

cessions from the United States of America, and also against the part relating to the basis for federal union with the Dominion of Canada.

Careful consideration of this report must indicate that those who voted against the passing of said motion were far from wrong in the criticisms we directed at it. I can well understand Hon. Mr. Job's endeavour to get tariff concessions from the USA for our fish and fish products, and can assure Mr. Job that every member of this Convention is just as anxious as he is, albeit, some of us must agree with the attitude taken by the Commission of Government, that the question is the active concern of the government of the day; who further point out and rightly so, that since in April of this year representatives of the majority of states forming the United Nations will meet at Geneva to discuss the formation of an international trade organisation, with a view to agreement on tariff and trade questions, it is scarcely likely that at this time a participating state would entertain proposals for separate tariff arrangements. Furthermore we understand from this report that representatives from Newfoundland will be present at this conference.

Turning now to clause three of the resolution and report thereon, it appears that the Commission of Government would be prepared to find out from the Government of Canada whether the said government would receive a delegation from the Convention to consider what would be a fair and equitable basis for federal union. You will note they are careful to point out that the words "or what other fiscal, political or economic arrangements may be possible" should not be included in any inquiry, or in the terms of reference of any delegation to Canada, as they say, and rightly so, that these are matters entirely for discussion between governments. If these arrangements cannot be discussed by a delegation from this Convention with the Government of Canada, I fail to see how any fair and equitable basis for union can be arrived at by any other consultations.

When I ask myself why this third section relative to Canada was introduced in Mr. Job's motion, I must seek out the grounds on which such an effort on our part should be based and we ought all to do some right thinking in the matter.

Why are we here? The answer is, "the Con-

vention Act". To this act we must go to get the terms of reference. We are told there to consider and discuss amongst ourselves the financial and economic conditions of our country, having due regard to the degree which the wartime prosperity has affected same. Then based on our findings as to whether or not the country is self-supporting, to consider and recommend forms of government to be recommended to the Dominions Office, any one of which might be suitable to our apparently peculiar needs.

They, then, in their omniscient wisdom, are to decide which forms of government they will place on the ballot paper at a referendum to be held at some time in the hazy future. If the Convention Act means anything, it means that and that only.

Let us go back to the Amulree report.<sup>1</sup> Everyone in this country is familiar by now with the implications of his several recommendations. We have had a dozen years under their benign influence. But the recommendation to which I chiefly wish to refer will be found in section 634, subsection 4(g) and it reads as follows: "It would be understood that, as soon as the Island's difficulties are overcome and the country is again self-supporting, responsible government *on request from the people of Newfoundland*, would be restored". Up to a year or so ago, few people if any in this country ever doubted that promise. On the 17 February, 1934, the new Letters Patent under the then new system of government were read in the ballroom of the Newfoundland Hotel.... These Letters Patent of 1934, which suspended the Letters Patent of 1876 and 1905, were granted to us by His Majesty George V. Paragraph four promised the highest dignitaries of this land that "We are graciously pleased to suspend the aforesaid Letters Patent which will provide for the administration of the said Island, until such time as it may become self-supporting again, on the basis of the recommendations which are contained in the report of the Royal Commission, appointed by us on the 17th of February 1933".

You will remember that a year ago, the Secretary of State for the Dominions, in the House of Lords, stated that machinery was being set up to find out the will of the people of this country, and that they would be given an oppor-

<sup>1</sup>Newfoundland Royal Commission 1933, Report (Cmd. 4480, 1933).