

are being speedily forced together by various sets of circumstances.... Now to summarise the position regarding Newfoundland, let it be made clear, that it's not our people, our economy, or both, which interests that group, or any member of it, but rather our clearly defined geographical or strategical position, the Gibraltar of the west. It is from this angle rather than our intrinsic value as the possessor or producer of wealth that we should lay a special emphasis on, stressing our real worth as a proposed partner with any member of that group. Notwithstanding the fact that our virgin territory in the Labrador may possess much valuable wealth, I am of the very definite opinion that Newfoundland is controlled and will be more fully controlled in the future by an international body in which Great Britain, the USA and Canada will be represented. The unfortunate, unsettled and troubled conditions in the world today makes this impossible to avoid. But the interest of our population and Newfoundland as a whole could best be served by a revised form of self-government for our country. And I would not agree to more than 15 members serving on that body. The basis of terms may have appeared at first sight to be generally fair to Newfoundland. But the more we examine them the more we are reminded of a huge iceberg which starts to sway toward the sea.... Mr. Chairman, unless our Canadian friends are prepared to equalise our national debt, putting aside the difference to be spent for the development of this country, and accept us as equal partners and prove we are to be treated as such, I fail to see how any fair-minded Newfoundlander can vote for confederation. We have all heard sufficient proof from both sides since the day it started. We should know by now what is fair and what is not fair in these terms. There must of necessity be inherent in every man such a thing as reason. And regardless of how they vote I'll give to every man the credit of possessing a fair and equal proportion of this gift. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to appeal to every member of this Convention to put both conscience and reason to the test. This is not a matter that we should take lightly. It is very, very serious. And it would be nothing short of an act of betrayal of your people's trust, to ask them to vote for a form of government which has not been fully explored or negotiated by a properly constituted or elected government of the people of

Newfoundland.

We have a serious task to perform, and it is our right and duty not to fail the people at this crucial hour. I advise you, gentlemen, to put Newfoundland and our people first, and never let them down. You must know that when we voted to get these terms, we were all anxious to give Newfoundland the best form of government possible, subject of course to the final wishes of the people. We are undeveloped solely because our progress has been incessantly retarded ever since 1497 by the ancient and worn-out colonial policy of the mother country, and by the constant fear and dread in the minds of our past governments of creating too great a national debt. Spend \$13 million a year for the next ten years on development work in Newfoundland, and our social and economic structures will be above what Canada's are today; and we would still have a much lower per capita debt. This debt must be breached, in addition to receiving sufficient back from the federal government to balance our provincial budget. I strongly think then that is reasonable. Supposing my friend Mr. Ballam...

**Mr. Chairman** Gentlemen, would you kindly refrain from talking, please?....

**Mr. Vardy** Supposing my friend Mr. Ballam and I decide we're going into partnership. We're going to buy a schooner together. We put \$1,000 each in the deal. Now let us say that Mr. Ballam owes Mr. Hickman on my left \$200, and I owe him \$1,400, just the same proportion as we have between Canada's and Newfoundland's debt today. Would it look fair to Mr. Ballam or the public for the partnership to pay the two bills? Someone may say, but this is different, this is a country, a piece of land. All right, we will call it a piece of land. Now Mr. Ballam's land is uncleared, undeveloped and he owes only \$200. Mine is cleared, has a nice farmhouse on it, a good road through it, hothouse, machinery to do the work, but I owe for it all. Would it be right for Mr. Ballam to assume my bills unless I paid into a trust fund sufficient cash to develop my partner's property to the level of my own? That's exactly the picture as I see it, and I'm trying to make it plain to the people. That's about as plain as I can go and that is exactly how I view the plans before us. I am not really prejudiced. I want what is best for our people but no outside partnership would ever prove best unless a sound basis of