

and her achievements as I have for the United States. Some of the finest people I have known have been Canadians, or the sons and daughters of Canadians living in this country. I would like that to go into the records of this House. Anticonfederate, yes; but anti-Canadian, no!

With that general introduction I would like to pass on to the present proposed arrangements, and make a few observations on the debate of those so-called terms which went on from 20 November to 12 December, 1947. I did not participate to any great extent in that debate, for I realised the magnitude of its implications, and I confess I felt rather at a loss as it muddled through the weeks before Christmas. I, for the most part, sat and listened to the by-play between certain speakers; and day after day I made notes on certain aspects of the debate as the House struggled slowly through the documents.

I do not intend to deal with each of the 23 clauses; many of them I shall only briefly refer to, for if some members here do not realise their limitations, I do. Hence, I do not intend to indulge in academic appraisals of high finance. I shall leave that involved problem to those better equipped to deal with it, and go on to considerations to my mind just as important in a proper understanding of the confederation issue.

Clause 2. "The Province of Newfoundland will include the territory of Labrador defined by the award of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1927 as Newfoundland territory." This clause has raised quite a storm, and that it will continue to do so is inevitable. We must be realistic on this question; we must face up to it. These arrangements, the Canadian government calls them, are supposed to be a "fair and equitable basis" for our entry into the Canadian confederation. We have heard it described as a federation of nine self-governing provinces with a central government set above them all. We have not heard it referred to here as a hybrid nation, which it is; for Canada is not one nation, but two. Canada is English and Canada is French; and if we don't recognise the difference, others do.... It is now almost a proverb that unless the present trend is not altered considerably, "Ontario or Quebec will destroy Canada".

The vexed question of Quebec and our Labrador cannot be pooh-poohed off, as it has been here on every occasion it arose, by the

oversimplification of saying that the Privy Council made a decision in 1927, and though the heavens fall, it stands. I put this to you, suppose the Privy Council in some not too distant day ceases to be the highest tribunal of the British Commonwealth. We know that the British dominions are each year becoming more and more autonomous, more and more self-sufficient. The King's title which effects his "dominions beyond the seas" is altered; citizens of the dominions are now Canadian or Australian citizens, etc., not "British subjects". In time the supreme courts of the dominions will no doubt become the highest courts of law, the highest tribunals of these dominions.... What then? Should the Supreme Court of Canada become the highest tribunal of the Dominion of Canada, superseding the Privy Council, what is there to prevent Quebec appealing to that new tribunal, and in the light of present events, receiving a reversion of the 1927 decision, in whole or in part? That is one aspect that has not been touched upon at all, and I draw it to members' attention, and to the attention of the country as well. This, separate and apart from the other excellent arguments on the possibility of our losing Labrador, such as the fact that our provincial finances after the first eight years of union would be in such a state as to force us to part with some or all of Labrador as contingent for the receipt of further federal aid.

Clause 3. The public services provided from time to time by Canada for the people of Canada generally will be extended to the people of Newfoundland, etc.... There is little need to comment on this. Canada is only doing what she would do for any other part of North America that went into confederation. She would extend the same facilities to Alaska, if it was a British territory and wanted to become a province. There is only one observation necessary to make. If we get those services, we will pay for them.

Clause 4. Welfare services presently provided by Canada, and therefore applicable to Newfoundland after union pursuant to clause 3, include the following.... This is the heavy metal of the confederates. This is why confederation can be an issue in 1947 when it could not possibly have been one four years ago when the family allowance scheme was not in existence. I am not attacking the family allowance scheme. It is only