

ago. They were looking for adjustments to heal their wounds and ease their dependents, and they were forced to apply to the general public of the country who, I am proud to state, so ably came forward and insisted that their rights be recognised. Labour is not being so badly treated with the Commission of Government, especially those who grew up and were strong enough to handle them. There are many places where the Commission might have done better, where the Labour Relations Office might have done much better. We find today the cost of living, as you all know, is terrific. But in spite of that we find men who were expected to work one day for \$4 and the next day for nothing.

I have heard some things referred to in connection with the town councils, and I agree with the principle of town councils, provided they are not a burden to our people. I have in many cases heard old men, very wealthy and well able to afford it say, "Oh yes, we must have a town council — it's going to cost me \$3-400 but nevertheless we should have it." But Mr. Chairman, that is not the same story. It did not cost them \$3-400, it cost the people, unfortunately. The Commission made no provision whereby he or she could not pass it on to the poor man. I deplore that system of legislation.

Getting back to the old politicians, I wish to be fair in this matter, and I am not trying to prove that all our public men were angels — just as the public men of any other country are not, and were not angels. In every phase of human action you will find the black sheep, but is it fair to condemn all the apostles because there was a Judas? Is it fair to condemn a whole nation because they have convicts in their goals? Must we condemn humanity because all were not perfect? Yet that is just what they try to do with us. I would suggest to the commission which was sent over here to make an inquiry, that they should search the Scriptures, and they might find something suitable. They would find, if they took the trouble, that it is not fair to talk about the mote in their neighbours' eye, until they have plucked the beam out of their own. If our old politicians were the evil persons they say, then why was it that when they came here as a Commission they took into their ranks three of these old politicians? If they are correct in what they state, by this very act they condemn themselves. I hold no brief for

the government of Newfoundlanders who gave away responsible government in 1933, but in fairness I do not hesitate to give it as my belief that if they had not been assured that responsible government would be restored to this country upon her becoming self-supporting, then they would never have voted as they did. Is this not proof, absolute proof, that when they condemned our politicians they were lying, and knew they were lying? People don't swallow their vomit unless they have to.

In heaven's name, when we discuss the past history of our country let us try to be fair, and not blind our eyes to the truth. I knew personally many of the so-called old politicians, and in 90 percent of the cases I found them men who had given much more to the country than they ever got from it. They sacrificed their business, their time and their money to serve the public. I know many who had to neglect their business to attend to their public duties, and as a result lost their business. How often have we heard the sad story of public men, who after having given a lifetime to public service, died in near poverty? There were public men who made money, but they were men who would have made money anyhow — they were merchants, like the Hon. Mr. Job and Mr. Hickman and Mr. Crosbie, but just because they were politicians, envy said that they were grafters. Why, the best proof of it is the refusal of so many ambitious men to enter politics. They know that if they enter public life they will have to make too big a sacrifice in time and money, which they could have been devoting to their own business. Forget it I say, this talk about this country meeting the disaster of 1933 because of bad politicians.

But apart from this altogether, let us remember that our task is not to deal with the past, but with the future. We have to look ahead, not behind. So then let us take stock of where we stand today and where we may hope to advance in the future. We have come a long way since 1933. Things have changed for us in such a way that we need never fear going back to the depths from which we have risen. Newfoundlanders today are in an era of prosperity, and it is much more than an unnatural post-war boom. It is, on the contrary, an era in which primary producers of goods have come into their own. The prosperous countries today are those countries which have natural resources