

our toilers on the deep, as well as our forests and our mines. I would like to see a scheme whereby our fishermen would become shareholders in the enterprise which through their efforts and long toil they had elected to build. This scheme is very much a reality in other countries, and is proving very successful. I have no hesitation in saying that the development in our fisheries, our mines and our forests, over the period of the next 20 years, will exceed our wildest imaginations. Let us go forward unafraid, for a greater Newfoundland is here.

Mr. Chairman, our position now is the same as it was in 1932. So I think that the great unsolved problem of Newfoundland is the economic problem — that of surveying, measuring and developing our natural resources, and of re-organising our existing industries. The difference is that now I know that if that problem is to be solved, it will be solved only by a government of Newfoundland elected by the people....

When the royal commission came here in the 1930s we expected a full and ungrudging recognition of the statesmanlike governments in office from 1931 to 1933 — recognition of their patriotic and really effective efforts to reorganise and finance our governmental machine, recognition of the magnificent new spirit, new order, and the change of heart of the government. In Newfoundland today not a dozen men would not disagree with this statement, that with the system of treasury control, the public debt converted to a lower rate of interest that would save \$2 million a year, and the same degree of financial assistance which the Commission of Government had actually received, Newfoundland now would be in no sense or degree worse off than she is after rule by the Commission.

Who speaks for Newfoundland today? Nobody speaks for Newfoundland. Nobody has the right, nobody has been authorised. In the absence of a House of Assembly or an opposition, the Newfoundland people are left voiceless. Anything could be put over on them, anything, turning our country into an international settlement like Shanghai, or making another Hawaii of us. That is why the people must be organised.

In 1934 we made a mistake in surrendering our responsible government, but may I say we made a great mistake once before, in November - December, 1933. That was when the whole idea

of suppressing self-government and substituting Commission government was flung at us. We did not dicker, we did not attempt to better it, we did not demand modifications. No, we took it all down, hook, line and sinker, and we appointed a deputation to go across to interview the British government — to plead for softening the proposals? No, we simply dotted the i's and crossed the t's. Let us not make that mistake again. We can get back responsible government, all we have to do is insist on it.... Let us all agree that this form of Commission government must be stopped. Does it automatically resolve our problems to scrap this system? What shall we have to replace this present form? Responsible government, you say. Yes, responsible government, but only in the sense that the government is responsible to a parliament elected by the people. The principle of responsible government is right. It is sound. No other form of government is right, or can succeed, but we are unworthy if we fool ourselves into the belief that the adoption of this sound British and democratic principle will automatically solve our problems.

Responsible government is the normal thing in the British Empire. It is practised in the United Kingdom, in Northern Ireland and in Eire, and in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada. Under responsible government the government executives are responsible to parliament. Parliament is elected by the people, and the government can hold office only as long as it commands the confidence of parliament. Parliament itself, having been elected by the people, and having to answer to the people again when the term is up, is necessarily responsible to the public. That is the glory of responsible government; but it also possesses some dangers. Is it possible to set up a system that will prevent the evils of 1920 - 1934, or at least the more serious of those evils? Let us not make the mistake of attributing to responsible government the many evils and weaknesses which in fact are the results of other causes altogether. But having guarded against making that mistake we may yet honestly recognise the dangers that do lie in the practice of responsible government — recognising them so as to start preventing them, or cataloguing them, or classifying them, and then devising ways and means of heading them off. We have two great sources of knowledge in our effort to