

there and have there from the first...preserving their ancient types...Newfoundland has lived a continuous life and has kept its identity inviolate for more than 300 years... For three hundred years, that is to say, during the whole of its colonial life, the colony has been menaced with complete or partial extinction; not by force but by incessantly reiterated arguments. From the very beginning until the very end of its life clever people proved over and over again...that the colony ought not to exist....

That is the end of the quotation, and though the arguments of those clever people alluded to failed to carry a decision, it would seem the argument is still going on.

I have said that confederation would mean a fundamental change in our national life. That need not be a bad thing necessarily. But it can be a bad thing, and will be if the people of this country are stampeded into such a union against what would be, under other circumstances, their better judgement.

What seems to be overlooked in this whole affair is that to be a success and a good thing for Newfoundland, confederation must work, and work a whole lot more smoothly than it does in the Maritime Provinces, for example. For these provinces are part and parcel of confederation, they grew up with it and within it. We have remained aloof until now, and in the meantime we have labouriously built up a country, a culture, traditions, faiths, hopes and, indeed, a certain kind of charity and a hospitableness that is unique. We are as separate a race of people, with ideas and standards of our own, as different from the Canadians as the Canadians are from the Americans. The adjustment of our whole lives, and our outlook on life, government, religion, everything would be a tremendous and shaking process. We might easily never become emotionally, psychologically or mentally adjusted to living under confederation at this stage in our development as a separate people, and might end up as the last and most neurotic and hard-to-live-with member of the confederation family. For a period now of 14 years, over three ordinary parliamentary government administrations, we have been without a vote or a voice in the control of our own affairs. To rush into confederation at this time would be to wake up tomorrow to find we

had a vote and a voice — but that the control of our affairs, at a time when that control could be used to immense advantage to ourselves, is gone forever to a capital 2,000 miles away where our faint protests would fail to reach; or if they did, would fall on deaf ears.

Therefore Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this motion, anymore than I could not support the resolution to send a delegation to Ottawa on the two occasions it was debated in this chamber. I again reassert my unshaken belief that the main decision that confronts our people is to say if they will let others govern them, as they have in the past 14 years, or if they will again govern themselves; and that if they do decide to run their own country and control its internal and external affairs, then the way lies open to them at any time to enter union with any other nation to the west or east of us, on the best possible terms that can be obtained by a sovereign government with power to negotiate.

Mr. Crosbie Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish to oppose the motion brought before the Chair. I am against this motion because, in my opinion, the terms have not been properly negotiated and have far too many loopholes for me conscientiously to support it. In fairness to the people of Newfoundland, I do not believe the motion should go on a ballot.

We hear a great deal of talk about the size of our country, and about our being too small to stand on our own feet. I would like to call your attention for a few minutes to Iceland. Iceland is a very small country having a population of only 120,000; yet this small country is standing on her own feet and since the war finished, they have had the British withdraw and also the Americans. If Iceland can stand on her own feet and make her own trade agreements, surely we in Newfoundland can do the same, that is if we have the courage of our convictions and the guts to carry on.

The greatest danger that I see to Newfoundland under the present suggested terms is to our fisheries — and this, gentlemen, can be a very real danger. I pointed out before the exchange difficulties that we would run into. Mr. Ashbourne in replying to my remarks led me to believe that this exchange could be available in Canada. Well, I see no guarantee in the terms before us that it would, and there certainly is not