

I made a week ago today, to the effect that even I was offered a senatorship, and the mover of the motion stated a moment ago that he inferred that I was alluding to him. To that I will say that I always have had a great regard for the reasoning powers of the mover of the motion, and I suspect strongly that he analysed the whole statement before he decided he arrived at a correct interpretation of the amendment. Now, if, on Monday past, I set a sprat to catch a herring, am I to be blamed if I caught a confederate cod? I noticed the greediness with which the proposer grasped at the bait, and I feel that he took the bait, the hook and all.

Getting back to the matter of sending a delegation to Canada, allow me to refer you to section 146 of the British North America Act, which makes provision for the entry of Newfoundland into the Dominion of Canada as a tenth province. I shall read it, section 146: "It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council, on the addresses from the Houses of Parliament of Canada and the Houses of the respective legislatures of the Commons of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those Colonies or Provinces, or any of them into the Union." Does that not presuppose that before we can enter into any union with the Dominion of Canada that we must have a legislature? Some people will say you have your Commission of Government, and they have the authority of the legislature. That may be correct or it may not. If it is, is it not therefore the bounden duty of the Commission of Government, if they have the power of the legislature, and if so many people in this country are so desirous of confederation, to go to Canada and find out the terms? The Dominion of Canada would then be negotiating with a legitimate government, not with 45 men who were sent in here to appraise the resources of this country. And, as Mr. Crosbie a moment ago pointed out, does it not look ridiculous to you that these 45 men of this Convention should proceed to Canada without even knowing the extent of our natural resources, without even knowing just how our finances are? In what position are we to ask Canada to lay her cards on the table if we ourselves are unable to put ours down? I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not against confederation and I am not for confederation, and

as Mr. Bradley from Bonavista said, I am not for or against responsible government, and neither am I for or against Commission of Government at this present juncture. What we are for, and what we are not for, should have been left to the time when we had gotten those facts which our people sent us here for. But when one member, whom I shall now call the senior member for Bonavista, elects to get on his feet on the floor of this house and make a political speech on the issue of confederation one hour long, and then reply for another half hour, then I submit that I or anyone else who did not get up and object to his motion would be failing in our duty to the people who sent us here. I do not wish to say anything more on confederation or responsible government or Commission of Government at this present time. I do think we are wasting an awful lot of time, and I submit that the quicker we get down to a vote on this issue and have done with it the better.

Mr. Bradley As I said perhaps an hour ago, I can sympathise with those members of this Convention who fear that we may be acting too precipitately. I tried on that occasion to explain to them that acting now did not mean an immediate delegation to Canada.... Obviously if we defer the passage of this resolution until some later date, by an equal space of time will the departure of the delegates be deferred. Why then should we defer the institution of these inquiries until we have finished the inquiries upon which our various committees are engaged today? If we do that it is perfectly obvious that when we have the financial picture of the country before us we shall not have the terms of confederation, and the same thing exactly applies to any inquiries which may be directed to the United Kingdom....

Already in the press a rather indiscreet and untimely reference has been made to adjournments of this Convention, in utter ignorance of the facts. There are few, if any, members of this Convention who desire to prolong it any further than necessary. It has been stated that this is costing the country somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 a day. I have never taken the trouble to compute the amount so I can neither confirm or deny the correctness of that statement. I have no desire to expend money belonging to the people of this country, and I feel that every member is of the same opinion, and if we are to