

just what kind of government they want, not what the Convention thinks is best for them. Will one of us then, mistakenly identifying himself as a Daniel Webster and an Abe Lincoln rolled into one, and falsely assuming an authority that was never vested on him, get up and say, "You can't vote for Commission, I positively hate it, and I am going to ensure you don't get a chance to vote for union with Canada." To me its very obvious that a few of us have improperly imagined that we are the be-all and the end-all here. I won't repeat that much-quoted text from the terms of reference, Mr. Chairman, for your lucid explanation of said terms at the outset of the Convention made it clear beyond a doubt that this assembly has no right to restrict the choice of the people of this country or limit the issues. For my part, I know nothing that might even remotely suggest confederation would be an extremely good or definitely bad issue to put on the ballot in the forthcoming referendum. I am not going to believe, nor will I be convinced that any member of this assembly is in the least cognisant with the text of the terms that may be offered us, apart from the outmoded BNA Act which does give us recognition in sections 146-147.

Some of us may be concerned about narrow nationalism, I am not; others may be worrying about their place in that administration of tomorrow, but that doesn't worry me in the least; but I am deeply concerned that the boys and girls of tomorrow grow up in an environment that is much better than that of their forebears. I am concerned that the government that will help shape our future be a government that will work in the best interest of Newfoundlanders everywhere, north, south, east and west. The people who sent us here are looking to this Convention for something constructive. They do not expect that we will revert to the days of useless recrimination and name-calling; they expect some definite recommendations. We must justify our existence, but we must not seek to unnecessarily lengthen the life of this assembly, or it might well be that this costly experiment may cause our fellow-countrymen to lose their patience. We were given a definite assignment a clear-cut assignment, so let's forget our petty bickerings and go straight to our objective.

Mr. Chairman, as the voice of the men and women of Bonavista North, who are intelligently

watching the outcome of this Convention, who hold to the undeniable rights of free men and free women to choose for themselves, I support the resolution.

Mr. Roberts This being my first time to address this assembly, I hope you will be patient if I do not stick strictly to parliamentary procedure. In seconding the amendment I did not do so with any intimation of not getting Canada's terms for Newfoundland. I considered the time inopportune; when all committee work is finished and we have a picture of the financial state of the country, then will come the time to approach Canada. I was elected by acclamation and did not have to canvass my district for any political plank. But, contrary to the admissions of some of the members, I did come here with an idea of the form of government I would like to see in this country. I am not going to disclose it at this time. But I may say I am not an advocate for confederation. This does not necessarily mean I would not favour confederation or any other form of government, if it can be shown me that it would be better for the country. So in due time I hope the proper authorities will find out for us what Canada's terms are. After all, as Mr. MacDonald said, we have a large number of people in this island who are sympathetic to the idea of confederation, why not give them a chance to learn more about it?

It was said by a member of this Convention that Canada's terms would be so favourable we would become confederates overnight. I am inclined to take this with a grain of salt. When we read the history of this country and see the raw deals we have always received, confederation may be another one of those deals. If we approach Canada as Mr. Smallwood would have us, saying we are a poor, ignorant, ill-clad, diseased, starving people, do you suppose we can expect generous terms? I would say "No".

I resent the expression that we are such a people; it's true we have some cases as he has described. I have seen people in such dilapidated shacks here in this city, that it's unbelievable they could live there, especially during the winter months. I never saw the like in an outport — as bad as we are supposed to live. But the same exists in the city of Ottawa with all its fabulous wealth. A relative of mine, a Newfoundland woman who became the matron of a large hospital in Quebec province, had many an argument