

received as much information as we have, for from the first day of the Convention, it has been clear to me that information was the last thing it was intended for us to get, and I am sure it is very patent to anyone who has been listening closely just as soon as we get into anything worthwhile, we are up against a stone wall. I could not help thinking yesterday, whilst listening to the senior member from Grand Falls, how close he was to the truth when he said the only reason the delegation was received was because the powers that be wanted a delegation to go to Canada.

At an earlier date I said we were going into confederation with a pull from the front, meaning Canada, and a push from the back, meaning Great Britain. We got more from the Dominions Office than I expected, in fact, all that was intended for us to get since 1943. It makes my blood boil to think we have a body of men elected by the people of this country treated in the manner we have been treated. I cannot understand how men with blood in their veins can put up with it. Every way we turn we are up against those cursed terms of reference.... They encircle us like the scalloped shrouds the old folks used to put around a corpse in the outports. Who made those terms of reference so entangling? Those who wanted it that way. The Convention was only intended to show the world that what would happen to this country would have a show of democracy, while all the time an organised minority in the Convention, backed by the powers that be, led us, an unorganised majority, the way they wanted us to go, like a horse is led or driven with a curb bit. The time has come for us to assert ourselves. I think the limit has been reached. No greater insult could be heaped on an elected body, than that they are not men of honour and discretion, and I see no reason why the stenographic report cannot be given to the Convention in an informal session. If the whole delegation concurred in this I am sure the people would not take it lightly, but with only two of seven of that opinion, then it looks to me like a plot to keep the Convention aw misinformed as possible, to becloud and to befog the issue.... Going back a year ago, and listening to the cheers in both Houses of Parliament when Newfoundland's sacrifices in both world wars were mentioned, how hollow do they sound today to you who are in reach of my voice? Don't

they sound like a travesty of democracy? Why the change from 1933, one has only to turn to R.A. MacKay's book on Newfoundland, page 503.<sup>1</sup>

Now the following paragraph in my opinion is making trouble for us today. This is where we get the pull and push. This makes Britain and Canada partners through the ages or until swords are beaten into ploughshares. This is why today only a small minority in the Convention is in the know, and the rest of us are treated like children. The iron curtain has nothing on it. This paragraph goes on to say,

The Newfoundland region is of vital strategic importance to Canada, both for its direct defence and, if it so decides, for despatching air to Great Britain in the event of war. It would be ignominious to Canadians to leave to the United States responsibility for the direct defence of Canada's eastern frontier as would be the case were the United States alone able to operate in the Newfoundland region. And now that Canada has become a substantial air and naval power in her own right, it would be equally ignominious to Canadians to leave to Great Britain sole responsibility for protecting the North Atlantic trade routes if Canada were an active partner in war. Freedom to operate for defence purposes in the Newfoundland region is thus an important consideration of Canadian defence.

I see nothing wrong with this, being British and a believer in the old navy axiom, "Twice blest is he who has his quarrel just, but four times blest is he who gets his blow in first." The only thing wrong with it is that we are treated like children. We are the oldest colony, yet with our record behind us, ashore and afloat, we are shuffled around like pawns on a chess board. Why could not that which has been taken from us have been given back? And with a government of our own, meet both the imperial and the Canadian authorities and let us take our share of the burden. If we haven't the cash, we have the men, and I'll wager my life that we will keep up our end of the stick. We did it before and we can do it again. We manned the ships for Canada in World War I, and our record speaks for itself. Everything has been done by certain members to vilify and cheapen us in the eyes of the world. This paragraph speaks

<sup>1</sup>R.A. MacKay, *Newfoundland: Economic, Diplomatic and Strategic Studies* (Toronto, 1946).