

three or do we take them singly?

Mr. Chairman You vote on Mr. Higgins' motion; that is to say, you will vote for or against the motion that covers both forms of government — after that, then if any member has a preference for responsible government as against Commission government, or vice versa, he has a right to state that view and he can have it recorded. He does not have to — he can if he likes.

Mr. Bradley This does not affect me at all, but I would like to point out that there are possibly some members of the Convention who would like to vote for one form in preference to the other. If a member votes in this motion for one of these forms in preference to the other, it puts him in a rather funny position.

Mr. Chairman As it stands it embraces both forms.

Mr. Bailey In this I have to vote for something I am not in touch with. I know I am not touching confederation with a fork.

Mr. Chairman That has nothing to do with this motion now before the Chair.

Mr. Fowler Mr. Chairman, at long last we find ourselves approaching the end, and soon our deliberations here will conclude to await the verdict of history. I support the resolution moved by my learned friend, Mr. Higgins, and in doing so will briefly comment on the two forms of government embodied in that resolution.

First of all, I believe in responsible government, I know it must be right in principle, and I believe it can be made to work in practice. It is now, and always has been the goal of civilised humanity. All down through the ages, men have struggled to achieve and maintain their independence. Twice in our time we have seen the freedom-loving nations of the world wage internecine war in defence of the very principles embodied in responsible government, and it is not necessary for me to remind you that Newfoundland acquitted herself nobly and well on both occasions. Therefore, gentlemen, the innate desire for self-government finds its roots in the natural aspirations of the human mind toward independence. The Burmese have it. The Hindus and Moslems of India have it. The largely illiterate coloured folk of Jamaica have it. Surely it must also lurk in the souls of the people of Newfoundland, who first won autonomy when the population was less than 100,000 and the

annual revenue around \$500,000, as Mr. Higgins reminded us on Monday. Gentlemen, in my opinion responsible government is the proper course for an independent people to take. That does not mean cutting ourselves adrift from the world, as some of you would have us believe. On the contrary, it affords us greater opportunity, it gives us a free hand to conclude arrangements with any country, should the opportunity present itself. And to those who desire a closer relationship with the United States, it must be evident that responsible government is the only means of attaining that end.

Mr. Chairman, thousands of young Newfoundlanders, on whom will shortly be placed the responsibility of determining our future form of government, like myself have no personal recollection of responsible government in this country. For I will remind you that nobody in this country under 35 years of age ever had the privilege of marking a ballot to determine the conduct of the affairs of their country. And that is why so many are inclined to accept as true the hearsay that corrupt and incompetent governments caused the financial debacle of the early thirties. They do not realise that it was mainly due to the condition of the time brought about by external circumstances over which our government had no control. The entire world was plunged into the direst depression it had ever known, Britain herself went through the gravest financial crisis in her history, and millions went on the unemployment rolls in Canada and the United States. Confusion reigned everywhere, people lost faith in everything and governments became the principal scapegoats, and thus were sown the seeds that today bear fruit in the unjust condemnation of responsible government. Let me remind the apostles of Commission of Government that when it assumed power on that bleak February day in 1934, with all its ingenuity and skill in the art of tax extraction, it could find nothing better for our people than six cents a day dole for five long years, and an annual deficit — which, by the way, they did not have to worry about. This should prove beyond reasonable doubt that there was more wrong at that time than the form of government. It is evident that the change to Commission did nothing to improve our condition until the beginning of the war, when demand for our products coupled with our