

sovereignty of our native soil?" Would Newfoundland have to go like a slave approaching its master, and ask for permission to exercise the normal, God-given rights of a free people? Of course not. Today, under a people's government, we would be in a position to fight tooth and nail for the protection of our country's interest. We would not have to beg — we would be able to demand.... We would be in a position to help our country in a tangible manner. We would be able to safeguard and further our trading interests. We could control the present squandermania which envisages in this one year the expenditure of the outrageous sum of nearly \$40 million. We would be able to throw in the wastepaper basket, where it properly belongs, this Attlee reconstruction programme, which indicates spending some \$60 million other than current expenditure in the next ten years. These are only some of the rights we could exercise if we today possessed the priceless asset of independence.

Speaking on the matter of expenditure I cannot help referring to a matter which properly belongs to the Financial Report, the evidence which has come before me and our Committee, which indicates beyond doubt that the financial policy of the present government is to dissipate the treasury wealth of this country in a manner so reckless and so unexplainable as to defy the understanding of the ordinary Newfoundlander. Take the matter of the proposed expenditure for the present fiscal year ending on March 31, 1947, we find that it is the intention of the government to run our expenditure up to the colossal unheard-of total of nearly \$40 million, more than half our total national debt; or if we deduct from that debt all our available cash surpluses, the sum of the national debt itself. I defy anybody else to find any logical or sane reason for this wild rampage and dissipation of a country's treasury, particularly a country such as ours, and am forced to come to one conclusion: that it is part of a callous and deliberately planned campaign to bleed the finances of this country to such an extent that it will be impossible for us ever to stand on our own feet; to so weaken us, that we will have no other recourse, but to remain forever a subservient and penurious people.

Now if, in view of this extraordinary spending, there was any commensurate arrangements to increase our revenues, or if such expenditure

were made with the assurance that there would be a corresponding increase in our revenues, one might be able to find some method in this apparent madness. But in our case it is clear there is no such justification. Another thing I would like to point out is that the proposed expenditure would, on the face of it, appear as the ordinary and necessary expenditure incidental to the proper operation of government, but such is not the case. Because out of this \$40 million the sum of only \$23 million is required for the administration of our affairs. The balance is what I regard as a creative, an artificial expenditure, and to that extent the budget of the Commission is both false and misleading:

In a previous address on September 18, 1946, in commenting on the statement of Prime Minister Attlee delivered in the House of Commons on December 11, 1945, I pointed out that he had indicated that the Commission government had a programme mapped out for Newfoundland, the working out of which would take two or three years, and would be pushed forward without interruption. Some of my listeners disagreed with the construction which I put on Mr. Attlee's remarks, which I said meant nothing more or less than that the Commission of Government intended to stay here several more years, regardless of such things as conventions or referendums. It was only a few days ago that I had my opinion confirmed by no less an authority than the present Commissioner for Finance, the Hon. Mr. James. When I reminded him of Mr. Attlee's remarks, he stated that was the programme at present in effect in Newfoundland and that it would be carried out in accordance with the statement....

Mr. Chairman, I may have possibly wandered slightly from my original intention of commenting on the report of this Committee, but I feel that the urgency of informing this Convention and the country of the matters to which I have referred is in itself a sufficient apology for any digression. As I see it, the only service we can be to the people of this country is to inform them of the political situation and the critical condition which faces us today.

Mr. HollettMr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks with regards to this report ... following a motion made by the Hon. Mr. Job and duly passed. I spoke against that motion, particularly with regard to the method of seeking tariff con-