

and helped defeat the purpose for which this body was created. Perhaps it is not too much to say that to the casual listeners-in, it appears to be just so much shoddy and lingering childishness. This is regrettable indeed, for to many of us, who have had and will have no part or parcel of such sometimes very undignified discussions, is also attached the lack of decorum which should at least be ours. I trust I am not being guilty of tedious repetition, sir, when I make reference to what you have so many times pointed out, that the specific mandate of this Convention was simply to examine into something, and on the basis of its findings, to make intelligent recommendations. That something was the financial and economic condition of Newfoundland. Has it done that? It has, in my opinion, deteriorated from the status of a fact-finding body into two hostile political camps, each apparently led by a crusading giant in the realms of oratory, and as the leaders fence and draw, the minor chieftains cheer or jeer as the tide of battle ebbs and flows.

The Canadian proposals now on the desks submitted by the head of a sovereign government to ... this Convention, have been bandied about and given many strange names. This, if I may say so, is hardly good ethics. Either they are good or they are not good; but perhaps the fiery enthusiasm of the gentleman from Bonavista Centre has unwittingly helped to strengthen much of the criticism which these proposals have received. He may have meant well, but as far as I am concerned, confederation is not the brain-child of Mr. J. R. Smallwood, neither is responsible government the privileged dowry of my good friend, Major Cashin. It does seem to me, sir, that the debates and discussions have developed into a marathon, a rush to ring the voters' doorbells, a scramble to see who gets there first with the most. Ironically enough, it may well be that in the finals, we will have brought too little much too late. I apologise for having perhaps generalised too much, but in view of the fact that my associate, the very able member for Bonavista Centre, has dwelt at great length with all salient points in both the Black Books and the Grey Book, I shall content myself with a brief summing up of some particular aspects of these Canadian proposals.

The chief line of attack of opponents of confederation seems to be the taxation problem. That

is proper I suppose, since two of the greatest fears of our race are death and taxes. Making a fine speech in his usual very able way, Mr. Hollett told of taxes on the house, on the boat, on fishing equipment. Now, it may well be that Mr. Hollett assumed such taxes would be necessary under the provincial set-up to pay for cost of government. Certain it is, that Mr. Hollett had no intention to tell Newfoundlanders that they were paying taxes now; for presently at the end of the fiscal year, the cost of government will have extracted from our people something in the vicinity of \$40 millions. Mr. Hollett very properly pointed out that fishermen may have to pay a tax or license to operate fishing equipment under confederation. May I be personal, Mr. Chairman, and get district-minded and be guilty of that Bonavista Bay provincialism? In 1946 a schooner in which I had an interest fished in the Province of Quebec. There was no tax other than a license fee of \$10 per codtrap. Thus the maximum taxes collected from the schooner amounted to exactly \$30.... Against that, if I could have purchased supplies in that Canadian Labrador port, the cost of production of that schooner would have been reduced by not less than 25%. Furthermore, that same province pays a bonus to fishermen for all small boats. That doesn't exist here, Mr. Chairman, except in cases of boats 12 tons and up; and my guess is that 90% of Newfoundland fishing boats are less than ten tons. The ordinary Newfoundlander does not need to be told that taxes are necessary, with that he is not greatly concerned. What does concern him is this: who will pay the taxes? Will it be, as it ever was in this country, placed on the backs of the toiling fishermen, the industrious farmer, least able to bear it?

Mr. Chairman, we must not ask our people to accept conclusions that are disturbing or fantastic, or other than those that cool logic would allow. Mr. Fogwill talked a few days ago of excise taxes, excise duties, sales taxes, luxury taxes, presenting an imposing array of figures which, in my estimation at least, has singled him out as a topnotcher in mathematics. He pointed out how an extra \$10 million from such sources would be extracted from Newfoundlanders, and thus go to enrich the coffers of the government of Mackenzie King. What Mr. Fogwill apparently forgot in his breakdown of figures and his obvious concern at their huge dimensions was just