

Canada will become the tail-end of the United States kite. On that point I think perhaps I have said enough — a little too loudly, perhaps, and with a little heat. I was determined I should say it at some time or other because, for anybody who wishes to listen to me, I want him to think seriously about this question of morale as we approach the problem of the future form of government in Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, in 1933 we made an error. It has not taken me from 1933 to 1947 to realise that. I said so at the time to an ex-Commissioner — an English Commissioner — and I do not think I will be breaking confidence if I say that he agreed that we had made a mistake on the grounds that we had gotten ourselves in a mess and we did not ourselves face up to it. What I am afraid of, in the approach to this problem, is that we will do exactly the same thing. There has been a lot of talk here about the Labrador....

[Short recess]

Mr. Butt Just before recess I was about to say a few words about clause 2. That is the one which deals with Labrador. I was saying we have heard a lot of talk about Labrador. "It cannot happen to us", some will say, "it was all settled legally." So was the case which led to the French fishing rights of 1857 all settled legally, but as a result of the willingness of the people of Newfoundland — and I think none was for the party and all were for the state — Newfoundlanders got together and fought for the rights of Newfoundland citizens, and we got what is termed today, or what used to be termed, the "Magna Carta of Newfoundland". It has been referred to on two or three occasions in this chamber. It reads like this: "The proposals contained in the Convention having now been unequivocally refused by the Colony, they will of course fall to the ground and you [the Governor] are authorised to give such assurance as you may think proper that the consent of the Colony of Newfoundland is regarded by His Majesty's Government as an essential preliminary to any modification of their territorial or maritime rights."¹ All very legal! What about the territorial rights given in 1940 at the expense of Newfoundland? Were we asked to give our consent to the modification of our territory? The

answer, of course, is "no". Here is a point I do not like. If we ever as much consider that we, as young Newfoundlanders, should ask, should think about asking, for concessions of some kind or another on behalf of our people (this has happened to me), we are treated as naive, simple schoolboys (age, Mr. Bradley!). But not the Secretary of State! When we discussed the matter with him, what he said to us in effect was this: "There are political considerations why the Government of the United Kingdom should not approach the United States on this matter; but now, if you had your own government, you could make a try." What is the relevancy of what I have just said to clause 2? In my opinion, just this: on paper, that clause is fine. I have no doubt about it. It is perfectly legal. But in the world of power politics of the higher level, in the world of big financial interests, there is only one force that can put teeth in a clause which looks all right on paper, and that is the willingness of the people of Newfoundland, however small we may be in number, to fight to keep our rights. Now, sir, when I use the word "fight", I do not necessarily mean fight physically.... If you look in the world of nations and power politics today, you will find there is (to use the new term) a cold war being fought today between the nations of the world. A cold war can be fought with material possessions, and it can also be fought with staying power on the part of the people. In this connection, I come back to my first point, which is in my personal opinion the only thing that could put real teeth in a clause of this kind. Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, at some time in our long history, should be able to stand together and say, "We have certain rights in this country; we are going to have those rights; insofar as we have the power we are going to fight to see we keep them; if we do lose them we will know we have kept the only thing which matters, and that is the drive to go forward in the material and spiritual progress of Newfoundland."

Now I would like to turn to the public services referred to in clause 3. When the list of federal services which would apply directly to Newfoundland was read in this Convention, I confess that I became a bit angered, not because of the

¹The famous Labouchere despatch (26 March 1857) stated that "the consent of the community of Newfoundland" was an "essential preliminary to any modification of ... territorial or maritime rights."