

"tommy-rot" for I am no more a tool of the merchants than is Mr. Hollett, or Mr. Bailey, as well as the many other men in this Convention who in the last analysis share the same beliefs. The second charge, no doubt, will be that I, and anybody else who believes as I do, is restricting the choice of the people of Newfoundland by trying to block confederation. I have already explained my position with regard to that matter, but I intend to go a little further to clear up that misapprehension and allegation in advance. I believe we are here to discuss and recommend forms of government, as I have outlined them, not forms of a form of government. If we are to discuss and recommend confederation on certain terms, for the sake of argument, then there are several other forms of responsible government we have to discuss and recommend, and in that case we shall be here another year, and none of us want that. The proponents of confederation know that for every one person in this island that advocates confederation, there are at least three who advocate union with or annexation by the United States. There are others who have a voice in this Convention in Mr. Bailey, who is a staunch believer in some sort of union with the United Kingdom, something on the lines of Northern Ireland. There are extremists too, who advocate secession from the Empire, with intent to establish a free state or a republic. These are all forms of responsible government. If we are to discuss and recommend one on a basis of terms like confederation, then we must get terms or conditions with respect to them all and discuss and possibly recommend them all. Where would it end? Where would we be? What confusion we would have. It is plain there are four options under responsible government open to the people of Newfoundland: 1. Dominion status; 2. Union with the United States; 3. Confederation with Canada; 4. Union with the United Kingdom. The second of these I intend to refer to next, and in doing so I will rebut the third charge.

The third charge levelled at me will no doubt be the hackneyed one of narrow nationalism. Why? Because I believe in an independent Newfoundland and the doctrine that God helps those who help themselves; because I believe that in this world no one gets something for nothing. Yet the very people who would make that charge will themselves likely raise a great outcry because it

is merely suggested that if Newfoundland is ever to relinquish her sovereignty and lose her identity in a larger unit, she could do worse than seek to lose it in the orbit of the United States. Just south of us lies the richest, most powerful nation in the world today.... If we are to forget such things as independence and national pride; if we are to ignore the truth that man does not live by bread alone; if we are more satisfied with servility on a full stomach than freedom with an empty one, but with the means to fill it if we strive; if we are to take the mess of pottage in exchange for the birthright, and sell ourselves to the highest bidder, then our calculations cannot exclude consideration of what the United States has to offer. It is apparent to everyone that it has been considered by those who control us. I have always believed that one of the main reasons why the report of the Goodwill Mission of 1943 was never published was that it had discovered that a majority of our people looked to the United States as a far more attractive possibility than either Canada or the United Kingdom. And that, Mr. Chairman, is not to say I am anti-British.

It is just as apparent to everyone that such a union could never be achieved unless this country were once again a free agent. That is to say, not until our people are the masters of their own house, a sovereign people with a sovereign government which could sign the Statute of Westminster. It could never happen while we are controlled by a puppet dictatorship which dances when the strings are pulled in London. Equally, it would never happen if Newfoundland became a province of Canada. We are no Alaska, as the *Ottawa Journal* insinuates. Many Newfoundlanders fail to realise that Washington, D.C., is only a hundred miles farther than Ottawa, as the crow flies.

Some months ago in a debate in this chamber the view was expressed that in time there might be a federal union of North America. That is a view I have long held. In ancient times, when a vast area of Europe, Africa and Asia was included in the Roman Empire, it was the boast of many men of many nations, "Civis Romanus Sum" — I am a Roman citizen. Perhaps that day may not be far away when "I am a citizen of North America" may be no idle boast. Such federal union may not be as far away as some people think. No one in his right senses then will deny