

Student Work

8-1-1977

The reaction of selected southern Ontario newspapers to the entrance of Newfoundland into confederation, 1945-1949.

Timothy A. Rutz
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Rutz, Timothy A., "The reaction of selected southern Ontario newspapers to the entrance of Newfoundland into confederation, 1945-1949." (1977). *Student Work*. 509.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/509>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

THE REACTION OF SELECTED SOUTHERN ONTARIO NEWSPAPERS
TO THE ENTRANCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND INTO CONFEDERATION
1945 - 1949

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of History
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
Timothy A. Rutz
August 1977

UMI Number: EP73147

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73147

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College,
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University
of Nebraska at Omaha.

Thesis Committee Dale H. Tuedert History
Name Department
John J. Farr Political Science

Tommy R. Thompson
Chairman

August 30, 1977
Date

PROLOGUE

The history of Newfoundland can be traced back to its discovery by the Norse. Its subsequent rediscovery centuries later by John Cabot then preceded a century-long non-colonization period, which lasted until the first permanent settlement, was established in 1610. From 1610 onward, the government of the colony grew very slowly until Newfoundland, in the nineteenth century, got its first year-round governor from the United Kingdom. The reason for this delay may be traced to the powerful western England fishing merchants, who because of their fear of the dominance of the fishing trade by any strong Newfoundland colony, used their wealth and influence to persuade Parliament to retard the growth of the colony. In 1832 Newfoundland finally received the grant of representative government, followed by responsible government (under which the country was given complete control over its internal affairs) in 1855. Two serious attempts at confederation with Canada were made in the late 1860's and in 1895. They failed due to Newfoundland's political intransigence and Canada's failure to offer favorable economic terms. In 1907 Newfoundland was recognized as a dominion. But with the coming of the twentieth century's great depression, Newfoundland's economy collapsed. The government teetered on the brink of insolvency, finally resulting in the voluntary

surrendering of self-government and reversion to a quasi-colonial status under the auspices of the United Kingdom Government. From 1934 onward, a Commission Government (composed of three Newfoundland Commissioners, three English Commissioners, and the Royal Governor) ruled Newfoundland. All of these positions were appointed by the United Kingdom Government as the Newfoundland people had given up the right to either elect or review the acts of government. By agreement with the United Kingdom Government in 1933, responsible government was to be returned to the country only when the Commission Government produced a surplus budget and if the people expressed a desire for responsible government.

In reality, this era of Commission Government was somewhat beneficial to Newfoundlanders, although many of the populace could not forget that the government's accomplishments were without the benefit of democratic rule. With the outbreak of World War II in September of 1939, the end to Newfoundland's economic troubles was not far distant. In the end, though, it was not to be the inspired rule of the Commission Government, the absence of political collusion, or the absence of sectarianism in politics (both of which were aspects of the pre-Commission Government) that would signal the end of depression, but war itself that would return Newfoundland's Balance Sheet to a surplus

figure. Critics of the Commission Government like the former English Commissioner Thomas Lodge, in his book, Dictatorship in Newfoundland, declared that "[t]o have abandoned the principle of democracy without accomplishing economic rehabilitation is surely the unforgiveable sin." However, since World War II brought a budgetary surplus to Newfoundland, the United Kingdom Government commenced moves after the end of hostilities to allow Newfoundlanders to decide their country's future political course.

In this thesis, the viewpoint of the southwestern Ontario press via three representative newspapers will be looked at from December 11, 1945 (the day the United Kingdom's Prime Minister Clement Attlee announced the calling of a National Convention in Newfoundland to decide that country's future government) until the first week in April 1949 (when Newfoundland's provincial government began to function after confederation with Canada) in order to trace their coverage of these developments. The three papers chosen were The London Evening Free Press, The Windsor Daily Star, and The (Toronto) Globe and Mail. The major objective of this study will be to determine the attitude of the southwestern Ontario papers towards Newfoundland and confederation.

The Globe and Mail, "Canada's National Paper" as it rightfully calls itself, was chosen because of its national

perspective in addition to its ample coverage of regional news. London, the home of The London Evening Free Press, is located midway between the metropolitan centers of Detroit and Toronto. The perspective of the London paper's stories had a higher ratio of local coverage as compared to national news than either of the other papers. Windsor, Ontario, is located across the river from Detroit, Michigan. The Windsor Daily Star was and still is Windsor's only daily newspaper. The Globe and Mail especially is an important paper since it is the most widely distributed newspaper, both provincially and nationally. Together these three papers provide news coverage to the most densely populated region of Ontario. In Canada, Ontario holds a position of importance as it is by far the largest English-speaking province and almost always speaks representatively for English Canada. Consequently, these papers, especially The Globe and Mail, have a far-reaching effect on the rest of the nation. These were the major reasons for the selection of these newspapers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this paper was carried out both in Canada and Omaha. Newspaper research was done entirely in Canada with the help of the following libraries: the Windsor Public Library, the Windsor Star Library, the University of Windsor Library, the Library of Huron College (London, Ontario), the Library of the University of Western Ontario (London), and the London Public Library. Dr. Larry Kulisek, Dr. John Morden, and Arnold Eagle provided invaluable help in furnishing assistance.

It was impossible to obtain everything necessary from the aforementioned Canadian libraries, though much of the background materials were gleaned from their shelves. This void was filled through the aid and assistance of Mrs. Elizabeth Laird of the Gene Eppley Library.

More than anyone else, Dr. A. Stanley Trickett, was responsible for the inception of this thesis, but it was the guidance, help, and painstaking patience of Dr. Tommy Thompson that helped make this thesis a reality. Lastly, a special thanks too is deserved by the typist, Joyce Mitchell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	1939-1945: THE WAR AND ITS IMMEDIATE AFTERMATH.....	1
II	1946: THE YEAR OF BEGINNING.....	18
III	1947: THE YEAR OF PROBING.....	34
IV	1948: THE YEAR OF DECISION.....	68
V	1949: THE YEAR OF ACCEPTANCE.....	113
VI	CONCLUSION.....	138
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	147

1939-1945: THE WAR AND ITS IMMEDIATE AFTERMATH

When the United Kingdom entered war with Nazi Germany, in September 1939, Newfoundland was brought along. Though the Newfoundlanders were not actually in control of their own policies, there is little doubt that Newfoundland, if independent, would have come to the aid of the United Kingdom. Canada, Newfoundland's English neighbor to the west, decided to aid the Mother Country and declared war on Germany.

Though Newfoundland was without local fortifications, it was well protected as the English controlled the ocean at the outbreak of the war. In fact, Newfoundland had never been responsible for its defense but rather relied upon the United Kingdom.¹

With the fall of France and the subsequent isolation of the United Kingdom in the spring of 1940, Newfoundland became strategically important since it controlled the main sea route between North America and a very desperate Mother Country. As a result of England's precarious situation, Canada (after receiving consent from the Newfoundland Commission Government) sent troops to Newfoundland for its defense.² Newfoundland was too important to risk its fall.

¹Robert A. MacKay, ed., Newfoundland: Economic, Diplomatic and Strategic Studies (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 492.

²MacKay, pp. 493-94.

or destruction by a sneak attack. Both convoys and planes would use Newfoundland's convenient bases as a departure point for Europe.

In August 1940, a Permanent Joint Board of Defense was organized by Canada and the United States to prepare the coast for a possible Nazi invasion. By September, the United States and the United Kingdom had agreed on the destroyers for bases deal, eventually resulting in the construction of three United States bases on Newfoundland soil.³ The construction and manning of bases in Newfoundland by United States-Canadian forces meant that control of the northwest Atlantic was once again secured for the United States. Also, from these bases planes could be used in the protection of convoys against German sea attacks.⁴ Obviously, these bases were of immense strategic value.

During this year of great stress, it was suggested by a member of the Canadian Senate, William Duff, that Canada go further and occupy Newfoundland as "a wartime aid to Britain." Canadian newspapers supported this position,

³MacKay, p. 494.

⁴MacKay, pp. 496-97. In a protocol signed March 27, 1941, between the United States and the United Kingdom, it was stated that should responsible government return to Newfoundland the leases for these bases would still be in force. Canada's right to be consulted by the United States regarding the operations or defense of these Newfoundland bases was also pointed out. St John Chadwick, Newfoundland: Island into Province (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967), p. 179.

creating a great fear in the minds of Newfoundlanders that they would be forced into confederation. To this Joseph Smallwood, a writer and radio personality, in a broadcast (December 1940) on the Newfoundland government radio station objected that:

There is no pretext, no excuse, no justification for putting Newfoundland into Confederation except by the free and ready will of the Newfoundland people, duly and regularly expressed by a secret ballot. Putting us into Confederation without complete consent in writing would be illegal and unconstitutional.⁵

But talk was as far as Canadian action would go; Newfoundland was not to be coerced.

Early in 1941, the largest vessel to ever enter St. John's harbor brought the first of the American troops, and work began in Newfoundland on the base locations that the United States had leased.⁶ Later, in the early summer,

⁵Richard Gwyn, Smallwood: The Unlikely Revolutionary (Toronto: McClelland and Steward Limited, 1972), p. 55. Joseph Smallwood was born in Gambo, Newfoundland on December 24, 1900. After receiving his formal education and working as an apprentice printer, he became a reporter in St. John's. Leaving St. John's, he gained further experience in New York (New York Call) and Boston (Boston Herald-Traveler). Upon his return to Newfoundland in the mid-twenties, Smallwood turned his energies to politics. In 1932, his attempt to be elected to the Newfoundland Legislature failed. During the years preceeding the National Convention of 1946, Smallwood wrote and edited a number of books on Newfoundland. Also, starting in the late thirties, he began broadcasting (six nights a week) a radio show called "The Barrelman," which told stories of Newfoundland and their country. The program lasted six years and made his name a household item throughout Newfoundland. Smallwood became the leading spokesman for the confederationist movement generated by the National Convention. James R. Thoms, ed., Newfoundland and Labrador Who's Who: Centennial Edition, 1967-68 (St. John's: E.C. Boone Advertising Limited, n.d.), pp. 2-3.

⁶S.J.R. Noel, Politics in Newfoundland (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 243.

Canada began work on its leased Goose Bay, Labrador, air-field to be used as a resupply base for planes, in addition to defense.⁷ A boom period began in Newfoundland that would eventually employ some 19,000 Newfoundlanders on United States-Canadian projects.⁸ With the beginning of construction, the position of the Newfoundland Commission Government's revenues versus expenditures was to move to surplus status. Although this prosperity was welcome, the Commission Government would not come out of these changes unscathed since it had attempted to get the Americans to pay no more than thirty-five cents per hour as wages. Though the Americans ignored this effort, the very fact that it took place was disheartening to the people.⁹

The most momentous event of 1942 was the visit in September of Clement Attlee, the United Kingdom Government's Dominions Secretary and Deputy Prime Minister. Attlee was upset because there was little local government. It became his intention to push the Commission Government to support local government in Newfoundland since Attlee viewed such

⁷MacKay, p. 506.

⁸MacKay, p. 221.

⁹Joseph Smallwood, ed., The Book of Newfoundland, III (St. John's: Newfoundland Book Publishers, [1966]), 110. Though the cost of living (base year 1938) would be up 63 per cent by the summer of 1944, the increase in wages more than offset this advance. The increase in prices also helped the Commission Government since it collected more money in customs revenue. MacKay, pp. 221-23.

a development as a necessary precursor to any restoration of responsible government. Consequently, the Commission Government actively began to push this concept through the establishment of the Local Government Department and the Special Acts passed to sanction these local governments. However, the chief obstacle to this move was the people, who did not want to be directly taxed for the support of local governments. The Commission Government handled the issue by attempting to persuade communities to accept the creation of local governments.¹⁰ This visit by Attlee once again focused attention on Newfoundland and was to raise the question with regard to Newfoundland and what form of government it should have after the war.

Early in the next year, 1943, the Newfoundland Board of Trade (Chamber of Commerce) requested that representative government be established. After further study, it also proceeded to call for a Royal Commission to examine Newfoundland's situation and make recommendations. This was opposed by seven labor unions, all of which suggested that the people should petition the United Kingdom Government when they wanted the former constitution restored.¹¹ The West

¹⁰John Parker, Newfoundland: Tenth Province of Canada (London: Lincolns-Prager (Publishers), Limited, 1950), pp. 40-41, 47.

¹¹Chadwick, p. 183.

Newfoundland Association (an "enlightened, progressive" organization based in Cornerbrook) while calling for a Royal Commission study, opposed a return to the former type of responsible government, since in its words, "politicians of that era are still considered as being incapable of providing good government, and are not wanted as an alternative to Commission Government."¹²

Clement Attlee, in an address to Parliament on May 5, 1942, enunciated Governmental policy in its effort to start steering Newfoundland, if possible, towards responsible government. He initiated this move by arranging for a "small Mission" of three M.P.s to visit Newfoundland in the early summer. There would be no written report. However, Attlee hoped that the men chosen would be able to find out how Newfoundland was doing in the war, tell the people there of the United Kingdom's fight, and study the way of life of people, both in towns and outports. The three appointees were: C.G. Ammon (Labor), Derrick Gunston (Conservative),¹³ and Alan Herbert (Independent).

Starting in late June, the three-man "Goodwill Mission" traveled over 3,000 miles by the end of its tour at the end

¹²Charles G. Ammon, Newfoundland: The Forgotten Island (London: Fabian Publications, Limited, and Victor Gollancz, Limited, 1944), p. 7; Chadwick, p. 183.

¹³Chadwick, p. 185.

of August.¹⁴ The three could not agree on a uniform interpretation of most of what they had seen. However, M.P. Herbert was certain that "[n]ot one of us recommended that Newfoundland should cease to be a Dominion and be absorbed by any other country; and we all agreed about the Ten Years' [development] Plan."¹⁵ But it was also a consensus of the "Goodwill Mission" that the men of the outports, still remembering the depression years and the political corruption of the twenties and early thirties under responsible government, desired no more contact with "the politicians."¹⁶

After studying the reports submitted to the Dominions Office, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Dominion Affairs, Emrys Evans, made a most important speech on December 2, 1943. In it he stated that though the island was doing well economically at that time, it was questionable how it would do in peace-time. Also, the Newfoundlanders had not requested a return to responsible government.

¹⁴Chadwick, p. 184.

¹⁵Chadwick, p. 186 citing A.P. Herbert, Independent Member, p. 287. The Ten Years' Plan was an economic development plan for Newfoundland. It would eventually be dropped as the United Kingdom Government found itself extremely hard up for money after the war. The lack of plentiful finances would also be an influencing factor in the United Kingdom's desire to be rid of the expense of Newfoundland's Commission Government.

¹⁶Ewart Young, ed., This Is Newfoundland (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1949), p. 62.

Continuing on, he stated that:

there should be no change in the present form of government while the war lasts.

As soon as possible after the end of the war...machinery must be provided for the enabling of the Newfoundland people to examine the future of the Island and to express their considered views as to the form of Government they desire...

Possible methods might include...[a] National Convention, but this is for further consideration...[T]here is no desire on the part of the Government to impose any particular solution...It is for Newfoundland to make the choice.¹⁷

After debate, no particular plan was officially adopted for the obtaining of Newfoundlanders' viewpoints regarding the country's future, but the United Kingdom Government's procedure was largely to follow along the lines of Evans' speech. Clearly, 1943, had witnessed the start of an important process--that of choosing a democratic form of government for Newfoundland.

Two other items of economic importance to Newfoundland's political future happened in 1943. First, with the containment of the German Navy, Newfoundland's chief export, fish,¹⁸ increased in demand. Secondly, the Commission Government, on urging by the Canadian Government, increased the personal¹⁹ and also corporation tax rate. This was not exactly an

¹⁷Chadwick, pp. 186-87 citing House of Commons, Parliamentary Debates, vol. 395 (December 2, 1943), cols. 596-600.

¹⁸MacKay, p. 225.

¹⁹Smallwood, III, 110.

entirely popular decision. However, both of these increased the Commission Government's revenues and, consequentially, its budget surplus.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four witnessed the beginning of the drive that would carry the Allies to victory in World War II over Germany, Italy, and Japan. Newfoundland had made a definite contribution to this effort. First, men from Newfoundland had fought in special units in the British military and some had enlisted in the Canadian forces. Secondly, a large part of the governmental revenue surpluses, generated through wartime prosperity being taxed, were lent in the form of interest-free loans to the United Kingdom. Newfoundland could not on any basis be accused of shirking her obligations to Mother England. Meanwhile, the new United Kingdom Government's Dominions Secretary, Lord Cranborne, in a speech to the House of Lords on May 3, 1944 restated the Government's position that once the war was over Newfoundland would be given the opportunity to chart its own course. He also expressed sentiment for a Newfoundland National Convention.²⁰ In August, three members of the Commission Government went to England to continue talks on the future of Newfoundland. Shortly thereafter, a senior Newfoundland district magistrate was chosen to write a plan depicting how

²⁰Chadwick, p. 192 citing Parliamentary Debates, Lords, vol. 191, 5th ser.

the members of the National Convention should be elected. ²¹

However, these plans for Newfoundland were put on the back-burner when Lord Cranborne announced on January 30, 1945 the suspension of further dialogue until the war was over. ²² The United Kingdom was in a financial crisis due to the continuation of the war on the fields of Europe and Asia. The war now required that the total effort of the United Kingdom be used to bring it to a speedy conclusion. The war in Europe ended in a complete Allied victory in May 1945, whereas in Asia the war dragged on into August. Meanwhile in a stunning election upset, the Labor Party under Clement Attlee ousted the former Conservative-dominated coalition government of Winston Churchill in June 1945.

The war had brought Newfoundland's people economic prosperity. The island's economy had been forcefully brought out of a deep depression. Because of the war, the Commission Government, having been placed in the background, escaped much possible criticism because almost all effort ²³ was directed towards winning the war. But once the war was over renewed criticism faced the Commission Government, especially on the government's radio station in a series of speeches by Peter Cashin. In these speeches, Cashin openly

²¹Chadwick, p. 192.

²²Chadwick, pp. 192-93.

²³Noel, p. 243.

attacked the Commission Government. Particularly, playing on the fear of forced confederation with Canada and also the pride of the Newfoundland people, he helped launch a petition drive "to demand the return of Responsible Government."²⁴

Despite the economic advances of Newfoundland during the war, doubts continued to arise concerning the strength of a peace-time economy. How was the Government to continue to pay for its increased expenditures for social service now that the abnormally prosperous war was over?²⁵ Also, where would returning veterans fit into the economy? Then, consider the fact that even after the war the predominant industry was still the fishery, which had shown severe fluctuations in the past. Exploration for minerals, the tourist trade, and the infant international air service via Canada and the United States were all small producers of revenue and jobs.²⁶ The question facing Newfoundland

²⁴Smallwood, III, 111-12. Peter Cashin was the son of a former Newfoundland Prime Minister. He had been a member of the Legislature for over ten years prior to the loss of responsible government. Due to his actions, two governments were brought down in which he was a cabinet member. He was a superb orator. Politically astute, Cashin, the unofficial spokesman for the responsible government faction, gave Smallwood and the confederationists a difficult time. Gwyn, p. 101.

²⁵MacKay, p. 228.

²⁶MacKay, pp. 229-30.

continued to be a familiar one: where would the money come from? And, if the money should cease flowing, how could any Newfoundland responsible government hope to exist? These were all hard questions that needed to be faced by Newfoundlanders in the near future.

Unfortunately, the United Kingdom Government could not immediately aid the Newfoundlanders in their search for answers to these questions. The Government in London had to face its own serious economic problems. These were staggering debts; the need to rebuild areas destroyed by German bombs; a war-torn economy; and now, thousands of men returning to the work force. London responded by cutting expenditures. Certainly, the prospect of continuing to finance the government of formerly depressed Newfoundland was not eagerly viewed. The people in Newfoundland, who had loyally supported the Mother Country, would not be cut adrift without their request. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom Government would probably be influenced by its own economic circumstances to some extent.

²⁷In retrospect, S.J.R. Noel had written in 1971 that the United Kingdom Government's choice was simple--it had to get itself permanently disentangled by creating an independent Newfoundland. Obviously, if Newfoundland was not to be independent, she had to become part of another country. There were only two possible grooms for the bride--the United States and Canada. But even here the suitors were far from equal and an examination of both revealed that the United States was not right for the relationship to be consummated. Consequentially, only Canada was left to take part in the marriage. Noel, pp. 244-45.

Finally, a few months after the war's end, the United Kingdom Government under Prime Minister Clement Attlee was ready to turn its attention to the Newfoundland question. In a speech on December 11, 1945, Attlee declared that London's policy was to:

set up in Newfoundland next year, as early as climatic conditions permit, an elected National Convention of Newfoundlanders. Elections to the Convention will be held broadly on the basis of former Parliamentary constituencies. All adults will be entitled to vote, and candidates for election will be required to be bona fide residents in the district they seek to represent.²⁸

Continuing on, he stated that the purpose of the National Convention would be:

To consider and discuss...the changes that have taken place in the financial and economic situation of the Island since 1934, and bearing in mind the extent to which the high revenues of recent years have been due to wartime conditions, to examine the position of the country and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government as to possible forms of future governments to be put before the people at a national referendum.²⁹

As a means of aiding the Convention, the Prime Minister offered to send an expert on "constitutional forms and procedure." Also, details relating to Newfoundland's economic health would be made available to Convention delegates. While the National Convention was meeting, the United Kingdom Government would proceed with a short-term (two to three year) economic scheme to help Newfoundland.

²⁸Noel, p. 245.

²⁹Noel, p. 245.

However, the Prime Minister stated that "the special difficulties of Britain's financial position...may well preclude us from undertaking fresh commitments." ³⁰ Mr. Attlee, in his speech, had made the Government's policy clear--namely, it was to be one of general help while awaiting the recommendations of the National Convention and the subsequent referendum.

Whereas, The Windsor Daily Star (hereafter referred to as the Star) gave just a brief mention of Attlee's speech, The (Toronto) Globe and Mail (hereafter referred to as the Globe and Mail) went into much greater detail on the events in the United Kingdom Parliament on that fateful December ³¹ 11. The latter paper's article pointed out that both sides in the House of Commons had endorsed the Government's decision regarding Newfoundland, while in the House of Lords, Viscount Addison, the Dominion's Secretary, elaborated on the Prime Minister's announcement. The intended election for the National Convention would be held during the first part of June, 1946. Also, contained in the speech was the United Kingdom Government's pledge of 1933 to give the people of Newfoundland a chance to choose what form of government they desired after their government had become self-supporting.

³⁰Chadwick, p. 193 citing Parliamentary Debates, Commons, vol. 417, 5th ser.

³¹Windsor Daily Star, December 11, 1945, p. 1 (hereafter cited as WS); Globe and Mail (Toronto), December 11, 1945, p. 1 (hereafter cited as GM).

James Maxwell, the leader of the Independent Labor Party (United Kingdom), welcomed the announcement as this would erase "the biggest blot on the British Democratic System."³²

On December 13, in an editorial entitled "Newfoundland's Second Chance," the Globe and Mail asserted that the United Kingdom Government's announcement "was not unexpected." It went on to point out that Newfoundland enjoyed "an artificial prosperity" due to the war and that:

If the external economic situation is bad, Newfoundland is bound to suffer heavily. This factor coupled with the urgent need for improvement in health and education, for more roads and railways, and for substantial capital investment in development of natural resources, will impose a heavy responsibility on any local Government...[Newfoundland] has twice--in 1867 and again in 1869-- rejected an invitation [to join confederation], but, according to a clause in the British North America Act, may still, upon address from the Legislature, ask admittance. Opinion does not seem strong for the move, however, on either side [my italics].

The editorial stated that Canada was glad Newfoundland would once again have a chance to be self-governed, especially since the war had raised both to a higher stature. In conclusion, it was hoped that this new "partnership which has been sealed with the blood of both peoples [may] long endure."³³

The London Evening Free Press (hereafter referred to as the Free Press) in an editorial published on the

³²GM, Dec. 11, 1945, p. 1.

³³GM, Dec. 13, 1945, p. 6.

thirteenth mentioned that if it had not been for a "cheeseparing attitude" by certain Canadian administrations in Ottawa, "Newfoundland might well be a part of Canada today." Geographically, Newfoundland had to be considered an extension of Canada claimed the Free Press. Political union with Canada was an entirely different matter, especially "as time goes on and separate traditions are established." Concluding, the editorialist stated that the United Kingdom Government made a good decision in allowing Newfoundland to chart her own course while the country returned to a peace-time economy.

Later in December, the Star in its "Press Opinions" column (in which significant editorials from other newspapers, mostly Canadian, were reprinted) published an editorial from the Regina Leader-Post entitled "Newfoundland's Status." Now that Newfoundland seemed to be on the verge of reacquiring responsible government, the editorial stated, "If Newfoundland did seek admittance [to confederation], it is likely Canadians would welcome it." The editorial did express doubts about Newfoundland's capabilities to go it alone. The fragile economy, when paired with the fiscal needs of government, might undermine the country. Therefore, "[t]he best solution," concluded the editor, "may ultimately

³⁴London (Ontario) Evening Free Press, Dec. 13, 1945, p. 4. (hereafter cited as FP).

prove to be union with Canada."³⁵ Truer words, as it would turn out, could not have been written.

Three days later, in a cable from Ottawa on the twenty-ninth, the Star reported that it would be up to Newfoundland to ask for confederation. This was the opinion expressed by "constitutional authorities" viewing the happenings in Newfoundland. This policy, along with one of "non-interference," had been enunciated by Prime Minister Mackenzie King in July of 1943.³⁶ Newfoundland was to be allowed to chart its own course. Then, just as the year ended, W.L. Clark in his "As We See It" column in the Star pointed out that many Newfoundlanders might prefer to chart a course independent of Canada. In his article, Clark discussed the "strategic position" of Newfoundland with regard to both military planes and ships. He also stated that: "Many Newfoundlanders do not want any part of union with Canada. They are proud of their little island and intend to go it alone." This fact, he felt, was often overlooked when rank and file Canadians discussed the merits and demerits³⁷ of adding Newfoundland to confederation. This feeling would surface clearly in the opposition generated to the movement in Newfoundland towards confederation pushed by Joseph Smallwood, the chief spokesman for union with Canada.

³⁵WS, Dec. 26, 1945, p. 4.

³⁶WS, Dec. 29, 1945, p. 9.

³⁷WS, Dec. 31, 1945, p. 2.

1946: THE YEAR OF BEGINNING

The press in January 1946 had little coverage of Newfoundland affairs. A Reuter's dispatch from London (England) dated fifteenth of January proclaimed the appointment of a new governor, Gordon Macdonald, for Newfoundland. It was pointed out that Macdonald was a former miner, who was also a tee-totaller, non-smoker, and a lay preacher in a non-conformist church.¹ Compared to the people he would now be governing, he had (to put it mildly) a less than exciting background and personality.

On the thirteenth of February, the Free Press carried a dispatch from St. John's stating that the National Convention, which was still to be elected would meet in June.² The Globe and Mail and the Star carried identical Canadian Press cables from St. John's on the twenty-second reporting that the National Convention would probably present Newfoundlanders three possible choices: confederation with Canada, self-government, or a colonial type status. Of these, confederation definitely would require a consideration by the convention of the Canadian Government's attitude toward the question. The articles correctly pointed out that: "the difficulties [regarding possible confederation] will probably require considerable

¹FP, Jan. 16, 1946, p. 24; GM, Jan. 16, 1946, p. 2. All newspaper footnotes in this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, will refer to 1946.

²FP, Feb. 13, p. 8.

negotiation with the Dominion." These papers also stated the belief that the National Convention would be guided by a "British expert's report on the economic situation."³ The people in southwestern Ontario were being informed of events of concern to Canada regarding Newfoundland. However, much ground was yet to be covered.

During March none of the papers carried any news on Newfoundland. April was also another month of relative quiet on the newspaper front. Only the death of a former Newfoundland Trade Commissioner mentioned by the Free Press, and the Star's notation of census results broke the quiet. Incidentally, the Star showed the population of Newfoundland to have increased from 284,872 in 1935 to 312,889 in 1945, and St. John's from 38,473 to 43,179 during the same period.⁴ This increase hardly constituted a population explosion, but it illustrated growth. Considering Newfoundland's size, overpopulation was not readily apparent.

Early in May, the Globe and Mail carried an article datelined Ottawa. Canadian Justice Minister Louis St. Laurent, on May seventeenth announced a defense agreement. The paper's article carried information about a "defense pact"

³WS, Feb. 22, p. 11; GM, Feb. 22, p. 15.

⁴FP, April 2, p. 3; WS, April 27, p. 1.

agreed to by Newfoundland, Canada, and Britain whereby Canada, in the event of an emergency, would assume control of Newfoundland's airports for military purposes and any other bases that might be agreed upon by the three countries. St. Laurent simultaneously complimented the Newfoundland people for their great wartime effort.⁵

The eighteenth of May edition of the Globe and Mail contained the main points of an interview held in Halifax with J.B. MacAvoy, a St. John's lawyer, in which he took a strong pro-confederation stand. In the interview, he praised the Commission Government for the stability it had brought the Island. However, he did not feel the situation was totally satisfactory since the government was undemocratic. From the social, geographic, cultural, and economic viewpoints, MacAvoy contended in this interview that Newfoundland should be a province of Canada.⁶

About mid-June, in identical articles, the Free Press and the Star announced that in a non-partisan election to be held Friday, June 21, delegates to the National Convention would be chosen.⁷ There were approximately 156,000 people eligible to vote in thirty-five districts for forty-two members. Seven were elected by acclamation, while voting in three remote districts was postponed. The election

⁵ GM, May 8, p. 10.

⁶ GM, May 18, p. 7.

⁷ WS, June 15, p. 15; FP, June 19, p. 19.

turnout was predicted to be less than total.⁸ The Globe and Mail noted that only two members elected had served under responsible government. They were Peter Cashin, former finance secretary in the 1928 government led by Sir Richard Squires, and R.B. Job, who had been a member of the Legislative Council.⁹

Two important facts related to the National Convention were reported on June 24. First, the form of government Newfoundland might choose would "follow a minute study of the economy." Secondly, Joseph Smallwood, a pro-confederationist,¹⁰ was assured of election to the Convention. From Ottawa the next day, also came a report that Justice Minister St. Laurent had stated in the Commons, in reply to a question put to him by the opposition, that if Newfoundland wanted to "throw in their lot with Canada," union would be given "most earnest and sympathetic consideration." Pointing out that he must be "careful in what I say...[T]his government would not wish to appear to be interfering in the affairs of that colony."¹¹ On the twenty-sixth in a followup editorial, the Globe and Mail pointed out that through the National

⁸FP, June 21, p. 8. Turnout was, in fact, less than 50 per cent. Noel, p. 246.

⁹GM, June 21, p. 2.

¹⁰GM, June 24, p. 3.

¹¹GM, June 25, p. 2.

Convention "Newfoundland [would be plotting] her future."¹²
 Significantly, the Star in July published the results of
 a Canadian Gallop Poll. The question posed to the Canadian
 participants was: "Do you think Canada should invite
 Newfoundland to become the tenth province or not?" The
 results were:

Should be invited:	57%
Should not be invited:	16%
Qualified:	3%
No opinion:	24%

From this Poll's result, the Star felt that there could
 be no question but that the Canadian people desired New-
 foundland to be part of confederation.¹³

In the only article concerning Newfoundland published
 in August, the Free Press gave out the information that the
 National Convention would assemble in St. John's on September
¹⁴
 11. Thus, the stage was now set for the National Convention.

The Star, on September 6, carried a short article stating
 that the National Convention would open the following
¹⁵
 Wednesday, September 11. On the ninth, the Star related
 that the counting of ballots for the last Labrador represen-
 tative had begun and on the eleventh, the day of the conven-
 tion, this paper carried the results of that last election.¹⁶

¹²GM, June 26, p. 6.

¹³WS, July 31, sec. 2, p. 5.

¹⁴FP, Aug. 5, p. 10.

¹⁵WS, Sept. 6, p. 8.

¹⁶WS, Sept. 8, sec. 2, p. 1; WS, Sept. 11, p. 20.

In Ottawa on September 11, Lord Addison, the United Kingdom Dominions Secretary, stated in a press conference that Newfoundland "is deciding for itself what its future would be. I won't prejudice its position by giving any advice."¹⁷

On the same day that Lord Addison had made this statement, the governor of Newfoundland, Gordon Macdonald, opened the National Convention with a speech. In his speech, he stated that it was the duty of the National Convention "to examine the position of the country and to make recommendations [to the United Kingdom government as to alternatives to be voted on by] the people at a national referendum." While he acknowledged that the task would not be easy, he pointed out that the "destiny" of Newfoundland laid "in their hands."¹⁸

Both the Globe and Mail and the Star carried short excerpts and a basic summation of this speech.¹⁹ The same day the Free Press in an editorial entitled "Newfoundland's Future," related the story of how the National Convention had come about. While pointing out that Canada would consider the possibility of Newfoundland joining it "desirable," the editorial concluded:

¹⁷GM, Sept. 12, p. 17.

¹⁸Gordon Macdonald, Newfoundland at the Crossroads: Speeches and Radio Addresses (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1949), pp. 16-18.

¹⁹GM, Sept. 12, p. 17; WS, Sept. 12, p. 13.

It is unlikely that Newfoundland... particularly now that they are prosperous and having a balance in the treasury, will consider joining with the Dominion. They will be welcome, but it is entirely a matter for the Newfoundlanders themselves.²⁰

Simultaneous to the meeting of the National Convention, a long series of articles by Ken W. MacTaggart, a member of the Globe and Mail staff, appeared during September in the newspaper. This series of thirteen articles, because of their detail, revealed a lot about Newfoundland to the average Canadian reader of the Globe and Mail, especially since most Canadians knew little about Newfoundland. In his opening article, MacTaggart pointed out that Newfoundlanders felt their land was valuable, particularly because of its strategic location. However, one of the Newfoundlanders he interviewed stated that most of the people opposed confederation now. But he also pointed out that because of a fear of depression, Newfoundland might later seek and accept confederation, if the terms were favorable.²¹ The next article said that because of high tariffs, the people felt that the Newfoundlander's dollar only bought about 50 per cent (most optimistic) to about 18 per cent (most pessimistic) of what a dollar bought in Canada. Again, Newfoundlanders continued to express a fear of a new depression which would create a fiscal problem for government. Some mentioned that if

²⁰FP, Sept. 12, p. 4.

²¹GM, Sept. 11, p. 15.

Newfoundland joined Canada then Canada's wealth would help
 pull the government through.²² Although Newfoundland
 faced serious economic questions, MacTaggart certainly be-
 lieved the people would not turn to a radical solution, such
 as communism, for their problems. This was due to their
 loyalty to "democratic ideals." Still, problems had to be
 answered. MacTaggart pointed out that because of the wide
 dispersion of the people, the cost of government was extreme-
 ly high.²³ In an article published September 17, he reported
 that the economy was divided into two major economic groups--
 "the merchants" and "the other" or "the poor." Due to the
 distribution of Eaton's catalogue along the west coast of the
 island, these "others" leaned towards confederation.²⁴

On Wednesday, September 18, MacTaggart's column
 shifted emphasis and dealt with Joseph Smallwood, who
 stated that he felt the National Convention should send
 a delegation to Ottawa to ask how Canada would feel about
 confederation.²⁵ On September 19, MacTaggart related how
 rumors (especially about how Washington, Ottawa, and London

²²GM, Sept. 14, p. 15.

²³GM, Sept. 16, p. 17.

²⁴GM, Sept. 17, p. 15. Eaton's was a large Canadian
 mail-order department store, whose catalogue contained lower-
 priced goods available to these Newfoundlanders.

²⁵GM, Sept. 18, p. 13.

were conspiring to put Newfoundland into confederation) caused great trepidation in the populace. Also contained in the article was a proposal by the "influential and forward St. John's Daily News" that Newfoundland could give Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States permission to take care of all its external affairs in return for an annual grant.²⁶

An article on September 21, concluded by stating the confederationist viewpoint that if they (the confederationists) failed now, they would not give up.

This attitude combined with a general dislike for the Commission Government by the delegates, left only self-government and confederation with viable support in the Convention.²⁷

Yet, the next articles stressed how Newfoundlanders, who prided themselves on their British heritage, disliked the way past British governments had treated them. These articles also pointed out that the idea of confederation was generally disliked and would no doubt be opposed by the Convention.²⁸

Obviously, MacTaggart's articles illustrated that in September 1946, Newfoundland had not yet decided on its political future. On September 26, he wrote that the people definitely wanted to choose their own future. He

²⁶GM, Sept. 19, p. 15.

²⁷GM, Sept. 20, p. 15.

²⁸GM, Sept. 21, p. 17; GM, Sept. 25, p. 15.

felt that the people in the outports would provide the key
²⁹ vote in determining Newfoundland's future. The following
 day MacTaggart indicated that it seemed few wanted confeder-
 ation, especially fishermen. The latter liked the
 Commission Government because of its help in their dealings
³⁰ with the merchants. A key man to watch in an effort to
 predict Newfoundland's direction, according to MacTaggart,
 was Chesley Crosbie because of his wide support. However,
³¹ he had not yet chosen a position. In his last article
 in the series, MacTaggart told how the Convention had
 divided into committees to study various aspects of New-
 foundland. It was speculated that within four months,
 suggestions for a plebiscite would be ready to present to
³² the United Kingdom Government. There can be little doubt
 that because of the breadth and scope of these articles
 the Globe and Mail's writer, while giving an even-handed
 analysis, greatly increased the Ontario residents' knowledge
 of Newfoundland.

In early October, the Star ran a series of articles
 by the Canadian Press on Newfoundland. The first article
 dealt with the background history of how the National

²⁹GM, Sept. 26, p. 15.

³⁰GM, Sept. 27, p. 15.

³¹GM, Sept. 28, p. 15.

³²GM, Sept. 30, p. 9.

Convention came about. In the writer's opinion about half of the members had an open mind towards all future forms of government.³³ A second article dealt with Newfoundland's economy, an economy that was "vulnerable to outside influences." It was felt that this exposed economy might be the "deciding factor in the choice of the future form of government."³⁴ The last three articles dealt with spokesmen for each of the three major choices (confederation, responsible government, and Commission Government), who pointed out the advantages of their choice. Smallwood pointed out good points for both Canada and Newfoundland in his arguments for confederation.³⁵ Peter Cashin forcefully argued the pro-responsible government position. His best argument concerned the 1933 agreement which stated that when the economy had righted itself, responsible government would be restored.³⁶ The last article pointed out the positive accomplishments of Commission Government.³⁷ Through these articles the Canadian Press made available to

³³WS, Oct. 9, p. 10.

³⁴WS, Oct. 10, p. 11; FP, Oct. 10, p. 5.

³⁵WS, Oct. 11, sec. 2, p. 1.

³⁶WS, Oct. 12, p. 9.

³⁷WS, Oct. 17, p. 13.

newspapers across Canada information which they could use to help better inform the Canadian people about the political situation. Also on October 10, in the "As We See It" column, by the Star's W.L. Clark, appeared the results of a poll of Newfoundlanders as to what form of government they desired. Over 3,700 favored responsible government, 2,000 union with Canada, a little over 1,900 for union with Great Britian, and 1,900 for union with the United States. Clark felt it was significant that so many favored union with the United States.³⁸

Late in October, both the Globe and Mail and the Star covered a debate in the National Convention in which Joseph Smallwood was the principal speaker. Smallwood had moved a resolution October 29 that would have asked the Canadian Government if it was interested in adding Newfoundland and on what terms. He felt that the people of Newfoundland should be informed of the results so that confederation might be included on the referendum ballot. In opposing this resolution, some members charged that they were offered bribes to vote "yes." While admitting he was an "anti-confederate," Gordon Higgins stated that the Convention's purpose was to discuss facts first, then only afterwards might Smallwood's resolution be taken up.³⁹ The next day

³⁸WS, Oct. 10, p. 2.

³⁹GM, Oct. 30, p. 8; WS, Oct. 29, p. 1; WS, Oct. 30, sec. 2, p. 1.

the Free Press reported a denial of one of the bribes by the Liberal Government in Ottawa.⁴⁰ Debate on Smallwood's resolution continued. Before debate was halted due to a possible stroke suffered by one of the members, Kenneth Brown, William J. Banfield, representing Fortune Bay, made an elegant speech supporting Smallwood's motion. He said:

Whether we are confederates or anti-confederates...It isn't a motion that makes us confederates or anti-confederates...[as we are not asked to take a particular stand]. If I were the bitterest anti-confederate, I would vote for it, to get the terms of confederation-- even if it was only for the purpose of attacking the terms when we got them.⁴¹

On November first, the Globe and Mail carried a dispatch stating that Newfoundland Justice Charles Fox had ruled that the National Convention could send delegates to Ottawa to discuss confederation and possible terms for it, if it was Canada's desire to discuss this topic.⁴² Thus, legally the door had been opened to send a delegation to Ottawa. The next day when St. Laurent was asked for the Canadian Government's position on Newfoundland's sending a delegation, he replied that they would be received. He went on to reiterate the Canadian Government policy of not "interfering"

⁴⁰FP, Oct. 31, p. 2.

⁴¹GM, Oct. 31, p. 10; FP, Oct. 31, p. 6.

⁴²GM, Nov. 1, p. 10.

43

in the affairs of Newfoundland. This was a very cautious response by the Canadian Government. Needless to say it was also a very wise one.

In a dispatch from St. John's on the fifth, two important moves in the National Convention were reported. First, an amendment by Gordon Bradley to defer sending a delegation to Ottawa was added to Smallwood's motion. Secondly, when Professor K.C. Wheare, the constitutional adviser sent by London to help the National Convention, was asked if confederation could be recommended for the referendum ballot, he replied affirmatively.⁴⁴ On the following day, the Convention passed a motion to defer talk on Smallwood's resolution until after the Convention had a complete study of the country's position.⁴⁵

In December, the newspapers reported increasing sentiment against the Commission Government. The Star on December 13, contained a summation of a committee report criticizing the Commission Government for taking over in March 1946, the Gander airport "for no conceivable local

⁴³GM, Nov. 2, p. 17; WS, Nov. 2, sec. 2, p. 2; FP, Nov. 2, p. 11.

⁴⁴GM, Nov. 6, p. 13; FP, Nov. 6, p. 15.

⁴⁵WS, Nov. 7, p. 16.

or national use."⁴⁶ Shortly thereafter, in a Montreal interview with the Canadian Press, Peter Cashin stated that confederation was "very unlikely" and that he saw no advantage in it. Continuing on, he criticized the leasing of land to the United States without Newfoundland's consent and also alleged mismanagement of the Gander airport situation by the Commission Government.⁴⁷ However the following day, the Star editorialized that Cashin's statement on confederation could not be viewed as "unfriendly to Canada." And as it was up to Newfoundland to decide whether to seek union with Canada, the editor expressed the desire that "our friendly relations should continue firm and unimpaired."⁴⁸

In an article datelined St. John's, the Star stated that a three week Christmas recess was to take place and that members of the Convention had shown increased hostility towards the Commission Government. It could safely be stated that a majority of the members favored a return to responsible government. But there still was much committee work to be finished, especially as the largest government department, Health and Welfare, had not yet been reported on.

⁴⁶WS, Dec. 13, p. 29. Gander, which had been used for a transatlantic airplane refueling stop during the war, was acquired from the Canadian Government for \$1,000,000. Due to its isolation and the infancy of the international air travel industry, Gander became an expense rather than a source of revenue for the Newfoundland Commission Government.

⁴⁷WS, Dec. 19, p. 26.

⁴⁸WS, Dec. 20, p. 4.

The pro-responsible government faction had expressed some fear and uncertainty over the economy of the country. For self-government, it was imperative that Newfoundland be self-supporting. In discussing the results of the Convention, the (St. John's) Evening Telegram had declared:

What undoubtedly has been accomplished by the convention has been to stir the public mind regarding its affairs and to reawaken interest in the democratic form of government of which Newfoundland for twelve years has been deprived.

Thus concluded the Star's article on this first series of meetings of the National Convention.⁴⁹ It had appeared that the tasting of democracy by Newfoundland had only wetted its appetite for more.

Late in December, an article in the Free Press stated that Newfoundland's direct tax revenue had hit an all time high (30 per cent of total revenue) in the fiscal year ending March 31. Over 20,000 income tax returns had been filed compared to only 6,000 in 1940.⁵⁰ Newfoundland had definitely recovered economically, but still the nagging question remained-- how would peace-time treat the nation? On the last day of the year, the Star used three sections to summarize the leading stories of the year. Neither Newfoundland nor her Convention was covered on any of these pages.⁵¹ Enough said!

⁴⁹ WS, Dec. 21, p. 13.

⁵⁰ FP, Dec. 27, p. 5.

⁵¹ WS, Dec. 31, sec. 3-5.

1947: THE YEAR OF PROBING

January of this year commenced only with coverage of smaller stories. The Star on January 11 reported that a motion for a conference concerning Gander airport was introduced in the National Convention by Robert Job. Instead of the Newfoundland Government running the airport and charging fees for its use, Job wanted to trade off the airport's use for trade concessions from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada.¹ No further mention was made of this so apparently the motion failed or was not implemented due to constitutional problems. Later in the month, the Free Press reported that Newfoundland had been hit by a coal shortage worse than any during the war. This was due partly to a shipping strike and lack of any other readily available energy alternatives.² Newfoundland's economy was once again demonstrating its vulnerability.

In February, more significant stories surfaced. As the result of another motion made in the National Convention by Robert Job, an anti-confederate, and then passed, the members of the Convention sought a meeting with the governor-in-council, to discuss a number of questions. Confederation

¹WS, Jan. 11, 1947, sec. 3, p. 8. All other footnotes for this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, refer to 1947.

²FP, Jan. 20, p. 18.

was one of the issues raised. Job stated that he felt the Commission Government could approach Ottawa for information concerning the possibility of confederation rather than have the Convention send a delegation there.³ In a story filed on the sixth of February by Ken MacTaggart, the writer stated that Canadian officials in Ottawa felt that until Newfoundland had talked to both Washington and London, it was doubtful that they (Newfoundland) would "approach Canada with any proposals for federation." Also reported were the recommendations of the National Convention that until Washington, London, and Ottawa had been sounded out, no "final recommendations" should be made. In closing, the author restated Ottawa's willingness to accept a Newfoundland delegation.⁴ The Star during the last days of February reported the Commission Government did not feel that a Washington delegation to seek "possible new economic relationships with the United States" was within the scope of the Convention. However, delegations to either Ottawa or London could be sent, if those governments chose to receive them.⁵ The Free Press reported from Ottawa on the twenty-eighth that the Convention was expected to vote either "today or tomorrow" on the sending of delegations to Ottawa and London. This

³WS, Feb. 5, p. 21.

⁴GM, Feb. 7, p. 17.

⁵WS, Feb. 27, p. 1; WS, Feb. 28, sec. 2, p. 1.

article emphasized the fact that the Canadian Government had "no idea what they [National Convention] have in mind" but that a delegation would probably be sent to London before Ottawa.⁶

On March 1, both the Star and the Free Press reported that the National Convention had voted twenty-four to sixteen to accept Smallwood's motion to send a delegation to Canada, if Ottawa was willing to meet them. Earlier in the day, a mission to London had also been approved.⁷ The Star five days later carried an article raising the question of whether Newfoundland would want to join a country (Canada) in which the central and provincial government were each fighting to get the upper hand.⁸ A very valid question! Editorializing on the seventh, the Globe and Mail welcomed the idea of a Newfoundland delegation visiting Ottawa. It went on to point out that Newfoundland's assets exceeded her liabilities. Therefore, Canada should "welcome Newfoundland as the tenth Province...and not be too harsh about the terms"-- if Newfoundland opted for confederation.⁹ W.L. Clark of the Star correctly pointed out that Newfoundland would not rush

⁶FP, Feb. 28, p. 14.

⁷WS, March 1, p. 10; FP, March 1, p. 1.

⁸WS, March 6, sec. 2, p. 1.

⁹GM, March 7, p. 6.

into confederation, but perhaps the people would come to that decision "slowly."¹⁰ On March 11, Canadian M.P. John R. MacNicol, called for the Canadian negotiators to give Newfoundland terms in the forthcoming talks that could not be refused.¹¹ The Globe and Mail, on the twentieth of March, reported that the members of the London delegation had been selected.¹² And four days later, the Star added that the Governor of Newfoundland had been invited by London to accompany the Newfoundland delegation for the talks.¹³

On April Fool's Day, the Star carried the news that the London delegation would depart for England on April 24.¹⁴ All three papers carried the announcement of a seven member delegation that would visit Ottawa after the London envoys had returned. John Marshall, reporting for the Star, included a statement from a Liberal Member of Parliament, L.E.M. Baker, that it was in the "strategic, economic, and political interest of both countries if this union can be brought about." The Globe and Mail's article made it clear that the visit was exploratory and went on to state that while union was felt to be in the Canadian interest, businessmen in Newfoundland, out of fear for themselves, would oppose confederation.¹⁵

¹⁰WS, March 8, p. 2.

¹¹FP, March 12, p. 7.

¹²GM, March 20, p. 2.

¹³WS, March 24, p. 7.

¹⁴WS, April 1, p. 8.

¹⁵WS, April 3, p. 6; GM, April 3, p. 3; FP, April 2, p. 3.

On the fifth, the Free Press reported a proposal to unite all the Atlantic provinces together with Newfoundland, if she joined, into one larger entity. This idea came from a member of the Canadian Parliament, but was immediately attacked by people from those provinces.¹⁶ W.L. Clark, in his column for the Star, stated the opinion that if Newfoundland joined Canada, Britain would still be guaranteed use of its bases in the province.¹⁷ Another Star writer, H.L. MacPherson, pointed out on April 10, that Newfoundlanders would be given a chance to determine their own future and would not be treated as Eastern Europe had been by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.¹⁸ The Free Press that same day carried an anti-confederationist editorial reprinted from the Edmonton Journal. In this article, it was argued that the addition of Newfoundland would create "serious burdens for Canada," especially fiscally. To the argument of economic gains to be obtained from union for Canada, the editor stated that he felt Canadian companies had already carved a good-sized niche in Newfoundland for themselves. Therefore, "a political union would not necessarily bring further economic benefits." As for strategic factors, the United States and Canadian bases were enough to take care¹⁹ of any possible defense needs.

¹⁶FP, April 5, p. 9.

¹⁷WS, April 7, p. 2.

¹⁸WS, April 10, p. 4.

¹⁹FP, April 10, p. 16; FP, April 10, p. 4.

On the twelfth of March all three papers contained the news that the proposal to send a delegation to Washington had been voted down by the Convention, thirty-four to three.²⁰ This proposal had been put forth by people who sought economic union with the United States as the solution for Newfoundland's problem. Perhaps the vote would have been closer if the delegates had been aware of information released one week later. The Star of March 17, contained the news that the Newfoundland government had managed only a surplus of \$106,111 the prior year, the smallest since 1941.²¹

Meanwhile, on April 21, the Newfoundland delegation left for London and arrived on April 28.²² The three proposals concerning a form of government for study in the London meetings with Lord Addison were: "self rule with Dominion Status," commission government, and confederation with Canada.²³ While a London (England) writer warned that Newfoundland would cost Canada money, the Commission Government announced in Newfoundland that it expected a budget deficit of \$1,800,000 for 1947.²⁴ Both the Free Press and Star on May 14 carried the news that if Newfoundland rejected

²⁰GM, April 12, p. 1; FP, April 12, p. 27; WS, April 12, sec. 2, p. 2.

²¹WS, April 17, p. 21.

²²FP, April 21, p. 14; FP, April 28, p. 10.

²³GM, April 26, p. 2.

²⁴WS, May 9, p. 8; GM, May 9, p. 8.

commission government, it would lose its British loan
²⁵ guarantees. Just prior to this on the tenth of May and
 continuing off and on through the twentieth, all three
 papers carried stories about complaints raised by the
 Newfoundland London delegation. Peter Cashin was the most
 outspoken of these delegates. He complained that almost
 every request seeking help from the United Kingdom was
 rebuffed. He also charged the London Government was
 reneging on its "pledge" to give Newfoundland responsible
²⁶ government. On the nineteenth, Cashin proceeded to
 accuse the United Kingdom Government of "a conspiracy to
 sell this country to Canada." This was due to the almost
 complete guarantee that Newfoundland would lose development
²⁷ loans if it reclaimed its independence. Another member,
 Cheslie Crosbie of the London Delegation, declared that "we
 were frustrated at every turn...We brought home nothing
²⁸ because we were given nothing." The Free Press editor-
 ialized that because of these charges, Canada had to "walk
 warily as the Newfoundlanders are suspicious and touchy."
 For Canada, descretion was imperative since it was important

²⁵WS, May 14, p. 11; FP, May 14, p. 18.

²⁶GM, May 12, p. 3; GM, May 14, p. 12; FP, May 10, p. 12;
WS, May 12, p. 7.

²⁷GM, May 20, p. 1; WS, May 20, p. 9; FP, May 20, p. 7.

²⁸GM, May 21, p. 1; FP, May 21, p. 24.

that Newfoundland must avoid the feeling of being "sold down the river. To enter in that spirit and with a chip on their shoulders would not make for future good relations."²⁹ Because of Cashin's charges, the island was stirring with speculation.³⁰ On May 21, a dispatch from St. John's reported mixed reactions to all the charges. Some felt that it was part of a plot to force confederation. Others felt that it was designed to raise anti-confederate feelings. Still others felt that Britain was only being realistic in its stance.³¹ Some were now more determined than ever to push for self-government.³²

Articles in both the Star and Free Press on the twenty-fourth of May stated that the Canadian-Newfoundland talks would begin the next day.³³ The Star, on the previous day, had editorialized that Newfoundland was obtainable at a price. The editor felt though that the unofficial proposed amount of transfer grant of fifteen to eighteen million dollars a year was in reality a cheap price.³⁴ It was also reported that the Canadian Government would not pressure

²⁹FP, May 21, p. 4.

³⁰FP, May 22, p. 8.

³¹GM, May 22, p. 17.

³²GM, May 22, p. 17; WS, May 22, p. 13.

³³WS, May 24, p. 12, FP, May 24, p. 2.

³⁴WS, May 23, p. 4.

Newfoundland in the forthcoming talks. ³⁵ On May 31, the Globe and Mail announced the names of the Ottawa delegation. ³⁶ Included were two men, Gordon Bradley and Joseph Smallwood, who were ardent supporters of confederation. Also covered this month was the attempt to set up a delegation to go to Washington for trade and tariff talks. This idea was refused by the Commission Government as being outside the Convention's ³⁷ authority. On May 26 in St. John's, it was announced that ³⁸ the National Convention would probably end by August 15. In a dispatch from London four days later the news was carried that a United Kingdom M.P., Alan Herbert, had proposed that Newfoundland be given representation in Parliament and ³⁹ aid if it should choose to reclaim responsible government. However, his effort was not supported very well at all and subsequently would fail.

A news bulletin released on June 19 announced that Prime Minister King of Canada was expected to talk soon in Commons ⁴⁰ on the Newfoundland question. The same day the Free Press

³⁵GM, May 26, p. 18.

³⁶GM, May 31, p. 2.

³⁷WS, May 23, p. 17; WS, May 24, p. 12; FP, May 23, p. 7; GM, May 27, p. 2.

³⁸WS, May 26, p. 9.

³⁹WS, May 30, p. 16; FP, May 30, p. 27.

⁴⁰FP, June 19, p. 37.

also contained an editorial entitled "Newfoundland at the Crossroads." It was the writer's opinion that strategic factors more than political or economic factors would have "the most important bearing upon the...[forthcoming] negotiations." In his opinion, Newfoundland would not be coming "hat-in-hand" as a begger, but would be asking serious questions and "negotiations...will not be easy." The author pointed out that "[p]olitical union with Canada may not be the only answer" for Newfoundland.⁴¹ A very honest and interesting editorial! The Globe and Mail on the next day contained an editorial, which emphasized Newfoundland's need to still decide if it wanted Confederation after examining the results of "the forthcoming discussions."⁴² While the delegates left that day from St. John's for Ottawa, the Liberal Senator, A.N. McLean, in a speech to the Canadian Senate stated that Newfoundland would be a "great addition" to Canada. Continuing on, he said, that if the Canadian representatives would try "to meet Newfoundland more than halfway...[They will lay] the foundation of this partnership."⁴³

⁴¹FP, June 19, p. 4.

⁴²GM, June 20, p. 6.

⁴³GM, June 20, p. 17; FP, June 20, p. 10. In Canada, members of the Senate are not elected, but rather appointed to fill the vacancies as they occur. This is done by the Government in Ottawa. Appointees are usually members of the ruling party.

While the Newfoundlanders were still continuing on their journey to Ottawa, both Bradley and Smallwood made pro-confederation statements.⁴⁴ From the emphasis both sides had been displaying toward the idea of reaching agreement, it appeared the conference in Ottawa would be most beneficial.

From Ottawa, the Star's John Marshall wrote that only the first session of the meetings between Newfoundland and Canada was guaranteed to have public access. He went on to discuss the advantages of having Newfoundland join, while expressing the fear of Canadian authorities that Newfoundland would not soon decide to become a Canadian province.⁴⁵ While Marshall was writing this piece, Gordon Bradley was expressing the possibility of union within a year.⁴⁶ The Globe and Mail also included an editorial from The New York Times that told of Newfoundland's precarious economy and the choice they now faced.⁴⁷ On the twenty-fourth, all three papers reported that Prime Minister King had named eight cabinet ministers to represent Canada in the talks. St. Laurent, the external affairs minister, was chosen to head the delegation. Prime Minister King, in his speech to Commons, made it clear that Canada would not try to influence the Newfoundlanders. He

⁴⁴WS, June 21, sec. 2, p. 1; FP, June 21, p. 1.

⁴⁵WS, June 23, p. 16.

⁴⁶GM, June 23, p. 3.

⁴⁷GM, June 23, p. 8.

also stated that the talks were nothing more than an
⁴⁸
 exchange of information.

All the newspapers covered the press questioning of
 Bradley of Newfoundland at the opening session. Many items
 (among them the Newfoundland debt, the United States bases,
 trade, and taxes) were listed by him as areas that would
 receive discussion. The purpose of the meetings was to
⁴⁹
 be "exploratory" in nature. Only the Free Press on June
 25, gave detailed coverage of Prime Minister King's opening
 speech stating that Canada would furnish the Newfoundland
 delegation with as complete information as possible for their
⁵⁰
 examination. The Star in an editorial that same day
 declared that Newfoundlanders generally felt neglected by
 England and hoped that the next twenty years would show
⁵¹
 improvements for them. Simultaneously, the Free Press
 alone carried a dispatch from London in which Lord Addison
 defended his handling of Newfoundland's London delegation.
 To those of the Ottawa delegation he wished good fortune and
 said that "Newfoundland had full liberty to decide what [it]...
⁵²
 think[s] best."

⁴⁸WS, June 24, p. 8; WS, June 24, p. 16; GM, June 24,
 pp. 1-2; FP, June 24, p. 14.

⁴⁹WS, June 25, p. 8; WS, June 25, p. 7; GM, June 25,
 p. 9; FP, June 25, pp. 2, 14.

⁵⁰FP, June 25, p. 14.

⁵¹WS, June 25, p. 4.

⁵²FP, June 25, p. 26.

All three papers reported on June 26, that the formal meetings would be adjourned for a week to allow each side to study the other's documents and to provide replies to questions that had arisen.⁵³ The Free Press in its editorial section commented that "we certainly don't want our neighbors to feel that they have been forced into an unwilling union" as there was no need for an addition to the "maritime provinces problems."⁵⁴ On the same day, the Star's editor discussed Newfoundland's objection to the United States bases and declared that, in his opinion, if Confederation did take place, the United States probably would give up the bases.⁵⁵ The last day of the month carried an announcement that the United States would surrender its Argentia base to Newfoundland.⁵⁶ This could hardly be attributed to the Star's editorial, but it helped to ease a potential problem.

In early July, while the Canadians were drafting replies to the Newfoundland questions, Smallwood studied the Fisheries Department so as to be better prepared for his presentation to the National Convention.⁵⁷ On the seventh, it was

⁵³ WS, June 26, pp. 19, 24; FP, June 26, p. 43; GM, June 26, p. 3; FP, July 3, p. 28; WS, July 3, pp. 1, 21.

⁵⁴ FP, June 26, p. 4.

⁵⁵ WS, June 26, p. 4.

⁵⁶ WS, June 30, sec. 2, p. 6.

⁵⁷ FP, July 5, p. 2.

announced that sub-committees were to be formed in the Canadian-Newfoundland talks to study and report facts on various topics, such as finances. This was to be done to help give the Newfoundland delegation as complete a report as possible to take back to the National Convention.⁵⁸ In a letter published on the editorial page of the Globe and Mail the former Financial Post correspondent in Newfoundland stated that he knew for a fact that union with the United States would not be on the referendum. Nevertheless, he urged that "generous terms" be offered Newfoundland.⁵⁹ In an editorial on July 9, the Globe and Mail expressed the fear that if Newfoundland should join the United States, Canada would become "geographically dependent." Thus, it was urged that favorable terms be offered to Newfoundland now, not in the future, when Newfoundland might come begging for union due to depression. Waiting was too great a risk to take.⁶⁰

The Free Press on July 11, carried a dispatch stating that Newfoundland was hoping to hold a plebiscite early in October, because it was felt that by August the National Convention would have finished its work.⁶¹ The Globe and Mail

⁵⁸FP, July 8, p. 20; GM, July 8, p. 13.

⁵⁹GM, July 8, p. 6. The Financial Post is the Canadian equivalent of the Wall Street Journal.

⁶⁰GM, July 9, p. 6.

⁶¹FP, July 11, p. 29.

that day contained an interview with Quebec Premier Duplessis in which he attacked Ottawa for not informing the Quebec Government about the Newfoundland-Canadian discussions. He went on to state that "no negotiations should be concluded without Quebec's opinion first being obtained and its consent

given."⁶² Duplessis had more than gone out of his way to challenge Ottawa's handling of the Newfoundland situation, but as time would prove his protests would be ignored. On the fifteenth, the Newfoundland delegation cabled St. John's to ask for more information on public services. The delegation secretary, Joseph Smallwood, stated he was unable to predict "when the discussion might end and the Newfoundland delegation embark for home."⁶³ External Affairs Minister St.

Laurent, when asked in Commons to comment on the state of negotiations,⁶⁴ replied only that they were continuing.

Joseph Smallwood in replying to news reporters' questions, stated that the date Newfoundland would hold its referendum would be determined when this delegation completed its work. He refused to comment on a report that several National Convention members were unhappy at the amount of time being spent in Ottawa by the Newfoundland delegation.⁶⁵ The next

⁶²GM, July 11, p. 15.

⁶³WS, July 16, p. 2; GM, July 16, p. 2.

⁶⁴GM, July 17, p. 8.

⁶⁵GM, July 18, p. 3.

day the Star reported that Joseph Smallwood said there was no basis for the article carried by the London (England) Daily Express stating that negotiations had collapsed. In fact, Smallwood was quite happy with the progress being made.⁶⁶ In commenting on this incident in an editorial on July 21, the Star pointed out that Smallwood was correct in saying that these talks were not negotiations nor had they collapsed.⁶⁷ The following day, the Star did report that the talks were being wound up.⁶⁸

Meanwhile, rumors and stories continued to surface, while all three papers reported the participants in the talks were pleased with the progress so far, Bradley and St. Laurent felt they had reached the central issue - would confederation work?⁶⁹ All three papers reported optimistic attitudes, but only the Globe and Mail ran a front-page banner headline on July 24, declaring that "Ottawa Parley Predict Entry of Newfoundland."⁷⁰ The Star had a similar feeling but ran its story back on page twenty-two.⁷¹ The next day W.L. Clark, in his "As We See It" column hastened to remind Canadians that the Ottawa talks were just that--talk.

⁶⁶WS, July 19, sec. 2, p. 2.

⁶⁷WS, July 21, p. 4.

⁶⁸WS, July 22, p. 16.

⁶⁹FP, July 23, pp. 1, 22; WS, July 23, p. 12; GM, July 23, p. 3.

⁷⁰GM, July 24, p. 1.

⁷¹WS, July 24, p. 22.

Before Newfoundland could go farther, the people would have to express their approval. Besides, Canadians should be aware that if Newfoundland was to join, it could not be considered a "bargain" since a great deal of money would have to be spent to upgrade the country.⁷² On the twenty-ninth, it was reported that both the question as to what was to become of Newfoundland's debt and how defense details would be worked out, remained to be discussed.⁷³ In his column on the thirty-first of July, W.L. Clark wrote that he felt the United States bases in Newfoundland were not blocking union. Despite the split in feelings on confederation in Newfoundland, it was his opinion that union "would work out to the advantage of all."⁷⁴

July had witnessed much progress in the Ottawa talks and with the first day of August came the announcement that a joint Newfoundland-Canadian committee had been chosen to draft a report containing possible terms for Newfoundland to enter confederation.⁷⁵ This report was to be submitted to the Canadian Cabinet for approval before the Newfoundland delegation presented it to the National Convention. On the fourth the Free Press reported that the talks were

⁷²WS, July 25, p. 2.

⁷³FP, July 29, p. 2; GM, July 29, p. 3.

⁷⁴WS, July 31, p. 2.

⁷⁵GM, Aug. 1, pp. 1,2; WS, Aug. 1, p. 13; FP, Aug. 1, p. 9.

the main attraction in Ottawa and possibly in a week, the terms would be completely drafted.⁷⁶ Smallwood felt the plebiscite could take place in May 1948 with Newfoundland joining Confederation the same year.⁷⁷ One could not accuse Smallwood of being a pessimist. The Globe and Mail on the seventh, reported the joint committee's work was continuing.⁷⁸ An article carried by the Star on August 9, explained that the Newfoundland people, who though they faced unique problems, would first give careful study to confederation before voting on it. A Canadian Press dispatch tried to explain some of the complexities of the economic issues that were causing difficulties in the Newfoundland talks. Ottawa had to walk a tight line so that its fiscal proposals would neither anger the provinces (by being too excessive) nor the Newfoundland voters (by being too strigent).⁷⁹ Definitely it was a dilemma for the Canadian negotiators.

The Free Press began on the nineteenth of August, a series of three articles on the editorial page in which George Wilkinson, a former Newfoundlander, attempted to convey to the readers a clear picture of Newfoundland. In

⁷⁶FP, Aug. 4, p. 5.

⁷⁷WS, Aug. 7, p. 11.

⁷⁸GM, Aug. 7, p. 1.

⁷⁹WS, Aug. 11, sec. 2, p. 2.

the first article, he covered the Newfoundland Government debt and how it might affect confederation.⁸⁰ Next, he wrote about the potential problem of Newfoundland's leased bases. He also stressed that it was every Canadian's responsibility to study what was happening in Ottawa.⁸¹ The last segment tried to alert the public to certain items, such as Commission Government and its background, that the readers might not be familiar with. The author concluded by calling for an end to Commission Government and a selection by the people of a new form of government.⁸²

Meanwhile, on the nineteenth of August, both the Globe and Mail and Star expressed the belief that the talks in Ottawa would soon be completed.⁸³ However, on the twenty-first, this optimism was dispelled when both Smallwood and Bradley stated that much remained to be done and no concluding date could yet be set.⁸⁴ Monday, August 25, saw the Globe and Mail carry an article stating that the drafting of the proposed terms of union might soon come to a close, but that it was impossible to predict what those terms might be.⁸⁵ The next day, W.L. Clark wrote in his column

⁸⁰FP, Aug. 19, p. 4.

⁸¹FP, Aug. 25, p. 4.

⁸²FP, Aug. 28, p. 4.

⁸³WS, Aug. 19, p. 14; GM, Aug. 19, p. 11.

⁸⁴GM, Aug. 21, p. 15; FP, Aug. 21, p. 19.

⁸⁵GM, Aug. 25, p. 3.

that the Newfoundlanders were a good people and "would make great Canadians."⁸⁶ Also, in the Star that day was a dispatch from Ottawa postulating that the reason discussions had taken so long was the Canadian Government's desire to avoid the "gimme" attitude of the provinces.⁸⁷ On the twenty-eighth, the subcommittee responsible for drafting of terms appointed Smallwood and Dr. R.A. MacKay of the External Affairs Department to write them. Once these had been accepted by everyone concerned, the Newfoundlanders expressed the desire that they be simultaneously released in Ottawa and St. John's.⁸⁸ On August 29, the Smallwood-MacKay draft was presented to the subcommittee for study while the talks adjourned.⁸⁹

Early September witnessed another attempt by the Quebec Government to have a say in the talks as a Quebec Government Minister claimed the Quebec-Labrador boundary was still in dispute.⁹⁰ A few days later more hot water was thrown on

⁸⁶WS, Aug. 26, p. 2.

⁸⁷WS, Aug. 26, p. 16.

⁸⁸GM, Aug. 29, p. 7.

⁸⁹GM, Aug. 30, p. 3; FP, Aug. 30, p. 5.

⁹⁰FP, Sept. 5, p. 10. In 1927, the Judicial Committee of the United Kingdom's Privy Council arbitrated a dispute between Newfoundland and Canada (representing Quebec) concerning the ownership of Labrador. The Judicial Committee ruled in favor of Newfoundland. The Quebec Government was still unhappy with the decision and wanted the boundary of Labrador finalized in their favor.

the talk participants when a telegram demanding the immediate return home of the Newfoundland delegation arrived from St. John's. It attacked them for "openly negotiating with the Canadian Government" and was signed by twenty-one of the forty-five National Convention delegates. However, sources that talked to the delegates in Ottawa reported that the delegates were confident they had stayed within their limitations.⁹¹ John Marshall, in his column in the Star, stated that it was the length of the meetings that had set off the protests of anti-confederates.⁹² In an editorial on the eleventh, the Star said the telegram showed the anti-confederate feeling of a goodly number of National Convention delegates, but cautioned against drawing the implication that the Newfoundland people felt the same.⁹³ Also that day, the Star and the Globe and Mail carried the telegraphed reply of Bradley for the delegation. It stated that the Convention's instructions were being followed and the delegation "will return at the earliest possible moment after the completion of their work." Also mentioned was that the possibility of having to give Labrador to Quebec was never discussed or mentioned in any of the talks.⁹⁴

⁹¹WS, Sept. 9, p. 1; WS, Sept. 10, p. 17; GM, Sept. 10, p. 15; FP, Sept. 10, p. 2.

⁹²WS, Sept. 10, p. 20.

⁹³WS, Sept. 11, p. 4.

⁹⁴GM, Sept. 11, p. 9; WS, Sept. 11, p. 19.

The first meeting of all the Canadian and Newfoundland participants since July 31 was held on September 23.

However, this was not expected to be a wrap-up meeting. ⁹⁵

The Globe and Mail carried a statement issued after the meeting in which it was indicated that, while further discussion was needed on a few areas, the talks would end on September 29. In a further article, the Globe and Mail carried the announcement by Bradley that the Newfoundland delegation would start home on the thirtieth. He defended his choice to refuse to break off the talks earlier as it "would rob the people of a chance to examine and give their verdict upon the basis of union." ⁹⁶ W.L. Clark, in his column

on the twenty-sixth of September, wrote that no matter what the arguments, it was inevitable that "[p]rogress cannot be stopped and it is part of progress for Newfoundland to join Canada." ⁹⁷ The next day the Globe and Mail and the Star

pointed out that the talks were just finishing up with a last meeting to be held on the twenty-ninth. ⁹⁸ All three papers reported that the Newfoundlanders had left without any finalized terms as it was still necessary for the Canadian

⁹⁵GM, Sept. 13, p. 17; WS, Sept. 13, p. 14.

⁹⁶GM, Sept. 15, p. 9.

⁹⁷WS, Sept. 26, p. 2.

⁹⁸GM, Sept. 27, p. 7; FP, Sept. 27, p. 9.

Cabinet and Parliament to approve them. It was hoped that this would be accomplished soon.⁹⁹

In the lead editorial, "A Tenth Province?," on October 1, the Globe and Mail charged that "[t]here seems no good reason why Canada's proposition should not be made known at once." Continuing on, the editor speculated that there would have to be provision for a "subsidy" as Newfoundland would suffer erosion of its tax base due to the loss of the tariff. He felt that Canada for the present would be giving up more than it would receive fiscally, but the future might change that. In closing, the editor proclaimed the willingness of Canada to accept Newfoundland, if that was her desire.¹⁰⁰

While on the way home some of the Newfoundlanders were interviewed. Bradley spoke favorably of the terms and stated emphatically that there was no way that Labrador would be given up.¹⁰¹ Smallwood was not as hesitant as Bradley since he felt confederation would be accomplished in 1948.¹⁰² On the third the Globe and Mail and the Star carried a story showing that Newfoundland had many able political men for the jobs confederation would create.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ GM, Sept. 30, p. 10; WS, Sept. 30, p. 13; FP, Sept. 30, p. 19.

¹⁰⁰ GM, Oct. 1, p. 6.

¹⁰¹ FP, Oct. 1, p. 26; WS, Oct. 2, p. 11.

¹⁰² GM, Oct. 1, p. 3; WS, Oct. 2, p. 11; FP, Oct. 2, p. 7.

¹⁰³ GM, Oct. 3, p. 15; WS, Oct. 3, p. 13.

Bradley in a talk warned that while Canada would not force Newfoundland to become a province, neither would it roll over and be overly generous.¹⁰⁴ The charge that the talks had not been very thorough, would not be the reason that they might fail as in prior Newfoundland confederation discussions.¹⁰⁵ On the eighth Bradley, the Chairman of the Convention, was faced with the demand that he resign by the members, who opposed his handling of the Ottawa mission. Joseph Smallwood defended him for his actions and added that "only the governor could dismiss him."¹⁰⁶ Despite their verbal assault, the chairman refused their request.

Finally, as he was being threatened with a no-confidence vote, Gordon Bradley resigned as Chairman, but not as delegate, of the National Convention. Angerly, he reminded the Convention that it was responsible for his selection after the death of the first Chairman, Justice Cyril Fox.¹⁰⁷ While Bradley was being attacked, so was the Canadian Government. The leader of the opposition, John Bracken, in the Commons, sought the proposed union details immediately and declared that he hoped Newfoundland would join Canada.¹⁰⁸ Then, the provincial

¹⁰⁴WS, Oct. 6, p. 17; GM, Oct. 6, p. 7.

¹⁰⁵FP, Oct. 8, p. 4.

¹⁰⁶GM, Oct. 9, p. 9.

¹⁰⁷GM, Oct. 11, pp. 1, 2; WS, Oct. 11, p. 9; FP, Oct. 11, p. 22.

¹⁰⁸WS, Oct. 11, p. 2; GM, Oct. 11, p. 3.

leaders of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island also sought, like Quebec, consultation of the provinces before Newfoundland should be allowed to join. ¹⁰⁹ In an editorial on October 11, the Star stressed that even though it might cost Canada some treasury money as set out in the still unreleased proposals, confederation would be worth it. However, the decision to determine the future of Newfoundland was still in the hands of the Newfoundland voters. ¹¹⁰ From St. John's came the news on the thirteenth that a St. John's lawyer, John B. McEvoy, had been selected to succeed Bradley as chairman. In that same session, Bradley predicted that by the end of the first week in November the proposed arrangements would be made public. To this Peter Cashin, the responsible government faction's leader, tartly replied that he did not expect any "terms," especially since the Canadian Government knew their proposals would not win in the plebisite. ¹¹¹ A bitter debate, in which the right of the people to know what was happening at the Convention, broke out on the fourteenth. Confederates especially opposed the proposal to end the radio broadcasts of the Convention as this was their best way to place their arguments before the people. ¹¹² The

¹⁰⁹FP, Oct. 11, p. 2; GM, Oct. 11, p. 3.

¹¹⁰WS, Oct. 11, p. 6.

¹¹¹GM, Oct. 14, p. 9.

¹¹²GM, Oct. 15, p. 2.

Star's W.L. Clark, expressed the hope that whatever decision the Newfoundlanders might make, it would be based on "facts and not...blind prejudice."¹¹³ Meanwhile back in St. John's on the fifteenth, the National Convention proceedings had been very harmonious, possibly due to the fact they were being broadcast.¹¹⁴ The Star carried a speech made by Peter Cashin on that day, in which he accused the Commission Government and the United Kingdom of having too much say and too little accountability to the Newfoundland people. He also claimed Newfoundland had never been in better fiscal shape and made a motion to accept the Convention's Finance Committee's report.¹¹⁵ That not all members agreed with the report was shown when it was sharply attacked by Joseph Smallwood for the report's complaint about the lack of compensation for the United States bases. Cashin proceeded to defend it. This hot argument was finally halted by the chairman.¹¹⁶

On October 20, writing from Ottawa, the Star's correspondent expressed the belief that the proposed terms would be disclosed shortly.¹¹⁷ Also, on this day the Free Press

¹¹³WS, Oct. 15, p. 2.

¹¹⁴GM, Oct. 16, p. 11; FP, Oct. 16, p. 28.

¹¹⁵WS, Oct. 17, p. 10.

¹¹⁶GM, Oct. 18, p. 2; WS, Oct. 18, p. 8.

¹¹⁷WS, Oct. 21, p. 20.

carried editorials from three major French Canadian papers criticizing the Quebec Government's handling of the attempt to get back Labrador, but not the idea.¹¹⁸ A Sydney (Nova Scotia) Post-Record editorial, expressing the belief that the anti-confederates were afraid of a referendum, was carried by the Star on the twenty-third.¹¹⁹ Near the end of the month articles appeared in the Star and the Free Press¹²⁰ pointing out that Newfoundland was nearing a historic vote.

In November the National Convention took up where it had left off in October with Joseph Smallwood, once again attacking the report of the Finance Committee. The report's prediction of future prosperity for the island and its lack of a forecast further than three years ahead were Smallwood's ammunition.¹²¹ The next day, November 5, witnessed a defense of the Finance Committee's report against Smallwood's complaint of only a three-year forecast.¹²²

The sixth of November was a very important day in Canadian-Newfoundland history: the proposed terms of union were revealed in both Ottawa and St. John's. The main points were:

¹¹⁸FP, Oct. 20, p. 4.

¹¹⁹WS, Oct. 23, p. 4.

¹²⁰FP, Oct. 25, p. 34; WS, Oct. 30, p. 17.

¹²¹GM, Nov. 5, p. 3; WS, Nov. 5, sec. 2, p. 1; FP, Nov. 5, p. 22.

¹²²WS, Nov. 6, p. 26.

1. a guaranteed annual tax transfer payment of \$6,800,000 until either 1951 or 1957 (Newfoundland's choice),
2. a transitional grant spread over twelve years amounting to \$25,450,000 (first three years \$3,500,000, thereafter decreasing by \$350,000 a year),
3. assumption of \$63 million out of the \$78 million Newfoundland debt,
4. Canada would operate all presently owned governmental transport and communication facilities,
5. appointment of a Royal Commission eight years after union to review Newfoundland's financial position, and
6. Newfoundland would also receive the special Maritime freight rates.¹²³

When these terms were read in St. John's to the Convention,

there was no debate, just notice of a motion to receive
¹²⁴ them.

Back in Ottawa, when St. Laurent introduced the terms, he made it clear the Government would not consult the provinces, but rather Parliament, the representatives
¹²⁵ of the people, for approval. The Canadian Government

added that Newfoundland should not use its treasury surplus to "unfair" advantage in the Maritime region, if confederation
¹²⁶ took place. On the following day, the Free Press

¹²³GM, Nov. 7, p. 2; WS, Nov. 6, pp. 1,2; FP, Nov. 6, pp. 1, 20, 43.

¹²⁴WS, Nov. 7, p. 11; GM, Nov. 7, p. 2.

¹²⁵WS, Nov. 6, p. 1; GM, Nov. 7, p. 1.

¹²⁶WS, Nov. 6, pp. 1,6; FP, Nov. 6, p. 43.

editorialized that Canadians should not forget that it was still Newfoundland's decision and, if she accepted, neither should they "begrudge" Newfoundland the monetary benefits she would get, especially as the addition of Newfoundland would strengthen the nation.¹²⁷ The Star stated that the paper felt the terms proposed were "fair" and, if Newfoundland rejected them, "[m]ost Canadians...would consider them shortsighted."¹²⁸ However, the Star's correspondent in Ottawa reminded his readers that Newfoundland might well refuse Canada's proposal in the referendum.¹²⁹ Definitely, an extra word of caution. Canada's proposals were also forwarded to London for study by the Commonwealth Relations Office.¹³⁰

Not everything was looking rosy by any stretch of the imagination back in North America. Reactions to the proposals from the people of St. John's were mixed at best, with a distinct weariness quite apparent.¹³¹ In the National Convention meeting of November 7, a motion to discuss the terms of union was refused though the report was accepted. At the same time a notice of motion by Gordon Higgins, an

¹²⁷ FP, Nov. 7, p. 4.

¹²⁸ WS, Nov. 7, p. 4.

¹²⁹ WS, Nov. 7, p. 28.

¹³⁰ FP, Nov. 8, p. 27.

¹³¹ GM, Nov. 8, p. 17; WS, Nov. 8, p. 7.

anti-confederate, to hold an immediate ballot was introduced.

It was now entirely possible the proposed terms might not
 132 even be discussed. If this had happened, it probably

would have been a fatal blow to the confederationists.

Shifting to Quebec City, Premier Duplessis attacked the
 Canadian Government for failing to discuss the terms with
 133 the provinces, especially Quebec. To this St. Laurent

replied that on the basis of the British North America Act
 134 there was no need to consult the provinces. On the tenth,

the Free Press stated in an editorial that if Duplessis and
 Quebec had been consulted on the terms that "would probably
 mean that Newfoundland would turn down the offer completely."
 135

Meanwhile, at the Convention, Joseph Smallwood filed a
 notice of a motion to hold a referendum offering three choices--
 commission government, responsible government, and confedera-
 tion. He also gave notice of a motion for the Convention
 136 to discuss the proposed financial terms. Certainly many
 Newfoundlanders endorsed this move. On November 12, a petition
 from the citizens of White Bay implored the Convention to

¹³²WS, Nov. 10, p. 8; WS, Nov. 8, pp. 7,12; FP, Nov. 8,
 pp. 1,16; GM, Nov. 8, p. 17.

¹³³GM, Nov. 8, p. 3; FP, Nov. 8, p. 36.

¹³⁴WS, Nov. 10, p. 8.

¹³⁵FP, Nov. 10, p. 4.

¹³⁶GM, Nov. 11, p. 17; WS, Nov. 11, sec. 2, p. 5.

divulge the proposed financial terms and also to put confederation on the ballot. By the sixteenth, similar petitions from seven other communities had arrived.

Finally, on November 21 Joseph Smallwood was able to begin presenting the proposed terms of union. The chairman had a hard time keeping order as both hostile remarks from some of the Convention members and bursts of cheering from the gallery created disturbances. When Smallwood began explaining the family allowance scheme, cheers interrupted and the meeting was adjourned. The cheering, when heard over the radio, must have made many a Newfoundlander's ear perk up and listen closer. During the next few days, Smallwood handled questions concerning union and the railroad, the civil service, defense relationships, transportation and unemployment.

Late in November, reporting was more general. The Star on the twenty-fifth of November carried a short notice from St. John's stating that an ad proclaiming the formation of a "Union with America Party" had appeared in the Daily News.

¹³⁷FP, Nov. 13, p. 6; WS, Nov. 17, p. 19.

¹³⁸GM, Nov. 22, p. 2; WS, Nov. 22, p. 9. The family allowance scheme involved the payment of money to parents with children under the age of sixteen to help with the cost of raising them.

¹³⁹WS, Nov. 26, sec. 2, p. 4; WS, Nov. 29, sec. 2, p. 4.

It proposed to seek terms from Washington in the same manner as from Ottawa and sought to have union with the United States placed on the ballot.¹⁴⁰ On the twenty-eighth of November, the Star reported that Premier Duplessis of Quebec had announced the finding of great amounts of valuable minerals in the north-central Quebec-Labrador region. He stated that about one-third of the wealth was in Labrador, a "territory in which we consider we have rights."¹⁴¹ Definitely his government would fight to try and get those rights and wealth!

During December the amount of ink given Newfoundland by the papers markedly decreased. The Star, in reprinting an editorial from the Brockville (Ontario) Recorder and Times, informed its readers that the iron ore of Labrador had been found in 1895.¹⁴² On the third, the Free Press carried an editorial that had first appeared in the Fort William (Ontario) Times Journal. This editorial pointed out that there was interest in Washington in Newfoundland-- interest from an annexationist viewpoint. However, Washington would surely respect the Newfoundlander's right of self-determination.¹⁴³ The Globe and Mail reported that in debate on the second on the floor of the National

¹⁴⁰WS, Nov. 25, p. 18.

¹⁴¹GM, Nov. 29, p. 2.

¹⁴²WS, Dec. 2, p. 4.

¹⁴³FP, Dec. 3, p. 4.

Convention, Peter Cashin, while holding a copy of the St. John's Evening Telegram containing an article on Quebec Premier Duplessis' viewpoints about Labrador, asked that the proposed Canadian terms be rejected because of Duplessis. John McEvoy, the Chairman, stated that the Quebec Premier was only "playing politics." To which Cashin replied, "It is time we finished with this foolish debating society." Only when Joseph Smallwood indicated he would table a communique to Ottawa asking about the effects of Duplessis' statements on the proposed terms; was the incident closed.¹⁴⁴ On the fifth of December, the Free Press in an editorial indicated that Newfoundland would probably have three options on the ballot. The decision of the Newfoundlanders would be awaited "with interest by Canada, which has surely made a generous offer."¹⁴⁵

Premier Duplessis of Quebec made news again on the fifth with his assertion that a United States court ruling by inference made the United States bases in Newfoundland possessions of the United States. This was felt to hinder "the federal project for the annexation of Newfoundland."¹⁴⁶ One could never accuse the Quebec Premier of giving up. On the ninth, the Star on its editorial page informed its

¹⁴⁴GM, Dec. 3, p. 3.

¹⁴⁵FP, Dec. 5, p. 4.

¹⁴⁶GM, Dec. 6, p. 7.

readers that Calvert C. Pratt, chairman of Newfoundland's Industrial Development Board, was adamantly opposed to union. The Star was quick to note that the people would make the decision and whatever their answer it "will be acceptable."¹⁴⁷ Once again the scene shifted to St. John's where Smallwood and Cashin were battling again in the Convention. Cashin attacked Smallwood's estimate that Newfoundland as a province would have to raise \$1,500,000 more in taxes as too low. Smallwood successfully defended his figures. Still Cashin was not satisfied, but unsatisfied he was to remain.¹⁴⁸ Lastly, in closing the year 1947, the Star's "Stories of the Year" section once again contained nothing on Newfoundland.¹⁴⁹ But though nothing had been included as significant, much had been accomplished!

¹⁴⁷WS, Dec. 9, p. 4.

¹⁴⁸WS, Dec. 9, p. 13; WS, Dec. 11, p. 7.

¹⁴⁹WS, Dec. 31.

1948: THE YEAR OF DECISION

After the National Convention's recess for the holidays, it did not take long for open hostility to erupt in its meetings. Taxes again served as the catalyst. In early January, Smallwood, as he was questioning an anti-confederate's tax figures, was greatly incensed by Pierce Rudge's snide interrupting remarks. As a result, this scene almost came down to fisticuffs between Smallwood and Gordon Higgins.¹ Both Smallwood and Chairman McEvoy threatened to resign. The next day, Peter Cashin charged that the radio broadcasts were splitting "the people politically." The Ottawa proposals were "false" and "the greatest fraud ever put over on the Newfoundland people at a cost of \$30,000." It was his opinion that the Convention was a waste. Frank Fogwill then proceeded to attack the Canadian estimate of Newfoundland's tax revenues as being \$9,000,000 too low at \$11,000,000.² Smallwood successfully rebutted Cashin's attacks on the Canadian proposals.³ On the ninth, the Commission Government informed the Convention members that if a spring referendum was to be held, they had to submit their recommendations by the end of the month. This had to be done so that the

¹WS, Jan. 6, 1948, p. 7. All newspaper footnotes for this chapter, unless otherwise indicated refer to 1948.

²GM, Jan. 7, p. 2.

³WS, Jan. 8, p. 13.

United Kingdom Government's Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs could have at least a month before announcing the choices to appear on the ballot.⁴ The Globe and Mail on January 13 printed an article saying that Gordon Higgins, an anti-confederate, had charged that Canada's interest in Newfoundland was the result of a fear that the United States' bases in Newfoundland would hinder Canada's defense of the St. Lawrence.⁵ On the fourteenth, in his continuing rebuttal of Peter Cashin's charges, Smallwood estimated that 80 per cent of all Newfoundlanders would not have to pay taxes--yet all would be eligible for a family allowance. Cashin's charge that Canada was nearly broke drew out Smallwood's scorn as he pointed to Canada's \$700,000,000 budget surplus for the previous year.⁶ The next day the Globe and Mail and the Free Press printed the news that the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company had offered \$150 million for Labrador's resources. Smallwood opposed this on the floor of the Convention.⁷ Gordon Higgins, on the sixteenth, made a motion that a plebisite be held and the choices should be commission government and responsible government. Smallwood proposed an amendment to Higgins'

⁴GM, Jan. 10, p. 3.

⁵GM, Jan. 13, p. 3.

⁶FP, Jan. 15, p. 26; GM, Jan. 15, p. 15.

⁷WS, Jan. 15, p. 11.

motion that the United Kingdom would guarantee "the solvency of Newfoundland's finances." Smallwood then proceeded to enter his motion to have the plebisite's ballot contain the following choices: commission government, responsible government, and confederation. It was the writer's opinion that all three choices would probably be on the ballot, but it was hard to say if the Convention would recommend all three.⁸ The Free Press in an editorial on January 19, noted that the Convention had reached its "main task--that of drafting the recommendations it will make to the Government, and hence to Great Britain." Included in the editorial was a statement by Prime Minister King that the proposed terms were the "best possible." Now it was up to Newfoundland to make its "fateful decision."⁹ Also on the nineteenth in St. John's, Gordon Higgins in a speech supported his motion by arguing that Newfoundland was self-supporting. This stated his case for responsible government. Smallwood, while stating his support for Higgins motion's referendum portion, attacked the idea of self-government as being filled with economic danger and thus also a possible loss of political independence.¹⁰ The following day, six more delegates spoke in favor of Higgins' motion.¹¹

⁸GM, Jan. 17, p. 3.

⁹FP, Jan. 19, p. 4.

¹⁰GM, Jan. 20, p. 7.

¹¹WS, Jan. 21, p. 16.

Shifting scenes, the Globe and Mail reported from Quebec City that provincial opposition leader, Adelard Godbout, in the Quebec Parliament had urged Canada to get Newfoundland before it fell "into the hands of the U.S." However, Duplessis still maintained his opposition to annexation as it would cost too much and the Labrador boundary had yet to be completely resolved to his satisfaction. ¹²

Back in St. John's, on January 26, Smallwood said that he was "well aware" that the majority of members, if they got their way, would keep confederation off the ballot. However, it was Smallwood's opinion the majority of the people were for confederation and should not be prohibited from having the chance to vote for confederation. ¹³ The assembly proceedings of the twenty-sixth witnessed sharp anti-confederate attacks on Smallwood's motion. To Albert Penney, confederation appearing on the ballot would be part of a "perpetual scheme" to sell out Newfoundland. R.B. Job warned that the move would not be reversible. But the harshest attack came from Peter Cashin, who charged that the proposals were incomplete--Canada had severe fiscal problems, and Newfoundlanders would literally be taxed to death under confederation. In summation he charged: "We are being asked to sell out our country and in my view this would be a Judas act." ¹⁴ To put it mildly, the anti-confederates, especially

¹²GM, Jan. 21, p. 3.

¹³GM, Jan. 24, p. 2; WS, Jan. 24, sec. 2, p. 1.

¹⁴GM, Jan. 27, p. 9.

Cashin, had strongly and sometimes emotionally argued their case. The next day, Gordon Bradley in rebuttal, charged the anti-confederates' speeches contained "misrepresentations and misconceptions" as they sought to prevent the public from having the opportunity to have a full say via the ballot. Smallwood also spoke briefly defending his motion to include confederation on the ballot before it was put to a vote. Smallwood's motion was soundly defeated 29 to 16. A six-member committee (three confederate and three anti-confederates) was then chosen to draft the Convention's recommendations for London. It was anticipated that a minority confederationist report would also be written. However, the Canadian Government made it clear that confederation had not been barred from the ballot by the Convention's lack of recommendation. The final choice of ballot items was the responsibility of London.

The Free Press in an editorial, "Newfoundland Barred from Confederation," stated that due to the Convention's decision the issue was concluded. Perhaps, said the editor, "it is just as well that Newfoundland should remain outside, if there is any strong sentiment against Confederation."

¹⁵ WS, Jan. 28, p. 1; GM, Jan. 28, p. 2; GM, Jan. 29, p. 1; FP, Jan. 28, p. 1; FP, Jan. 29, p. 18.

¹⁶ GM, Jan. 29, pp. 1, 2; GM, Jan. 30, p. 2; WS, Jan. 28, p. 2; WS, Jan. 29, p. 13; FP, Jan. 30, p. 23.

¹⁷ FP, Jan. 29, p. 4.

Obviously, the Free Press' editor had not done his homework. This would be pointed out by an article from Ottawa the very next day in the Free Press.¹⁸ An editorial published by the Star soundly criticized the Convention's recommendation for being unfair to the voters, but also noted "Britain, it appears, has the jurisdictional authority to overrule the convention" on what may be contained on the ballot.¹⁹ The Globe and Mail's editor also expressed the same feelings as the Star's editor, except that he felt the United Kingdom's Government would not add confederation to the ballot in order to avoid the charge of interference.²⁰

Though Canadian newspapers might be skeptical about the chances for confederation to appear on the ballot, Joseph Smallwood was not. After chastening these papers for their fears, Smallwood said: "Members have recommended union with Canada and it will, therefore, appear on the ballot. A majority vote was not required."²¹

This session of the National Convention closed on the thirteenth of January with its recommendation for only two choices (commission government and responsible government) to appear on the ballot sent to the Commonwealth Relations Office.

¹⁸FP, Jan. 30, p. 23.

¹⁹WS, Jan. 29, p. 4.

²⁰GM, Jan. 30, p. 6.

²¹GM, Jan. 30, p. 2.

L.E. Emerson, administrator of the Commission Government, substituting for the governor, included a hint of what was to come in his closing speech to the Convention. He declared that "Newfoundland [should] return to a democratic system either by administration of its own affairs or in association with another country."²² This statement had to give Newfoundland confederates a definite boost. The Globe and Mail on the thirty-first, also contained excerpts from a London (England) Daily Express editorial asking that the United Kingdom Government give Newfoundlanders on the ballot the option of joining the United Kingdom.²³ However, this suggestion never received any serious attention from the United Kingdom Government.

However, after the Convention was over, all forty-five members signed a postscript memo to be sent to London asking for the inclusion of confederation on the ballot.²⁴ Concerning this move, the Star editorialized: "Apparently the politicians there can change direction just as fast as any in Canada."²⁵ After a radio address by Gordon Bradley urged petitions to be sent protesting the lack of the confederation option on the ballot proposal, Smallwood reported on the

²²GM, Jan. 31, p. 3; WS, Jan. 31, p. 9.

²³GM, Jan. 31, p. 3.

²⁴WS, Feb. 2, p. 1.

²⁵WS, Feb. 3, p. 4.

third of February that 11,000 voters had telegraphed arguing for the inclusion of confederation and that "today thousands more are telegraphing."²⁶ This request had brought much submerged confederation sentiment into the open. On the fifth, W.L. Clark's "As We See It" column indicated that due to the actions of the National Convention:

The plan to join Canada has been given a serious setback. If Newfoundland does not come into confederation soon, it will probably be a couple of generations before the opportunity comes again.²⁷

Not a very optimistic statement.

Now the scene shifted to Ottawa, where in debate on the Speech from the Throne, a Quebec M.P., Frederic Dorion, asserted Quebec's title to Labrador. He assailed the King Government's proposed terms for Newfoundland because they acknowledged the Privy Council decision of 1927, which had awarded Labrador to Newfoundland. To this St. Laurent replied that the decision, while not in Canada's or Quebec's favor,²⁸ was legal and binding.

Back in St. John's, on the ninth, it was announced that petitions with the names of 40,000 voters already had been received seeking the inclusion of confederation on the referendum ballot.²⁹ The next day, a dispatch from St. John's

²⁶GM, Feb. 4, p. 9.

²⁷WS, Feb. 5, p. 2.

²⁸GM, Feb. 7, pp. 1,2; WS, Feb. 7, p. 12.

²⁹GM, Feb. 10, p. 13.

was carried by all three papers. It stated that thirty-two lawyers in messages had supported the absence of confederation from the ballot for constitutional reasons (1933

³⁰ Agreement). Also, on the same day in Montreal, Peter Cashin acknowledged that Newfoundland was awaiting the decision of London as to the ballot's choices. He hinted that soon after the announcement of the ballot, a "Liberal-
³¹ Labor Party" would be formed.

On the twentieth of February, the Star contained an interview held in Windsor with T.W. Sparks, a St. John's merchant, in which he proclaimed that 75 per cent of the people would vote for responsible government. Why? Because they did not like Canada's baby bonus idea, its old age pension scheme, or the fact that Quebec was pushing
³² confederation so it would obtain Labrador. On the editorial page the next day, H.L. MacPherson writing for the Star, pointed out the gross inaccuracies in Sparks' statements. MacPherson concluded by writing: "In the matter of Newfoundland's opinion on confederation...the confederationists have
³³ a better case than the opposition."

³⁰ GM, Feb. 11, p. 13; WS, Feb. 11, p. 12; FP, Feb. 11, p. 2.

³¹ GM, Feb. 11, p. 13; FP, Feb. 11, p. 21.

³² WS, Feb. 21, p. 3. The baby bonus refers to the popular name given to Canada's family allowance plan. Canada's old age pension scheme was far superior to the one in use in Newfoundland because of its greater monetary benefits.

³³ WS, Feb. 21, p. 4.

In St. John's on the twenty-third, Joseph Smallwood announced plans for a pro-confederate newspaper. This would be used to help counteract the effect of weekly radio programs of the anti-confederates.³⁴ A little later in the month, a full-page ad in the St. John's Evening Telegram announced the formation of the "Newfoundland Confederate Association," with Gordon Bradley, the chairman, to be assisted by 102 local vice-presidents. The ad contained the names of many people who were serving as advisors.³⁵ The month of February had once again witnessed great strides being made by Smallwood and his colleagues in their fight for confederation.

All three papers in March carried the United Kingdom Government's announcement that the referendum ballot would offer three choices: responsible government, commission government, and confederation.³⁶ That Smallwood and Bradley's petition drive for the inclusion of confederation on the ballot got over 50,000 signatures out of a total population of 330,000 was felt to be a factor.³⁷ The Star also on the eleventh reprinted on the editorial page an article from The Manchester Guardian Weekly entitled, "Newfoundland's future."

³⁴WS, Feb. 24, p. 15; FP, Feb. 24, p. 9.

³⁵WS, Feb. 27, p. 20.

³⁶GM, March 12, p. 1; FP, March 11, p. 1; WS, March 11, p. 2.

³⁷WS, March 11, p. 2.

It was the opinion of the writer that the reason Newfoundland merchants objected so vehemently to confederation was their fear of the higher Canadian income taxes. He also described the Canadian proposals as "fair."³⁸

In editorials on the twelfth, all three papers praised the United Kingdom Government for including three choices on the ballot. Now the Newfoundland voters would be given a chance to vote on the proposed confederation terms. Thus the will of the people, rather than that of a few at the Convention,³⁹ would decide the question. Both the Star and the Free Press carried a story from Ottawa in which Prime Minister King said he was glad that Newfoundlanders would have a chance to either accept or reject the proposed Canadian terms.⁴⁰ London decided to add confederation to the ballot because the United Kingdom Government felt "it would not be right that the people of Newfoundland should be deprived of an opportunity of considering the issue."⁴¹ Speaking in Toronto, Calvert C. Pratt, chairman of the Newfoundland Industrial and Development Board, stated that most Newfoundlanders felt if confederation were chosen, more negotiations would be necessitated.⁴²

³⁸WS, March 11, p. 4.

³⁹GM, March 12, p. 6; WS, March 12, p. 4; FP, March 12, p. 4.

⁴⁰GM, March 12, p. 1; FP, March 12, p. 8.

⁴¹GM, March 13, p. 3.

⁴²GM, March 16, p. 2.

On the twenty-second of March, the Star carried the announcement by Chesley Crosbie of the formation of a political party to seek economic union with the United States. As president of the party, he was "convinced that such economic union can be brought about by elected representatives of a self-governing Newfoundland."⁴³ A few days later Bradley and Crosbie met in St. John's with confederation⁴⁴ as the topic of discussion.

For the first time since 1939, the Commission Government announced in April that the government had run up a deficit. (revenues = \$40,156,541 and expenditures = \$41,019,784 for a deficit in excess of \$860,000).⁴⁵ Then late in April, the Free Press published letters on the editorial page from former Newfoundlanders living in the London area predicting Newfoundland would reject confederation.⁴⁶ An editorial in the Star on the twenty-seventh, announced that Newfoundlanders would have a chance to exercise their choice in the referendum scheduled for June 3. The writer expressed the opinion that confederation was the best of the choices.⁴⁷ According to both the Star and Free Press, Jack Watts, a Newfoundlander working at the Grenfell Hospital, stated that Labrador was solidly backing union.⁴⁸

⁴³WS, March 22, p. 7.

⁴⁴WS, March 25, p. 11.

⁴⁵FP, April 3, p. 16.

⁴⁶FP, April 26, p. 4.

⁴⁷WS, April 27, p. 4.

⁴⁸FP, April 29, p. 10; WS, April 29, p. 19.

In May, as the election date grew closer, all sides in the issue became more vocal in attacks on their opponents' positions and in support of their own. The Globe and Mail, in a series of three articles from St. John's by Ewart Young, gave an in-depth look at the Newfoundland campaign. In his first article on the thirteenth, Young made the observation that Crosbie's campaign for "Economic Union" had probably caused the confederates to lose votes. As the United States had never been officially consulted in its willingness to even discuss Crosbie's proposal, the effect it was having was a most bitter irony to the confederates, who had worked long and hard to get their plan. Bradley, speaking for the confederate cause on radio, derided Crosbie's plan as "economic bunkum." The St. John's Evening Telegram attacked Crosbie's arguments. The Confederate, paper of the Confederate Association, challenged Crosbie's ideas and suggested his party be renamed "the Comic Union."⁴⁹ On the fourteenth, Young's next article pointed out that all three active "parties" (Confederate, Responsible Government, and Economic Union), were heavily using the radio to spread their propaganda. As a result, the Newfoundland voter's feelings could be summed up in the words of an eighty-year old person--"What this country needs now is a lie-detector."⁵⁰ In his last selection, the writer reported the Confederates were portraying themselves as the party of the poor and repressed in stark contrast to

⁴⁹GM, May 13, p. 17.

⁵⁰GM, May 14, p. 21.

the responsible government faction, which was comprised, they claimed, of merchants and millionaires. These people were afraid of confederation, declared the writer, because of the fear of taxes and also open economic competition with Canadian firms.⁵¹

Meanwhile back in Halifax on the thirteenth, Charles Penny, a spokesman for the Newfoundland Confederation Party, charged that anti-confederates "are spreading stories that native Newfoundlanders in Canada are all starving to death on bread lines." Thus, he was turning to Canada to ask these so-called starved Newfoundlanders to sign for publication in Newfoundland, a petition asking for union.⁵² If union was selected, the Cornerbrook (Newfoundland) Western Star predicted that Newfoundland's national debt per capita would rise from \$160 to \$1340. In spite of this, the paper was for confederation.⁵³ In St. John's, the issue of economic union with the United States was the center of much talk. The plebiscite was believed to hinge on the credibility of the economic union proponents--who wanted their backers to vote for responsible government. While Crosbie attacked Judge M. Hudson's memo, which threw much cold water on economic union, Joseph Smallwood, in attacking Crosbie's party, made much use of the memo.⁵⁴ On the twenty-fourth in St. John's, Crosbie

⁵¹GM, May 22, p. 2.

⁵²FP, May 14, p. 8; GM, May 14, p. 2.

⁵³FP, May 22, p. 20.

⁵⁴GM, May 24, p. 17.

announced that fifty United States Senators had indicated they would be willing to discuss his proposal if responsible government was selected by the people.⁵⁵

The Globe and Mail on the twenty-eighth of May, carried a Canadian Press dispatch from Washington concerning economic union. The story quoted Senator Robert Taft, a possible Republican Presidential candidate, as saying, "Personally, I would favor economic union with Newfoundland."⁵⁶ The next day the Star reprinted an editorial from the Ottawa Journal that criticized a Canadian journalist, who had expressed the fear that Newfoundlanders might vote for responsible government to get economic union. The journalist had missed the point--it was the Newfoundlander's right to vote as he would choose.⁵⁷ R.B. Job declared in May that he wanted the people to vote for commission government. His reasoning was that in this way, Newfoundland might eventually obtain closer ties with the United States or confederation with Canada on better terms at a later date. Job's campaign was fatally hurt when the government radio station refused him time to air his views because he did not belong to any political party.⁵⁸

With the election quickly approaching, the pot of controversy was heated up in early June. Peter Cashin, while implying that patriots would vote for responsible government,

⁵⁵ GM, May 25, p. 8.

⁵⁶ GM, May 28, p. 12.

⁵⁷ WS, May 29, p. 4.

⁵⁸ GM, May 31, p. 7.

charged that the Confederate Party was getting monetary aid "from Canada" and only "Quislings, Judas Iscariots, fools, or knaves" would vote for confederation. Smallwood, when asked about Cashin's charge, replied that the confederate campaign money had come from over 12,000 people in amounts ranging from twenty-five cents to fifty dollars.⁵⁹ On the third, the Free Press, while announcing that 176,297 Newfoundlanders were eligible to vote that day, told about the main protagonists and issues in the election battle.⁶⁰ The Globe and Mail editorialized on the third that:

it is more than probable that the issue involved will be settled today, but it is possible that another vote will have to be taken to make sure the decision reached is the will of the majority of the people...[T]he choice is Newfoundland's alone.⁶¹

On the fourth of June, the Star carried two articles. The first stated that Ottawa would have no comment until all votes were counted.⁶² In the second article Maurice Jefferies' "Today in Ottawa" column, speculated that even if confederation won, Newfoundland would not enter union at once.⁶³

⁵⁹GM, June 2, p. 7; WS, June 2, p. 15, FP, June 2, p. 18.

⁶⁰FP, June 3, p. 11.

⁶¹GM, June 3, p. 6.

⁶²WS, June 4, p. 1.

⁶³WS, June 4, p. 28.

The results of the election on June 3 were inconclusive since none of the ballot items received over 50 per cent of the vote. Consequently, another election would be held sometime in July with commission government, which had received the least votes, deleted from the ballot.⁶⁴ In an editorial entitled "Newfoundland Uncertain" the Star's editor wrote that, "The Newfoundland plebiscite settled nothing about the Island's future except that it did not want a continuation of colonial status." H.L. MacPherson, writing on the same page, said if Newfoundland chose Canada in the second referendum, there probably would still be heavy opposition to union internally. This "union looks a little less desirable," MacPherson declared, since Canada did not need another quarrelsome province.⁶⁵ Both the Star and the Globe and Mail's correspondents in Ottawa reported what the Prime Minister had to say concerning the referendum. Jefferies' column, apparently written earlier in the day for the Star, stated that King would not venture an opinion as to what the final results would be.⁶⁶ Warren Baldwin, writing for the Globe and Mail, pointed out that King had indicated another vote would be needed. The author finished his article wondering what majority the Canadian Government would

⁶⁴GM, June 4, p. 1; FP, June 4, pp. 1,8; FP, June 5, p. 8; WS, June 5, p. 1.

⁶⁵WS, June 5, p. 4.

⁶⁶WS, June 5, p. 26.

consider to be necessary for the selection of union by the
 Newfoundlanders.⁶⁷ The Free Press, in an article from St.
 John's, expressed the feeling that Newfoundlanders were worn
 out by the politicking and were not looking forward to
 another tough and hard campaign. On the sixth, the St. John's
Evening Telegraph's editorial expressed the feeling that
 nothing much new could be stated by either side in the upcom-
 ing referendum.⁶⁸ The next day, the Free Press editorialized
 that

"The [second] referendum is being rushed
 in order to end the uncertainty which is
 hurting business, and because Newfound-
 landers are getting fed up with the
 electioneering."⁶⁹

The Globe and Mail's editorial on this subject directed its
 questioning towards the election results (almost complete):
 responsible government 67,670; confederation 61,930; and
 commission government 21,661. How would the people, who
 voted for commission government, mark their ballots at the
 next referendum?⁷⁰ Both the Free Press and the Star on the
 eleventh of June, related that Ottawa was maintaining its
 policy of non-interference in the Newfoundland referendum.⁷¹
 W.L. Clark of the Star, thought this to be wise "as any intru-
 sion by Canada would be resented."⁷² On the fourteenth, all

⁶⁷GM, June 5, p. 1.

⁶⁸GM, June 7, p. 17.

⁶⁹FP, June 7, p. 4.

⁷⁰GM, June 8, p. 6.

⁷¹FP, June 11, p. 22; WS, June 11, p. 10.

⁷²WS, June 12, p. 2.

three papers carried the announcement that Newfoundland would vote on July 22 for either responsible government or confederation.⁷³ The next day the Star's editorial page section,

"Press Clippings," included an editorial from the Sydney (Nova Scotia) Post Record. The writer maintained that:

"Many residents of areas outside of Ottawa are not too keen on...[the possibility of] Newfoundland's entry into Confederation."⁷⁴ Meanwhile in St. John's, it was announced that

Governor Macdonald was to go to London to get directives on how to implement the governmental selection in the next referendum.⁷⁵

The highlights of a speech by External Affairs Minister St. Laurent in Commons on the twentieth of June, was printed in the Globe and Mail. St. Laurent said:

I hope there will be a clear-cut decision on this second vote. I hope it will not be so close as to leave us in the embarrassing position of having to take in a large group of recalcitrants, or having to renounce the opportunity of completing what the Fathers of Confederation intended.

St. Laurent would not speculate on what percentage of the total vote the Canadian Government would feel necessary to accept Newfoundland. He went on to say that it would be wrong "to do or say anything" that would bar Newfoundland

⁷³GM, June 14, p3; WS, June 14, p. 1; FP, June 14, p. 35.

⁷⁴WS, June 15, p. 4.

⁷⁵FP, June 15, p. 32.

from confederation.⁷⁶ The Star's W.L. Clark declared in his column, that the Roman Catholic vote was heavily in favor of responsible government. He also wrote that the "[c]ampaign was warming up."⁷⁷ In an editorial, the Star stated that Ottawa should not quibble about what per cent of the total vote would be needed to accept Newfoundland. After all a majority, no matter how small, for confederation was still a majority.⁷⁸

While the newspapers were silent during the first week of July, political combat continued on in Newfoundland. On the sixth, Maurice Jefferies in the column, "Today in Ottawa," reported to the Star's readers that the opinion was being expressed in Ottawa that if Newfoundland opted for confederation the "majority" [should be] decisive."⁷⁹ The Free Press, on the same day, reported the intention of a Canadian Conservative M.P. to go to Labrador to study its resources.⁸⁰ No doubt the reason was to become better informed of the mineral wealth of that land. The editorial page of the Star on July 9, contained an article reviewing a northeastern North American trade conference held at Halifax. The close association, both in topography and history, was discussed with the emphasis on increased trade amongst the United States, Canadian, and Newfoundland

⁷⁶GM, June 21, p. 3.

⁷⁷WS, June 22, p. 2.

⁷⁸WS, June 22, p. 4.

⁷⁹WS, July 6, p. 14.

⁸⁰FP, July 6, p. 46.

81
 members of the region. On the twelfth, the Globe and Mail reported the appearance of prominent merchant and a member of the Commission Government on a nation-wide radio broadcast, both of whom spoke in favor of confederation. Their open support of confederation was felt to have helped Smallwood's drive.⁸² The Star's editor, writing on the fifteenth of July, pointed out that the Newfoundlander's desire for "economic stability" would greatly influence the outcome of the voting. While Canada had remained "aloof,"⁸³ it was hoped the results would be clear-cut." On the next day, the Star's W.L. Clark, pointed out that not all businessmen were anti-confederates, and the Star's Ottawa correspondent was relating that a high official with External Affairs stated the Canadian Government felt the vote would be close.⁸⁴ On the nineteenth, the Globe and Mail raised the question that if confederation was selected, how would the Newfoundland people be represented and by whom in negotiations for union terms?⁸⁵ Both the Globe and Mail and the Free Press in editorials on the twenty-second, hoped that the Newfoundlanders would select confederation by a wide margin.⁸⁶ While Ottawa was hoping for a decisive margin

⁸¹WS, July 9, p. 4.

⁸²GM, July 12, p. 13; FP, July 14, p. 19.

⁸³WS, July 15, p. 4.

⁸⁴WS, July 16, pp. 2, 20.

⁸⁵GM, July 19, p. 9.

⁸⁶FP, July 22, p. 4; GM, July 22, p. 6.

for union, back in St. John's it was speculated that if Newfoundland chose union, it would probably get seven seats in the House of Commons. ⁸⁷ On the twenty-third, all three papers joyously reported that with most of the vote counted, it appeared certain that confederation would win by a slim margin. ⁸⁸

Reactions to this decision by the people would not take long to be forthcoming. The way the vote was leaning for confederation created much speculation among Newfoundlanders in St. John's on how their country would be affected.

These predictions created much elation for Smallwood and his supporters, while leaving the people for responsible government bitterly disappointed. ⁸⁹

While Smallwood in St. John's, insisted that Canada had no choice but to accept Newfoundland as a province, Prime Minister King in Ottawa refused to comment on the topic of accepting Newfoundland until the final results were in. ⁹⁰ Editorially, the Star commented that it would be "risky to accept Newfoundland

⁸⁷FP, July 22, p. 6; WS, July 22, p. 17; GM, July 22, p. 15.

⁸⁸GM, July 23, p. 1; WS, July 23, pp. 1,6; FP, July 23, pp. 1,8.

⁸⁹WS, July 23, p. 9; FP, July 23, pp. 2,18.

⁹⁰GM, July 24, p. 1; WS, July 24, p. 8; FP, July 24, pp. 1,12.

into Canada" by such a narrow vote, but it was a risk that should be taken.⁹¹

The Free Press's editor wrote that the narrowness of the vote was not particularly flattering to Canada. However, Canada should accept Newfoundland despite the potential conflicts with Quebec over the Labrador boundry and the number of M.P.s representing French Canadians.⁹² The acceptance of Newfoundland was the only alternative open. While in St. John's the bitterness of some of the responsible government people was decreasing somewhat, one of the Star's Ottawa correspondents was speculating that within the next week Newfoundland would contact Ottawa to ask how confederation proceedings should be set up.⁹³

Monday, July 26, witnessed a very accurate statement by W.L. Clark in the Star as he predicted that time would be a great healer to help overcome the losing Newfoundlanders' resentment.⁹⁴ However, while Newfoundland confederates expressed their belief that Canada would accept them, the Responsible Government League on the twenty-fifth, indicated it would oppose with every means possible confederation unless a parliamentary election was held first in Newfoundland.⁹⁵

⁹¹WS, July 24, p. 4. The majority for confederation was just over 6,000 out of practically 150,000 votes cast.

⁹²FP, July 24, p. 4.

⁹³FP, July 24, p. 8; WS, July 24, p. 18.

⁹⁴WS, July 26, p. 2.

⁹⁵GM, July 26, p. 3.

In reality, they wanted another chance to defeat confederation. The next day the Globe and Mail editorialized that Canada should accept Newfoundland even though the vote was close. The paper felt that many people, who were for responsible government, wished to have a Newfoundland elected government carry out union negotiations.

During the last days of the month, both Ottawa and St. John's dispatches filled the papers as the Canadian Government was deciding its course. The King Government sent R.A. MacKay to meet with Newfoundland officials and the Canadian High Commissioner in St. John's. Throughout these last days, the Cabinet met to discuss the vote in Newfoundland. The election results, except for Labrador, were announced officially in St. John's on the twenty-eighth: responsible government 71,258; confederation 77,814 (52.2%). Now it was felt in Ottawa that Newfoundland would be accepted shortly. On the twenty-ninth, Warren Baldwin writing for the Globe and Mail speculated that the national Liberal Party convention would have observers from Newfoundland present

⁹⁶GM, July 26, p. 6.

⁹⁷GM, July 27, p. 1; GM, July 28, p. 1.

⁹⁸GM, July 27, p. 1; GM, July 28, p. 1; WS, July 27, p. 2.

⁹⁹FP, July 28, p. 1.

¹⁰⁰WS, July 28, p. 9; WS, July 29, p. 22; FP, July 28, p. 8.

101

when it met in August. All three papers announced on the thirty-first of July that Newfoundland had been accepted by Canada. Prime Minister King indicated that Canada would meet with representatives of the Newfoundland Government to negotiate the terms. However, he flatly refused to meet with any Responsible Government League representatives. ¹⁰²

Meanwhile much was happening back in St. John's during these last days of July. In telegrams to British and Canadian political leaders, the Responsible Government League demanded that only an elected Newfoundland government could negotiate terms of union. The St. John's Daily News agreed with this, but the St. John's Evening Telegram saw no sense in this as the "people" had already expressed their will. ¹⁰³ However, the Free Press carried a dispatch stating that the people who had supported responsible government were now split on accepting union due to the vote. ¹⁰⁴ If the electoral divisions of 1933 were applied to the plebiscite vote, the confederates would control the legislature. ¹⁰⁵ On the twenty-eighth, both daily St. John's newspapers urged that something be done to fill the governmental void in Newfoundland. Whereas the Evening Telegram sought only an interim government with limited powers, the Daily News advocated the election of

¹⁰¹GM, July 30, p. 15.

¹⁰²GM, July 31, pp. 1,2; WS, July 31, pp. 1,6,8; FP, July 31, p. 11.

¹⁰³GM, July 21, p. 1.

¹⁰⁴FP, July 28, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵GM, July 28, p. 8; WS, July 28, p. 9.

a national assembly, which could veto the results of the negotiations of union terms.¹⁰⁶ The next day the Responsible Government League claimed that resistance to confederation was stiffening.¹⁰⁷ All three papers carried the announcement of Governor Macdonald that Commissioner Albert Walsh would head a seven-man Newfoundland delegation leaving as soon as possible for Ottawa to conduct negotiations regarding the terms of union.¹⁰⁸ That Joseph Smallwood could be considered the "Father of Confederation" for Newfoundland was contained in a Canadian Press dispatch from St. John's.¹⁰⁹ This was stated by both his supporters and opponents.

From Ottawa on the second of August, came the news that the Canadian Government hoped to have Newfoundland as a full member of the country by July 1, 1949. The provinces were not going to be consulted on the terms.¹¹⁰ The Free Press and the Globe and Mail both carried an article on the second in which it was stated that Newfoundland businesses probably would be very careful until they could ascertain the effects of union.¹¹¹ While the Globe and Mail carried a public speech by Prime Minister King welcoming Newfoundland, the Free Press told of Chesley A. Crosbie, the anti-

¹⁰⁶FP, July 29, p. 24.

¹⁰⁷GM, July 30, p. 15.

¹⁰⁸FP, July 31, p. 2; GM, July 31, p. 13; WS, July 31, p. 8.

¹⁰⁹FP, July 31, p. 14.

¹¹⁰GM, Aug. 2, p. 15; FP, Aug. 2, p. 2.

¹¹¹GM, Aug. 2, p. 3; FP, Aug. 2, p. 19.

confederationist, asking the people of Newfoundland to accept the majority decision of the people for confederation.¹¹² In an editorial on the second, the Free Press welcomed Newfoundland into confederation and hoped that the Canadian-Newfoundland marriage would be a happy one.¹¹³ Editorially, the Globe and Mail suggested that before Newfoundland formally entered Canada, "it might be well to hold an election and install a representative Government for the Island which has a clear mandate to complete the Union."¹¹⁴ The Free Press in its column, "French Canadian Editorial Opinion," contained Le Devoir's editorial questioning "the worth of the alliance," while Le Droit, another paper, used the Newfoundland issue to once again ask for a truly Canadian flag.¹¹⁵ Meanwhile, in England, a former United Kingdom war minister held up the Canadian-Newfoundland union as a model for Western Europe.¹¹⁶ Obviously, the example he was using was not entirely valid when compared to the European situation. On the fourth, the Globe and Mail published an article speculating on whom would be on the Newfoundland delegation to Ottawa.¹¹⁷ Victoria, British Columbia, was the scene of a speech the same day by the provincial Finance Minister Herbert Anscomb. He attacked the federal government for not consulting the provinces regarding Newfoundland.¹¹⁸

¹¹² GM, Aug. 2, p. 4; FP, Aug. 2, p. 2.

¹¹³ FP, Aug. 2, p. 4.

¹¹⁴ GM, Aug. 2, p. 6.

¹¹⁵ FP, Aug. 3, p. 4.

¹¹⁶ FP, Aug. 3, p. 7.

¹¹⁷ GM, Aug. 4, p. 13.

¹¹⁸ FP, Aug. 5, p. 2.

The Newfoundland delegation for union negotiations was named on the fifth of August. Albert Walsh, the head of the Newfoundland delegation, was to be accompanied by Smallwood, Bradley, McEvoy, Crosbie, Philip Grunchy, and Gordon Winter. The last three were chosen for their economic expertise.¹¹⁹ The ability of Smallwood was called to attention by a Star article which pointed out that he knew over 100,000 of the 320,000 Newfoundland people by name and had visited over 1,000 of the 1,300 Newfoundland communities.¹²⁰ Both Smallwood and Bradley attended the national Liberal Party convention, where they were warmly received.¹²¹

Of special concern to both Newfoundland and Canada were the United States bases in Newfoundland. The question as to whom would own them was raised by Smallwood.¹²² Later that month, Canada stated she would own the bases though the United States would continue to use them.¹²³ The Star pointed out that the United States might ask Canada to take them over.¹²⁴ That the United States would keep the bases and Canada would not enter into the decision was the contention of articles in the Free Press.¹²⁵ The Globe and

¹¹⁹FP, Aug. 6, p. 2.

¹²⁰WS, Aug. 6, p. 11.

¹²¹WS, Aug. 7, p. 10; FP, Aug. 7, pp. 9, 12; GM, Aug. 7, p. 3.

¹²²GM, Aug. 7, p. 3.

¹²³GM, Aug. 13, p. 13; FP, Aug. 13, p. 21.

¹²⁴WS, Aug. 13, sec. 2, p. 1.

¹²⁵FP, Aug. 12, p. 38.

Mail carried an article on the twentieth that pointed to the United States expansion program on the bases as indicating they would stay on.¹²⁶ However, on the twenty-first, a letter to the editor argued that the United States had absolute sovereignty over the bases under the terms of the Leased Bases Agreement of March 1941.¹²⁷ Thus, the problem was not as simple as it had been made out to be.

Warren Baldwin writing for the Globe and Mail on the ninth of August from Ottawa, speculated that the proposed financial terms would be increased in Newfoundland's favor.¹²⁸ The next day it was announced in St. John's that the earliest date for union to be effected was March 31, 1949.¹²⁹ Both the Star and the Globe and Mail stated that a good number of anti-confederationists were still vocal and would continue to fight confederation.¹³⁰ The Star said in an editorial on the eleventh that both Smallwood and Bradley were in favor of union at the earliest possible date so Newfoundland could soon join Canada. The editor also correctly stated that Newfoundland would benefit through a lower cost of living.¹³¹ H.L. MacPherson in a column in the Star expressed the viewpoint that it should be interesting

¹²⁶GM, Aug. 20, p. 15.

¹²⁷GM, Aug. 21, p. 6.

¹²⁸GM, Aug. 10, p. 3.

¹²⁹GM, Aug. 11, p. 13; WS, Aug. 10, p. 1; FP, Aug. 10, p. 1.

¹³⁰GM, Aug. 11, p. 13; WS, Aug. 11, p. 6.

¹³¹WS, Aug. 11, p. 4.

to see the reaction of the national Conservative Party to Newfoundland, especially as they mostly opposed this process of achieving confederation.¹³²

Back in St. John's Responsible Government League members were circulating a petition to be sent to the Commons in London protesting the results of the voting and demanding responsible government.¹³³ This move was not likely to cause anything more than debate whenever the British Government sought enabling legislation for Newfoundland's marriage to Canada.¹³⁴

In considering the number of stories about Newfoundland, September was like the calm before the storm. The Free Press reprinted an editorial from the Welland Tribune in which Newfoundland's great beauty was described. The editor also felt that most Newfoundlanders he had encountered seemed to "welcome...the idea of union."¹³⁵ On the second, the Star editorially urged the appointment of C.J. Burchell as Canada's High Commissioner in St. John's as it was felt that he would greatly help "expedite Newfoundland's entry into Canada."¹³⁶ The subsequent appointment of Burcell was announced on the fifth. He was also held in high regard¹³⁷ by the St. John's Evening Telegram for his skills. Ottawa

¹³²WS, Aug. 12, p. 4.

¹³³WS, Aug. 26, p. 21.

¹³⁴WS, Aug. 26, p. 21; FP, Aug. 26, p. 27.

¹³⁵FP, Sept. 1, p. 4.

¹³⁶WS, Sept. 2, p. 4.

¹³⁷GM, Sept. 6, p. 3; GM, Sept. 7, p. 11; FP, Sept. 6, p. 15.

announced on the third that a delegation, headed by R.A. MacKay, would go to Newfoundland to make an introductory study of possible administrative problems for "pensions and family allowances."¹³⁸ Maurice Jefferies in his column for the Star pointed out three important benefits of union for Canada: a new market, iron from Labrador, and the geographical completion of Eastern Canada.¹³⁹ On the fifth, it was announced the Newfoundland delegation would be coming to Ottawa soon.¹⁴⁰ Meanwhile, in England, The Times received and published letters by Alan Herbert, M.P. Oxford, and Thomas Lodge, a former commissioner in Newfoundland, protesting that Newfoundland was being mistreated because responsible government was not being restored as promised in 1933.¹⁴¹ Shifting to St. John's, it was announced union talks would start on October 4. Also announced were the Canadian representatives - Acting Prime Minister St. Laurent, External Affairs Minister Lester Pearson, Trade Minister C.D. Howe, Finance Minister Douglas C. Abbott, Defense Minister Brooke Claxton, Fisheries Minister F. Mayhew, and Resources Minister James J. McCann.¹⁴² September 16 saw the

¹³⁸GM, Sept. 4, p. 3; FP, Sept. 4, p. 38.

¹³⁹WS, Sept. 4, p. 20.

¹⁴⁰FP, Sept. 6, p. 15; GM, Sept. 6, p. 3.

¹⁴¹GM, Sept. 10, p. 2; FP, Sept. 13, p. 25.

¹⁴²FP, Sept. 13, p. 24.

Globe and Mail publish an irate letter from a St. John's anti-confederate, who questioned Canada's and more so Britain's actions in not fulfilling the 1933 agreement. ¹⁴³

That confederation was best for Newfoundland, Canada, and the Empire was proclaimed on the same day by The (London, England) Evening Standard. Concluding, the editorial stated: "The people of Britain acclaim the union." This appeared ¹⁴⁴ in the Free Press.

On the twenty-second, Philip Noel-Baker, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, speaking for the United Kingdom Government proclaimed in Parliament that confederation had his Government's approval. ¹⁴⁵ Now the scene shifted back to Ottawa, where the Star's Maurice Jefferies wrote that it had been predicted Newfoundland would seek better terms. ¹⁴⁶ All three papers announced the Newfoundland delegation would leave for Ottawa Sunday via plane. The three main topics on the agenda would be:

1. the minimum amount needed by a provincial government in Newfoundland,
2. how much revenue, without increasing taxes, would be generated, and
3. what, if needed, alternative forms of taxation could be used. ¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ GM, Sept. 16, p. 6.

¹⁴⁴ FP, Sept. 16, p. 16.

¹⁴⁵ FP, Sept. 23, p. 2.

¹⁴⁶ WS, Sept. 27, p. 18.

¹⁴⁷ GM, Sept. 29, p. 2; WS, Sept. 29, p. 9; FP, Sept. 29, p. 21.

In October almost on a daily basis, articles on Newfoundland appeared in the Star and the Globe and Mail. Though the Free Press carried fourteen news stories on Newfoundland, this was far below the Star's twenty-seven, and the Globe and Mail's twenty-three. The Star on the second in an editorial, suggested that when union was finalized the federal government should spend more money on Newfoundland agricultural development. Hopefully, this would help cut the high cost of living there. ¹⁴⁸ On the fourth, it was announced that the talks would be postponed for a day, as the Newfoundlander's plane had been delayed by bad weather. ¹⁴⁹ The Free Press carried an article speculating the forthcoming talks would center around the topics of transportation, defense, and especially monetary items. ¹⁵⁰ The result of a Gallup Poll showed 64 per cent of all Canadians questioned favored union, appeared in the Star on the fourth. ¹⁵¹

In the opening session of the Ottawa meetings on October 6, optimism reigned. St. Laurent for Canada and Walsh of Newfoundland, in their opening speeches, felt there was no doubt but that union terms would be finalized in these negotiations. ¹⁵² This same day, back in St. John's the

¹⁴⁸ WS, Oct. 2, p. 4.

¹⁴⁹ FP, Oct. 4, p. 5.

¹⁵⁰ FP, Oct. 4, p. 21.

¹⁵¹ WS, Oct. 4, p. 11.

¹⁵² GM, Oct. 7, p. 15; WS, Oct. 6, pp. 2, 11; FP, Oct. 6, p. 18; WS, Oct. 7, p. 24.

Commission Government announced that there would be no referendum held concerning the negotiated terms.¹⁵³ On the seventh, after announcing the reopening of the proposed financial terms for further study, the conference, which had been closed to the public, announced an adjournment until the following week to give the delegates time to study the documents presented.¹⁵⁴

Quebec City was the site of a press conference held by Premier Duplessis on October 8. Once again, he made clear his opposition to adding Newfoundland and demanded that the Labrador boundry be adjusted.¹⁵⁵ The Star editorialized on Duplessis' demand that "the rest of Canada must side with Newfoundland." Duplessis should not be allowed to "hijack" any territory.¹⁵⁶ In reply to the Star editorial, The Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph stated that all the Premier wanted was a royal commission study. In reply, the Star said it would "eat...crow" if after five years it could be proved this was all the Premier intended with his remarks.¹⁵⁷ Due to a Cabinet session, the talks in Ottawa were interrupted on the twelfth. At this time a Newfoundland delegate

¹⁵³GM, Oct. 7, p. 15.

¹⁵⁴GM, Oct. 8, p. 17; WS, Oct. 7, p. 21; FP, Oct. 8, p. 22; WS, Oct. 8, p. 24.

¹⁵⁵GM, Oct. 9, p. 3; FP, Oct. 9, p. 20.

¹⁵⁶WS, Oct. 12, p. 4.

¹⁵⁷WS, Oct. 29, p. 4.

said all that remained was "putting the final touches on
 [the] terms."¹⁵⁸ On the thirteenth, Canada asked for
 another adjournment to study Newfoundland's brief. In
 Toronto on October 20, Smallwood in addressing the Liberal
 Businessmen's Club pointed out that after union it would be
 important for them to branch out to Newfoundland.¹⁵⁹ To
 help in the discussions various Newfoundland leaders were
 called to Ottawa to give testimony.¹⁶⁰ On the twentieth
 in Ottawa, the talks' progression was optimistically stated
 with a goal of March for union.¹⁶¹ All three papers pointed
 out that no Newfoundland M.P.s could be elected until after
 union had occurred.¹⁶² Also noted, was Bradley's objection
 to some Canadian papers calling Newfoundland, "Newland."¹⁶³

On the twenty-sixth of October, Walsh in a Montreal
 speech contended that the entrance of Newfoundland would
 provide great benefits to Canada.¹⁶⁴ A similar opinion of
 the benefits of Newfoundland's entrance was voiced by C.M.
 Hincks, general director of the National Committee for Mental
 Hygiene (Canada).¹⁶⁵ On the twenty-seventh, the Globe and

¹⁵⁸GM, Oct. 13, p. 3.

¹⁵⁹GM, Oct. 20, p. 4.

¹⁶⁰GM, Oct. 20, p. 14.

¹⁶¹GM, Oct. 21, p. 17; WS, Oct. 21, p. 24.

¹⁶²GM, Oct. 22, p. 3; WS, Oct. 22, p. 13; FP, Oct. 22, p. 16.

¹⁶³GM, Oct. 22, p. 3; FP, Oct. 22, p. 16; WS, Oct. 29, p. 28.

¹⁶⁴GM, Oct. 27, p. 10; FP, Oct. 27, p. 24.

¹⁶⁵GM, Oct. 29, p. 11.

Mail contained the information that soon the final stage of these talks would be reached. Walsh had commented that "satisfactory progress" was being made.¹⁶⁶

November was another month of heavy coverage of Newfoundland, especially regarding the progress of the Confederation Talks. The Free Press carried the announcement of the beginning on the second of talks on finance between the two sides.¹⁶⁷ Agreement on many "miscellaneous subjects" was announced from Ottawa on the fifth.¹⁶⁸ Speculation about additional sources of taxation available to Newfoundland as a province centered around a gas and/or sales tax.¹⁶⁹ On the ninth the Globe and Mail felt the talks could be finished within two weeks.¹⁷⁰ The next day, the Free Press carried an article estimating the talks would end the next week, noting that neither side would comment on this assumption.¹⁷¹ St. Laurent and Walsh on the tenth, announced for each side satisfaction with the progress being made.¹⁷² The Globe and Mail on the twelfth, stated legal experts were working on the constitutional problems (main question concerned what was "appropriate authority in Newfoundland" for ratification) and both sides were now only six million dollars apart

¹⁶⁶GM, Oct. 28, p. 10.

¹⁶⁷FP, Nov. 3, p. 36.

¹⁶⁸GM, Nov. 6, p. 3.

¹⁶⁹GM, Nov. 6, p. 3; WS, Nov. 5, p. 14.

¹⁷⁰GM, Nov. 9, p. 3.

¹⁷¹FP, Nov. 10, p. 21.

¹⁷²GM, Nov. 11, p. 3; FP, Nov. 11, p. 26.

on the fiscal package. ¹⁷³ The Star and the Free Press on November 15, also reported the closeness to agreement on financial concerns. ¹⁷⁴ Editorially the same day, the Globe and Mail cautioned that "Newfoundland was still in doubt" as anti-confederates were planning to fight the issue in court and also in the British Parliament. While acknowledging that the effect of these moves was unpredictable, the editor called for either an elected Newfoundland assembly or "autonomy" for Newfoundland before negotiations. Then, union could take place to help ensure that Newfoundlanders would enter union happily and willingly. ¹⁷⁵ A writ challenging the constitutionality of the procedures being employed to obtain union was filed before the Newfoundland Supreme Court on the fifteenth. ¹⁷⁶ The Star's MacPherson wrote an editorial on the anti-s, which he called a "group of old die-hards." It was possible they might delay union, but he did not feel they would be able to block it. In fact MacPherson felt that this would:

serve to cut down the anti-confederation movement to size; to reduce a successionist element to an inconsequential rump. Newfoundland and Canada ought to find this mutually helpful. ¹⁷⁷

¹⁷³GM, Nov. 12, p. 3.

¹⁷⁴WS, Nov. 15, p. 10; FP, Nov. 15, p. 33.

¹⁷⁵GM, Nov. 15, p. 6.

¹⁷⁶GM, Nov. 16, p. 3.

¹⁷⁷WS, Nov. 17, p. 4.

All three papers had articles speculating the ending of the negotiation rounds within a couple of days on November 17.¹⁷⁸ The source of this for the Star and Free Press had been St. Laurent. Adjournment of the main body, except for the drafting committee, was revealed on the eighteenth.¹⁷⁹

Three prominent anti-confederate Newfoundlanders (Peter Cashin, John Higgins, and Frederick Marshall) presented a petition with 50,000 signatures to Parliament in London on November 23 via M.P. Alan Herbert.¹⁸⁰ Three days later, Herbert and three other members submitted a motion calling for the restoration of responsible government before confederation should be allowed.¹⁸¹

Back in Ottawa on the twenty-third, it was announced that draft terms were ready to be presented to a plenary meeting, and, if all went well, the terms could be signed on December 2.¹⁸² The Globe and Mail announced that the negotiated terms, when accepted by the Commission Government, would then be sent to London for approval. At the same time, the Canadian Parliament would ratify the terms and then ask

¹⁷⁸GM, Nov. 17, p. 3; WS, Nov. 17, p. 7; FP, Nov. 17, p. 16.

¹⁷⁹GM, Nov. 19, p. 3; WS, Nov. 18, p. 24.

¹⁸⁰GM, Nov. 24, p. 7; FP, Nov. 23, p. 12.

¹⁸¹GM, Nov. 27, p. 7.

¹⁸²GM, Nov. 24, p. 7; WS, Nov. 24, p. 15; FP, Nov. 24, p. 25.

the United Kingdom Government to pass enabling legislation. Thus, for the first time the definite procedure to be used appeared in one of these papers. But this was delayed as the plenary meeting was unable to agree to the draft on Saturday and the meeting was continued until Monday, the twenty-ninth.¹⁸⁴ The Star on the last day of the month, carried a speech by Revenue Minister McCann. He praised the idea of Newfoundland's entry, especially as it would solidly round out Canada's eastern defense perimeter.¹⁸⁵

As December began the long road towards confederation appeared to be rapidly approaching the end. On Wednesday, December 1, Newfoundland's Deputy Secretary of Justice, James Power, issued a court summons for the people seeking the writ to bar confederation. During the hearing Power announced his intention to seek dismissal of the writ attempt.¹⁸⁶ As a result of the hearing, Newfoundland Supreme Court Justice Brian Dunfield took the arguments under advisement.¹⁸⁷ On the thirteenth, Justice Dunfield ruled against the writ petition, whereupon the complaintants announced they would appeal to the full Supreme Court.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³GM, Nov. 24, p. 7.

¹⁸⁴WS, Nov. 27, p. 17.

¹⁸⁵WS, Nov. 30, p. 2.

¹⁸⁶WS, Dec. 1, p. 14.

¹⁸⁷WS, Dec. 7, p. 16.

¹⁸⁸WS, Dec. 14, p. 17; GM, Dec. 14, p. 8.

Turning back to the negotiations, both the Star and the Free Press speculated that St. Laurent and Walsh would formally sign the terms for union during the week of December 5.¹⁸⁹ After the drafting of the document was completed, it was announced that the terms would be formally signed on Saturday the eleventh with the session broadcast. The date of entry for Newfoundland was set for March 31, 1949.¹⁹⁰ Editorially, the Globe and Mail questioned the rush to sign. In the editor's opinion, it was still not too late to halt and rather negotiate after the Newfoundlanders had elected a legislature. By doing this it was hoped future controversy over the means used to accomplish union might be quashed.¹⁹¹ The Globe and Mail's editor was not the only unhappy person with the negotiations. So was Chesley Crosbie of the Newfoundland delegation. Because of the financial terms, Crosbie on the tenth announced his intention not to sign the agreement and, instead he stated his intention to make a minority report to Governor Macdonald opposing the agreement.¹⁹² From St. John's Eric Seymour, writing for the Globe and Mail, related that a protest demonstration concerning the signing at the governor's residence resulted

¹⁸⁹ WS, Dec. 14, p. 17; GM, Dec. 14, p. 8.

¹⁹⁰ GM, Dec. 9, p. 3; WS, Dec. 9, p. 17; FP, Dec. 9, p. 35.

¹⁹¹ GM, Dec. 10, p. 6.

¹⁹² FP, Dec. 10, p. 18; WS, Dec. 11, p. 7; GM, Dec. 11, p. 17.

in the calling of a special meeting of the Commission Government at 10 A.M. on the eleventh. However, this attempt was not expected to be successful.

Many articles concerning the actual signing of the terms appeared in all three papers. Both the Star and the Free Press printed summaries of the union terms' text. All three papers carried summaries of the signing ceremony in the Senate Chamber during which St. Laurent and Defense Minister Claxton signed for Canada and six of the seven Newfoundland delegates affixed their signatures. The terms signed included an increase for Newfoundland in money compared with the proposed terms of 1947 and were considered worth \$193.5 million by the Globe and Mail. Walsh called the terms improvements over the 1947 proposals. It was also the impression of a writer in St. John's that the Newfoundlanders felt satisfied with the terms. One of the potential problems now facing Canada were the United States' bases in Newfoundland. Education would remain

¹⁹³ GM, Dec. 11, p. 17.

¹⁹⁴ WS, Dec. 11, p. 10; FP, Dec. 11, pp. 1,12.

¹⁹⁵ GM, Dec. 13, pp. 1,2; WS, Dec. 11, pp. 1,10,24; FP, Dec. 11, pp. 1,12,25.

¹⁹⁶ WS, Dec. 11, pp. 1,10; FP, Dec. 11, p. 1; GM, Dec. 13, p. 10.

¹⁹⁷ FP, Dec. 11, p. 12.

¹⁹⁸ GM, Dec. 13, p. 11.

¹⁹⁹ WS, Dec. 11, p. 1.

under the Newfoundland provincial government's juris-
²⁰⁰ diction. A six month income tax holiday was also

included (three from the commission and three from the
 provincial), though the question of special tax pacts
 already in effect would be left in the hands of the

Canadian Parliament for a decision.²⁰¹ Newfoundland would
 be allowed to keep its Treasury surplus of about

\$40,000,000.²⁰² But it was soon expected that the govern-
 ments of Newfoundland and Canada would seek to avoid the
 importation of lower-dutied items into Newfoundland from
 now until union.²⁰³

Canada was also sending governmental
 representatives to Newfoundland to help organize the family
 allowance plan.²⁰⁴

The Globe and Mail's article, while
 announcing that a Newfoundland provincial election was to
 be held before July 31, 1949, speculated that Walsh, Small-
 wood, Bradley, and Crosbie would emerge as the political
 leaders in Newfoundland.²⁰⁵

On the thirteenth St. Laurent,
 now Prime Minister, hosted a dinner for the two delegations
 and the other important people involved in the negotiations.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁰ GM, Dec. 13, p. 10.

²⁰¹ GM, Dec. 13, p. 11.

²⁰² GM, Dec. 13, p. 10.

²⁰³ GM, Dec. 13, p. 10; GM, Dec. 14, p. 8; WS, Dec. 14,
 p. 15; WS, Dec. 14, p. 26.

²⁰⁴ WS, Dec. 13, p. 13.

²⁰⁵ GM, Dec. 13, p. 10.

²⁰⁶ WS, Dec. 13, p. 4; FP, Dec. 14, p. 2.

Also on this day, Maurice Jefferies in a Star column predicted Quebec would still complain about its boundary and the anti-confederates in Newfoundland would also criticize union.²⁰⁷

Needless to say, all three papers carried editorials pointing to the length of negotiations. The Free Press proclaimed that "[This] is no hasty shotgun marriage." But the writer also said union with Canada would require a period of adjustment for everyone.²⁰⁸ The Star in an editorial proclaimed "Destiny Strikes Approval" as the union terms were signed, but also noted that Newfoundland court action and the United Kingdom's Parliament were "obstacles... yet to be overcome."²⁰⁹ W.L. Clark, under his "As We See It" by-line, stated: "When Newfoundland becomes a part of Canada...it will be a natural development" in which all of "British North America" would be joined.²¹⁰ The editor of the Globe and Mail reminded his readers that there was still a "cloud across the sun" as Newfoundland had no responsible government to speak for the people. He also argued that "There must be a disposition to withhold judgment on many details, pending study of the documents." Thus, the paper in the future months would address itself to those topics arousing possible inter-governmental conflict (e.g., the

²⁰⁷WS, Dec. 13, p. 20.

²⁰⁸FP, Dec. 13, p. 4.

²⁰⁹WS, Dec. 13, p. 4.

²¹⁰WS, Dec. 13, p. 2.

211
oleomargarine question). Continuing true to form the editor of the Globe and Mail was the 'doubting Thomas' of these three papers.

The rest of the month, few articles appeared which were directly connected to the terms of union, but in arguing for union the Star's Maurice Jefferies calculated that Newfoundland's cost in becoming part of Canada was \$1.08 per acre, 212 less than either Alaska or Louisiana cost the United States. One important announcement appeared later in the month telling of the establishing of the necessary bureaucracy in 213 the Newfoundland family allowance system. Writing on the Star's editorial page, H.L. MacPherson speculated that opposition to Newfoundland's confederation with Canada 214 would continue to decrease in that country. All three papers carried the news item that the confederation issue would be the first item of business before the Canadian 215 Parliament after it opened on January 26. On the twenty-fourth, the Globe and Mail speculated that Bradley would get a cabinet position, Walsh probably a Senate seat after

211 GM, Dec. 14, p. 6. One of the terms of union granted Newfoundland the right to continue manufacturing and selling oleomargarine. This created a conflict as Canadian law banning the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was still on the books. Thus, the signed terms of union would ban the effect of that law in Newfoundland.

212 WS, Dec. 15, p. 20.

213 GM, Dec. 20, p. 17; WS, Dec. 22, p. 11; FP, Dec. 22, p. 10.

214 WS, Dec. 23, p. 4.

215 GM, Dec. 24, p. 2; WS, Dec. 23, p. 1; WS, Dec. 28, p. 4; FP, Dec. 22, p. 1; FP, Dec. 24, p. 7.

serving briefly as an executive, and Smallwood the premier-
ship of Newfoundland.²¹⁶ On the twenty-ninth, St. Laurent
speaking in Quebec City told Quebeckers that while they
would not get Labrador, they would benefit along with the
rest of Canada's economy from its addition. Finally, this
year the Star included the addition of Newfoundland to
confederation as one of the "Stories of the Year."²¹⁷ Thus,
during the year Newfoundlanders had voted for union and the
terms affecting it had been negotiated. However, confedera-
tion still needed to be ratified by the United Kingdom's
Parliament, the Canadian Parliament, and the Commission
Government. There also still existed the possibilities of
legal challenges that would have to be resolved.

²¹⁶GM, Dec. 24, p. 3.

²¹⁷WS, Dec. 31, sec. 5, p. 10.

1949: THE YEAR OF ACCEPTANCE

January was a relatively quiet month in 1949. The negotiation of terms had been finished about mid-December. The Canadian Parliament's next session was not scheduled to open before late January. Especially with the beginning of Parliament, news articles concerning Newfoundland would once again appear with much more rapidity.

The Free Press on the fourth, related that A.J. Walsh had been knighted and speculated that he would become Newfoundland's first lieutenant governor under confederation.¹ In England Alan Herbert (M.P., Oxford) announced in a letter to The Times his intention to introduce a private bill in Parliament. The intent of the bill would be to prohibit confederation.² Back in St. John's it was disclosed that the full bench of Newfoundland Supreme Court would hear the appeal of Justice Brian Dunfield's dismissal of the anti-confederates' attempt to secure a writ to block confederation.³ After a full day of hearings concerning the writ, the court adjourned to January 22.⁴ The court ruled then that the writ should be denied as there was no basis for it.⁵ Thus ended the attempt to block union in the courts of Newfoundland. Shifting back to London, it was announced that

¹FP, Jan. 4, 1949, p. 10. All newspaper footnotes for this chapter will refer to 1949.

²FP, Jan. 7, p. 18.

³WS, Jan. 10, p. 15.

⁴FP, Jan. 15, p. 30.

⁵FP, Jan. 24, p. 11.

Herbert would introduce his bill to hold a May election in Newfoundland to allow the people to elect a legislature that would choose either self-government or Canada, but there was little chance the bill would even be debated.⁶ An editorial in the Globe and Mail on the fourteenth, vehemently attacked the process being used to bring Newfoundland into confederation. The editor charged the parties involved with violating the British North America Act (sometimes referred to as the BNA Act) and also the 1933 British agreement with Newfoundland. In summation, the writer continued:

...Sir Alan Herbert has forced an embarrassing decision on his colleagues. But his action should also serve to arouse Canadian opinion. This may be taken as a certainty: that if Newfoundland is brought into Canada by any method open to criticism as undemocratic or unconstitutional, an anti-Confederation party in the island will forever be able to argue that union was railroaded and that the island's economic troubles (which will not end soon) are due to the forced marriage. Such are the future troubles in the family invited by the procedure now in view.⁷

The Star's editorial on the same day felt the anti-confederates were "more wishful than logical" to expect the British Parliament to in effect "invalidate the referendum held last

⁶WS, Jan 13, p. 13; GM, Jan. 13, p. 15.

⁷GM, Jan. 14, p. 6.

year, and perhaps kill the union idea for another century." Another factor was felt to be Britain's fatigue at bailing Newfoundland out of trouble.⁸

On the fourteenth of January, the Globe and Mail noted the many Canadian officials in Newfoundland were preparing the land for transition. Over ten different officials were partaking in studies ranging from civil service to narcotics to veteran's affairs.⁹ St. Laurent was confronted with an additional problem of how to elect M.P.s from Newfoundland after union. He could either call a special by-election or a general election. However, a general election would not be necessary before August 1950.¹⁰

The question of who had jurisdiction on the United States' bases also came up due to the filing of a suit by M. Evans and M. Cahill, who charged that they had been wrongly arrested by the United States Military Police the previous July. A Newfoundland Supreme Court jury awarded Cahill \$100 damages, but the trial did not settle the question of sovereignty.¹¹

Another story from St. John's on the fourteenth stated that the Commission Government would ratify the terms of union only after the Canadians had done so. Governor Macdonald and the three British commissioners would probably

⁸WS, Jan. 14, p. 4.

⁹GM, Jan. 14, p. 17.

¹⁰FP, Jan. 15, p. 32.

¹¹WS, Jan. 18, p. 11; FP, Jan. 17, p. 13.

leave on the thirty-first of March with the Lieutenant-¹²
 Governor remaining, to nominate a temporary government.
 In commenting on the fiscal relationship of the family
 allowance and the income tax, W.L. Clark of the Star felt
 Newfoundlanders would receive more money back than they
 would pay to Ottawa.¹³ Prime Minister St. Laurent on the
 nineteenth announced in Ottawa that enabling legislation
 for Newfoundland's union would be the top priority of the
 forthcoming session of Commons.¹⁴ The Star speculated
 that the Conservatives would probably attack the terms as
 the party leader, George Drew, wanted fiscal terms to be
 the subject of federal-provincial negotiation.¹⁵ In
 editorializing on the forthcoming legislation the Star
 hoped all members of Parliament, especially "party leaders,"
 would "refrain from party politics on this legislation [as]
 [i]t is too important a measure." Because of the closeness
 of the election, "Canadian politicians [must be] careful lest
 they aggravate still sore wounds."¹⁶ The Free Press' editor
 was afraid debate on union "may center on detail and pro-
 cedure rather than on the actual matter of union."¹⁷

¹²WS, Jan. 18, sec. 2, p. 1.

¹³WS, Jan. 28, p. 2.

¹⁴GM, Jan. 20, p. 3.

¹⁵WS, Jan. 25, p. 18.

¹⁶WS, Jan. 26, p. 4.

¹⁷FP, Jan. 27, p. 4.

On the twenty-seventh, the Canadian Government gave¹⁸ notice of a bill to ratify the confederation terms. However, the Government was forced to delay debate on the union proposals for a week.¹⁹ Editorially attacking the opposition for winning a "queer sort of victory" in delaying the Newfoundland Bill, the editor of the Star asked: "What will proud Newfoundlanders think when they hear the opposition parties were anxious to postpone action on federation so as to allow members opportunity to talk about everything else under the sun?"²⁰ The Government on the next day with support from the CCF won a procedural fight to delay the Newfoundland Bill only a week as the Conservatives²¹ attempt to defeat the Government lost 141 to 55. On the twenty-ninth, the Globe and Mail reported that George Drew had received a telegram from Fred Marshall, President of The Responsible Government League. In part it stated:

[we] endorse the stand you have taken to block the improper rushing of legislation in the Canadian Parliament to effect union... [As] [n]either the government nor delegates had authority from the Newfoundland people to negotiate terms... [Therefore] [w]e appeal to our sister Dominion, through you, to safeguard our democratic rights.²²

¹⁸FP, Jan. 27, p. 1.

¹⁹WS, Jan. 28, p. 24; FP, Jan. 28, p. 16.

²⁰WS, Jan. 29, p. 4.

²¹WS, Jan. 29, pp. 9, 18.

²²GM, Jan. 29, p. 3.

The anti-confederates of Newfoundland thus continued to demonstrate their willingness to continue fighting union, but they were now starting to run out of time since February was almost upon them.

In February, the items directly related to union, appeared in large numbers since the Canadian Parliament was now set to take up action on the Newfoundland Bill. On the first a Free Press staff writer, Robert W. Needham, filed a story from Ottawa. As he felt confederation legislation was only a formality, Needham speculated Smallwood would be the first premier and also listed four possibilities for the position of Lieutenant-Governor.²³ Saturday, the fifth, was accompanied by two short notices in the Star declaring that the Newfoundland Bill would be taken up in Commons on Monday, and that Smallwood would be there to watch the debate.²⁴ The Globe and Mail on the same day noted that after April 1, Canadian manufactures sending goods to Newfoundland would have to pay Canadian sales and excise taxes.²⁵ On the seventh, the House of Commons gave first reading to the Newfoundland Bill.²⁶ Prime Minister St. Laurent on the seventh was to move a resolution expressing endorsement of union, which was expected to be unanimously approved. However,

²³FP, Feb. 3, p. 10.

²⁴WS, Feb. 5, pp. 13,20.

²⁵GM, Feb. 5, p. 7.

²⁶WS, Feb. 7, p. 13; FP, Feb. 8, p. 7.

opposition especially from the Conservatives on the manner
of obtaining union, was expected.²⁷ A day earlier in St.
John's, Canadian Trade Minister Howe addressed the Newfound-
land Board of Trade. He stated that while there would be
minor problems regarding industry, these would be worked
out. Also stressed were the economic benefits of union to
Newfoundland's industries.²⁸ Maurice Jefferies in his
article for the Star said he believed the United Kingdom's
Parliament would have a completed Canadian Newfoundland
Bill within three weeks of its approval.²⁹ Two of Conserva-
tive leader George Drew's objections centered around the
tax agreement and allowing Newfoundland to sell oleomar-
garine.³⁰ John Diefenbaker, also a Conservative, criticized
the Bill because it did not follow the BNA Act exactly. As
a result Newfoundlanders opposed to union were not being
protected by the law.³¹ Prime Minister St. Laurent success-
fully defended the Government's actions on all three points.
Thus, the Bill passed its second reading with only one vocal
dissenting vote (Irene Hamel, Maurice-Lafleche, Quebec).³²

²⁷WS, Feb. 8, p. 9; GM, Feb. 8, p. 3; GM, Feb. 7, p. 3;
FP, Feb. 8, p. 5.

²⁸GM, Feb. 7, p. 3; WS, Feb. 7, p. 17; FP, Feb. 7, p. 30.

²⁹WS, Feb. 7, p. 20.

³⁰WS, Feb. 9, p. 10; GM, Feb. 9, p. 3; FP, Feb. 9, p. 16.

³¹WS, Feb. 9, p. 10; GM, Feb. 9, p. 3.

³²FP, Feb. 9, p. 18; WS, Feb. 9, pp. 10, 20.

The Free Press in commenting on the debate prior to passage³³ noted that debate had been surprisingly short. H.L. MacPherson wrote that the demand put forward by the Conservatives to have Newfoundland enter union in strict accordance with the BNA Act was unnecessary. Canada had not made Newfoundland vote for confederation; besides, do not the voters³⁴ elect the legislature?

The Newfoundland United States' bases as an issue also surfaced again in February. J.B. McEvoy, the last Chairman of the National Convention, pointed out that strategically³⁵ these bases could help win the "Cold War." The Prime Minister announced in Commons on the eighth a trip to see President Truman and stated that "some aspect of the leases" will be covered. Continuing on, St. Laurent said he hoped negotiations with the United States (already underway)³⁶ to obtain modifications in the leases would be successful. An editorial from the Ottawa Journal on this subject was carried in the Star about a week later. The main issue was seen as what arrangements Canada and the United States would have to make to keep each side happy. But one item was clear, the Ottawa Journal did not want military bases³⁷ in Canada subject to United States sovereignty.

³³FP, Feb. 9, p. 18.

³⁴WS, Feb. 9, p. 4.

³⁵FP, Feb. 8, p. 19.

³⁶WS, Feb. 9, p. 10; GM, Feb. 9, p. 7.

³⁷WS, Feb. 17, p. 4.

On February eighth in St. John's, it was announced by The Responsible Government League that they had been granted leave to appeal the Newfoundland Supreme Court decision to the Privy Council.³⁸ And in England, during debate in the House of Lords, the terms of confederation were defended as being fair and generous to Newfoundland.³⁹

Meanwhile back in Canada, the Newfoundland Bill was undergoing continued study in Commons. During the next week and a half, debate on the Bill and the presentation of statistical data by the Government to support the Bill would occur. While Finance Minister Abbott showed how Canada would make money by taking over Newfoundland coinage, he also mentioned that Canada would help Newfoundland by paying for items it had previously been responsible for (e.g. war veterans' pensions) and by starting new programs (e.g. family allowances). In all fifty-three amendments to Canadian law would be applied to Newfoundland after April 1.⁴⁰ The estimated deficit for Canada in the exchanging of money with Newfoundland would probably run from twenty-three to thirty or thirty-five million dollars annually for the first years of confederation.⁴¹ Both war veterans and senior citizens' pensions would at least be partially underwritten by Ottawa.⁴²

³⁸FP, Feb. 9, p. 18.

³⁹FP, Feb. 9, p. 16.

⁴⁰GM, Feb. 10, p. 3.

⁴¹GM, Feb. 10, p. 17; WS, Feb. 10, pp. 10, 22; WS, Feb. 11, p. 20.

⁴²WS, Feb. 11, pp. 13, 21; WS, Feb. 11, sec. 2, p. 1; FP, Feb. 18, p. 4.

Transport Minister Chevrier estimated the Newfoundland Railroad would run over a three million dollar deficit annually, plus the cost of betterments.⁴³ An amendment to

the Emergency Exchange Compensation Act was passed in an attempt to block Newfoundland trade loopholes for a year after confederation.⁴⁴ All three papers carried the news

of St. Laurent's Commons-stated opinion on the tenth that The Responsible Government League's appeal to the Privy Council was not seen as barring union. The Prime Minister concluded, there will be "no delay on our part in asking

Parliament to confirm this agreement."⁴⁵ The editor of the Globe and Mail, after reiterating his prior objections to the methodology used in the union proceedings, speculated that the threat of successful court action, no matter how

"remote" put "limits on the Canadian Parliament's discussion."⁴⁶

Also, commenting on the debate of the past few days, the Free Press stated "that the island was not in a healthy state under British control." Therefore, the price Canada might pay (Abbott's estimate) was not really excessive. Why? Because "[w]e could not afford to stand aside and watch" a

⁴³FP, Feb. 11, p. 8.

⁴⁴GM, Feb. 11, p. 1.

⁴⁵GM, Feb. 11, p. 3; WS, Feb. 11, p. 24; FP, Feb. 11, p. 8.

⁴⁶GM, Feb. 11, p. 6.

poor relation "at our gate, become poorer."⁴⁷ Commenting on Premier Duplessis' assertion that if "St. Laurent's interpretation of the British North American Act is correct then Confederation was a fraud," the Star felt he was trying to erect almost "fraudulent" barriers to union.⁴⁸

On the eleventh of February in Ottawa, the Newfoundland Bill received its third reading. An informal vote on it was taken with only two or three against it--most notably P.E. Gagnon (Independent, Chicoutimi, Quebec).⁴⁹ The address to the United Kingdom Government would be the first topic on Monday the fourteenth. The Bill was now to be sent to the Senate for its consideration.⁵⁰ The Star's MacPherson commented that the fact that no party had opposed the third reading must have disheartened every Newfoundland anti-confederate when they found out.⁵¹ On the thirteenth, it was reported that Gagnon's dissenting vote was not recorded, thus, creating the illusion of unanimity.⁵² Editorially in the Monday's paper, the Globe and Mail criticized the margarine clause in the Newfoundland Bill as indefensible.⁵³ Both the Star and the Globe and Mail reported union would cause Newfoundlanders to pay more for tobacco due to the Canadian tax.⁵⁴

⁴⁷FP, Feb. 12, p. 4.

⁴⁸WS, Feb. 12, p. 4.

⁴⁹GM, Feb. 12, p. 3; WS, Feb. 12, p. 18; FP, Feb. 12, p. 34.

⁵⁰GM, Feb. 12, p. 3.

⁵¹WS, Feb. 12, p. 4.

⁵²GM, Feb. 14, p. 21.

⁵³GM, Feb. 14, p. 6.

⁵⁴GM, Feb. 14, p. 2; WS, Feb. 14, sec. 2, p. 1.

February 15 was not the easy day as expected for Commons to debate and finalize the address to the United Kingdom Government before putting the Newfoundland Bill to a final vote. George Drew plunged the session into an uproar by offering an amendment requiring the provinces to be consulted on the terms of union. With the CCF Party voting with the Liberals and the Social Credit Party voting with the Conservatives, the Government defeated the Drew amendment⁵⁵ 137-66. In the debate preceeding the vote, the Conservatives had charged that the Canadian Constitution was being treated like a "scrap of paper" and being violated.⁵⁶ However, the majority of members did not agree with this assessment and accepted Justice Minister Garson's denial of the charge.⁵⁷ The Globe and Mail applauded George Drew's opposition to the Government's failure to consult the provinces. The editor felt that Parliament by defeating Drew's proposal had given future governments the right to amend the BNA Act without consulting the provinces. Thus, in the future, even rights could be taken away by the vote of a simple majority of Commons.⁵⁸ A second amendment offered by Wilfred Lacroix (Liberal, Quebec-Montmorency) would have

⁵⁵GM, Feb. 15, p. 2; GM Feb. 16, pp. 1,2; WS, Feb. 15, pp. 11,16; FP, Feb. 15, p. 13; FP, Feb. 16, p. 26.

⁵⁶FP, Feb. 16, p. 26; GM, Feb. 16, p. 1; WS, Feb. 16, p. 11.

⁵⁷WS, Feb. 15, p. 16.

⁵⁸GM, Feb. 16, p. 6.

required Ottawa to receive the consent of all the provinces prior to putting union into effect. This amendment was defeated 191 to 12 as the Social Credit Party was the only major party to support it.⁵⁹ The second vote ironically had the Conservatives supporting the Government's side by its votes opposing the Lacroix amendment. This action was felt by the Star's editor to prove that "the Conservatives did not mean what they implied, about consultation of the provinces."⁶⁰ Switching to the Senate Chambers, debate on the Newfoundland Bill had been proceeding there. Senator John Farris (Liberal, British Columbia) made a brilliant speech defending the Bill and attacked the idea of consulting the provinces. While negotiations on union were taking place, he declared, was the time to have raised the issue, not now.⁶¹

While Ottawa was engaged in voting and debate, St. John's witnessed a different aspect of the union attempt. Chesley Crosbie told Governor Macdonald his reason for refusing to sign the terms. He felt they were inadequate financially and would eventually hurt Newfoundland. Meanwhile Peter Cashin challenged Prime Minister St. Laurent to

⁵⁹GM, Feb. 16, p. 3; WS, Feb. 16, pp. 11, 24; FP, Feb. 16, p. 26.

⁶⁰WS, Feb. 17, p. 4.

⁶¹GM, Feb. 16, p. 3; FP, Feb. 16, p. 6; WS, Feb. 16, p. 19.

come to St. John's and in debate attempt to disprove Cashin's contention that Canada, the Commission Government, and Britain schemed together to achieve union for Newfoundland.⁶²

February 16 witnessed the end of debate. St. Laurent in defending the petition to the United Kingdom Parliament denied this would be an amendment to the BNA Act, therefore consultation of the provinces was unneeded. In asking the Commons to approve the resolution to address the United Kingdom Parliament, the Prime Minister argued "that [rejection] would mean...no union...on the terms that have been approved." Again with the support of the CCF, the Liberal Government won the vote by 140 to 74.⁶³ As the results were announced all members joined in singing "O Canada" and "God Save the King." The writer stated that former Prime Minister King deserved much of the credit for union as his government had started the negotiations.⁶⁴ Commenting on the Liberals starting the singing of "God Save the King," W.L. Clark wrote this must have caused "[s]ome of the old conservatives...[to turn] over in their grave."⁶⁵ On the seventeenth, the Globe and Mail's editor wrote a scathing article attacking both the Government's

⁶²WS, Feb. 15, p. 2; GM, Feb. 16, p. 2; FP, Feb. 15, p. 18; FP, Feb. 16, p. 7.

⁶³GM, Feb. 17, p. 1; WS, Feb. 17, pp. 15, 24; FP, Feb. 17, p. 6.

⁶⁴WS, Feb. 17, p. 15.

⁶⁵WS, Feb. 23, p. 2.

handling of Newfoundland's union and also the support of the CCF in votes approving the Government's policy.⁶⁶ This day also witnessed the introduction in the United Kingdom's House of Lords of the Newfoundland Liberation Bill that sought to prohibit union and return responsible government in Newfoundland.⁶⁷ The Bill was given no chance of passing. Back in Ottawa, the estimated effect of union on the Government's spending on the railroad and family allowance program was announced.⁶⁸ After Senate approval, the Newfoundland Bill received the Royal Assent in the Senate Chambers on Friday, February 18.⁶⁹ While the Free Press complimented George Drew for criticizing the Government's interpretation of the BNA Act in securing union, the editor also showed Drew's contention that the provinces must be consulted, was not in the BNA Act either. Continuing on the editorial stated:

[T]here should be some clarification of procedure regarding the constitution. What is happening is that the Federal Parliament is acquiring simply by precedent, the power to amend the constitution. There has been little opposition as long as the amendments were not controversial. But it is easy to see how a serious clash could arise...[We need to find] some method other than application

⁶⁶GM, Feb. 17, p. 6.

⁶⁷WS, Feb. 17, p. 1; FP, Feb. 17, p. 1; GM, Feb. 18, p. 3.

⁶⁸WS, Feb. 18, pp. 2, 11; GM, Feb. 18, p. 3.

⁶⁹GM, Feb. 18, p. 1; GM, Feb. 19, p. 17; WS, Feb. 18, pp. 17, 24; FP, Feb. 19, p. 14.

to Westminster for making [controversial] changes, ... [otherwise] our constitution might easily become a strait jacket.⁷⁰

This demonstrated need for change was probably the greatest side-benefit of union. In its "Press Opinions" column, the Star carried an editorial from the St. Thomas (Ontario) Times-Journal which criticized Drew's attempt to halt union. The editor also expressed the opinion that Newfoundlanders may feel the fear they are not wanted in confederation due to this.⁷¹

On February 18, in responding to questions from the press, George Drew defended his party's stance. He also pointed out another potential problem in that Newfoundland's Gander airport under union would probably lose its right to allow passenger transference of airlines as this was not allowed in Canada.⁷² Thus, Newfoundland's economy would be hurt. The Commission Government on the twenty-first, approved the terms of union for Newfoundland and sent that information on to London.⁷³ On the twenty-second in London, M.P. Noel-Baker introduced the British North American Bill (to implement union; the British North American Bill hereafter will be cited as the BNA Bill) to Parliament, which then gave the Bill first reading.⁷⁴ The next day, M.P.

⁷⁰FP, Feb. 18, p. 4.

⁷¹WS, Feb. 21, p. 4.

⁷²GM, Feb. 19, p. 1, 3.

⁷³FP, Feb. 21, p. 14.

⁷⁴WS, Feb. 22, p. 18; FP, Feb. 22, p. 14.

Alan Herbert, speaking for twelve other M.P.s, led the tabling of a motion to delay consideration of the BNA Bill until after the Privy Council had heard The Responsible Government League's appeal.⁷⁵ Only two days before the Star's W.L. Clark had criticized Alan Herbert's past and forthcoming attempts to halt union as hurting "the cause of Empire."⁷⁶ Switching back to the Canadian scene, the Ottawa Journal had charged in an editorial that Drew was using the Newfoundland issue in an attempt to become Prime Minister.⁷⁷ On February 23, it was announced in St. John's that Governor Macdonald was expected to leave soon.⁷⁸ The same day, the Globe and Mail again attacked the Canadian Government for using an "irregular procedure to obtain Newfoundland," and also those newspapers, which had opposed editorially the consultation of the provinces concerning Newfoundland.⁷⁹ A dispatch, telling of the start in St. John's of a fund-raising drive (\$25,000 goal) to finance an appeal to the Privy Council, was printed in the Globe and Mail and the Star.⁸⁰ Writing for the Star W.L. Clark on the twenty-fourth commented: "Petty arguments can befog an issue. The real fact is that Newfound-

⁷⁵WS, Feb. 24, p. 25; FP, Feb. 23, p. 7; GM, Feb. 24, p. 8.

⁷⁶WS, Feb. 21, p. 2.

⁷⁷WS, Feb. 22, p. 4.

⁷⁸WS, Feb. 23, p. 18.

⁷⁹GM, Feb. 23, p. 6.

⁸⁰GM, Feb. 23, p. 13; WS, Feb. 24, sec. 2, p. 17.

land is a great country of fine people who will be splendid Canadian citizens." ⁸¹ The rest of the month the newspapers carried no unsigned articles pertaining to the political in-fighting taking place in either Newfoundland, Canada, or the United Kingdom regarding union.

The union with Newfoundland was still a topic of much conversation in the papers during March, even though it remained only for the United Kingdom's Parliament to approve it before Newfoundland would join Canada. An editorial in the Globe and Mail on March first, was entitled: "Again--Newfoundland." While the writer acknowledged that this would seem "tiresome to those taking part as well as to patient readers," it was felt that a Financial Post editorial must be rebutted. The Financial Post, while agreeing the BNA Act had not been followed, argued that this was the result of "[t]he evolution of our institutions." This was found to be reprehensible by the Globe and Mail as plebesites were "a device which Canadians have been invited to regard as handy and popular among dictators." Only if Newfoundland received a responsible government to negotiate union terms could this be avoided. ⁸² Very strong words indeed had been written as the editor seemed to have lost his temper. The same day in Ottawa, St. Laurent announced that plans for union celebrations would not be

⁸¹WS, Feb. 24, p. 2.

⁸²GM, March 1, p. 6.

made until the United Kingdom Parliament passed the BNA⁸³ Bill. The next day, the second, in London, the United Kingdom Parliament defeated M.P. Alan Herbert's motion to first restore responsible government and passed the BNA⁸⁴ Bill on its second reading 217 to 15. On Thursday, the third, it was announced that the third reading of the Bill⁸⁵ was being scheduled for March 10. An editorial, appearing in the Globe and Mail on the fourth, noted the United Kingdom Parliament was speedily proceeding with the consideration of the Bill for union. Because both Canada and the United Kingdom's Government wanted the Bill to pass, Herbert's motion had not a chance to pass. In a semi-conciliatory gesture, the writer noted that unless the Privy Council sided with The Responsible Government League's case, union would be an accomplished fact within a month. Therefore: "[t]his newspaper, having no doubt it will bring great benefits to both parties, hopes that the constitutional flaws in the arrangement will not cause discontent and⁸⁶ strife in the future." The Globe and Mail by this editorial seemed to be signalling the end of its campaign against the way union had been negotiated and was now in the process of being approved. Also on the fourth, the Free Press

⁸³FP, March 2, p. 16.

⁸⁴GM, March 3, p. 1; WS, March 3, p. 16.

⁸⁵GM, March 4, p. 17.

⁸⁶GM, March 6, p. 4.

speculated that Gordon Bradley was most likely to be
⁸⁷
 invited to join the cabinet.

Turning back to England, the Star carried the text of The (London) Daily Graphic's criticism of the United Kingdom Parliament's handling of the BNA Bill as being insensitive to a sizeable Newfoundland minority, which had
⁸⁸
 voted for responsible government. In Winnipeg, E. Russel, a Newfoundland Resources Department official, said it was wrong to feel almost half the Newfoundlanders opposed union. Not all, who opposed, disliked union, but rather the method being used. But because of the improved terms offered, he
⁸⁹
 felt support for union had continued to grow. On the tenth in London, the House of Commons passed the BNA Bill by a vote of 241 to 12. The Bill was then sent to the House
⁹⁰
 of Lords. The Globe and Mail's editorial the next day, pointed out that the United Kingdom Government's Attorney-General, Hartley Shawcross, stated the Statue of Westminster (1931) did not apply to Newfoundland. Thus, the Dominion
⁹¹
 of Newfoundland was considered to have colonial status. Back in Ottawa, it was announced that Newfoundland would
⁹²
 have reserve units in all three branches of the military.

⁸⁷FP, March 4, p. 16.

⁸⁸WS, March 7, p. 8.

⁸⁹WS, March 9, p. 11.

⁹⁰GM, March 10, p. 1; WS, March 10, p. 18; FP, March 10, p. 15.

⁹¹GM, March 11, p. 6.

⁹²WS, March 12, p. 14.

Also, noted was the space left in the Peace Tower Arch to hold the coat of arms of a tenth province, and a description of the arms of Newfoundland.⁹³ In St. John's on March 14, Smallwood noted Newfoundland's "traditional fear of the property tax" was fading and "there is a great reconciliation to confederation among the people." He also said that Newfoundlanders believed their income taxes would be lower.⁹⁴ However, as W.L. Clark pointed out in the Star, there were still many "die-hards" in Newfoundland. This would be a challenge to other Canadians to try to make sure that Newfoundlanders will not be unhappy as Canadians.⁹⁵

Some negative reactions from the anti-confederates in Newfoundland were experienced by Canadian Government experts preparing for the transition to take place March 31.⁹⁶ H.L. MacPherson of the Star speculated that the Canadian Government would have to hold national elections soon, probably in early June, so as to give Newfoundland representation in Parliament. Before the elections, Newfoundland would probably be represented by a minister in the cabinet. This would be done to avoid charges of 'no representation' by Newfoundlanders.⁹⁷ In Maurice Jefferies' Star column

⁹³WS, March 12, p. 22; WS, March 14, p. 4. Later this month on the twenty-fifth, the order was given to prepare to begin carving Newfoundland's arms on April 1. GM, March 25, p. 3.

⁹⁴GM, March 15, p. 2.

⁹⁵WS, March 17, p. 2.

⁹⁶WS, March 17, p. 11.

⁹⁷WS, March 18, p. 4.

on the twenty-second, it was stated there would be no formal celebrations held to mark Newfoundland's entry into union. He also noted that the CCF, Liberal, and Conservative Parties were expected to try to get candidates in Newfoundland elected.⁹⁸ Shifting to London, the House of Lords passed the BNA Bill on March 22.⁹⁹ The Bill received the Royal Assent the next day. The Canadian Commons broke into cheers upon learning of this. St. Laurent also announced ceremonies welcoming Newfoundland would take place on April first in St. John's and Ottawa with the Canadian Broadcasting Company to carry them live.¹⁰⁰ Finance Minister Abbott had estimated that Newfoundland's cost for the Canadian Government would be \$23,000,000 for the first year.¹⁰¹ Ottawa's Budget's tax provisions were viewed by Newfoundlanders very favorably.¹⁰² On the twenty-fifth, the Star speculated that Bradley would be chosen as Newfoundland's cabinet representative--four days later the Globe and Mail carried a similar report.¹⁰³ The Free Press on the twenty-sixth, contained an editorial from the Vancouver News-Herald attacking the announced intentions to appoint Newfoundland's Senators on

⁹⁸WS, March 22, p. 16.

⁹⁹GM, March 23, p. 2; WS, March 24, p. 15.

¹⁰⁰GM, March 24, p. 7; WS, March 24, p. 14; FP, March 25, p. 16.

¹⁰¹FP, March 23, p. 9.

¹⁰²FP, March 24, p. 5.

¹⁰³WS, March 25, pp. 25,28; GM, March 29, pp. 1,2.

sectarian lines and lamenting the fact that the Senate had not been reformed so that the Senators would be elected by the people.¹⁰⁴ From St. John's on March 26, came the news that the anti-confederates were dropping their fight. This could be attributed to the lower Canadian income taxes and also family allowances.¹⁰⁵

On Monday, March 28, the Star in an editorial noted it would be a "historic week for Canada" as the country's land area, population, and mineral resources would be greatly increased.¹⁰⁶ W.L. Clark in commenting on the people in England, who were for responsible government, noted Britain had neglected Newfoundland in the past and now it would become Canadian. In fact, said Clark, "Newfoundland enters a new era as a Canadian province. All tears being shed in Britain today are too late."¹⁰⁷ Meanwhile in London, the News Chronicle bade "farewell" to Newfoundland and said Newfoundland's joining Canada "would be beneficial to all concerned in the long run."¹⁰⁸

Joseph Smallwood, the Newfoundland premier-designate, stated on March 29 that he was "ardently anxious" to assume office because "the opportunity that lies in the hands of the first premier is tremendous to do something for the people."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴FP, March 26, p. 4.

¹⁰⁵FP, March 26, p. 9.

¹⁰⁶WS, March 28, p. 4.

¹⁰⁷WS, March 29, p. 2.

¹⁰⁸WS, March 29, p. 9.

¹⁰⁹GM, March 30, p. 9; WS, March 30, sec. 2, p. 1.

The next day, the thirtieth, Finance Minister Abbott tabled a budget estimate in excess of \$55,000,000 for Newfoundland the first year under union.¹¹⁰ Newfoundland was to join Canada one minute before the stroke of midnight on the night of March thirty-first.¹¹¹ Both of these articles pointed out the background of Newfoundland, but only the Star's went on to say that Walsh would become Lieutenant-Governor at a 1:15 P.M. ceremony tomorrow, and elections were scheduled for June. On March 31 in a front-page editorial, the Free Press joyously welcomed Newfoundland to confederation. The editor stated Canadians were glad that Newfoundlanders "have at last by their own free will, decided to join with Canada in forming a strong nation."¹¹² The Star editorialized: "We are proud to have Newfoundland as a tenth province. We should do all possible to make all Newfoundlanders proud to be Canadians."¹¹³ Both editorials pointed out Newfoundland's extra need for economic help as it was economically backward compared with Canada. W.L. Clark traced the growth of confederation in his column, "As We See It," and concluded: "There is a challenge to Canadians to make sure that Newfoundland will never regret coming into confederation. Canadians and Newfoundlanders! Canadians all!"¹¹⁴ Thus,

¹¹⁰WS, March 31, p. 28; GM, March 31, p. 1; FP, March 31, p. 30.

¹¹¹FP, March 31, pp. 12, 18; WS, March 31, pp. 1, 8.

¹¹²FP, March 31, p. 1.

¹¹³WS, March 31, p. 4.

¹¹⁴WS, March 31, p. 2.

ended a very significant month in the separate histories of Newfoundland and Canada because now the marriage was to be consummated just the minute prior to midnight on the night of March 31--April 1.

CONCLUSION

All three papers covered the news of Newfoundland entering into confederation on the front page April 1.¹ The King of England conveyed a message to the Ottawa ceremony via the Governor General. His Majesty expressed the desire that the union under the guidance of God would prosper.² Prime Minister St. Laurent in his speech pointed out the nations in "the North Atlantic" area were now more secure due to the union.³ He also stated Newfoundland was a "full and equal" partner.⁴ In finishing St. Laurent said loyalty to the King of England would be a centerpiece of the life on this expanded nation.⁵ To Gordon Bradley union was the transformation of "a dream of long ago into an accomplished fact."⁶ Bradley was chosen as Newfoundland's representative in the Canadian Government's Cabinet and given the portfolio of "Secretary of State."⁷

Because of the timing of union, Newfoundlanders were eligible to receive a family allowance check in April.⁸

¹GM, April 1, p. 1; WS, April 1, p. 1; FP, April 1, p. 1.

²FP, April 1, p. 16; GM, April 2, p. 17.

³GM, April 2, p. 17. ⁴WS, April 1, p. 1.

⁵WS, April 1, p. 2; FP, April 1, p. 16.

⁶FP, April 1, p. 1; GM, April 2, p. 17; WS, April 1, p. 1.

⁷FP, April 1, p. 1; GM, April 2, p. 17; WS, April 1, p. 1; FP, April 2, p. 20.

⁸WS, April 1, p. 1.

While Newfoundland fishermen and farmers felt union would be beneficial, the responsible government hot-bed of St. John's witnessed the use of black crepe and flags at half-mast as a silent protest.⁹ In London, England, at a reception held at the Canadian Embassy, there was a party celebrating union. Prime Minister Attlee and Philip Noel-Baker, Commonwealth Relations Minister, were in attendance.¹⁰ The Star's editorial on the first, hoped that when the Canadian Parliamentary elections were held, the Newfoundlanders would not divide on the basis of either pro or anti-confederates.¹¹ The editor of the Globe and Mail expressed the hope that Newfoundlanders would:

find this moment in their history pleasantly exciting...May the union be forever a blessing to Canada and to the island which is yielding its ancient independence, but not its identity, to belong to a large fraternity.¹²

On the second, the Star praised the selection of Gordon Bradley as Secretary of State, since he was not in as vulnerable a position as the Fisheries Ministership would have left him. That he was a very capable debator, a good politician and also one of the driving Newfoundland forces for union was mentioned.¹³ Meanwhile back in St. John's

⁹GM, April 1, p. 19; WS, April 1, p. 26.

¹⁰GM, April 1, p. 19.

¹¹WS, April 1, p. 4.

¹²GM, April 1, p. 6.

¹³WS, April 2, p. 4.

Smallwood was choosing a cabinet and preparing for the
¹⁴
 upcoming provincial elections.

On the third, an article was written from St. John's
 describing the set-up and important members in Premier
¹⁵
 Smallwood's interim government. Smallwood was able to

announce a budget surplus of \$1,126,000 for the year
 ending March 31, 1949. Communications were rather hectic
 for the first days as the Premier's office lacked tele-

¹⁶
 phones. Smallwood in a radio message on Saturday night,
 April 2, set the tone for his government when he said: "Our
 governments are not archangels and we are not supermen. I
 think I can say that we are an average bunch of Newfound-
 landers who are determined to do our best for the toiling

¹⁷
 masses of this country." On the fourth the Star, in an
 editorial pointed to the forthcoming election in Newfound-
 land as good for the province because it meant the restora-
¹⁸
 tion of self-government to the people. The New York

Times in an editorial stated that: "Within the extremely
 flexible British political structures it has been possible
 for the people themselves to determine what course of action

¹⁴FP, April 2, p. 40; WS, April 2, p. 9.

¹⁵WS, April 4, p. 13; GM, April 4, p. 19.

¹⁶GM, April 4, p. 19; WS, April 4, p. 7; FP, April 4, p. 6.

¹⁷WS, April 4, p. 13; FP, April 4, p. 6.

¹⁸WS, April 4, p. 4.

they wished." And they had freely chosen confederation with Canada.¹⁹ On April 6 the Free Press and the Globe and Mail named additional members in Smallwood's cabinet and said Smallwood would take the industrial minister portfolio for himself.²⁰ H.L. MacPherson of the Star noted when a distant Newfoundland community asked for help, Premier Smallwood was able to send help quickly to the town.²¹ Government had really improved.

Joseph Smallwood, the Father of Confederation for Newfoundland, led his Liberal Party to victory in the May 27, 1949 Provincial Election. Smallwood thus became the province's first elected premier and continued in office until 1972, when the Liberals were narrowly defeated by the Conservatives in a disputed election.

Newfoundland, today, while having received many benefits from Confederation, still is one of the poorer provinces. The province's government has been, since 1949, occasionally charged with corruption and the making of political payoffs. The attempts to generate projects to help the people of the province have been often less than successful and have caused a return of skepticism to the province's politics. Newfoundland, while having markedly improved since confederation, still has a distance to go. But knowing

¹⁹WS, April 4, p. 10; WS, April 5, p. 4.

²⁰FP, April 6, p. 9; GM, April 6, p. 10.

²¹WS, April 8, p. 4.

the strength and determination of the people, Newfoundland will, if it is humanly possible, obtain further advancements for her people.

The following chart is included to help show the increases in Newfoundland Government expenditures and also general benefits, which have accrued to Newfoundlanders in the first fifteen and twenty years of confederation.

Total Expenditure of Newfoundland	c.1949	c.1965	c.1969
Government	30,011,000	157,628,000	311,581,000
Education	4,012,000	82,000,000	74,106,000
Health	5,538,000	28,580,000	56,611,000
Social Welfare	8,620,000	19,009,000	44,510,000
Transportation and Communications	3,978,000	47,371,000	57,997,000
Per capital income:			
1949, 1963	472	1,029	1,769
Population: 1951, 1961, 1971	361,416	457,853	522,104
Population of incorporated areas: 1949, 1967	85,000	338,000	NA
Number of municipalities:			
1949, 1967, 1971	23	152	218
Road mileage: 1949, 1966	2,296	4,627	5,931
Number of motor vehicles	13,765	91,165	112,027
Number of public libraries	27	53	3
Number of books	127,000	311,000	833,788
Circulation	264,000	693,000	2,054,833
School enrollment	75,086	144,000	160,650
University enrollment:			
1949, 1967	307	4,762	5,157
Number of television and relay stations: 1955, 1965	0	11	NA
Number of radio stations	4	11	NA
Number of telephones:			
1949, 1962	18,688	69,777	135,251
Number of working doctors:			
1949, 1964	150	330	466
Number of hospital beds:			
1949, 1964	2,000	5,000	NA ²²

²²Constructed from data in Noel, p. 265; 1972 Canada Yearbook: Statistical Annual of Resources, Demography,

The people of Newfoundland have also benefited greatly in the reduction of mortality rates between 1948 and 1964 due to increased availability of doctors, hospitals, and medical care. General mortality fell 25 per cent. Deaths due to diptheria and tuberculosis both fell off 95 per cent. Both mothers and their babies have greatly benefited from this increased health care as infant deaths fell by 40 per cent and maternity-related demises dropped by 80 per cent.²³

In general, the coverage given Newfoundland and the major events involved in the struggle for confederation was rather well done by all three southwestern Ontario newspapers. It was only in the secondary coverage that differences showed between the papers. The Globe and Mail as it was considered the national paper, ran longer articles from the wire services as a rule. Whereas, the Star would often cut down the length of articles as carried by the Globe and Mail, the Free Press would often edit them so that they would be sometimes even shorter. The Star, perhaps influenced by Detroit and its closeness to the United States, tended to give more coverage than the Free Press due to a need to establish and maintain a definite Canadian identity. The Free Press' lack of coverage was probably a direct result of the provincial nature of the paper.

Institutions, and Social and Economic Condition of Canada (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1972). NA means not available.

²³Noel, p. 265.

This provincial attitude was also demonstrated by the Free Press' failure to send a special correspondent to Newfoundland to cover in any depth the background of the country.

Editorially, all three papers claimed to be independent--thus, taking sides on issues rather than on politics.²⁴ All three papers supported the idea of confederation being expanded, but only the Globe and Mail openly and consistently attacked the methodology used to obtain union. This probably helps to explain why the Globe and Mail carried more articles on the moves of the opponents to confederation.

All three papers, in addition to their articles on the political happenings in Newfoundland, printed stories concerning other aspects of the Newfoundlander's life. The number of these articles and their frequency increased at the same rate as the corresponding political coverage escalated throughout this period from December 1945 to the actual joining of Newfoundland to Canada. In this area, as in the political arena, the coverage of events by the Star and the Globe and Mail was far superior to the Free Press', both in quality and quantity. Only the Globe and Mail and the Star sponsored special correspondents, who

²⁴Letter from David A. Rhydwen, Chief Librarian, The Globe and Mail, Toronto, June 18, 1974; letter from William C. Heine, Editor, The London Free Press, London, June 27, 1974; letter from John Marshall, former Associate Editor and Chief of the Ottawa Bureau, The Windsor Daily Star, Orangeville, Ontario, June 19, 1974.

were to traverse the island of Newfoundland and furnish their papers with first-hand information. The Star's correspondent, Rupert Jackson wrote thirty-seven articles between September, 1948 and March 31, 1949. Except for a couple of articles, all of Jackson's stories were carried prominently on the Star's editorial page. Eric Seymour, the special correspondent for the Globe and Mail, writing during the same period as Jackson, sent back twenty-seven articles to his sponsoring paper. However, these articles, unlike Jackson's, were printed in no set location by the Globe and Mail. The thrust of these correspondent's stories were to tell the paper's readers about Newfoundland. Besides covering the reactions and feelings of the Newfoundlanders to confederation, they dealt a great deal with the life of the Newfoundlanders. By covering the annual spring seal hunt, the probable effects of union (both short and long-term) on the Newfoundland economy, the lives of everyday people such as the fisherman and logger, the effects of the Newfoundland railroad strike, and the importance of Gander to Newfoundlanders, among other stories these special correspondents fulfilled a vital role in filling the gaps existing in the knowledge of the forthcoming province. That this was a vital task that needed to be done was demonstrated by St. Laurent's own admission that prior to the first Newfoundland-Canadian talks on

possible terms of union in 1947, he knew little about
Newfoundland.²⁵ Undoubtedly, due to the various articles
on Newfoundland written by Seymour, Jackson, and other
newspapermen Canadians were much better acquainted with
their newest province. Without a doubt, confederation
could have been achieved without the newspaper coverage,
but the role played by the press assured the Canadians
that confederation with Newfoundland would be thoroughly
examined and presented to the people.

²⁵Smallwood, III, 131.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers

The (Toronto) Globe and Mail. December 1945-April 1949.

The London Evening Free Press. December 1945-April 1949.

The Windsor Daily Star. December 1945-April 1949.

Correspondence

Letter from William C. Heine. Editor, The London Free Press. London. June 27, 1974.

Letter from John Marshall. Former Associate Editor and Chief of the Ottawa Bureau, The Windsor Daily Star. Orangeville, Ontario. June 19, 1974.

Letter from David A. Rhyden. Chief Librarian, The Globe and Mail. Toronto. June 18, 1974.

Government Publications

Pink, Margaret, ed. 1972: Canada Year Book: Statistical Annual of the Resources, Demography, Institutions and Social and Economic Conditions of Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1972.

Books

Ammon, Charles G. Newfoundland: The Forgotten Island. London: Fabian Publications, Limited, and Victor Gollancz, Limited, 1944.

Chadwick, St John. Newfoundland: Island into Province. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.

Gwyn, Richard J. Smallwood, The Unlikely Revolutionary. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972.

Lodge, Thomas. Dictatorship in Newfoundland. London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1939.

- Macdonald, Gordon. Newfoundland At The Crossroads: Speeches and Radio Addresses. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1949.
- MacKay, Robert Alexander, ed. Newfoundland: Economic, Diplomatic, and Strategic Studies. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Noel, S.J.R. Politics in Newfoundland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Parker, John. Newfoundland: Tenth Province of Canada. London: Lincolns-Prager (Publishers), Ltd., 1950.
- Smallwood, Joseph, ed. The Book of Newfoundland. Vols. 3 and 4. St. John's: Newfoundland Book Publishers, 1967.
- Thoms, J.R., ed. Newfoundland and Labrador Who's Who: Centennial Ed. St. John's: E.C. Boone Advertising, [c.1968].
- Young, Ewart, ed. This is Newfoundland. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1949.

OTHER WORKS REFERRED TO FOR BACKGROUND

Government Momographs: Canada

Canada. External Affairs. Reports and Documents Relating to the Negotiations for the Union of Newfoundland With Canada. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1956. (Conference Series, 1948, No. 2).

Proposed Arrangements for the Entry of Newfoundland Into Confederation: Terms Believed to Constitute a Fair and Equitable Basis for Union of Newfoundland With Canada Should the People of Newfoundland Desire to Enter Confederation. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, King's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1948. (October 29, 1947).

Statements on Questions Raised by the Newfoundland Delegation during the Negotiations for the Union of Newfoundland with Canada. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, King's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1948. (December 11, 1948).

Canadian Government Publications

Department of External Affairs. Canadian Information Service Bulletin. June 27 to November 7, 1947.

_____. Canadian Weekly Bulletin. August 6 to October 8, 1948.

_____. External Affairs Bulletin. (August, 1948), 1-8.

"External Affairs in Parliament: Union of Newfoundland with Canada Approved." External Affairs, I (March, 1949), 22-25.

"Newfoundland and Canada: Terms of Union Signed." External Affairs, I (January, 1949), 3-14.

"Union of Newfoundland with Canada." External Affairs, I (April, 1949), 25-31.

Government Monographs: Great Britain

Commonwealth Relations Office. Terms of Union of Newfoundland With Canada: Memorandum of Agreement entered into between Canada and Newfoundland. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949. (Cmd. 7605).

Dominions Office. Newfoundland: Papers Relating to the Report of the Royal Commission, 1933. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1933. (Cmd. 4479).

_____. Report on the Financial and Economic Position of Newfoundland. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1946. (Cmd. 6849).

_____. Newfoundland: Royal Commission: 1933 Report. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1933. (Cmd. 4480).

Treasury Office. Newfoundland: Copy of Treasury Minute dated 22 January 1934, relating to the treatment of advances made from Votes of Parliament to the Government of Newfoundland in December 1932, and June 1933, as a free grant. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1934. (Cmd. 4497).

Newfoundland: Memorandum on Proposed Financial Resolution. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1933. (Cmd. 4481).

Books

- Birkenhead, Frederick Edwin Smith. The Story of Newfoundland. London: Marshall, 1920.
- Blackburn, Robert H., ed. The Encyclopedia of Canada. Newfoundland Supplement. Toronto: University Associates of Canada, Limited, 1949.
- Carrington, C.E. The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers. Cambridge: University Printing House, 1950.
- Cochrane, James Arthur. The Story of Newfoundland. Boston: Ginn and Company, [c.1938].
- Day, James Wentworth. Newfoundland: "The Fortress Isle." Fredericton, N.B.: Brunswick Press, 1960.
- Dean, Veva Kathern. Newfoundland: A Study in Political Geography. Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester Press, 1954.
- Fawcett, C.B. A Political Geography of the British Empire. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1933.
- Fay, C.R. Life and Labour in Newfoundland. Based on Lectures delivered at the Memorial University of Newfoundland. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1956.
- Gunn, Gertrude E. The Political History of Newfoundland: 1832-1864. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Henderson, Dorothy (McLaughlin). The Heart of Newfoundland. Montreal: Harvest, [1965].
- Innis, Harold Adams. The Cod Fisheries: The History of an International Economy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.
- McAllister, R.I., ed. Newfoundland and Labrador: The First Fifteen Years of Confederation. St. John's: Dicks, 1966.

- McLintock, A.H. The Establishment of Constitutional Government In Newfoundland, 1783-1832: A Study of Retarded Colonisation. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1941.
- Millais, John Guille. Newfoundland and its Untrodden Ways. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.
- Moyles, R. Gordon. Complaints is many and various, but the odd Divil likes it.: Nineteenth Century Views of Newfoundland. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited, 1975.
- Neary, Peter, ed. The Political Economy of Newfoundland, 1929-1972. Vancouver, Capp Clark Publishing, 1973.
- Pearson, Lester B. Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson. Vol. I: 1897-1948. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.
- Perlin, A.B. The Newfoundland Story. Grand Falls, Newfoundland: Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, [1959].
- Prowse, Daniel Woodley. A History of Newfoundland from the English, Colonial, and Foreign Records. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1896.
- Rawlyke, G.A. Historical Essays on the Atlantic Provinces. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Limited, 1967.
- Responsible Government League. The Case for Responsible Government. St. John's: The Responsible Government League, 1948.
- Rothney, G.O. Newfoundland, A History. Ottawa: [Canadian Historical Association], 1964.
- Saunders, S.A. Newfoundland: Sentinel of the Saint Lawrence. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1943.
- Seitz, Don Carlos. The Great Island: Some Observations in and about the Crown Colony of Newfoundland. New York: Century, [c.1926].
- Shelton, Alfred Cooper. Newfoundland: Our North Door Neighbor. New York: Dutton, 1941.

Smallwood, Joseph, Ed. The Book of Newfoundland. 2 Vols. St. John's: Newfoundland Book Publishers, [1937].

I Chose Canada: The Memoirs of the Honorable Joseph R. "Joey" Smallwood. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1973.

The New Newfoundland: An Account of the Revolutionary Developments Which Are Transforming Britain's Oldest Colony From "The Cinderella of the Empire" into One of the Great Small Nations of the World. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

Tait, Robert Holland. Newfoundland: A Summary of the History and Development of Britain's Oldest Colony from 1497 to 1939. Harrington Park, New Jersey: Harrington Press, [c.1939].

Thomas Aaron. The Newfoundland Journal of Aaron Thomas, Able Seaman in HMS Boston. A Journal written during Voyage From England to Newfoundland and From Newfoundland to England in the years 1794 and 1795, Addressed to a friend. Ed. by Jean M. Murray, Don Mills, Ontario: Zongmans, Limited [c.1968].

Wade, Mason, Ed. Regionalism in the Canadian Community, 1867-1967: Canadian Historical Association Centennial Seminars. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Waite, P.B. Confederation, 1854-1867. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Limited, 1972.

Whitbourne, Richard. A Discoverse and Discovery of New-found-land. Amsterdam: DaCapo Press-Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., 1971.

Articles

Copes, Parzival. "The Fishermen's Vote in Newfoundland." The Canadian Journal of Political Science, III (December, 1970), 579-604.

Crosbie, J.E. "Local Government in Newfoundland." The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science. XXII (August, 1956), 332-346.

Lacey, A. "The Confederation Question -- Its Historical Background." The Atlantic Guardian (March, 1945).

McGrath, P.T. "Will Newfoundland Join Canada?" Queen's Quarterly, XXXVI (1929), 253-266.

Marx, Hilda Fisher. "Newfoundland in Tenth Place." Current History, XV (October, 1948), 209-212.

"Newfoundland Looks at Her Future: The Question of Federal Union with Canada." The Round Table, XXXVIII (March, 1948), 551-558, 624.

"Newfoundland: The Vote for Confederation with Canada." The Round Table, XXXIX (December, 1948), 62-66.

Young, Ewart. "The Challenge of Confederation." The Atlantic Guardian. (September, 1948), 13.