

ing to the fairy godmother. I would go so far as to say that if that is the kind of people we are, I don't think Canada would want us — I'm sure she wouldn't respect us. Certainly, we couldn't respect ourselves. The whole question of federal union is bigger than that. It is my feeling the day may soon come when the peoples of the entire North American continent may find it even necessary to let down their barriers and adopt a common citizenship. Many people feel that day is long overdue, and that it points the way to eventual peace and prosperity for all men. Should that day come, we will need to bring to bear on the problem sound reasoning in minds free of thought of personal aggrandisement or selfish gain. Newfoundlanders are watching us, hoping, praying that we have among us men equal to the task. Can we produce men of the calibre of those who did their duty in these chambers long ago? If we can, we are saved. God help us if we can't. **Mr. Job** I feel I should say a few words for or against the resolution proposed by Mr. Smallwood, and somewhat half-heartedly seconded by Mr. Higgins. It is probable that somebody at some time will have to ascertain the terms obtainable for confederation, but personally I doubt if this Convention is the body that should ask for these terms. I think the request, if any, will have to come from a government of Newfoundland which at least has some elected representatives of Newfoundland in its body.

It is most unfortunate that Mr. Smallwood has disturbed the even tenor of our way, by introducing this confederation issue when we were all working so well together to secure the information necessary for our decisions. No one will approve of Mr. Smallwood's tactics in seeking to destroy the independent views of members of this Convention by enticing them with promises of seats on the proposed delegation, senatorships, etc. This savors very much of the old petty politics and is not conducive to the smooth working of this Convention.

I am opposed to the resolution for the following reasons: firstly, I think it is premature for this Convention to broach the subject of confederation at a time when we are bending our energies to solving the question of our self-supporting status. Secondly, because I consider that the resolution as worded is not at all adequate. Previous speakers, especially Mr. Harrington, have

stressed the first point and I cannot add anything of value to their remarks. As regards the second point, my feeling is that if any Newfoundland delegation is sent to Ottawa, its objects should range further than a discussion of terms for confederation, and that there should also be discussed the general policy of Canada towards Newfoundland if confederation is *not* adopted.

I have previously stated that Canada has an important interest in the future welfare of Newfoundland on account of the great value of Newfoundland's strategic position, as evidenced during the recent war. It might conceivably be to the interest of both Canada and Newfoundland to take down entirely their tariff and immigration barriers without any actual federal relationship, and I take the liberty of quoting from a most interesting address by our very highly respected fellow citizen, Raymond Gushue, which was made before the Canadian Club in Ottawa on February 13, 1945. In this address Mr. Gushue said in part:

I have referred more than once to the fact that Newfoundland is indissolubly a part of a larger continental unit. North America is in many ways one geographic and economic entity. Would it not accrue to the benefit and well-being of the whole continent if that large fact were more fully realised? We are all North Americans — more alike in our thinking and ways of living than perhaps any other similar collection of contiguous people, in an area of great resources and in which we can all contribute something to the others. Is not this a situation which favours the adoption and practical expression of a broad principle relating, among other things, to commerce among the three countries? Where for example there is an exchange of food — that most essential of all articles of commerce — should we not examine the merits of free or freer interchange? If, in this greater geographic and economic entity there are regions favoured by nature for the most efficient, and therefore most economical production of a commodity, why should we try to offset that gift, and make living harder, not only for producers within such regions, but also for consumers within the larger unit? It is not only possible but probable, that if the governments concerned sat down together