

say in his heart that present tendencies will bear me out.

For such reasons I intended to have it. If it was to be a trick, as some have said, it would not be one of the trickster's tricks. As a Tower of Babel, I would not "divers tongues". So I reasoned, in order to persuade the thin, small voice of conscience that told me I was shirking the very responsibility that I was urging on my fellow Newfoundlanders. In the end like Jacob I wrestled with an angel whose name was reluctance and at 5 pm on Thursday, the 30th of May, 1946, I decided I would put my name in nomination the following day. Even then I felt my chances were very slim, as the opposition in St. John's (City) West was tremendous from the standpoint of the calibre of the other 11 candidates.

I have said all these things merely to underline the fact that the district that elected me knew what I stood for. Indeed, I will go so far as to say that the country knew it. But now that I was into the fray, I left no stone unturned in order to keep the minds of the electorate clear on what I represented. In the month and a half preceding the National Convention elections, I was engaged in writing a column for the St. John's *Sunday Herald*, under the caption "Looking Ahead." In one of my columns I wrote, "The more one considers that clause of the statement relating to the National Convention, which suggests that candidates should have an open mind, the more one is inclined — especially a candidate — to come to the conclusion that it is either a very stupid clause or a very clever one. It has put every candidate in a somewhat embarrassing position, to say the least, and it has put the voting public into more confusion than previously existed." In the light of past developments I am forced to the conclusion that it was a very clever clause, in the shady meaning of the word "clever". Far better would it have been if every man could have gone out and campaigned on his own particular belief; when the election was over, we would have had a pretty good idea of where the country stood. The delegates who did that, although against the spirit of the Convention as alleged, were by far the wisest of us all.

In another weekly column during the same period subtitled "Confederation" I wrote:

There's a lot of loose talk in certain

you say: "We suggest that large sums of money in fisheries." I understood that there was some arrangement with the federal government — I was sure it would clear that up?

390

Mr. Job I think what the Committee was centralizing salted by someone. storage plants might be a curing place for fish. you can carry that government sub- it would be a big until last fall that they had any search.

Mr. Ryan I \$12,000 go? they had any? Mr. Job W past 40 years? time. You Canadians and seen able to dried for

Mr. Job but four paid for Mr. Van- found the la

It was that belief, strengthened by events that caused me to adopt my uncon- ing attitude in the debate last fall on the to send a delegation to Ottawa.

On June 14, one week before election day over radio station VOCI in a campaign speech, I said: "Ever since the announcement of the machinery of the National Convention, and even before whenever the question arose, I followed the same line of reasoning, both in my Barreman radio program, and my editorials in a local newspaper. First, we have to make a decision as to whether we wish to retain the present commission form of government or to return to self-government. If the decision is to return to self-government, then the second step is to decide as a people what form of self-government we think best for our needs — the 49th state of the American union; the tenth province of the Dominion of Canada; a status like that of Northern Ireland with control in London; or to remain under responsible government as from 1855 to 1934." My views are no different now than they were when each of these statements was made. If anything, I am more certain now that I knew then what I was talking about.