

vote for the motion, for all the motion asks me to do is to be in favour of letting the people decide." If I were an anticonfederate, that is what I would say, and the people would respect me for saying it. Why, sir, even the anticonfederates amongst our people are expecting all the members of the Convention to vote in favour of this motion. They'll be ashamed of their anticonfederate leaders if they vote to deprive the people of their chance to decide the matter. That is the first point I wanted to make today, sir; that it is the duty of every member of the Convention to vote for this motion to submit the confederation question to the people themselves.

The second point I want to make is connected with a remark made by Mr. Banfield when he seconded the motion. Mr. Banfield said that the people of the southwest coast are all in favour of confederation. He said they are looking forward to referendum day to cast their votes for confederation. Well, I have heard how strong the people are for confederation up on that great coast, and what Mr. Banfield said was no surprise to us. But Mr. Banfield must not run away with the idea that it is only on the southwest coast that there are confederates. I come from the west coast, the best coast in this country today. And I can tell you there are confederates on our coast too. Out on the west coast we have many good Newfoundlanders who are just waiting for the chance to mark their "x's" for confederation with Canada. And I can tell you this: our west coast people are not going to be very pleased with any members who cast their votes against letting the people decide the question. We have a strong sense of fair play out on the west coast, sir. We believe in playing the game. We believe in giving the other fellow a chance. Live and let live. I won't go so far as to say that every man and woman on the west coast is in favour of confederation, but I will say this: that even those who are against confederation are all in favour of letting the question be settled by *all* the people in the referendum.

To tell you the truth, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand some men's line of thought. I know a certain district here on the Avalon Peninsula that is very strong for confederation. I do not know a great deal about the Avalon Peninsula, or the districts that make it up, but this one particular district I am thinking of, I happen to know very

well; and I know they are very strong for confederation.

**Mr. Penney** It is not Carbonear.

**Mr. Ballam** And yet what do we find? We find the member for that very district standing up here and fighting tooth and nail against confederation, and fighting just as hard to keep confederation off the ballot in the referendum. He knows how his district feels. He knows all about the strong confederation sentiment in his district, yet he seems to be willing to go right against his own people. I can't understand it. I won't condemn him, for it is a matter for his own conscience, but I must say it is more than I can understand. And I wonder how many other cases there are like that in this Convention?

Mr. Chairman, I can see a great many good reasons why our country should become one of the provinces of Canada. I have given some thought to the matter — I have tried to sort out my ideas on the subject. And let me say this first of all: I would be strongly opposed to confederation if it meant that Canada was going to annex Newfoundland, if it meant that Canada was just going to take us over, body and bones. I do not want our country to be annexed or taken over by any country. If confederation meant that the Government of Canada would take us over and run us, then I for one would be opposed to confederation. But confederation does not mean that at all. In fact, it means anything but that. Confederation is a partnership. It means that Newfoundland would become a province in the Canadian union. And even that does not state it clearly, Mr. Chairman, for Canada is not just a union of provinces. It is a federal union. I will explain what I mean. It so happens that I was the second man to become president of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. I was for years president of an important union in Corner Brook, and as such I played some part in forming the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. My union was only one of quite a number of unions in this country at that time. When the suggestion came up to form the federation, did it mean that all those unions would be joined together to form one union? Is that what the Federation was, an amalgamation of all the individual unions? Did the Federation simply annex all those unions and form them into one union? No, that is not what happened at all. Every union kept its own rules