable condition of the road for a motor car. Now I think that is pretty near home and we should start in this year without going far afield.

I think also, sir, that some attention should be given to the fisheries. Perhaps I could be able to make some suggestions whereby a whole lot of fishermen of this country would benefit if the government were inclined to give them some help; but it is a very difficult problem to handle, I admit, and have all the fishermen satisfied. There are so many factors to be considered that it is almost impossible to construct some policy whereby everybody would benefit. However, I think it is high time the Government

did something with that \$200,000 that was voted for the encouragement of the fisheries. I believe the Government could find a way with this money at their disposal for the encouragement of the fisheries to satisfy everyone, if they wanted to. Whether they are afraid or not I do not know. However, I hope that this Government will try and do something before they go out of power to help out the fishermen.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would not be doing justice to those who have gone to the sealfishery this spring, and the sealers of this country, if I allowed this session to go through without saying something in reply to what has been said in that connection this session. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to have much to say on the Budget Speech as I am not one of those who like to hear myself in the last session of the House so as my speech may be broadcasted for political purposes. But I have heard certain statements made in connection with the sealfishery this spring and I deem it my duty to try and contradict these statements for at least 95 p.c. of them are not true. It has been stated here from the beginning of the session that sealers were starved practically at the sealfishery and that the food they got was of the rottenest kind, and also that it was improperly cooked and that some steamer before it came in had no food at all. Personally I know Mr. Chairman that all this talk on the Opposition side of this House has been thrown at me. I have the misfortune probably through no fault of my own to have been a sealer in this country since I was ten years old, and finally after forty years I succeeded in being able to stand on the floors of this House as Minister of Marine and Fisheries of this colony, and of

course it is the same old story, the same old thing going on at the present time that has been going on in this country the past fifty years probably one hundred years, if a fisherman of this country through energy and hard work and perseverance happen to get ahead and get his head out of water, no one in this country is more anxious to down him than those representing the fishermen of this colony.

Nevertheless this is the closing session of the Monroe Government after four years. During the four years I have had a lot of abuse from the other side of the House and insult, but I have taken all in good parts, but Sir, the time will soon arrive when the people of this country will judge a man on his merits and in a few short months, six months at the greatest no doubt, this country will have a chance to throw back in the teeth of those that have been throwing across the House that I have not done my duty for the fishermen of the country and the sealers. It is true that since I first became Minister of Marine and Fisheries I have not been able to do probably what I would like to do, but I challenge any man who ever stood on the floors of this House of Assembly to say that he has tried to do more and has spent more time, and has put more men in the country through his hands in the four years than the person now speaking. I have given all my time, not only day time but night time whenever they needed it. I have done the best my knowledge allowed me to do and my strength allowed me to do. Now then during the past four years or three years previous to this year very little was said in this House in reference to the sealers of this country, but now when we are about to embark on a general election it seems every person in this House is dying about the fishermen

and sealers of the country, but show me the man or give me the man that will do as much the first year he is elected in this House as he will do the last year before a general election.

In reference to the sealers having starved this spring: now probably a man in politics as I am, may go down to the District of Bonavista Bay, and if I do stay and go down there on the general election campaign it will be the north side of Bonavista Bay where most of the outport sealers come from and these are the people I shall have to look to for support and probably the statement I am going to make here now, you may say will be a wrong statement to make especially if I intend to go look for support from the sealers on the north side of Bonavista Bay, but I care not, I am going to speak right, and I am going to make a statement in reference to the food aboard the ship I was on at any rate, and whether the sealers on the north side of the bay like it or not I will take my chance. I say that the food the sealers got on the Ungava this spring at the sealfishery was as good as ever I got since I came into this world even at my own house at the present time or during the last four years, and I say too that 99 out of 100 men on the Ungava will say that the food was quite satisfactory and better than they ever expected to get, but we have in this country a few men that are only too glad to come to Mr. Brown, or Mr. Bradley, or Mr. Scammell or Mr. Hickman to say that the food was bad for political purposes, nothing else. It is true there has been a statement or two made here that was correct in a way. I think the Honourable Member for Trinity said that some of the pork was sour. That is true in a certain degree but I am glad to say that there was enough pork on board to leave the sour pork when it was opened and put

it aside and open barrels that were not sour and there was quite enough. The most careful man will sometimes buy meat that is supposed to be good meat and will find that he may strike a certain bad barrel.

It is also true that some ships when they came in were getting short of food. The Ungava was getting short of food when she came in but not one meal was missed from the time she went out until she came back. We had the same meals when we came in as when we went out with the exception of potatoes. The Ungava this spring had 160 barrels of potatoes and we had fresh seal meat the day before we came in for every sealer aboard. Potatoes as you all know are things that sometimes go bad, and that was what happened to the potatoes, but I care not what he said, whether the grub was short or wasn't short, as far as the men are concerned or as far as others are concerned, if because of anything I say here the sealers don't feel like voting for me when I ask them for it, and if the merchants in town don't like any statement I make here that is truthful, and turn me down, why if I can't make a living in this country I will go to some other country and make it. I went to the sealfishery for fifteen or twenty years and never saw a piece of soft bread. We ate hard tack all the time, and never saw a pound of sugar—drank all molasses—and never saw a pound of fresh meat; ate salt meat, pork and duff three times a week.

What do you find now? They have beans regularly; fish and brewis in the mornings three times a week; fresh meat three times a week, for at least the first few weeks that we are out, and have about 3,000 pounds of seal meat and jams of all kinds three times a week. What more do you want? I can speak here for the

sealers and say that it is not the sealers at all that are making the complaints, it is a few disgruntled politicians doing it for political purposes. But, Mr. Chairman, I do say that probably there was not grub enough on the large ships this spring if we did get caught in the ice and had to stay out till the middle of May. But I can account for that. We had the sealers on board this year seven days earlier than I know the sealers have stayed on board ship before, and the men were fed as soon as they struck town. Other years they wouldn't be until they were signed on; and we had an extra 75 men more than the last eight or ten years, except the Beothic. Therefore, in consequence, the food became short. There was baked on board the Ungava this year 12,500 loaves of bread; one barrel of flour baked in soft bread every day during the spring and we had on the Ungava four different departments. There was the port bunker with 56 men and the starboard bunker where another 56 men stayed and these two 56 men never ate a cake of hard tack on board the ship only when they would go on the ice, and of course it would be no use taking soft bread on the ice, but the 75 or 80 men in the after hold went through quite a lot of bread. But I say those charges are unfair to the sealers and unfair to the owners, because the sealers are not grumblers. Why if you have a small family of your own you will always find a growler in reference to the grub and so you cannot expect with 250 sealers but that you will find some one who will start to growl. It was only to-day Mr. Hicks was in my office. He is cook and inspector on board the Beothic and I asked him if they were short of food and he said that they were beginning to be short when they got in. They had enough until they got in but they

were practically out when they got in.

Some people argue that the killing of old seals is detrimental to the seal fishery. I know different. I am no Will Jones, I am merely a plain man, but I cannot agree protecting old seals is a great help to the seal fishery. I will put it plainly to you and in a way that fishermen would say it. If you wanted to increase the population of this country would you kill the young of the country and leave the old alone? and if you kill every young seal pupped every year and leave the old alone naturally the seal fishery is gone. But I say, Mr. Chairman that if you want the seal fishery to increase for five or six years allow no young seals to be killed for three years and then there will be an increase each year I am sure of at least half a million seals. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you want to increase the sealing fishery there is only one way and that is by closing down and having a three year close season. But personally as far as I am concerned I am of the opinion that there are just as many seals out there now as there were twenty years ago and I think my opinion should be worth as much as any man on the floors of this House of Assembly.

Now then, Sir, in reference to the seal fishery dying out, there have been statements made on the floors of this House of Assembly since opening, that if something is not done the seal fishery will be a thing of the past.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is this, that we have men getting upon the floors of this House and making statements for the purpose of putting his ideas, and not in any way for the benefit of the people of this country; that such is not the case.

I noticed in the papers this year there was one man by the name of Penny, who I know, who went to the

seal fishery for the first time last year and when he came in you wouldn't know but that he had been out for five hundred years. I was out to the seal fishery this spring and I brought in a few seals; I brought in a fair share, but I offer to bet, Mr. Chairman, that if we had four hundred vessels out we would have brought in over four hundred thousand seals, and young seals at that.

I have a statement of statistics here of the seal fishery ever since back as far as 1863. In 1870 up to 1880 we had twenty steamers going to the seal fishery and averaged 225,000 seals per spring; from 1880 to 1890 averaged 223,00 seals per spring for twenty two ships, from 1893 for the next ten years averaged 217,000 seals and from 1900 to 1920 they averaged 224,000 and this spring we were 240,000 seals including the Young Harp. Twenty ships went to the seal fishery ten years ago and only managed to bring in on an average 220,000 seals but today with ten ships we go out and manage to bring in 225,000 to 230,000. Where is the decline? I fail to see it. These are not my statements they are records of the story and work of the seal fishery back to 1863. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a great cry that the seal fishery should be protected. I say by all means protect it if you can, but in my opinion, the same man who has protected the seal fishery for years can manage the job much better than any of us can. I have been to the seal fishery and I know that some unseen person looking after the seal fishery for years can manage the job

The conditions have changed altogether. This year when the "Young Harp" was taking her seals fifty miles north of the Funks we were one hundred miles South East in a patch of thirty five thousand seals. Never the like known before. It is a common

fact and common property of everybody that reads the papers that on the 9th day of March old seals were noticed down in Green Bay. No person ever heard talk of the like. I have no knowledge what they were doing and apparently can get no one to tell me.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—In following the herring.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Well, I hope they got a lot of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to proceed much further. There was a lot of talk made in the different statements made by different members. I don't know how much to believe; I am satisfied that a good deal of what has been said by the opposition members is not to be taken seriously, some may be, possibly five per cent was well meant but the rest was mostly political.

I don't think it is necessary for me to say much more about the fisheries but I would refer to this part of it. Now people have some serious complaint to make about the lobster fishery or some other fishery and they go to work and write an account to the papers. The proper place is the Department of Marine and Fisheries and it is their duty to see if a complaint is made if there is any truth in it or not. A few days ago I saw by the Evening Telegram that lobsters were being sold in the city of St. John's and that some under eight inches were being sold. I wrote the Editor of the Evening Telegram at least ten days ago and asked him to give me the information about this and up to the present time I have never received a reply from him. Only to-day that I got the truth of the matter and it was that a reporter of the Evening Telegram saw a lobster that was no more than six inches long and when the Editor of the Telegram found that out he

put it in the paper and only found out afterwards that the reporter didn't know any better than to measure the body of the lobster and not the tail at all and everything with a body under eight inches was under the law.

I say, Sir, no person is more ready to try and help the sealers in every respect and form than I am and if any report was justly made to me I would do my utmost to try and trace it and see if it was correct. I think Mr. Bradley made a statement that some men told him something and he promised to tell the Prime Minister and up to the present time I have not heard his reply. Mr. Brown made a statement that the food was not cooked properly. I would not say it was. I know it was cooked alright on board of my own ship. If it was badly cooked somewhere else and Mr. Brown will be good enough to give me the cook's name and the boat I will see to it that he will not get to the seal fishery in that position next spring.

If I am not in the Government next spring, and I go to the seal fishery as the skipper of a vessel, and I see that conditions are not as they should be. I will not get up on the floors of this House of Assembly and say that certain men told me a certain thing, I will go down to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and make my complaint to him, and see if it can be remedied. But I will say this that if I go into politics the next election I will have a seat on the floors of this House next election.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Chairman; I am sure that everybody enjoyed Capt. Winsor's speech. We could not but enjoy it. I was not in the House but I heard that Capt Winsor made the statement, that what I had said with regard to the food on the sealing vessels was all wrong, and was only said for political purposes. Now I want to

inform the Capt. and everybody else in the hearing of my voice that I did not want to say this for political purposes. But if Capt. Winsor has a right to talk for the owners, then I have the right to talk for the men. That is what I am here for. Now when you talk about the seal fishery I will not get up against you but when forty men of one ship and fifty of another tell me that the food is not cooked and conditions are not as they should be, I have a perfect right to believe them. Because the complaint came in last year from one or two of the ships and you were told it in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I cannot find one man to make that statement you made.

MR. BROWN.—For a reason, because the men that made that statement would not make it in your presence. He was afraid that he might not get a berth next year from you. That report that I made in this House tonight I got from forty sealers on the Beothic and fifteen on the Ungava. Surely I can speak after forty men and if they make a statement I can believe them. They are not all wrong. And I do not say that for political purposes. I may say that I do not have to do that for political purposes, because I am just as strong in my district as you are in yours. And I have just as much chance of coming back to this House as you have.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman; I did not intend to speak on the motion before the Chair, but I cannot very well refrain from saying a word or two in view of what has been said by previous speakers. Before referring to other matters I must say that I listened with a good deal of attention to the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was a very practical speech and I do not know of any subject that we could give as much atten-

tion to as the cod and seal fisheries. After all it is the staple industry of the country and when a man with the experience of Capt. Winsor gets up and talks, we know that he is talking about something that he has some knowledge of. I was very glad to hear Capt. Winsor make a comparison between the conditions which existed in the seal fishery of former years and that which has existed during more recent years. Capt. Winsor briefly referred to the conditions that the sealers had to endure, in the early days, particularly in the matter of food and accommodation on board the ships, and he compared them in very appropriate language with the conditions prevailing to-day. Of course those of us who have been members of this House during recent years know quite well that Capt. Winsor meant to pay a tribute to Sir William Coaker, who was responsible for bringing up regulations in connection with the seal fishery. As the years go by we try to improve, and I am glad to hear that remark from a man of Capt. Winsor's standing, and I presume, as he certainly was not imbued with any desire to throw any bouquets, at the man who was perhaps more instrumental than any one else in bringing about the changed conditions to which he refers.

In the meantime I feel that Capt. Winsor will admit that there is an indication to-day and perhaps for the last few years to grow a little lax with regard to the carrying out of those rules and regulations. Now and then we have to buck up a little. There is always that tendency to fall away. We do not expect the Minister to be so particularly interested in the carrying out the strict letter of the law regarding the seal fishery as were those that preceded him. Take for instance the seal fishery. During the

last couple of years I have had quite a number of men come to my house after coming in from the seal fishery. Some of them from my district and some from other districts. They have told me that conditions have altogether changed during recent years. Now I can quite understand the sealers in the Ungava which the Minister himself commands not making complaints to him. They do not want to offend the man from whom he has his berth. I think that Capt. Winsor would be the first to hear of any grievance from any member of the crew, but when it comes to six hundred men and most of them having only a brief acquaintance with the Capt, they do not feel like coming along and talking about their grievances. Perhaps they prefer to come to me.

I was very interested in what the Capt. had to say in regard to the depletion or otherwise of the herd. He quoted some figures going back to 1870 when we first have a sealing fleet. When the fleet brought back in the neighbourhood of 220,000 seals. However I do not think that we ought to take a great deal of courage from that. I do not think that we ought to be influenced by the fact that in 1870, 1871 or 1872, the sealing fleet of those years brought in 220,000 seals, and that now in 1928 with eleven steamers going to the seal fishery, with much better power than the sealing vessels of that time, they have brought in 227,000. I would like for the Capt. to go back to the years of 1833, 1834 or 1836, and the Hon gentleman will find that with a fleet of that time consisting of not one steamer, but all sailing vessels, they brought in in 1833, 586,622 seals, in 1834, 565,284, and in 1836, 530,000. And then for several years down the line they had 500,000. I admit that at that time they had four hundred chances of get-

ting seals against about twelve now, but it goes to show that there was a much larger voyage brought in earlier than can be got now. Of course the question arises then as to whether the herd is being depleted or not. We have heard various reports from people who are not very experienced sealers. We have heard of liners going across the Atlantic and running into miles and miles of seals, estimated at hundreds of thousands, that the sealing fleet did not see at all. I heard this year that the Young Harp got her seals in altogether a different latitude than where the sealing fleet was. I understand that they saw a very large herd of seals estimated at one hundred thousand. If that is true then the main fleet missed the main patch.

I have no intention of talking at any length on the Budget, for the simple reason that I have not even read it, as I was out of town and only got back yesterday and therefore I am not in a position to discuss the Budget intelligently. There is one thing that struck me, now that the session is drawing to a close, and that is Mr. Monroe's honesty. Despite our political differences, one has got to admire him for his frankness and straight-forwardness. I have heard him express himself both in the House and at various functions and the one outstanding feature I noticed about him has been his honesty to admit his mistakes. Besides, Mr. Monroe, after his four years' experience as head of the Government, has a different opinion of his predecessors in office than he did have. However, there is a fundamental difference in political parties, and, personally I do not agree with the policy of the Monroe administration. I feel that they have made serious mistakes and I do not think the present Prime Minister

will admit that, because it would not serve any good purpose for him from a party standpoint and he would avoid many of the pitfalls he fell into during the past four years. The record of the present Government is not one that either the Prime Minister or his party can congratulate themselves on; but I am reminded at this juncture — and we must give credit where credit is due—that the Monroe Government did one good act and that was they gave the women of Newfoundland the franchise to vote. But, of course, it does not follow that the women would be refused the right to vote if the Liberal Government had been in power the past four years.

As a matter of fact, take the Re-Distribution Act. The Monroe Government took a leaf out of the book of the F.P.U., because that was a plank that the F.P.U. party intended to put into effect if they had been returned to power.

Now I feel that the fishermen and the wage earners of the country generally were treated very badly by the present administration. Already overburdened with taxation, the Monroe Government increased taxation by fifteen per cent three years ago. They spent all their revenue and when the additional fifteen per cent was not sufficient they went outside and borrowed more and spent that. The easiest thing in the world is to spend money and then go outside and borrow on the credit of the Colony.

Another matter that I would like to refer to is the fish regulations which have been ably dealt with by Capt. Randell, who spoke from experience; but it does not require to be a fish exporter to know that the fish regulations had some good points. I think the Prime Minister will admit that. Perhaps the only fish exporter who will not admit that in this House is

the Finance Minister, for reasons best known to himself. Now it is just as well for us to say that we are not going to adopt the idea of having airships and motor-cars, on the grounds that they are too modern and too up-to-date, as to say that we are not going to have fish regulations and standardisation, because every country in the world has adopted standardisation of their main products and have had the sanction of outside legislatures. The same should apply in Newfoundland regarding the standardisation of fish and regulating of shipments of that commodity; and by not falling in line with every advanced country in the world you are kicking against a principle.

Mr. Brown referred to the wholesale discrimination in connection with the expenditure on able-bodied relief. Well, the district that I have the honor to represent got \$7.55 as against an average of \$9,000 each for every other district. I feel sure that the Prime Minister will agree with me that it would have been much better if the Government had allowed these people who were unemployed around the country, to work on the roads, as by giving them something for nothing you were taking away their independence and pauperizing them. I believe that work could be done in every district, as our people as a rule would sooner work for their own living if given a chance, in preference to receiving dole.

That is, I think, a sound principle. All the people of the country should be treated as fairly and squarely as it is possible to treat them. The main object of my standing up now is to refer to a vote. I notice that a special grant for public works of \$250,000 is to be granted and as later when this matter comes before the House I may not perhaps be present, I want to discuss that for a moment. The Gov-

ernment puts in an item of \$250,000 for Public Works, and I quite agree with the Government in that. I do not know that \$250,000 could be spent in a better way than on our public works because it is well known that money for the various public works about the country is badly needed and up to the spending of the \$500,000 last year things were in a very bad way, and it is hard to measure the amount of benefit to the people of the country from the expenditure of that money. Wharves and bridges were falling to pieces, and no doubt great good and benefit resulted. Now when this is to be spent I am interested because of the money needed for my district. I happen to represent a district which is perhaps in a worse position than any other. It is right in the ocean, making it very difficult to keep up wharves, and we have a great many needs which I have to bring before the House now and again. I am going to ask the Prime Minister now if it is his intention to have that money spent impartially throughout the various districts represented by Opposition as well as members of the Government. Does he intend it to be treated as that was treated last year? Are Opposition members to recommend the expenditure of that money just as was done last year. I would like the Prime Minister to give his word, and if he does I am sure we will all be inclined to accept it. That is a question we are not quite satisfied on at the present moment and we are interested, of course, because we have so many problems. Things cannot be done without money, and we would like to ask the Prime Minister right now if he would not mind making a statement as to whether that is the intention of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I might say that the

Government have discussed the matter and their desire is to treat it exactly the same as the \$500,000 was treated last year. The position is somewhat different because the votes are now going out to the new electoral districts. That is the only way we can handle the matter; and we have a deal of confusion already owing to the local road grants being distributed in the new districts, and consequently there are certain districts that will be left absolutely alone and come into another district. The only way we can see that this can be handled is by a Committee formed by the Government to try and treat it by forgetting the new districts and rather treating it as the old districts were constituted before the Redistribution Bill, and make sure that recommendations that come in from Opposition members, that we gave every consideration to last year, will not be accepted if they are very apparently directed to the particular end of a district that is new to the member who proposes to stand for it, leaving neglected the portion of the district represented before and that may be represented by somebody entirely new at the next election. Our idea is, and our desire is, that all of the districts as formerly constituted shall be given the same consideration as they were when the \$500,000 was distributed.

MR. HIBBS.—I am very thankful for that explanation. If that is the intention of the Government I am sure every member on this side of the House as well as on the Government side will be satisfied. I don't see any other way that it can be handled other than by the system outlined because after all the whole country is represented by somebody on one side of the House or other and if it was going to be handled according to the new districts it would cause a good deal of

confusion and I think that treating it from the standpoint of the old electoral districts will be the best system. I am prepared to remain for any emergency that might arise in the district of Fogo. Last year in Twillingate Capt. Winsor and I discussed the matter of disposing of the share of \$500,000 but I was big enough if I may use the term and broad enough to say to Capt. Winsor, "You will probably be contesting the district on the North Side of Bonavista, which extends over the straight shore of Fogo and if you have any desire to handle that money, well then alright go ahead and I will handle the new district only, that I hope to be contesting next year." It was not for political purposes, but I feel after all we had to get down to that next year and it would be just as well for me to handle the district. It will have to be new districts next year so there would be no trouble under those circumstances even if the Government decided to divide on the basis of the new electoral districts. However I am in accord with the idea expressed by the Prime Minister and I am sure that will be satisfactory to us all. If I may be permitted to make such a request now, I know it is an unusual manner but the circumstances may allow it, I would like to ask the Prime Minister now, before I take my seat if he is not too busy to-morrow I would like for him to give me ten or fifteen minutes. I am very anxious and I am sure he is to help out for deserving fishermen and I want to get some understanding as to when it may be possible to fix the Fogo canal. I hope the Prime Minister will be able to say to-morrow to go ahead with that, and that will cover a multitude of sins in the present Government. Not only Fogo but other sections of the north of Bonavista Bay will benefit.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Possibly when the Hon. Member is in conference with Prime Minister he might ask him on my behalf also for something for the fishermen in Harbor Main for making of a harbor at Long Pond?

MR. HIBBS.—I want to support the matter brought up by the Hon. Minister. It is not unsimilar to the subject matter of my discussion. I have some knowledge of the necessity of that harbour at Long Pond as I was born in that vicinity. From the time when you leave Torbay right until you go to Holyrood you have not got one harbour; you have a long straight shore, and the people there are seriously handicapped and would be greatly benefitted by that harbour. Long Pond would make a splendid harbour. A great number of fishermen along that coast could use it and I do say that it is a very laudable thing for Mr. Woodford to make an effort to provide a harbour at Long Pond. I am sure if they had a harbour at Long Pond twenty years ago I am sure there would be a hundred motor boats along that portion of the coast by Manuels but the people have not been able to have them on account of conditions. I strongly endorse that request and I hope that Mr. Woodford will be able to secure sufficient money to complete the harbor at Long Pond. I strongly support that.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, my friend, Mr. Hibbs, has spoken very readily, not only for his district of Fogo, but also for the district of Harbor Main, and I shall be very pleased if, after I have said a few words, he will say something about the district of Fortune to this House and endeavor to advocate the spending of some money in that district.

At this late stage of the game, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to

begin any lengthy discussion of the Budget Speech presented by the Finance Minister and already subjected to the wise criticism that has emanated from this side of the House. The Budget has been discussed very extensively and the result one must come to when considering many of the facts contained in that Budget as pointed out by honorable members present in this House is that somebody should be put here to govern the affairs of the country, which the present Government is not able to do properly.

If I were inclined to criticise any part of this Budget or make an extensive reference to any one part more than another it would be to that part of the speech which deals with the present position of the railroad and the prospects of the railroad. I notice on page fifteen of the printed form of the Budget that the Finance Minister makes a reference to the railroad and to the minimum deficit, which he says, to the 20th of June, 1926, is \$300,000. I think it is a great pity in respect of the railroad undertaking, as you can look upon it as an important venture, a public undertaking, to have to admit, and when you get the facts fairly and face them squarely, that the local condition is bad and that the deficit is very much more than \$300,000.

Looking over the report of the Auditor General for this year speaking of the Government expenditure for last year, I was very much impressed by a remark he makes to the effect that to the date of writing of that report the railway had cast the country very nearly forty million dollars, as a matter of fact, thirty-seven million dollars. If that sum was capitalized at the low rate of 4% it would total an annual interest of one and a half million dollars. When you add to that the estimated deficit of \$400,000 the

costs of the mail service and steamer operations, we have an actual deficit in respect of the railway of upwards of a couple of million dollars. The railway offers one outstanding problem the country has to face now and in the future and in view of the cost to the country one is led to question whether the Government is wise in undertaking to spend over \$2,000,000 more money in improvements to that railway and add to the expenditure another \$100,000. I think that the railway costs us a great deal more now than we can afford to carry, and in the future, I hold, it will be the duty of successive Governments to reduce rather than increase the cost of that public service.

Now the main purpose of my rising to speak this morning, Mr. Chairman, was to make some reference to remarks that previously crossed the floors of this House in the course of the debate in respect of the report that was passed in to the Government of the day by the Tariff Commission of 1922-24. I was not present in the House when the remark was made but I understand it was to the effect that the Tariff Commission was responsible for the increase in duties that have taken place under the present Government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the honorable member, I might say that it was my remark and I have simply one thing to tell him. It was really bringing the 25 per cent and 10 per cent surtax and consolidating them and there was not very much difference. It was really the old tariff, instead of having the sur tax.

DR. MOSDELL.—The honorable Minister has been so anxious to reply. The newspapers have made the same remark, exactly the same charge, if you put it that way. I will

not occupy the time of the Committee with very lengthy remarks about that, and the Finance Minister has borne so well the remarks of the previous speakers that I do not intend to weary him with too harsh a criticism.

When the committee was appointed it was appointed under commission under the great Seal of the Colony and given certain specific directions, certain members were appointed members of the Tariff Commission and they were instructed to consider the old tariff and to make such changes and suggest alterations in the tariff as were necessary for a better and more satisfactory tariff. They were told it should be their business to conduct such investigation as was necessary to discover the anomalies of the present tariff that could be corrected, the number of items that could be dropped and how the rates existing in the old tariff could be consolidated, and the tariff commission were to report on their labors making very plain and having no misunderstanding of their remarks set in. After all, when you come to consider it, it was no easy job and it must be remembered that they had no power to set the tariff rates. The power to interfere with the old tariff was not given to them.

That Tariff Commission existed three years. If the rates as set down in the schedule of that tariff commission were to be held, good or not, simultaneously, those who were interested in the trade of the country simply had three years and more before that tariff was to be heard. And as gentlemen here very well know, the changes in the tariff are kept secret until the very last minute. The Tariff Commission simply took schedule in which there were four margins, consisting of three ratings.

Very frequently it happened that when considering a rate to be set down it would amount to say 28.

Then in some cases where there was such a rate the importers simply figured on the tax as 30 and in such cases we considered it was best to make the round figure and set down the tax as 25 or 30, and then there were cases in which without need there were articles on an absolutely free list. The Tariff Commission in its report strongly recommended that the free list be abolished.

It would have meant a \$700,000 increase in the revenue under the new schedule. It is interesting to know the endeavors of the commission. When the commission had returned it sent in its report, a copy of which I have in my hand, and the total difference between the old rate and the new rate was something like \$700,000 or \$800,000.

My understanding of the position then was that the first items having been presented in proper order for recommendation the Minister of the day intended to use that \$800,000 too.

The present Government has taken the consolidated rates and taken advantage of the general increase and have increased the burden of taxes to do so.

Personally, and as a former member of the Commission, I say fearlessly that the Government has not seen fit to carry out some of the general recommendations made in the report of that Commission. They have taken evidence of all classes of all sections of the country. We travelled all over Newfoundland to devise all the needs of the people of this Island and the reports of the evidence taken are contained in the report and the Government has all the evidence that is necessary for the proper adjustment of the tariff and tariff rates, and I

hope that the day is not far distant when those other recommendations will be adopted and brought into force. The bulk of them are practicable and their adoption and enforcement will, I believe, result in a great deal of profit to all classes of people in this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman; In his criticism of the Budget Speech a few days ago, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, made reference in his usual jocular way to the very poor audience which he said included Mrs Earle and Mr. Michael Condon as well as a half-dozen others in the gallery. I noticed, however, that shortly after he had commenced his criticism of the Government's policy during the past four years, the galleries became empty. Even Mr. Condon could not stand the strain and he had to retire, so that only Mrs. Earle dutifully remained as she has done on previous occasions, till the closing of the House.

I was delighted to hear the Leader of the Opposition inform us on the subject of Mr. Churchill's success in the old country's affairs, and may say in passing that it is my earnest hope that he will succeed in bringing back Great Britain to prosperity. But, gentlemen, it would be idiotic and ridiculous to compare the affairs of Newfoundland having the population of an English village, with those of a country like Great Britain having forty-seven million people. Why a small increase in the British imports of chewing gum would easily cover one of our deficits.

Mr. Hickman admits that reduction in the Tariff is impossible at the present time, and from his admission Hon. Members will appreciate that the financing of this Colony's affairs presents some rather difficult features.

I am quite in accord with him in his remarks on this subject, as I am sure that whoever takes over the administration will not fail to realize these difficulties.

One difficulty all Governments must face and that is the maintenance of a public service by two hundred and sixty thousand people over a coast line larger than Great Britain, and it can be readily seen, therefore, how heavy the burden on our people must necessarily be.

I must take exception to the Hon. Leader's remarks when he says any commercial Trading concern who could not show a surplus would not exist very long. That of course may be so. At the same time my Hon. friend must realize as well as I do that very many business houses do not show surpluses every year; that on the other hand, they often show heavy deficits. Under such circumstances, no business whose credit was exhausted and could not borrow from the Bank would last very long. Besides, Mr. Hickman, well knows that he cannot fairly compare Government affairs with the business of a commercial house, as Governments have to supply many utilities of service to the public absolutely necessary without regard to the cost of same in a commercial sense.

I have to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition on the question of expenditure when he claims that it has cost one and one-quarter millions of dollars more to run this country than it did four years ago. If he will be good enough to look up the expenditure column of the Budget, Page 31, he will find that the current expenses of the Colony for the last completed year 1926-1927 were \$10,533,408.87. In 1923-1924 these expenses back as 1920-1921 they totalled as amounted to \$10,022,137.45 but as far

much as \$10,951,488.90 or \$418,080.03 more than 1926-1927, although the latter year had to bear heavy interest charges not included in either of the years 1920-1921 or 1923-1924.

Now this is a comparative statement of facts. These are the actual amounts expended on current account during the years referred to, as they appear in all the Blue Books published since the year 1920. But the Hon. gentlemen may say this is all very fine so far as it goes but you are only referring to current or every day expenditure of the Colony. What about your expenditure on Loan or Capital Account?

Well, my answer to this is to refer Hon. Members to the fact that statements of expenditure on Capital account as tabled in the House during the past session, prove beyond doubt that the present administration spent less during their four years period than their predecessors by the sum of six and one half million dollars, and there you have the full story of the present Government's expenditure for both running or current expenditures as well as that spent on loan and capital expenditures.

I have already quoted these figures to the House and I should like to repeat that they are not merely estimates; they are not by any means flights of fancy but, on the contrary are the actual, official figures as supplied by the Department of Finance and verified by the Auditor General's Department.

I have already dealt in detail with the constructive nature of our capital undertakings and I think it will be agreed that we have all the time endeavoured not only to relieve distress which has been more or less prevalent since the conclusion of the Great War but have at the same time produced public works of lasting profit to the

Colony. I feel certain that there is no one in this country but will admit that it is better to spend loan money on the building of a modern dock, which will be a source of continual revenue to the country, than to waste it breaking rocks.

I do not criticize the late administration for relieving destitution wherever it existed; in fact I consider it was their duty to do so; but I do condemn the methods used in distributing this relief. I find fault with the general laxity which appears to have existed in affording relief to those unfortunate people. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that to find bills and accounts paid by the Public Charities Department containing such items as tobacco and chocolates was an absurdity which should never have been allowed to happen. The system was all wrong from beginning to end. It is true that this Government has had to spend considerable money on relief of destitution but I submit, sir, that greater benefits accrued in every way through our efforts, and the system was so abused that we were compelled to use drastic methods to overcome these abuses.

As a matter of fact, the assets secured to the Colony by loan expenditures undertaken by the Monroe Government are plainly to be seen. Every item of expenditure may be said to be represented by some improvement. The money spent on the Railway has been and will be effective for many years to come. The Highways account is another item that is earning money for our people every day. In my opinion there was over a million dollars by tourists in this country last summer and this money went into the pockets of our people, indirectly helping the Revenue of the country. As I have pointed out in the Budget, over 6,000 bona-fide tourists visited our shores

during the summer of 1927 and as many more were turned away by the shipping offices through lack of accommodation.

We could never have looked after all these people without hotel accommodation and the means of transporting them to the outlying settlements. They were certainly obliged to spend money on taxis, on our steamers, on our railway, in our hotels and stores, and I think after a little reflection it will be admitted by honourable members that the high-roads policy pursued by the government has not been the dead-head people had at first believed it would be. As an instance of the value of these roads, I might state that the number of cars imported in 1925-1926 was 249, valued at \$179,458.00. In 1926-27, 299 at a value of \$272,145.00. For the information of the House I may say that these values include tires and parts, but the increase in the number of cars imported is a correct comparison.

Moreover, this policy was taken up by the Government in order to see that some permanent benefit should be derived for money spent on roads. Millions of dollars had been spent in the past under the old patronage system without producing anything of a lasting nature. It was felt that the old wooden bridge, requiring annual votes for maintenance, should be replaced by more permanent steel and concrete structures in order to cope with the heavy traffic consequent upon the general use of motors, and I am sure the House will agree that if the Island were to make any progress in the way of development our roads had to receive the scientific attention which was lacking in previous years. Then, take Labrador. Here the items of expenditure chargeable to this account may be regarded as very small compared with the immense value of

this asset. If one stops to consider the interest, I might say even the excitement, evidenced in the Canadian Parliament over the Privy Council's grant of our title deed to this territory, the cost of securing the title is almost infinitesimal. And no wonder when it is estimated that the value has been placed from two hundred and fifty to five hundred million dollars during the debate on this subject in the Canadian Parliament.

Another small item, the building of the "Caribou," which cost us in the neighborhood of \$500,000.00. As the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has told the House, arrangements have been made whereby Canada has resumed the payment of a subsidy for that ship's operations in the Gulf, amounting to \$35,000.00, and here we secure a round 7 per cent interest on our investment. As a quid pro quo, we are asked to give the same treatment to Canadian goods in our tariff as we are already giving Spain and Greece. In return for this, all fish products and everything else produced here will be admitted into Canada free of duty, and this is all the more to the Government's credit when it is considered that there was quite an agitation to tax Newfoundland fish 50 cents per quintal in the Canadian market.

With regard to the formidable array of figures presented to the House by the honorable member for Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, all I can say is that his detailed argument sounds very well. He has taken great pains in order to prove that the tariff now in force is unduly burdensome upon the fishermen of this country. No matter what Mr. Grimes may say, every member of this House is agreed that the present tariff he so bitterly complains of is the product of two years' work of a Tariff Commission appointed and paid for by his own

Government. He himself must admit, in justice to the Government of today, that the Commission was composed largely of influential members of his so-called Liberal party, all of whom were paid substantial sums from the Treasury of this Colony. And I presume if his Government paid out some thousands of dollars for this Commission's work, they no doubt were of opinion that value had been given, as perhaps it was.

But Mr. Grimes, in his interesting details, did not tell all the story. He forgot to say that such items as flour, pork, kerosene oil and gasolene and many other items used by our fishermen are absolutely free. He did not say that the inclusion of these items on the free list represented hundreds of thousands of dollars saved our fishermen; nor did he mention the fact that the actual tariff rate borne by our fishermen on all goods used by them works out at about twelve per cent.

However, I am not surprised at the honorable gentleman's omission of these interesting details, as it would rather spoil the morale of his speech. I remember a political campaign in which Mr. Grimes took part in 1919 in the District of Port de Grave, and have some knowledge of the tactics employed by the honorable gentleman in the game of politics.

This goodly array of figures is meant to blindfold the voter, but even at that he may get left.

As a matter of fact, I was somewhat amused when the honorable member for Twillingate in opening his address said he quite agreed with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, because I seem to have a recollection about four weeks ago that he did not at all agree with that gentleman. In fact, he went on strike. And my opinion is that it is a

pity he did not agree to fulfill his obligations till the end of the term at any rate. It is a poor business to tell him now he agrees with him, as there is sure to be a lingering doubt that he means it. In conclusion, I thank the Opposition members for their kind criticisms of the Budget, especially the member for St. Barbe, Mr. Scammell, who admitted that whatever mistakes could be charged to him he (Sir John) made a special attempt to collect the Revenue.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain resolutions, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill "entitled an Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925 and Amendments Thereto," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925, and Amendments Thereto."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

LOAN BILL RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know that we are in a position just now to do what the Hon. Member requests and immediately send out that sum of money. The Committee that has this in charge has not even been appointed by the Government and this Loan has got to be handled very carefully just as the last one was and I think we have got to apportion the amounts to districts and get recommendations from districts the same as we did last year, before we can send out money.

MR. GRIMES.—I understood from the Colonial Secretary this afternoon that there was a vote for the Highroads Commission of money that would be expended for unfinished roads and that is certainly an unfinished road.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Unfinished "Highroads".

MR. GRIMES.—Well; that is really a highroad, though not done by the Commission; it is a road intended for motors and an important road.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I would like to ask the Hon. introducer of the resolutions if it would not be advisable to have some provision to enable the Loan to be recalled at any time. Supposing for argument's sake that money got very cheap in the future and we could get a loan for 3½ per cent it would be in the interest of the Government to recall the Loan at a higher rate.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Possibly there is a good deal in what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says, and possibly in the near future, we may be able to get cheaper money.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I don't suppose we would be likely to

get financial people to float a Loan that might be called in at any time. These loans are invested in mainly by people as an investment for income, and I don't think it would be practicable to have such a provision from the standpoint of floating a loan.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—I would like to inform the honorable member that most every loan raised today has a proviso made to recall it. I am not referring particularly to government loans, although in France and other continental countries they have certain loans callable in any year. You will find provision made for recalling loans and still the rate of interest is not high.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I am afraid we could not get the same terms, because, as has been said, an investment of this nature intended for income would want to be for a definite length of time.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Why not make it fifty years then, if you could get a lower rate for the loan.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I do not know but there is something in that suggestion. It might be a good thing to make it thirty years, because we are certainly getting them pretty close together.

I am going to advertise the loan tomorrow or Monday and it will be advertised in ten days or another two weeks in New York. We shall decide then which we shall accept. We are asking for two tenders, 4½ and 5%, and we shall see which looks the best for the Colony.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what is the Colonial Stock Act, 1877, under which this loan is raised?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is in Section 8. Well, Section 8

is a section which has been put in for some years at the request of financial people in the Old Country in the event of a loan being raised. The requirements of the Colonial Stock Act justify trustees in the Old Country being able to invest in these bonds as trustee securities.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925" and amendments thereto, was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; Regarding the vote for highroads extension, I am pleased to find that the Highroads Commission propose to complete the road from Hants Hr. to Old Perlican, and it is only right that the Highroads Commission would recommend that to the Government because there is a missing link there and the people of that locality would not be considered at all if this road was left undone. Regarding the road policy of the present Government is that the building of roads should have taken place first in places where people lived and there would have been better service and more satisfaction because you would have been linking up the different communities where the producers of the country live. Even the Chairman of the Highroads Commission admits himself now that the circuit on the south side of Trinity district is the best in the country and should have been done two years ago.

I hope and trust that the time will be not far distant when a passable

road at any rate will be built right on up to Whitbourne. I am pleased to see that the Highroads Commission intends to make that connection and I suppose that is all we will be able to do this year. The upkeep of course and the overhead expenses is costing a lot of money and we may still question that, but what is done is done and now is not the time to question it, but all we can say is that we hope that the optimistic outlook of the Finance Minister in this connection is correct.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with that vote for the encouragement of the fisheries, what is meant by work for the encouragement of the fisheries. Do you understand such works as water works and canals to be included?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—I understand that the money is for the encouragement of the fisheries. I don't think there is any special plan, but I think possibly if a place really requires a grant for a canal if it means helping the fishermen I think it may be taken to include that. That is the idea as far as I know.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the \$200,000 that was voted here last year for the encouragement of the fisheries, I don't think the Government has any idea what it is to be used for, but I think that it should never be touched for canals, breakwaters or anything else of that nature, because in the meantime it would be divided amongst the different districts and before long there would be no money left.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we should leave the money intact.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the object in granting that \$200,000 last year was to do anything to increase the catch of fish. The trouble is that we have too much fish.

The idea was not to encourage the catch of fish, but it was to try and make better marketing conditions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The object was to help the fishermen.

MR. HALFYARD.—The fishermen are on the whole satisfied with conditions as regards the catch of fish. It is after the fish are caught that the trouble is. They don't know what to do with it. The idea was to use the \$200,000 to help the fishermen in some way, so as to get better prices for the fish or lessen the cost in some way. I agree with Mr. Scammell, the honorable member for St. Barbe, that it is better not to be dallying with it. I don't think we should give part of it for a canal in some particular district, for we would be having claims from all around the Island.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think that if once you started to build a canal in some particular district, every other district would be looking for some money as well.

It would be better to put it straight into the other amount and be done with it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legis-

lative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Government and the Minister of Justice to the fact that last year there was a Dog Act passed in this House, which particularly related to the District of Ferryland, and which was sent to the Upper House and thrown out.

I have been approached by some people again regarding the same matter. I don't know whether the House of Lords have changed their opinions since last year or not, but I would bring the matter up and would ask the Minister of Justice if he may be able to put the Bill through in the same form and see if the House of Lords changes its mind.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the member for Ferryland has brought up this matter and brought it to my attention. If the House is agreeable it is only a short amendment to the Act and I am quite willing to try it again, and the third time may be lucky. I think that under the Act we can compel them to pass it the third time.

The Act is very simple. Instead of the ten-year period now provided there, where it is necessary the people may petition, or else it will stand for another ten years. The people of any district may petition and we will give the petitioners a hearing. The Dog Act was introduced for the protection of sheep. It has gone up twice from this House to the Upper House but they felt that it should not be passed. After all, there is no reason why the Upper House should not pass it, for I think that this Chamber directly represents the people of the country, and since that Bill was turned down I have had requests from all over the

country to see if it could be done. I, personally, cannot see what harm that it can do. If the people don't want dogs, after all, they can drive them out, and if they want them, alright. They certainly make all sorts of confusion in the district of Ferryland and along the south shore and around Conception Bay. People from St. John's bring their dogs there, and they are not allowed to have them in Carbonear.

I will look up the old Act and refer again to the matter on Monday.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice what is the position of the outport road boards? Have they elected members lately?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I don't think there has been any election held for some time. I think that practically none are active.

DR. MOSDELL.—Are there no steps taken to provide for road boards?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—There is no reason why the road boards there cannot function. I think that is what has happened. The existing boards are not active.

DR. MOSDELL.—I have no intention of delaying the House, Mr. Speaker, I am only looking for information. In some cases all the members but the president have resigned, and do I understand that he can officiate with regular authority?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is perfectly correct. I will undertake to see if I can throw some light on this thing on Monday.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to his Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Ex-

penses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1928, and the 30th day of June, 1929, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 4th 1928.

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

PETITIONS

Mr. Scammell, from White Bay re Fisheries.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until four of the clock.

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.

MARINE DISASTER'S FUND.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the permanent Marine Disasters Fund" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker; In rising to move the

introduction of this Bill, I might explain that the idea behind the introduction of the Bill is to merge the Permanent Marine Disaster's Fund and the fund that was raised in 1924, known as the Marine Disaster's Fund. It will be remembered after the terrible tragedy of 1914 wherein the Southern Cross and some eighty odd members of the Steamship "Newfoundland" were lost, involving the lives of two hundred and fifty of our fishermen. Such a blow coming at that time naturally brought forth, not alone from the people of this country but from the entire world expressions of sympathy to Newfoundland and its people in this terrible tragedy. Personally, I happened to be acting Prime Minister in the absence of Sir Edward Morris, now Lord Morris, and I had a great deal to do with matters, pending re-adjustment of affairs in connection with the disaster. The terrible scenes that we saw enacted when the bodies of the Newfoundland disaster were brought in here by one of the other sealing steamers, and subsequently prepared for burial brought forth practical expressions of sorrow and sympathy, and the meeting was called at the Court House which was attended by the leaders of Society, Churches and Profession in this community, and a very strong and representative committee was formed to elicit subscriptions from citizens of this country and the outside world. A very generous response was experienced on that occasion, and it was fortunate that we had a number of citizens who were prepared to take up and gratuitously administer that fund, and serve in a great measure in relieving the sufferings that were caused the bereaved people, due to the loss of their brethren. Whilst, no doubt, in many homes there is very sad remembrances of that occasion, at the

same time the dependents on that fund have diminished to a very remarkable degree. It was fortunate, if I may use that expression, that out of that fund grew something of a more permanent and tangible nature, and we have had brought to our notice almost daily in the press the responses to appeals to provide means for dependents of those who have lost their lives at sea, and very generous responses have been experienced. We have had a committee of gentlemen who have banded together for purely philanthropic reasons, and have administered that fund, and whilst the Government has subscribed a small measure to the relief of those in distress, still a very much larger amount was received by private contribution.

Those who were in public life prior to the last eight or ten years will remember the claims and calls that were continuously made upon Governments and private individuals when anything in the way of a marine disaster occurred. There was the humiliating spectacle of having to go around the streets of the town and from door to door soliciting aid. Now this has been done away with entirely. Although I have been connected with the committee in an honorary way as Colonial Secretary, I claim no credit whatever for the amount of work that has been done by it, although I have intimate knowledge of what was accomplished. It is very gratifying to know that this fund has worked so quietly, so unostentatiously and so effectively and has done so much good. But what has been done has not been accomplished without a great deal of labour and self-sacrifice on the part of those who have been actively identified with the movement, and in this connection there is one man who seemed to have devoted himself to the work in a most unselfish, self-sacrificing and philan-

thropic manner. I refer to the Hon. Dr. Robinson, who is Honorary Secretary of the Committee. The amount of work he has done I think will remain a lasting monument of his memory. His appeals in the newspaper that he presides over have been most effective and the responses that have been met with must have been a source of much gratification to him.

From the information handed to me it appears that the Marine Disasters Fund are getting down to a very small number indeed and whilst the Committee are quite prepared to continue the work of administering that fund, still find it now desirable to have the two funds merged, which will obviate the necessity of duplicating the accounts and will reduce the amount of clerical work, whilst at the same time it will not diminish the effectiveness of either of the funds. The annual report of this fund I tabled a few days ago in this House, and although Hon. Members may not have an opportunity of reading the report, it is very enlightening and I am sure will be received with a great deal of thankfulness that the fund has been carried on so successfully. I have here a report of the Committee showing the number of applications received for the year and the amount of disbursements under the different classifications and the following are extracts;-

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Speaker this Bill respecting the Permanent Marine Disaster's Fund was introduced in the Upper House by the Hon. Dr. Robinson and some well deserved and well merited tributes were paid to that gentleman and to the other members of the Committee in that Chamber for the work they performed, and it is my special privilege this afternoon to introduce this Bill and to in every possible de-

tail endorse the sentiments that have been expressed concerning the magnificent work so excellently performed by Hon. Dr. Robinson and his associates.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund" was read a second, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD.— Mr. Chairman; In supporting the Bill now before the Chair I want to express my appreciation of the work done by the members of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Committee. I was officially connected with that Committee for the short time I was Colonial Secretary and I know of the wonderful work performed by that Committee. It was a labour of love to them and every member of that Committee from time to time was naturally imbued with the idea of doing the best possible to ensure the success of the work. I think Sir that the thanks of the Government and the entire Community are due this Committee.

My purpose in speaking to this Bill this afternoon is especially to refer to Hon. Dr. Robinson. If there is one man worthy of recognition of King and Country for valuable services rendered it is Hon. Dr. Robinson. Many men have been honoured by His Majesty the King for much less service, and I hope that the Prime Minister, who has been too modest to ac-

cept an honour himself from the King, will recommend, before he resigns from office, to His Majesty the King for the conferring of a Knighthood upon Hon. Dr. Robinson.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; Personally I would like to add a few words to this debate, but Mr. Halfyard has expressed the views that I feel about the Marine Disasters Fund. I feel sure there never has been so far as my knowledge leads me in connection with the country the least shadow of a doubt but that this fund, as has been pointed out by the Colonial Secretary, was impartially and honestly and fairly administered all along. I have never heard of any complaints whatever, and I only wish that the public affairs of this country were conducted in a like manner the way this fund has been administered.

And I only wish that more of our public affairs in this Colony were conducted in a manner as little to be criticised as the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Administration. The Daily News has placed its services at the disposal of the Fund and done everything in its power to enhance it, and I can only subscribe to the debt of thanks this country owes Hon. Dr. Robinson and concur with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Halfyard.

MR. GRIMES.—I wish to join with Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Scammell in the sentiments they have expressed and agree that the Fund is administered to the satisfaction of the country and wish to join with them in their expressions of great appreciation of the efforts of Hon. Dr. Robinson in spreading that Fund. There is no question of the benefits that accrue from that Fund and we, as members of the House of Assembly desire to express our debt of gratitude for what has been done in that direction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The amount to the credit of the Disasters Fund 1914 is \$50,000; that is quite sufficient to take care of all claims that come in under that credit until it is exhausted.

MR. MOORE.—Before the vote goes through I would like to say a word of thanks on behalf of Ferryland District to the Hon. Dr. Robinson and the gentlemen associated with him in connection with that Marine Disasters Fund. We suffer considerably in that district, and I would not like to see the vote passing without going on record on behalf of the district of Ferryland.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing that body that the said Bill had been agreed to without amendment.

MARINE SHELL RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Marine Shell Export Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Browne took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; It is customary with a private Bill of this kind to send it at this juncture to a select committee to report on and I concluded that the same committee would probably be appointed to consider this matter as

was appointed a few days ago to consider whether the rules of the House had been complied with in respect of this same matter and I had that committee meet this afternoon with Mr. Gushue who came to represent some of the protestors in connection with this Act. As we go through with the Bill I can show you some alterations that have been made not only in an attempt to meet the desires of the gentlemen that met us this afternoon a protest against certain clauses in the Bill, but also in an attempt to meet certain arguments brought up in the House when the matter was under consideration before. For instance the Hon. Member for Fortune suggested we should protect other industries besides the fisheries. The people that are protesting now are not entirely satisfied. They claim first that monopolies are not given in England at all and on that account we should not give monopolies at any time. We are not concerned with what happens in England. We are concerned with what happens in Newfoundland. As you know we gave a certain monopoly last session in respect of Holyrood Pond and if you go back to the record of 1910 you will find that this House gave almost a similar monopoly in connection with the Atlantic Pebble Company. On that occasion a Company was expected to be able to make money by taking pebbles off of Topsail and Manuels beach and exporting them to the United States, and a monopoly was given in this House for twenty five years to export those pebbles from the coast in Conception Bay and in that case they weren't paying anything for it and the country got nothing out of it. In this case as I have said the Company will have the exclusive right to export these shells from Labrador and will pay twenty five cents a ton for every ton exported

and if they export a hundred thousand tons of shell in any one year the revenue of the country benefits to the extent of \$25,000 and that is what we need. I think I have already stated an. I want to emphasise it again that it has been clearly demonstrated to the Government that a few people getting comparatively small quantities of shell cannot possibly make the proposition pay. It can only be done in a big way. That has been shown in the result of the venture of the schooner bringing a cargo to the United States last year and Mr. Smythe's Company have convinced the Government that it is impracticable to try and make this a paying proposition in a small way.

Thus the reason for the monopoly that is being granted.

The only other point that the protestors brought to the attention of the committee is this, that they thought that people who took out mining claims in 1927 or after should be given the same exclusive rights as were given by the Government to Mr. Smythe. They took out their claims after Mr. Smythe had worked this thing up and after they knew that the exclusive right was given to Mr. Smythe and his company, and they think that they should get the same rights to export shells. That is something the Government could not entirely accede to because anyone could have gone down there and taken out mining rights and Mr. Smythe could not be protected at all under the law that the Government made at that particular time. I also want to emphasize that the Government had no personal interest in Mr. Smythe and his company. I say, as Prime Minister, and I think I can speak for every member of the Executive, that we looked at the thing solely and simply from the standpoint of the

benefit that the Colony was going to get out of it. I agree that monopolies are objectionable as a general principle, but in some cases they are necessary to start new industries and I hardly think that Mr. Smythe's company could have obtained the support and co-operation of an American corporation if it had not been for the concessions that we are giving them.

If the House considers that the protests of those that object to this Bill have been rightly heard then I would suggest that we go ahead and read the resolutions. If, on the other hand, it is felt by members on the other side of the House that seven full days after the resolutions have gone into committee should be given in order to find out if there are any further protests to come in, then I can only suggest that the House adjourn for a week in order that we may receive these protests; but this matter has been before the House for over seven days now and anybody in the country or Labrador that is in any way interested in the subject must know of the transaction, and I am perfectly satisfied that outside of Mr. Gushue, who is acting for various petitioners in this connection, and those who have taken out claims, we should hear nothing if we did adjourn for a week in order to receive petitions.

Consequently, it does not appear to me that anything is to be gained or the community at large be in any way benefitted by postponing the matter. However, I leave it to the members of the Opposition, possibly they have no desire to have the matter go ahead yet.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, when these resolutions first came before the House I was more or less opposed to them because they contained a monopoly.

I was one of the members of the Select Committee and this afternoon we met and heard Mr. Gushue, who represents the petitioners, and several changes were made in the resolutions at the suggestion of Mr. Gushue, and when the Committee had finished their work I said to Mr. Gushue, "Are you now satisfied with the Resolutions; have you any further changes to make in the interest of your petitioners?" and he said, "Yes, we are satisfied, except we would like the date of October 1926 to be taken out of the Bill." That is, they would like to have the right to export shells off the marine claims which they have taken up since 1926.

So I presume that Mr. Gushue, representing the wishes of his clients, is satisfied, and if he is satisfied with the Bill, with the changes that have been made, which will be read to the House as the resolutions go along, I see no reason why I should not be satisfied and why I should oppose these resolutions.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I was rather surprised a few moments ago when I heard the Prime Minister make a statement that a select committee had already met in connection with these resolutions.

I quite agree that these gentlemen may meet when they like, and meet independently with perfect propriety and discuss these resolutions with any persons who are interested, but it must be remembered that that committee was not a select committee, or any other committee, of this House, and consequently any representations that may have been made to that committee was not officially to the House at all.

Now, while I agree with the Hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that if Mr. Gushue representing this opposing corporation has expressed

himself more or less satisfied with the Bill — and I don't think that is altogether the case following what the Hon. Gentleman has said, he still has a very serious objection — that in itself is not sufficient to satisfy me as a member of this House of Assembly that this Bill should be passed into law, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I propose, as briefly as I possibly can, to prove that this bill should not pass into law in any event.

In the first place it is admitted on all sides that the proposers of these resolutions will get a monopoly of all the shells which they like to export from the Labrador. Whether that will be one mile of sea coast or two or three thousand miles of sea coast I don't know, but I have to contemplate it being two or three thousand miles. If that be so it seems to me that that concession is an extremely huge one and ought to be viewed by the members of the committee and the House with the greatest opposition. Mr. Speaker, I say that such concessions should not be permitted unless it can be deemed beyond all possible doubt that no injury will accrue to the colony by the passing of the Bill.

And I submit that the Prime Minister has not proved up to the present moment to the satisfaction of any reasonably minded man that there is no possible detriment likely to accrue to the colony. He has told us without producing evidence in support of it, that if those people are not given rights the shell will not be exported. He has told us that Mr. Smythe and his associates are connected with an outside American corporation which is prepared to put them on a commercial basis and export shells in large quantities. I presume that he gets these statements from the interested parties and what else would you expect them to say than those things

which you would naturally expect to advance their cause to this House both with the Government and other members of the Assembly. But mere statement is not proof and it must be remembered that the function of this House in connection with a private bill is not merely legislative but judicial in its nature.

I want to say at the outset that in line with what has already been said unofficially by other members of the House in connection with the Northern Products Company, that I, so far as the Labrador Marine Shell Company is concerned, I have absolutely no interest whatever. I know Mr. Gushue personally very well. I know one other gentleman very slightly that is associated with the Company — I don't think I have spoken twenty words with him in my life — and I have not the faintest idea who the other members of the Company are. Mr. Chalmers, I don't know if he is associated with them, I know him to see him but haven't spoken to him in my life.

I am not approaching this matter from the angle of the Labrador Marine Shell Company so much as from the angle of the interests of the colony itself, and, Sir, I think there are a number of gravest considerations which we should seriously take into account before passing these resolutions and any bill which may be brought in to give effect to them.

Monopolies of such a nature excite extra suspicion and the monopoly must be searched very carefully and it must be shown that they are in the interests of the country and not likely to prejudice in any wise against those interests before we are justified in passing them. In other words, the monopolist must prove his case.

I think that I am correct in saying, Sir, that since the days of Queen

Elizabeth or King James or somewhere around that period you will not see a monopoly statute in the statute law of England, with the exception of those in connection with patents. The fact that an experienced legislature such as the British House of Parliament has refused to grant any monopolies during the last three hundred years is some evidence of undesirability and should act as a deterrent to one of the children of that great Parliament when such matters come before it.

Now the first point that I would like to have made plain to me, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of a mineralogist or a geologist, is as to what category the word shell comes from. Is it a mineral or is it not a mineral. The grants which I understand have been issued to the Labrador Marine Shell Company are valid mineral grants under the law of the colony. The result of that is of course that these people interested in the Labrador Marine Shell Company have absolute vested rights, rights given by the Government of this colony, and for which they paid. And now the situation appears with people to give them certain mineral grants that they have already granted and taken money for, and now you propose to deprive them of their rights. I suppose you will at least hand them back their money.

I remember last year, when in the interests of the country and not of capitalists, I suggested that certain timber rights on the Labrador, which in my opinion then and now were being illegally held, should be cancelled by this legislature, and that the parties holding these claims improperly should be handed back their money. I raised a storm of righteous indignation in the minds of some of the members of this legislature, and in

certain sections of the country, because of the immoral attitude that I was alleged to be taking. This country had taken the money of those unfortunate timber speculators, year after year, and now it was proposed having taken their money to divest them of their rights on the Labrador. I was hounded down as a bad man. But Sir, the very Government that turned me aside in that particular case, now propose to do the very thing that I asked to be done in the interests of the country last year, they now propose to do in the interests of capitalists. I think Sir, that it would be extremely difficult for the Government to justify that position. It may be argued possibly by the Hon. the Prime Minister that the amounts which had been paid in by those parties that had acquired timber limits on the Labrador were large, while on the other hand the few claims held by the Shell Company and others on Labrador only involved the payment of a very small sum. Ten dollars per claim I say that makes not the slightest difference whether the amounts paid by the Marine Shell Company and the others that had received these mineral licenses, were ten dollars or ten thousand, the principle is the same. You have taken their money and given them certain rights in return for their money. And now you propose to take from them the benefits of all that they paid you. Is that justifiable. According to my knowledge not merely of law but of morality it is certainly unjustifiable. On no grounds whatever can it be defended. That is assuming that the word shell still comes within the definition of the word mineral. I do not know whether it does or not. I have not looked into the matter. If it is mineral then the position that I have set out applies. If it is not mineral, then where do we find those peo-

ple prevented from going in on the claims of persons that have what may be regarded as a mineral claim on Labrador. I do not know whether any such exists or not. For the moment I am not interested. I look into the principle. And I say that if shell is a mineral then the Newfoundland Shell Company has the right to go in on a person's claim and take the shell that may be there, and thus interfere with vested rights. I cannot conceive now that that can be regarded as in any way justifiable.

These are more or less introductory remarks, to what I have to say. One of the considerations which I conceive to be of the utmost importance at the present time, in connection with dealing with the matter, as to how far the creation of rights upon the sea shore or the fore shore of Labrador may interfere with any possible arrangement that may hereafter be made by the Government of this country in connection with the sale of the Labrador, which was suggested by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, a day or two ago. He told us if I remember rightly that he was out to sell the Labrador. Only in that way in his opinion could Newfoundland ever right itself. If his opinion is worth anything it is worth our consideration as to whether or not we ought in any way to involve the sea shore or any other part of the Labrador pending any arrangement for this sale. I am not prepared to say at the moment just how far the granting of these rights will interfere with any such agreement for sale. That I do not know. That will depend largely on the tenour of the proposed agreement, and it will depend also on the attitude of the persons who may propose to buy it, and I think that in tying up any portion of the sea shore of the Labrador in the interests of private

corporations at the present time is most dangerous. A very little thing sometimes will interfere with a very important agreement. A very small wrench thrown in the gear box will destroy the working of your car.

Now I want to draw the attention of the Committee to one section of the resolutions which strikes me as getting at the root of the whole subject. Section four says;-

(Reads)

Of course if shells are minerals they can acquire the same rights under the Crown Lands Act. If they are not then this Act gives it to them. But the point that I want to make is this that the moment the areas are identified, a grant of every section of the sea shore on the Labrador, that they want is given to them by this bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is not so. They do not get an inch of land.

MR. BRADLEY.—What is shell but land. You know as well as I do that land does not merely mean clay.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not know what shell is.

MR. BRADLEY.—Well it is time you did. You brought the bill in here.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I object to this kind of remark. I say that there is no granting of anything at all in this bill except shell. And I say that shell is not land.

MR. BRADLEY.—Shell is as much land as stone is and the Hon. Minister knows that perfectly well. And if the shell extends a half mile inland, he has a perfect right to go in that half mile and take the whole thing. I mean the shell. I repeat Sir, that that section of the bill gives to the Newfoundland or the Northern Shell Company, every bit of coast constituted of shell, if you like to put it that way,

from the southern part of the Labrador to the northern end of it. Now that is the plain grant. There are no tags on it and I propose to show that there are none. You have in section six what appears to be a limitation.

(Reads)

Now I just got this bill and I do not know what amendments are proposed to be, so I can only discuss it from the angle of what I have before me. Perhaps it would be better if the Prime Minister were to read the alterations so that we might be able to speak on them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; I refrained from making the explanations, because the question seemed to be whether we were going to insist upon a Select Committee reporting upon this, and were going to adjourn the matter for a week. If that matter is settled, and it is decided to proceed and debate those resolutions, then most certainly I shall be desirous of making those explanations.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, the point is this that the stage when these resolutions go to a Select Committee is not reached yet. I take it that what the Prime Minister means is that if we accept these resolutions and arising out of those resolutions a bill is read the first time, and then a second time, then it is referred to a Select Committee who reports back after a lapse of seven days. That period does not arrive yet. Anticipating this position being raised, the Prime Minister got together a Select Committee to day, and I take it that what he wants to know now whether we go on the understanding that if a decision is made on the resolutions then there is not any necessity of having another hearing when we come to the bill.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman; I do not think that we ought at this stage to be called upon to give any indication as to whether we would be prepared to forego the usual formalities or not. Allow the resolutions to proceed and I do say, and I do not think it has been the history of this session, that the opposition have given any indication that they are likely to obstruct public business. In fact only Friday night last the Prime Minister spoke to me personally and I told him that my only desire as far as the delay in connection with the Select Committee was concerned was to protect the public and private rights of those individuals who were objecting to this bill. Now of course though we have agreed to a certain extent with those resolutions, but there are certain portions of them that we do not agree with. Whether we ought or ought not to press for an enforcement of the rules is a matter that we have to consider, and we will consider that when the time arrives. But I think in the first place that it is rather unfair that we should be asked to go on with the discussion this afternoon without having had an opportunity of seeing what may or may not be the alterations.

And now it appears the Prime Minister proposes only to give them to us verbally. It is very difficult off hand to form any judgement on a matter of this kind when Amendments are given verbally at a moment's notice. If those changes were to be made, they should have been brought down with the bill in printed form so that we could have some little time at least to consider them. As the situation now stands I do not think we should go on to the resolutions at all at this stage. I understand that some very radical changes have been made in the resolutions before us. This

afternoon we came here with our views crystalized, so to speak, upon the resolutions in their present form, and now we are asked to consider at a moment's notice totally different provisions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member might have waited until we explained the alterations in the Resolutions and then he would know whether they were radical changes or not. If it is the desire of members of the Opposition to get themselves familiar with the amendments I think they might reasonably this afternoon take a copy of the alterations, and, if necessary, give consideration to them to night or to-morrow or whatever time the House may so decide. I do think, however, that if the members of the Select Committee could take a half hour to digest the alterations proposed to be made in this Bill that other members of the House would be equally able to digest them. The amendments are not difficult to understand and they really do not amount to more than a few words in the alteration of the Resolution as they stood before. To begin with the first alteration in the Resolutions is in clause (2). After the words "hereinafter set forth" insert the words "and except as herinafter provided." We will understand what that means when we come to clause (8). Clauses (3) and (4) are not altered at all and clause (5) is only altered to comply with the suggestion made by the member for Fortune Bay. We propose to take out clause (7) and clause (6) is amended in this way:

(Reads)

In section (7) which is now proposed to be delineated the suggestion was made to us that the Company should have this right except by right of war or acts of God, and the Committee thought that as that was prob-

ably a contentious clause and difficult to understand, it was better to put it in that for any of those reasons they could not ship the 75,000 tons of shell for one year they were bound to ship an equivalent for two years or make up the shortage caused the previous year. Now clause (8) reads as follows.

(Reads)

That was for the protection of those who may have mineral grants. Clauses (9) and (10) are the same as they were.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, the point raises itself immediately. It is not merely as to actually the purport of these particular alterations, but it is their effect upon other sections of the agreement, which agreement may possibly have to be interpreted by a court of law. I have no desire to delay this matter, but I think we ought to have some time to consider the various amendments because of their effects upon different sections of the Resolutions.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask if there was any agreement? If so, what has become of it, and could we have a copy of it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There was an agreement, but it has been changed and altered so often by consent of the agreeing parties in many respects that it now ceases to exist. The parties were satisfied with minor alterations from time to time and they allowed me to bring in this proposition in this form now.

MR. BRADLEY—I take it then that there is no agreement now.

MR. SCAMMELL—If these amendments could be typed and distributed amongst the members I presume we could go on to-morrow to deal with them.

MR. BRADLEY—I think it a good suggestion to have the amendments

typed and we could be ready to go on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is no reason why we could not have them typed or printed and distributed amongst the Opposition by 8 o'clock. I understand that it is the wish of members that that be done and that we now adjourn this matter until to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises it may be of help to Honorable Members of the Opposition to draw attention to two points. The effect of section 6 as amended now is to make it definitely clear that on non-compliance with export of 75,000 tons, it definitely forfeits not alone export rights but definitely forfeits all rights of every kind. That is the object of the wording, and I think it clearly covers that. Our attention was drawn to the fact that that was possibly open to doubt. It might be held that all that was forfeited were rights of export. The object now is to clear up that.

MR. BRADLEY—As a matter of fact that is one of the very points I wanted to deal with; and in my opinion under the original resolutions the company acquired a complete right and if they exported a pound every year they held the right though they might lose the exclusive right.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The second point is that the Honourable Member for Port de Grave spoke of the point as to the question whether or not shell would be a mineral, and we have at least taken care to see this that even if it should not be regarded as a mineral, any claims or rights to shell areas held up to October under mineral licenses and rights or claims to shell so held or presumed to be held are protected.

MR. MOORE—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the Company

fails to export 75,000 tons in any year do they forfeit all rights to everything?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes; subject to the provision to make up the succeeding year.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask the total number of miles on the Labrador. The point I want to raise is this, according to mineral licenses granted by the Agriculture and Mines Department for each square mile there is paid annually \$20.00, and if these resolutions pass no revenue accrues to the country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This does not give mineral rights; only gives rights to shell. Supposing the Company gets a grant to shell I can go down and get the ordinary mineral license over the same area. This does not effect the ordinary mineral grant.

MR. MOORE.—I wonder if anyone in the House know anything about the deposit of shell on the Labrador. I was talking to a Captain from Labrador and he said they would never get 200,000 tons on the Labrador, I wonder if Captain Randell would know anything about it?

CAPT. RANDELL.—The point might be considered by the House. In reference to the coastline I don't believe anybody can give the mileage of coast line because there never was a proper survey made. I believe there are thousands of miles and thousands of islands. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the line dividing Canadian territory and Newfoundland territory goes at its unmost point to Cape Chidley? I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Cape Chidley is on an island and very likely half the island belongs to Canada and half to Newfoundland and inside of that island there are two other islands and I believe you will

find that the line of the division cuts across those islands so there is a thing that possibly maybe brought up when legislating in regard to islands over the sea coast. I just mention that fact because it may have to be considered by the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The point is well taken by the Hon. Member for Trinity Captain Randell. We anticipate that one of these days there will have to be a line laid down. As a matter of fact a line should be laid down. That will have to be done by agreement some day between the two Governments to settle exactly the points. The settling of the actual points and division line has not yet been done by the Governments and that survey will have to be made some day.

DR. MOSDELL.—There is nothing in the Bill I take it to prevent Newfoundland fishermen from taking supplies of shell from areas not wanted by this Company and bringing them to Newfoundland. That would not be export. But all areas might be granted to those people and all supplies usually got by the fishermen be unavailable. My attention has been called to this by people who have been bringing home a few barrels. I think the Bill should be made clear that such requiring small quantities for their own use be not deprived of the right to that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I quite agree with that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; Before the Committee rises, there is one point commented upon by the Member for Port de Grave that I would like to speak of. He asked a question as to whether this bill would not interfere with the rights in the event of the possibility of selling the Labrador.

We were not going to pass over any rights that would effect the possible sale of the Labrador, and then the question arises, when is the Labrador going to be sold? For my own part I think that it is a long way off. The first thing that we have got to do is find some person who is willing to buy it. There is always talk about a sale, but in such a case the first thing to do is to get a customer and so far I have not seen anyone who is prepared to buy the Labrador at the present time.

There is one thing, too, that I want to point out in respect to the taking of shells off the Labrador. If we can prove to the outside world within the next two or three years that we have a valuable shell deposit up there worth lots of money and wanted by another continent I think it would greatly assist us in getting rid of the Labrador rather than it would be against it.

Anybody would imagine judging from all the shells that we have heard of from the Northern Products Company that are going to be gathered up on the Labrador in the next four years that it is going to be a profitable industry. I have very grave doubts in my mind that seventy five thousand tons of shell can be taken off the Labrador each year. But they are not satisfied with that but are taking about a million tons in one year.

However that may be. I know of men of capital and men of business ability are now prepared to back this thing in a financial way. I beg to move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

SHARK BILL RESOLUTIONS

It was moved by Hon. the Minister of Justice, seconded by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that, pursuant to the terms of Rule 314, in view

of pressing necessity, Rule 304 be suspended in relation to the Bill entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of the Shark Industry."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Speaker; In connection with this Bill, the Committee will pardon my introducing it, but I am doing so at the request of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It will be remembered that the committee reported or presumed to report the other day but exception was taken and it was held that the committee should not make a return for seven days.

I understand that the committee has had under consideration the matter of the protests in connection with this bill and that they are now in a position to report. Under the circumstances, when I say that the committee is in a position to report I don't think that there was any committee appointed for the second reading but that the old select committee, the original select committee, has acted—No, I am wrong, the committee was appointed at that time, so the position now is that the committee is now ready to report and whether the House in the light of what is notoriously the desire of both sides to dispose of matters as quickly as possible, is willing, I would suggest that the House be prepared to meet the necessity to dispose of business, permit the committee to report.

If that be so, the House we can proceed and the matter may be taken under Rule 314 where the House unanimously agree to waive the rule in the matter of necessity, which, I submit in this case comes very specially within the meaning of the present necessity—necessity of not holding up the House.

The House might intimate its desires with regard to this motion.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker; As it was through my instigation that this report was prevented from being presented, I would like to ask whether the Hon. Minister of Justice has any information as to the attitude of the parties who were objecting according to what the Prime Minister told us last week. I expressed myself before as not in any way opposed to the passing of this bill and that is still my view, and if we have the assurance that nobody's rights are in any way prejudiced I think myself that it is just as well to withdraw the objection.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—

Mr. Speaker; I can only speak for myself and I personally fail to see where there are any serious objections.

I was called into the Upper House in connection with another matter altogether and then I mentioned to Mr. Job the matter of the shark bill and he then explained to me that he was somewhat surprised, at least that was only for three years as he understood that the period was a good deal longer. I pointed out to him that they asked for a longer period, when they came in they were looking for ten years. I gathered from him and it seemed to me that a good deal of his objection disappeared when it was seen that it was only for three years.

I am in no situation to withdraw his objection.

My opinion is that in this country no man will withdraw all his objection when once he has said something.

There is no man who has done anything or when trying to do something in this country but you will find somebody coming along and objecting to his getting some concessions. They cannot get it themselves and they don't want the other fellow to get it—like the dog with the bone.

That is my experience in this country that when a gentleman objects to anything he will not withdraw all of his objection.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker; I understand that there are some people who indicated that they had some objections to this Bill. Has there been any investigation of their rights in connection with this?

MR. BRADLEY.—Did they indicate a desire to appear before the select committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker; In connection with this famous shark bill that we are hearing so much talk about, I might say that I wrote Mr. Barr and I also wrote Mr. Job and Mr. Barr claims as long as it is only a three year monopoly that he is satisfied. Mr. Job wrote me a memorandum of Job Bros Ltd., in connection with their objections to this bill. The select committee that was appointed read it and I will now read it for the information of the House.

(Reads)

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I notice that this Bill is still on the Order Paper and I presume that it is a matter of indifference to the House. Let us get together and let this Bill go through and let this company get started as soon as possible. A man who has the courage to start a company to catch sharks should be given a chance and I hope he will catch all the sharks that he can. They are no good to us anyhow and I think that the Bill should be read and that everybody is agreeable to let it go through. This should have been off the Order Paper a week ago.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I understand that this young man is a returned soldier, who went over there to learn the business. He was over there twelve months and it cost him a

considerable amount and now we find another company trying to hold him up because they have been thinking of it for the past three or four years. I agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Brown, that it is better to give this man Hanrahan a chance. I don't know who he is, I have never met him, but I understand that he is not capable of doing very hard work but went over there and learnt this business and got certain amount of capital invested in this project, just now I don't think that we can do too much to assist him. Mr. Speaker, since I have no serious objections to the Bill coming before the House as it is only for three years, I think that the matter should be brought before the House.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on behalf of the select Committee appointed to consider the Bill relating to the Shark Fishery, presented the following report:

The Select Committee appointed in connection with the Bill in relation to the encouragement of the Shark Industry beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, have given due consideration to the representations made in reference thereto by certain parties who claimed to be interested, and now recommend that leave be granted for the further progress of this Bill.

House of Assembly, June 4th, 1928.

(Signed) C. J. CAHILL,
W. C. WINSOR,
I. R. RANDELL,
W. J. WALSH,
P. F. MOORE.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Encouragement of the Shark Industry."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have just looked through this protest of Mr. Job and I really do not see anything objectionable in it. It simply says that he has spent a considerable amount of money in trying to find out whether anything can be done with sharks, but he does not give us much evidence that he has spent much. He is simply says that the monopoly should be confined to certain limited areas. As I understand it Mr. Hanrahan and those associated with him very clearly state to the Minister of Justice that they have not the faintest idea where they are going to look for sharks. Consequently you cannot limit them to any area. That was a point that suggested itself not to Mr. Job but to myself when they asked for these concessions in the first place. I said "what do you want the whole island for." They said that they did not know where they were going to start. That they wanted to make a thorough survey, and see where they were going to catch them. It would be advantageous to the country to know where the sharks were and to have somebody chasing them around to find out where they were going to manufacture and treat them. I think that is the manifest reason for the Government giving certain monopolies for the short period of three years to this company.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the nature of the two bills, and the remarks made by the Prime Minister are worthy of consideration. It might be thought wise to wait and see the result of the three years experiment to try and locate sharks. It is altogether different from the resolutions that we are considering now. It may be advantageous to the country to locate sharks in sufficient quantity, if it does take two or three years to do that.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to hold up the business, but I do want to draw the attention of the House and purely from the standpoint of principle, that I do not see any pressing necessity. In the first place we have another matter which is in the resolution stage, and which in the ordinary circumstances will have to be submitted to exactly the same procedure as this particular bill. If another matter to which I refer has to go through the ordinary channels then there is no reason in the world why we should be anxious to put this through hurriedly. I just want to draw that to the attention of the Committee and in the first place I do not want in these resolutions to suspend the rules if they might in any way prejudice the other matter to which I refer, or to be regarded as a precedent, and to treat the other bill in the same way. At the same time I do not think there is any necessity either urgent or pressing for it. But if the members of the House are satisfied that there is, I do not want to enforce my views any further on the matter.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Encouragement of the Shark Industry" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the

Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

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 5th 1928.

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

PETITIONS

Mr. Scammell from St. Anthony, re Public Building.

RESPECTING THE KEEPING OF DOGS

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Keeping of Dogs." was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker; I would ask the indulgence of the House to go into Committee on this Bill "An Act Respecting the Keeping of Dogs" now for the reasons I gave yesterday on notice of motion. The Bill is simply a repetition of the Bill that passed the House last year and year before. Instead of the statutory period of ten years after one year the people if they wish can have the law changed and may keep dogs.

The Bill has been sent up to the Upper House on two previous occasions and the Upper House has seen fit in its wisdom to turn it down. Their grounds for turning it down, I understand, are that they think the object of the other Bill is for the protection of sheep and that this is going to be the introduction of a measure that will make the Bill returnable at the end of one year. I have been already in conversation with members of the Upper House and I admit that I do not see just what their objection is. Under the law as it stands today at the end of any ten year period the majority of residents of any locality can get the benefit of that act, whereas under this they may apply at the end of one year, and where the period is so unknown to the people it gives them the right, instead of finding themselves debarred of taking steps where the views of the people have changed to alter the law, they may do so now at the end of any year.

I would like to say to this House that this measure is introduced as it was last year at the request of members of this House, and not as a matter of policy but to meet the desires of all sides of the House. We are all equally interested and there is one fact about the whole matter is this, that the best evidence you can get in support of the idea of this Bill is the fact that these requests for changes in the law come from sheep raising districts and particularly I have in mind Conception Bay district, Hr. Main, from which petitions have come right from the very heart of the district where sheep are grown, where sheep are raised. Mr. Cahill, the junior member for Hr. Main presented a long petition; there are petitions from people of the South Shore, right in the home of sheep, asking for permission to keep dogs; Mr. Cashin and

Mr. Moore have last year and again this year presented the same request, all coming from people in these areas where they must have given some consideration to the preservation of sheep. There are requests from various parts of Conception Bay, such as Carbonear and Hr. Grace; certain sections of Placentia; from certain sections of the districts in what may be termed the more northern section of the island; there have been very very strong for the opportunity to change this law from Corner Brook. In the fall last year, though it may seem humorous to suggest it, but the situation was so acute in that settlement that certain men who were very fond of their dogs simply cleared out of their jobs and went home. I don't say we lost much by it, the jobs were left open for somebody else, but I indicate the fact merely to show that the Bill is not produced hastily nor with idle regard for existing conditions. It has been the result of representations from various parts of the Island.

I am not unmindful of the object being the Sheep Preservation Bill. I think we shall shortly see introduced some management on the lines of the Bill that we have discussed for the past few years but are not offering to the House, now in which these very centres will be able to administer their own affairs by way of a local council and they would be able to handle the idea of a tax on the dogs.

This talk of devouring sheep and cattle troubled by dogs is not as great as it at first flush appears. I think it will be found if arrangements are made in the various districts where dogs are allowed, where the local authorities have the power to put on a license fee, I think enough would be found to pay for the damage that resulted.

In St. John's East last year, in the heart of the sheep raising district, it has been found that the amounts paid out for damage done by dogs have not amounted to any considerable sum. I offer the Bill to the whole committee and suggest that they will be good enough to have suspension of rules in this connection for the reason, that I would like to send it up to the Upper House at the earliest possible time.

We are going to try this thing out again. There is nothing meant at all that, so far as I am personally concerned, to do any more than respond to the requests of the various outport representatives.

Why men from St. John's should be permitted to go around to these districts and bring their dogs with them and shoot for birds and the local men cannot keep dogs, on the face of it it is not fair, not just. I don't think that the fear of depletion of sheep is really as grave as some members of the Upper House appear to think.

If this House in its wisdom thinks fit to submit this measure for two years in succession and now for the third time, we feel that there can be no charge of impertinence when we say to the Upper House that we think they should be satisfied with the decision of this Chamber. I do think that primarily we cannot be accused of any hasty action after passing this bill and we cannot be accused of any action without good deal of consideration for this is the third time, the third session that the bill has been before this House and we feel that the Honourable Members should pay respect to our wishes.

I only say this to the House in moving the committee stage of this bill.

The bill has been drawn up with the idea that we feel that if any section throughout this country where the majority of the people require the law

changed, the only point of difference in the bill which is now law is that where the people change their minds instead of having to wait for the expiry of the present term, for the next nine, eight, seven, six years, they may do so, if they wish, during this present season.

I ask the House, Mr. Speaker, to be good enough to accept the motion for reference to the committee stage, and I merely say that it is only introduced because of the requests of members of the House, submitted here in this House a few days ago.

I beg to move the House into Committee now.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, just before this section is passed I might make it quite clear and might say, as the Prime Minister has suggested, that this section is exactly the same as was introduced during the last two years. It is the same word for word as was introduced last year.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, as being one interested in this bill and having followed it this last two years, and representing a district from which petitions have been sent in, I would

like to know from the Minister of Justice can the Upper House turn this bill down for the third time?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, that is a hard question to address to me. They do pretty queer things in the Upper House. The other day the Upper House turned down a bill that was a money bill and seeing that they turned this down twice they may turn it down a third time.

When a bill is turned down for the third time by the Upper House there are certain steps that can be taken to ensure its passage, and that is provided the bill is introduced a month before the closing of the House and turned down for the third time. After being turned down it becomes law automatically. I don't think that the Upper House will turn it down this time. As a matter of courtesy, I asked certain Hon. Members of the Upper House, to give the matter serious consideration and I hope it will have some result.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, it is a hardship to the people of the district up there, when dogs are taken in during the shooting season by sportsmen from St. John's and I think it is very hard when their petitions come here and we cannot follow them up and have what they ask for granted.

They don't think they suffer as greatly as suggested through loss of sheep, if the majority want it done I don't see any reason why it should not be granted.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, this bill has passed the House on two previous occasions and there is no necessity for a debate. Those people who have taken the trouble to petition for the keeping of dogs must know their own business and we must give them credit for knowing what they want. I suppose they realize that the

country has gone to the dogs anyhow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922," and "An Act relating to the Disposition of Balance remaining out of the Loan raised under the Act 18 Geo. V., Cap 18." without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled, "An Act Respecting Harbour Regulations for the Port 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 they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act 1925," with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of these Amendments made by the Upper House, I would like to point out to the House that all that has happened is, that the Upper House have put the Bill back into the same form as the printed bill, Section 6 of the printed bill.

(Reads)

I think Hon. Members thought that they might like an addition to sub-section F, that the Commission wish to cut out the lighting of parked cars. Henceforth parked cars carry no lights. The idea is that regarding cars that are parked between twelve and six a.m. shall have an attendant on them. The reasons given by the Commissioners and Mr. Hall in particular for cutting out the lighting is, that it has been found that it is nothing more or less than a foolish hardship on people with parked cars. People in driving cars with their own lights can pick up a parked car, and so far as the parked car themselves are concerned, it is only running down the batteries. I would like to say while the bill is going through the House that the Honourable Members will appreciate that someone on one side or the other offer the opinion that this looked like an additional section instead of an amendment. We put it in without giving it a thought. Section 10 reads this way,

(Reads)

The idea of this Act as I actually introduced it was,

(Reads Section 6)

We cut out Sub-section F and put in the General Provisions,

(Reads)

They say that as far as country parking is concerned, I think Honourable Members will agree from experience that the parking of a car on the country roads, the lights being on a parked car is of no value at all to a

person that is actually driving. Their own head-lights reveals anything about, and they feel that this is not necessary.

I ask for the moving of the Second Reading, because of the reasons that I gave in introducing the Bill the first time. It comes as a result of the actual experience of those handling traffic, and I commend it to the House now.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice 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 agreed to without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Certificates of Masters and Mates," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries 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 agreed to without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had

passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act 1925," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

Second Reading of Council's Amendment to an Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker; The amendment now offered is a very necessary one and was made by the Upper House at the request of the Highroads Commission. It refers to sub-section (B) of section (9) and deals with the removal of fences. The sub-section now reads as follows;—

(Reads)

But we are asked to add the words;

(Reads)

We desire to give the Commission the alternative right by compensating people for fences taken down by capitalized amount or by putting up fences and keeping them in repair. This is the result of considerable expense and arbitration. When arbitrations were held sometimes the Commission received abnormal claims for fences. But now the Commission shall be able to pay the owners for fences definitely, or they will undertake to put up the fences and keep them in repair.

I commend the addition to the House from personal knowledge and experience the Commission had in which the most unusual demands for compensation were set up and very considerable difficulty had to be met by the Commission as a result. The amendment cannot prejudice the owners of property because the personal right is there.

MR. BRADLEY.—Does that contemplate the expropriation of any land at all?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No. It is absolutely and entirely a matter of fencing.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice 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 agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the Export of Shells.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Browne took the Chair of Committee.

LABRADOR SHELL RESOLUTIONS

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I explained the alterations in the resolutions which were made prior to coming into the House after the conference of the committee that it was assumed might be appointed and I do not think that there is anything further that I have now to say. There are no new alterations except those I mentioned yesterday.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, Yesterday afternoon I dealt with some of the main principles and my reasons for objecting to the passage of these Resolutions, particularly the points of creating a monopoly of all shell on the Labrador and that there was not sufficient evidence of the necessity of this monopoly brought to the attention of this House. Now this proposed industry is either a commercial undertaking or it is not. Judging by the earnestness with which these Resolutions are pressed on the House by the promoters one would be justified in saying that they anticipate con-

siderable profit therefrom, and the amount of shell upon the Labrador if we are to believe what is suggested to us by some of the promoters is considerable. They anticipate taking some 75,000 tons each year from Labrador.

Several Honourable Members have thrown some doubt on their ability to ship that amount. Some have gone so far as to say that in all probability the amount will never be shipped. That statement leave us on one of the two horns of a dilemma; either the amount is capable of being shipped in which case we are granting a monopoly, or other wise we are engaging in this present debate and debating upon an absurdity, and to suggest for a moment that this House should seriously engage its attention for several days on consideration of a proposition which may develop into an absurdity is not in accordance with the maintenance of the dignity of this Assembly. I do not know whether 75,000 tons of shell are on the Labrador or 7,000, but it is apparent that there are some people who believe that there is a considerable quantity there, and they believe it to such an extent that if the reports made to the Prime Minister are correct they have expended a considerable sum of money on their finds already. The proposition is that we shall give them half a mile of Labrador coast inland from the southern extremity of the coast line to its northermost point. I do not know the length of the Labrador coast taking into account all the indentations, but I am given to understand by those who do know something about it, that it would run to anywhere between three and five or six thousand miles. Taking a reasonable average distance of say four thousand it means that we are possibly giving these people control, while the shells last of some two thousand square miles of

Newfoundland territory and these grants are given for nothing. True it is that we get a royalty if the shells are shipped but in the meantime the territory is held up for a period of two years at least. Nothing and nobody can in any way interfere with that expanse of two thousand miles of coast because the Northern Products Company has the right at any time to nominate any or all of that coast as being what it desires and the Government will give them a grant of any of the parts, and the whole of the Labrador coast is tied up for two years. I object to that principle. I object most strongly to the idea of setting aside four or five thousand miles of coast in length and half a mile inland for a period of two years or one year on behalf of any company which has not yet given us substantial proof that any benefit is likely to accrue to the colony. The grant is irrevocable subject to the export of a certain amount of shell.

If these people had come to us and asked for concessions for territories which they have already explored, and they have explored a considerable portion of the territory, in fact according to a map very kindly given us by the Prime Minister they have marked out a number of places on the Labrador coast and island adjoining thereto for which they propose to ask for grants; if they had confined their request to the parts already discovered and these parts as I said are considerable, it might perhaps be argued that some color of right would be showed that they should be given these particular areas, but to tie up the whole Labrador coast for any length of time to a company of this kind which may or may not be successful, and which in the opinion of some Members of this House and a great many citizens outside is not likely to be successful, is not only an absurdity

but is interfering with the rights of the colony and the rights of the individual citizen of the colony. Furthermore in reply to the Prime Minister's attempt to minimise the effect of my remarks yesterday in connection with the possible effect of the passage of these resolutions on any arrangement which may be made by the colony in the future in reference to the sale of the Labrador, I want to say this that I do not suggest for one moment that these Resolutions give any portion of the coast of Labrador to the Northern Products Company indefinitely, but these Resolutions do give them the right to ship whatever shell is on the Labrador on whatever areas they select and these Resolutions do not impose any time limit for that right. They may either take them all this year or next year or in a thousand years to come. But to give an absolute right to remove that shell might at some time in the future interfere with a purchaser interested in the Labrador as a whole as apart from those parts of it on which these shells will be found, and as I pointed out this afternoon it is not the value of the shells in themselves to any purchaser of the Labrador that I had reference to, but rather the fact of the existence of a right which gives the owner that authority to go in on that sea-coast for years and years to come and possibly interfere with operations of those who might become the purchasers of the whole country, that might upset any possible arrangement which we might make in reference thereto.

Now the Prime Minister suggested that it was going to be very difficult to make any arrangement for the sale of Labrador of advantage to the country. He may possibly be right in that, but, the greater the difficulty in making such an arrangement the more careful ought we to be to accord any possible obligations on the colony

which might interfere with the consummation of such arrangement, difficult as he suggested it would be to be made in any event. It is one thing to dispose of the Labrador with a free title to it and quite another thing to dispose of it when rights exist, even such rights as in the opinion of the purchaser will not necessarily interfere but may possibly interfere with his use afterwards. Consequently I am satisfied we ought not to in any way tie up the coast of Labrador unless we are absolutely certain that considerable good is bound to accrue to the colony as a result of such tying up.

It has not been proven to my satisfaction and I submit that it has not been proven to the Prime Minister's satisfaction that any considerable advantage will accrue to the colony. If 75,000 tons or say 100,000 if you like, according to the Prime Minister or the suggestion of the promoters it may be millions, if 100,000 tons are exported that will give the colony the sum of \$25,000, and that will be poor consolation to the taxpayers of Newfoundland if by any chance it should result in upsetting any arrangement which we might make for the disposal of Labrador on terms advantageous to the colony and very little things at times will interfere with the consummation of an arrangement of this nature.

I would like to remind the Prime Minister of the fact that according to the Government side of the House at any rate the mere insistence upon a demand by Members of this House for a schedule of articles which the operating company at Buchans Mine would want introduced duty free, last year, would have upset the whole arrangement. If that be so then we are justified in entertaining considerable fear as to the ill effect of the passage of these resolutions on any future arrangement for the disposal of Labra-

dor that might be made. We legislate not for today, but for the future. We are tying up certain assets on the Labrador for a private company which has not yet justified its position, and I propose to prove that it has not justified its position in asking for the passing of these resolutions at the possible cost of considerable damage to the colony. Now, a monopoly must always be justified, before those who have it in their power to grant it, are justified in doing so, and I have not yet heard any arguments in this House which would justify me in voting for this. On the contrary I have heard good arguments that no such monopoly is necessary. The Labrador Marine Shell Company filed a petition in this House a few days ago and that petition points out that no monopoly is necessary and proves it. Section 4 of the petition reads as follows:

(Reads)

Now if it is possible for the Labrador Marine Shell Company to carry on operations and export shell from the Labrador without the aid of a monopoly, then it is either possible for the Northern Products Company to do so or they ought to get out of business. That Company further points out in its petition that not only are they prepared to go on, but they are at present in possession of orders for these shells, and are prepared to go ahead right now, and I am credibly informed that they have exploited their product not only in Canada and the United States but also in Germany and Belgium. Now I want for a moment to deal shortly with the history of this as I understand it, and any Honourable Member who can disprove any statement that I make will confer a favor on me if he will do so. My understanding of the situation is this that this shell industry first became known through the efforts of one Mr. Chalmers. He was the originator of the

scheme. He interested himself in the matter some years ago when he was working with the Reid Newfoundland Company. I understand also that the Reid Newfoundland Company held certain areas down there. I understand further that at some subsequent date Mr. Chalmers together in partnership, and I want that word to be noted, with Mr. Smythe, the promoter of the Northern Products Company, acquired a five year option on the lands containing these shells. They went on with their investigations for some little time, just how long I do not know, and then Mr. Smythe broke away from his partner for what reason I do not know, and formed this Northern Products Company, Limited. Last year it was proposed to introduce a bill into this House to give partner two, Mr. Thomas Smythe a monopoly of all the shells found on the Labrador, and the man who originated the scheme was to be left out in the cold. The Prime Minister knows full well that the bill was not proceeded with last year because it could not pass through the House. I need not tell you that now because he knows it and I know it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You know a whole lot; I know some things about you that I might mention.

MR. BRADLEY—You will know more about me before I am through.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Presumably the same as the remark you made yesterday.

MR. BRADLEY—That bill did not proceed very far, it did not get beyond the Government rooms, for the very simple reason that it could not pass the Assembly at the time, but the House closed in the month of September, on the fifth or sixth of September, and a couple of weeks later, the whole of the Labrador coast was reserved by the Government and Mr.

Thomas Smythe by minute of Council was given the privilege to search, or the Northern Products Company was, which Minute of Council was entirely illegal and of no effect and the parties who know anything about this Minute of Council should realize Mr. Smyth's object. But he did not know that in the meantime the Labrador Shell Company had applied to the Crown Lands Office for grants of certain areas containing shells on the Labrador and these grants were given and presumably paid for in the ordinary way.

Now this bill proposes to take from the Labrador Shell Company the very grants which the Government gave them last year and for which they paid their money. Now I want to ask the Government members, do you consider this as British fair play or not? The company promoted by Mr. Chalmers, the originator of this shell industry scheme having acquired further grants upon the Labrador for which he paid the Government their money is now proposed to be robbed of that for which he paid in favour of the man who left his partner and branched out on his own evidently with the intention of knifing him in the back, and knifed him in the back he has done.

I want to repeat for the benefit of those who may not have heard me yesterday that so far as the two companies are concerned I have no interest in them whatever and so far as Mr. Chalmers or Mr. Smythe are concerned I have no interest in either. I know both gentlemen concerned but if I know one better than the other I know Mr. Thomas Smyth and the same applies to the promoters of both these companies.

I do, Sir, object to this legislation being introduced to grant a monopoly and assist what I regard as most despicable conduct of the promoter of

the company which is knifing his partner in the back, and trying to take his rights away from him. I for one will not be a party in any such dastardly scheme. The very phraseology of these resolutions show the intention of the Northern Products Company beyond all possible doubt.

They are going to allow, according to the resolutions, the Labrador Shell Company to retain those rights which they acquired prior to the 13th day of October, 1926. The only areas which they had acquired prior to that date are those in which Mr. Smythe and his company have a half interest. That is all that they have got prior to that date. Now how is it possible for the Marine Shell Company to operate those areas without the consent of Mr. Smythe. You simply put a rope around his neck and choke the life out of him by granting him rights which he does not possess. You are hanging a noose around his neck with one end in the hands of the Northern Products Company and the other in the hands of the Labrador Shell Company. He cannot export a single shell, cannot do anything, unless he obtains permission, which is rather expensive proceeding ordinarily. If the Northern Products Company acquires from the Government the absolute rights on the Labrador which will enable them to take away from the man who originated this scheme, by taking the coast and coastal districts in order that Mr. Thomas Smythe's company could come in and take the areas which are paid for in hard earned cash to the Government I can only consider it as attempting daylight robbery. Taking a man's money and giving him grants, now that you have the money you are taking the grants and giving them to Mr. Thomas Smythe and his associates. It is just, is it decent?

In connection with this section I have to suggest, but I know before I

suggest it that it will not be adopted, that that phrase "prior to the 13th day of October, 1926" be changed to read "prior to the date of the passing of this Act," and I am prepared to wager now that it will not be accepted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Why do you say that?

MR. BRADLEY—I say because it is true.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Much of what is there at present may be changed.

MR. BRADLEY—I give you the opportunity to change it now. I am not going to have you butting in all the time. Mr. Chairman please call the Minister of Justice to order.

THE CHAIRMAN—Both Honourable Members will address the Chair.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to interrupt, but the Honourable Member is not entitled to offer a wager in debate.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I would draw your attention to the fact that any impropriety in the debate is not my fault but the fault of the Minister of Justice.

Now I was going to ask the Prime Minister to alter section 7 to read instead of "prior to the 13th day of October, 1926," "prior to the date of the passing of this Act," which will permit the Shell Company to retain their rights and export shells from the places where they have already found them.

Now I want to refer to Section 3 of the Act,

(Reads)

"during the said period," now what is the period? We have to look back to Section 2 which reads as follows: (Reads) "for a period of five years." That is the period. You get a 25c. tax on all shells exported for a period of five years and when the five years ex-

pires you don't get any further royalty there.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is the joke in the whole thing, I thought you would fall for it. We will make an agreement with them then, for the royalty.

MR. BRADLEY.—We are making an agreement, let us make it now.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, we are not going to do that because for instance they may be making profits in the five years that the Government may be justified in putting on \$1.00 tax.

MR. BRADLEY.—That is the idea, to get these people down there and if in your opinion they are making more profits than they should be making you are going to take it from them. That is in accordance with the Government's action in most cases, and in respect of the bill and I can quite understand their attitude in this respect.

There is no protection for the Colony with regard to the taxes arrears. There is no protection in the bill and I submit that the section should be changed and if the members think that it would be in the interests of the colony to increase the taxes at any future date put in "such sum not being less than 25 cents per ton as the Government of the Colony may deem reasonable."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is one thing that we have considered. The Government may want to make it a \$1.00 tax and it is bound not to change the amount only at the end of the five years.

MR. BRADLEY.—I have an idea that if the Government that is in the House at the time when the five years expires does not take any more care to protect the rights of the people than the present Government that

there is not much to expect from them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They wanted that proposition of twenty five cents a ton put in for the next fifty years and we turned it down.

MR. BRADLEY.—You could not possibly justify that. Now sir, there is not any protection whatever given to this Marine Shell Company. Section seven I think it is of the resolutions which is supposed to protect their interests does not protect them in any way whatever. It simply sets out that nothing;—

(Reads)

Prior to that date the Marine Shell Company held no right whatever except those in which the Northern Products Company had a half interest, and these rights cannot be exercised, except with the concurrence of the Marine Shell Company. If that is so how are they protected? All these rights that they once acquired and hold at the present time from the Government, this Company are now proposing by these Resolutions to take from them, and they are not even considering that they should be compensated in any way. That is unfair and unjust, and in addition to the unwarranted interference with private rights which is apparent on the face of these Resolutions, the whole section is entirely wrong in principle and that no justification whatever has been given for the extension of the Northern Products Company of the monopoly of practically the whole coast of Labrador, for all time, as far as these Resolutions go. Now, Sir, I want to propose an additional section to these Resolutions, and I move this, that this Section be added:

(Reads)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I just want to say a few words on

this matter. My Honourable friend that just sat down seems to be thoroughly in earnest about this matter. The difference between myself and my Honourable friend is that I am differently constructed. I like interruptions to help my argument. I am not as touchy as some people in this House, so that he can go ahead now and interrupt now as often as he likes.

There is no great occasion at all to be labouring this question here. It appears that one man's name has been repeatedly mentioned in connection with these Resolutions, and that man's name is Smythe, for what particular reason I cannot say. I do not know why the whole Resolutions are referred to as the Smythe Resolutions.

MR. BRADLEY—It is easier to say "Smythe" than the "Northern Products Company." That is the reason why I used the phrase.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—My methods are rather different. I do not believe in talking of the pioneer of the mighty thought on the other side. I thought it would be very unkind of me to refer to his name by way of comparison. At least I could say here that in dealing with the name of the gentleman mentioned, I do not know whether the idea that no man can be a profit to his own country, has any influence, that the idea of progress from a man belonging to the town is out of the question, and the whole thing has been submerged on account of that, and we must give undue consideration to some other one the father of the mighty thought, merely because he is not belonging to the town or the country. Of course, we have a habit in this country of falling over people from outside countries. Now I do not know that we ought to discontinue this thing, because some man from our town comes along and tries to do something. The Prime

Minister has been very fair about the whole thing. He says that on a certain date, namely the thirteenth of October, 1926 that certain people had claims held at that time under the guise of mineral claims, under which they thought they had a product to be exploited called "Labrador Shell," and he says that at that time one of these parties came and put a proposition to the Government that they thought they were given control of the market in shell they could interest outside people. They could not interest people in this country, to the extent that the capital was required. That is quite obvious from our experience in the past. It is going to require enormous capital to live up to this contract. Whoever is going to take seventy-five thousand tons of shell from the Labrador, it will not be done with children's go-cars and spades. There must be equipment in the way of loading and transferring of the shells to the steamers and getting them away. So we can all agree on the point that if those resolutions are going to be lived up to it is going to require a very substantial financial backing behind the move. One of the gentlemen that we have just referred to here interested local capital in the first place. I think that the two hundred local shareholders here who put up about fifty thousand dollars are entitled to some consideration. May be there is a reason why it has been thought worth while to talk about one individual than to refer to the couple of hundred people to-day principally in St. John's and some outport people, who have subscribed to this proposition.

MR. BROWN—In both companies.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, In one company. I have not had the privilege of seeing the share lists.

MR. BRADLEY—Capt. Randall knows a man in both companies.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I have no doubt about that. I know a man in both companies myself.

MR. BRADLEY—Then the Hon. Minister does know something about it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I know a lot more. Perhaps Capt. Randall knows the same man as I do. I know a lot of people in this town that would be in a half dozen companies if they could get in them. I am dealing with the fact that we have Resolutions before us dealing with the Northern Products Company. Two hundred people have money invested in that company, based on what? Upon the idea that the Government has undertaken to do what? What is the terrible thing the government is going to do. To give them a grant of this product of this thing called shell on the Labrador. What the shell consists of I do not know. I never had the privilege of having it analysed. And also whether it is mineral or not it is not for this House to determine. It has been down there since the Labrador was first thrown out of the sea. No one apparently has done anything with it, and after all these years, when the idea comes to exploit it, and like everything else in this country you have a crowd of people, like that hanging around the Office of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, looking for the fellows that have enterprise enough to go and search for minerals, and then they take out their claims. Now I am going to discuss this in the abstract. Now these people have gone to work and acquired this grant from the Government, and they are going to embark on this provided they can get two things. First an opportunity to make a search of the areas for shell, and secondly to get the right for a limited period of years that is five, to control the market.

MR. BRADLEY—And control other things as well.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, and if I had the privilege of being their lawyer which I am not, I would advise them to accept. I would pull my best in the hope that the legislature would give them these concessions, and in that way save the cost of development by having them do it.

MR. BRADLEY—And force the sale.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are not forced to sell at all because they hold the areas.

MR. BRADLEY—They have no right to hold these areas if this bill passes.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Oh, yes they have. In the first place they have up to the thirteenth of October to sell the claims that they had taken up to that time.

MR. BRADLEY—They only have a half interest in them. The other half is acquired by the Northern Products Co.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Does my learned friend know that Mr. Gushue the representative of these companies has been advised, that they can take the two and a half claims in whatever name they like.

MR. BRADLEY—No.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There are some things then that my learned friend has not been fully instructed about. I have no wrong idea about the claims before the thirteenth. And I say here now definitely and positively and formally, that the gentlemen that are interested on the other side have had offers to take up their two and a half claims. Now in the next place as regards the claim taken subsequently to the thirteenth namely that on the thirteenth certain people had mineral licenses, and cer-

tain people at that date having these licenses were presumed to hold this thing as a mineral, and the government is not bothering about the question as to whether it is a mineral or not, and next the government merely reminded them that whether it is a mineral or not that in any event up to the time they took those areas on a venture, that those people who presume to hold shells under a mineral license should be protected.

Section (7) makes it clear and sure that, even if it were not a mineral license, any persons who should presume to hold any mineral licenses under that section shall be protected. As to anything that occurred subsequently I think that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines answered that one point that was taken up by the Member for Port de Grave and by the Select Committee formally, namely, that the granting of a mineral license shall be subsequent to the 13th of October, 1926, and shall be regarded as indicating that the Government meant to give those other people the shell too. I say now, as a matter of charitable construction, that that argument is merely advanced without due consideration. The Government could not possibly refuse a mineral license to any person because the Government had made no survey of the Labrador minerals. The Marine Shell Company might have taken out claims for anything at all, but the Government did not know what it was for.

MR. BRADLEY—The Department of Agriculture and Mines knew what it was for.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I say the Department did not know and the Hon. Member has been long enough around the Government to understand that the Government never sees these things at all, and have no knowledge of them either directly or

indirectly, but the Government has got to accept responsibility sometimes for Department and for lots of things that it should not accept, and, if my Hon. friend wants me to give him a lecture as to how to handle a Department I will give it to him now. We have heard such a lot of talk about this whole shell matter that one would think that some desperate thing was being done. I am afraid that the Hon. Member for Port de Grave is suffering from the penalty of youth, and he has got to grow up to learn, and if he will only keep his ears open and his mouth shut I am sure he will learn something.

The Hon. Member for Port de Grave stated that the Marine Shell Company held prior to the 13th of October five areas in conjunction with Mr. Smythe. As to that I can definitely state that there was on occasion for a petition from the lawyer of that company, because I know that the five areas can be divided at any time and Mr. Chalmers and his associates can have their two and a half acres for their own right. The second point raised here is regarding this idea of any so-called stabbing in the back. One would imagine this whole thing as if some desperado was going around stabbing in the back and that one certain gentleman was almost going to be murdered. Now the facts are that one man who is enterprising goes out and promotes something and immediately some drones and good-for-nothings come along and proclaim what they were going to do. We had the same thing here yesterday in connection with another Bill. That seems to be the history of everything that is promoted in this country; but the most important point is the suggestion that the granting of these concessions has anything worth while considering with regard to this so-called selling of the Labrador. This

cry of the selling of the Labrador is almost becoming a chesnut. I have only to repeat what other speakers have said that we are mostly selling Labrador with our mouths, particularly when we do not see any persons falling over the place with the purchase money; but the most important part of the whole thing is that these Resolutions give no rights of property whatever to the Company on the Labrador in the sense of the Labrador as such. The Resolutions do not give the people concerned one inch of land or one inch of coast on the Labrador. It is simply an undertaking to grant them a deposit of shells exactly the same as if the right were granted to give them a deposit of kelp on the sea shore, and I do not think that it would be seriously contended that if a right was granted to-morrow to take kelp that we would be granting the coast of Newfoundland. Now that is exactly what the Resolutions give, and I say here now that one of the first things this Shell Company have got to do in order to save their Resolutions is to apply for landing sites on the Labrador. I cannot imagine to-day that it is physically possible for them to transfer their stuff without having some sort of premises here and there, but I want the House to accept the assurance that there is no foundation at all that they are given territorial rights to Labrador. They are given no rights as to soil; they are given only such rights as would be given them to take the manure off the streets of St. John's.

Finally, I would say in all fairness that, as this is not a Party measure, is it worth while trying out? I have been hearing for a long time about saving this country and hold on to your beautiful rocks. Now, if instead of having somebody belonging to the country, some fellow with a lot of titles to his name, with a head of

long hair and looking like a professor comes along he is received with glad hands and he is dined and wined; we would hear speeches about him a yard long from political leaders, and he would become almost as famous as the Carbide-Wilson deal. but immediately it is found that an industry is promoted by a man from town it is an entirely different story. Well all I have to say is that I have sufficient respect for the intelligence of those people who are identified with this shell business to say that as they have invested their hard earned money in this venture that they should be given a chance to get their money back.

The last point I would like to make before I sit down is what are we giving those people? Take section (3) which is suggested here to be the most offensive section of the Resolutions. In effect the section says that the Company undertakes to pay the Colony 25 cents per ton on all the shells that they export from Labrador for a period of five years. After five years we can take a revision. We can increase the tax; get more than the previous five years. There was a suggestion of a period of 25 years that it would be no less than 25 cents and I think that they would be delighted to get that put in, but I turned this section down. From the standpoint of the wishes of the Company I think they would be glad to get the section but I threw it down. I did not think it fair to bind ourselves in the experimental state.

MR. K. BROWN—Supposing any other company found minerals on these areas that say may be owned by the Shell Company and they want to start operations there, would they be hindered or interfered with in operating them?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, Section 5 covers that. As a matter of fact they are given no min-

eral claim at all. If I have mining rights down there, they have to so take off the shell as not to interfere with my operations. That is covered by that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, there is one point I would like to discuss in reply to the Honourable Member for Port de Grave. That is in respect to the respective merits of Mr. Chalmers and Mr. Smythe or the particular concerns behind them. I want to say to this House right now that if Mr. Chalmers had come with the proposition that Mr. Smythe came with we would have received him exactly the same and given him the same concessions. The position was that Mr. Chalmers was employed by the Reids, and he was working on that shell proposition for years and the result was that the Reids gave up the whole thing, and the 9 claims that they happened to have they handed over to Chalmers in part payment for work Chalmers had done. In the attempt to pick up more claims or check up on what Reids had he came to the conclusion I think of the nine claims that four were no good and he held on to five and sold half of those five to the Smythe Company. Now why did he sell to Smythe? I would be rather inclined to say that he sold to Smythe Company because he thought that Company was able to find somebody to work the industry in a large way. I am satisfied in my mind that is why. Otherwise if he thought he had a good thing; if he thought he could float a big company, why didn't he hold on to the five claims and get a company together to get more to like Smythe's Company did. I have no more of a brief for Mr. Smythe than Mr. Chalmers. I never met Mr. Chalmers. He was never here to me. Mr. Smythe has become interested in this thing and because he went up first

and spent his own money thoroughly with the knowledge of Chalmers, who went up I think because jointly interested in the five claims. He evidently got a local company together and named it the Northern Products Company, and a number of men placed sufficient confidence in it to get in as shareholders.

I think if any business man on the other side of the House gives consideration to the matter he will know that this can only be done in a large way. It cost \$10,000 to take a schooner load off the Labrador and distribute it. They can only make a profit by taking tremendous quantities up and by getting it into steamers at a moderate cost. Now, they are taking great care with regard to the matter of getting it into the steamer, but I for one am most decidedly skeptical as regards the cost of shipping shells. They may think they may get them up with suction pumps or something like that, but I am inclined to think it may be more difficult than they anticipate; but, however, they have gone into it and they have the capital behind them, and it means a bit of profit to us if they can make a success of it, in revenue to the country. What is going to happen supposing this Bill is thrown out now? I am going to tell you what would happen. The people who are ready now to send down steamers, and who are asking; and I have some messages; what is the delay, and why cannot they get to work now; if they should get a message back to say the House has decided they cannot pass the Bill, they will drop it. We gave concessions last in connection with Holyrood Pond and it may be remembered that some Honourable Members were disinclined to give the concessions, and I had to say at the suggestions of Mr. Job that the Government would withdraw the Bill if there was much more

opposition, and the Bill went through and I the Company today would be much better pleased if the Bill had been dropped, because I understand Mr. Job has spent some \$6,000 and has passed it over to a gentleman named Cowan who is now trying to interest somebody else. There may be nothing come of this and those Americans may lose their money and the local people may lose their money, but don't you think it right to give them a fair chance?

Do you think if this large organization reputed the biggest handlers of shell food in the United States and who send travellers all over the States to get people interested, if those people are turned down, through Mr. Smythe's Company, do you think that next year they are going to get interested through Mr. Chalmers? I believe in taking the bird in the hand rather than the bird in the bush, and we have a bird in the hand and let us try and exploit it and get some money for the country in payments of export tax from that business. That is the point I want to emphasise. I do not want to see this money lost to the Colony, and that is my only interest.

Another point the Honourable Member for Port de Grave particularly dwelt on I think has been replied to very largely by the Attorney General, and that is that there may be some interference with interests on the Labrador; that we might spoil the sale of the Labrador as a whole. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is just as ridiculous to say that by taking a few pebbles off the beach at Topsail we might be taking a chance of losing an opportunity to sell Newfoundland. In my opinion the thing is absolutely ridiculous. The Honourable Member talks about two thousand square miles of Labrador and almost makes us think of steamers blocking up the whole two

thousand miles taking shells out. I wish to goodness I thought it was true that they were going to be taking them to that extent and paying 25c. a ton. But again, I like the bird in the hand better than the bird in the bush, and we cannot tell what we are going to get from the sale of the Labrador, but if we could see steamers taking off shells at 25c. a ton like that we would see a handsome revenue. As a matter of fact I am satisfied the Shell Company won't be operating on more than 60 or 80 miles at the outside.

The amendment the Honourable Member hands into the House is in my opinion the most ridiculous amendment that was ever placed on the table of the House. I could understand his moving that the Bill be given the twelve months hoist. I could understand his moving that the Bill be dismissed altogether. I could understand any kind of a proposition except this.

(Reads)

He suggests by his amendment that we should spend time debating the Bill and then write at the bottom that this Bill doesn't mean anything at all.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question. We give this Company the right for two years of going to the Labrador and locating areas there on which shells may be. They discover these shells and they are found on all parts of the Labrador. They are given grants for what they locate, and supposing they carry out their contract of exporting 325,000 tons of shell during five years, do they then afterwards hold these claims in perpetuity?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the other man can prove that shell is a mineral. I take it if the other man has a mineral right he will keep the right to export shell for himself.

MR. GRIMES—And hold it for all time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The other man can.

MR. GRIMES—If they can go down and locate shells all over that coast and select every place that they want and hold that coast for themselves and nobody else has any right to go in and export, though there may be millions of tons of shell anybody else that might become interested is cut off. Is it possible to locate a quantity of shell sufficient for the purposes of the Company within an area of 60 or 70 miles? Having done that there are lots of other shells to be found, and could it not be said then by the Government "You have a quantity of shell and we are going to reserve the right after five years to keep the rest."

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—We have the right after that to put any export tax we like on, and we could kill it that way.

MR. GRIMES—I am speaking about the rights to go over the Labrador and claim shell wherever it can be found though there may be millions of tons more than they may ever export. The Prime Minister says it is possible they may find what they want within a 60 miles area, and if there are millions of tons outside why can't the Government reserve the rest for the country and let somebody else come in when they can.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—My reply to that is that I do not care whether this Company or some other exports it as long as we are getting the export duty and why shouldn't we get this duty from this Company.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I think the point that Mr. Grimes is trying to make is that they might tie it up.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, my objection to this bill is that it is giv-

ing this company a monopoly of the whole coast of Labrador from Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to remind the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, this only gives the right to look for shells.

MR. BROWN—The Labrador has a very extensive coast line and there is a good deal that we do not know about. I have been over a lot of it.

MR. SULLIVAN—What is the extent of the coast line from Cape Chidley to Blanc Sablon?

MR. BROWN—In the vicinity of six hundred or seven hundred miles, I would say. That is the whole coast line, and these people are given the monopoly and for two years can go anywhere from Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley.

They can put ten steamers down there if they wish and search all the coast and if they find shell in every Harbour or any Island they can get grants for the shells. I think that any monopoly of the whole coast of Labrador to one company is not fair. If another company starts up tomorrow and wants to make a search for shells it is not allowed, for this company instead of making a search of a particular property, has the monopoly and no other company is allowed to operate. They cannot do as much business. If there are five or six companies going in and operating there would be five times as much shell exported and five times the amount of money going into the revenue of the country. This company is going to export seventy-five thousand tons of shell a year according to the contract with the Government, and if there were other companies there would naturally be so much more.

Suppose one company stated halibut fishery, and because they were the first company to start no other com-

pany can start it. You give them the monopoly and no other fishermen are allowed to start the halibut fishery. Well this is the same thing.

I am not against getting this objective started down there but by all means don't give a monopoly of the whole coast, so that nobody can go on the coast at all. We have a coast line there of a thousand miles and we are giving a monopoly of the whole thing in two years they can get two, three, four, five ships down there and discover all the shells that may be on the Labrador and they get the monopoly and nobody else can get a chance.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I have had very little to say about the situation, but I have listened attentively to what honorable members on both sides of the House have had to say in this connection.

I have been in here and seen monopolies given by the present opposition, and the present government, if you like, and I have been here for some years.

There has been a certain amount of talk about that fellow Tom Smythe and the Northern Products Company. But who is this Mr. Chalmers, where did he rise from? Tell us something about him. Any person like these connected with a very large scheme come to you, you usually discuss them in debate. I have been here and heard a lot of things during the last ten or fifteen years that I have been in the Government. I say in all seriousness that I don't think we will have any man starting an industry in this country that is worth while unless somebody gets a monopoly. If Mr. Smythe comes into this country and asks permission to export an amount of shell and he needs a monopoly, I say give it to him. If seventy-five thousand tons of

shell pay them to export, they will export ten million tons if they can, and it is just as well for the community. We are not anything unless somebody gets a touch of monopoly.

The very arguments that are used in connection with fish regulations, the same can be used in connection with shells. The Opposition tell us that we do not combine together, we do not trust each other and are not able to put into practice the fish regulations. They say that the merchants disagree and all that sort of thing. That is the position the Opposition takes. Mr. Hibbs tells us that it is wrong to give a monopoly on shells. If everybody was allowed to take a bag of shells once a week, that would be no good. On the one hand the honorable member discusses the fish regulations and tells us that united effort will help the fish producers, and you must now be prepared to admit that you must be compelled to have it for the shell industry.

I cannot, for one moment, reason with Mr. Brown in the position he takes. Mr. Brown is, I believe, quite honest about it, but he is one man that I don't understand. This man outside the House when you speak to him personally is fine, but when he gets up to speak politics he does nothing but offer abuse where ninety per cent of the people interested in shells are concerned, and he tells you you are doing wrong by the International Power & Paper Company. What is the good of pointing that out to us; that I cannot conceive for one moment. Surely it is no good to us. No one in Newfoundland today is going to change his vote on that account. The point fails.

MR. HIBBS.—Look at it from a political standpoint.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Don't talk that way to me

about it. On the Opposition side of the House—I have been there—they talk against something even if they don't think it is right.

MR. BROWN.—Did you do that when you were here?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—You bet your bottom dollar. I don't deny it. I am too honest. That is the trouble with me and Mr. Halfyard will agree with me that is the very position that I take up to today and since I have known Mr. Halfyard. I cannot see anything wrong with this Shell Bill and if there was anything inconsistent in it I would be the very first man to say hands off.

Here we have these men who have been down there long before anybody else got down there, and made sure of the shell business and are ready to supply labour, I say hands off. They don't ask for any particular rights or duties, they are paying twenty-five cents on everything they send out.

MR. BROWN.—Are they asking for free entry?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—They are asking for free entry for machinery and we are going to allow that. Anybody can get that. They are paying on everything else and they are paying twenty-five per cent on their export.

If they export seventy-five thousand tons and make fifty cents or a dollar a ton on it, I don't doubt they will export one million tons if they can.

I think that every honorable gentleman will agree with me on one point, looking at it broadly, never mind your political affiliations in the matter at all, I think that as a paying business if it is a success it is going to be a great thing for the country. I am certainly a doubting Johnny

as to whether it is going to be a success or not, but I feel that if they are to make a success of it there must be a monopoly.

Mr. Scammell talks of the fishing regulations and there is only one way he tells us, to improve things, and that is that we have got to be all together in order to be able to export at a greater profit.

Capt. Randell knows as much as I know about it and he is as much interested as I am, and he must realize that if we want results we have got to be together. Am I not right?

CAPT. RANDELL.—There is truth in that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Thank you; and that is the only possible way that you can get anything out of the shell business. They hope to be able to sell seventy-five thousands tons a year. I know that there were forty-eight thousand tons imported into one place in the United States in a month. I don't know how much hens eat, but they seem to get through it.

I would suggest and ask you to let this company try it out, and only ask you to look at it from a broad point of view. I would like to see Newfoundland support this thing and get it going.

I don't see anything objectionable in it and I believe that it is the beginning of the possibility of making the shell business worth while.

DR. MOSDELL.—With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice to refer to Section 7 of the Bill which refers on the second last line to "areas held under mining licenses or otherwise." How are these areas on the Labrador held, under mining license?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman; The people who held

mining licenses want to be protected and this section is put in here merely to make it clear that these people who have ordinary mining licenses are protected.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; Where is it provided in this bill that the person shall give proof of discovery within a certain area before filing application for the grant of a particular area. Under section four of these resolutions the company is simply obliged to notify the Government. But to do that they have to give notification of the location of the areas in order to obtain the grants. If the Minister of Justice can strengthen that I would like to see it done. Another strong objection raised to this bill has been in respect to the point that was raised to the Hon. Minister's suggestion just now, except along different lines. It has been claimed that not setting a limit to the operations of the company will give them the potential right to a strip of territory a half a mile wide along the whole coast of the Labrador. I would rather see some territory actually stipulated for operation. Say one hundred square miles. Why not limit the actual holdings of the company to the particular amount of territory that is essential for the export of shells. Why give them so much more than they can possibly use in one year or in five years. The balance of the territory is strictly held by the Government excluding other parties from operations there. Then at the end of the five years provided these resolutions go thru, the whole territory not absolutely granted by the Northern Shell Company, reverts to the Crown.

HON. MR. DUFF.—Mr. Chairman; After listening to the discussion on these resolutions it strikes me that several members know very little about the Labrador Coast. Members

must know that there are large sections where there is not a shell to be seen. And where you do see shells is on the islands on the other side of the coast, where no steamers can possibly load that shell. It can only be done by manual labor, where you have to go in the dories or boats of shoal draft. It would have to be done by individual men with shovels, digging up this shell in the holes between the rocks. I would like to think it is possible. The usual tonnage for a ship in that kind of work would be five thousand tons, and to ship the amount of ore every year that is stipulated in these resolutions would require two hundred steamers, sailing around this coast. The thing is absurd. We have shell on this coast, In Hr. Grace there are immense mussle beds. They are not thrown ashore in the harbor. They are only thrown ashore where the sea is rough. Then all this discussion is a waste of time. I am not worried about giving concessions to the Northern Shell Company for any number of years.

I am perfectly satisfied to give two years to see what they can do; but I think all this is ado about nothing.

MR. HALFYARD.—Do you think it is possible for them to ship 75,000 tons of shell from the Labrador in one year?

HON. MR. DUFF.—I do not think it is possible. I wish it was. I have had 25 years' experience on the Labrador and have travelled as much of that coast as any man in this House and I never saw any shells in great quantities. If any company can ship 75,000 tons of shell from the Labrador in a year I will take off my hat to them. I have seen beaches of shells a considerable distance upon the hills on the Labrador, but this company have only got a half mile

from the shore to search and they cannot go up the hills.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Like many other members, I have my own opinion about the securing of this shell, but I do not want to put it on record. There are people on their way to this country today and I do not want to stop them from putting their money into this thing. If they do not get out 75,000 tons of shell, that is their business. They make that request; and as far as I am concerned I have but to respect the opinion of the member for Carbonear.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, after hearing Mr. Duff express his opinion that it is practically impossible to ship 75,000 tons of shell from Labrador in a year, I do not want to associate myself with or place myself on record as supporting a Bill which will give a wrong idea to any people either in this country or in the United States, otherwise their chances of recouping themselves for the money they invest will be small indeed. We are not unmindful of the fact that company promoters have done more harm to Newfoundland than anything else I know of, and strange to say with all our so-called greenness have succeeded in getting capitalists away to invest their money in wild cat schemes and have not done the country any good. Therefore, I would not be a party to seeing money obtained under false pretences and I hope the Government will govern themselves according to the idea I now express, and eliminate any clause in this Bill that would give a monopoly and let everybody do what they like with shells on Labrador.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, we have heard very practical advice from the Hon. Member for Carbonear, who has had twenty-five years experience has travelled the Labrador extensively, and, of course, has had amply oppor-

tunity of observing the coastline. He says in effect that it is absolutely absurd to imagine that 75,000 tons of shell can be exported in a year. Now I would like to get the opinion of Capt. Winsor, who, I feel sure could give expert advice anent this proposition, and if he endorses Mr. Duff then there is no question about the Opposition voting against monopoly.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of talk about this shell business during the past two years. Now I have always been opposed to monopolies, as strongly as any member of the Opposition, whether it was a shell or any other monopoly until I saw good and substantial reasons for the granting of a monopoly, like in the case of the shark bill a few days ago. For the past two years I have fought tooth and nail with the Government in connection with this Shell Bill until it was made to give the Marine Shell Company the same privileges to ship shells as the Northern Products Company. I have been on the Labrador for 35 years and I doubt whether any man in this House or outside of it at my age ever travelled the coast as much as I have. I have been from Blanc Sablon, the beginning of the Labrador, to the Seven Islands fishing, and with the exception of Grois Water Bay and a few other adjacent islands outside I never saw any shells worth speaking about, and like Mr. Duff I am prepared to take off my hat to any man who will ship 75,000 tons of shell a year. You cannot get any 5,000 ton ships to where those shell banks are to load, under any circumstances. The shells have to be carried in scows and dories and I tell you it takes quite a lot of shell to make a ton. My opinion is that all this fuss has been kicked up here about all the shell that is on Labrador

is a joke, because there is very little shell from Blanc Sablon to Cape Harrison. Below that I have never seen any at all. In some sections of the Newfoundland coast there are shell deposits to be found, but shells on the sea-coast are very deceptive things. I know of a little island near where I was born, and in the spring of the year one would imagine that there were thousands of tons of shells piled up there, but after a couple of boat loads were taken you got on the rock.

Therefore, as I have already said, I fought this Bill until I was convinced that the other company got equal rights to ship their share of shells and I am now prepared to support the present bill as it stands. I was always against monopoly when there was no justification for it, but in this case if these people are going to ship 75,000 tons of shells a year, and, if it is correct are going to find a ready and profitable market for it, I think it will be the best proposition we got in Newfoundland for the Labrador.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, in reference of the different gentlemen behind these concerns interested in this matter, I may say that Mr. Smythe is known to me and has been known to me for a number of years by virtue of the fact that some years ago I was agent here for a certain company and in the course of my duties I had occasion to come in contact with Mr. Smythe. Mr. Chalmers I have known personally for a number of years; and to-night from the standpoint of the personality of either of these men or of immediate interest in the subject of these resolutions I approach them absolutely in the most dispassionate manner. I am not at all concerned as to whether the interests of Mr. Smythe are going to be advanced or deterred or whether the interests of Mr. Chalmers are going to be advanc-

ed or otherwise. But I am chiefly concerned because of the very big principle which is involved in these Resolutions namely the principle of a monopoly.

Now this afternoon our Honourable and learned friends discussed these Resolutions from a strictly legal point of view. It would be impossible for me, and I would not presume for one minute to venture into the legal intricacies that these present, because as a layman I would probably involve myself in a hopeless mess; but from the general point of view I have some observations to make. I consider that we are going too far in these Resolutions. I will go so far as to say that to-night in passing these Resolutions this House is legalising robbery. I find it difficult to see that ten men or nine as the case may be constituting the Executive Government in this country charged with the responsibility of protecting the interests of the people of the country and carefully guarding their rights, and on all occasions doing their utmost to enhance their welfare could have given the serious consideration to these Resolutions that it is apparent they have given, and on the other hand that Ministers of the Crown should come in here, knowing that there is a immense feeling of opposition to these Resolutions which will be even larger when they are known of throughout the country. I might term it in defiance of public opinion coming in here, not in accordance with giving the best that is in them, but coming in here and attempting to pass Resolutions of this nature, and I cannot for the life of me understand it. We certainly have a definite expression of opinion from the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, and they certainly left no doubt on the minds of the country that they were absolutely in a state of panicky haste to have these Resolu-

tions put through this committee, and we have had the spectacle this afternoon of at least two Members standing up and declaring apparently that they have absolutely no faith in the project on which we are legislating, and in the final analysis all of it seems that we were having much ado about nothing. In other words we have the spectacle of having two responsible Ministers of the Crown trying to put this thing through and legislate in the interests of foreign capitalists, and on the other hand when we would consider the matter deliberately two other members say that all our talk is a matter of much ado about nothing. I don't suppose that any Member of a Government ever placed himself in such an embarrassing position as the Hon. Member for Carbonear or the Finance Minister placed themselves this afternoon, because practically in effect they said, not in so many words, that they had absolutely no faith in the project, and the Minister of Finance knew Members of the Government that had no faith in the project.

HON. MR. DUFF—I did not say that.

MR. SCAMMELL—I am not going to quibble with the Honourable Member on words, but at least it was distinctly understood from the Honourable Member for Carbonear that he had no idea that 75,000 tons of shell could be got or exported, in fact he almost went so far as to say it would be practically impossible to do that in a year and he questioned if they could export 75,000 tons in five years.

I submit that the Prime Minister, if he was consistent, in view of the fact that two members of the Executive and one other member who is not a minister got up here and disavowed that practical fulfillment of the agreement, should immediately have proceeded to withdraw the Resolutions from the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal within these four walls of this chamber within the last week or so on the subject of monopolies, and it has been pointed out that once or twice within the history of the last twenty years or more on this site that monopolies have been granted.

I submit, Sir, that no monopoly has been granted ever by this Legislature of the extent of the monopoly which we are contemplating here to-night, and I submit further that no monopoly was ever granted that was not only so very large but goes so far as to reach further than we can see, because we cannot see what is in the distance now. As I say then, the granting of this monopoly certainly cripples or binds us in respect of any sale of the Labrador.

We disputed it and found that we had won a great victory, at great cost to the Colony, and I have and I again ask the Minister of Justice if it is not possible to estimate the total cost of carrying on the Labrador case. It was suggested that it cost about \$250,000 but in view of some of the payments stated in the statements tabled in this House we shall possibly find in the final analysis, if we find any one energetic enough to give us the figures, that securing the Labrador territory cost the people of this country during the last twenty years something like half a million dollars.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I have already tabled a statement of the cost.

MR. SCAMMELL—You have tabled a statement of the costs up to a point.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—All that I know of.

MR. SCAMMELL—I don't think, with all due respect to the Minister of Justice that there has been any research into the accounts in order to obtain the total cost. You have not tabled a

statement for some time, possibly since then there has been an investigation. If he did search I would like to hear from him now.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—When we gave the statement we gave all the amounts that we knew of. I don't think it would be possible for me to trace back all the public accounts. I can do no more than say that I can only give the amounts that are there. Estimate it at the outside \$300,000. That is all that I can locate. There is no secret about it.

MR. SCAMMELL—I agree that there is nothing secret about it, but the Minister of Justice himself supposing the political position reversed and a new government in, would want an exact statement of the cost of the case for the country. The Minister of Justice knows that it is only a reasonable question, and even if he had to employ clerks to get it it is only reasonable to suppose that we would like to know the total cost. At least we have won a victory and should know what we had to pay for it.

However, for the sake of argument, I will take the words of the Minister of Justice and call the cost \$300,000.

We have paid \$300,000 to get a very valuable decision, and last year we were astonished to discover when we came here that a large part of our victory was practically shorn from us because eleven thousand square miles of valuable timber lands was already given away. I do not say that the present Government gave it away but the present Government was in a position to have secured it for the Colony, eleven thousand square miles of timber land, which they made secure to those who held it.

Now we are down here witnessing the second scene in what I would term "monkeying with the Labrador."

The Minister of Justice this after-

noon and the Prime Minister rather pooh-poohed the idea that it would be worth while to discuss the potential value of the Labrador to us in order that we might know how our assets on the Labrador today are being parcelled out, and we don't know where we are and how we are going to get on when we come to make a real bargain in connection with this territory.

I submit that the first consideration of the Government before they began at all, when the proposition was first laid before them, the first consideration of the Government should have been that question, as to how far and what is going to be the effect as regards any possible proposal that may come before the House or be laid before us in future as regards the sale of the Labrador. You are here tonight granting concessions, giving a monopoly to this concern for five years in which to export exclusively a number of marine shells from the Labrador.

I do not consider that the worst feature of the proposition. If I was asked which was the most objectionable feature of the business, I would say the most objectionable feature is section 1, where you are giving the Northern Products Company the right to exclusively explore the Labrador for marine shells, and then making it safe after discovering the areas, if areas can be discovered, making it safe that they shall enjoy the securing of them.

I want to say now that from my point of view the most objectionable section of the Bill is the first section. It is bad enough to give the Northern Products Company the exclusive right to export for five years, but it is infinitely worse to give them the exclusive right of exploring for marine shells for two years, and to take care that they shall be the only persons there for two years.

The Prime Minister told us the other day here that we were legislating for a local company, and that we were turning it down because there were local men interested in it. We were told that if a Canadian or American or Englishman came in here with his hat in his hands we would all submit and bow and give concessions to a foreigner, but because this is a local concern we are turning it down, and because it is a local concern we should be more charitably inclined in our consideration towards the same.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Prime Minister, we are not legislating for the men who are shareholders in that Company; we are not here to-night legislating for a local company. On the admission of the Prime Minister and the members of the Government, his colleagues, who espoused the case from the other side of the House, we are here legislating to give rights which a foreign concern will enjoy. The shareholders are ready to sell the whole thing to an outside concern.

If you take up the shareholders list you will see amongst the shareholders the following:

(quotes from shareholders list.)

And these people will be looking for their money again. My contention is this, that all these gentlemen I now have mentioned here are all very estimable gentlemen, who have interests in the country, but we are not legislating for them. If we were legislating for Hon. Mr. Alderdice, Hon. Tasker Cook, Dr. Brehm and the others, I would not be so much opposed to the bill as I am. But we are not legislating for Newfoundlanders. We are legislating for a company that seems directly for the shareholder, but is indirectly for a crowd of Americans who are going to get the rights that we are supposed to be giving to a bunch of Newfoundlanders. I have

nothing against the gentlemen, the promoter or the men as outlined in the shareholders list, they are all Newfoundlanders but they would only be glad to get their money, because I know that every man who subscribed as a shareholder not a man has any faith in the management of the concern or in the thing going to be a practical value, but they got their money into the concern and I could suggest and say how they got it there. There are in my opinion, at least \$35,000 worth of shares in that company are simply promoters shares of which there is not one dollar paid in cash, and these people haven't a dollar spent on it and those who have money invested want to get their money back. They have no interest in the proposition; they have no faith in that it is going to be a practical success. There are men in this House who have been as long as twenty-five years on the Labrador, Mr. Duff and Captain Winsor, and Mr. Brown and my own humble experience in that connection of four years, all stand up here and tell you that they are never going to get seventy-five thousand tons of shell from the Labrador, and men who have got money in that company and men who are shareholders know that the thing is never going to be a practical success. They are hoping that it will go through the Legislature so that they can make a deal with some American concern and get their money back in that way. Yes, we are legislating for an American Company and you will find that as soon as this bill passes the House. Mr. Smythe will be taking a passage to the United States and he will take his interests up there and sell them out, and as soon as the men that have put their money into this get cold feet, they will be demanding that the shares be marketable and that they want their money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If it is sold.

MR. SCAMMELL.—You know it is sold. And you stood up here as Prime Minister, who ought to be the last word in integrity, and told us that you were legislating for a local concern. If it is sold we are not legislating for a local concern. I am for giving any local company any reasonable concessions to develop the Labrador. But you say that they have not got enough capital to put into it. Therefore, we are legislating for what must become an American concern. As to the development of those things concerning Labrador, and the argument that we are legislating for a local concern and all that stuff that is thrown across at us here, makes it only too evident that once a Newfoundlander wants anything, we have no sympathy for him, but if an outsider comes in we are inclined to take off our hats and give him all he wants. I for one have never been in favour of giving every man that comes in here all the concessions that he wants. I would say further that the gentlemen interested in the trade of this country should be given these concessions, and had sufficient faith to go ahead and spend capital in the venture. But they have no faith in it and the Honourable Mr. Duff, a member of the Executive got up this afternoon and called this bill a case of "Much ado about nothing." I want to know to-night whether he knows that we are legislating for an American corporation. Whether Mr. Chambers knows, what Mr. Power thinks of it and Mr. Sinnott. Surely they must have an opinion on these subjects, and probably they have the idea that they are doing something for the crowd of shareholders on this list, but really in effect they are giving a franchise that is going to be sold in the open market in America one of those days.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Surely there is no objection to a local concern selling out to an American concern if they want to.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Certainly not. But what right have you to tell this country that you are legislating for a local concern? And the men today that have got money in the Northern Products Company are going to try and get their money out of it, instead of these men coming down and putting their money into this corporation. And a question that I want to ask here is whether the records of the Agriculture and Mines Department show that the Northern Products Co. have any claims on the Labrador in respect to shell outside of those that they hold in conjunction with the Marine Shell Co.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—I do not think so, speaking from memory. I do not think that their name appears on the books of the Agriculture and Mines Department at all. The claims that they have are claims that they were promised or got from the Reids by option.

MR. SCAMMELL.—They have got nothing. There is another aspect of this matter. The question that I proposed to ask if you had told me that they had claims there, was whether they got them under mineral licenses or not. Now we find out that this company has not got any claims at all. All that this crowd have got now is an option. And they come here and ask thirty six representatives of the people of this country to endorse a proposition of this magnitude. Outside of the executive there are not five members on the other side that know the first thing about these resolutions. I challenge any man over there to get up and say that he knows the first thing about it. Yet these gentlemen

will stand up here about twelve o'clock tonight and vote for these resolutions.

Number two, they own no claims on the Labrador to begin with, and if they had claims they would not want all those concessions. They have nothing. I doubt whether they have very much money in the company. Not a cent of money spent last summer. I think that the Government should be absolutely ashamed of themselves. Now the only thing to do is to take these resolutions and consider them piece meal. First and foremost:-

(Reads)

You are going to give the people the right to go on the Labrador Coast and search for Marine Shell. I consider that clause in the resolutions as most reprehensible, on the part of the Government. Now if you are content that there is a market for this thing and there is a profitable business in it, why do you want to grant a monopoly. The Prime Minister tried to set up a parallel here between this and what we were advocating in connection with the fisheries. There is no parallel here and the Prime Minister knows that as well as anyone. The most objectionable feature in these resolutions is the section where you are going to give this company to go along the seashore and survey for these marine shells, and then you are going to give them the exclusive right to export same from the Labrador. As regards this clause one I would not be so much opposed to it if you were going to limit the Northern Products Co., to a certain area. I do not go so far as to agree with the Minister of Justice in his proposal to limit the area to two hundred square miles. Let them come in and suggest the territory where they will search for these shells. But surely you are not going to suggest that from Blanc Sablon to

Cape Chidley, you are going to give them the exclusive right to go in and search for Marine Shells, and they being the first on the scene are going to be the first that are going to take these areas up. I cannot believe that the Government have so lost all reason as to contemplate doing a thing of this sort. Now in section three you say:-

(Reads)

What are you going to accept for the summer of 1928, and if you are referring to the period mentioned in the section, does it mean that according to these resolutions the company are only obliged to pay a royalty for the following four years, because you are exempting them for the summer of 1928. That is a point that I would like the Minister of Justice to take note of and explain further in committee. Coming down now to the case of the other gentlemen, and as I stated at the start I hold no brief for them, but coming to their position, have they no right to be considered. Ought there to be no sympathy for them whatever. Mr. Chalmers was the original discoverer of these marine shell areas. He was rewarded with a certain number of these claims. We are particularly now debarring him from doing what he likes with his own property. I do not see where the fair play is in a proposition of that sort. I can only repeat what I said at the start that I cannot discuss the resolutions from a legal point of view, otherwise I would be able to say a lot more about them. But I consider that these proposals are outrageous in the extreme. What guarantee have we got here that this company is going to expend a reasonable amount of money this year. It seems to me that we have no "bona fides" given here. The company is not being compelled or urged to spend any money, and it is not going to be bound

to spend any money this year if it does not choose to do so in connection with this proposition. Now in regard to the exportation of seventy five thousand tons of shell, I say that no seventy five thousand tons is going to be secured for export. Some of the steamers that come here are about four thousand tons, and that is a pretty large steamer. You have got to contemplate the aspect of this Northern Products Co., loading twenty of these steamers in four or five months. Would any sane man believe that, and certainly no one that knows anything about Labrador, would not. And if the company did not export seventy five thousand tons in any year the resolution were null and void I take it. But you fix it up for them this year, when you find that they may not be able to export that amount this year, so that they can export it next year.

As far as I am concerned I strongly object to having that section concerning the 75,000 tons in the Resolutions. There should be no loophole for the company to excuse itself. If you are going to put the Resolutions through and you got some hold on the company, let the matter stay as it was originally and insist that the company got to export 75,000 tons and not leave the company to make up the deficiency in the next year. Now we have got no guarantee here that the company is going to spend any money at all this year. The Prime Minister stated that he had received telegrams from people in the United States who are interested in this proposition, messages such as "what is wrong; we want to get to work and what is the reason of the hold up"? I wonder if that sort of stuff is going to be taken at face value, I wonder how much bluff is mixed up with it. If the Resolutions are going to go through, I would say to the Government to get

busy in order that this company that are going to get these concessions can start in and do some real business this Summer, and I would suggest that the following amendment be embodied in the Resolutions.

"That all rights and concessions shall become void at noon, Nov. 1st 1928, unless the company shall have expended the sum of one hundred thousand dollars in development".

Surely it is only reasonable to ask that, in view of the large concessions and big monopoly they are getting, this company should be called upon to spend at least \$100,000.00 in connection with that development on the Labrador. I believe that the Government are going to see the Resolutions through, but I want to go on record as being unhesitatingly and unequivocally opposed to the measure now before the Chair because of the principle at stake here and the granting of such a huge monopoly and because of the bad effect it will have upon our future relations and negotiations in connection with the sale of the Labrador; furthermore, that the rights of Mr. Chalmers and the gentlemen associated with him shall not be interfered with, and in this connection I would suggest that section (7) should be altered to read as follows;-

(Reads)

I recommend this to the Committee in order that the other gentlemen interested in the shell enterprise shall get a square deal, that is, as we know what a square deal is.

In submitting these amendments I do say that we ought not to be called upon to consider these Resolutions at all to-night in view of the practical opinions expressed here by two Ministers of the Crown concerning this shell business. Because of that and in the light of the huge monopoly and

sweeping concessions this company is getting under the Resolutions, I can only characterize the whole thing as a piece of legalized robbery.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, before these Resolutions are passed absolutely, I would like to have a few words to say in connection with some of the remarks that have been made already as well as on the Resolutions now before the Chair. Comment has been made regarding the sale of the Labrador. I do not like the idea, personally, of hearing talk about the sale of the Labrador, because if we carry on as we have been going in this House there will be very little left on the Labrador to sell except barren lands and rocks. Now I want to ask a question in reference to the lands that are held under lease, that is, timber limits. It has been stated that there are about eleven thousand square miles of timber limits held on that territory which we won in this dispute with Canada, and I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if it is a fact that there are eleven thousand square miles held under license there now?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—The same amount that was held when this House was in session last year. I think about eleven thousand square miles.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Well, I would like to point out that there is not much left of that eleven thousand now.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—More than there was when we came into power.

MR. RANDELL.—If that is so they were not timber limits. The total area of Newfoundland is forty-three thousand square miles, and the late Mr. Turner in his estimate gave one-fifth of that to be timber; the bal-

ance was water, bog and barrens. Now I think I am safe in saying that the northern part of that Labrador territory that was given to us by the decision of the Privy Council has no timber on it at all, because timber does not grow as far north as that. Supposing we had 110,000 square miles and half of that is minus any timber. If you take 55,000 square miles that there is supposed to be timber on, it is only reasonable to say that it is not more wooded than is the Island of Newfoundland. Then take one-fifth of the other 55,000 and that is all staked off by the present holders of timber limits. Therefore, you have nothing to sell on the Labrador in the shape of timber. So when it comes to selling the Labrador, all the timber is held as far as I can see. I know a little about the Labrador although I have not gone into the interior.

We have now before us Resolutions wherein we are asked to give away for a period of five years to a company the sole right to export shell on the sea coast, and we are giving away such a stretch of territory that I do not believe that the majority of members here now understand what they are giving away because the contract is such an immense one that it is difficult for the ordinary individual to understand. I venture to say that we are giving away tonight thousands of miles of coastline, and three or four hundred miles in Hamilton Inlet alone. I put it to the Government that if the Northern Products Company want to operate on the Labrador for shell and they want a monopoly, why not they take a certain section where they have their holdings until they find it necessary to carry on further; but to give away such an immense tract of land and seashore as we are asked for in these Resolutions, is absolutely wrong in principle and I think

every member of the House will agree with me that it is wrong. The argument has been put up here that the gentlemen identified with the Northern Products Company have spent a lot of money finding out what shells are there and that they have gone to considerable trouble to get their plans so far ahead.

We have had nothing shown to us in this House to show that they have expended any money of any account. If you could say that they had spent a certain amount of money and got no returns or were not recompensed then there might be some argument in that, but personally I cannot think they have spent a big lot and I do not see any argument in that whatever. Now with regard to a monopoly, every one in this House within sound of my voice knows that it is a very serious thing to give monopoly. You interfere with the rights of the ordinary citizen; you are taking something away from him that he has and he thinks he has always. It is not done; it has not been done, I understand, in Great Britain for the past three or four hundred years; not a monopoly of this kind anyway; and you are taking away from the ordinary citizen something he holds for his own, something that you should safeguard, before we allow ourselves to be a party to handing over the whole coast, in fact. If the argument is that somebody else may go there and export shell and be in competition with these people, then why not give them all Newfoundland as well. If we are going to give them all Labrador, why not give them all Newfoundland? From Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley we have an immense stretch of coast. Of course there are no charts to enable us to say what it really is, but I think if it were measured it would be found that there was a seacoast equal to all Great Britain's, and

probably a lot more. Now then, Sir, I want to just draw the attention of this House to this proposition. What would really happen a man if he went to Great Britain and asked to be allowed the sole monopoly of standing on his head in Great Britain, even if he was paying \$25,000 to do it. It is undesirable in every way you look at it. If the Government wanted to get labor I might see some reason for it, but as far as I can see, I may not be correct, there is no way to get that stuff off the Labrador in some places where it is found except by machinery and conveyors and that kind of thing, and that means that the labor is going to be small. I do not want to take up the time of the House any further just now, but I want to put myself on record as being opposed to this on principle. I think it is interfering with the rights of the ordinary citizen of the country and I feel it is my duty to oppose it.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Barbe in the course of his remarks threw a challenge across the House that there was nobody on this side of the House except those composing the personnel of the Executive Government who could offer any idea at all with regard to the matter now before the Chair. I want to take up that challenge. In doing so I do not intend to take up to any great extent the time of the House. During the war period we heard a great deal about various effects on men at the war, of the various engines of destruction; during the war we heard of men being shell shocked. Today I think we are fighting a miniature war here and it appears to me that some of the combatants have become shell shocked having heard so much about this during the past few hours. Now I want to subscribe to the attitude taken by

Mr. Halfyard, the Honourable Member for Trinity, when he deplored the idea of so called wild cat schemes and pointed out that considerable harm had been done the financial development of this country by such. I quite agree, but I do not think in making that statement the Honourable Member referred to the present Bill we are discussing as a wild cat scheme.

Now, the history of this proposition as I know it, and I speak subject to correction, is that the Reid Newfoundland Company during the period when they paid particular attention to mineral development in Newfoundland and Labrador, sent a number of men to various parts of Newfoundland and Labrador prospecting for minerals. During the activities of one of these parties on the Labrador there was discovered this shell. They reported to their principals, the Reid Newfoundland Company, which had considerable of the shell brought up here to St. John's; and they sent away considerable amount and one of the members of the Reid Newfoundland Company went to Canada and the United States to see if it were possible to develop a market, and after spending considerable money and time, the Reid Newfoundland Company discovered or found or felt that they could not exploit the product. One of the gentlemen in their employ was the gentleman I think as stated by Mr. Scammell who first found this, and he bought or got in payment from them for work or for good behavior a certain amount of area on the Labrador. A gentleman in St. John's had sufficient enterprise to interview the Reid Newfoundland Company, having seen some of the shell, and having sent some away he found that there was an American concern connected with the business and that there was a possibility if there was a sufficient deposit that an industry might be developed,

and he then interested the gentleman who had been prospecting for the Reid Nfld. Co and he acquired part of the territory given or sold to him by the Reid Nfld. Co.

The next step he took was to interest 150 or 200 practical business men in St. John's and the outports and got them to invest some forty to fifty thousand dollars in the industry. He went to the United States and Canada and succeeded in interesting desirable people who were prepared to put in their money and come down and give it a tryout.

Is it not reasonable that this House of Assembly should try and help? What are we here for? Is not that our business to try and interest outside capital. It is nonsense to speak of trying to develop the country on local capital. If we had to depend on local capital how many of our mines would be developed? At Buchans Mine there was spent three millions and they have not got back in return three cents yet and probably they will have to spend another million before they will get any returns. Isn't it common sense to know that we cannot get any people in Newfoundland to subscribe four millions for the development of such an industry. We must go outside and get capital; and then we hear talk about monopolies. There isn't any monopoly in this proposition. We are giving this company a monopoly, a monopoly of five years, four years from September past, for the sole right to export from Labrador.

When the A.N.D. Company Bill was going through in 1905; and I might remind the House that the gentleman who then presided as leader of the House was the late Sir Robert Bond and nobody would suggest when Sir Robert Bond was alive and I know will not now, that he would come into the House and try to do something not in the interests of Newfoundland;

in that Bill we gave an area of two thousand square miles in the middle of Newfoundland in fee simple for ever and ever; anything in the ground under the ground and over the ground, and absolute ownership for ever. I have been sixteen years in this House and there is scarcely a session that people do not come in here with some proposition, train ferry service and all kinds of questionable enterprises and ask for monopolies and get them.

The sale of the Labrador has been referred to by several speakers this afternoon and how granting these concessions may materially interfere with the sale of the Labrador. In the first place the Company only asks for the right to prospect a half mile from the seashore and I hope that any Honourable Member in this House who may have in mind the possible sale of the Labrador will not consider selling the coast. If any Government that I am any way connected with should desire to sell the Labrador I would not consider any proposition that did not reserve the sea coast for our fishermen. I want to concur with the attitude of the Minister of Justice and those connected with him when in Quebec discussing the possibility of making a friendly settlement of the question. It was then pointed out by the Attorney General that in any proposition the purchase of Labrador, it would have to be distinctly understood that Newfoundland would have to retain the right to the seashore and the valuable industry of the fishery on that coast could not be interfered with. Any proposition we have in mind for the sale of the Labrador must make provision for retaining the coast line of Labrador, so I think we can easily dismiss that aspect of the criticism. Now the last speaker, Captain Randell, just before he sat down referred to the 11,000 miles of timber land on the Labrador that was held under licenses

by private individuals; and I do not say the Honourable Member meant to infer that that 11,000 miles had been sold, granted or given away by the present Government, but I want to make it distinctly clear to the House and the country that no such thing happened.

When the Monroe Government came into office four years ago we found that under license and lease, twenty-five thousand square miles of timber land on which large amount of money was owing to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. The Monroe Government instructed the Department of Agriculture and Mines to collect the amount of arrears outstanding on timber land and anybody who did not pay was to have his license cancelled. As a result fifteen thousand square miles reverted to the Crown, fifteen thousand square miles of timber land that was held by licenses when the Monroe Government assumed office because no one paid the amount that was owed on it.

I think it a pity, Mr. Chairman, that this debate has developed a subject that in my opinion is going to do considerable harm to the country if the Government succeeds the present one makes any serious attempt to try and make a sale of the Labrador. Provided we contemplate a sale we are going to be crippled in our attempt to do so if the Honourable Members in the House get up and state that eleven thousand square miles of timber land is all that is down there, and that we can't sell the Labrador because there is nothing left to sell. How can you consistently expect financiers outside not to take cognisance of the statements of members in this House. It is true that we have no official data of what we hold on the Labrador, but I do not think that anybody will deny that there are people tremendously in-

terested in the possibilities of the natural resources of the Labrador.

I hold that it is the only bright spot in the future of Newfoundland. It is idle to suppose that we are able to come into the House year after year and hear that the Finance Minister of the day has to introduce a loan bill. People are crying for increased road-milage, lighthouses and other public utilities. We cannot possibly carry on without some adjustment being made in the public debt and in any adjustment of the public debt the Labrador must figure. And if you begin making these insinuations which are mostly political, how can you expect outside financiers to take us seriously.

I trust that the members who spoke in the debate and needlessly raised these views of the Labrador before they go out in the public press will have an opportunity of scanning over and cutting out what they think is not in our interests.

Now with regard to the attitude that two thousand miles of coast line is given away under this act, I don't think that there is any such position intended.

I was in conversation this afternoon with a gentleman who has spent considerable time on the Labrador. This gentleman has spent a great deal of his hard earned money in the proposition that we are now discussing. I refer to Captain Walter Kennedy, who, I understand, has invested \$5,000 in the proposition. Captain Walter Kennedy has had considerable experience on the Labrador, and he informed me this afternoon that all the areas on the Labrador that the Company would want, would not exceed eight hundred miles, and of that eight hundred miles they would from one hundred and fifty miles that they may ask for grants from the Government for as they may contain shells. I

understand that you are able to go perhaps fifty miles without finding a deposit and then there may be a small one of a quarter of a mile long and perhaps quarter of a mile wide, and then perhaps you have to go another ten miles before you discover another.

These gentlemen have two years in which they are able to investigate and make application to the Government. They would be in a position to send men down and measure out the territory they want. I think, as suggested, that we make it clear that no more than say one hundred miles be taken up by these people. It might be added to the section that "areas not to exceed two hundred square miles." I think we might even lessen that. They only ask for half a mile inland and I think that perhaps one hundred miles by a half mile would cover the bill.

I am not in the habit of giving a silent vote in the House. I must get up and justify my position. I am always prepared to take my stand and tell why I support or oppose any proposition. I am glad of the opportunity of being able to support this proposition and to hold the same views as the gentlemen who give support to the proposition. Take the case of Bell Island, the people were using it to ballast their boats because it was heavy. Let us take Mr. Howley's figures, four billion tons at ten cents a ton, gives us \$400,000,000 and Bell Island should be worth hundreds of million dollars to the country.

I don't subscribe to the idea that this proposition is not a good one. I want to have American financiers come in here. We don't want them to get cold feet before they come inside the "Narrows" at all. Capital, that is the whole thing and with these people interested in the country you can supply labour with the money that you get from these men.

You want to get them in and bring them down on the Labrador and if they don't find shells they may find gold, they may find copper, water power, timber they may find something that will interest them.

Those who became interested in Grand Falls came here deer shooting and as a result have one of the biggest paper industries in North America.

Get capitalists here and take them along and if they don't find anything then it will be our loss as it will be theirs.

I have very much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this measure.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I just want to correct one statement that was made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

When reference was made to the sale of Labrador and I said what we had there I was referring to timber limits. I would like the Hon. gentleman to realize in that respect that I made no such remark to speak disparagingly of what areas otherwise may be there. I made mention of water power that may be there but as far as timber is concerned I think that when eleven thousand square miles is taken out of it you get pretty nearly all.

With regard to the coast line I think honestly that I can state without any qualms of conscience that I believe there is two thousand miles of coast line between Blanc Sablon and Capt Chidley. That is my question.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman; The remarks of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and of my friend Capt. Randell have suggested to me this idea.

I understand the Minister to say that after two years spent searching for shells this Northern Products Co. comes back to the Government and

says that they have located shells in certain places. Do you not think that it would be wise to limit them to two hundred miles of coast line? The Minister of Justice I think, suggested that it be inserted in the Act that they be confined to two hundred miles of coast line.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Two hundred square miles.

MR. HIBBS.—It occurred to me that is one of the strongest arguments against a monopoly to one company. As Capt. Randell says there is at least two thousand miles of coast line. I don't think that we should bar out another company from coming here.

That seems to be one of the strongest arguments against any monopoly of the whole coast. I think that two or four hundred miles of coast line would be enough.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; If I might interrupt the Hon. Member. The point is not suggested in this bill to give them a monopoly of so many miles of coast line, it is proposed that the financial backers of the local company, requires five years monopoly to sell the shell off that coast. That is the point. They do not want another company coming in and competing with them. That is the particular object of the bill. They want five years in which they have the market all to themselves because they have to go to enormous expense to get the trade, to throw out one kind of shell and take in another.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman; That brings up a bigger and broader question. The rights of the other party.

Now at this stage I do not intend to begin to talk for any great length. I want to review a few things that occurred to my mind.

I want to previously remark that I am in no way prejudiced against any

people connected with the Northern Products Company, nor do I serve in the remotest way the Labrador Marine Shell Company. I am not connected with the Northern Products Company and as far as Mr. Smythe is concerned I want to affirm again that I am in no way prejudiced against Mr. Smythe. As a matter of fact I rather admire his independence. He has been a friend of mine as long as I have known him and anything I say or do in connection with this matter, I repeat, is not because I have anything against Mr. Smythe or any brief for the other party which has been reported to me, but when you consider that the other company has the same rights I think that they have the same merit in the case and I don't think that they are being treated fairly.

Now I want to refer to two or three remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines which I particularly noticed. The Labrador Marine Shell Company is not a formal company in the same sense as the other people. They are not regarded in the same light. I think the answer to that is that two years ago the Executive Government gave the Northern Products Company a monopoly. How can you expect the Labrador Marine Shell Company to compete with them?

DR. MOSDELL. I do feel that those people have their rights. In the first place there are the five shares which they have there at the present time. I would like the Minister of Justice to explain this matter. I think he remarked that the Northern Products Company purpose to divide up those shares and give those people their portion, and permit them to co-operate if they so wish.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I want to explain that had actually been arranged for. I give you my authority as Mr. Gushue. He told me

that himself. The object of that section is clearly to protect them in that way. And I state further that if I thought for one moment that there was any doubt about the statement that I made I would not make it.

MR. HIBBS.—It has been stated here that the Northern Products Co. has spent in the neighborhood of ten thousand dollars during the past year. No doubt but they have. But I think that it ought also to be taken into consideration that other people have spent considerable money also. I heard from a very reputable member of that company that they have spent seven thousand since 1926 in acquiring five claims which are now useless, on the Labrador. They belong now to the Northern Products Company, and if that is correct as I take it it is, then it is certainly very unfair. And surely if that is true then there should be some compensation for the company that originally bought these shares. In referring to monopolies I made a note of some of the remarks made by the Prime Minister, last evening, when he referred to the Holyrood Pond Co., as an argument in favour of the present monopoly. And he stated that that was a monopoly that both sides of the House agreed to. I think it will be seen that there is no comparison whatever between the two.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I did not make any comparison, I merely said that a monopoly was given to them.

MR. HIBBS.—Well you will agree that there is no comparison whatever.

Again with regard to the Company which took the pebbles off the beach around Conception Bay. There is no comparison between the two, because there was no competition there. There was no other company asking for similar concessions. And also the area

involved was very small. But in this case there is an immense coast line, which gentlemen acquainted with the coast will tell you is in the neighborhood of two thousand miles. And you propose to give these people the right to search over all that area for shell. According to information given me, Mr. Chalmers was the original discoverer. He was acting for the Reid Newfoundland Co., and discovered the shell there in the early days. I think he was very sincere about the project and eventually he made up his mind that it was of commercial value and that he would have to float a company, only to find that there were other gentlemen who were more enterprising perhaps, that had been before him. I do not want to reflect on Mr. Smythe but I think it will not be gainsaid that Mr. Smythe had a good many friends in the present administration that he could talk to. The other man was not of the same type. I understand that even if Mr. Smythe did not get the monopoly he would not stand to lose very much. I have been informed on very good authority that a very substantial offer was made them by an American syndicate, to buy out the rights that they now have without any further monopoly. So that in any case they stand to come out of the proposition fairly well even if the Government do not give them the monopoly that they are now asking for. The more I learn about those resolutions the more I am determined to vote against them. Right here in St. John's we have certain monopolies which we should not have, if they possibly could be avoided. Maybe in the very nature of things they cannot be avoided. The principle of the thing is absolutely wrong, when you have another company coming in here and prepared to interest capitalists, and think that they would be able to ex-

port as much shell off the Labrador as the northern Products Company. Why then you go in and deliberately discriminate against another company and put them practically out of business, in order to give the other people a sweeping monopoly over the whole coast. No matter what attitude you may take there is no way in which you can possibly defend this action. The Prime Minister also mentioned the A. N. D. Co. but they were not given the whole of Newfoundland. The other areas were reserved and other companies have come in since. But in this case you have absolutely barred everybody else out. And no guarantee after all that they are going to operate. A great deal might be said against this thing, but I do not feel like taking up the time of this House, in repeating what has been said by other gentlemen, and they have pretty well exhausted the subject. I intend to vote against the resolutions. If the committee would consider the matter of changing that date as I suggested yesterday. Then you would give the other people a chance to operate the five claims that they have got down there, and which they have paid, you, say, seven thousand dollars is acquiring. I think that is only decent and fair. If there is any quantity of shell around that coast, I do not think that would debar them from coming in. If there was no shell there there would be no harm done, and we would be giving a square deal to both companies. And if they can form a company and get capitalists in it and a sufficient number to operate the ten claims, why not go ahead and do it. I think if we were to do that these resolutions would pass to-night. Nobody would object. I would ask the Prime Minister to consider his determination as expressed by him some time ago against doing

that, and giving some consideration to that matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We cannot do that.

MR. HIBBS.—These Resolutions then go so far as to actually rob these people of that which they secured and which cost them seven thousand dollars.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as regards these Resolutions. As a representative of the people, I cannot support such resolutions or anything which interferes with vested rights of any person in this country. I understand that certain persons hold licenses upon the Labrador which were granted to them prior to October 1926, and I feel that these people have rights and should be looked after by the Government. If any person goes to the Crown Lands office and gets a mineral grant, then of course the government is in honor bound to carry out its agreement and that is one of the main objections I have against the Resolutions that we are now considering. The other objection I have is the granting of a monopoly to this Company. According to the petition that was presented to this House, this Company could carry on this industry without any monopoly and for that reason also I cannot give my support to the Resolutions. There was a matter I wanted to ask about in this regard and that was what fees this Company will be called upon to pay for the grants of the areas which they may acquire after searching and what is there to prevent the Company from taking all the areas on the Labrador coast for shell purposes? If the Company takes in all the areas and exports 75,000 tons a year, then they will have a monopoly in perpetuity, in my opinion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They do not have to pay fees, they

will have to pay 25 cents per ton on every ton of shell exported.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They merely get the right to take the shell, as moveable.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—As I read the Regulations they can go and search for shells wherever they like at no cost; whereas a fisherman has got to pay \$5 before he is allowed to search for minerals. Under Section 4 what is to prevent this Company from asking the government for the areas granted since 1926 to this Company. I wonder would the government give it to them?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes, if the Government is going to get 25 cents a ton out of it.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—They would get that from the other Company also. Why not you put a definite tax on all shells exported from the Labrador? Now I do not intend to reiterate the arguments already put forth against these Regulations, but I want my position made clear, namely, that I am opposed to interference with vested rights.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, the first time this matter was spoken of to me I must say I was not much interested, but, strange to say, as the debate on the Resolutions proceeded I happened to be somewhat impressed with them. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines criticised the statement made by Capt. Randell that outside of 11,000 square miles there was very little valuable timber limits left on the Labrador. Well, I do not think that any statements that we may make in this Assembly will have any effect upon any future purchaser of the Labrador. No prospective purchaser will take any advice at all from the Legislature or from any citizen of Newfoundland. That purchaser will first go and make a survey of it. Out-

siders are not going to buy "a pig in a bag" and if any outsiders want to buy the Labrador they want to know what they are buying, and perhaps none of us have the same opinion as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this regard, that anything in the nature of depreciating the value of timber limits on the Labrador are better left unsaid because they will have no effect on outside purchasers.

I don't think we need worry about it. We can express our opinions for what they may be worth and it will have absolutely no effect on outsiders, whoever they may be who may consider buying the Labrador. It is not my intention here to refer to any action of the government or policy of the government with regard to their attitude to those who held timber licenses on the Labrador when they assumed power. I just take the opportunity of remarking in that connection that I might call to the attention of the Government and Minister of Agriculture and Mines that if he were to look up the records of the Councils of the Executive Governments he would find letters written by the previous administration showing its attitude with regard to these who held licenses and had not paid rentals. I know orders were issued repeatedly for them to be cancelled and the time had come when they should be cancelled and it so happened when the present government came in it was time to cancel the licenses of those who had not paid rentals. We took the attitude on this side of the House that even those who had paid rentals should lose their licenses and be compensated, so as to have the Labrador clear; but the present government thought that was immoral and should not be considered. Following up that argument with regard to interference with vested rights, we

accepted money from those who held timber limits on the Labrador, that were granted not by the present Government, but granted between the years 1913 and 1917. Look up the dates of these people who hold licenses and you will find they were granted during these dates. Following up the argument of immorality in connection with the cancellation of licenses held by people who have paid rentals, we have an example here as pointed out by several of the honorable members on this side who have spoken to these Resolutions. I was surprised to know that the Labrador Marine Shell Co. did take out licenses since the 13th of October 1926, and now by these Resolutions we declare them null and void. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines makes out that when these people took out licenses they understood that they did not mean shells. What in the world did the Labrador Marine Shell Company go to the trouble of applying to the Crown Lands Office for claims or licenses on the Labrador or islands on the Labrador which contained nothing but shells, if they did not mean shells. I firmly believe that the Labrador Marine Shell Company when they got their licenses from the Executive Government thought that they were getting licenses for shells and they regarded shells as minerals. But I understand that the question has been raised on the part of the Northern Products Company that shells are perhaps not minerals. And the Executive Government certainly if they gave some attention to the recommendations of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines when these went up for the approval of the Government, gave some passing attention to them. Anyhow questions would be asked by one or more of the members of the Executive Government as to what these people wanted—had they struck any

mineral down there, and so on—and if these questions had been raised no doubt some members of the Government would find that this was the Labrador Marine Shell Company and that they were after shells, and I firmly believe that it was fully within the knowledge of the Government that shells were wanted and nothing else .

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It does not come before the government at all. The honorable member has been Colonial Secretary for years and knows that mineral licenses do not come before the Executive Government. They never see them. I do not want to interrupt, but that is absolutely correct.

MR. HALFYARD.—Some of the Executive Government should certainly have some knowledge of what is being done. They have an opportunity of knowing what is being done in connection with the operations of parties looking for shell on the Labrador more so than the ordinary individual, and I cannot conceive that the members of the Executive Government either in their official or private capacities, having the interest of the country at heart, these claims being granted on the Labrador, not knowing that these people were applying for shells, that there was a Labrador Maine Shell Company, and that they were grants of shells.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Very improper and very indecent for any member to go down to the Agriculture and Mines Office and ask any such questions.

MR. HALFYARD.—It is a matter of general knowledge. Anyone who had any interest in Newfoundland certainly knew it. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines understood that leases were being applied for and that shell was what was wanted and

nothing else. That being so we should not be a party to interfering with the rights of any party who received privileges or concessions and paid for such, even if it be called to your attention afterwards that the Minister granting that did not really understand just what was meant. These people want and asked for claims for territory on Labrador which they thought contained shell. Now is it right, knowing that, the Legislature of Newfoundland knowing it, for this Legislature to be asked to be a party to an unjust action, to put it mildly—an unjust action. You received these people's money and now you are cancelling their claims. I think you should accept the amendment changing that date of 13th of October 1926, and allow those claims since then to be good, as follows: (Reads).

Of course no one will question the bona fides of the Government not to harm, or make incur liability, or treat any Company that had rights previous to the time the Northern Products Company came on the scene. That is one reason why I think we should have regard for those who were the pioneers of the industry. Those people spent money and expended their time and exerted their brains to try and further their own interests. I understand that the reservations given by the Executive Government in favor of the Labrador Marine Shell Company were given after a protest of the Maine Shell Company when they heard that some rights were being considered, and they did not grant them a hearing. Mr. Chalmers is one of the promoters of the Marine Shell Company. He is the originator of the marine shell idea. Other men are coming in reaping the profits of his idea. All other things being equal, certainly we should give the originator of an idea, preference, or we should give him equal hearing

with those who came in after and benefitted by his work. I have made reference to that clause which makes null and void the claims that the Labrador Marine Shell Company now have.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not want to interrept, but I might say for the information of the honorable member that it does not make them null and void.

MR. HALFYARD.—It makes them nul and void in this way; it says here:

(Reads)

“prior to the 13th day of October.” But these claims that we are discussing now were made since October 1926 and you are disallowing these now.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No claims are disallowed. We are protecting the Labrador Marine Shell Company. It is contended by some that shell is not a mineral and we say that if not a mineral those who held under mineral licenses before the 13th of October, 1926, are protected anyhow, and we secondly state that if shell is a mineral, mineral that is got under a grant, cannot be interfered with.

MR. HALFYARD.—This definitely states you recognize the rights existing before the 13th day of October only. What does not come under that is affected by the resolutions and is null and void and that is well confirmed in our opinions because the introducer of the resolutions said that he would not consider altering that date.

I understand the Northern Products Company hold practically no areas. All they hold are the shares that were Reid's holdings, and possibly I would not be far out in saying that the Northern Products Company are in the hands of a huge concern in the United States. We are told that this

concern is asking them now why the delay and why can't they send down their steamers and that the whole thing will fall through if they cannot do so soon. So we are asked to legislate now in the interests of an American concern purely and simply.

They must have some assurance, the capitalists of the United States, that all they want in connection with shells on the Labrador is their's for the asking; otherwise they would not have steamers ready to come down. The bargaining is made; all that they want is to put these resolutions thru the House. Then, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister, when he introduced these resolutions on the 29th of May made some remarks and said that these resolutions were about to be introduced last year and for some reason or other they were not tabled, but after the House closed then the Executive Government made an agreement and gave the Northern Products Company these concessions—all the concessions contained in these resolutions were given to them—and they go ahead and negotiate with foreign capitalists abroad and got them sufficiently interested and as soon as the resolutions go through and become legislation the promoters of the Northern Products Company will change over-night and may be re-established over-night. All the shareholders interested in the company now will try to get their money back; the money that they have spent. They say that the capital of the company is \$100,000. Of that probably \$35,000 to \$40,000 is made up with promoters shares. It is a consideration, just what money was spent in this connection. We cannot find out in regard to the Company. They have not filed their share list. Nobody can find out.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; I do not want to interrupt the Hon.

Member, but a short time ago — I was not as wise then as I am now — I was told that by paying 25 cents at the Registry of Companies I could get the list of shareholders. But it is not there, unless it was filed during the last four or five days. The Minister told me that I could pay 25 cents to the Registrar of Companies and get it, but I could not get it if I paid 25 dollars.

I suggest that the Minister of Justice should see that the law is conformed with.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.— That is not part of the Minister of Justice's job. He has enough on his hands now. That is the job of the Registrar of Companies.

MR. HALFYARD.—After the House closed the Government made this agreement with them. They could do anything if they could get away with it. After expressions like that, yet they talk about being shell-shocked. That is enough to shock anybody. They would not give away the Labrador but the whole of Newfoundland if they could get away with it.

And it was done in spite of opposition raised in the House by Government Members. Something must have changed their opinions. Of course, anybody is subject to changing his opinion.

The Prime Minister at that time ridiculed or laughed at the idea that seventy-five thousand tons of shell could be exported in a year. You have to be very careful what you say in this House. If the American corporation finds that out from somebody beyond the water, that we cannot get ten thousand tons down there, they may hesitate about coming here. Anyway the whole responsibility of legislating this outrageous proceeding rests with the Government and if they said that it was for the sake of

getting a friend out of a hole they would get some support from members of both sides of the House, and if the people who have invested money are in the hole and it is to try and get them out of it, and if they get their money back, we must give credit to the members of the Government for doing something which in their own hearts they know they shouldn't do. It is money invested in an undertaking that is or appears never going to be a success; that is undisputed.

There is another thing, Mr. Chairman, we are here now and, as has been said, the House should be closed and it was thought that the House would be closed tomorrow. Why was this Bill not introduced the first week after opening the House, or the very first day? I think, after all, you have broken faith with some members of the Opposition, for it is contentious legislation. I have been here some time now and I have never witnessed anything bordering on the interest that has been taken in this. It is not very often that we get people outside sending a representative to the bar of the House to petition against some legislation going through. If this is not contentious I would like to know what it is. There was an understanding with certain members of the opposition that no contentious legislation should be introduced at this session of the House and it is apparent that some members sitting on the opposite side of the House were so disgusted with it that they absented themselves altogether.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.— The same might apply to some of your associates.

MR. HALFYARD.—I am as much associated with some of the members who sit on this side of the House as I am with members who sit on the Government side of the House.

Anyway this Bill should not be introduced at this late stage, keeping us here longer than we should be. And I am sure that there is not any desire of opposing the Bill just for the sake of opposing it, but because it is quite a serious bit of legislation that should have been introduced by the Government three or four weeks ago.

I feel it my duty to oppose it. I am not sorry after having given the matter some little thought, to express my views on the matter now, and I cannot see my way clear but to oppose the Bill, and I have to vote against it.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman; Evidently the Government intend to put this through.

May I ask why they are not accepting royalty this season. Why not start right in and collect royalty right now. They are prepared to start as soon as the Bill goes through and why are you not accepting royalty for 1928? and if you accept it for 1928? have you still got five years to collect? I suppose if you collect from them for this season you will only collect a royalty for four years.

Why not accept them this year?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—To give them a chance to get legs under them.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I understood the Hon. Prime Minister to say that the American Company interested in this project are holding their steamers waiting until the legislation passes before sending them down for shells and take away tens of thousands of tons and there is no need to pay any royalty under the Bill. When the Bill passes why not start to collect royalty.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We have promised the Company that we will let them have the first year.

I did not make any such statement that there was a fleet of steamers to come down after marine shells. They are likely to do something this summer and as the season is short on the Labrador and even if they only take one steamer down this year they naturally want to know when the bill goes through so that they can get the steamer away.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman; It seems to me that the rights conceded under section 4 are very large. In effect, you grant the Company the right to explore for Marine Shells for two years which is tantamount to giving the Company all the Marine Shells on the Labrador. That is certainly not fair to other parties who have already been doing a small business with this Shell.

The conditions also, under which you grant the Northern Products Company an export monopoly for five years are contradictory. In one breath you say if 75,000 tons is not exported during one year all their rights under this bill are forfeited, and immediately afterwards you allow them another extra year in which to get the minimum quantity. I see nothing in this bill by which the country will benefit. As usual you intend to give all and get nothing in return. I question whether you have even the security for the export tax of 25 cents per ton.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman; It has been suggested that people would be able to come along and apply for areas under this section and to have that rounded off it has been suggested that it may be well to limit the total areas that they could get.

I had suggested that we might put in the words "which said area or areas shall not exceed in all two hundred square miles."

DR. MOSDELL.—I do not care how far the areas are likely to extend at all. I suppose a hundred square miles would be a lot. My point is that the aggregate number of square miles they should claim should not exceed a certain number.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman, is that suggestion favorable to the father of the Bill: To specify the exact area over which they can have rights issued to them?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It is perfectly satisfactory to put that at the end of the Bill: "The areas shall not exceed in all two hundred square miles."

DR. MOSDELL.—How is the gentleman going to measure two hundred square miles? A half a mile would mean four hundred miles of coast line. And unless something is done to limit the width the company is given the opportunity of monopolising the whole coast of Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Except that they have only got the right to search within half a mile in depth.

DR. MOSDELL.—With a width of half a mile, I admit that the two hundred square miles is not very material, but if the width is not set the holdings can be stretched along the whole of the coast of Labrador. Why not pin them down to a reasonable extent of coast line. Be a little liberal if you like, but prevent them from going to the extreme and holding it after the period of exclusive export is over.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—All that they hold is the right to take shell off it.

DR. MOSDELL.—Why agree to the measure if it does not give them some right?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I do not see the value of it.

DR. MOSDELL.—Why is the measure being put through?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It is merely done because you on the other side have asked for it. But it does not matter what limitation is put in. All that we are giving these people is the shell on any particular part of the Labrador, but anybody else can go down and do what they like with the land.

DR. MOSDELL.—I do not see how anybody is going to obtain the land for any purpose whatever as long as any company has a right on it in respect to the exploitation of shell. They are certainly locking up the resources in the land.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Supposing a man found a gold mine, do you mean to say that he is interfered with by people that are getting shell out?

DR. MOSDELL.—What is there in the Bill to prevent them? It simply refers here to industries that are at present conducted on the Labrador.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—No; it also refers to the future industries.

DR. MOSDELL.—Is it contended that even over the shell areas a man can go in and prospect for gold or anything else?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—If my honorable friend thinks that prospecting for gold is not an industry, then we can add words to that effect if you like.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Would this cover it if we put in "any other business or occupation"?

MR. BRADLEY.—Put in "business, industry or occupation."

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, does not that mean that these surveyors have to submit proofs to the government of actual survey of the areas for which claims have been made.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—That is the intention of it. To meet the point suggested as to what evidence the government have unless it was done in that way.

CAPT. RANDELL.—I understand that the claims that are marked off and which are supposed to be held by the Northern Products Company are in the neighborhood of Hamilton Inlet. Would not the Government specifically indicate what stretch of coastline there is where those claims are and confine them to that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Whilst some of their claims are marked on that chart, that is not all the claims they are looking for.

(Clerk reads Resolutions.)

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest an amendment to Section 7 to cover the point Mr. Halfyard was referring to.

(Reads amendment.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We cannot accept that amendment because there is an amendment already suggested by the Hon. member for Fortune Bay to add to that Section, and it reads as follows:

(Reads).

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that apart from the merits of the amendment, I do not think it can be entertained, because it is not really an amendment. It is practically a proposition which would render the whole scheme of the Resolutions totally ineffective. In other words, the Resolutions are to be passed to bring in an Act. We are now asked to accept an amendment for the cancellation of that Act within twelve months by the Legislature.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is nothing at all inconsistent about it as with the other sections of the Resolutions. It mere-

ly provides that in the event of a repeal, which may never take place, then the Government do not have to accept liability from the Company. It does not nullify the section at all. It simply says that if there is an appeal that no action shall be taken against the Government. The Act continues in force until it is repealed.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—Mr. Chairman, I submit that from a legal standpoint the amendment is entirely ridiculous. In the event of a Legislature within twelve months repealing this Act, it could then make a provision such as the honorable member suggests. So far as my knowledge of the Statutes goes I think it is quite a precedent for this Colony to anticipate the repeal of a Statute of this kind, but should a Legislature want to repeal this, or any Act, it can do so with full protection to the Colony.

MR. BRADLEY.—In reply to the honorable member who has just sat down, I have to say this, whether it constitutes a precedent or does not, it does not make any difference at all; and, in the next place, that the section is not wanted in the Bill, and it might be argued that to specify in this section that the Act may be repealed is doing the very thing that these Resolutions propose to do now, namely, expropriate property, may be answered by this, that if at any future time it appears to be in the interests of the Colony that this be repealed, I am providing that the Government of the Colony be under no liability because of that repeal, and I am giving these people due notice now so that they may know where they stand. I think that is the best thing I can possibly do. If, as the honorable member suggests, we let the matter stand and give no notice whatever of possible interference with obligations or rights then, as I pointed out, already, we are doing the very thing which these

resolutions at present propose to do with the Marine Shell Company, and which the present Government refused to do with Labrador timber licenses when the Labrador Bill was before this House last year. I am protecting the Northern Products Company.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to bring before the House for consideration. I propose to have that inserted as a new Section 9. I would ask the Clerk to read it.

(Amendment read.)

Mr. Chairman, in moving that that section be inserted, I would like to point out that I do so simply to ensure that the Company will give some definite undertaking in return for the concessions that are granted; that they will get down to business in real earnest; and I would recommend the clause to the serious consideration of the Committee on that account. I think it is only right to have that, for if, as we have been told, the company are going to begin operations this year, we ought to insert a clause definitely outlining something tangible for them to do this year, and with that idea in view I propose the clause just read. We are merely asking the company, in effect, to give a guarantee of their bona fides. We ask them to expend one hundred thousand on machinery, plant or otherwise in connection with the establishment of the industry and carrying it on for the first year, and I contend that is a very reasonable proposition, and I recommend it to the serious consideration of the Committee. I do not see anything in that that is going to interfere with the Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honorable member that it is a very much more reasonable proposition than some of the amendments that have been presented or clauses suggested,

but it would be a very difficult thing for the Government to check up on the expenditure of that hundred thousand dollars. The only way to check up is on the quantity of shell exported, and we promised this year we would not charge anything for exporting shell; so we have not anything to get out of it this year. I take it they are only going to try and get established this year; to get started; exporting a small quantity of shell for the purpose of exploiting the market, and getting well established so that they can get 75,000 tons out next year, or a larger quantity.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman. I do not think this new clause proposed by the honorable member for St. Barbe would work any great hardship to a company proposing to send down a fleet of steamers to take away shells, this year

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We do not know of any fleet of steamers this year.

MR. HALFYARD.—If the cost of operating on the Labrador will cost any way near what has been suggested to the Committee, \$100,000 is a very small amount for this Company to spend on machinery, conveyors and all the rest of it; and I imagine in one year even that they would spend a sum of money over that only on steamers, though perhaps the cost of ships would not be covered by this clause. If they do not spend one hundred thousand this year I fear that they will not be in a position to ship any great amount of shell next year; and it will satisfy the committee to know that this Company is spending \$100,000 on the Labrador this year, and all objections to the Bill may disappear when we find they are willing to spend this large amount of money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I think the honorable member is mak-

ing a mistake. I think he said something to the effect that if they do not export 75,000 tons this year they will have a hard job to make up 150,000 by the next year. It may be seen from the Bill that they have only to export 75,000 tons by the year 1929. This year and next year are included. This year they are only more or less exploring the matter and we are not charging them anything for it, but by the end of 1929 they have got to have 75,000 tons taken out.

MR. HALFYARD.—The Prime Minister will agree that the first year the initial expense will be, and the largest expense.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I hope it will be spent, but we cannot bind them down to spend \$100,000, and it would be a hard job checking it up.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we subscribe to the principle behind the statement. I take it that really the position is, as the Prime Minister states, that we do not accept it because this is really purely experimental.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, before the last clause of this is read to the Committee. I want to ask the Minister of Justice what exactly is the position of the Labrador Marine Shell Company in respect of those grants that were given to them prior to 1926, and to what extent will these be now available to the Northern Products Company to use as a part of the areas they may have the right to take up on the Labrador.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Bill with some amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received.

MR. BRADLEY.—I think at this juncture the amendment I proposed this afternoon should now be inserted in Section 9, namely, "The repeal by Legislature within one calendar year from this date shall not involve the Colony in any liability whatever."

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Bradley moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded that the following be included as Section 9 of the Resolutions:

"The repeal by the Legislature within one calendar year from the date of the Act giving effect to these Resolutions shall not involve the Government in any liability of any kind or nature whatsoever."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Capt. Randell,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Dr. Mosdell,
Mr. Bradley.

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Duff,
The Minister of Agriculture and Mines,
The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne.

so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I have just this minute received a writing, and I am very glad of this opportunity to express myself, and what I have to say should be interesting for some of the people to know.

I have here a list passed by an honorable member of the Upper House to a member of the Opposition in which my name appears, which has been circulated in the Upper Chamber of this House and lastly down here. The names are written here without anything else whatever on the sheet with Mr. Thomas Smythe's letter attached to it.

It is an absolutely deliberate attempt on the part of the member of the Upper House, in my opinion, an absolutely deliberate act to make an attempt in the Upper House to show that I am a shareholder in this company.

I stated, I absolutely stated, that I am not a shareholder; I have no interest in this company; I have none there and I don't want any, and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of expressing to this member that it is a rotten, dastardly attack on the character of a man by a gentleman who should be making his soul ready to pass out. This was an attempt to be used in the Upper House to protest against this Bill and indicated that not only am I desperate liar, but a traitor to the House, where I hold the honorable position of Finance Minister. I object to it, and I will take the opportunity, if I have an opportunity, to make the honorable gentleman to prove that I am a shareholder, and if he cannot tell who this third party is I will take the opportunity to make him prove it. It is a most dastardly attack, and I will not and I do not accept it. I have the docu-

ment here and I hold it in my hand and nobody can get it from me. It is my property now and I will make the honorable gentleman prove it before it passes out from here.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs knows that at the time I asked if there were any shareholders in the House I did not have him in my mind. I had no particular person in mind.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I want to say in reply to the honorable member, that I have nothing against any member in this House, whether I am associated with him or against him. It is the man who put this thing into the pocket of a member of the Opposition and sent this writing into the Lower House, and I know that every member of the Opposition, every honorable gentleman on the other side of the House, would not do that.

The man who circulated this thing, well, I would not like to say what I am going to call him. I am not going to stand for it and I will have the opportunity to vindicate myself outside the House of Assembly.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to propose in the form of an additional section.

(Reads.)

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to second the amendment moved by the honorable member for St. Barbe.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in connection with this amendment that apparently the spirit is not entirely in discord with my own views on the matter, yet it is so totally unreasonable as to be entirely unacceptable.

In the first place we do not ask them to export more than seventy-five thousand tons by the end of 1929, and so far as I am aware we have not

asked any company who have come in here to start any industry to expend such a large sum as they are expected to raise, within such a short time.

The spirit of the amendment is largely in accordance with my own view if the amount was made smaller and the period extended somewhat.

Mr. Scammel then moved and Mr. Brown seconded that the following be included as Section 9 of the Resolutions:

"All rights, privileges, concessions and grants by these Resolutions granted to the Northern Products Company, Limited, shall be subjected to the condition that the said rights, privileges and concessions and grants shall become absolutely void at noon on the first day of November 1928, unless the said Company shall have expended by the 30th day of October 1928, in permanent development of their properties on the Labrador, a sum not less than \$100,000."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Capt. Randell,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Bradley. (10)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Duff,

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines,

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne. (15)

so it passed in the negative, and was ordered accordingly.

On the original motion for adoption of the Report, the House divided, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Duff,

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines,

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne. (15)

and against it:

Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Capt. Randell,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Dr. Mosdell,
Mr. Bradley. (10)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

The Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, the motion made by the Hon. the Prime Minister means suspension of the Rules of the House with regard to the Bill.

We shall proceed with these Resolutions in the most moderate manner and conform to the Rules of the House.

It is the intention of the Government to override the Rules of the House with regard to the Resolutions before the House, but I do not think that the members of the Opposition will agree to having any rules suspended in connection with these Resolutions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Speaker; I do not think that a single member on the opposite side of the House anticipates anything different a week hence than now, but if they want to go on and delay the House and have the Bill go through in a week it is up to them to do it, and we will come back in a week and put it through.

I am perfectly certain that no member on the opposite side of the House thinks that there will be any alteration in the position a week hence, but we must comply with the rules of the House and wait a week to see if any protests come in from any firm whatever.

The matter has been debated fully in the House. The Government have decided to put the Bill through and if members on the other side think they can go away and come back in a week's time, by all means let them do it. I think it is a pity, now that we have got through the session so amicably, that we should delay to-night in putting through this Bill.

MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Speaker, probably I have been misunderstood as far as my attitude in connection with this Bill is concerned, and I shall be

misunderstood right to the end. Whether that be so or not makes no difference to me personally. Anybody who has listened to me knows my attitude on this Bill. I think it is quite evident at this stage, that no matter what attitude I adopt on his Bill, it is the intention of the Government to force the measure through. Whether that intention will continue during the seven days which must intervene between the second reading of this Bill and the sitting of the select committee, I do not know. It is not my business to consider that, sir. The matter which is now proposed to be sent to a Committee of the Whole is one which involves a monopoly of a considerable section of the Labrador coast for a period of eighteen months now, I suppose. The Northern Products Company has the exclusive privilege of searching for shell there and nobody else may do so. After that period has elapsed they will have acquired the rights to ship all the shell that they find on the Labrador coast, in various places, provided that the areas given to them do not exceed two hundred square miles. That may possibly involve the whole coast. I do not know and I am not interested. But the matter is of such grave importance that this Assembly, in my opinion, should not permit any abrogation of the rules of this House formed for the protection of the public. I believe that a week hence we shall come in here, the Select Committee will report, the matter will go through its various stages, and eventually become law. But what I do or do not believe does not in any way affect my attitude as to what should be done. And the fact that I am of opinion that no alteration will take place in the situation has nothing whatever to do with the matter. It is possible something may be brought to the attention of the Government

which may alter their minds on the matter, and whilst that possibility exists I, sir, believing the Bill to be wrong, would be delinquent in my duty to this Assembly and to the public were I to permit of these safeguards which surround the passage of legislation of this kind to be abused at the present moment. As I said, I believe that within a week this Bill will be passed by this Assembly, but that does not in the slightest degree affect my attitude. There is a regular procedure to be carried out in connection with matters of this kind, and where the principle involved in this particular bill is of such an objectionable character as the granting of a monopoly, I believe it my duty to see that the proper regulations for the governing of proceedings in this House be carried out in every detail. Therefore, I cannot agree to the suspension of the Rules on this Bill.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shell from Labrador" was read a second time.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following as a Select Committee to consider and report on said Bill:

Hon. the Prime Minister,

Hon. the Colonial Secretary.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mine,

Mr. Hickman,

Capt. Randell.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I received a reply to my question to the Prime Minister regarding the wages paid to the late captain of the Caribou and the wages paid to the present master, and I notice that there are fifty dollars in the difference of the wages paid to the former captain and those about to be

paid the man now holding that position. With your permission I would like to ask the Prime Minister why that difference in the wages paid these two men.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, Captain Stevenson was paid an extra salary, for very special services when building the ship. Capt. Tavernor now gets more salary than any other captain in the service. I notice that while there is a constant criticism from the other side of the House when salaries are being raised, the moment you reduce a salary there is always somebody ready to get up and kick about it. We can find a man to take charge of the Caribou for two hundred dollars a month, and we offered Capt. Tavernor two hundred dollars to take charge. Capt. Tavernor accepted the two hundred dollars, and I do not see what the former master's salary has got to do with him.

MR. BROWN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that Capt. Tavernor, as a matter of fact, never mentioned this matter to me about wages. But I fail to see why Capt. Tavernor is not entitled to the same wages as was paid to the former captain of that boat.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, the 12th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 12th 1928.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until quarter past four of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of the Bureau of Education 1926-27.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Resolutions respecting the Export of Marine Shell from Labrador as follows;

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill respecting the Export of Marine Shell from Labrador beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, have posted the notice called for under the Rules of the House as to meeting; and recommend that the annexed Bill be now referred to Committee of the Whole House.

June 12th 1928.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
A. E. HICKMAN,
J. R. BENNETT,
W. J. WALSH.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shell from Labrador" be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

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 Export of Marine Shells from Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Browne took the Chair of Committee.

LABRADOR SHELL BILL

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Chairman; We discussed this matter very fully in committee when it was before the House last week and there is very little more that I need to add to what has already been said, any more that I can add, to what has already been said on the subejct.

Since we last met there has been a further protest come in against the Bill from the Hudson's Bay Company and the Committee which met this

afternoon has heard their counsel in connection with it.

The impression that the Committee must have got in listening to the counsel for the Hudson's Bay Company was, in the first place, that he did not read the bill and did not even know that under clause 7 of the bill and of the resolutions, that the property of the company is protected absolutely.

When he did discover that, and I am inclined to feel that he did not discover it until he came to the committee and I am inclined to think that the London company didn't even know that they were protected, but when he did discover that their properties were protected, he took the plea that they should get ten miles on either side of their property so as to prevent people from coming within ten miles on either side of their property looking for shells. That request is, I think, entirely absurd and much more ridiculous than the protests of the first petitioners.

The Hudson's Bay Company have been connected with the Labrador for two hundred and fifty years and during those two hundred and fifty years has had ample time if there is any value in the shell trade to have found out before this.

The Missionary Society got a grant from the British Government of one hundred thousand acres on the Labrador for the purpose of promoting the Gospel and they leased their rights to the Hudson's Bay Company, which rights they claim were in the name of the present company for a very few years, but it is eighteen months since the Northern Products Company gave public notice in the papers that they were going to ask for these concessions and the Hudson's Bay Company people and everybody else had an opportunity of making a protest before now.

I am perfectly satisfied in my mind that Mr. Parsons, the district manager of the Hudson's Bay Company was induced by some of the other petitioners to move in this matter and I don't believe the London Company knew anything about it and only put in a protest by cable on the instructions or advice from him, and at the time they were thoroughly ignorant that their property was entirely protected under Section 7 of the Bill. Nobody can go down and take shells off property that were held prior to the time these concessions were made to the Northern Products Company by the Government.

Consequently anybody that has held property prior to that decision of the Government has his right absolutely and entirely protected, and nobody can look for more than that. If the Hudson's Bay Company had seen value in the shell, why did they not take out claims prior to 1926. They had an opportunity of doing so, but it appears to me that it is just the same as the other people. They let somebody else spend their money proving that something can be made of the shell product, and then they start and try to put them out of business. I claim, as I claimed it before, that the Government had a perfect right, and were perfectly justified in giving this monopoly, if you choose to call it that, to the Northern Products Company who were the first to come before us representing that shell could be exploited only in a large way. Those people who were handling this business would not give up the oyster shell that they are using now and take up another product, if they were not perfectly satisfied that they could get this product out in large quantities, and when we were satisfied with that we said "all right providing you pay the Government twenty-five cents

a ton, and guarantee to take away not less than seventy-five thousand tons a year." There are a great many people, and I do not know but I was one of those people myself, who are very sceptical about the possibility of taking away seventy-five thousand tons of shell off the Labrador Coast. But if these people can do it I will give them my blessing, and say to them "go ahead", and let twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars come into the revenue every year in return for the shell that these people are taking off the Labrador, and which has been down there all these years. Consequently I have not very much to add to what I have already said in respect to the Bill now before the House.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that it is necessary for those of us on this side of the House, who have placed ourselves on record as being absolutely opposed to the principle contained in this Bill to debate this Bill at any length at the present time. From the interest taken in the Bill not only by members of this House, but also by those outside the House, we would certainly conclude that it is of more than passing interest. And any legislature should hesitate to give its approval to a bill of this sort without more serious consideration. As the Prime Minister insinuated we are creating another monopoly by passing this Bill. A great many question whether it is in the interests of the country or not. I may say that a great many are of the opinion that it is not in the best interests of the country for this Bill to be put on the Statute Book. For a body of people to be so exercised over the passing of this Bill as to go to the trouble of sending a representative to the Bar of this House, and by petition protest against the enactment of this measure, that alone is sufficient to cause members of this

House to question the advisability of being party to this enactment. We are told that this bill will not interfere with the vested rights, and certainly we should not be a party to penalising anyone in their rights of whatever nature they may be, whether private or public, when the benefits to be derived are of a questionable nature. Not only the Marine Shell Company has mineral claims and rights of certain shell areas on Labrador, which rights have been granted by this Legislature; not only have they protested but they say their interests will be seriously handicapped and may cause a great loss if the measure becomes law, not only them, but we have also an old established company, the Hudson's Bay Co., protesting against the passing of this measure. The fear that it will interfere with the operation and the exploitation of their lands on Labrador. I say that all these things cause us to hesitate. Whether the Hudson's Bay Co. know what the bill contains, whether they had it analysed or not, I do not know. But it is passing strange that they did not know what Clause 7 contained. I should have to be an accomplished lawyer to know whether the rights of the Hudson's Bay Co., or anyone else, will be interfered with by the enactment of this measure. But the Prime Minister intimated that Mr. Parsons, who is acting for the Hudson's Bay Co., possibly has a different opinion now that he has seen the Bill and read this Clause. The Prime Minister said that it is strange that only now the Hudson's Bay Co. are waking up to the fact that they can exploit the shell on their holdings on Labrador. I do not wonder at it at all. I suppose that it is quite recently that shell has become valuable, and as soon as they found out that they would certainly see that anybody having interests on

the Labrador would be given sufficient time to exploit their interests, and not to give a monopoly to a company which has benefitted by the pioneer work of other companies. The Hudson's Bay Co. is like any great corporation, probably. I do not know anything about their dealings with their employees, but we generally look upon large corporations as being soulless. But anyhow, according to our modern civilisation, if we do not have capitalists and corporations it seems that we are going to be left in the lurch, and we will take a long time to exploit the latent resources of our country. Anyhow, give them the benefit of the doubt by saying that they have been benefactors to the race. I do not know whether modern civilization is beneficial to the race or not. But anyhow, in the ordinary acceptance of the term we will say that it is. But it is questionable whether the Eskimo will live any longer or be any happier by the introduction of modern civilization, but if they have to submit to modern civilization they have rights on Labrador as well as Newfoundlanders, and they should be protected. No doubt if the Hudson's Bay Co. operate the shell business down there they will have both natives and Newfoundlanders as laborers. But if the operation of the shell business is solely and absolutely carried on by outsiders or American concerns, it is questionable whether these people down there will get the same treatment as if the Hudson's Bay Co. were treating with them. These are things that must be considered in connection with this Bill. And there is another thing. According to a statement made by the Prime Minister and some others that have spoken from the Government ranks they are sceptical about any company being able to take away seventy-five thousand tons of shell in any one year. Why

all the time given to this measure if we are legislating for what may be termed an absurdity. Who are we deceiving, ourselves, or the men that are prepared to put money in this concern, to carry on the operations of the shell business on the Labrador. Are we morally honest in putting a measure on the Statute Book which is unworkable. It is hopeless to induce men outside Newfoundland to put their money into a project of which the legislation binds them to certain conditions which make it impractical for them to get their money back. That is the other side of it. It is taken as an absurdity that seventy-five thousand tons of shell will be exported from the Labrador during open navigation. But still so as to placate and please and pacify the men who have money in the Northern Products Company, we are to put this bit of legislation through the House. Well, if you can call that honest legislation, all right. We have different ideas of ethics and honesty. As has been pointed out, by this Bill we are making null and void contracts entered into by the Labrador Shell Company and the Government. Claims have been taken up by the Labrador Shell Co. since October 1926, and by Clause V they become null and void. After receiving their money, and the money has gone into the Treasury, we legislate that the claims are worthless. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to spend any more time on this measure; the more you think of it the greater the iniquity appears in it, and if the Government, as a Government, have made up their minds that the House should put it through, they are taking the responsibility; but as far as I am concerned, and a great many more on this side of the House, we will not be a party to it. I won't be a party to fooling a beggar or a millionaire into investing money in any-

thing, and by the statements made by those who are trying to get this measure through, we are doing so by voting on this, for we are voting on an absurdity, an impossibility. If it ended there it would be all right, but it does not end there. People will have invested their money and find it impossible to get returns for it. I was not interested in this measure, but the more I see of it the worse it appears to me, and of course we must be influenced to some extent by public opinion as represented to this House by protest and petition. I would therefore, without taking up any more time, merely say that I wish to be put on record as absolutely opposed to the passing of this Bill.

DR. MOSDELL.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the width as set forth here of half a mile was set at that by arrangement between the Government and the Company, or was that arrangement made by the Company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I do not know that I can say. I do not really remember whether they originally asked for half a mile or whether we got them to change it to that. I rather think it was the original proposition of the Company.

DR. MOSDELL.—Did any question arise as to the necessity or otherwise of that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—It was simply granted as enough to cover what they would require.

DR. MOSDELL.—Is it necessary to have a strip as wide as that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They claim it is. It may not be necessary to get as much probably as they are looking for in another section, but we propose to give them enough to cover what they may find necessary, taking the whole thing into consideration.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Government does not see some way of limiting the total of coastline of the Company under this section? With a limit of two hundred square miles, and a depth of coast line of anything up to half a mile, by taking very narrow strips in places there could be quite a considerable stretch of coast.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We gave consideration to it and it would be exactly as I said with other clauses with this; we want to give them sufficient areas to make sure they have enough.

DR. MOSDELL.—It is not a question of giving sufficient areas. It is a matter of giving the whole coastline and more areas than they can possibly exploit or develop themselves. By getting those areas and retaining them after the expiry of the monopoly period they may be enabled to retain their monopoly to all these areas, being perhaps all the areas there are. If it is stipulated that the limit is 200 square miles without any further stipulation as to depth I think, as I pointed out, that they can get all the areas of any value; and that will be impossible unless the Government stipulates an average width of the claims to be taken by the Company. If they were pinned down to a half-mile strip along the coast, that 200 would mean 400 miles. There is no such stipulation now and that 200 can be stretched along a considerable coast-line length. The Company then could use only a limited part for the export of shells and be able to reserve the balance for sale or disposal at their own profit or could monopolize the whole business by holding those areas irrespective of their actual requirements for development.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact the

Committee will remember that this section has really been the result largely of suggestions from the Opposition side of the House, and I think in its present form, on consideration, it will be found it is as practical as one could make it. I think it is much in line with ideas expressed by honorable members of the Opposition. The Company have within the two year period mentioned here to make a notification to the Government and prove satisfactorily to the Government the nature, extent and position of the areas and then they have got to furnish plans made by a surveyor duly approved by the Government, and then as regards the grant or grants, it simply amounts to this, and I do not know that there is very much more that you can do than you say "A grant or grants of the shells in and upon the said area or areas and in all the areas you get are not to exceed 200 square miles." As regards the coast, the honorable member, I am sure, did not mean to suggest but might possibly convey the impression, that there was interference with the coast. In any event all that ever comes to the Company is a grant of shell on the coast. They are granted shell on areas, and there might be ten or fifteen miles between areas, and all they will be given is a grant on particular locations on the coast of the shell on these locations; not a grant of the coast as such, but merely a grant of a deposit on the land, and therefore that position with the provision made in Clause 5, whereby the Company is bound to carry on operations so as in no wise to interfere with the property or operations of any person now or hereafter carrying on the fishery or any other industry, would make it seem here that the suggestion of what we call giving the company a strip of coast in any case does not amount to any-

thing, because they do not get the coast. They do not get any rights to any portion of it more than to deposits of shell and they have to so work as not to interfere with property or operations of others as in Section 5. I can hardly imagine how one can draft a section limiting it more, in the idea the honorable member has in mind, than that section. I think the Committee, on reflection, will see that with these wrappers about it it hardly amounts to anything, even if you said not exceeding ten thousand, whether 200 or anything bigger, because all they are given is shell and the granting of that has to be done pretty quick because they have less than one and a half years to make surveys. Therefore, I submit, I do not think it is really of practical importance just what words you put there, whether 200 or 2000 square miles, in the sense of interference with the coast.

DR. MOSDELL.—I do not think I made any suggestion with regard to the coastline from the general standpoint. When we discuss this Bill we discuss the shell industry, and the point I want to make is this, the Government professes to limit the rights of the Company to take up grants, whereas as matter of fact, the amendment has no such effect. I am stressing my opinion that the Company will still have the right, still be in a position from a shell export standpoint, to be able to monopolise the whole Labrador coast.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—As a matter of fact they originally requested that. The limitation if anything is somewhat of an improvement upon the original position.

DR. MOSDELL.—I think that the Leader of the Government made the point that the Company might find it sufficient work and develop one hun-

dred miles of coast line. My anxiety was to prevent that Company or any other Company from securing and holding up an excessive mileage more than they could possibly develop. They might secure far more than they intend to develop, ostensibly to work them, but hold them and after the five-year period they would be in a position to keep their monopoly. My feeling is that areas over and above those the Company can possibly exploit or develop should be at the disposal of the Colony generally and the people of the country. Now there must be something of unusual benefit in connection with the shell industry, because we have not only this particular company coming here and asking for exclusive rights and blanketing the whole coast, but we have another company, a local company, which claims that they were really the pioneers in the industry asking for consideration, and then we have the Hudson's Bay Co., a company that might justifiably be said not to be interested in the thing but sees a chance of considerable profit in connection with it. Now if this company has been developing the resources of the Labrador, always of course to the profit of the company, but giving profitable employment to the workers on the Labrador, if they feel that their operations on the Labrador are going to be hurt, if they feel their rights are going to be interfered with, I consider this Committee should pay particular heed to the protest or request they have made.

The Prime Minister remarked this afternoon that for two hundred and fifty years they had been operating in Labrador and had never before taken any cognizance of the shell industry. I understand that the representation made to the select committee suggests that the company had been experimenting in this connec-

tion and that the company contemplate adding to their fur trapping and fishery operations the exportation of shells.

That being the case, it strikes me that it is rather a pity the Government is not prepared to lend some practical aid or give some attention to the representations of this company because, after all, no matter how profitable the operations of the Northern Products Company may be in respect of the Labrador, they can never measure up to the financial benefit to this country by having such a company as the Hudson's Bay Co. interested, particularly in the fresh fish trade.

I would suggest that the Government seriously consider the question of limiting the extent of the areas that the Northern Products Company will be permitted under this Bill to take up on the Labrador, and at least reserve sufficient areas so that later on, if the shell exporting industry develops to such a large extent, then the Government will be able to take in some large sums of money in the way of royalties from the Hudson's Bay Company or some other company, for the development of the other areas left over and outside of the lands occupied by the Northern Products Company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I think the idea was generally discussed by the Minister of Justice already in connection with this, that they have got of necessity to get plans and surveys of any properties they wish to take up. You cannot imagine these people in a year and a half surveying the whole of the Labrador. Why, it took us four months to survey a little part of the timber limits in the Labrador this winter and what is it going to take these people to send down surveyors

and make a survey and plans of the properties they are going to take. I think you are exaggerating the whole thing when you say they are going to take the whole of the Labrador. They have got one and a half years to take out their claims and they have to send out their surveyors and make a survey and make out plans of the properties they are going to work.

DR. MOSDELL.—I understand that most of these marine shell areas on the Labrador coast are alongside of the Hudson's Bay Company areas and the Company made representations in respect of these areas.

Surely if some of these areas were reserved the colony would then be in a position of advantage and could dispose of the shell areas to the Hudson's Bay Company if they should offer an attractive proposition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—

If the Hudson's Bay Company had come to us with the same proposition they would have it to-day.

We have no brief, as I have stated several times already, for Mr. Smythe or anybody else. It mattered no more to me whether Mr. Smythe, Mr. Jones or Mr. Henderson got this proposition. It was given to the person who came to us and put up the best proposition and would give us 25 cents a ton and would export seventy five thousand tons a year.

I believe that if we made the offer to the Hudson's Bay Company on condition that they would export seventy five thousand tons a year they would say that they were not prepared to do it. These people came to us and were prepared to get the exclusive right only if they exported seventy five thousand tons a year. We hold no brief for Mr. Smythe or the Northern Products Company but I would just as soon have the money of the Northern Products Company as I would the money of the Hudson's Bay Company.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I don't think that is quite right. I don't mind where the money comes from but the point that I am urging is not that a monopoly or special right of any kind be given to the Hudson's Bay Company or any other company — I am opposed to it being given the proprietors of the Northern Products Company — but I certainly do claim that in respect to the protest made by the company of such standing as the Hudson's Bay Company, more attention should be paid by the Government than has been paid to that company's protest and petition with a select committee of the Whole House of Assembly. I hold no brief for the Hudson's Bay Company and it is not my intention to urge that anything be done that is not of benefit to the Northern Products Company because of the Hudson's Bay Company, I understand, are not asking for exclusive rights or a monopoly; and I merely urge that some of the territory be reserved for the colony and the people so that if the shell industry should turn out to be a profitable business the colony may profit in a business way by an arrangement with the Hudson's Bay Company or some other company that may become interested in the future.

So if we have such valuable shell deposits down there as to make the Northern Products Company insist on exclusive rights; the Labrador Shell Company protest against such rights being given and the Hudson's Bay Company wanting to keep the areas wide open, we should take care to shape the legislation so that the colony may derive benefit in the future
That is my position.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman; At the resolution stage of this bill I made myself plain as to my stand with regard to this monopoly. I was opposed

to it and I want to reiterate that I am still strongly opposed to this bill, and more so, as a matter of fact today than I was before because of the fact that there was a protest made by the Hudson's Bay Company which should have been given more consideration by the Government than they seem to have given it.

I am surprised that the suggestion made by my Hon. friend, Dr. Mosdell, has not been given more consideration.

I think it is very reasonable.

Now section 4 which has just been passed says that the area of all the areas shall not exceed in all two hundred square miles and if they go a half a mile deep that means they get four hundred miles of coast.

What the doctor has been pointing out is that there is nothing at all to prevent those people taking a strip of land one quarter of a mile in and securing eight hundred miles along the coast, or one eighth of a mile and going sixteen miles along the coast. Surely that is only reasonable. I understood the other day that some of the company stated that two hundred miles of coast would be sufficient for their purposes and why tie up the balance?

That is what I call "dog in the manger" policy. Surely there is no reason why you should not state in Section 4 that this rests on a basis of half a mile deep so that they would not be able to extend along the coast more than four hundred miles. They may take a very very narrow crease and extend along the whole coast. The Prime Minister has stated here this afternoon that it would take some time to survey the coast line as they have only one and a half years, but we don't know the method they will employ to survey the Labrador. If

those shells are as valuable as some people think there is no reason why they shouldn't send down two or three boats and go over the coast line in no time. If they can get sufficient areas to carry on their operations there is no reason why they should give them the means of being able to tie up the whole coast.

I think it is a very reasonable suggestion and I think the Government should give some consideration to that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We have given consideration to it and amended it already.

MR. HIBBS.—I think it would be an improvement to make it one half mile and then you would confine them to four hundred miles of the coast line, for they may take a mere fringe and occupy the whole coast.

When we remember that in connection with our claim against Canada they claimed that the only claims we held was a mere fringe of coast. However the Privy Council thought otherwise and now we seem so delighted at having the inland that we are giving the coast to the Northern Products Company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Hon. Member is all wrong. We are not giving away the coast, we are not giving away any property, we are only giving them rights to take shells. There is a very great difference between the right to take shells off the land and giving them the territory.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what form would the licenses to these people take?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It would be much in the nature of an ordinary conveyance of furniture of sale of some chattel. It would have to be a grant, a special grant of the shell

itself. It would not be a grant of any land nor a mineral license. It would be much the same as any instrument of sale giving a grant of any particular movable article.

DR. MOSDELL.—In respect of that territory reserved by special Act of the Legislature would a special grant such as that mentioned by the Minister of Justice be sufficient?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes, quite.

I understand they are granted only the right to take the shell and that this does not interfere with the mineral rights. It is a very poor point and it was only yesterday that I was discussing this matter with a man who is somewhat of an authority on these matters and he told me that shell was not a mineral. This is to protect those who have mineral rights there now.

There is no need of a license. I am no authority on the matter myself but I believe that my informant is a highly competent man.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; In other words the Hon. gentleman means that it would be sufficient for the Governor in Council to give this company a special form of license in respect to shell and that would hold good.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I think so but at any rate, as regards this point it is only the funeral of the company. Blackwood and Emerson their solicitors, appear to regard it as sufficient. They have accepted that wording.

MR. GODDEN.—What general statute would those be under?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Under the Common Law.

MR. GODDEN.—Not the Crown Lands Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, it is under this act. In this case

we are making a special act with regard to the Crown owing shell, as the Crown has the inherent right to dispose of its own property.

DR. MOSDELL.—So that the statement that the Hon. Member made a few days ago that these grants would be given by virtue of mineral licenses, is not quite correct.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I never said any such thing. What I did say was distinctly the opposite. Because I said for the same areas over which the Crown has given a grant of shell John Jones may be given a mineral license. Those who held mineral licenses prior to the sixteenth of October, shell is covered under these.

DR. MOSDELL. Mr. Chairman; I would like to ask the Minister of Justice this question. If the Hudson's Bay Co., have a hundred miles of Crown Land on which shell is found in marketable quantities, does the Hon. gentleman mean to inform us that despite this bill, the Hudson's Bay Co., have the right to begin now and export even though they have not got a shell license.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In regard to any land that the Hudson's Bay Co., or any one else on the Labrador owns, section seven says;

(Reads)

No matter what way land is held, under the Squatter's right, or otherwise. Take for instance the case of the missionaries two hundred and fifty years ago, up there. If these missionaries were given at that time one hundred square miles of land, it is good to-day, and they can do what they like with the shell on it. Personally I accept the responsibility for that to-day.

MR. GODDEN.—In other words anyone that exports shell, will have to pay twenty five cents a ton to the Government?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—No, our contract is only with those people. That would be decided on general policy. There is no export duty on shell to-day under the general law.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman; The one outstanding objection that I see to this bill is that there is nothing in the bill to ensure that the tax will be paid. It is true that we have a clause here which says;

(Reads)

But how are we going to get that twenty five cents, out of this company.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I suppose the same way as it is done everywhere else. They will not let the steamer sail.

MR. GODDEN.—This bill gives them a monopoly to export shell for five years, but the bill is contradictory, because in another clause you give them three years in which to make up any deficiency in the export of the seventy five thousand tons. They are allowed to export in the summer of this year, without any tax whatever, and without any decisive quantity. And if there is a discrepancy in the amount that they are to ship, you give them another year in which to ship it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In which to ship one hundred and fifty thousand tons for the two years.

MR. GODDEN.—But if they do not ship seventy five thousand tons by the end of this year, this bill still says;

(Reads)

In other words they shall have a further year, until the end of 1930 in fact. There is one thing that I would like to feel sure of and that is, supposing that this company only exports ten thousand tons, who are you going to call on for the export tax. And are you sure that the company is going to pay the tax. Are you going to deal

with a company that is financially able to meet its obligations.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The steamer will be worth the cargo that it is carrying, and I take it that no steamer will be going out without the tax being paid. They cannot get a customs clearance.

MR. GODDEN.—Mr. Chairman; I gather from some of the members on the other side of the House that they consider that it will be well nigh remarkable if this company exports seventy five thousand tons. And it is not impossible that during the current year, and the next year, this company may get all the available shell that is down there. They may have a scheme by which they can get one hundred and fifty thousand tons of shell during the next two years and use all the shell that is there. In that case we are giving a monopoly to one company to take all the shell that is on the Labrador. Nobody else has a chance even though they have prior rights.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman; Would not the Government be well advised if there was a difference in any one year, to stipulate that the deficiency should be made up in the succeeding year. If section six bound them down to a minimum portion of the seventy five thousand tons, that they should export in one year, and limit the amount that they could carry over to the next year, you would get more of the element of material development and keep out more of the element of speculation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I may say that that point was considered from all angles, as to what was the best way to have that section. . . The Company itself wanted the provision put in, that in any years if they did not ship 75,000

tons "through causes beyond their control." We felt that that was too vague a term. Then it was suggested to put in the expression "Through acts of God, or war." We decided that the most practical thing to do was to put in the idea of making sure that if any balance was carried over, no matter what, that they would have to ship that balance of the 75,000 for the succeeding year. I think that members will appreciate that it is the only fair way to meet the situation. Because we may have extraordinary late summer in regard to ice conditions down there, I do not think that we would be in any better position if we said that they must ship ten thousand this year. Anything suggesting a limitation of ten thousand might be in the way of an indication that we are not expecting much.

DR. MOSDELL.—This Company does not really mean to export any shell from Labrador for the season of 1930 or 1931.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—If they do not ship anything for 1930 they have got to ship one hundred and fifty thousand tons in one year.

DR. MOSDELL.—But they may have transferred their obligations to somebody else before that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Nobody is going to come along in August, say, of 1930, and contract to ship one hundred and fifty thousand tons of shell in one season, if there has been nothing done up to that time.

It seems to me the most practical way to look at it is if they are going to touch the thing at all they are going to try and start to ship at the earliest possible moment, even if they can't this year they will try as soon as they are able. But this year is more in the nature of experimenting and searching out what they want.

and finding the best way of handling the proposition, and I think that is the best way to handle the proposition. Let us give them this year free and next year let them tackle it and ship as much as they can.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested to me by a practical fisherman that if shells on the Labrador are worth \$15.00 per ton landed at New York, say cost, insurance, and freight, New York, that would be 3-4c a lb., which this practical fisherman figures out for a 150-ton schooner, of which the carrying capacity would be about 250 tons, making two trips to New York in the season. That would be 500 tons shell, and all expense being figured out in connection with wages, port charges, etc., would give a round profit of about \$5,000 for a schooner taking away 500 tons of shell at 3-4c a lb; and this fisherman said it would be a much better proposition than fitting out for the Labrador fishery. There could be employed some of our large schooners in exporting shell from Labrador to New York. I would like to hear the point discussed. This man was very much exercised over it and he said it was a crime for us to be giving a company a monopoly, that is if the shells are valuable. I do not know if any of the Committee can give an idea as to what shells are worth landed at New York. The possibilities in connection with this industry may be greater than we anticipate at present. We are a little inclined to regard it now as valueless, to say anyone might as well take it away and give us a little employment and pay 75 c. a ton, and it is all right to give it away for that, and the thing cannot be open to everybody so we will give a monopoly. I would just offer this point to the Committee that the possible future value of the shells to our own men in schooners may be worth con-

sidering and God knows we will soon lose all our schooners if they have to continue to contend with conditions in connection with the fishery that they are and have been contending with, and if there is anything for them in the shell industry we should certainly try and assist them to get it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I can assure the honorable member that if the owners of schooners are to have nothing else to depend on for a livelihood but the shipping of schooner loads of shells to New York we will see the end of our fleet of schooners. I do not know the value of shell per lb. at New York but I know it cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10,000 to ship a 150-ton schooner load to New York from the Labrador coast and distribute it. If shell were so valuable shipping it by schooner loads surely they would have paid expenses, to say nothing of doing so badly as to have had it cost the company that much to have it distributed. I do not think there is any doubt that this shell cannot be handled in small quantities, in schooner loads. It has got to be handled quickly in big steamer loads and brought to exporting centres to be distributed from there; and by handling it in a very big way somebody can make some money; and in that way alone money can be made out of it. We protect the fishermen. Nobody can take for the purpose of selling to other countries, but they can take for their own use and for sale in the Colony, but not outside.

MR. RUSSELL.—Do I understand from this section that any of our fishermen fishing on the Labrador can take any quantity of shell he can get for his own use or sell to anybody within the limits of this Colony, that is for local consumption? Because several in my district have approached me recently to ask me to get them

information respecting this thing and convey it to them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes.

MR. RUSSELL.—From areas covered by this Company?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—They may take these shells from anywhere. If it would be any clearer we could amend it, cutting out the word "such," and saying "any shells," and then "for sale within the Colony," amending it as follows:

(Reads.)

MR. RUSSELL.—That is clear. A fisherman can bring home shell and sell it in Newfoundland.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes.

DR. MOSDELL.—Where is he going to get shells? Take them off the areas of the Northern Products Company?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes. There is no question at all about that; "any shells."

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, if the Company were bound down to a reasonably large area of territory for the development of their business, and all this shell upon territory outside these areas were reserved to the country, where the hardship to the Company would come in? In other words wherein could the Company raise any objection to a Bill containing such a limitation on their rights in respect of areas that they may take up for the prosecution of this business?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—My point is that we are giving, we must admit, a monopoly. We are giving these people the right to have the market for these shells, and I am perfectly satisfied to give them the whole market, to give them a complete monopoly if necessary, if they are going to

export 75,000 tons and over every year and pay us \$25,000. There is a period given to search for shells. It is only a year and a half, and then I want to give them as large a territory as they want. They have to search and survey and there may be 400 miles between different shell sections. I do not know that I would raise any objections to giving them the whole coast as long as they have got to make a survey and bring in plans of such places. I do not think we need be very much afraid of their taking any very large area. In the meantime, however, I do not see any objection to giving them the largest area possible for them to select their territories from.

DR. MOSDELL.—Are the rights assignable?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the Report, the House divided, when there appeared for the adoption of the Report:

Hon. the Prime Minister,

Hon. the Colonial Secretary,

Hon. the Minister of Justice,

Hon. the Minister of Posts,

Hon. Mr. Long,

Hon. Mr. Cramm,

Hon. Mr. Duff,

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines,

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

The Minister of Public Works,

Mr. Sinnott,

Mr. Power,

Mr. Linegar,

Mr. Browne,

Mr. Russell.

and against it:

Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Capt. Randell,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Brophy,
Dr. Mosdell,
Mr. Bradley. (9)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928, and the 30th day of June 1929, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928, and the 30th day of June 1929, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, 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 Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928, and the 30th day of June 1929, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman; I think this is the first session during the time I have been in the House that the pay of the captains of the coastal boats was discussed here, and I think it is my duty to make a few remarks. As is well known the men that go down to the sea in ships have to do the hardest kind of work, have to endure all kinds of hardships, but are generally the worst paid. I do not get up to advocate the cause of Captain Taverner, I am something like Capt. Randell; I consider that every one of these captains are underpaid. Take the "Clyde" or one of those small boats, they carry more passengers than the "Caribou". I don't mean that the accomodation is more, but during the twelve months I think they got passengers. Then it has ten ports of call to every one of the "Caribou"; and the same thing applies to the "Meigle", "Prospero", "Portia", "Argyle", "Glencoe", "Sagona" and as far as I am concerned I am not one of those who advocate any more salaries unless I feel sure, unless my conscience tells me that those I advocate are honestly entitled to be paid by the people of this country. You are all aware that these men from nine to twelve months, some of them for

twelve and some for nine, are continually, night and day, going round the coast at least four months out of the nine or twelve that half of them never take off their clothes, and yet for all to get only \$175. It hardly seems fair that men putting in from 10 to 4 in the day should get practically double what those men get who are not only enduring hardship night after night but have under their charge hundreds of people who are trusting the safety of their lives to the captains of these ships; and my recommendation, Mr. Chairman, would be that all these captains be paid the same salary and I argue here and I fear no justifiable contradiction that the man on the "Portia", or "Prospero", or "Sagona" has a much harder coast than the man on the "Caribou".

The man on the "Caribou", whether Captain Stevenson or Captain Taverner or any other, has one port to leave and one port to enter, just two ports, and after he leaves Channel nine times out of ten after a while clear of land he has very little occasion to go on the bridge to look out. Take the men round the coast, if he is a good captain paying attention to the full safety of the ship, from the time he leaves port an hour but he is called on to go the bridge or enter some port where there is a certain amount of danger no matter what hour they go into it, therefore my opinion on the matter would be, if ever the matter of raising Capt. Taverner's salary at any time should be considered, or any other captain, that we should make the salaries all the same and I am sure that the travelling public of this country knowing the men who go round night and day round this country nine months out of twelve, and some twelve months out of twelve, all hours of the night and all kinds of ports, will agree that they are well entitled to good salaries; and

I feel sure no one in the country has any objections to any Government paying these men good salaries. Most of our captains have spent probably five, six or eight years crossing the Atlantic Ocean, spent that time to put in time to enable them to go out and get a master's ticket. Perhaps after that they got a ship round the coast and probably after a year or two running round the coast they might have the misfortune to get their boat on shore and probably lose the boat. Nine cases out of ten they are discharged and thrown out for always and so I consider at least that these men running these boats and doing their work well, round the coast should get a fair wage,

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman; Some of the Members of the Opposition asked me to take advantage of this opportunity to speak about the vote of \$250,000, that is in the new loan for public works. In opening this subject I may say that my associates have good knowledge of the fact that assuming the responsibility of recommending money for districts will not do them any benefit politically; that is my experience. At the same time those representing districts for four years know the districts requirements as well and perhaps better than anybody else. To look after the affairs of a district is something like a person having to look after a large family with very limited means to provide for those dependent on him the best way possible, and on such a limited salary he has to meet the requirement of his family in the best way possible. It is the same way treating with districts. Possibly some representative of districts have \$300 or \$400 to the credit of their districts in the different departments, but the requirements are great and it is difficult to know how to allocate. In a great many cases

commitments have been made. I do not say that any representative has presumed upon the authority of the Executive Government or the Ministers of the Departments, I am very careful in that respect when approached by one of my constituents as to what I can or cannot do. It all depends on the money we have to the credit of the district and before we make our commitments we must have approval of the Executive Government or the Minister of the Department; but I may say that although some of us possibly may not contest a district we do not know whether contesting or not but at the same time we think it would be in the best interests of the district we represent if we had the privilege of recommending to the Executive Government or a committee of the Executive Government or the Minister of Public Works and Minister of Marine and Fisheries, where that money should be spent and we would like to know from the Executive Government, the Prime Minister or the Colonial Secretary, when that \$250,000 will be available for allocation and when it is available if in short time whether the Government will consider the applications of any sitting Members for districts. I would like to know what it is hoped to be able to do, what the intention is, and if representatives will have any influence, be able to make recommendations, allocate, and how the money is to be spent.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I may say I am glad of the opportunity before the House closes to make some observations upon the matter, because I had considerable to do with the \$500,000 voted last year. I want to be distinctly understood that the Government in introducing this vote into the loan do not intend it for a political slush fund

It was never intended for that. This is meant to be used purely exclusive of politics, but we realise, we have realised the past two or three years, the great want all over the Island of improvements in public works; and this grant I say will be administered the same way as the grant last year. A committee consisting of the Ministers of Public Works and Marine and Fisheries, and the Prime Minister and myself was appointed. I opened an account in my own department and personally supervised every allocation; and honorable members, I think, will do me the justice to say I did not make any discrimination when applications came in. It was done entirely on the lines arranged when the House was open. With regard to this, we will have after the 9th of July no members of the House. Every member in the House is in his place as representative of a district and will no longer be a member after that date, but at the same time in the interests of the public I do not think we should lose the advantage of the experience and advice of members who have sat here and represented districts and who are better acquainted with the requirements of the districts than any other.

It must be also remembered that this year we have allocations on the lines of the Redistribution Act districts, so that grants will not be in globo. In some of the larger districts as they were before there will be grants according to per capita basis under the Redistribution Bill. Of course we have not yet got the money. The loan has to be raised by the Minister of Finance and in the ordinary course of events when it is raised the money will be available, but we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that there are pressing needs and this season of the year being the most desirable to do work, the government

have decided to raise a temporary loan for the benefit of all in proportion to the amount credited in the loan (\$250,000), and when the loan is raised this temporary loan will be repaid.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman, while the House is in Committee on the Public Service Act, I would like to avail of the opportunity which may be the last we shall have, to say a word or two in respect of a situation that was raised here at the last session.

In answer to a question tabled by Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate, it was discovered that the salary of Capt. Tavernor of the S. S. "Caribou" is \$200.00 a month. The same answer contained the information that his predecessor, Capt. Stevenson, got \$250.00 a month, and I do not feel that it is fair, sir, that this occasion should be passed without associating myself with the protest which Mr. Brown made with regard to the discrimination being practised in Capt. Tavernor's case. I see no very fair or substantial reason why such a situation should exist.

From my knowledge of Capt. Tavernor there is no man better fitted for the situation and no one is able to disprove it. He is an able seaman. He is a master mariner, already of good repute judging by all reports; a man who sailed ships and got his master's certificate in the days of the square-rigged ships; a man who has carried afar the produce of this country in the old-time sailing vessels, and a man who has served this country faithfully and well on more than one occasion in connection with the coastal service around the country.

The Prime Minister told us here the other day that when anyone started to attempt economy by reducing salaries somebody would stand up here and object to it.

Mr. Chairman; When you come to a case where one single individual is singled out and the only attempt at economy is made in that case, I think there is no other alternative for those who have any feelings but to protest. If you come down here with a general stand of economy and reduce the salaries all around then no one would protest where the reduction of salaries was of a general nature, but I strongly resent this discrimination being practised in the case of Capt. Tavernor. It was pointed out, I think, that the late Capt. Severson received \$250 a month by virtue of the fact that he had performed some very special service for the Government. In return for that, if I mistake not the figures were tabled in this House, Capt. Stevenson was amply paid for travelling in connection with the "Caribou" and for such services rendered in that connection.

I hold no brief for Capt. Tavernor. He has not asked me to plead his case. He has been a friend of mine for some time, and I must say in justice to him that he asked me, on the other hand, to desist from having anything to say about the matter. I want to see fair play meted out and see that he is given a square deal, and if Capt. Tavernor is capable of being master of that ship and if his record is such as will support his being appointed captain of the ship then he is entitled to the highest wages paid to his predecessor in this connection.

No member of the Government, in view of the circumstances, would take a position of any worth under such a proposition. If the Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Justice or the Colonial Secretary were put into office and told that because it was their first time in office they would have a salary \$600 less because their predecessors were there some time

before them or remained in office for a long time, what would they think? That is the position here, and discrimination of the very worst kind, and there is a reason for it. It should not exist, and I am going to appeal to the Government and the Railway Commission, to the Colonial Secretary, Sir John Bennett, to try and take a fair view, a more reasonable view of the situation, and not have it said that the Railway Commission singled out one man, Capt. Tavernor, and made him the butt of their first attempt at economy.

Throughout the length and duration of this session we, on this side of the House, have been very reasonable in our criticism of the Government's financial policy and other matters, though our criticism could have been a good deal more severe. We have not been very severe in our criticism of conditions in the Colony and I hope the Government will take cognizance of that and will reconsider the whole situation and give Capt. Tavernor the salary that his predecessor enjoyed, thereby eliminating the charge of discrimination you have placed yourselves under by your conduct today.

CAPT. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, following the remarks made by the honorable member for St. Barbe in reference to the salary that is being paid to Capt. Tavernor, I would like to point out to this House one or two sides of this question not generally understood in connection not only with the salary of Capt. Tavernor, but also in connection with the masters of the Government ships generally.

I hold, sir, that none of the men that are now in command of the boats doing our coastal service are paid as they should be. As, for instance, take the "Caribou." The man there

is solely in charge of a ship worth half a million, and the value of the lives that are under his care occasionally, cannot be estimated. For argument's sake, supposing that you have a plant on shore where a man is solely in charge where he can by his own act or otherwise put them all to perdition if he is careless. Supposing that plant cost half a million dollars, that man in control is probably paid five thousand dollars per year. If he has to stay on the Labrador or some place away from cities, he is paid a lot more. Now that I am speaking of this matter I want to point out to the Committee that a master's position, even on one of the coastal boats, is not an enviable job. His is a position where one mistake is liable to ruin his whole life's work. He puts in many years of training before getting command. Let him lose his ship and the chances are that he will never get another. As I once heard an old shipmaster say, "The judge hangs his mistakes, the doctor buries his, but the shipmaster makes one, and one only." After that he is finished, that is if he makes a serious error. Therefore, although I have not been approached by Capt. Tavernor or anybody else in connection with the coastal service, I want to say here that they are not paid enough. Their pay is not by any means proportionately equal to the other public servants. And I would ask the Government and the Minister of Justice, or the Railway Commission, or whoever has got to do with the granting of salaries, to recommend the paying of Capt. Tavernor not less than his predecessor.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—

Mr. Chairman, the honorable member for St. Barbe has mentioned my name, and I would like to say that I endorse what has been said by the Minister of Finance in regard to this

matter, and I would like to point out that in deciding as to who should take charge of the Caribou, Captain Tavernor came to me and made a request for consideration, and I told him that I would give it my very favorable consideration. At that time he was Captain of the Kyle. He was getting one hundred and seventy-five dollars a month. Two years ago Capt. Stevenson was getting two hundred a month. As a reward for the splendid way that he had carried on the Channel service, the Railway Commission thought that he should be given some special consideration. He was a man that had devoted his life to the service, in fact he lost his life through the hardships that he had to contend with in crossing the Gulf in the winter nights and on other occasions. Now Capt. Tavernor has been given the premier position as captain of the Caribou, and he will no doubt receive consideration as he proves to possess the same capabilities in that particular respect as Capt. Stevenson. I do not think there is any occasion for alarm, or to charge the Railway Commission with discrimination, because they have already recognised his claims in the matter. I subscribe to things being said about Capt. Tavernor's capabilities, as I testified to his action last year when looking out for the aeroplane, the Old Glory, and I am sorry to say that he did not receive the reward that he expected in that connection. It is an extraordinary thing that people of the standing of the Hearst Company should make a promise of reward for the discovery of anything that might lead to the identification of the people that were lost in that aeroplane, and I think that Capt. Tavernor's display of seamanship was such that he certainly should have received the full merit of the reward that was promised or

that the people concerned said they would pay. However, that is not our business. Our business in this instance was to collect the hire of the ship, and we did. Now I don't know that there is any reason for the alarm about Capt. Tavernor. He is in the best ship that the Government has, and I think it is up to him now to show that he is as deserving of the same consideration from the Railway Commission of the future, whoever they may be, as this present Railway Commission gave his predecessor.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman; I cannot lose this opportunity of saying a few words on this subject. I have the highest regard for every man that is captain of a coastal boat in this country. And I have often wondered how they escaped so well. And I do not think that there is any man in this House, qualified to express an opinion outside of the present Minister of Fisheries and Capt. Randell. I do not think that the Caribou's route is any more arduous than that of Captain Connors, or Capt. Wesley Kean. I am not here to say whether Capt. Taverner should get more, or get the same pay. But I do say that if the Railway Commission undertook to raise his pay that every coastal Master in the service should get an increase, and I am not prepared to say that they would not be justified in doing it. I quite agree with Capt. Randell that their responsibility is very serious, not only as regards the ship, but the lives entrusted to him. And there is no coast in the world to-day that offers such hardships to captains, and where less accidents have taken place than Newfoundland. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with me thoroughly in that. This is a position that some thing will have to be done with, but

when you start to increase one person's pay a lot of things will have to be considered. Capt. Taverner for instance getting two hundred dollars a month and a man on the route like the Fogo route getting one hundred and fifty five. These will require attention and if this Government is not prepared to improve those conditions, then they will have to be looked after by another Government. I do not see any bit of difference between the present position of Capt. Taverner and the position of the other coastal masters. Now I would like to say this. The question arose here about Capt. Stevenson's position. We all know what he did. I am not prepared to go around and repeat what he did. At the time that he did it it was at the request of the British Government. He was the one man that would go and he went. He was years and years in the service before Capt. Taverner; and I do not think when you come to figure out the other man's pay that Capt. Tavernor has been unjustly treated. It is now for him to prove to this country that he can handle his steamer, which I do not for a minute doubt. But I do say in fairness to Capt. Stevenson that he was one of the best men that I ever met, and I would have no regret even if this Country increases his pay fifty dollars a month more. But I think that Capt. Tavernor will make a good man. But I also think that it would be very silly to give him two hundred and fifty dollars a month. Capt. Randell feels I am sure just as I do about it. These men have a great responsibility, and they deserve the best that this country can give them, and I think that they are the finest class of men that this country can produce.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman; I do think that there are cases in the public service, particularly in the Rail-

way Commission's province that do require readjustment. I do not stand up for the purpose of supporting Capt. Tavernor's case because that has been done very well by those who have spoken before me. I feel that the members of the Railway Commission will recognize his ability as a seaman, and that matter will be readjusted in due course. I agree with Sir. John about what he said about the other captains on the coast. I would not like to have Capt. Jacob Kean's name left out. He happens to be the captain on the Fogo run and I am sure that anybody that has travelled about with him along that coast will agree that it takes a very capable man to handle that ship on dark nights going into the shallow harbors that we have around Fogo Island. I think they all need special consideration because they have a great responsibility on their shoulders. While I am on my feet I would like to refer to one other matter that I think the Railway Commission ought to give some consideration to. I refer to Richard Mosdell who is the traffic manager on the railway. He is well known to many honorable gentlemen in this House and has been in the Railway service for twenty years. That is a long time. He is a capable man and has a responsible position. He is today receiving about one hundred and ninety dollars a month, while his predecessor, I understand, received two hundred and ten dollars a month. There may be some reason why this man receives less than the former man. But I do not think that it can be said that this man is not performing his duties well. He is a man of vast experience. He was in the railway service when men occupying better positions in that service today, financially, were in their swaddling clothes. I think that the Railway

Commission should give him consideration.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two to endorse the remarks of Dr. Mosdell, member for Fortune.

I quite agree with his suggestions as to the possibilities of constructing a road to Fortune Bay over the old railway track from Goobie's Siding. I might say that about forty miles of this road was built and rails laid for a considerable distance. The rails have been taken up, and this spring I allocated \$2,000.00 which I had in reserve cut of our special grant to make a road on the old railway track from Swift Current to Goobie's Siding. About five miles are completed, and Mr. Dave Murray, who has recently been over the road, informed me that specially good work has been done.

I am very glad the member for Fortune mentioned this matter this afternoon, and I hope, in future, that with the co-operation of the members for Fortune Bay and Burin and the member for Placentia West, that this road will be continued up to Burin Peninsula, touching at Paradise Sound, Boat Harbor, Baine Harbor, thence on to Burin proper, and, eventually, link up with Grand Bank.

It would be a great benefit to the people of the sections mentioned as it would put them in easy touch with the railway track.

I can assure the honorable member that should this matter come up, and I be in the House of Assembly, either as a Government candidate or on the Opposition side, I will give this matter my hearty support.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members who spoke to me on this question, I must express my thanks to the Hon. Colonial Secretary for the very honest, straight-

forward manner that he has spoken on the question, and we know that what Sir John Bennett says in this connection he will adhere to, so we shall leave this House quite satisfied that we shall get fair and honest treatment with regard to the allocation of that money.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman, if the members of this House, in connection with the quarter of a million dollars, are treated as courteously and well as they were with the half million last year, I know that they can make no reasonable complaint.

Personally, as member for Fortune Bay, I must say that favorable consideration was given to all my requests. Of course, I simply made ones that I was quite certain were for the public interest.

Last fall, through the courtesy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I was enabled to take an official inspector around Fortune Bay from one end to the other. I understand that he was supplied out of the money for marine purposes. He made a survey of the general condition of marine works and made a report to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Now my anxiety is to have the work that was started under these auspices continued, that the amount allocated out of the provided amount to Fortune Bay district shall be continued to be spent upon works suggested by the official in question.

The committee can rest assured that the official record of public improvement will be continued and the money spent only for the benefit of the people and without any regard for political advantage whatever.

In a number of places in the district works that were commenced with the allocation of \$5,000 last year, have been completed by the enterprise of the people of the places on the understanding that from year to year

the money that was advanced would be reimbursed. I think that is an obligation that should be kept, no matter who is representing the district and it is the sort of spirit that any Government should encourage among citizens of this country.

Before I sit down there is one matter that I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to, and it is that the people around the district of Fortune Bay are very anxious for something to be done for the utilization of the railway road bed. They have the idea that some thirty miles of road bed can be utilized by the Highroads Commission and the seven or eight miles left between there and the northern part of Fortune Bay may be built in and there would be an excellent highroad that would be an advantage not only to the District of Fortune Bay, but the South West Coast generally. It is a little too late in the session to advocate that something be done in the near future in the way of practical financial support, but I feel it incumbent upon me to bring it before the Committee. I would urge in this connection the practicability of the claim and the great general benefit bound to accrue if the plan is carried into effect. The country has already spent a great deal of money on that road bed and it is going to waste and if this road is completed it will be a benefit not only to the people of Fortune Bay, but to the people of the district of Burin and the various districts practically all along there on the south west coast of the Island.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Government for the undertaking given the Opposition through the Colonial Secretary with regard to the spending of that \$250,000. I would like to say that my own experience when dealing almost exclusively with the Hon. Colonial

Secretary I received the utmost courtesy on each occasion on which I had to deal with him, and everything went along smoothly. I don't think any of my requisitions were turned down. I made no requisition that was not a reasonable one and consequently the Government saw to it.

Now I do not propose to numerate here the need of my district because that would take up considerable time, and after all there is only a certain amount of money remaining and it is only useless to get up in the House and talk about the needs of a district when we haven't got the money to remedy the trouble, but I would like to make special reference to the matter which I brought up here the other day and I would like to get some understanding if it is possible to have something done, because the very nature of the undertaking absolutely means that something be done at once. It is not only of interest to my district but to other districts as well. I refer now to well-boring at Change Islands.

The season is beginning to advance. This is the proper time now with the long days and good weather and I would ask the Prime Minister or the Colonial Secretary if we could get some undertaking that the \$250,000, or our portion of the \$250,000, can be forthcoming within the next month and if we could get that there is no reason why we could not get our men to go ahead.

Captain Winsor has been pressing me very much to get it in the district of Bonavista. We cannot give it to him until we finish in the district of Fogo.

I would like very much to get that assurance from the Colonial Secretary.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I told the House that it would be available almost immediately.

MR. HIBBS.—Before I sit down as this may be the very last opportunity we have left, I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his very courteous interview he gave me this morning and I feel quite sure that he is quite sympathetic towards that project and I ask him now and the Colonial Secretary and the Executive generally to advance that work as much as possible in order that we may get ahead with the work on that canal. Mr. Hall has signified his willingness to come down next week for the purpose of looking over the canal and making a recommendation and when he returns and makes his report I trust that no time will be lost in giving us the grant that we asked for.

I think there is some misunderstanding among the members for after I spoke and asked for a grant after I went down stairs Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Scammell spoke of that \$200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries and stated that they did not altogether support taking small separate amounts from that fund.

There must be some misunderstanding.

They did not intend to knock this proposition, they have told me so that they did not object to this but they differentiated between the projects because this is a good deal greater than the building of ordinary wharves.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It would have to be done under the supervision of a competent engineer.

MR. HIBBS.—The impression the Prime Minister got from me was they were opposed to spending any of that money on any part of Fogo district.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—They certainly made it clear.

MR. HIBBS.—I think the Prime Minister got the wrong impression

and I don't want him to have a wrong idea.

Mr. Scammell told me that he did not intend to knock the project.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman; There is one matter that I would like to bring up while we are in Committee. It is a matter of great public importance. I understand that a claim has been made to the Government to extend the concessions to the St. George's Coal Field's Ltd. that were granted in 1920. But this extension has been refused by the Government, and I would like the Prime Minister to explain why they have not taken into consideration the great necessity of trying to develop the St. George's Coal Field's. We have the authority from the Manager that there is abundance of coal there, and if that be so then the working of that coal mine would give abundance of labour to the people of this country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable member, I would like to say to begin with that the Government has not refused to renew any contract with the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd. Neither is there any contract to renew. The contract that was made with the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. ten years ago has not yet expired as far as the terms of that contract are concerned, because that contract has ten years to run and only eight years have yet run. But the contract is dead in as much as according to that agreement the company had to build their railway within five years of getting those concessions, and they have not built anything. Consequently, as I see it, the contract was dead three years ago, and the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. should have got busy three years ago and tried to get their new contract then. They have been very desultory about their own

business. The Government said to this Company several months ago that if they were prepared to bring before the Government a bona fide proposition for the operation of St. George's Coal Fields Ltd., that we were prepared to give them reasonable concessions, and probably a renewal of the contract that was entered into eight years ago. And they went away to try to get that bona fide proposition and all that they have brought back to us is an undertaking from the International Paper Co. that they would take an option on the property. According to that option the International Paper Co. do not undertake to spend one cent. Mr. Charlton told me that he was going to bring down a man to explore the property and probably blow in ten thousand dollars in finding whether there was coal there or not. He said that they use one hundred and seventy-five thousand tons of coal a year, and if they could get that from the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. they were prepared to work the property. But they do not undertake in the agreement to do anything. They simply take an option from the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd., which goes to show that if they got the renewal of the contract from the Government as before that they will take an option to buy the property for two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and that if the Government pays them the same bounty that was given them before of seventy-five cents a ton paid by the Government for the first five years and fifty cents for another five years, that they will give back ten cents a ton of that money to the shareholders of the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. and five cents extra as well. So that really means that the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd. were carrying out a proposition and this contract was to come before the House, I do not think

it would even then be considerable matter for debate. I may say that I can see very much more debatable points in those concessions than I can see in the shell or the shark Bill or anything else that has come before this House this session. In other words, this country is to pay, or had to pay according to the former bill, seventy-five cents a ton for every ton that they took out up to one hundred thousand tons for five years, and fifty cents a ton for the next five years, and after that the company would go to the International and say that they are prepared to take this option to pay back to the shareholders five cents a ton as dividend. I think that the whole matter is one worth giving great consideration to by this House, if it comes before the House at another session. I want to say that what this country has got to look at in these proposals is whether it would be worth our while to get coal if we have to pay seventy-five cents a ton for every ton that we get. I think it is quite worthy or consideration if we can buy our coal in Sydney a great deal cheaper. It may be a very valuable thing and we may be very desirous of having it in our own country, but if it is going to cost more to get the coal out of the ground and bring it to the customer than to get it from Sydney, then I do not think the coal is worth anything. These points have got to be considered. Now that the bill is dead and there is no bill to be considered, I do not think that the dying hours of this session is the time to bring the matter before this House. The Government is prepared to consider now any proposition from any company of good financial standing who would make proposals of doing something and of spending so much money to develop that area, but no such proposition is in the option that was proposed to be entered

into by the International Paper Co. and the St. George's Coal Fields Ltd.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928, and the 30th day of June 1929, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes 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 sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925 and Amendments Thereto," "An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes," "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs,'" "An Act to Govern the Gathering of Wild Fruits," and "An Act Relating to the Encouragement of the Shark Industry," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from

the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited," with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice 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 agreed to without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council informing the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker; I would ask that the amendments be read. This matter was brought up at the request of Members on both sides of the House. I think particularly the Hon. Members for Ferryland and Hr. Main this session, and I undertook as we had been turned down twice already by the Upper House to do the best I could with them this year. I regret that they have not seen fit to accept it again. The object of the Bill is that under the present law it takes ten years once dogs have been done away with to have them reinstated and it was thought desirable to have the law changed at the end of one year on petition. The Upper House refused it two years and this year they have

amended it substituting for the word one the word three.

I am rather disposed to say that we might take advantage of small mercies. If we reject the amendment now and try to insert "one year" I would not like to undertake that there would be much more headway than the last two years. There is one point in connection with it also worthy of notice that will be of assistance in some of the cases where they are anxious for a change as early as possible. All one has to do now is compute periods of three instead of ten and it will be found that in certain cases there will be only a year or two and the people will be able to take advantage of it as changeable. I do not regard this as being quite what we wanted; it does not go to the extent we would like in industrial centres, but from all standpoints it is an improvement.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice 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 agreed to without amendment.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 13th 1928.

The House met at half past two 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 Bill sent up entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928 and the 30th day of June 1929 and for other Purposes relating to the Public Service," without amendment.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if he could give us any information as to who the new Governor is to be.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—As far as I know the new Governor will be Sir John Middleton. All I know is that the Government were asked to give their assent to have his name placed before His Majesty the King.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Speaker; It seems to me in this connection that precedent has been for us to have had governors that have had no experience in dealing with responsible governments.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, in reference to what Mr. Scammell has said, I think that in some of the Dominions of the Empire it has been customary to make a suggestion to the Home Government of some man belonging to the Dominion. At any rate they have some voice as to who the new Governor should be. I do not think that it would be out of place for the Government of this country to make a nomination of their own, and I do not think that we need go outside of Newfoundland to find a Governor.

At three of the clock, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Administrator commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House attended his Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, at the Bar of the Council Chamber, addressed His Excellency as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1928 and the 30th day of June 1929, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service;"

"An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925 and amendments thereto";

"An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes";

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances";

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922";

"An Act Relating to the Distribution of Balances Remaining out of the Loan raised under the Act 18, Geo. V, Cap. 18";

"An Act to Further Amend the Law Society Act";

"An Act to Provide for the Guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals';

"An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates';

"An Act Respecting Harbor Regulations for the Port of St. John's";

"An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry";

"An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925";

"An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act, 1925";

"An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited";

"An Act to Govern the Gathering of Wild Fruits";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Customs';

"An Act Relating to the encouragement of the Shark Industry";

"An Act Respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

His Excellency the Administrator was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

Mr President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In relieving you from further attendance here it gives me great pleasure to observe the diligence and earnestness with which you applied yourselves to the despatch of business, and the spirit of concord and harmony which marked your deliberations.

I feel sure that you may retire from this Session with a feeling of confidence that your labours will be productive of substantial advantage to the country.

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

I thank you for the Supplies you have granted for the Public Service. The best efforts of my Ministers will be directed to secure judicious and economical expenditure in respect to the various appropriations.

Mr President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honorable House of Assembly:

It must be gratifying to us all and to every interest in the trade and industrial life of the Colony to observe the favourable signs under which the present season's operations are opening and the feeling of hope which prevails at the prospect of a substantial increase in the price of our staple product, the development of new fishery and mining enterprises and the promise of continued prosperity which they represent.

I trust that the various measures which have now been enacted may achieve in the fullest degree the objects for which they were designed and that the proposal for the diversion of the railroad in the interior, if it proves feasible, will commend itself

as likely to effect a more economical and efficient operation, and hasten the approach of the day when as a result of further development of the natural resources of the interior this important public utility will become self-sustaining.

In now bidding you farewell I sincerely hope that under God's Blessing your highest aspirations in the public interests may be realised.

After which the Hon. the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Administrator, said;

"Gentlemen,—It is His Excellency the Administrator's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be now prorogued until Saturday, the seventh day of July next, then and there to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY,—

- Motion for, 5.
- Committee on 29.
- Draft, 32.
- Presentation of, 166.
- Governor's Reply to, 237.

ASHBOURNE, MR.

- On Opening House with Prayer, 24.
- Report of Posts and Telegraphs, 226.
- Supply, 235, 293.
- Fogo Canal, 263.
- Railway Operating, 338.
- The Shark Bill, 349.
- Ways and Means, 362, 364, 381.
- Labrador Shell Bill, 475.

BROWNE, MR. W. J.

- On Address in Reply, 5.
- C. of E. College Loan, 71-75.
- Public Charities 204.
- Supply, 248.
- Practice of Optometry, 259.
- Highways Traffic Act, 367.
- Customs Act, 378.

BRADLEY, MR.

- On Suspension of Rules, 372.
- Shark Industry Bill, 350, 351, 435, 437.
- Highways Traffic Act, 346, 368.
- Motion for Adjournment, 53.
- C. of E. College Loan, 55, 68, 71, 72.
- Address in Reply, 76.
- Second Reading Crown Lands Act, 117.
- Supply 188, 233, 353.
- Lobster Fishery, 193.
- Public Accounts, 221.
- Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 252, 253.
- Practice of Optometry, 258.
- Labrador Shell Resolutions, 305, 427, 430, 431, 433, 443, 455, 481, 482, 484.
- Loan Bill Resolutions, 331.
- On Ways and Means, 395.

BROWN, MR. K.

- On Address in Reply 48, 52.
- Supply, 298.
- The Shark Bill, 349, 436.
- Ways and Means, 389.
- Sealfishery, 407.

BROPHY, MR.

- On St. John's Water Supply, 171.

CASHIN, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 18, 119.
- Fogo Circular Letter, 22, 23, 24.
- St. John's City Water Supply, 172.
- Outside Hospitals, 212.
- Supply, 238, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 289, 291.
- Ways and Means, 317, 392.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 249, 250.
- Loan Bill Resolutions, 329.

CRAMM, HON. MR.

- On Supply, 289.
- Labrador Shell Bill, 482, 485.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.

- On C. of E. College Loan, 65.
- St. John's City Water Supply, 169.
- Seed Potatoes 182.
- On Bill to Regulate Practice of Optometry, 184, 255, 256, 257, 258.
- Supply, 186, 188, 189, 190, 230, 231, 232, 233, 247, 248, 289, 295, 297.
- Public Charities, 198.
- Buchans Mine, 211.
- Outside Hospitals, 215.
- Loan Bill Resolutions, 334.
- War Pensions Act, 370.
- Marine Disasters Fund, 422, 425.
- Coastal Steamers, 504, 506.

DEPUTATION OF UNEMPLOYED,—

- Petition Re Unemployment, 96.

DIVISION ON LABRADOR SHELL BILL, 484, 501.**DIVISION ON AMENDMENT TO LABRADOR MARINE SHELL BILL, 486.****DUFF, HON. MR.**

- On The Shark Bill, 349.
- Labrador Shell Bill, 458.

BROWN, MR. K.

- On Address in Reply 48, 52.
- Supply, 298.
- The Shark Bill, 349, 436.
- Ways and Means, 389.
- Seafishery, 407.

BROPHY, MR.

- On St. John's Water Supply, 171.

CASHIN, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 18, 119.
- Fogo Circular Letter, 22, 23, 24.
- St. John's City Water Supply, 172.
- Outside Hospitals, 212.
- Supply, 238, 242, 244, 245 246, 247, 289, 291.
- Ways and Means, 317, 392.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 249, 250.
- Loan Bill Resolutions, 329.

CRAMM, HON. MR.

- On Supply, 289.
- Labrador Shell Bill, 482, 485.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.

- On C. of E. College Loan, 65.
- St. John's City Water Supply, 169.
- Seed Potatoes 182.
- On Bill to Regulate Practice of Optometry, 184, 255, 256, 257, 258.
- Supply, 186, 188, 189, 190, 230, 231, 232, 233, 247, 248, 289, 295, 297.
- Public Charities, 198.
- Buchans Mine, 211.
- Outside Hospitals, 215.
- Loan Bill Resolutions, 334.
- War Pensions Act, 370.
- Marine Disasters Fund, 422, 425.
- Coastal Steamers, 504, 506.

DEPUTATION OF UNEMPLOYED,—

- Petition Re Unemployment, 96.

DIVISION ON LABRADOR SHELL BILL, 484, 501.

DIVISION ON AMENDMENT TO LABRADOR MARINE SHELL BILL, 486.

DUFF, HON. MR.

- On The Shark Bill, 349.
- Labrador Shell Bill, 458.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER.

On Supply, 173, 188 231, 236, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 247, '008 '682
351, 355.

Twillingate and Grand Bank Hospitals, 192.

Unemployment, 217.

Parcel Post System, 226.

Wireless, Gray Islands, 227.

Ways and Means, 264, 383, 388, 415.

Loan Bill Resolutions, 326, 333.

Suspension of Rules, 375.

Retiring Allowances, 377.

Coastal Steamers, 507.

Disposition of Loan Balances, 337.

Labrador Shell Bill, 456, 457, 485.

GRIMES, MR.

On Opening House with Prayer, 25.

C. of E. College Loan, 55, 61, 64.

Address in Reply, 130.

Second Reading Crown Lands Bill, 136.

Supply, 189, 231, 232, 235, 238, 240, 299.

Lobster Fishery, 198.

Public Charities 201, 203.

Court House Clock, 218.

Turn-Keys, Penitentiary, 219.

Broom Department, Penitentiary, 220.

Salaries Nurses General Hospital, 220.

Ways and Means, 319.

Botwood Highroad, 341.

Marine Disasters Fund, 425.

Labrador Shell Bill, 454, 455.

GODDEN, MR. E. J.

On Address in Reply, 89.

Labrador Shell Bill, 480, 498, 499.

HICKMAN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 12, 155.

Resolution of Sympathy, Mr. Justice Warren, 30.

Resolutions re C. of E. College Loan, 54, 62 63. 67, 68, 116, 117.

Crown Lands Act, 136.

Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 137, 252,

Supply, 189, 223, 233, 237, 239, 243, 289, 300, 351, 353.

Lobster Fishery, 196.

Trinity Bay Mining and Development Co. Ltd., 254.

Labrador Shell Resolutions, 305, 427.

Ways and Means, 309.

Loan Bill Resolutions, 327.

The Shark Bill, 349.

Wild Fruits Bill, 380.

St. George's Coal Fields, 511.

Shark Bill 437.
 Dog Act 440.
 St. John's City Water Supply, 171.
 Close Season for Caribou, 206.
 Suspension of Rules, 375.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

On C. of E. College Loan, 55, 60, 61 63, 64, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 116.
 Presenting Petitions, 58.
 Second Reading Law Society Act, 95.
 Address in Reply, 103.
 Act to Amend Law Society, 114.
 Crown Lands Act, 136.
 Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 140, 252, 253.
 Supply, 190, 238, 300, 352, 353.
 Public Charities 203.
 Close Season for Caribou, 206.
 Civil Service Act, 218.
 Turn-Keys, Penitentiary, 219.
 Salaries Nurses General Hospital, 220.
 Wabana Light and Power Resolutions, 284, 343.
 Highways Traffic Act, 301, 345, 366, 441.
 Highroads Commission Act, 301, 368, 442.
 Labrador Shell Resolutions, 306, 431, 449, 451, 459 472, 473, 481,
 482, 493, 498, 499.
 The Shark Bill, 350, 435.
 Central and Harbor Grace Districts Courts, 370.
 Suspension of Rules, 374.
 Dog Act, 421, 438, 440, 513.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES.

On Presenting Petitions, 56.
 Second Reading Crown Lands Act, 92, 95 117, 118, 135, 136.
 Seed Potatoes, 177.
 Departmental Deputy Heads, 208.
 Logging Act, 210.
 Supply, 231, 299.
 Ways and Means, 315.
 Wild Fruits Bill, 379.
 Labrador Shell Bill, 464, 468.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

On Presenting Petitions, 58.
 Supply, 223, 224, 229, 231.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

On Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 137, 248, 250, 251, 253.
 The Sealfishery, 403.
 Bill Respecting Masters and Mates, 166.
 Lobster Fishery, 193, 197, 198.

Salaries Marine and Fisheries Department, 194.
 Cod Liver Oil, 197.
 Public Charities, 201, 203.
 Funks Island Light, 206.
 Fogo Canal, 263.
 Shark Industry Resolutions, 347, 350.
 On Supply 355.
 Labrador Shell Bill, 459.
 Coastal Steamers, 502.

MOSDELL, DR.

On Address in Reply, 106.
 Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 434 458, 473, 480, 481, 484, 493, 494,
 496, 498, 499.
 Ways and Means 412, 509.
 Supply, 188, 209, 229, 231, 299.
 Twillingate and Grand Bank Hospitals, 192.
 Salaries Marine and Fisheries Department, 194.
 Vote for Government Analyst, 209.
 Bay D'Espoir Water Powers, 212.
 Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 251.
 Practice of Optometry, 256, 257, 258, 259.
 Retiring Allowances 377.

POWER, MR.

On Address in Reply, 9.

PRIME MINISTER, THE.

On Address in Reply, 25, 102, 103, 104, 130, 156.
 Correspondence Between Government and Reids re Gander Pulp
 and Paper Mill, 27.
 Resolution of Sympathy Mr. Justice Warren and Hon. M. Power, 30.
 Resolutions Guaranteeing Loan to Church of England College, 53,
 54, 55, 60, 61, 63 70, 95, 96, 115, 116, 308.
 Re Relief Works 1922-24, 185.
 On Supply, 189, 191, 231, 294, 296.
 Twillingate and Grand Bank Hospitals, 191.
 Close Season for Caribou, 206.
 Departmental Deputy Heads, 209.
 Bay d'Espoir Water Powers, 212.
 Court House Clock, 218.
 Broom Department, Penitentiary, 219.
 S. S. Kyle, 222.
 Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 252, 253.
 St. George's Coal Fields, 254, 511.
 Practice of Optometry, 258.
 Educational Reports, 263.
 Labrador Shell Resolutions, 303, 305, 306, 307, 425, 431, 432, 433,
 443, 453, 455, 472, 473, 480, 481 482, 483, 484, 490, 495, 498, 499,
 500, 501.

Loan Bill Resolutions, 331.
 Deposition of Loan Balances, 337.
 Shark Industry Bill, 350, 437.
 Suspension of Rules, 376, 487.
 Ways and Means, 393, 411, 419.

PETITIONS,—

Mr. Ashbourne, 31, 56 172, 184.
 Mr. Hibbs, 31, 372, 422.
 Mr. Halfyard, 56, 172.
 Mr. Brown, 76, 284, 372.
 Mr. Grimes, 76, 237, 422.
 Mr. Lake, 76, 96, 186.
 Mr. Godden 76.
 Mr. Long, 137.
 Hon. Mr. Sullivan, 172.
 Hon. Minister of Justice, 185.
 Minister of Agriculture and Mines, 284.
 Mr. Scammell, 284, 302, 325, 372, 422, 438.
 Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 302.
 Dr. Mosdell, 346.
 Mr. Hickman, 372.

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY,—

On Hon. Mr. Justice Warren and Hon. Michael Power, 30.

QUESTIONS, NOTICE OF,—

Mr. Scammell, 186, 205, 222 237, 255, 284, 302, 325, 347, 372, 513.
 Mr. Godden, 29, 284.
 Mr. Grimes, 29, 56, 60, 186, 255, 284, 513.
 Mr. Moore, 29, 156, 222, 284.
 Mr. Brown, 29, 60, 302 372.
 Mr. Randall, 29, 186, 302.
 Mr. Cashin, 29, 156, 172 284.
 Mr. Halfyard, 60, 172, 222, 255.
 Mr. Hickman, 172, 205, 347.
 Mr. Hibbs, 186, 205, 255.
 Dr. Mosdell, 186, 255.
 Mr. Ashbourne, 237, 255.
 Mr. Browne, 347.

REPORTS TABLED,—

Of St. John's Municipal Council, 31.
 Liquor Control Board 32.
 Select Committee, 32.
 Newfoundland Railway, 60.
 Public Accounts, 96.
 Public Debt, 96.
 Current Account Government of Newfoundland, 96.

Customs Returns, 172.
 Railway Commission, 239.
 Educational Reports, 239.
 Tourist and Publicity Commission, 255.

RANDELL, CAPT.

On Address in Reply, 84, 169.
 Coastal Steamers, 506.
 Loan Bill Resolutions, 329, 337.
 Labrador Shell Resolutions, 307, 433 467, 472, 482.
 C. of E. College Loan, 63, 65.
 Funk Island Light, 207.
 Salaries Nurses General Hospital, 219.
 Trinity Bay Ferry Service, 220.
 Supply, 229, 235, 354.
 Harbor Regulations, Port of St. John's, 250, 253.
 Ways and Means, 400, 401, 402.

RUSSELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 143.
 Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 500, 501.

SCAMMELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 32.
 Supply, 186, 187, 189, 190, 224, 232, 293, 299.
 Lobster Fishery, 195.
 Public Charities, 200.
 Close Season for Caribou, 205.
 S. S. Kyle, 222.
 Wireless Gray Islands, 227.
 Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry, 256.
 Labrador Shell Resolutions, 307, 460 461, 462, 464, 478, 482, 483,
 485, 486.
 Loan Bill Resolutions, 330, 341.
 Labrador Shell Resolutions, 307, 460, 461, 462, 464, 478, 482, 483,
 485, 486.
 Ways and Means, 356, 388.
 Marine Disasters Fund, 425.
 Coastal Steamers, 505.

SPEAKER, HIS HON.

On Parliamentary Practice, 52, 168.
 Public Accounts 221.
 Shark Bill, 350.

SULLIVAN, HON. MR.

On Clark Steamships Subsidy, 231.
 Supply, 246, 289, 292.
 Railway Problems, 338, 340.
 Ways and Means, 382.
 Coastal Steamers, 509.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE,—

On Opening, 3.

Closing, 515.

SUSPENSION OF RULES RE C. OF E. COLLEGE LOAN, 61.

SELECT COMMITTEES,—

On Address in Reply, 32.

Labrador Shell Bill, 254, 284 489.

Petition Wabana Light and Power Co., 185, 259.

Shark Bill, 302, 325, 437.

WAYS AND MEANS, 264, 308, 357, 381.

Proceedings

OF THE

Legislative Council

DURING THE

FIFTH SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SIXTH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1928

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Legislative Council of Newfoundland.

Session 1928.

WEDNESDAY, May 2nd 1928.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature, the House met.

At three o'clock p.m. His Excellency the Administrator, Sir William Horwood, Knight, having arrived at the Council Chamber, and being seated on the Throne, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, through the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, to let the House of Assembly know "It is His Excellency the Administrator's pleasure they attend him immediately in this House."

Who being come thereto with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to speak as follows:—

(Speech appears elsewhere)

Then the House of Assembly withdrew and His Excellency was pleased to retire.

Hon. Mr. President informed the House that His Excellency the ex-Governor had granted leave of absence to the Hon. D. Ryan, Hon. Sir M. G. Winter and Hon. R. B. Job.

The Speech from the Throne was then read by the clerk

HON. MR. ALERDICE.—In moving a resolution of sympathy to the relatives of the late Hon. Mr. Michael Power, said he had known the Hon. Gentleman for many years; his life had been a long and useful one. For fifty years he had worked assiduously in the business of the country and in later years had given largely of his time to civic matters. Mr. Power was one of the first four to be elected on the City Council Board and in subsequent years acted as chairman of that Board. To-day we are enjoying the fruits of his labour in that capacity. Fourteen years ago he was appointed to a seat in the Legislative Council, and was in regular attendance, except during the last year when failing health prevented him. Whilst he may not have taken an active part in discussions he always evinced the greatest interest in the business of the House and invariably cast his vote in the way in which he considered would be in the best interest of the colony. He was considered by all who knew him a modest and retiring man of sterling character, and one who served his day and generation worthily and well. He was a faithful son of his

Church; his home life was happy; he was honorable in all his dealings and proved a patriotic son of his native land—all of which go to make up the best in citizenship.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—In seconding the resolution of the Hon. Leader of the Government, said he had known the Hon. Mr. Power intimately for twenty-five years. He was a man whose word was his bond, the type of man the world needs, but unfortunately one which is becoming scarcer every day.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I beg leave to support the resolution. As has been observed, since we last met in this Chamber, death has removed a model christian and a good citizen. It was my privilege to have known the Hon. Michael Power the greater part of my life and what impressed me most was his strong faith of sterling honesty. He was ever ready to lend a helping hand to those in need, and unknown to the world often during his journey through life befriended those in distress.

Mr. Power belonged to that class of pioneers who, by their silent work, courage and christian virtues are instrumental in laying the firm foundations of a country's progress. He left no great wealth other than that of a name of honesty, integrity and christian virtue, but, what greater legacy could he bequeath to those who were near and dear to him or to the country in which he lived.

For years he carried on a successful cooerage business in this City and was elected three times a member of our City Council. He was a member of our first elected City Council and served as its Chairman. It was in that capacity that he gained the familiar name of "Councillor Power" by which more people of this City knew him. In civic matters, he displayed that interest

and evidenced that integrity for which he was noted in business and other dealings.

Now that he has paid our tainted nature's penalty, I feel sure that he can look back upon a life well spent and I know that I voice the sentiments of members of this chamber, and the vast number of his friends outside it when I say that an honest and upright citizen, a christain in the fullest sense of the term, has passed from our midst.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Wished to associate himself with the previous speakers. He had known Mr. Power for half a century, more intimately of later years. As Councillor Power he was best known. He was a model citizen and has left an example for the younger generation to follow.

HON. CAPT. KEAN.—In rising to move the appointment of a Select Committee to draft a reply to the Speech from the Throne, said he was more surprised than the other Hon. Members in finding himself acting in his present capacity. Hon. Mr. Ayre was unable to attend at the last moment and he was substituting. At first he considered reading the memoranda which Mr. Ayre had, he understood, in readiness, but decided he would feel like David in Saul's suit of armour, and preferred using his own sling and stone. In referring to the opening paragraphs of the speech he said that business had improved and happiness increased since 1924. In reference to the Labrador fishery of last year he said the results were more satisfactory than those of the previous year and the sharemen reaped the benefit. The present seal-fishery showed a larger catch and the demand for skins had increased. The results were puzzling for it had been shown that steamers hailing for a smaller number of seals than some others turned

out equivalent weight of fat. The regulation concerning the date of killing was in a measure the explanation of that, as some seals killed the first day, the 13th, averaged but 32 pounds, as against 39 pounds, and even 50 pounds for others killed later on. The matter of estimates will be brought to the notice to the House within a few weeks which make it unnecessary to speak at length on them at this time. Another question which should be given careful thought is the matter of the diversion of the railway through the town of Buchans, thereby avoiding the Topsails. Some years ago the Hon. Capt. Kean had a conversation with a gentleman who knew much about these matters and who considered that a great deal of the difficulty experienced in winter traffic on our railroad in this section would be eliminated. The last item of the Speech from the Throne is the most important mentioned. In his opinion the matter of the coming election meant more to this country than any other. The women now have the opportunity of voting, but what their attitude will be is impossible to foretell. Whether they will listen to the promises of politicians and vote for the ones promising the most or vote for the best interests of the country time alone will tell. If they vote with a view to furthering our best interests the politicians will learn a lesson. But they should vote for the man whose reputation is untarnished having regard to their honesty and integrity as well. Capt. Kean had much pleasure in moving the appointment of a committee to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

HON. MR. BARTLETT.—I rise with pleasure to second the motion so ably proposed by the Hon. Gentleman.

If His Excellency the Administrator welcomes us here to-day I am sure

that we on our part welcomes him with equal heartiness in the position which he so worthily fills for the sixth time, I understand. If there are occasions when temporarily we are without a Governor, it is a satisfaction to know that here is one in the person of our Chief Justice, one whose ability and experience well fits him to fill the breach.

The departure of Sir William and Lady Allerdyce from our shores has occasioned universal regret. The interest taken by Sir William not alone in the social life but also in the industrial enterprise and general welfare of the Colony is too well known for me to elaborate on it to-day while Lady Allerdyce, whose magnificent work on behalf of Nonia will cause her name to be long remembered throughout the entire country, cannot be too greatly praised.

We must all rejoice at the signs of the Colony's prosperity which were so evident during the past year, and I am confident that as the years go by we may look forward to an ever increasing measure of national prosperity.

Apart from the fisheries the development that has taken place in mining and paper making enterprises encourages the belief that great things are in store in the not distant future for the industrial progress of Newfoundland.

As one interested in the prosecution of the fisheries, especially the cod fishery, it is gratifying to note that shore fish sold at remunerative prices last year and that with stocks lower at present than they usually are at this season, one may hope for similar, if not improved conditions, in the season that now lies immediately ahead of us.

There is a steadily growing belief that the future of the cod-fish indus-

try, here and elsewhere, lies in the development of methods of preserving the same by chilling, freezing, and so on. It is most desirable that the fullest information on the progress in these directions by other countries should be obtained and made available to those who live by our fisheries and that plans may be devised to enable us to market an increasing proportion of our fish foods in a fresh or frozen state. It is encouraging to know that at least two well known firms are entering the fresh frozen fish industry this year on what I believe is to be a considerable scale and I feel confident that we are united in wishing them a full measure of success in their enterprise.

Our feelings towards the announcement respecting the legislation enacted last year in connection with the pulp and paper industry must be somewhat mixed. While we rejoice that the transfer of the Corner Brook properties to the International Paper Company has been finalised, we cannot but regret that the establishment of a paper mill on the Gander has not yet materialised. Rumour is active as to the reasons for this, but lacking any official statement, which no doubt, will be made elsewhere, I shall content myself with saying that as a representative of the South Coast I sincerely hope that the aspirations of the East Coast for a large paper making industry in that area, may, before long, be realised.

It must be a source of great gratification to every Newfoundlander to consider the prominence into which this country is coming as a centre for big mineral development. The visit of the Mining Congress last year was a striking proof of this, and the number of prospectors and others whose attention has been attracted to our mineral possibilities further attests our

standing in this respect. Of course, the chief cause of it is increased interest in our mineral deposits is the development which is now being undertaken at Buchans by the American Smelters, probably the greatest corporation of its kind in the world. The large sums which are being spent upon the development of Buchans is an indication of the value of the minerals which have been located there. The discovery and development of this property has led to the acquisition by influential mining interests of large stretches of adjoining territory and it would therefore be a wise step at this juncture, to modernize our existing mining legislation, a step which I am confident would meet with the warmest approval of this House.

There will, I think, be universal approval of the action of the Government in opening negotiations with the owners of the Bell Island mines, with a view to securing greater advantages for the men employed there. Obviously, capital must be fairly treated, but it is only fair that if the owners of this property can take measures to improve the conditions of the workers in their Cape Breton coal mines, they should be prepared to adopt similar measures for the benefit of the men employed in the iron mines of Bell Island.

While questions of finance are not properly the province of this House, we can welcome, as taxpayers, the measures which will concern the refunding of the War Loan of 1918. This action should be the means of saving the country a considerable amount in interest charges. It seems, however, that it will be necessary to borrow other money and we can only hope that the government, in presenting its proposals in respect to this, will bear in mind that the burden borne by the people is already great and will limit

the additional demand to the lowest figure compatible with the requirements of the Colony.

It is unfortunate that there is likely to be a small deficit on account of the financing operations of the Colony during the current fiscal year, but it must be remembered that this small country is still struggling under the weight of the heavy obligations incurred as a result of our war effort and that it will be some considerable time before we shall be completely relieved from these. It is gratifying, however, to know that the Customs receipts have increased by nearly three-quarters of a million, and that, moreover, the railway deficit has been cut in half and we may look forward to soon reaching the time when the Newfoundland Railway will be able to pay its own way. In that connection the government's proposal for diverting the main line of railway across the Topsails to a lower level near Buchans is well worthy of close consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am sure that it will be the aim of this House to facilitate in every way the speedy enactment of such measures as may come before us. I trust that it is not too much to express the hope that elsewhere it may be found possible to deal with these measures in such a way, that while they shall receive the fullest consideration, the time of the Legislature may not too heavily be drawn upon, and that the business of this session will be concluded (as His Excellency the Administrator observes), without undue strain on other occupations of those who are charged with the disposal of the Parliamentary business of the country.

Again, Sir, it gives me much pleasure to second the motion for the appointment of a select committee to

draft an address in reply to the speech which His Excellency was pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—Said he had listened with great interest—as he had always done—to the speech of Hon. Capt. Kean. The first time he had heard the Hon. Capt. speak was at the British Hall many years ago when he (Capt. Kean) was advocating the return of Hon. Sir Edward Morris. He was at that time a great supporter of Morris's. Now he has turned round because he (Capt. Kean) does not want the electorate to cast their vote for tarnished politicians. So far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned it contained everything but the weather report. According to it prosperity abounds throughout the country. Never was business better. Hon. Dr. Campbell differed from this because he knew from his journeying from house to house in his professional capacity that poverty was rampant; and poverty of the worst sort. In fact he had never seen so much. As another proof of this there is the fact that day after day a gang of men troop up to the C.C.C. Armory for the dole. And this has been done since the present government came into power in 1924. Signs of this sort were not evidence of prosperity. Speeches like that from the Throne were not to be swallowed wholesale. One section of it mentions that there will be another little deficit. In the years to come this government will be known as the government of magnificent deficits. Then there is the matter of the loan. The loan to be floated to redeem the 1918 war loan was something gained but this would be eaten up in the other loan to meet the deficit on current account. No mention is made of the two million dollar dock nor of the tourist policy, probably because they have

not made any returns nor shown any profit. The Railroad deficit is down to \$300,000 but this is nothing to be proud of because money will have to be expended to divert the railroad from the Topsails, which means more expense. Probably Buchans Mine would benefit through this shift. Three years ago Hon. Dr. Campbell was told by Mr. Scott of Grand Falls that the track should go through Hinds Brook Valley. The part of the Speech from the Throne that deserved most mention and which the Hon. Dr. intended to speak at length on, was section five. This section dealt with the pulp and paper industry. Last year two bills were introduced and passed. One was the Corner Brook measure and the other was the bill for the Gander Valley operations. Never before in the history of any legislature in the British Empire had such monstrous legislation been brought in. The special function at a Legislative council, in fact the reason for its existence was to criticize such measures and act as a protection and a safeguard in the public's interests. In Hon. Dr. Campbell's opinion no legislation ever introduced in any parliament in the Empire approached the indecent to use a strong word, as nearly as these measures did. In Mr. Monroe's speech on this question last year made on the 5th of August he mentioned that the third feature contributing to the failure of the original company was the drop in the price of paper in the foreign market, due to the entry of many other companies into this field of industry. The statement given by the original company was that there would be a deficit of \$1,200,000 in the company's operations for the eighteen months prior to July 1st, 1927. This statement was swallowed by the premier, by his supporters and by the country. There were no "Thomases."

No one questioned it. Instead of swallowing it Mr. Monroe should have had an independent audit made to ascertain whether this statement was corroborated was his business and would have been sound common sense. Mr. Monroe then said as a result of his deficit the company would be unable to operate and the country would have to find the money to meet the interest charges. Hon. Dr. Campbell then read the statement issued by the International Paper Company to the Royal Securities Ltd., who are handling the sale of the Gold Bond issue of that company. The statement signed by the President of the International, A. R. Graustein states that due to its advantageous position and the supply of material and water power the mill at Corner Brook is the lowest cost producing mill in North America. The statement is also made by the same person that the earnings available at the moment the circular was issued, February, 1928, were \$2,789,000, for the previous twelve months. This circular was issued five months after Mr. Monroe's speech was made, in which he said that the deficit was \$1,200,000 for the 3 months prior to July, 1927. This means that when the interest charges on the Gold Bond issue were paid and the interest charge on the sinking fund were paid the company would have a net profit of roughly one million dollars. From this it might be inferred that the premier last year was chasing the shadow instead of the substance. He wanted to build a mill on the Gander just as Squires had built on the Humber. And through his efforts towards his object the country had lost more than it realised. Unfortunately this is inevitably the result of hasty legislation. Measures which are passed in the last gasp are suspicious to say the least. Hon. Dr. Campbell said that he had remarked

last year when these measures came up that they had a bad odour. Now we are reaping the results of that odour. What are the losses to the country? Instead of the royalty of one dollar per ton of newsprint received under the Squires contract, there was no royalty under the present measures. Similarly with the royalty of twenty-five cents to be received from the company per horsepower, there was no return under the present measure. Rights of exporting one half cord of unmanufactured material per ton of newsprint from White Bay and the Gander Valley were granted, in spite of the fact that the policy of conserving our raw materials has been consistently advocated since the days of the Bond Government. Thus in one item alone, that of the royalty on newsprint, the country loses \$436 a day. The raw material that should be manufactured in this country is being shipped away to fill the hungry maws of the company's mills on the Hudson River, in the United States, and other mills in Canada. The country's guarantee of ten million dollars for which under the Squires contract a second mortgage was given on the company's property as security was again given with a third mortgage instead of the second as security. The third mortgage is no security at all. These are a few of the losses. In dollars and cents the amount lost to the country is enormous but more than that our credit is ruined. The interesting public will hesitate to place capital into this country when such assets as we have are handed out in this way. We have lost from every angle and the International people have got the best mill in North America for a song and a poor song at that. The moral of it all is this:—

Are we ever going to get anything from our natural resources? So far

sweat is the return from our forests and grime from our mines, which might as well be in Peru as far as the development of our country is concerned. We are not used to fighting big interests and are constantly having it put over us in every shape and form.

Another large subject requiring discussion is Confederation. If the Canadian Senate could spend a week March 20th—30th in dealing with the possibility of the confederation of Newfoundland with Canada surely a half hour, at least, might be given to it at the present session. Quotations were read from the speeches of several leading gentlemen, among whom were C. E. Tanner of Nova Scotia, Senator Rufus Pope and Senator Robertson who knows Newfoundland better than those who live here, and whose figures quoted were exact in every instance, going to prove that information was obtained at first hand. Should Confederation with Canada take place Newfoundland would be the second smallest of the Maritime Provinces. Our trade with Canada in flour, sugar, boots and shoes, textiles, coal etc., amounts to twelve million dollars which is paid for in cash, while Canada's trade with us is two million dollars. So the balance of trade is against us. Canada does not need our lobster, salmon or paper she does not need our codfish. The St. Lawrence that huge waterway has caused the growth of cities farther inland such as Montreal, Toronto. If that river were not there the big sea-ports would be on the coast but as it is the Maritime Provinces are showing marked decreases in population. Ever since Confederation the Maritime Provinces have groaned and moaned and chafed under Confederation. Newfoundland would merely become one of the shreds and patches of

Confederation as the Maritime Provinces have been described. Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have never been satisfied and things became so bad that last year the Prime Ministers of the Maritimes petitioned the Federal Government to come to their assistance to save them from becoming bankrupt. As a result, the Duncan Commission was appointed to investigate their greivances, and certain cash payments as well as other recommendations were made.

He (Hon. Dr. Campbell) was opposed to Confederation and thought most people from the Maritimes were opposed. If these provinces suffered from confederation, Newfoundland would be fooled by mere rumours, but that there was something more behind all this talk and the people of Newfoundland should know what it is.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—Said he did not intend to make any speech of any length but he felt that he should give his idea of the kernel of the situation so far as confederation was concerned. The keynote of the question is that until a country could make a financial success of its affairs it had not right to govern itself. It could not maintain its status as a self governing country unless its financial success could be handled locally. Every bank in the country was Canadian. There was not a Newfoundland bank in the whole Island. It left the question could Newfoundland do without Canada, open to debate.

The motion for the appointment of a committee to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was put in and carried unanimously. Hon. President moved the following as members of the committee:—Hons. Capt. Kean Mr. Bartlett, Mr. MacNamara, Mr. Davey, and Mr. Bell.

On motion of the Leader of the Government, Hon. Mr. Alderdice, the

Council adjourned until Friday 4th, at three o'clock. p.m.

FRIDAY, May 4.

The Council met at 3.30 p.m.

HON. CAPT. KEAN presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and same was read a first time.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the Speech from the Throne.

It was unfortunate the House had to meet at this time of the year. Especially is this so when it is remembered that the various business occupations of honorable members are becoming more active just now and consequently their first thought and consideration is with their business rather than with the public business of the country. The correct time of the year to have the interests of the public best conducted is in the winter, when honorable members have more leisure and can give greater deliberation and consideration to the best interests of the Colony. It is only at such times that the economic and industrial affairs can be given the thought they deserve. Why is it that the interest of individuals receive more attention than those of the country? The Legislature was unable to open until now because some gentlemen wished to go to the seal fishery, or someone else had other matters to attend to. It is most unfair that the interests of the country be sacrificed in order that the individual may be served. I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the drafting of a reply to the Speech from the Throne. None but themselves can understand the difficulties they were faced with in trying to explain

away the sins of omission and commission of the present Government. At the moment this country is faced with acute industrial problems and no attempt is being made towards their solution. Twelve months have elapsed since this Council last met for the conduct of business and during that period nothing has been done to solve the important questions that are agitating the public today. The only solution to the problem is to increase the earnings of our people. If the purchasing power of the community can be increased the burden of their taxation can be alleviated proportionately. Unfortunately nothing has been done either to increase the earning power or to decrease the taxation. In the Speech from the Throne there is a paragraph to the effect that another loan will have to be raised to meet the difference between expenditure and income. This is no new thing. It has been going on year after year, but it is disastrous in its results. It simply means that our indebtedness is being increased and that the burden of taxation on the public is being made heavier. The increase in taxation implies a corresponding decrease in purchasing power. The Hon. Mover spoke at some length on the difference between the condition in 1924 and the present time, and with the intention of showing that the contrast was favourable at the present time. I contend that the honorable gentleman could not be very familiar with conditions in St. John's in 1924 if this was his view, because he would have known of the queues of able-bodied relief men now receiving pauper relief because of unemployment. Instead of providing employment that would at least have made some return, the people were given dole, which is the contrast between the two years. I can remem-

ber the time when public men set their faces against the dole, any argument in favor of it met with denunciation, with the result that it was abolished. Why the change? The men are willing to work for relief. It is preferable by far to have them work for it than to have them lose their independence and manhood by receiving public money without the necessity of having to make some return therefor. The unemployed have become so accustomed to this system now that they take this money day after day without any qualms of conscience at all. It is far better to get fifty cents in the dollar return for the money given out as relief than to get no return at all. More than that it is better to have them retain their independence, initiative and manhood, which they would have had they to work for the relief. So far as the providing of work was concerned there were many ways of having them employed. For instance, thousands of sleepers are needed yearly for the railway. This is fit work for employment. Such things as repairs to public buildings, improvements to the harbor, would provide work for these people. It would also enable them to give value for the money they receive. Why should one citizen receive money for nothing and another have to sell his product or work, as the case may be, to live. The system of pauper relief has reached the stage now that the men prefer the enforced idleness for which they are paid. If the fishery operations are to be continued, means must be found to make their waste products remunerative. The old system is passing everywhere. We must not sit idly by and view its demise with unconcern. The new order must be taken advantage of. In this connection scientific research is the foundation stone for improved methods and increased value. I

contend that the man in the laboratory is far more important than the man in the factory, because he is endeavoring to find new ways of enlarging resources and enhancing the value. He is trying to discover methods by which waste products may be converted into channels productive of wealth. Germany's case is illustrative of the soundness of this argument. She has practically regained her pre-war standing in the commercial and industrial world. Her position has been regained through the efforts of her scientists to find new ways in which to make the waste products of her resources valuable. We have immense resources, but perhaps the most valuable parts are being thrown away because of our inability to make use of them. Another instance is that of the Buchans mine industry. Years ago, although this territory was known to contain certain minerals, it was impossible to carry on any operations there because of the impossibility of separating the various constituents of the ore.

The American Smelting Company set their chemists to discover a means by which this might be done. Their efforts met with success and now that property, once considered valueless, is wealthy in terms of millions. This country does not appreciate that a dollar spent in research may be the means of doubling the potential wealth. The average public man in this Colony is far more concerned with the idea of letting the man in the bottom of the bay have a barrel of flour twenty-five cents cheaper than the man in St. John's, than to increasing the value of the country's resources. Because of this misdirection of energy he is depriving the public of work, he is depriving the railway of traffic, because he diverts it to these other channels. They have politics of this sort more

at heart than the interests of the country. Then there is the question of highroads. No one realises the amount of traffic these roads take away from the railway. Because of this policy and that of subsidising steamship lines, the expenses of the railway are made heavier, traffic is diverted and its income lessened. Buchans Mine has demonstrated to us that we do not realise the resources of this Colony. After the territory around Buchans became known as valuable, speculators were allowed to come in and stake out claims regardless of their titles or not. Instead of the profit from these areas lessening the burden of taxation it is going into the pockets of the speculators. In this connection, I venture to say that the titles of many of the people with areas staked out were invalid. And this was so because they had not complied with the law on the question. Not alone must a man stake out his territory to make it his, but he must first find mineral there, otherwise his title is worthless. As to the reference in the Speech to Bell Island, what has the present Government done for Bell Island during its term of office? Has there been inspection of mines, or inspection of the living and working conditions of the men employed there? I think not. Bell Island is of little value to Newfoundland; for any industry which does not afford wages to the employees such as will enable them to live as decent members of society is a loss to the country. Bell Island is a serious loss. Because of the poverty-stricken wages the workers are unable to provide their homes with the commonest necessaries of life. During the past three or four months the tale of several men for whom application was made to the Supreme Court to have them declared insolvent, was a pitiable one, and one almost unbelievable. Men who have

been working for fifteen, seventeen or twenty years in the mines and have families of five or six children have not even a chair to sit on. One man's total goods were not worth four dollars. These people live in hovels and under the poorest conditions, with the result that men who should be in the prime of manhood are physical wrecks and are no longer able to do hard work and the country has to come to their aid. Bell Island mine is one of the richest in the world and one which is worked with greater economy than any other ore body. There are only two others which exceed Bell Island in quantity—one in Brazil and one in U.S.A. Ours is the third greatest in the world. Those which surpass it in iron content are in Spain and Lake Superior. Alsace Lorraine and Brazil have less iron content in their ore, and English ore has very much less. Some of the ores have to be roasted before smelting. We do not appear to appreciate the value of our great iron ore bodies when a living wage is not given to the men who work them for us. Canada possesses no iron worth while; there is more in square mile of Bell Island than in the whole of Canada and we have not vision enough to see the great possibilities in store for Newfoundland. Is it not worth while to make this industry at Bell Island of permanent value. Our ore is mined cheaper than that in Alsace Lorraine, in England or in U.S.A., while the worker is paid the lowest wages on the North American continent. Here is an opportunity for the Government to solve the problem of taxation by increasing the earning power of the people of the country to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. They might answer the mines would then have to be closed down. But on investigation it will be found that the demand for iron is increasing. Ger-

many, through the war, lost 50 per cent of her iron ore deposits. The amount of ore used before the war by Germany amounted to twenty million tons. Alsace and Lorraine has deprived her of ten million tons of raw iron which must be obtained elsewhere. She cannot buy from U.S.A. nor from France, for France won't sell to Germany who is in competition with them. Nor will Spain or Sweden supply their loss, for the deposits of these countries are controlled largely by English capitalists; nor is Great Britain going to sell. Where is the ore to come from if not from Newfoundland? Here then is a means if properly handled, and advantage taken of it, of solving materially the economic and industrial problems which confront us. From time to time, because of having denounced conditions on Bell Island so vigorously, the terms "breeder of discontent" or even "communist" have been used. It is such places where living conditions are so bad that communism breeds. What is the greatest asset of the country? It is not its industries or its manufactures, but rather its children, because without them industries cannot be carried on. If one looks at the conditions under which the people of Bell Island live—inadequate wages, the most unsatisfactory living conditions—one cannot but ask is it not advisable to make those assets of more value to the country in the future than they have been in the past.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—Before the gracious speech of His Excellency the Administrator goes through its final stages, I would like to make a few comments on it, and feel that the Government are justified in claiming that marked progress has been made during their four year term of office now drawing to a close. When we look around we will find ample

evidence of this progress, and in proof of this assertion, I would like to point out that we have better roads, better bridges, better railway service, better steamship service, and in addition to this we have a new dock and a new hotel—the latter not having cost the Government a solitary cent since its completion, and unlikely to cost anything in future.

It is true all these improvements, excepting the Hotel, represent a large outlay on the part of the country, and I make bold to say that nobody will dispute the fact that these splendid assets are well worth the money expended by the Government on their acquirement.

It is pleasing to find that the seal fishery has resulted in a larger catch than last year—according to this morning's paper the total catch is 224,639, as against a total catch of about 180,000 last year, showing a handsome increase of roughly 44,000 seals. It is understood that the seal skins are more valuable this year, which will materially add to the returns of this hazardous enterprise. There is one disconcerting thing, however, about the returns of the seal fishery and that is the small remuneration the men receive for their share in this enterprise. As far as can be learned the largest bill made this year only averaged about \$60 to \$70, or at the rate of about \$3 per 1,000 seals, and considering the high price of seal skins, due in some measure to the high price of leather in the world, the average onlooker feels that the men producing this wealth should receive more reward than they do for their efforts in this perilous industry.

It is gratifying to learn that the pulp and paper industry shows expansion, and that activities in connection with our mineral wealth give promise of marked development. It

is disappointing, however, to find that the Gander Valley proposition has not materialised, but it is hoped that this enterprise may be undertaken before much further delay.

The visit of the Empire Mining and Metallurgical Congress here last autumn was a splendid "ad" for the country and great good will likely eventuate from this knowledge this Congress gained during their stay amongst us.

The Government are to be congratulated on taking up negotiations with the owners of the mines at Bell Island, with the object of bettering the conditions of men working at this hazardous calling. At present, I understand, that the average wages paid miners at Bell Island is about 24c to 25c an hour, and as far as can be learned this is the lowest rate wages paid anywhere on this side of the water, at least for unskilled labor of this character. I would like to point out that miners leaving Newfoundland and employed at Sydney receive 30 cents per hour, and it has always been a puzzle and a mystery to me to understand why a Newfoundlander is only worth 24c to 25c per hour in his own country, but by taking a trip of 90 miles across Cabot Strait he was paid 30c by the same company.

The rate in St. John's is 30 cents per hour for unskilled labor, and that on the surface, and assuredly the same wages at least at Bell Island undergrounds, would only be bare justice to the men occupied at the mining industry. It is hoped, therefore, that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at between the mine owners and the government in their present negotiations.

The retiring of the \$6,000,000 6½ per cent war loan which matures this year, and securing the same loan at a much lower rate, will roughly save the country interest charge of \$100,-

000.00 per annum. We do not know enough about the balance of the contemplated loan of $1\frac{1}{8}$ million dollars to comment upon it, but I have enough faith in the Government to feel that this new loan will be used in the best interests of the country.

It is regrettable that the financial operations of the country show a small deficit despite the fact that the revenue shows an increase of approximately \$750,000.00. \$300,000 of this deficit is apparently represented by loss on railroad operations for the year. When we recall the fact that in the past the railroad loss was upwards of one million dollars yearly, I think the railway management are to be congratulated in reducing the deficit on this utility to such a large extent compared with last year, and the hope is expressed that in the near future our railroad will be able to meet all expenses of operation. The diverting of the railroad from the Topsails to the town of Buchans will mean that Buchans will be on the main line instead of being on a branch line as it is to-day, and in addition to this there will be the advantage if cutting out a good deal of snow fighting experienced every winter on the Topsails and that this work will justify itself is apparent from the statement made in the Prime Minister's speech on Wednesday when he said that we could look forward to the time when the town of Buchans will pay half the interest on our public debt.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE.—I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. Capt. Kean saved the situation by stepping, at the eleventh hour, into the breach caused by the sudden illness of Hon. Mr. Ayre. I am pleased to be able to state that the Hon. Mr. Ayre's condition is now somewhat improved.

The Hon. Captain's remarks on the Sealing paragraph of the Speech were interesting and informative.

Hon. Mr. Bartlett was very appropriate in his reference to the good work performed by His Excellency Sir William and Lady Allardyce during their term here.

Mr. President, if the Hon Members will permit a personal word. I want to assure them that the leadership of the Government in this House is a greatness that has been thrust upon me. Last session through the illness of Sir Alfred Morine the Hon. Dr. Robinson assumed the leadership. This session the Hon. Dr. has an important engagement in Canada that will take him away in the course of a few days. The position has developed itself upon me and I can only say that what I may lack in the qualities of leadership I shall endeavour to offset by giving of my best for the services of the country, the government and the Hon. Members of this House.

The fisheries, as our major industry, receive first reference in the Speech from the Throne.

The returns from the shore fishery were remunerative. In the case of Labrador the shortness of the price was offset by the size of the average catch of the fishermen.

It is most unfortunate that this main industry of ours should be allowed to drift in its present desultory fashion.

It is all very well to try to work up the bye-products of the industry but it seems to me before spending undue effort and money in this direction we should first try to get all that is obtainable out of the main product.

Through lack of standardization, through lack of the regulation of shipments to the foreign markets and generally through lack of co-ordin-

ation between those most interested in the fishery we are not getting the best possible results in the marketing of our staple product.

Roundly, our catch is 1,200,000 qtls. per year; made up of 800,000 Shore and 400,000 Labrador.

The fresh frozen fish trade may be developed to a more or less extent but I think for many years to come we must depend upon the markets for dried fish for the disposal of our catch.

Every credit is to be given the business firms working so hard and at expense in the development of the fresh fish markets. It would a very great difference to the entire value of the catch were we able to relieve the dried fish markets by diverting part of our fish into other channels.

The Pulp and Paper industry is showing steady expansion and whilst affording a valuable outlet for our labour, in my opinion, it will never eclipse the fisheries as our principal industry.

In 1927 the export of manufactured paper exceeded the exports of Dry Cod Fish by over \$460,000. From a labour giving point of view for we must bear in mind the net labour return on a quintal of fish greatly exceeds the labour return on a hundred weight of newsprint.

I quite agree with the Hon. the leader of the Opposition that we have been altogether too free in the granting of our timber, mineral and water power resources.

The revision of the Crown Lands Act is vitally necessary. To an extent it may be a case of locking the stable door after the steed has been stolen. Nevertheless, it will be the means of bringing our Act into uniformity with the similar laws in other parts of the Empire.

That we should have a first class up-to-date dock costing nearly two

million of dollars appears to hurt the feelings of the Hon. Dr. Campebl. We are a maritime people and it seems to me it is only fitting that we should have the best in the way of a marine hospital for our vessels. The Government might have skimmed the job by repairing the gates of the old dock by means of a cofferdam. At the best it would have been a makeshift job; besides people needed the work. It is necessary to state that the dock did not cost two millions of dollars. The actual cost was about one and three quarters of millions, the extra quarter of million being spent on the erection of fire proof freight sheds and the like. The latter will give a very satisfactory return for the money spent on them.

Mr. President, have you ever considered the psychological effect the working on first class jobs must have on the labourer. I mean real constructive work, such as the building of good roads, the re-railing of the railroad, the building of concrete bridges, the construction of the dock and the like.

You could easily imagine a man saying with a certain amount of pride, "I helped to build Mr. Monroe's dock." But could you imagine a man stating with any sort of pride, "I worked in Dr. Campbell's rock shed."

Asking a man to perform a futile task as an excuse for the giving out of relief is a mistake. If we cannot find work for the destitute that will not be humiliating, better by far let those in actual need have the so-called "dole," seeing to it that only those really in need receive ..

The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition waxed very wrathful over the transfer of the Corner Brook Mills into the hands of the International Paper Company. I am quite free to admit that certain sections of the agreement are not to my own liking. I gave free

expressions of my opinion at last year's session.

At the same time I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that the balance sheet submitted by the N. P. & P. Co. may have been nothing more than a "scrap of paper" so far as a true statement of the conditions was concerned. It is quite true had we had the time, it might have been better to have verified the figures. Unfortunately, the time at our disposal was too short to permit of a thorough checking of the figures submitted.

Again we must remember the very same figures were accepted by the British Treasury Board, the Bank of England and the Armstrong-Whitworth Company. Now the Bank of England as well as the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. had much more at stake, financially, than we had.

It was not unreasonable; in fact it was most reasonable, that the Government to take the attitude that if the Bank of England was convinced of the accuracy of the figures it would be a useless waste of money to go to the expense of an audit.

The fact that the directors of the Bank of England were willing to exchange 6 per cent Utilities Debentures of the old Company for 5 per cent Preference Shares of the International Power & Paper Co. of Newfoundland convinces me that the Bank considered the Preference Shares of the new Company were of sounder value than the Utilities Debentures of the old Company.

Now, Mr. President, I believe our government had every right to feel aggrieved over the secrecy of the option negotiations. As a matter of fact, our government was so incensed that they cabled the British Government direct, expressing their feelings on the way matters had been handled in England. Our government had so little

notice of what was transpiring that had they had not indicated a willingness to deal with the International Corporation the financial consequences might have been very embarrassing.

The prospectus covering the 5 per cent Gold Bond issue of January 1st 1928 contained a statement which has caused considerable comment.

I refer to where the statement reads as follows:—"Earnings available for interest on funded debt, before depreciation and depletion, amounted to \$2,179,340 for the 12 months ended November 3th, 1927."

To the uninformed the conclusion to be drawn from that statement is that the old company had been a money maker, that we had been fooled and inferentially the British Treasury Board, the Bank of England and the Armstrong-Whitworth Company were in the same box. But who had fooled us? Surely the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company would not deliberately sacrifice itself by issuing a fraudulent balance sheet, prevailing upon the company's auditors to vouch for its correctness.

Supposing the reorganization had never taken place; that the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company was still in existence and that funded debt obligations remained as when the old Company was in control and that for the year ended November 30th, 1927, the earnings available for interest on funded debt, before depreciation and depletion amounted to \$2,179,340. how would this sum meet the then requirements of the funded debt?

We have earnings available
for interest\$2,179,340

Interest Charges:
Bank of England Loan..... 292,000
Utilities Debentures 600,000
"A" Debentures 438,000

"B" Debentures	535,333	Depreciation and Depletion	600,000
Purchase Money Mortgages	14,250	5% Dividend on Preference	
	<hr/>	Shares	506,100
	\$1,879,583		<hr/>
"B" Debenture Sinking Fund			\$2,506,100
Commencing July 1928.....	434,354		<hr/>
	<hr/>		
	\$2,312,937		
	<hr/>		
Making a deficit of.....	\$ 134,597		
	<hr/>		
To be added:—			
1927 Instalments Purchase			
Money Mortgages	95,000		
Capital additions of 1927			
Spillway Bridge completion			
Main dam, new warehouse			
Stock filler and completion			
Grinder Room	249,870		
	<hr/>		
Cash deficit	\$ 479,467		
	<hr/>		

In addition, for correct accounting, an allowance for depreciation and depletion must be provided. I know little or nothing of what should be allowed, but I think, bearing in mind the amount of the funded debt, a write off of \$600,000 would not be excessive.

Adding this amount to the cash deficit of \$479,467 we have a total deficit of \$1,079,467 for the year. This would have been the result had Corner Brook continued to operate under old conditions.

Beyond the satisfaction of having control of the Corner Brook Mill and controlling its output it seems to me the International Paper Corporation will get very little out of this venture for many years to come.

Their financial interest lies in the Common Stock. This is the voting stock and of course gives them control.

Before they can get any return from their Common Stock investment they must first provide for:

Funded debt interest and
sinking fund, say.....\$1,400,000

And in addition a special Debenture Reserve for "B" Debentures, amounting to \$2,500,000 must be accumulated out of profits before the Common Shares can participate in the profits of the company.

One other matter. The Hon. Dr. Campbell labors under a misapprehension as to the right of the company to export pulpwood. The Act reads: "The Company may, subject to the following provisions, export pulpwood at a rate of not exceeding one half a cord for each ton of paper manufactured by the Company at Corner Brook in excess of 120,000 tons per year." This means that not a single cord of pulpwood can be exported until the output of the mill is increased by at least one additional machine.

Mr. President, no one claims that the Corner Brook agreement is ideal from this country's standpoint. It is as favorable as perhaps could be expected under the conditions.

We have the comforting assurance that there will be no repetition of the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company breakdown. The International Paper Corporation of America with all its huge resources will stand by the mill. No subsidiary of the International Paper Corporation has ever fallen down and with its splendid prospects least likely of all is the International Power & Paper Company of Newfoundland.

Mr. President, there are one or two other matters such as the Tourist Traffic Policy to which I should like to refer, but they must stand over for another date.

FRIDAY, May 18th 1928.

The Council met at 3.45 p.m.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read message stating H. E. the Administrator would receive the Council to present the Address in Reply at 4p.m. He therefore left the chair and hon. members proceeded to Government House.

The House resumed and Hon. President read His Excellency the Administrator's acknowledgment of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and also a message from His Excellency re the appointment of the commission of Internal Economy, the members of which are as follows:—Hon. Mr. President, Hon. Mr. Alderdice, Hon. Mr. Milley, Hon. Speaker of the House of Assembly, Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary and the Attorney General.

Pursuant to notice Hon. Mr. Gibbs asked leave to introduce a Bill concerning Patents. The Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The House resolved into committee on Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the guaranteeing of a loan for the Church of England College." Hon. Mr. Anderson in the chair.

HON. MR. McNAMARA.—I am sorry I cannot support this Bill which calls for the guaranteeing of a loan for the Church of England College, for the reason that I fear it is establishing a dangerous precedent that may have disastrous and far reaching results in the future.

The principle of guaranteeing loans to Corporations came into being during the period of the post war depression, and could then be justified to some extent and only because public subscriptions of a capital nature could not be obtained without government support.

Governments were faced with large numbers of unemployed, and were

prepared to take a certain measure of risk rather than be obliged to give relief to those out of work at the time.

The unemployment and depression justified this government guarantee then, which I claim does not apply in this instance to-day.

If the principle of government guaranteeing capital expenditure on Colleges, be accepted as a policy of the government it should be dealt with comprehensively and not sectionally and certainly only after consultation with the educational authorities of the different denominations.

Ambitious colleges have been, and are being built in the city by other denominations without any assistance from the public funds, and whatever views may be had about denominational education, there is no doubt that the rivalry which has existed in the past has produced very successful results from a financial standpoint, the people of each denomination contributing substantial sums towards the erection of these buildings. In my opinion this rivalry will now cease, and the bodies who might contemplate the erection of an addition to their schools will in a large measure refuse to contribute, on the ground that to ask the government for assistance is all that is necessary.

Then again, Mr. Chairman, don't you think this continued and everlasting appealing to the government for everything is going a little too far—"The Milch Cow"—the government cannot stand it forever and isn't it time to cry halt and stop advancing, hypothecating and mortgaging the "milk" supply to nearly every measure brought before us for consideration.

The serious and sad part of the present application for help is that it is coming from educationalists—the people who are supposed to teach self re-

liance and independence to their pupils—rather than impart ideas to them showing how to secure funds on easy terms from the government.

I know I am running the risk of making myself unpopular with a certain section of the community, but I feel strongly on this matter and would use the same arguments against the Bill if it were my own denomination that was concerned in this affair, as I can foresee all kinds of demands and claims being made on the government and of course on the treasury if these guarantee proposals are permitted.

I can imagine the case of a pensioner, say with \$500.00 per year asking the government for a guarantee on a loan of \$10,000.00 to build a house and allow his pension to be deducted as interest on the cost of this house and possibly, an old age pensioner may want a road costing \$1,000.00 built to his back garden and ask the government to take his \$50.00 pension as interest on the cost of this undertaking, and I cannot see how the government can consistently refuse these or similar demands if they establish the precedent of advancing funds to corporations receiving an annual appropriation from the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman I wish to go on record as being opposed to the legislation called for in this bill.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE considered the comparison drawn between the request made by a college of a prominent denomination and that made by a man receiving a \$500.00 pension to build a cabbage garden, was odious. He did not look upon the matter as a loan but rather interpreted it as what was due them from the government, for if the directors failed to pay up, the money could be deducted from the college grant, and other schools would in no way suffer. The security was in the hands of the government, as a

grant of \$16,000 a year goes to the college. What had been said might be considered right in theory, but it was not a theory but rather a principle which was involved in the present case. We were not justified, he thought, in doing anything to stop the progress of education. Before taking the step they, the Directors, had left no stone unturned; they had considered all means at their disposal and finally approached the government in a most business-like manner. If they could not get the \$80,000 necessary to carry on the work and were able to give good security he was unable to see why they should not make the request they had. It was not unusual in an outport if a school were being built and the inhabitants subscribed half the cost for the Government to come along and help them furnish it. At present there are here one million dollars worth of schools and the Government has not contributed any money towards the erection of them. If the directors of a college of any other denomination came to the Government in the same way and were able to put up the same security. Hon. Mr. Alderdice felt that they would be willing to grant them their request. The assets available for mortgage amounted to \$300,000 and in addition to that the assessed value of pledges amounted to \$50,000 more, this was to be put against an \$80,000 loan. And the denomination was behind it. The money would not be taken from other schools, as section 5 of the Bill states. "If His Excellency the Governor in Council shall be called upon in any year to pay the interest on the said loan by reason of the default of the Board of Directors, it shall be lawful for the Minister of Finance and Customs to deduct the amount so paid from the grants of the Church of England denominations for College purposes for the then current

year? This amount is ear marked for the College and will effect no other school.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL thought that in relation to the request there seemed to be no objection. Where the objection seemed to be was that it left an open door to the other denominations. Another College was being built on LeMarchant Road at the present time,, the Government could not refuse a similar request should one be made by the directors, if security were given, and the same thing would apply to a multiplicity of institutions so placed, It was the creating of a precedent, and we could not tell where it would be lead. Education should be promoted in every possible way. The ten million dollars toward the newspaper plant at Corner Brook had great opposition at first; if guarantee was given for this why not for educational purposes. His only objection was in the precedent.

HON. MR. JOB wished to record himself in favour of the Bill. He appreciated the views of the previous speaker concerning the creation of a precedent and added that if it established such in educational matters, on the same sort of security, it was a very good precedent to establish.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT said if other denominations found themselves in the same situation he failed to see why the Government would not be as fully justified in granting a request such as was made in the present bill, for the government had the funds in its own hands.

HON. MR. GIBBS thought the Government would not dare touch those funds if the directors found themselves unable to pay the annual instalment. It would cause an uproar.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT did not agree. He thought if any one were getting better terms than another, the

one unfairly treated would protest. The fact that there were three or four institutions each with its share of the grant was the best evidence that the country was not going to lose anything by it. If, however, it was to be premised with the idea that evasion was to be practised, it would be best to throw the Bill out. But he thought that such would not happen in a bill of this character.

Upon the suggestion of several Hon. Members that the Hon. Leader consult the sponsors of the Bill with a view to a slight change in the phraseology of section five, the committee rose reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of second reading of the "Law Society Bill".

HON. MR. GIBBS said that the object of the Bill was to raise the educational status of the Law Society and to make some minor alteration and addition to better its machinery and enable it to carry on its work more efficiently. He would be glad when the Bill went through the Committee stage to make any explanation Hon. gentlemen desired.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

On motion for the second reading of the Bill amending the Crown Lands Act, HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained that this bill was in the nature of a temporary Act. The idea was to cover the period between the present Act until the new one is brought in. In other words it was to fill the breach until such time as a complete new measure was drafted. The old Act required some alterations and some additions and the Government thought it wise to make some necessary changes now. The Crown Lands Act was the most important on the Statute Book, controlling our natural re-

sources, and nothing should be left undone to safeguard and conserve them, and the rights of Newfoundlanders to them. Perhaps this has not been done as well as it should have but there is no time like the present for reformation. This present measure covers settlers and their rights, water power, timber, pulpwood and all the other things comprising our resources. Another feature must be borne in mind in connection with this matter and that is that not alone must the resources of the Island be protected but also Labrador, with all its potential wealth. The new Act contains many new features. It compels prospectors to take out licenses signed by himself. This will tend to place a responsibility on the prospector and bring him to realise that he is not on his own property and this in turn will make him more careful. In this way his movements can be known and the number of the prospectors known. Any woodsman or fire warden has the right to make him produce his license. The license in short has advantages, it enables the department to trace the prospector, it provides a means of controlling him and it puts a responsibility on the prospector. Another feature which would add to the revenue is the reduction in mining locations from 320 acres to 160 acres. Another is the limiting of locations against any one mineral discovery to twenty as against no limit now. Thus besides the first discovery nineteen other sections may be granted. Under the old Act there was no limit. These are the salient features and as the Bill would go through the committee stage, he (Hon. Mr. Alderdice) would be glad to make any sections clear to the House. There was one other matter he wished to refer to. Some time earlier in the session Hon. Mr. Gibbs had raised the question as to the validity

of some titles at present. In this connection Mr. Gibbs ventured to say that the titles of many of the people with areas staked out were invalid. And this was so because they had not complied with the law on the question. Not alone must a man stake out his territory to make it his but he must first find mineral there, otherwise his title was worthless.

This is hardly correct. The original location must be based on a discovery stake. The Crown then may lay perhaps hundreds of other locations around and sell them to the public generally.

As to forfeiture of title through irregularities at the time of filing claim. This is met in the case of McNeily vs. Blandford tried in our own Supreme Court here in 1911 where our Court held that irregularities in connection with an application did not prevent licenses once duly issued from being good.

HON. MR. GIBBS wished to make a few objections to the statement that his remarks in connection with the matter of these titles were incorrect. The non compliance with the law when staking claims was not an irregularity, but amounted to a nullity of title. In order to get a good title a lode or vein of mineral had to be discovered and the prospector must then stake his claim and report his finding of the actual lode or vein. He must do this to comply with the law. If there is no mineral discovered there is not compliance with the law and consequently there is no title. In the case cited by the Hon. Leader facts of that kind were not before the Court. There have been instances at Buchans where people have put stakes in the snow and sections have been laid off from them, and there are other cases where it was a physical impossibility to stake claims in the places reported.

The worst feature about this is that capital may be invested in these impossible claims. As far as this measure was concerned it was only tinkering with legislation. The Government had ample time during the past four years to draft a proper measure. The inauguration of Buchans Mine is twelve months old and in that time those responsible should have had plenty of time in which to draft the proper Crown Lands Act; an act which should provide for the future development of our mineral resources. Buchans Mine was an example of what might have been done if a proper act were in force, to relieve the taxation on our people. The wealth that should have been Newfoundland's has been given to speculators. Instead of introducing a measure years ago whereby our people in this country would have derived great benefit and our big problem solved this measure has been brought in at the eleventh hour.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL desired some information on the question of a license. It was much more important than it looked at the moment. The section created a new profession, that of prospectors. Only licensed men could stake claims. Our fishermen working in the woods coming upon a discovery of mineral would be unable to stake it unless they had a license, and if they did so without this license they could be fined one hundred dollars. Our fishermen often when in the woods keep an eye open for discoveries of this sort though they have no intention of taking out a license or becoming professional prospectors. Are these to lose the benefit of their find?

HON. MR. ALDERDICE in reply said that if such should happen, the man discovering it, would surely have sense enough to keep the matter quite

until such time as he could procure a license and make his title legal. The man who had wit enough to make a find of this nature would have sense enough to make sure of his position and title.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE tabled the report of the Highroads Commission.

The House then adjourned until Tuesday next at four o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, May 22.

The Council met at four o'clock. The Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Guaranteeing of a Loan to the Church of England College" was referred to Committee, with Hon Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained that he had to get in touch with the directors of the College and discussed the suggestions of the Council with regard to the change in the phraseology of Section 5 of the Bill, and that they had agreed to the substitution and would agree to any further amendments made by the Council.

The section as amended was then read and the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some slight amendment.

By unanimous consent of honorable members the Bill was then read a third time and passed and a message was ordered to be sent to the Lower House acquainting that body that the Council had passed the Bill with some amendment and asking the concurrence of the Lower House therein.

The House resolved into Committee on the Bill respecting the Law Society, with Hon. Mr. Shea in the Chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE desired to congratulate the honorable gentleman in charge of the Bill on the expeditious way in which the Bill had been passed through the Lower House and on the manner in which it was being received by the Council. Every barrier that might have obstructed its passage had been raised. Of course he realised that any measure drafted by the legal fraternity was beyond criticism. It would be gilding refined gold to introduce any changes in its construction. The main purpose of this Bill was to raise the standard of education in the Law Society. In other words, it was to lift the society to a higher tone. Yet those interested in raising the tone of the legal fraternity were blocking the efforts of the business men to elevate the position of commerce in this country. He meant that the insolvency law of this country was inadequate and that efforts on the part of business men to have this law strengthened were unavailing. He hoped that he was not out of order in introducing this matter but he felt that as the efforts of the Council were being directed to raising the tone of the Law Society the same treatment might be accorded efforts made by business men to tighten the insolvency law. There are two distinct and separate types of insolvents. One was the type that was hard-working, industrious and energetic. This type carried on as best he could, honestly and justly but at some time he met with misfortune through an error in judgment and had to succumb to the vicissitudes of business and compromised with his creditors. The insolvency of this type was unfortunate, but at least honest. The other type was that of the man who through his wilful act brought about his own bankruptcy and wheedled his creditors into a compromise and paid anything up to

ten cents in the dollar to his creditors. This was the type for whom the new law was needed to weed out. This type took advantage of the Act and evaded his responsibilities. The business men of the country want a revision of the Act and they have approached individually, and collectively and through the Board of Trade those in charge, but have met with refusal. In this case it might be said that the Department of Justice had replied to the advances of these business people that the machinery now in force was adequate to meet the situation. The truth was that the present machinery was not sufficient. It was forty or fifty years old and could not cope with modern conditions. At present it works out advantageously to the bankrupt. What is wanted is machinery that will allow the appointment of an official receiver, that will force an insolvent to appear before court and be examined under oath, then have him meet his creditors and finally submit a composition to a judge of the Supreme Court before it is ratified. It may be said that the present Act provides for all this or the most of it, but it does not allow of the appointment of an official receiver, and this is the most important feature. The personal question enters largely into the present state of affairs. Creditors are interviewed separately and hard luck stories handed out to them, with the result that pity is taken on the insolvent and he escapes with a cheap compromise and then sets out on the highroad to success. If what was desired could be obtained there would be fewer failures. He thought that the business men should get the same consideration as the lawyer. He cast no reflection on the lawyer, but suggested that the two who received the most benefit under the present Act were the bankrupt and the lawyer.

HON. MR. McNAMARA heartily supported the comments of the Hon. Leader of the Government. The only solution to the problem was the inclusion of a penalty in the Insolvency Act. A fraudulent bankrupt was not penalised under the present Act but if such a clause were introduced he felt that it would do away with the cheap compromise. What happened now was that the insolvent went around and interviewed his creditors, gave them a hard luck story, and when the meeting was called the verdict that it was useless to throw water on a drowned rat was given, with the result that he was allowed off, compromising at twenty or thirty cents in the dollar. He is whitewashed and allowed to carry on again. It is a great injustice to the honest business man who pays his hundred cents in the dollar and unless a penalty is provided for it will go on indefinitely. The honorable gentleman supported the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Government that an official receiver should be appointed and that new machinery should be introduced to cope with the situation.

HON. MR. MILLEY congratulated the Hon. Leader of the Government in bringing this subject up. He agreed that something must be done to remedy the situation. It was only fair that business men should receive the same treatment as others. He trusted that the efforts of the Hon. Leader would bear fruit.

HON. MR. GIBBS congratulated the speakers on the stand they had taken on this question and admired the outspoken criticism of the Department of Justice in this connection. He thought that the honorable gentlemen should go a step further and demand that something be done, and this they could do by refusing to support the Government un-

less remedies were instituted. If they so desired the Bill could be introduced here and sent down to the Lower House in its ordinary course for concurrence. He pointed out how much the world owed to the present commercial laws, before the enactment of which there was simply the custom of usage. Mansfield (afterwards Lord) and Holt collected data and put in force the act of the whole commercial law of the British Empire. Very often lawyers are looked upon with suspicion, and an ulterior motive it attached to their actions, but the fact must not be forgotten that the laws on the Statute Book to-day are the work of lawyers, and we enjoy the rights and privileges contained therein solely as a result of their labors.

The Committee on the Law Society Act reported having passed the same without amendment and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

The House resolved into Committee on Act entitled "Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals." Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS enquired whether the Government would accept any amendment of this Bill. Some of the most important discoveries had been made by fishermen and men of that class who at all seasons of the year go through the country. As the Act stood, these men would be now penalized, for only those who held a miner's license had the right to prospect.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE stated that the Act was more to protect the woods and the timber lands. There were so many irresponsible people wondering many irresponsible people wandering difficult to keep track of them. The Canadian Government, from whence this legislation came, found it necessary to grant this miner's license to

protect the newspaper manufacturing interests. There was no intention on the part of the Government to inflict hardship on men who discovered very valuable mineral deposits. In such cases the procedure would be for the finder to mark the spot and take out a \$5 license and then stake his claim in the regular way.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—In view of the opinions expressed by some of the visitors at the Metallurgical Conference here last year concerning the plans of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, it is time that a different class of work be turned out by departmental survey parties. A survey plan to convey any information worth while to a mining man must show contour lines or notes conveying information in regard to elevations and depressions of the surface. It was because this essential information is lacking on the plans of the Department that those visitors made not very friendly references to these plans. Other visitors from outside the country have from time to time done the same. I have been told that there was no leveling instruments or paraphernalia of any kind at the Department for making contour plans, neither are there instruments for use in ascertaining the horse power of rivers. There can be only one reason why this is so, and that is, because the Department has been lacking in workers qualified to do certain classes of survey work.

In Canada a surveyor must have certain well-defined qualifications of an exacting nature, while here in Newfoundland, if what one hears is correct, a knowledge of the most simple rules and processes of arithmetic is barely necessary to enable a man to be placed in charge of a survey party.

Section 15 of the Bill deals with surveys. These should be correctly

made. Surveys actually made on the ground, not haphazard work, not guess work, not paper surveys.

A survey to be of any use must have a definite starting point, not an imaginary one; hundreds of these latter are now in the registered volumes of the Department. This point must be described in such a way that there is no possibility of any other point being taken for it. Impossible descriptions are to be found in many of the registered volumes of the Department. Only men specially trained or properly qualified are capable of giving correct description. A starting point or any discovery stake should be connected in the description with some permanent monument or well defined natural feature, such as two roads crossing a road or junction, stream crossing a road, river forks, boulder or a marked rock or cliff, a cairn or especially erected monument.

Having fixed the starting point and description, the boundary lines come next. In the past, these lines have sometimes been made on paper. No survey should be accepted by the Department on compass courses only. Where compass courses are used lines of more than one-eighth of a mile should be run off. Compass work can never be depended on in Newfoundland owing to the fact that there is scarcely a place in which there is not some local attraction of the magnet. Every survey should be made from the true meridian, and the surveyor's observation notes in establishing the meridian from celestial observation should be subjected to a most critical examination by a competent official in the Department and then filed away amongst the Department's archives after first being indexed on the records of the Department. The work of important survey is being done today in the old

slip shod rule of thumb ways of the past quarter of a century and must and will (as it already has) lead to confusion, overlapping and underlapping. Valuable properties are now being dealt with and handled by persons and exactitude is essential.

We cannot afford to have strangers coming in and finding that we have no men capable of making a correct survey. A proper standard of qualifications for surveyors is an absolute necessity. Having copied the Canadian Act in certain features, we should go further and adopt the Canadian standard of qualifications for surveyors.

The acceptance of discovery location by the Department where no discovery of minerals was ever made, shows a pronounced evasion of an existing law by the Department itself. If genuine discoveries are actually made on locations, the staking of which has not been according to law, we may be brought to a realisation of our laxity in not having properly qualified men to do the work.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE said he agreed with the remarks of the previous speaker. He himself would like to see competitive examinations introduced into the civil service. He would like to see our civil servants worked a little harder and paid a little more. But until such examinations were commenced it was difficult to reach the right standard suggested by Hon. Mr. Gibbs.

HON. MR. GIBBS asked in reference to the section respecting locations, who had recommended the additions or who had made a report on them.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE replied that the section had been added to suit the needs of Bell Island and that it was the suggestion of one of the Judges in the Supreme Court.

HON. MR. GIBBS said that the Bell Island Company held and controlled one of the greatest iron ore deposits in the world, and the only control we can exercise is that on the areas not given under fee simple grants. Under this section we further limit ourselves because if they spend \$300,000 dollars on one area they are enabled to get the fee simple on four other areas, and this though not one dollar is spent on them other than on the first area. More than this there was no demand on the part of the Government for a royalty on these grants. Under the present Act a royalty was received. He thought some evidence of the desirability of these sections should be produced before the measure was passed. If Newfoundland is to be the gainer, large corporations should not be granted such concessions as these.

On suggestion of the Hon. President, the Hon. Leader of the Government moved that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, in order that this point might be elucidated.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved the second reading of the Bill respecting "Patents" and said: Last year a new Act was passed with respect to the granting of Letters Patent in this country. In the application of the Act some of the provisions have been found to be unworkable.

When making laws in this country, we unfortunately labor under serious disadvantages, because we are not in a position to call to our aid experts to advise us as to their application and effect. In other words legislation should be studied by a Commission of experts who will, after due deliberation and research, recommend or otherwise a particular Bill for presentation or rejection as the case may be. The person in charge would perform no other work; his whole

time and attention being given to the study and drafting of legislation. Sometimes, we hear it said, that we enact laws during one session of the Legislature and amend them the next. This is too true, but it is not the fault of the legislature or the gentlemen who draft the legislation. It is due to the fact that we have no permanent body to study and advise as to the scope and form the law should take. We are without the necessary help to instruct us, and it sometimes occurs, that we enact laws which we do not, perhaps, thoroughly understand. The Bill now before us, has been in action nearly a year, and the application has shown the desirability of amending it in some way.

I may say that these amendments are not solely the production of Gibbs, Barron & Gibbs; they are concurred in by other law firms who have from time to time been retained in connection with applications for Letters Patent, such as Messrs. Higgins, Hunt & Emerson, Harold S. Knight, and McGrath & Furlong.

Sub-Section C of Section 3.—The reason for the addition of this subsection is that some countries date their Letters Patent from the date of filing and other countries date them from the date of actual issuance. A person seeking to have a Patent issued in this country is at a loss to know which date to accept. This subsection fixes and determines which is the correct date to accept. This subsection fixes the date as being the date of actual issuance.

The next Amendment is the deleting of Sub-Section 4 of Section 4.

The law now in force requires that the Petition, Specification and Drawings shall each be signed by the inventor or applicant and identified by the signature of the official before whom the affidavit is made. There is a

provision in the Act as at present constituted for the appointment of a person to act as an Attorney. The form and the Act give the donee power to act for all purposes in connection with the application. The Department does not consider this provision sufficiently explicit to permit the donee of the Power of Attorney to sign certain necessary documents. This power was given under the old Act and the present situation is often the cause of much delay.

The proposed Amendment states that the inventor applicant may sign the Specification or Drawing necessary for the application. This provision will obviate many difficulties which from time to time arise.

Sub-Sec. 5 of Sec. 4.—This Sub-Section is introduced to give a protection to the Petitioner which is omitted in the present Act. Under the present law, there is no provision made giving protection to the Petitioner after he has filed with the Department here papers necessary for the issuance of the Patent. The protection proposed under this subsection is but a re-enactment of a similar provision in the Old Act and its omission from the present Act may result in serious loss for Petitioners.

Sub-Sec. 1 of Sec. 10.—It has occurred, shortly after the passing of the Act that inventors have made application here for Letters Patent only to be confronted with the fact that they were three or four days past the time provided for by the law, that is, they should have made application within one year from the date of the issuance of the first foreign Patent. There was no such provision in the Old Act, and as they had no notice of a change in the law, this amounts to a virtual confiscation of their right. Therefore you have this sub-section

which protects such Petitioner. Of necessity it can have but a limited application.

Sub-Sec. 2 of Sec. 10.—Under the Act as it now stands, Sub-Sec. 2 Sec. 10 presents an obvious contradiction. It plainly was the intention of the drafters of the Act to state that the Letters Patent granted here shall not continue after a foreign Patent has expired. The wording of the Section in the Act does not bear out that intention but enacts that it shall expire after the expiration of the first foreign patent. Many others may have expired before the first foreign one yet ours would continue because the first foreign Patent has not expired.

Sec.—13 makes no provision for the procedure which an assignee of assignees of an invention have to follow in order to obtain a Grant of same. This is the re-enaction of the section in the Old Act.

The next amendment is in relation to bringing the Patent into operation in this country within two years. The present law is, that unless it is brought into operation within two years from the date of its passing, it becomes void unless the applicant gets an extension of time from the Supreme Court. This he does by Petition, and the Court must take evidence to come to a decision. This may and will necessitate the taking of expert testimony, and puts the inventor to considerable trouble and expense. If I were looking up the matter from a lawyer's point of view, desirous of promoting litigation for the sake of the fees which may be paid, the present law would admirably suit my purpose. This statement may sound strange to some, but nevertheless, there are some people who want to serve the public weal. Patent Acts are enacted to encourage inventors in their work, because of the enormous

amount of good they can accomplish. The amendment safeguards the rights of the public, since, if the sale or license of the Patent be refused by the inventor, the Colonial Secretary after due enquiry, is empowered to cancel the Patent or to sell or license it should the licensing be in the interests of the general public.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the insolvency Act.

The House then adjourned until Monday next at 4 p.m.

MONDAY, May 28, 1928.

The Council met at 4 p.m.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read a communication from His Excellency the Administrator granting leave of absence to Hon. Dr. Robinson to visit Canada, and to Hon. R. K. Bishop for the remainder of the session.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Gibbs the motion to introduce a Bill amending the Insolvency Act was deferred.

The Bill entitled "An Act to further amend the Law Society Act was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed the same without amendment.

The House resolved into committee of the whole on the Crown Lands Act, Hon. Mr. Steer in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained an error he had made when the Bill was last in committee regarding a request that a sub-section should be inserted; and explained that the request had come from the Department of Justice and not from a Judge of the Supreme Court as he had previously said.

HON. MR. GIBBS in speaking on section 17, sub-section, asked the necessity for the legislation. As the law stood on the Statute Book in relation to submarine locations the holder of a submarine area was entitled to a grant in fee simple if he expended \$6,000 on that area and if he did not expend the money then he had to pay an annual rental to the Colony. The amendment would exempt the holder of the submarine area from expending \$6,000 upon that area and it would enable him, if he be the holder of a number of areas contiguous to each other and had spent \$100,000 on one of them to get a grant of all the others as well. This amendment, he thought made a precedent, at the expense of the Colony, to wealthy mining corporations. He asked if there had been any report given or any investigation held showing the need of such legislation. If so, it would be well to have it tabled so that an intelligent opinion might be expressed as to why the amendment should be passed.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE replied that the only object was to give fair and equitable treatment to all parties. If \$100,000 were expended on an area the government then would consider it fair that such expenditure should be taken into account.

HON. MR. GIBBS said that this section had only one application and that was to Bell Island. The Company is the only one with submarine area, and in the opinion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs it would be the only one. Then why should it be exempt from its obligations under the old Act. These areas had all been held for more than ten years consequently no amount of expenditure could give them a grant in fee simple. We had had enough of such legislation, and if we were to have more of it, the sooner we cease to exist the better.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL asked that the particulars of all grants of Crown Lands during the past 18 months be furnished Hon. Members.

In order to procure this information it was decided that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. This was accordingly done.

The Council resolved into Committee on the Bill respecting Patent with Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

After much protracted debate Hon. President suggested that as this was a question bristling with technicalities and legal terminology beyond the ken of the layman, it be referred to a select committee. His suggestion was acceded to and the committee rose, reported progress, and asked that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

HON. PRESIDENT announced the select committee to consist of:—Hons. Messrs. Gibbs, Alderdice, McNamara, Job, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Campbell, and the President.

HON. DR. ROBINSON gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund."

The following Bills received from the House of Assembly were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

"An Act Relating the Certificates of Mates and Masters."

"An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry."

"An Act Entitled of Harbour Regulations for the Port of St. John's."

The Council then adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, at 4 o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, May 29, 1928.

The Council met at 4 p.m.

Motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs for leave to introduce a Bill respecting "Insolvent Debtors" was deferred.

The Bill respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund was read a first time, and by unanimous consent of the House, the second reading followed.

HON. DR. ROBINSON said the sole object of the measure was to promote efficiency and economy. For the last fourteen years there have been two separate and distinct funds, under the same committee. One was the Sealing Disaster Fund of 1914 and the other is the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. In 1914 there were 750 beneficiaries under the former. Now the number has fallen to 126, and within the next two years this number will be greatly decreased, inasmuch as the age limit for the youngest child will be reached by April, 1930. The Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, on the other hand, has now 350 beneficiaries on the list, and further increase is probable. By consolidating the two funds duplication of expense and of labour will be avoided. This consolidation has the approval of the Auditor-General. At the present two credits have to be made and two sets of books kept. Under the Bill this will be abolished and the two funds merged, the P.M. D.F. assuming all the liabilities and responsibilities of the 1914 Fund; thus the work will be done more efficiently and economically.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on tomorrow.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE asked that the Bill respecting "Crown Lands, etc.," which was to sit again in committee, be deferred, as he had not yet received the information requested. His request was acceded to and the Bill was deferred.

On motion for the second reading of the Bill respecting the "Certificates of Masters and Mates," Hon. Mr. Alderdice said: This Bill will remove

a most incongruous state of affairs where masters of ships are without masters certificates. The Bill differentiates between a certificate of competency and a certificate of service. A certificate of competency permits a master to take charge of either a foreign-going ship or a home passenger ship. A certificate of competency cannot be obtained except under examination. To obtain a certificate of service a master must give evidence of sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship. A certificate of service permits a master to take command of a home passenger ship but only on what are termed "coastwise voyages." Section 6 provides that on and after May 1st, 1930, no ship of 25 tons gross or over shall engage in the business of carrying passengers unless the master and first mate are holders of certificates of competency or service. I may say that about twenty-seven men are eligible to take advantage of this Certificate of Service. They are all known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as being worthy men giving valuable service as masters on our coastal steamers and in like work. In every case the same qualifications apply to the granting of mates' service certificates as are required for masters certificates, excepting, of course, the difference of rank. The granting of these service certificates to masters of proved experience, but which must have been prior to May 1st, 1928, is a wise step on the part of the government. It removes what if the strict letter of the law were enforced, would amount to a hardship on a class of men who are giving faithful and valuable service to the public and at the same time will serve notice on young men taking up a seafaring life that the rules in connection with the granting of masters' and mates' certificates will in the future

be adhered to. This is only right and proper and from now on the granting of service certificates will be a thing of the past. In the Memorial College a very excellent navigation course is available for intending masters and mates. With this educational facility at their disposal there will be no further justification for the granting of service certificates to masters and mates.

HON. CAPT. KEAN wished to give this Bill his hearty and unqualified support. He was present at its introduction in another place where the introducer had made some cutting remarks upon it, especially on the ability of our seafaring men so far as local knowledge was concerned. He concurred in the remarks the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had made on that occasion. There was one man who had interested himself from the start in this Bill and that was Mr. Paton of the Memorial College. Almost as soon as that gentleman had arrived he had interviewed Captain Kean to lecture on navigation to a class Mr. Paton intended to begin. Hon. Capt. Kean could not find it possible to do this and had suggested Capt. English. This gentleman could not take on the work and Capt. Major was approached, with success. The class, however, did not meet with the results anticipated. Very few persons availed of the opportunity and for a time it appeared as if the class would die out, but Mr. Paton persisted and later enlisted the services of Capt. W. B. Kean to carry on the work. Mr. Paton interviewed the Prime Minister and was told that he might introduce this present measure. The efforts of Mr. Paton have met with success. Three persons passed with high success the examinations set, and Hon. Capt. Kean had it from one of the examiners Capt Dalton, that he (Capt. Dalton) had never

seen work so well done or so thoroughly understood as that of the three. In connection with the local knowledge of our captains, it was undoubtedly true that they knew the local conditions. Only one accident resulting in loss of life had occurred since the inauguration of the coastal service. This was a record to be proud of. However local knowledge only takes us so far, as conditions and marine affairs grow more improved so must the standard of the captains be correspondingly higher and so must they become more efficient, Hon. Capt. Kean could go back to the day when there was only two coastal steamers and now there are 27 or 28. To him it was miraculous that with this increase there were so few accidents. Only a thorough knowledge of local conditions could have made this possible. But he thought that there was more luck than skill in this. Three times while he was actively engaged as a master he had narrowly avoided an accident. Each time he had been compelled to take a course he knew to be wrong in order to avoid a collision as the other master did not know the rules of the road. The Hon. Capt. was far more concerned with the rules of the road than with any other branch of this service. Hon. Capt. Kean added that the wireless service made a further demand for efficiency. Formerly if a steamer lost a rudder or had any serious mishap it had to wait until met by some other ship or became a wreck; to-day with the aid of the wireless the government receives the information at once and immediately sends a message to the nearest coastal boat, stating position of disabled vessel, and advises it to render help. Unless a man understood the difference between the true chart and the magnetic chart and knew how to locate the vessel in difficulty he would make a poor hand at finding it. In reference to the rule of

the road, it was little use for one person to undersand it if another did not; for if signals were given they would not be interpreted correctly, unless understood. Character and ability were splendid qualifications, but by no means all that was required. A man of fine character, being strictly sober might find himself, through no fault of his own, in a collision causing loss of life. Ability without knowledge did not fill the bill. Any man to-day who was a master and could write a letter and write his log could qualify in three months for his certificate. Every encouragement should be given to these men, and inducements held out to them to hold on to their job, otherwise they would have to give way to those more efficient, if life and property were to be safeguarded.

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

HON. MR. ALDERDICE moved the second reading of Bill respecting the Practice of Optometry and said; Next to sanity the most precious to mankind is sight. Optometry is that science which is devoted to the preservation and improvement of the eyesight of the human race. Consequently as this bill has for its intention the creation of a board to regulate the profession and practice of optometry within the Colony it is entitled to our warmest support. The enactment of this bill will be the means of preventing the tampering of the eyes by unskilled and unlicensed persons. The bill provides for a board along the same lines as the Dental and Pharmacy Boards. The board will act as a vigilance committee, as it were, to see that none but only qualified persons, those holding proper diplomas, are allowed to practise optometry within the Colony. Heretofore, unscrupulous persons with but little knowledge

which is a dangerous thing have treated credulous and confiding people at the risk of the impairment of their sight. Spectacles unsuited to the eyes of the wearer are calculated to do great harm and many people to-day are suffering from that cause. To these unscrupulous and unskilled vendors of spectacles the most important consideration is the making of a sale; the improvement of the sight of the patient is a secondary consideration. There are many other items of interest in this bill which however, can be taken up in detail in committee stage.

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

HON. MR. ALDERDICE moved second reading of bill respecting Harbour Regulations for Port of St. John's and said: The passing of this bill enables the appointment of a commission to act as the authority of the Port of St. John's. With a commission constituted of proper and qualified persons, together with active energetic harbour master, we should have a well regulated port. The bill gives the harbour master, under the authority of the Commission, power to regulate and control the movements, anchorage and removal of ships; the regulation of the fairway; the removal of obstructions and hindrances to navigation; and to prevent encroachments and encumbrances on the harbor. Another important change in the control of pilots and pilotage and no doubt means will be found to provide a proper seagoing boat to take out pilots a proper distance off shore to meet incoming ships. Altogether, Mr. President, with the right men appointed to form the commission we may look for a greatly improved condition of affairs so far as the port of St. John's is concerned.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on tomorrow.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE tabled the annual report of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund, for year ending Dec., 31, 1927. And the report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths and Marriages for year ending Dec. 31, 1927.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at four o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 30, 1929.

The Council met at 4 p.m.

HON. MR. GIBBS' motion to introduce Bill respecting Insolvent Debtors was deferred.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE in response to the enquiry of Hon. Dr. Campbell tabled list of the mining locations granted since January 1st, 1927.

The House resolved into Committee of the Whole on the Crown Lands Bill; Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL considered there was not much Crown Lands left to legislate about, so appalling had been the number of claims. It was a matter of locking the stable door after the horse was gone.

HON. MR. GIBBS enquired if any evidence had been received, or reports given, or investigation held which caused the amendments to be made.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE replied that no report other than that which came from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines from day to day as to complications which arose from the Act and which could be obviated by amending it. The Bill, as was mentioned previously, was to bridge over a period until a more comprehensive Act was passed.

HON. MR. GIBBS thought that it was a permanent structure in that

rights conferred under it to companies could not be taken away without a breach of contract. There was a large number of claims in the country, particularly on Bell Island, held by companies under lease, each paying \$100 per annum which could not get a fee simple grant unless it was enacted by law. If enacted we should relieve these companies of the sum of money for the number of years their lease had still to run without getting anything in return.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT while not regarding the section under consideration so serious as the Hon. Mr. Gibbs, yet thought a portion of the clause might with advantage be amended. The proposal was that persons who had expended a large sum of money on a half mile area might be permitted to use that expenditure to authorize them to secure certain contiguous areas up to the amount of money expended. But as a preliminary to such steps being taken the government engineer was then to report whether the expenditure was of such a character as to come within the scope of the section. The colony had that protection in addition to the expenditure. But the expenditure upon such works may at the option of the holder of the locations be applied towards the obtaining of a grant in fee simple, was the part Hon. Mr. President referred to. The option should not, he considered, lie with the holder of the locations but rather with the Governor in Council. A great deal of consideration should be given to a company, already in existence, coming in and spending a large sum of money. The Bell Island Company was the only one to which this might seem to apply. At a later date the area about Buchans Mine might come within the scope of the provision. An outstanding case was cited of a tunnel which had to be made by

the Nova Scotia Steel Co. in order to get access to their own area. The tunnel was over a mile underground and through area owned by the Dominion Co. The ore in this bed had to be turned over to the Dominion Co. and also the tunnel. This was the only means of getting at their own area. Finally the Nova Scotia Co. had to get below this area and cut another tunnel costing hundreds of thousands of dollars to give them access to their own area. When an expenditure of that sort was undertaken, the company should be given some consideration. Subterranean operations were being carried on in many other places, for often solid rock was encountered and tunnelling was the only way to overcome the difficulty. It was unsound to leave the applications for obtaining the grant in fee simple to the holder of the locations and the suggestion was made to consult the Department with regard to leaving the decision with the Governor in Council.

The committee thereupon rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House resolved into Committee on Bill entitled "Of Certificates of Masters and Mates." Hon. Mr. Davey in the Chair.

HON. CAPT. KEAN referred to the two sorts of certificates mentioned; one to be given when a qualifying examination had been passed; and the other was to be granted for service, without examination. This was not new the hon. gentleman pointed out, for a previous bill provided for the same thing. The result was at that time that there was no inducement held out to men who had service certificates to qualify themselves further. This bill states that those who receive one of those certificates may go as far as Greenland on one side and Cape

Hatteras on the other. The position is that to-day the government has seven ships in the coastal trade. The officers on these ships aggregate 22. Seven of these hold certificates of competency, one of service one for hometrade service, such as is meant under this measure. Thus nine out of the twenty-seven have certificates of one sort or another and the rest have none. The remainder must come to the government for certificates of service. They do not have to pass any examinations and there is no necessity for them to answer as to their competency or knowledge of the rules of the road. Section 5 provides that they be sober, have had some service and be a good character and know their ships. Hon. Capt Kean submitted however, that this does not provide for their efficiency. A man may be sober, have great experience know his ship and his crew but yet not have adequate knowledge of the rules of the road and various matters of this sort. Nor as he had said yesterday none of these attributes be of any use if the possessor of them were to meet another ship in a narrow channel and did not know the right thing to do. Hon. Capt Kean had an experience of this thing before as he had mentioned yesterday. It is impossible to have efficient officers if a master or mate requires only a year service to acquire a certificate. The able seaman would lose heart if his ambition is to be thwarted because of the easy qualifications for a certificate of service. The Hon. Capt. did not wish to do any one out of a job but he wanted to have an examination necessary to a granting of a certificate. This bill will not make the coastal service any better. The efficiency of the officers will not be raised. Recently two men were discharged for dishonesty and another for lack of efficiency. Neither the good character or sobriety

of the first two gave them efficiency nor did the inefficiency of the latter give him the character mentioned under section 5. This section should not be qualified but rather an addition should be made to it. And the addition should be a requirement of an examination. It would not be very heartening for passengers to know that the captain is sober, knows his ship and his crew and has had some experience if when delayed in a fog he did not know what one blast or two blasts on a steamer's siren meant. The hon. capt. wanted to see every man on these boats duly qualified and having the proper standard of efficiency. He would wait to hear the opinion of other hon. members before he suggested his amendment.

HON. MR. COOK said that he did not think that the Hon. Capt. Kean quite understood the position as interpreted by this bill. The idea of this measure originated in the Old Country under the Board of Trade. Hundreds of men desired to get certificates but through lack of education were unable to take the ordinary examination. To help this class the Board of Trade granted certificates of service. To-day we are assuring two sorts of certificates, one for competency and the other for the coastwise trade. It is reasonable to assume that the man applying for one of the latter would know the first thing one learns at sea. It would be a hardship for a man with a thorough knowledge of the coast and of sea conditions to be unable to get such a certificate. However, the section could be made more definite and a provision made to have applicants sit for an examination held by competent persons. Thus those wishing to receive certificates could give a satisfactory report of their qualifications to a competent board who would have the power to consider whether he was qualified to receive one.

HON. MR. RYAN said he had had much experience with vessels, having chartered a good many in connection with the fish carrying trade. He had met captains with and without certificates. One captain in particular had come out here about 19 times. He used to clear from England to the Channel Islands and from there to Newfoundland. He never had a certificate and never had had an accident. Accidents will happen at sea. An example of this is the Halifax explosion and the Titanic disaster. These ships it may be assumed carried duly qualified and certificated captains yet this did not prevent the mishaps. It might be said that the captain without a certificate is subject to the same chances as the man with a certificate. It was a wise stipulation, however, to have applicants pass an examination before a competent board before granting a certificate. He did not think any one likely would refuse to undergo the examination. Nor did he think that the persons mentioned as being likely to come under the conditions of this measure should suffer any hardships by losing their jobs. As far as dishonesty was concerned it was to be found in every avenue of life. It was by no means confined to captains. Hon. Mr. Ryan concluded his comments by repeating that he was in favour of the addition respecting an examination being added to the bill.

HON. MR. COOK thought that if a clause worded to the effect that applicants for certificates should have to pass an examination set by a competent board appointed by the government the position would be fully covered. In this country coasting steamers do not sign on or discharge seamen before a commissioner or superintendent and consequently have no proper discharge papers by which they might prove their length of ser-

vice. But Hon. Mr. Cook thought that an examination set by such a board would examine into this just as they would go into all other branches of the service.

HON. MR. JOB was in accord with the remark made as to the desirability of an examination being necessary. Perhaps the words in section five covered this point. There were many things that should be essentials to the acquisition of a certificate. The Board of Examiners appointed should have rules and regulations whereby to judge whether an applicant was or was not capable enough to be granted a certificate. The extent of the examination should be left in their hands.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE said that this bill was introduced to remedy a condition of affairs that was most unsatisfactory. There are many good men in the trade with every attribute necessary to comply with section five and who had much ability. It is to help those men to get a certificate that this measure was brought in.

HON. MR. COOK said there seemed to be a slight haziness towards this bill. Only a coastwise certificate is being dealt with and not one for competency. The situation as it is must be remedied. At present a man in charge of a ship on the coastal trade may lose a ship to-day and to-morrow apply for a new one. If he had the proper certificate he would be examined by a court of enquiry and if found negligent his certificate would be taken away from him for a period corresponding to the extent of his carelessness. This is just what should be provided for in this country.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT suggested that as this bill dealt with seafaring matters it should be sent to a select committee consisting of those whose knowledge of such a measure was considerable. The Minister of Marine

and Fisheries could then confer with the committee and the whole matter explained away and settled satisfactory.

The committee rose and reported having made some progress and recommended the bill be referred to a select committee.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT nominated the Select Committee to consist of the following:—Hons. Alderdice, Capt. Kean, Capt. Dawe, Shea, Cook Steer, Job, Ryan.

The House resolved into committee on Bill to Regulate the Practice of Optometry, Hon. Mr. Shea 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 Harbour Regulations Bill and the Permanent Marine Disasters bill were deferred till to-morrow.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read a message from the House of Assembly to the effect that the amendments in and upon the Bill "Guaranteeing a loan for the Church of England College" had been passed by that body without amendment.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday at 4 p.m.

THURSDAY, May 31th 1928.

The Council met at 4.15 o'clock p.m.

The motion by Hon. Mr. Gibbs for leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act respecting Insolvent Debtors" was, on account of his absence, deferred until next meeting.

The Bill respecting an Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Lower House with the bill acquainting that body that the Council had passed the bill without amendment.

The bill respecting Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's went into committee with Hon. Dr. Robinson in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE suggested that as this bill was one that dealt with the regulation and appointment of a harbour commission and full of technicalities and things pertaining to this work it should be referred to a select committee composed of the hon. members most conversant with this sort of thing, in order that it might be dealt with properly and expeditiously.

HON. CAPT. KEAN said he did not wish to oppose the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the House but he would like to make a few comments on the bill. He (Hon. Capt. Kean) had had more experience with this matter than any other man. As he had several important remarks to make on the measure he craved the indulgence of the Council while he pointed out some of these. He would have to mention several officials but his reference was not meant as in a personal way.

A Harbour Commission was first mooted in the Board of Trade some three or four years ago by men who thought that we ought to get commissioners to do that job for nothing. I opposed that, on the ground that in my experience the man or men who undertook to do things for nothing, did nothing, and did it well. Some advance has been made since then and we have a bill before us which proposed to appoint a commission of three:—namely, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and two others appointed by the Trade and the Harbour Master is to act as their Secretary. And in consideration of this work being done in all respects satisfactorily, this bill proposes to pay three men \$500.00 to be divided between them and one of these men is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wh is al-

ready a well paid Government official which will make the pay for the two commissioners at most \$166.66 which is considered by many out of all proportion with the chairman of that commission, who is already getting \$5,000.00 out of the public funds of the Colony. At least in my opinion the sum of \$300.00 each should be paid to these commissioners. That they should be nominated by the Board of Trade and elected by ballot and he held amenable to the Board of Trade and hold office during pleasure subject to the Council. Now, sir, if any man thinks that this is a job that can run itself that man in my opinion is mistaken. If it is, how is it that no harbor has ever kept rules and regulations and what has been the answer we have got in the Board of Trade every time we have asked for regulations? Invariably the answer has come back, "the Harbor Master has no money," a very substantial reason if it is true.

Now then, sir, let us see what this bill proposes, is there any vote prepared in the estimates this year more than other years? If there is I should like to know. A supporter of the government the other day said, "it was necessary for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be on the commission because they would have to get the money from his department." Does this mean there will be a vote for carrying out the Harbour regulations the coming year, and if not, why could not the Harbour Master get supplied from that department in the past if the money could be obtained from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Now, sir, so far as I can see you are not giving to this commission any power that the Harbour Master did not have before.

Now, sir, let us take a glance at the Harbour at it is at present. There is the "Edmund Donald" for years

swinging around on two anchors taking a sweep of the Harbour of some hundreds of yards at every change of the wind and tide. And a little further down you have to S.S. Strandhill, a ship of 2000 tons, moored the same way and until a few months ago the S.S. Homestead in the same position. Now, sir, the first thing the Harbour Commission has to do is to get these ships removed and the question will be asked where can we put them and I must confess, I see no place in this Harbour unless interfering with private property and the question arises, can that be obtained? If not, then these owners should be asked to remove these ships to other harbours in the country where they would not be in the way, and if not, the only thing that I can see be done, is to compel the owners of these ships to moor them with anchors ahead and astern. The Red Cross Line moored the Rosalind in the harbour last season and I heard of no one who complained or anyone who said she was the least in the way.

The next consideration, Mr. Chairman, is the salt steamers that discharge their salt in the harbour. They, too, should be compelled to moor ahead and astern if the commission is to keep a track in the harbour for the egress and ingress of shipping. But, sir, all these things that I have mentioned are insignificant compared with keeping the rules and regulations with our own fishing fleet and coaster and traders that are coming and going for nine months in the year but more particularly in the months of May and June in the spring of the year, and September, October and November, in the fall, especially in the last three months mentioned. And the man or men who undertake to make rules or regulations must have some knowledge of what it means to battle with the October or November gales and

reach port at midnight dead beat after fighting with wind and sea. These men should be approached with some consideration, if that crew is asked to remove their vessel before they have sufficient rest to compensate them for the loss of sleep during their passage from their home port to the port of St. John's. If any harsh measures are undertaken then that commission must be prepared to hear language that is not strictly parliamentary. But while such a commission may be lenient and considerate they must be firm and see the law carried out, and the first consideration must be given is the distribution of rules and regulations for the Harbour of St. John's in printed forms. These should be placed on board of every vessel in the Harbour of St. John's, so that men could read for themselves and be prepared to act accordingly.

Let me ask you, sir, has that been done in the past? Well I have been coming in and going out in fishing schooners for 30 years and no such regulations have ever been put on board of my schooners, and I know no more about the rules and regulations for the harbour of St. John's than a man who never saw it. And sir, it is now 51 years ago since I went to Liverpool mate in the brig Peerless and as soon as we entered the dock a book of rules governing the docks were placed in my hands and from that hour that ship was held responsible for the carrying out of every clause contained in those rules and ignorance of the law would excuse no one. But here the hardest thing is to know what the law is and as things have gone on in such a slipshod way it looks as if every man is a law unto himself.

Not only should we have laws and regulations in the Harbour of St. John's but the same should apply to

many of the outports where mail boats are calling and where these boats are expected to call at public wharves. Especially is this true of Catalina King's Cove, Twillingate, St. Anthony, Griquet. (Port aux Basques has harbour regulations and so has Grand Bank). Of course the places in the outports that I have named the two places where the mail boats are likely to meet with most trouble is St. Anthony and Griquet. There is less excuse for it than any other harbour on the coast, both harbours have narrow entrances but plenty of room inside.

If only our people would give that consideration before they come to anchor and not hamper the entrance, plenty of room could be left so that our mail boats could go to the public wharves and land their freight, thereby giving these people satisfaction instead of forcing them to row out in their boats at considerable trouble which could be avoided if there was proper regulations carried out and until the Government has rules and regulations enforced this trouble will continue. So much for harbour regulations in the outports.

Let us now get back to the Harbour regulations in the port of St. John's. On page 14 of this bill clause 43 reads, the following amounts as harbor dues shall be paid by vessels arriving at the port of St. John's, at the time of their being entered at the Custom House except ships of war and vessels engaged in the Coasting Trade or Fishing. That means, Mr. Chairman, that every man that engages in the Local Foreign Trade of this Country has to pay his tax. In my opinion there never was a trade in this country that the Government of this country should have encouraged more so than the Local Foreign of this country, because I believe it to be the most vital to the welfare of this Country.

To-day we have the miserable spectacle presented to us that while we are a maritime people and boast of seamen equal to any in the world, we have our foreign trade prosecuted by Norwegians and Danes, while our Captains, Mates and Seamen have been forced to go to other countries to seek for a living which is denied them in the land of their birth. Let us now take a short review of the conduct of all Governments in connection with the men who have invested their money in this venture.

To-day we have lighthouses all along the coast from Capt Race around the Island as far North as Draw Bucket Tickle on Labrador for the benefit of some five hundred or a thousand vessels not one of which is expected to pay Light Dues. The local foreign tonnage has to pay Light Dues. Every other vessel in the country is exempt from Hospital and Quarantine Dues. The Local Foreign tonnage has to pay both. All the other vessels in the country are free from Harbour Dues for the port of St. John's (although if there was regulations it would be for their benefit). The local foreign tonnage has to pay Harbour Dues.

In the estimates for this year, we shall pass a vote for conveyance of sick poor, of \$7,000.00 and for the conveyance of sick men from Labrador \$2,000.00 and for shipwrecked crews around the coast and Labrador \$5,000.00. For every one of these votes the man in the local foreign tonnage has to bear his proportionate share and yet if his crew in one of his vessels takes sick, he is to pay full cost at hospital and if his vessel is lost, the owner of the vessel has to pay the shipwrecked crew to their home port. The owner may think himself well off if he gets out of it for less than \$350.00 per crew. Why this discrimin-

ation, Mr. Chairman, why penalize a citizen of this country for doing a legitimate business, when you believe that the business he is engaged in is of the utmost importance to the welfare of this country. In 1922 an investigation was made by very competent men basing their calculation on war time freights and other figures showed that our Local Foreign tonnage collected in freights to and from foreign countries \$3,895,000. That investigation wound up in the following words: "It must be remembered, we have only dealt with one year, but taking a five year period it would be found if we lost our Local Foreign tonnage, we would find no less than 19,000,000 would be sent out of this country for freights and nine million dollars would be lost to the country by way of expenditure."

Just a word re Hospital and quarantine dues and Harbour dues and Pilot dues.

(Here Capt. Kean read correspondence between Messrs. A. S. Rendell & Co., and the Secretary of the General Board of Governors in reference to the charges re treatment to the Captain and one of the crew of the schooner "A. B. Barteaux.")

In conclusion Mr. Chairman. I think it most unfair to impose any tax upon our Local Foreign tonnage, that is not imposed on other citizens of this country, and lastly to collect dues for any specific object and not apply it for the purpose for which it was collected is little better than obtaining money under false pretences. My only reason for taking the stand I do on this Bill is to place the men in connection with the Local Foreign tonnage of this country on an equal footing with the other tax payers of this country. When I have heard the opinion of other Hon. Gentlemen of this House, if they agree with me, then I shall propose that this committee rise and

send this Bill to a Select Committee of both branches of this legislature let us see if we cannot redress these grievances.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL had been quarantine officer for some years and in explaining the reason for the regulations existing at that time said their object was to prevent the importation of diseases. Our public health officer, Dr. Brehm, was always notified of any disease on board of our local ships and knew of epidemics within our borders, but one never knew what contagious diseases might be brought in by ships going to foreign countries, Portugal, Spain, Italy or the West Indies. There was usually leprosy in Cuba and yellow fever was common to some of the other places. Every precaution had to be taken to protect the community from those diseases. In spite of careful watching some had been brought in. A case of typhus broke out on Barters Hill a few years ago and thirteen out of the seventeen patients stricken died. Where the germ came from or how it came to St. John's is not known. Spanish flu came here in a strange way. It was brought to St. John's in a local schooner. A girl in domestic service in Boston had returned home to recuperate and had met members of the crew at a party. This showed the importance of the quarantine regulations. The reason the foreign and not the local ships were charged was that the health authorities were in touch with the diseases in our midst but they never knew what might be brought home by ships going to foreign countries.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE considered that the Hon. Capt Kean's remarks had strengthened the already unanimous feeling of the House for the appointment of a select committee to deal with the Bill. Much desultory speaking would be thus avoided.

The committee rose, reported progress and recommended that this Bill be referred to a select committee.

The Hon. Mr. President appointed the following to act on that committee:—Hons. Mr. Alderdice Capt. Kean, Capt. Dawe, Mr. Shea, Mr. Cook, Mr. Steer, Mr. Job and Mr. Ryan

On motion of Dr. Robinson the House resolved into committee of the whole on the Permanent Marine Disasters Bill. Hon. Mr. Job in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE While we are putting legislation through this House, which has for its objects the amalgamation of the Sealing Disaster and the Permanent Marine Disasters Funds I feel we should be remiss in our duty towards those who have the custody and distribution of these funds were we to fail to take advantage of this opportunity for the expression of our thanks and appreciation of the great work that is being done for those in distress brought about by marine disaster.

For surely no work can be more praiseworthy; no work more approved either in Heaven or on earth than the comforting of the widow and orphan in their affliction.

This House is honoured by the fact that it has always been well represented on the Committee of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. The personnel of the Committee is as follows:—Chairman, Hon. George Shea, Vice-Chairman, Mr. J. C. Hepburn, Hon. Treasurer, Hon. Robert Watson, Hon. C. P. Ayre, Mr. Eric Bowring, Mr. C. O'N Conroy and the Colonial Secretary and Minister of Marine and Fisheries ex-officio

I am sure Hon. Mr. Shea if present would agree with me when I state that to the Hon. Dr. Robinson more than any other must be given credit for the satisfactory position this Fund occupies to-day.

In season and out of season, that is to say if it is possible to be out of season in the advocacy of so worthy a cause, the Hon. Doctor has worked persistently for the Fund and for those in need of its assistance.

I am sure if his modesty did not forbid, the Hon. Doctor could tell many a tale of how he had been instrumental in making life's path easier for the widow and orphan. He could, I am sure, tell of how many a widow who in her agony of bereavement and helplessness found her first ray of hope and comfort for the future through the practical sympathy of those in charge of the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund.

The "Daily News Chain", inaugurated by the Hon. Dr. Robinson, produces from six to eight thousand dollars per year. Last year owing to the great August gale a special appeal was made by the "Daily News" resulting in an increase to the "Chain" of some twenty-five thousand dollars.

The total amount distributed since the inception of this Fund is in the vicinity of four hundred thousand dollars.

This splendid work on the part of the Committee is entirely a labour of love and I feel sure I am voicing the sentiments of every Hon. Member of this House when I express the hope that the Hon. Doctor Robinson may long be spared to carry on this noble work.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL rose to say that he concurred in every word that had been uttered by the Hon. Leader of the Government, with regard to the work of the Committee of the P.M.D.F. and the Hon. Dr. Robinson. In his professional capacity he had seen the good work done by this fund over and over again. Many was the family he visited who had no ray of hope to look to when one of the earners was

lost, who had nothing but misery and starvation to contemplate, but who through the good work of the committee were able to exist. The cases he had seen brought home to him very strongly the truth of the statement that one half of the world does not know how the other half lives, and in many cases does not care. In view of the tremendous work they do for the benefit of such people it is just that we should publicly acknowledge the services of this committee and especially those of the Hon. Dr. Robinson.

HON. MR. JOB said that he had at one time been a member of the committee and was therefore qualified to speak of the good that it did. There are no fees paid the members of the Committee. It is a labour of love. The utmost care and consideration has to be given to the proper application of this relief else unfairness might be the result. He could say that the way in which the relief was distributed was worthy of the highest credit. Special thanks were due to the Hon. Secretary through whose efforts the fund was originated and through whom the relief was so carefully and considerately granted. He had much pleasure in adding these few words to those of the previous two speakers and he was heartily in accord with the remarks made.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT said he entirely concurred in what had been said by the previous speakers. He was himself associated with some members of this House in the operation of another fund of a public character for a number of years past and had found many evidences of the splendid work done by the Marine Disasters Fund. He thought the Committee in charge deserved the warmest praise for their loving and unselfish services, but he felt that without in any way derogating from the credit due to them it

would be fair to say that a special meed of praise was due to the Hon. Gentlemen in charge of the bill. He it was who breathed into the project the vital spark which brought it to life and for all these years he had been untiring in his efforts to widen the scope of its activities. His services in his capacity of secretary had been tremendous but in addition to that he had placed at the disposal of the fund year after year the facilities which his splendid newspaper organization provided for increasing the funds available for the work of the Committee by which its good work could be made possible of continuance. He (President) re-echoed the view expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House that the Gentlemen associated with the movement might be spared for many years to continue their self-sacrificing efforts in the advantage of the beneficiaries of the Fund and of the country at large.

HON. DR. ROBINSON said that had he supposed that this bill would have given rise to discussion he would have hesitated to introduce it, and regretted greatly that the President of the Committee was not present. On behalf of the Committee, and personally, he was most grateful to those who had spoken so kindly of the work of the P. M. D. F. He would, however, emphasize the fact that what measure of success may have been achieved is due to the generosity of the public, both of the City and throughout the Island. He again thanked Hon. Members for their generous appreciation of the Committee's work; which will encourage it to greater efforts.

The committee rose and reported having passed the bill without amendment and it was ordered that it be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Council resolved into Committee on the Crown Lands Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Steer in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained that the authorities with whom he had consulted as to the amendment of the Hon. President, had agreed to the substitution and had suggested a further change.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of the Hon. Leader of the Government the House then adjourned until Friday at four o'clock p.m.

FRIDAY, June 1st 1928.

The House met at four o'clock pursuant to yesterday's adjournment.

In the absence of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the motion for the introduction of a bill respecting "Insolvent Debtors" was deferred.

The bill respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund was read a third time and it was ordered that it be sent to the Lower House with a message acquainting that body that the Council had passed this bill without amendment and asking the concurrence of that House.

The bill respecting Crown Lands was read a third time and it was ordered that it be sent to the Lower House with a message that it had been passed with some amendment.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE presented the report of the Patriotic Fund and the reports of the select committees on the Harbour Regulations bill and Mates certificates bill.

It was ordered that these two latter reports be sent to the committee of the whole House on Monday.

THE HON. PRESIDENT then read a message from the Lower House acquainting the Council that it had passed the following bills and asking the concurrence of the Legislative Council therein.

A bill respecting "Harbour Grace Central Court."

A bill respecting "Highways Traffic Act."

A bill respecting "Highway Commission Act."

A bill respecting "War Pensions Act."

A bill respecting "Disposition of Balance of 1918 War Loan."

A bill respecting "Wabana Light & Power Co. Ltd."

The bill respecting "Harbour Grace Central Court" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on Monday.

By unanimous consent the following bills were read a first and second time:—

A bill respecting "Highways Traffic Act."

A bill respecting "Highways Commission Act."

A bill respecting "War Pensions Act."

A bill respecting "Disposition of Balance of 1918 War Loan."

A bill respecting "Wabana Light & Power Co. Ltd."

HON. MR. ALDERDICE gave notice that at the next sitting he would move that the rules of the Council be suspended with regard to bills before the House and all bills likely to come before it.

On motion the Hon. Leader of the Government the House adjourned until Monday at four o'clock.

MONDAY, June 4th 1928.

The Council met at 4.45 p.m.

HON. MR. GIBBS' notice of motion re bill entitled "An Act respecting Insolvent Debtors" was withdrawn.

The Hon. Leader of the Government moved the suspension of the rules of the House in relation to all bills be-

fore or to come before the House for the remainder of the session.

The House resolved into committee on the bill entitled "Of Certificates of Masters and Mates." Mr. Davey in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained that while the bill was in select committee it had undergone careful scrutiny and several amendments had resulted. These amendments were stated and the bill passed its third reading and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed same with some amendments and requesting concurrence therein.

HON. CAPT. KEAN asked the ruling of the Hon. President regarding the non-publishing of certain correspondence, which was included in his speech on the Harbour Regulations Bill, which correspondence he said was the crux of the whole matter. It had been omitted and no explanation had been given why this was so.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT in answering stated that the cost of publishing debates had been considered some three or four years ago. It was found that the expenditure, was out of all proportion, being in the region of twenty thousand dollars for both Houses. Often the debates in this House were not published until the session was ended and consequently were of little value to the public at large. The Internal Economy Committee thought that a charge might with advantage be brought about in the matter and it was agreed that a fairly general summary of the hon. gentlemen's speeches would be published within 24 or 48 hours of the time they were made, rather than a verbatim account of them months after; and that no speech should occupy more than a column. This worked so satisfactorily that it had been con-

tinued. The Hon. President pointed out the hansard of the British House of Commons printed only about one-third of the words actually spoken by the members; so he considered the gentleman, as a whole, had been treated generously.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL was glad to hear the Hon. President's explanation. There were not, he thought many long speeches made, as a rule. One he remembered made by the Hon. President on the Railway bill, which had extended over two days. He did not mind the speeches being shortened but what he objected to was being misquoted; and time after time when any particular criticism was forthcoming it was obliterated. There was no sense in expressing an opinion if it were to be suppressed.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT answered that in the matter of publishing or not publishing material such as that under discussion, the supervisor referred to him and asked what should be done. Probably the explanation of the hon. member being misquoted was due to his not being heard distinctly. The reporters' desk might not be in the best position. In Canada the reporters' desk was adjoining the Clerk's table, whether we should adopt that plan was left to the hon. members.

HON. CAPT. KEAN thanked the Hon. President for his reply which exonerated the supervisor of the reporters from all blame, and said the whole thing might have been remedied if a message had been sent him to that effect; but since the communication had been put in the reporter's hands he had not seen it published and it was not returned to him; and no explanation had been given him. He did not think that the additional cost would have been very great. The correspondence was the crux of the situation in the matter referred to and

the public wanted it. If no objections were made and the communication handed back he would see himself that it found its way into print.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT apologized for the Hon Gentleman not having received a message and added that he would arrange for the publication of the communication referred to in the subsequent notes of the House.

HON. DR. ROBINSON said he was not at all sorry that this discussion had taken place for it had raised a burden from his shoulders. An idea apparently existed in the minds of some hon. members that the debates on arrival at the News office were taken and cut to pieces. Such was not the case, as the explanation showed; the report being official was of course sent direct to the hands of the printers, as received at the office.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE stated that the bill respecting the "Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's" had been considered by the select committee to which it had been referred and asked that bill be taken as read.

The committee rose and reported having passed bill without amendment. It was read a third time and a message ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed the same without an amendment.

The committee reported the bill without amendment and it was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly to that effect.

The House resolved into committee of the whole on the Highways Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained that there were a number of amendments; some were typographical errors; others were alterations which the Highroads Commission found ad-

visable after being two years in office.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT drew attention to the state of the Quidi Vidi road and said as this was often the first road used by tourists, and responsible for impressions it would be desirable to have it improved.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL thought the fifteen miles an hour rate for the city impracticable especially in the taking of hills.

The committee reported the bill with some amendment and it was read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message requesting concurrence in such amendment.

The House resolved into Committee on the Highroads Commission Act Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Shea in the chair. The bill was reported with some amendment and was read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message requesting concurrence in such amendment.

The House resolved into Committee on the War Pensions Act Amendment Bill, Hon. Capt. Dawe in the chair.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to the House of Assembly with a message to this effect.

The House resolved into Committee on the Bill relating to Disposition of Balances of Loan, with Hon. Mr. Shea in the chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL referring to the amount of \$750,000 which had been ear marked for the Gander Railway and now to be used for the proposed diversion on the Topsails and thought there should be further light thrown on this matter. Such diversion would cost in the vicinity of two millions of dollars. The railway is our largest expenditure and this matter should be dealt with in a separate bill. He asked that when the Loan Bill is brought up

the Hon. Leader of the Government would be in a position to give full information in relation to railway matters. He (Hon. Dr. Campbell) has been reading the Railway Bulletin recently where it stated that there was just as much snow along the proposed route as on the Gaff Topsails. If there was to be no betterment of snow conditions why change the line. The two millions of dollars might be saved.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE promised all information available and perhaps drawings of proposed route if possible. He did not think there was any doubt about the great saving to be achieved by cutting out the Gaff Topsails. It would enable operating on a proper schedule during the winter season, and tend towards better efficiency and more economy.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT thought the diversion would save money. To reduce the elevation by 500 feet should make a lot of difference in conditions.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL asked if any survey had been made in the past. The only people knowing that area would be trappers.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE said the Railway Commission had visited the section in April, and found the grass green there and the weather quite springlike, but when they came to the Topsails they experienced a regular blizzard, and on their return trip met a freight train blocked by the snow.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL thought one trip by the Railway Commission members not quite sufficient. We should have a series of a survey over several seasons.

HON. MR. PESSIDENT said the late Mr. W. Scott had always been very strongly in favour of this particular diversion.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment and it was read a third time and passed and ordered

to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The House resolved into Committee on the Wabana Light and Power Co. Bill, Hon. Mr. Davey in the chair.

At the request of Hon. Dr. Robinson the consideration of this bill was permitted to stand over.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House resolved into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Central and Harbour Grace and Districts Courts." Hon. Capt Kean in the chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Alderdice the committee rose.

The following bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow:—

(1) "An Act Governing the Gathering of Wild Fruits."

(2) "An Act to amend the Act entitled of the Customs."

(3) "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

(4) "An Act providing for the Raising of a Loan."

(5) "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

HON. MR. PRESIDENT read messages from the House of Assembly to the effect that the Bill re the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund and the Amendment in and upon the Crown Lands Bill had been passed without amendment.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday at three o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, June 5th 1928.

The Council met at 3 30 p.m.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Wabana Light and Power Co. Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

The Committee on the Wabana Light and Power Co. Bill rose and re-

ported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The Revenue Act 1925 Amendment Bill was read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole. Hon. Mr. McNamara in the chair.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment and it was read a third time and passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The Loan Bill was read a second time and the House resolved into Committee thereon, Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON thought Hon. Gentlemen did not think seriously enough on the railway; we are spending \$1,250,000 on re-routing the trunk line by way of Buchans Mine and breaking out at Howley. That is the estimate, but his experience was the estimates can usually be doubled. He judged the cost would be \$2,000,000. We are also spending on Capital Account for re-railing \$800,000 so that this year the amount of three million will be spent for the railway on capital account, and that is going along as regularly as the clock strikes. He did not think the Government justified in spending that amount in one year. When we took the railway from the Reids who were then unable to carry it on, it looked as if we were spending a stupendous amount of money. Yet here is three millions to be spent and last year there was another huge sum. He asked Hon. Members to look into it and see if the Government were justified in spending that large amount.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE said if the railway was ever to be made pay, it must be put in decent running order. Year after year the road-bed was neglected, and trains were constantly being derailed and unnecessary expenditure resulted.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL.—People are travelling by the boats.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE.—They were driven off the railway because it was not fit to travel on. The Government was fully justified in making that expenditure for diversion and also for the re-railing from Corner Brook to Port aux Basques in order to better handle the products of the Corner Brook Mills. He explained that if the building of the railroad was not considered a profitable investment the money would not be spent. The Government was not bound to carry on the proposal unless it should prove remunerative. The following arguments were then given why the proposed line should be built. The average operating cost per train mile is \$2.55, and over the 36 miles of dead haul for all trains in either direction between Millertown Junction and Kitty's Brook is estimated at not less than \$5.00 per mile, or double the average operating cost. By estimating this 36 miles or non-revenue mileage for an equal number of revenue miles it would reduce the general average to be around \$2.00 per mile. The saving would not only be in the cost of snow fighting but as regards operating costs. Owing to the fact that the line of Railway from Mary March's Brook to the Topsails has a long 2 per cent grade and the same thing applies from Kitty's Brook to the summit, with a heavy curvature on the latter grade, when the question of diverting the main line of railway was being considered, the grade of the easiest curvature was given first thought and consideration.

The grade from Kitty's Brook to the Gaff Topsails is practically 2 per cent grade with heavy curvature, for a distance of seven miles. If the proposed diversion is made it is calculated that the summit on the new div-

ersion well be at least 450 feet lower than the present summit.

Taking over Buchans Mine line on fair terms would be an advantage to the railway. We should then have control of the carriage of 70 to 80 thousand tons from the Buchans Mine.

As far back as 1906 the Hon. M. S. Sullivan when making a survey for the A. N. D. Co., saw the possibility of getting through Hinds Valley with the Railway instead of going over the present summit. This line was not so easily apparent to the Reid engineers for the reason that that section of the country was thickly wooded and did not lend itself to survey work.

Expenses of snow fighting for several years were quoted as follows:

Total Expenses	Proportions For Topsails
1918—\$67,480.07	\$22,492.97
1920— 97,211.21	33,111.40
1924— 69,521.00	27,750.00
1925— 52,849.00	15,500.00
1926— 97,205.00	25,000.00
1927— 40,015.00	15,250.00
1928— 37,962.42	10,500.00

To March 31st.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL considered that the survey was too small an item for public consideration, but the legislation for the building of the line was of major importance.

HON. DR. ROBINSON thought it was putting the cart before the horse. Under such conditions progress could not be made. The Government would have been wiser, he considered, in asking that a survey be undertaken first and if the reports justified the diversion then the question could have been dealt with intelligently. As to re-railing he regarded it as essential to the comfort and safety of the travelling public.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT stated that the problems which confronted us in

this connection were not peculiar to our country, but rather were common to every other country in the world. Partly was this due to the increase in the number of motor cars and motor lorries. Competition was taking place which resulted in serious loss to railway companies. In the U. S. A. it was possible to travel from New York to Boston by bus in greater comfort than by rail, and with added scenic attractions. Similar Journeys could be undertaken from Florida over asphalt roads a hundred feet wide. Trains were being scrapped in consequence. Our railway was the only means of communication with the interior and we could not scrap it. But the mistake made was in subsidizing facilities to compete with our railway. A contract had been made by Corner Brook with the Clarke Steamship Co., of Montreal, by which all freight was to be carried from Corner Brook by steamers alone, and the Government had given its guarantee. Montreal was therefore getting what we should have got. People won't travel by train, where they can use cars; even those who travel at the expense of the Government, prefer cars. Whether the railroads suffer because of the high roads was a debatable question. An effort could not be made to win out unless the road bed were put in proper condition. A contrast had only to be made between the old street railway system and the present one to see the truth of that statement. If the diversion took place it would be in a section over which there would be an enormous amount of traffic, and this would not be secured unless we were prepared to spend more money on a good modern railroad.

The Committee on the Loan Bill reported the bill without amendment and it was thereupon read a third time and passed and ordered to be

sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The House resumed the Committee stage on the Wabana Light and Uower Co. Bill and the Committee reported the same with some amendment. It was thereupon read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message requesting concurrence in such amendment.

The House resolved into Committee on Bill respecting certain Retiring Allowances, Hon. Mr. Shea in the chair.

HON. DR. ROBINSON thought it unjust to members of the Legislature to have to deal with bills of this character, as they could only be discussed in a personal way. The remedy is to adopt a system and enforce it. Until this question is taken up seriously and some definite plan evolved by which officials will continue. All Governments bring in these Pension Bills and cases are seen sometimes where men of two or three years service receive large pensions. Then again men of advanced age are given positions in the Civil Service probably for the sole purpose of getting a pension. Every pension provided for in this Bill may have been honourably won but surely some scheme could be evolved whereby some unpleasantness of having to discuss these in session of the Legislature might be avoided.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment and it was thereupon read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The Customs Amendment Bill was read a second time, committed and reported without amendment, and was thereupon read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

Bill entitled An Act to Govern the Gathering of Wild Fruits was read a second time and committed, Hon. Mr. Davey in the chair.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE explained the bill was framed to regulate the picking of the different species of Wild Fruit and to see that they are properly packed and that the quality is up to the standard. The export of berries was becoming quite a factor in our industrial life and it was proper that every safeguard should be taken to see that the consumer received a good article.

The Bill was reported without amendment and thereupon read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly to that effect.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT announced receipt of messages from the House of Assembly accompanying bill relating to the Shark Industry and of the Keeping of Dogs and requesting concurrence therein.

The Shark Bill was read a first time.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE said the bill gave certain parties exclusive rights to fish for and catch sharks for three years. They agree to spend \$10,000 for initial experiments. The chief value of that fish at present is the oil but there are also possibilities as regards the skin for leather. It is an old industry in Norway. Hon. Mr. Alderdice thought the country had something to gain and nothing to lose by giving the concessions asked for.

HON. CAPT. KEAN said he had heard nothing concerning the Bill and had received no explanation of it. If concessions were to be given to anyone doing something for the country and to the advantage of the people, he would not hesitate to approve. But he was opposed to granting a concession

when nothing would be given in return. A monopoly should not be given to one man. Again a man might come here and fish for sharks and not employ one man in the country; this he would object to. Regarding the quantity of sharks the hon. gentleman said he had seen many during his sealing voyages and mentioned an instance in the year 1885 when four or five steamers loaded with seals had thrown away coals and on return trip had run short of fuel. Acting on the suggestion that sharksliver be used, the men at once began to procure it. Instead of giving one man the monopoly of all the coast, it would be wiser, he thought, to limit the area. Other men had this industry in mind and by giving a monopoly they would be debarred. He did not see why their way should be blocked, because of one man having the monopoly.

The Bill was read a second time and the House resolved into Committee thereon.

HON. DR. ROBINSON agreed that there was a great deal in what the hon. gentleman had said, but added that sharks had been around our coast for generations and nobody had suggested the exploitation of them until now. Here was an effort to do something with them for the first time. If hon. gentlemen agreed he would suggest the reduction of the time from three to two years.

HON. MR. COOK thought that it would take two years to locate the places where the sharks were. He was not personally interested but added that he knew the young man, a returned soldier, who had spent last year in Norway in connection with the industry. The ten thousand dollars was the amount raised for the exploitation. Nothing had been said about the investment if the business were profitable. The amount mentioned

might be thrown away and not a cent made. The search for fish would occupy two years as it was slow work. It often happened when someone undertook to do something others said they were going to do it.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without an amendment. It was then read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed the same without amendment.

The Bill relating to the Keeping of Dogs passed its first and second reading.

HON. DR. ROBINSON said the Dog Bill had now come up three times. The last occasion, as now, was in the dying hours of the session. This he resented now, as then. But he had some sympathy with the parties who consider themselves aggrieved, and the Bill merited consideration. Last September he had received the following letter from a resident of Ferryland.

Ferryland,
Sept. 16th, 1927.

(COPY)

"I saw by report of Legislative Council proceedings that the Hon. Members turned down again the amendment of the Dog Act which several localities have petitioned to have altered so as to allow the keeping of licensed setters and water dogs. The big majority of people around our localities, Ferryland, Aquaforte and Freshwater, have petitioned on this matter twice of late; on the first occasion, it was at the end of the ten years limit (when the old Act renews itself automatically). The late Sir M. Cashin was in ill health and out of the country at the time and it was pigeon-holed until the time had passed.

"I was surprised to see and read the remarks of an Hon. Member on this matter. He claims that those dogs are needed no more in the outports. Well the majority of those people who petitioned are poor people and it's not for pets or play toys that they want those dogs. We feel also that we are labouring under an injustice under the old Act as it applies around here, in this way that men from outside those settlements can come in here with their dogs year after year and clean up all our game birds, while all we can do is just look on. Also the want of a good water dog keeps many a poor man out of much needed fresh meat during the long winter and spring when our coast line is teeming with sea ducks of several kinds.

"And now about all the sheep that would multiply so rapidly when those bad dogs were destroyed. It is well over thirty-five years since the dogs were put out of here and yet the oldest anti-dog man (and there are only two or three) will readily admit that the sheep are far more scarce in our localities at present than in years gone by. If the amendment was granted for licensed dogs no poor man would keep any more dogs than he absolutely needed, and also would be more inclined to look after and keep his dog in a proper way. There is also another (and perhaps not a bit unjustified) view taken of this law as it works out around here at present and that is it discriminates against the poor, and when the very big majority of those feel reasonably sure that what they are petitioning for is just and to their best interests it should be given a more considerate treatment.

Respectfully yours.

To this he had replied as follows:

October 1st.

You are in error in saying that

the Legislative Council turned down the Dog Act. The facts are these—The Bill did not reach the Council until the last day of the session. Some of the provisions are controversial, and it would have been impossible to have given the Bill the consideration due to it in view of the announced closing of the House on the following day.

The course the Council took was to drop the Bill, and intimation was given that if it were introduced again at the opening of the 1928 session, the matter would be carefully considered as to its merits.

As a matter of fact most of the Council have an open mind. They want to know what the facts are. I could not even give an opinion as to the probabilities, but I can assure you that if the Bill is sent up again the whole matter will be very thoroly discussed. You will agree with me that any legislative body would be very remiss if it accepted a Bill without first of all studying its merits and demerits.

Yours truly.

He, therefore, supported the second reading, and would introduce an amendment in Committee.

The House resolved into Committee of the Whole on the Dog Bill; Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. DR. ROBINSON said that it was obvious that if changes were made every year many districts would be plunged into continual turmoil. There would be the dog party and the anti-dog party. At the same time, he thought, the ten-year period too long. The bill had been passed when sheep raising was being tried out, and had possibly served its purpose. The communication read had shown the hardships the bill had caused to certain districts and he proposed as an amendment that the

period be reduced from ten to three years.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE agreed that this would be satisfactory.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendment. It was therefore read a third time and passed and ordered sent to the House of Assembly with a message requesting concurrence in such amendment.

The House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4 p.m.

— — —

TUESDAY, June 12th, 1928.

The Council met at 4 p.m.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT announced he would leave the Chair until 8 p.m.

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

HON. THE PRESIDENT announced receipt of a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Council's amendments to the Keeping of Dogs Bill and the Wabana Light and Power Company Bill; also a message accompanying the Public Service Bill requesting concurrence therein.

The Public Service Bill was read a first and second time and the House resolved into Committee thereon: Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was thereupon read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message to that effect.

The Bill Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador was received from the House of Assembly with a message requesting concurrence therein. Said Bill was read a first time.

On the motion for second reading, HON. MR. ALDERDICE said:—The Bill now before the House has for its object the granting of certain concessions to the Northern Products Company to enable that Company to develop a demand and a market for

marine shell lying on the shores of Labrador. The Company asks for the exclusive right of export for a period of five years starting from September 1927. Consequently, nine months of the term has already expired. Of the sections of the Bill the most important is the undertaking to ship an average of seventy-five thousand tons per annum commencing 1929 and continuing until the end of the five year term. Failure to comply with these conditions means forfeiture of all rights and grants under this Act. Another section provides for the payment of an export tax of 25 cents on every ton exported. Under Section 5 any interference with the fishery or any other industry provides for compensation, for loss sustained to be arbitrated under conditions laid down under the Judicature Act. Section 7 provides right of export to parties holding licenses prior to October, 1926. The same section permits fishermen to take shell for their own use but not for sale outside the Colony.

Now, Mr. President, the granting of exclusive rights to operate is no new departure. Only this season we have granted exclusive privileges to the Wabana Light and Power Company and to a Company entering into the catching of sharks. The promoters of this industry state that whenever they approached United States capitalists with a view to interesting them, they invariably stipulated that before they consider the proposition they must first be assured of the exclusive right of export of shell for a period of years. They contended it would be impossible to build up this industry if they took the risk of being thwarted in their efforts by the dumping of shell by irresponsible parties. To obtain a footing in the markets of the world against the heavily capitalised and strongly entrenched Oyster Shell industry, the Labrador pro-

duct must have a term of protection against the indiscriminate shipment of shell. Were no exclusive right of shipment given to this or some other company, the most likely tactics of the Oyster Shell people would be the buying of a few hundred tons, if available, and they would be available under uncontrolled shipment, grinding the shell at their own plants and offering it at a price that would prevent remunerative manufacture by others, and at the same time using every effort to discourage its use or entry into competition with Oyster shell. To be successful, the Labrador Shell must be worked on a large scale. It will take one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to prove its possibilities, and if these are favorable it will entail a total expenditure of one and one-half million dollars to make the venture a success.

Now, Mr. President, the promoters of this industry, to say the least, are optimistic. But if they carry out their plans the labour return to our people will be well worth while. The greater part of these shell deposits have been lying there for thousands, perhaps millions, of years, and unless this or some other company is granted like, or perhaps greater, concessions these shells are likely to continue to remain there until the Millennium arrives.

That the working of these shell deposits will hamper the sale of Newfoundland Labrador is far fetched and absurd. It is its wealth of timber mineral and water power that will induce the consideration of a prospective purchaser, and not the problematic value of the shells on the seashore. Furthermore I would venture to wager were a prospective purchaser of Labrador to come along asking for an inventory of its natural resources, until the present moment, we should

never have thought of including marine shell as one of those assets.

An argument used against this bill is that the passing of it will facilitate the promoters in the unloading of their scheme on the unsuspecting public of the United States. We need lose no sleep on that score. For before the United States interests spend one cent on operations their engineers will have made a thorough inspection of the deposits, and will have handed in a report favourable to the possibilities of the industry.

Some of the Hon. Members of this House may be asking themselves the question, "why is the Government pressing for the passage of this Bill?" Mr. President, there is such a thing as good faith. When a Government gives a promise it should feel itself just as much in duty bound to carry out that promise as would an honourable man. That is to say if that Government is composed of honourable men. When the promoters during the Fall of 1926 approached the Government stating they could interest United States money, in the hitherto worthless Labrador shell deposits, provided certain concessions were granted. After giving careful consideration to the concessions asked for, the government said "go ahead and if you can get the required capital we will give you the necessary legislation." After giving that promise what a spectacle we should appear in the eyes of the financial world if the Government went back on its promise. Intimating to the promoters we admit we agreed to give you certain legislation but we have changed our mind. We are sorry if you and your United States friends have spent much money on the proposition but we can't help that. Mr. President, that would be a breach of good faith. This bill is an evidence of good faith on the part of the government and

that together with the possibilities of the industry is the reason why the government is anxious to live up to its pledged word.

Mr. President, as leader of the government in this House, I have presented this bill as it appears to the average business man. Owing to the fact that I have some financial interest in the Northern Products Company it would not be seemly for me to remain within the House to discuss or to listen to the discussion of the merits or demerits of this bill at second reading or to vote on it. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask your permission to withdraw.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL said this Bill represented the first raid on the newly acquired Labrador territory and he was sure it would not be the last. The Bill was a very important one, and like some important ones on other occasions had been left to the dying hours of the session—in this case, perhaps, to the dying hours of a dying party. He opposed the Bill on the grounds that he considered it was our duty to keep the Labrador intact. We might not be in a position to develop it; but while it was intact we should be safeguarded against insolvency. It was, in fact, our only available asset. Our debt had nearly trebled during the past twenty-five years and it was difficult to say how long the borrowing could continue. He was not opposing any company or individuals. This year it was to one company, next year there would be a dozen, and so on. The Bill should not be allowed to pass, for the colony needed badly the resources of Labrador. Enough to pay off our national debt, over and over, had already been given away to land sharks; was it to continue, he asked. If money were to be made, the country should have it. Our debt had been accumulating due

to the building of branch railroads, the war, and its aftermath. Why then should the only asset we possessed be given away, rather let it be kept in toto until our day of doom arrived. Certain timber grants had been given to parties thirteen or fourteen years ago, some of whom had paid their license fees, others had not. The Monroe Government had wisely cancelled the grants of those who had not paid, but allowed the others two years in which to fulfil the conditions of the Crown Lands Act in relation to building mills, etc., and this period will expire in March next. In the event of the Act not being fulfilled the lands revert of the Crown. If Labrador remains intact we should have a free title to it and should be in a position to sell it.

HON. DR. ROBINSON.—With some of the remarks of the previous speaker he was in accord. To others he took exception. He did not regard the Bill as vicious, but as unwise. Nor did he impugn the bona fides of those who were shareholders. Water Street had encouraged shell export as a new industry, but he was informed that many of them were greatly surprised when they learned that appeal was to be made to the Legislature for concessions and monopolies. The idea that a contract given by a government was binding was not borne out, because all contracts are made subject to ratification by the Legislature. If this were a public bill the reference by the Hon. Leader, to “going back” would be justified. A Government should stand by its policy. This, however, was a private Bill, so introduced in both Houses. Labrador was a great asset to the colony. Whilst he hoped it would never be sold, the contingency was there. As he saw it, Newfoundlander’s duty, and best interest, was to administer and develop it, under

remodelled and wise laws. This Bill established a very dangerous precedent. The only justification for concessions was the provision of local labor. He failed to see that this was provided. If ever the disposal of Labrador was seriously considered, its value as an asset would be greatly reduced if complications, such as must arise from the granting of monopolies and concessions, were admitted. The Monroe administration had adopted this policy by statute, and he failed to see the wisdom or justification for departing a policy so sane. In referring to the introducing of precedents, the Hon. Gentleman regretted not being present earlier in the session to oppose what was in his opinion a great menace, and support the Hon. Mr. McNamara in his attitude. Precedents were easy to frame but difficult to avoid. He foresaw that similar requests would come from similar bodies hereafter, and wished to place himself on record as opposed to the granting of them, from wheresoever they may come. Much though he regretted it, he felt no option offered other than to oppose the second reading of a Bill from which he was convinced no good, and possibly much evil would result.

HON. MR. McNAMARA whilst not opposing the Bill, thought it contained some dangerous clauses and if it passed second reading he would have some amendments to offer. The serious part of it was the establishing of a precedent. Another Company, the Labrador Marine Shell Company, had similar claims and had been operating since 1924, previous to this Company. Other licenses had been taken out by them last year and their fees accepted by the Government, yet it was now proposed to give exclusive privileges to another Company. He questioned the legality of such a proceeding. Hon. Mr. McNamara was opposed to mono-

polies. He instanced the case of that given the Anglo-American Telegraph Co. in 1856, under which they were able to prevent Marconi erecting a station at St. John's in 1901. One never knows what conditions might arise in the future, and he regarded it as a very serious matter to give exclusive rights. He had opposed with other Hon. Gentlemen to the monopoly in regard to Buchans last year, but the monopoly it still there. He would support the Bill if the Labrador Marine Shell Co. were placed on the same footing as the Northern Products Co.

HON. CAPT. KEAN—Mr. President: I think in all bills of this kind if there is anything we can't understand or if we are opposed to any clause in a Bill we ought to ask for information or give our objections and disabuse people's minds that the members of this branch of the legislature are mere voting machines, and I must confess that the different clauses in this Bill are so contradictory that I must seek for information. For instance, clause one of this Bill says:—

“The Northern Products Company Limited, a company incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland, is hereby granted for a period of two years from the Nineteenth day of September, A.D. 1927 the right to enter upon any seashore to a distance not to exceed one half-mile inland adjacent thereto, for the purpose of searching for marine shells.”

Thus the Northern Products Company are given two years to search for marine shells which it appears they are not sure exist down there, whereas clause six provides that they shall export seventy-five thousand tons in each year or lose all rights given them under this Bill.

In effect under clause one they ask the Government to give them the right to make a search of the coast to the

extent of two hundred square miles to see if shells exist or not, and if no shells exist there everyone can have the right to export them, but if they find the shells they want the exclusive right to export them themselves. That sounds to me like a monopoly with a vengeance, and to use a common expression monopoly leaves a nasty taste in the mouth with some people. I can't say that I am so particular as some on that point, I am willing to give a monopoly when monopoly is the lesser evil, I would give a monopoly to a company who would undertake to start some enterprise and give a lot of employment to our people for something which our people would hesitate to put their money in, either through lack of knowledge of the enterprise or being too risky, but where other companies are ready to invest their money, I think it is poor policy for the Government to interfere and give one company rights and privileges which they are not prepared to give others.

A few days ago when we considered a shark Bill when I pointed out other companies were prepared to go in the same business. Another Hon. Gentleman said it was ever so whenever some man made a start in any industry we would always hear someone else was about to do it. Well, Mr. President, that has not always been my experience. Regarding the remark made by that Hon. Gentleman as to returned soldiers, whenever a Bill comes before this Legislature with anything regarding a returned soldier, that bill will get my hearty and unqualified support, but when I find that a returned soldier has ten thousand dollars to invest in any enterprise, then I shall feel like wishing I was a returned soldier myself.

The seafishery had a very small beginning, first with seal nets then with ice skiffs, then fore and afters,

then brigantines, brigs and barques, then wood steamers, then steel ships, and so far as I know no Government has been asked to help and none has been given a monopoly.

It is a short lifetime since the first Lobster was canned on this coast, yet the accumulation on our coast for thousands of years was killed out and a close season for three years just expired, and so far as I know no Government was asked to give a monopoly for carrying on that industry.

The same is true of all other fishing industries of this country, while it is true our fishermen asked for a bounty on their fish it is equally true they have not got it. I was not in favour of a bounty on fish because I believed it was class legislation. I am opposed to this monopoly of the Marine shells on the Labrador for the same reasons.

The accumulation of these shells on Labrador has been going on for the last hundreds of years, winds and waves have obeyed the command of Him who alone can say "peace be still," and the shells on the margin of that coast and the right to export these shells subject to the tax which the Government may impose for the benefit of this country belong to every citizen of Newfoundland as much as the right to catch fish in the waters along the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. I hold that the right to gather shells on the coast of Labrador is inherent in every man, or company of men belonging to this country, and to give one company a monopoly is interfering with the just rights of others, and cannot be upheld or defended by any impartial mind.

I further contend that for any company to offer to export seventy-five thousand tons of shells from the Labrador in any one year, such an offer can only be made by men who

have no practical knowledge of the Labrador coast nor the difficulties that crop up in getting these shells on board ships from where they are deposited along the coast. Many of these deposits are in rough water places and islands where there is not a semblance of a harbour, and can only be dealt with in smooth water, and in my opinion the greatest good can be accomplished by the Government throwing the door open to as many companies as not to lessen the amount of profit per year to the country. For the most we can hope for any year is four months for transportation as ice will interfere in June and storms in October and November. The next thing I notice in the Bill is no provision is made for employment for our people. This to my mind ought to be placed beyond peradventure. Already hints have been given that all machinery which cannot be made in this country will be admitted duty free, and I have been informed the machinery spoken of consists of grabs which take the shells from the shore and swing them on board of the scows or lighters or perhaps in some place on board ship, and I was informed these grabs can be controlled by four men. I mention this because it seems to me almost the only profit coming to this country is the 25 cents per ton export tax and that it is not good policy to confine the export to one company, as two or three companies could export more than one and consequently be of more value to the country. And while the Government could not in any way dictate to any company the class of ships to carry these shells to market, while large ships may be preferable for freight, I think ships of over 2000 tons dead weight would be altogether too ungainly for the places on the coast where these shells are found. Ships the size of our sealers would be very useful for the work, but whether

they could be obtained or not I do not know. If so that would give employment to about 120 of our men to man the ships and perhaps 50 more to do the loading the six ships if they could be hired would carry about 4000 tons a trip.

I give this information for what it may be worth. Coming back to Clause 6 in this Bill, everyone seems to dispense with it by saying they can never ship seventy-five thousand tons, and then they will lose their monopoly, and they say it in such a way that they would be proud if that was to happen. But, personally, I take a more serious view of that clause. If the company are serious and really believe what they offer, it will take them two years to prove they were wrong, and the Government will in the meantime find out that they have been grasping after the shadow for the substance, that while they anticipated eighteen thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars per year they may find that they will have to be satisfied with half that amount, and the company may be claiming possession of two hundred square miles of shells on the Labrador coast which they may by some technicality claim as theirs by right and may not abandon it without litigation and in the meantime there will be a deadlock and all enterprise at a standstill. Personally, I am not so much concerned about the class of men who invest their money in shares in these companies as I am about the laboring class, who will be engaged to do the work, if ever these shells will be lifted from the coast of Labrador or Newfoundland. And while some people say very flippantly it will be only four years, I maintain we cannot afford to delay employment for our people four days, if by any effort on our part we could begin work tomorrow.

I have been told by some that in their opinion members of the Government party were interested in shells themselves and that certain members in this branch are also interested. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned that has not the slightest effect on me.

If such is the case, I am proud that we have such enterprising men, as members of our Legislature, who are prepared to invest their money in a venture that will give employment to our people.

If it can be proved that no one in either branch of the Legislature has money invested then I will give this Bill my best consideration for the sake of those outside of this Legislature, who have, and I shall try to be as impartial to one as I am to the other. In conclusion, Mr. President, I have been induced to make these few remarks from the fact that I have some knowledge of that coast, from the fact that I fished on that coast for some ten or twelve years all the way from Battle Harbour to Ramea and had charge of a mail boat from Battle Harbour to Nain for three years. You can see by this I have some practical knowledge about that coast and I trust what I have said will be taken in the same good spirit in which it is given.

HON. CAPT. KEAN asked permission—which was granted—to read a petition from the Hudson's Bay Company in reference to the Bill.

HON. MR. RYAN expressed himself as being averse to monopolies of every sort. He did not think two years were needed to locate the shells in Labrador; one year would be quite sufficient. Exception was also taken to the two hundred square miles, if two hundred coastwise instead of square miles were granted it would make a great difference. If these amendments were made he would support the Bill;

otherwise he would vote against it.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL then moved by way of amendment that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

HON. MR. SHEA seconded the motion; which on being put there appeared in favour:—Hons. Dr. Campbell, Shea, McNamara, Dr. Robinson, Ryan, Bell and Capt. Kean (7); and against:—Hons. Mr. Anderson, Milley, Steer and Bartlett (4).

HON. DR. ROBINSON expressed his high appreciation of the services rendered by the Hon. Leader of the House during the session; and in doing so, felt that he voiced the feelings of all of the Hon. Members. The courtesy and kindness uniformly shown, and the readiness with which all enquires had been answered, helped to make the session one of the most pleasant in the experience of many years. Leadership involved a tremendous amount of labour, for a leader had, necessarily, to dig down to the foundation of matters, and to have a knowledge of the various steps of legislation—as well as to inform and advise on many points. No enquiry had been made which had not been answered immediately, and in a profitable manner. No matter how difficult a question was to answer, it was answered with a smile. Hon. Dr. Robinson felt that he was speaking for every member of the House when he said how exceedingly grateful he was to the Hon. Mr. Alderdice for the valuable services rendered during the session.

HON. MR. ANDERSON expressed pleasure in endorsing what the Hon. Dr. Robinson had said and added that the Hon. Leader had fulfilled his duties in a matter creditable to an experienced diplomat.

HON. MR. ALDERDICE thanked the two Hon. Gentlemen for the kind and encouraging words which they had said. His work had been undertaken,

with the ready sympathy of the Hon. Members, a labour of love. In some things he might have fallen short, yet his spirit had ever been anxious to do its best in the service of the country. the Government and of the Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT announced that H. E. the Administrator would prorogue the House at 3 p.m. on tomorrow.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

WEDNESDAY, June 13, 1928.

The Council met at 2.30 p.m.

At 3 o'clock p. m. His Excellency the Administrator, Sir William Horwood, Kt., having arrived at the Council Chamber, and being seated on the Throne, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, through the Hon. President of the Legislative Council, to let the Hon. House of Assembly know:—"It is His Excellency's pleasure they attend him immediately in this House," who being come therein with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to give his assent to the following Bills entitled respectively:—

"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 1928 and the 30th day of June 1929, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service;"

"An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925 and amendments thereto";

"An Act Relating to the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes";

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances";

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922";

"An Act Relating to the Distribution

of Balances Remaining out of the Loan raised under the Act 18, Geo. V, Cap. 18";

"An Act to Further Amend the Law Society Act";

"An Act to Provide for the Guaranteeing of a Loan of the Church of England College";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals';

"An Act to Amend Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Certificates of Masters and Mates';

"An Act Respecting Harbor Regulations for the Port of St. John's";

"An Act to Regulate the Practice of Optometry";

"An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1925";

"An Act to Amend the Highroads Commission Act, 1925";

"An Act Respecting the Wabana Light and Power Company, Limited";

"An Act to Govern the Gathering of Wild Fruits";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Customs';

"An Act Relating to the encouragement of the Shark Industry";

"An Act Respecting the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund";

"An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

His Excellency the Administrator was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

(Speech appears elsewhere)

HON. MR. PRESIDENT then said: "It is His Excellency's will and pleasure that this General Assembly stand prorogued until Saturday, the 7th day of July next, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly."

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY,—

- Motion for, 4.
- Committee on, 10.
- Presentation of, 19.

ALDERDICE, HON. F. C.

- On Resolution of Condolence Hon. Michael Power, 3.
- Address in Reply, 15.
- Church of England College Loan Bill, 21, 23.
- Crown Lands Act, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30.
- Law Society Bill, 24.
- Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 31, 37, 45.
- Practice of Optometry Bill, 33.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 33, 38, 46.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 42.
- Highways Traffic Act, 46.
- Disposition of Balances of Loans, 47.
- Loan Bill, 48.
- Wild Fruit Act, 56.
- Shark Industry Bill, 56.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 53.

ANDERSON, HON. JOHN.

- On Address in Reply, 10.
- Loan Bill, 48.
- Appreciation Hon. Leader of Government, 59.

BISHOP, HON. R. K.

- On Resolutions of Condolence Hon. Michael Power, 4.

BARTLETT, HON. G.

- On Motion for Address in Reply, 5.

CAMPBELL, HON. DR. ALEX.

- On Resolution of Condolence Hon. Michael Power, 4.
- Address in Reply, 7.
- Church of England College Loan Bill, 21.
- Crown Lands Act, 23, 30, 34.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 41.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 42.
- Certificates Masters and Mates Bill, 45.
- Highways Traffic Act, 46.
- Disposition of Balances of Loans, 46, 47.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 55, 59.

COOK, HON. T.

- On Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 36, 37.
- Shark Bill, 51.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.

- On Resolution of Condolence Hon. Michael Power, 4.
- Address in Reply, 10.
- Church of England College Loan Bill, 21.
- Law Society Bill, 21, 25.
- Crown Lands Act, 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 34.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE,

- Members of, 19.

JOB, HON. R. B.

- On Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 37.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 43.

KEAN, HON. CAPT. ABRAM.

- On Motion for Address in Reply, 4.
- Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 32, 35, 45.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 38.
- Shark Bill, 56.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 56.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE,—

- Notice of, 29.

McNAMARA, HON. F.

- On Address in Reply, 13.
- Church of England College Loan Bill, 19.
- Law Society Act, 25.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 56.

MILLEY, HON. S.

- On Law Society Act, 25.

PRESIDENT, HON. THE

- On Church of England College Loan Bill, 21.
- Crown Lands Act, 34.
- Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 37, 45.
- Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 43.
- Highways Traffic Act, 46.
- Disposition of Balances of Loans, 47.
- Loan Bill, 49.

RYAN, HON. D. A.

- On Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 36.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 59.

ROBINSON, HON. DR. J. A.

- On Permanent Marine Disasters Fund Bill, 31, 43.
- Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 46.
- Retiring Allowances Bill, 56.
- Shark Bill, 51.
- The Keeping of Dogs Bill, 51, 52.
- Labrador Marine Shell Bill, 55.
- Appreciation of Hon. Leader of Government, 59.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES,—

- On Address in Reply, 10.

SELECT COMMITTEES,—

- On Address in Reply, 10.
- Crown Lands Act, 30.
- Certificates Masters and Mates Bill, 37.
- Harbor Regulations Port of St. John's, 42.