

resistance. I feel if you are not prepared to help yourself, no one else will help you. We had to help ourselves and not outsiders. We had no right to let them in here at all. And so it is that today, after 14 years, we sit here in these same legislative halls, this same House of Assembly that bartered away our liberties in 1933, whose walls once re-echoed to the voices of our illustrious men. Where we sit today the fervent oratory of our ancestors urged our people to eternally fight and battle for the protection of their democratic rights. It is a tragic twist of fate that in this very place we should also sit, and have placed before us the strange question as to what form of government we want for our people and our country. As if there were any form but one that any intelligent, any reasonable, any patriotic Newfoundlander could think of asking for either himself or his people.

To understand how misguided such a question really is, just consider what would be the reaction if the same question were put today before the parliament of Great Britain or Canada or the USA, or for that matter any country, whether big or small, whose people know what it is to enjoy the priceless privileges of self-government. Do you think that any of them would consider the surrender of their liberties for the boon of any form of commission government? That they would think of giving a small group of strangers a free hand to do as they wish with their treasury and their territory? That has been done. I have already pointed out that the Commission government gave away our territory. Mr. Smallwood said they were honest. Again I am reminded of the Labrador mining concession given out in 1937, whereby certain concessions were given to the Labrador Mining Co., and for which Newfoundland was to receive in return a royalty of ten cents a ton on ore when the mine came into production, but what happened? Two years ago this same company approached the government, and what happened? They cancelled this royalty and instead took an agreement to be paid 5% on the net profits of a company that is going to cost \$140-150 million to go into production, and it will be years before there are any net profits arrived at. What is that but dishonesty?

Again, I pointed out here during the debate on the Economic Report and on the Finance Report the manner in which our various monies were

handled by the Commission government, and I re-point out now that I consider personally, that the Newfoundland treasury has been plundered of \$4-5 million since 1940-41, and if anyone wants to take me up on that I am prepared to meet them. The talk is too extravagant, too far-fetched, too ridiculous to even contemplate, and yet that is the crazy proposition which is put before us today, and which we are asked to calmly consider.

Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, what our forefathers would have done in such a situation? They would have regarded the whole thing as a black insult to themselves and their country, and would have probably thrown it out of the window and those who proposed it after them. These men are in the cemetery. We must face the facts as we find them, disagreeable though they be. We have to recognise that we are allowed to sit here at all only by the grace and permission of a dictatorship government, and consequently that we can only move and act to the extent and limits which our chains of bondage will allow us. So recognising these facts, we find that we must include in our recommendation, not a form of government mind you, but forms.

My first reaction to such a proposition was that the terms of reference which contain such a stipulation were, and are, absolutely contrary to both the letter, spirit and substance of the agreement made between the government of this country and Great Britain in November, 1933. I regret to say that such a condition is an absolute violation of that contract, and of the laws governing relations between two governments. The question has been asked here many times as to why the British government did not and does not carry out the contract which it made with our government in 1933; further, on what grounds we are supposed to ignore this solemn international pact and allow it to be kicked aside. That question has been asked but we are still waiting for the answer.

I directed that question the other day to His Excellency the Governor through the medium of this Convention, that on his visit to Great Britain he ascertain why they did not carry out the 1933 agreement up to the present time. All that has come back to us are trick evasions and flimsy excuses. They tell us in effect, as if we were so many children, that we have no right to ask such embarrassing, impudent questions. What a