

have been rushed. It is not a matter of short investigation on something small. It is even bigger than some of the delegates realise.... We should carry on as we are until we come to some definite conclusions; there will be plenty of time to get the terms of confederation. There is lots to do before we get round to discussing it. After earnest consideration, I cannot do anything but support the amendment Mr. Penney put forward yesterday.

**Mr. Keough** ....At this moment, Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for confederation. At this moment I am not convinced that we should come to enjoy a more spacious tomorrow as the tenth province of Canada, than we should enjoy should we undertake to carry on crosshanded. I should like that to be quite clear. I should also like it to be remembered that I said "at this moment". For when we come to the working out of the equation, the answer I arrive at may well make me a confirmed confederate. It may make me exactly the opposite. For the moment I am more concerned to probe for the identity of several as yet unknown quantities — among them the terms of confederation.

I wish to speak in support of the motion moved by Mr. Smallwood because I consider that there is a matter of principle involved. The principle is this: the right of the people of Newfoundland to know all the facts, to see both sides of the story to be shown all the angles. When the people of this island finally come to determine upon the form of government they desire I want them to be in a position to determine, if they so desire, upon that form of government that will admit of a higher standard of living than any other. They may well determine upon that form of government that will just enable them to make both ends meet — they hope. But they should be in a position then, among the several forms that may be available to their discretion, to determine upon that calculated to mean the most in terms of better living.

When we read our terms of reference we find that we are here, in the first instance, to examine into the economic and financial condition of Newfoundland.

In interpretation of those terms a not inconsiderable number of people would subscribe to the view that we here should endeavour, in the first instance, to answer the question, "Just how

much of what is enough?" — meaning enough to get along, or enough to make both ends meet and have a little to spare that could be tied into a little bow of security. I am not satisfied that it is "enough" to know where one's next meal is coming from. I see no reason for subscribing to any lesser dimension of "enough" than a standard of living for our people comparable with that enjoyed by other western peoples. Whether we can ever rise to such material apexes is another matter. But I see no good and sufficient reason for being satisfied with anything less. "Enough", as far as I am concerned, is not less than the most that may be had. I hate to say anything so original, but the best is none too good. And, whilst I do not wish to imply that confederation is the best that may be had, I do wish to affirm that we must not fail to search out all information that will enable the people of this island to judge wherein the best may be achieved.

There are some who are prepared to settle for less than that. Thus we hear much mention of the irreducible minimum cost of government. I do not like that yardstick. A mere 36 inches of ability to make both ends meet at this moment would seem to me too meagre a measure of our ability to be sufficient unto ourselves tomorrow. I cannot see that it would be the wisest thing to decide the constitutional issue on our ability to meet the irreducible minimum cost of government at this moment. For given an economic reversal of any magnitude we might easily find ourselves below that level.

With regard to the motion before the House, I am not going to be greatly moved by any who may care to point the finger of constitutional scorn. I am not an expert in constitutional law. Thus was I shocked in the beginning to hear this Convention in which I sat termed illegal. I did subsequently console myself with the thought that perhaps the Parliament of Britain did also know something about what was constitutional and what was not, that whilst that Parliament might often do things of which many did not approve, it was unlikely to do that which was constitutionally improper. So I sit here quite content that it is legal to sit here. It may be immoral, even fattening, but I am quite convinced that it is not illegal to sit here. Similarly if the appropriate authorities act now as requested, then I feel that we shall have every assurance that the act en-