

we are going, and are inclined to drift. This certainly applies to the question now being discussed. To my mind we must establish certain things first. One of these is whether or not the Convention can, and if so, will, discuss this point has not been confirmed beyond any doubt. If the answer is no, then let's put it in the attic; if yes, then we might as well recognise it as part of our work and drop the parley. The possible forms of government to be discussed should be listed, and this should have been done long ago. In this respect I claim we are drifting. By not doing this we rest on the haphazard manner of having the issues introduced by ardent supporters — would-be leaders — who in their turn win the antagonism of the proponents and would-be leaders of some other form, and so we get a succession of blind rushes accompanied by invective which is unnecessary here. Surely we can discuss this matter without adopting the low methods of attack resorted to by some delegates. I have heard it said and read in both the local and foreign press, that Newfoundland, and the world, looks to the men of the National Convention to supply at least in part material for future governments. How disappointing it is then, and sad, to hear these men fall back on low methods of attack. Surely it is a poor recommendation for local autonomy. Further still, these blind rushes show always a leniency towards some particular form of government desired by the speaker, as well as a move to crush any contrary opinion. This is a definite shortcoming. I and others like me, would be content to hear propositions from all the major powers, England, Canada, etc.... Yet there are those so confirmed in their opinion that they would narrow the field of survey. Had we not then better end this Convention in view of the predominance of this confirmed opinion? No, we had better go right on with our programme, because sitting before me are delegates willing to give a fair hearing to all issues. To these delegates, and I hold it an honour to be one of them, I say stand firm. Not through high oratory or low invective is the real issue found, but rather in the cool calculated decisions I know you are so capable of making. Mr. Job, speaking to an earlier meeting and referring to the St. John's merchants, said the old suspicion still exists. I will, if I may, make a similar remark about the outport members.... We read in the press and hear in everyday conversation how

these outport men are being talked over, yea bought over, by the would-be leaders. Since this opinion has been stated on the floor of the house I deem it my unpleasant duty to tell any delegates who might have short-sighted opinions of the outport men, that these men are here with a knowledge born of realism; that they are Newfoundlanders and have just as much patriotism as any member here.

As I have said, these discussions disclose a leniency towards whichever form of government a particular speaker closely guards as his secret, or, as in some cases, openly declares as his platform, both to my mind equally harmful. We have as a result a wall of suspicion and jealousy building up, so much so that name-calling is just around the corner, so that the question is not discussed, but rather the personalities behind the question. I fear that our decisions will not be in the best interest of Newfoundland. We have in this Convention no Hitlers, no Quislings, no Judases, nor do we expect to give to the world a new demon or God. Why then discuss personalities? Why stand on that philosophical pedestal on which some members try so hard to balance? There have been instances in the world of some born philosophers, but they have been rare. Let's be content with the fact that we are a bunch of ordinary Newfoundlanders....

Mr. Hickman Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with considerable interest to these addresses of yesterday and today, and I have given quite a lot of thought to this question, as it is one of the most important to come before us up to now. I think from what I can gather that the majority of the members here, perhaps all of them, are in favour of the motion as put by Mr. Smallwood. I myself subscribe to the motion, but I cannot subscribe to the immediate rush of having this submitted at the present time. Some people want the Convention to be finished before Christmas, some finished by January, and there must be an election, according to Mr. Smallwood by May. This job is probably one of the most important in the history of the country, and the few months or a year we may take to thoroughly go into this question and arrive at a conclusion should not interfere. It may be for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland for the next 100 years or more, and what's a year in that? I think we are rushing too much.... I have a feeling that even the reports