

and their campaign was rather drab this time in comparison with the highly theatrical performance which they put on last May. Their emphasis toward the end tended to shift away from actual economic union toward advocacy of trade treaties with the United States and their main effort tended to merge with endeavours on the part of the Responsible Government group to detract from Confederation as "closing the door" on the hope of a "deal" with Washington. The actual appeal of the "economic union" idea was nevertheless unquestionably present on July 22nd as it was on June 3rd.

12. There was, as on June 3rd, a very strong Responsible Government vote in three districts where the Roman Catholic faith is the predominant religion. Nevertheless, the vote for Confederation was slightly larger even in these districts, and a fourth Roman Catholic district on the West coast was, as on June 3rd, won by Confederation but by a larger majority. I believe that this is one indication of a definite movement away from a division of political opinion along strictly religious lines. The influence was certainly present on this occasion but it was clearly somewhat less pronounced. In this connection, I would like to make one point clear. The well-spring of Roman Catholic advocacy of Responsible Government is the Archdiocese of St. John's. There are two other dioceses in Newfoundland and the Bishop of at least one of these dioceses leans toward Confederation. It therefore appears that whatever the basis of the Archbishop's stand may be, it is not shared by all the clergy in the country. Nor, indeed, can it be said to be shared by all Roman Catholics. While it is true that only one prominent Roman Catholic has come out in favour of Confederation — that is, Mr. J. B. McEvoy — at least two fairly well-known members of that religious faith have spoken out on the West Coast. I would not suggest that there has been any alteration in the fundamental attitude of the Archbishop and his followers on the political question, but they have certainly not exerted the effort that they put forth before June 3rd. This may mean either that they were reluctant to press further along the road of sectarianism or that they began to feel that Confederation has sufficiently strong support among Roman Catholics to make it undesirable to force the issue beyond a certain point.

13. Toward the end of the campaign there was an increasing tendency on the part of Responsible Government spokesmen to emphasize that the terms proposed by Canada are unnegotiated and that to consummate union without prior restoration of Responsible Government would be to flout both the Newfoundland Act and the B.N.A. Act. It is perhaps of some importance to understand the significance of claims of this kind being made in Newfoundland. There are a few individuals here who sincerely believe that it is wrong in principle, or at least constitutionally incorrect, for Newfoundland to become a Province of Canada merely on the basis of a plebiscite. The vast majority of the supporters of Responsible Government, however — and this includes most of the leaders who argued vociferously on the constitutional point — are preoccupied not about any principle which may be involved, but rather about the substance of the matter. Some of them genuinely believe that it is naive to consider either that the Canadian Government would unilaterally offer Newfoundland the best possible terms or that, as a result of negotiations subsequent to a commitment by the Newfoundland people, the best possible terms could be secured. The majority of their