

foundland and her people, but that it is the *only* thing. I could not accept that view. I never did accept it. If the confederates had attempted at the very beginning to prove in a reasonable and not-too-eager way that confederation with Canada might be a good thing for even a fairly prosperous and well-fixed Newfoundland, I believe their cause might have had more success and a less thorny way than it did have. Instead, that cause was driven into the Convention's proceedings with as much diplomacy as a battering-ram, and kept swinging with all the power that fanaticism, over-eagerness and agitation could muster. Underlying the whole issue was the insistent effort at every turn to prove that Newfoundland was in a hopeless mess, that she would never get out of it, in fact that it would get worse, and the only hope for Newfoundlanders was to have sense enough to come in out of the wet — under the big umbrella of confederation. The attempt to becloud the real issues at stake by this smoke-screen of emotionalism, and by an appeal to the underdog, will not succeed, Mr. Chairman. I resent this line of argument by the delegate from Bonavista Centre. It is an insult to the intelligence and the integrity of myself and others who do not see eye to eye with him. Of course, he is not trying to convince us; he tells us that every time he speaks into the microphones it is to the people, his masters, he is speaking. I solemnly warn the people to beware, to "beware the Greeks, when they come bearing gifts."

I resent also his statement that he is getting ready to go out and tell them the truth, which they have never got in this Convention. I consider that a reflection on us all, including yourself, Mr. Chairman, for we have honestly striven to give the people the truth, and that is why these so-called terms, this basis for confederation has been the storm-centre of such a prolonged discussion. What kind of truth is Mr. Smallwood going to bring to the people when he begins his crusade? Is it the same sort of inflammatory doctrine that he spewed forth on Friday last? If that is the kind of truth the people are to hear, then I say, God help them and God guard thee, Newfoundland!

But, proceeding from this point, Mr. Chairman, there is one statement that Mr. Smallwood made in his remarks that I made special note of. After he had made it perfectly clear that he believed his motion was going to be defeated,

which was a fair assumption I grant you, he nevertheless went on to state emphatically that he had no doubt that confederation would be on the ballot. Then what are we here for? What is the sense of this debate or the month-long debate on the so-called terms? What does it matter then if this motion is defeated? Why is Mr. Smallwood appealing for support? Because he knows that the British government will take the recommendations of this Convention; that it cannot afford to do otherwise.

"Let the people decide" is the confederate slogan. Therefore they vote to put Commission government and responsible government on the referendum, but declare they themselves will vote for neither one nor the other. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the line of least resistance in this Convention is taken by those who will vote to put everything in sight, every form of government on the referendum. They put the onus on the people. "Let the people decide", they say again and again. But I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, who will the people blame if they make the wrong choice? They will blame this Convention, and rightly so, if they make the irretrievable mistake, and I submit that the only form of government put forward here that admits of the possibility of the people making an irretrievable mistake, is confederation with Canada on the basis submitted by the Prime Minister of Canada. In the other two cases, the other two forms, there is a second chance. But there is no second chance under confederation, no matter what specious arguments its proponents may offer in that regard.

The confederates argue we have no right not to recommend any particular form of government — put them all on the ballot, let the people decide. But they overlook the fact that this Convention months ago took to itself the right not to recommend a certain form of government which has far more supporters in this country than confederation with Canada, that is union with the United States. It voted Mr. Jackman's resolution right out of the House without even making an attempt to investigate the whole matter or to even discuss it, despite the fact that the constitutional expert stated in answer to a question put by Mr. Fogwill, that to send a delegation to discuss terms of union at Washington was within our famous terms of reference. And we have heard Mr. Smallwood, when his own resolution was being