

Mr. Higgins Yes.

Mr. Smallwood I think it is in the estimates for the current year, which means that this report by the Secretary is more up to date — \$299,000 for the current year. I cannot be responsible for the Chadwick-Jones report.

Mr. Higgins I thought you might.

Mr. Smallwood Only to a limited extent am I responsible for the Chadwick-Jones report.

Mr. Northcott In yesterday's debate there seemed to be a lot of misunderstanding in connection with the smaller post offices in the island. On page 5 of the report you will see, "203 postmasters — salaries paid \$80 per year." In these small places there are perhaps ten families. They have a boat once a week. When the boat arrives, these ten families go to the post office and get their mail. On the return trip, the ten families will go and post their mail. That is all the work there is to that post office. Perhaps that person spends one hour in a week in the post office; therefore he or she is fairly well paid. In nine out of ten cases the post office is in the person's home. He or she gets a small rent. That will make a clearer picture. Then 97 postmasters are in places where there are 15 or 20 families; they are getting better salaries, \$126-\$240 a year. They have no telegraph system; they have about 20 families and weekly mail. And the same thing applies. In the next group, at \$240-\$500 a year, nine out of ten of these have a money order office and perhaps a telephone. They send only three or four messages a day. It is not necessary for that person to spend all of his or her time in the office. Again this office may be in the home, for which rent is received. Then we find 21 getting \$500-\$600 a year. There is more work there. The person who is underpaid is the postmaster or postmistress in places like Botwood, Fogo, St. Anthony and Lewisporte. You have in the last place a post office and telegraph office all in one — one person doing three persons' work. The Canadian army is there, the Shell Oil Co. and other businesses. It is a centre. They are in the office from nine in the morning until 12 at night. This group is very much underpaid. If these people were getting \$200 a month they would be getting a fair rate of wages.... Again we have 159 mail couriers, these people have long, hard and weary trips, and to them the country owes a great debt of gratitude. Sometimes they travel on hor-

ses, sometimes on dog teams, and sometimes they have to carry the mail on their backs.

Mr. Vardy I am not so sure that that is, critically speaking, a true picture. I am thinking of a place where there are 600 people and the postal operator is employed there 20 years. He is a family man, his salary is \$22 a month, and he gets \$2 a month rent for the post office. He collects an average of \$100 a month customs duties. I have a message today from a man who is employed around 30 years; his monthly salary is \$11.62 including war bonus, and he has four in his family. I think that this Convention must have some sympathy for these people. I know this postmaster to be a capable man. There are at least three communities adjoining that settlement where post offices were taken away, telegraph and telephone poles chopped down, and this office serves 1,200 to 1,500 people. That man is employed full time all the year round and he receives \$11.62 a month. I have every sympathy for him....

Mr. Miller Mr. Chairman, I have but few observations to make and shall refrain from any detailed criticism. It appears we have today a worn-out railway and a worn-out telegraph system, and we are coldly advised of this fact by both of these departments. This has happened despite the fact that both the railway and the telegraph system had been building up pre-war in a highly satisfactory manner and indicated an ability to handle our normal needs for a long time. What, then, was the reason for this overburdening and unprofitable business? Plainly, sir, it is because we have just fought a war, we have rendered services beyond our means; whether willingly or unwillingly I don't know, but certainly to a distressing effect in assisting a world interest. Are we then satisfied to receive from that world a graceful thank-you, and leave the matter there? England, the US and Canada, stand together because they must.... Standing together in war they still stand together in peace, but we stood with them in war. Why then are we so quickly forgotten in peace? If I were to answer that question I would say because we work out our deals on "friendly terms" — two words to be careful of in the future of Newfoundland. In a friendly manner we have gone on in the past and accepted things as we found them. We have accepted the word and treatment of old England as final and live