

visioned by the motion is in order.

I am not going to be greatly moved either by the argument that we must restore intact our island sovereignty or there will be those who will turn over in their graves. If my great-grandfather wants to turn over in his grave because we want to hear both sides of the story, that's entirely the business of his revered shade. If those who were giants in his day and theirs want to join in his macabre gymnastics, that is entirely their own business. It is our business in this day and generation to endeavour to provide for the future so that our children, and their children after them, will not have to stumble down into early graves on beri-beried legs.

It might be just as well if we were to face up to a few facts concerning sovereignty. It is something that has intimate relations with economics. Sovereignty must be based upon an economic structure that will admit of being sovereign unto itself. One reason why, let us say Bell Island, would not be granted responsible government tomorrow would be the economic inability of Bell Island to be sovereign unto itself in all things. I have often wondered if it was not lack of an adequate economic basis for sovereignty that was the main cause of our failure in responsible government. It is a fact of our history that we have depended, for the most part, upon our fisheries to finance our sovereignty. It is a fact also that most every time the fisheries failed a large number of Newfoundlanders have nearly starved to death. I am by no means an old man, and in my own time I have known more than one man who did not know where his next meal was coming from. And as far as the man who does not know where his next meal is coming from is concerned, sovereignty is not enough. And there will subscribe to that opinion, all those Newfoundlanders who in the years that were rotted with depression sought to walk the world with dignity, as sovereign men should, on six cents a day.

Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln once warned his people that they could not escape history. We might as well now come to realise that we cannot escape the 20th century. And the lives of men in this mid-20th century are dominated by two desires of such dimension as to make them the predominant passions. There is, first of all, the fierce passion to be free. Within the days of all of us here, men have fought two

titanic wars to be free. The generals and the politicians and the financiers may have had other ideas. But the ordinary man who fought at Beaumont Hamel and at Ypres, who stormed the heights of Cassino and who closed the Falaise Gap — he fought to be free. Second, there is the passion, equally fierce, to be secure — for three square meals a day, a decent suit of clothes and a tight roof that I have already made mention of in this house. The proletariat has mastered the three Rs. It has come even to understand a little of the language of economics. It has read all the assurances that have been given that the historic problem of production has been solved. It is convinced that the affairs of men can be so ordered as to make it possible for all men to earn from an honest effort a decent living. And the mass of men everywhere are in a mood for the establishment of such controls as will achieve that desideratum.

Those two things the men of this mid-20th century demand. Liberty! Security! One of them they're going to have. Which one? Or need it be which one? Must men choose between the mastery of their own destinies and three square meals a day? There are those who answer that they must; those who assert that civic liberty and economic security are two such disparate entities as may no more be fused into a satisfactory social order than water and hot lead may be fused into an amalgam. I am not one who subscribes to such dark pessimism. I have every confidence in the ability of that Christian intelligence, which has proven equal to every challenge of two millennia, yet to arrive at the reconciliation of civic liberty and economic security into a social order to which the Christian conscience can subscribe. If that can be done, then will the future offer men some chance of happiness and dignity. If it cannot be done, then will the future be dark and heavy with a new and a more monstrous Gethsemane than has ever come upon the face of the earth.

Every man of goodwill has a contribution to make to the achieving of that satisfactory social order for the lack of which civilisation itself may well go by default. The immediate contribution the men of this Convention have to make is to indicate, as well as we may, the way the people of this island should go to a more spacious destiny. We have consequently, and among other things, to seek out the terms of confederation. For