

men, sooner or later; and if good men do not come forward, then incapables will. It's a Newfoundland problem to find good men. Newfoundlanders go to other countries and do well, become clannish, and in war they are very loyal, but at home we are suspicious of our governments and one another, very divided in our opinions. Lord Ammon, of the British Goodwill Mission, who visited here some few years ago said, "If I talk to five Newfoundlanders I get five different opinions. How can I tell the British Parliament what Newfoundlanders want? They do not know themselves." The British Parliament knows the state of affairs out here, and regardless of what people might think, I am of the opinion they are doing the right thing not to give us back responsible government. They will let us decide for ourselves at the referendum, and then if the majority should want responsible government we will get it. I have yet to be convinced that England will force us into any form of government, although we have given her plenty of provocation to do so. Throwing ourselves on her mercy in the 1930s after admitting we could not govern ourselves, she had every right then to attach us to Canada or any other country, on any terms. Instead, she tried to build up our economy and to give us another chance.

The time has arrived. We have the resources, but have we the men with the courage to face the future on our own, remembering our mistakes, taking note of our failures, so as to apply a remedy? The men who will handle our affairs will need plenty of courage and brains. They will also need to be thick-skinned and hard, to keep in check graft, waste, dishonesty, the needless spending of huge sums of money on party politics, always keeping in mind the best interests of the country, instead of their own selfish interests. The leader will do very little if his party and the people are not satisfied to be led in the right direction. I want the people to note the quality of the men who will be putting themselves forward with the expectation of governing this country, and to demand nothing but the best; also to think of our huge government expenditures of today, our isolation, our backwardness, and think long and well before marking a ballot for a return to the responsibilities of self-government. It's no small thing we are about to tackle. We had an experiment before and failed. Will we do better

another time? That's a question a lot of people would like to have answered. Will they trust the younger generation of today, even with the huge revenues we have? Time will tell.

After throwing in the sponge and admitting we could not govern ourselves, England set up a government by commission, a dictatorial government. But after the fiasco we made of our affairs we needed a bit of dictatorship, and it has been good for us in many ways. It's not the ideal thing for Newfoundland, and it was never intended to last any longer than necessary. They have made mistakes, and will continue to make them as long as they are in power, and in this respect they can be excused, as all governments make mistakes. The main thing is to see they are not repeated. But they have done a great deal of good, which fact cannot be denied by the ardent supporters of any other system of government.

The first seven years of their rule were the seven lean years — there was no corn in Egypt, and very little in any other country. What could any government do during these years to better the living conditions of the Newfoundland people? Many schemes were tried, many millions of dollars from the pockets of the British taxpayer were spewed out to keep our people alive. Many of the schemes failed, as was to be expected, but some were good and are functioning today. Then, after the seven lean years, came the seven fat years, brought about by a war which devastated untold millions of lives and property in other parts of the world. Their loss was our gain: money poured so fast that the government could not spend it. We created a surplus; we became to all intents and purposes self-supporting. But just as the people needed not seven years of plenty, but twice that time to get back on their feet from the poverty of the depression, so does the government, which required not seven years, but I should say 20 years to give us the social services we require.

\$40 million of a revenue will not buy as much today as \$20 million ten years ago, when we consider the rate of government pay then and now, and also the price of commodities. A cottage hospital, for instance, which cost \$20,000 to build ten years ago, will cost \$65,000 today. But there is one thing about all this spending, we can look around the country and see something for it. Ask the people of any district where they have