

to the Chair. Your task, sir, has been a very onerous one, but the wise judgement, cool decisions and great consideration which you have shown have added still more lustre to your already well-known abilities, and a greater admiration for one of Newfoundland's greatest sons. To your immediate predecessor, my learned associate from Bonavista Centre, I would say that when and if the records of this Convention are written, history will accord no mean place to the name of F. Gordon Bradley, K.C. I would also, pay tribute to the memory of that great and good man, the late Mr. Justice Fox; to me (and I knew him but a short time), his demise represented a personal tragedy, and I shall treasure memories of that kindly gentleman long after Conventions are forgotten. To members generally, I express a deep sense of gratitude. As far as I am concerned, this Convention has been a great lesson in political democracy at work, even though it may have been a very expensive one. Here the managing directors of the big vested interests were called by their first names by the ex-schoolteacher, the outport merchant. Here the ex-policeman from the west coast talked over his people's problems with the co-op worker from White Bay. Forty-five men with divergent views did much toward enlightening public opinion and awakening a sense of political responsibility among our people. If I may be permitted to be personal on a final note, and I trust it is not in bad taste, I would express my sincere thanks to my good friend, Mr. Hickman. He probably more than any other has gone out of his way at times to extend those little courtesies that mean so much. Also to Mr. Crosbie, the Hon. R.B. Job, Mr. Smallwood and to my great friend, Arch Northcott, and to members generally; and I make my final bow by saying, "Thank you, gentlemen."

Mr. Miller Mr. Chairman, I hesitated when this subject was being discussed in committee of the whole to engage in the debate. I felt it was being buffeted around the house, and that the discussion on it was being rendered in extremes on both sides. And so I mostly sat it out. However, in view of the bigness of the question, and in view of the fact that I, on both occasions, voted in favour of the motion to send a delegation to Ottawa to request the terms of union, I feel I should make some comment at this time.

If I were asked why I supported getting the

terms of union, I would say, yes, I would honestly swear that my first and perhaps only reason was a psychological one. We were called together to consider forms of government. The question of confederation had been up before. True, it has failed, but on its merits or demerits as the case may be. But it had become an object of continuous curiosity and many unfounded arguments had, down through the years, been advanced in its favour. This old flame had been rapidly fanned in the interim between the announcement of the holding of this Convention and its opening date, September 11, 1946. A glowing picture of union with Canada was laid before the people. It was not to be wondered at then, that since we were dealing with such questions, that curiosity was further aroused and being aroused, had to be satisfied. It is not my intention now to comment on the methods adopted by the pro-confederates as to their fairness or otherwise, and I say but one thing, that they are, to my mind, not based on sound national principles and consequently could not be considered as bait. A further remark is that its progress through this assembly has provided the means of passing on the bait.

And so I voted for the motion to send a delegation to Ottawa. That decision was against my feeling, for in the autonomous sovereign integrity of our country I had a strong belief. But my feelings, I felt, should be set aside for the moment, and should yield to a proven case: a case in which all the evidence should be submitted and considered. And there a great shadow came over our subject, our inability to negotiate. I do not pass reflections on those who gave us this job to do, and who set the limits wherein we work. No part of this is unwittingly planned, and it is well that it is so.

I voted to get the terms. That covered that. There was at one time a possibility of our having to consider what is still only a word, a condominium. The idea of investigating government of the North of Ireland status was hinted at, as was also a present-day application of representative government. All these, I believe, were possible forms of future government and one would act in a restrictive manner not to favour their being looked into. But having investigated these forms of government, it does not necessarily follow that one would recommend any or all