

my limitations and I have not gone very thoroughly into the high finance of the question which has been, in any case, dealt with very effectively by other speakers. It is argued that we are too small to stand alone; yet other countries as small, and smaller, notably Iceland, have done so; and Iceland is not in half as important a part of the world as we are, and her position is not as quarter as strategic as ours; nor does she have even a fraction of the bargaining power that we possess. Even though there are 60 to 70 miles of deep Atlantic water between us and the mainland at the end that counts most, it is argued that we are a part of the Canadian mainland, when it would be equally correct or incorrect to argue that we are a part of the American mainland. The truth of the matter is, we are no more an intrinsic part of the mainland than is England of the continent of Europe, and I would recall to your attention how barely 25 miles of water made all the difference for England in 1940. The attempt to foist confederation on us is to ignore the facts of geography and international politics, which makes us as much a part of the United States as of Canada. The men who voted for a delegation to Ottawa on the grounds that they were concerned with the people's welfare, will not be able to reconcile their concern for that welfare with their refusal to vote to send a similar delegation to the United States.

I say then, Mr. Chairman, that it is wrong, ethically, morally and economically to suggest, much less to ask our people to vote themselves into union with Canada on such one-sided arrangements; arrangements which even ram-bunctious debates by a crowd of amateurs, for the most part, have shown up as shot through with future trouble — trouble which will involve ethics and morals and economics and finances. They, these arrangements, are a one-sided bargain — which is no bargain at all — and as has been pointed out by one member of the delegation, all these arrangements actually provide is a fair and equitable basis on which a sovereign government of the Newfoundland people, assisted by the expert knowledge and staff that this delegation did not have, could negotiate "terms" acceptable to the Newfoundland people.

Here is Newfoundland, a people voteless for 14 years, coddled for 14 years, not thinking, not doing the normal political things that all Anglo-

Saxon peoples have won the right to do — governing their own people, governing themselves. At the present stage they are divided as to whether or not they should take once again that control of their own affairs and bid farewell to outside control. Yet while they are in that dilemma, it is proposed, on the basis of these one-sided arrangements, to ask them to not only assume control of their own affairs, yet at the same time give the complete control, finally and irrevocably to outside sources, by entering a political union which may not be the best political or economic union this country could get. I say to them, make haste slowly, take one step at a time. The Canadian offer can wait; they've been waiting since 1864 and another year or two won't hurt. Decide first whether you wish to reject or retain Commission of Government. If you reject it, then with a sovereign elected government of your own choosing you will be able to approach Canada and the United States, so that if your wish is then no longer to stand alone, you can be assured that whichever union you enter, political or economic or both, it will be the best that can be secured for yourselves and those who come after you.

Mr. Vincent Mr. Chairman, if my introductory comments are just so much water under the bridge now, I yet cannot refrain from making reference to them. Some of us, after more than a year of bickerings, divisions and not too dignified debates, had fondly hoped that with the passing of 1947 would come an eclipse of such shortcomings that would be as permanent as it was total. Unfortunately such has not been the case, and 1948 brought no angel of light presenting this assembly with a certificate of freedom from having such millstones around its neck, and so the debates meander on.

I have, sir, watched with growing admiration your intelligent attempt to keep this Convention from bogging down in dawdlings and delays. Some were inescapable, however, and members have from time to time as self-appointed proponents of this, and crusading prophets of that form of government, lost complete sight of the forest in the minute and precise examination of their own particular trees.

In the discussion statements, speeches, apparent implications made by members, though not intended perhaps to do so, have incited bitter antagonisms that rankle deeply, created ill-will