

them to success. Can we be so different from those people? Are we the kind who refuse to honour obligations? Will we fail to make our country a respected one? For posterity, what do we provide? Of that which we have! If we cannot add to it, let us not take from it.

We pass on — the man, the country; the great and the small fill their places in the universe, some willingly, some strugglingly, some with endurance and forbearance, some with vigour, some with viciousness, some with languor, disease and deterioration. The man, the country, are but one; and fame or glory but a line in history's pages. *Quo vadis?* Whither goest thou? And whence and wherefore the struggle? For that line in history's pages? I think not. For the pleasures of the day then, for three square meals and a tight roof? Not there does man's duty to man begin or end. Somewhere it is said, "Man doth not live by bread alone." There is a call, a challenge born in the heart of man to rule, to govern. This must find an outlet, or the man, the country, deteriorates. This instinct, strong and lasting, is patent; and its suppression can but activate more strongly. Sometimes it is that suppression that guides it on to a predetermined destiny, if such there can be. It was suppression that many years ago urged our forefathers to seek this new land. It was the suppression which followed them here that urged them to fight for the freedom and justice and the right to govern, which was theirs. They have won their cause. They have passed to us the torch. Will we fail to hold it high?

Mr. Chairman Mr. Job, I am reminded of your recent illness and of your convalescence; and we all hope, please God, that your convalescence will come quickly and permanently; but while addressing the Chair, to do you justice, it might be well for you to do so sitting down. If you would prefer to do that, I shall be glad to hear what you have to say.

Mr. Job I appreciate that very much. I think, perhaps, I can make my address better while sitting down.

Mr. Chairman, under Mr. Higgins' motion as it stands, we are invited to give special attention to a return of responsible government in its old form; and a continuation of our present form of Commission government. I very much regret that so much time has been spent over the confederation issue and so little time left for a thorough

consideration of what, in my opinion, are the very much more important matters referred to in the present resolution. However, I suppose this cannot be helped now.

In following the cue of Mr. Vardy, the seconder of this motion, I do not suppose I shall be accused of digressing if I also discuss some suggested alterations or improvements in these forms of government...

Mr. Chairman The forms of government before the Chair?

Mr. Job Yes. And some suggestions which, in my opinion, should accompany any report that is sent to the authorities prior to their coming to a definite decision as to the forms of government to be placed on the referendum. I propose to make brief reference to the question of return of responsible government. Much abuse has been heaped upon the head of the late Hon. F. C. Alderdice, as well as upon those who supported him in accepting the recommendations of the royal commission which resulted in the installation of the Commission of Government, which appeared to be the only choice except the one of facing default on our bond issues, which was the clear alternative. I knew Mr. Alderdice very well, and believe that we never had a more sincere or a more honourable leader of our government; but in my opinion, he did make a mistake in not referring the recommendations of the royal commission to the people of Newfoundland prior to accepting them. I was aware of his view, and that of his supporters, that there was not the slightest doubt that the scheme would be approved by the electorate, but as a matter of principle it should certainly have been submitted. The urgency of the situation, however, had convinced Mr. Alderdice and his government that they were following the right course, and as history shows, the proposals were carried in the House of Assembly, rightly or wrongly, with only one or two dissenting voices. One of these was that of Mr. Bradley, whose efforts to get some revision of the proposal are on record, and I fancy that history will say he should be given credit for those efforts to improve the system outlined by the royal commission.

In November 1933, when I was a member of the Legislative Council discussing the resolution regarding suspension of our constitution in favour of a temporary period of government by