

first debated, say that he would vote to send a delegation anywhere, to Timbuctoo if necessary. That was before his own resolution was carried. After that he sang a different tune.

In speaking to Mr. Higgins' motion, Mr. Keough, a few days ago, went to great pains to rule out several forms of government which might be possible future forms of government for Newfoundland, on the grounds that, as far as I can see, they were unsuitable from his point of view. None of these forms had ever been discussed in this Convention, none of them had ever been given the slightest attention. One of them was union with the USA, and Mr. Keough's argument for ruling out that form was that the issue raised "matters of conscience" that he was not prepared to raise among our people. I would like to know what matters of conscience union with the United States would raise that confederation will not raise. The educational and divorce problems are present in each case, and the only other matter of conscience is that of a change of flag and loyalty. And I would ask Mr. Keough, pursuing his own line of thought, how would that affect the fisherman on the bill of Cape St. George as long as he gets his three square meals a day?

No, Mr. Chairman, the argument here is that this Convention has discussed three forms of government, therefore it should recommend three forms, ignoring the fact that there are several others which can be dealt with under one or both of the forms discussed in Mr. Higgins' motion, which are forever discarded if this Convention should recommend and the people accept confederation on the so-called terms of November 6, 1947.

As I said before, nowhere in the Black Books or the Grey Book does the Canadian government refer to them as "terms"; neither, I note, does Mr. Smallwood in his resolution, where he simply calls them a basis for confederation. And I submit that's what they are, a basis for a future sovereign government of Newfoundland to negotiate the final and satisfactory terms of union. We had a month's discussion on these arrangements for the entry of Newfoundland into confederation. I disagree most strongly with Mr. Smallwood's assertion that these are the only terms we could get, the best terms we could get. That is unmitigated

nonsense, "trash and nonsense" to use his own words. I also strongly object to his statement that we could get out of confederation. How? Thirteen of the United States of America tried it in 1861 and they had a four-year civil war, and when it was over the 13 states were still a part of the federal union. We'd look nice declaring war on the rest of Canada if we found that confederation was a mistake, as it will be under the present circumstances.

Speaking of the United States reminds me that Mr. Banfield said, "Newfoundland is too small, too poor to stand alone. She must have somebody at her back." If Mr. Banfield believes that we should have a big country at our back, then I say let's have the United States at our back, either in economic or political union, whichever the people desire at the proper time under their own elected self-government.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke for an hour and a half in committee of the whole during the debate on the proposed arrangements for the entry of Newfoundland into confederation, and gave my reasons why I could not accept them. I do not intend to take up too much of the limited time allotted for this debate to rehash my arguments, or to go over the ground covered by other speakers, but there are a few points I wish to make at this time with respect to Canada and confederation.

Confederation with Canada represents a complete change of the constitution of Newfoundland; a complete alteration beyond recognition almost of the whole basic concept of the life and the living of our people — 450 years of history as a distinct unit with a separate life of its own. "Newfoundland... still remains *sui generis* and an exception to the rule in the British Empire", states Rogers.¹

The apartness of Newfoundland from the rest of British America has persisted for a long time, and its history has for many centuries contrasted with the history of other colonies in two or three essential characteristics.... In the first place there is an immobility in the history of Newfoundland, and a fixity of character in the Newfoundlander, which is unique in colonial history. Somersetshire, Devonshire and Irish peasants are

¹J.D. Rogers, *A Historical Geography of the British Colonies: Vol. V, Part IV, Newfoundland* (Oxford 1911), p. iv.