

to offer us terms on which half the Canadian population cannot agree, I think would be a very strong factor against recommending it ourselves to the people.

We have been interested in listening to the reasons which several members have been offering for acceptance of these terms of confederation, but there has been one very significant fact in these last weeks of discussion, and particularly in the debate just recently finished covering the finance end of it and the estimated provincial budget. This very significant fact, sir, which stands out as a weak link in the chain of the confederation-backers, is that they have not mentioned anything about the provincial budget, or how we are going to fare operating Newfoundland as a province, or how the people are going to pay for the benefits they might receive from confederation. I have heard eight or nine of these members speaking in favour of confederation on generalities alone. They have not stated any solid basic facts to back up their recommendation to the people. They have glibly skipped over the most important part that the people should consider, and that is, sir, how can we operate a province and who is going to pay for it?

I was most surprised indeed by the impression I received of what Mr. Burry said on January 13. He spoke very feelingly of the people on the Labrador, and quite rightly so, and pointed out the benefits to them; but my impression was that he spoke through the eyes of 5,000 people on Labrador as a basis for recommending to the other 300,000 people of Newfoundland that confederation would be good for them. I realise that Mr. Burry has the people of Labrador at heart, and I have every respect for this gentleman, but to me his sole argument was based on and around only that small percentage of the whole country and I cannot accept his argument as referring to the rest of Newfoundland.

Our number one senator, Mr. Ballam, described the wonderful country that Canada was and the sights they saw and which, no doubt, were seen from the back seat of a car or at garden parties which he attended while in Ottawa. Did he see the horrible conditions in the slums in Montreal and around other cities or walk down through the poorer sections? He apparently did not, or he would have seen conditions there that we have never known in Newfoundland. I am afraid I

could not recommend confederation based on the arguments I have heard here which are pure generalities, without foundations or anything solid on which people can base their future hopes.

I want to make it quite plain that I am *not* an anticonfederate. I do not hate the thought of confederation. I naturally prefer our own independence, but if we were offered terms that would really benefit this country, raise the standard of living of our people, and secure or improve our national economy, I would be the first one to vote for it. But looking at it on the basis of the terms we have been offered, I cannot sincerely recommend it to the people of this country.

Mr. Ashbourne said on January 16 that he could not see why we always want to remain independent. I can hardly believe Mr. Ashbourne seriously considered this remark, as surely it is the wish of everybody in this country to remain independent if they can do so without sacrificing too much. Mr. Ashbourne also mentions the fact that under confederation a man could leave here after the fishing season for winter work in Canada, but surely he realises that people in Canada are in similar industries as ourselves, and that they are in the identical position as us, and the volume of work to be obtained in Canada during the winter months would affect such a small part of our population, and would benefit us so little, that this is hardly a reason for his strong recommendation of confederation. If conditions become poor in this country and work is hard to get, it will also apply to Canada, and the jobs that are available in Canada are being filled by immigrants consisting of displaced persons from Europe who are coming to Canada on very low salary to start with, such a salary as Newfoundlanders could not exist on, and which would not give them sufficient returns to pay their fare up and back again. He states that we are dependent on Canada to defend our shores...

**Mr. Ashbourne** I maintain that I referred to Great Britain as well as Canada.

**Mr. Hickman** Surely we are more dependent on the United States who already has three bases established here and who is by far the strongest nation in the world today. It would be to them that we would have to look to defend our shores rather than Canada who would only be a part, with the USA, in a joint defence of the North American continent. He feels that Canada is at our back,