

choice down to responsible government. It maddens them, it infuriates them, when I introduce this resolution, when many delegates support it. It maddens them because it takes attention away from the one thing that they want the people to see, responsible government. But, sir, our people are not blind. They see through this political dodge. Our people know why this effort is being made to block this resolution. Our people have learned a lot in the past 20 years. They have their eyes open today. Mr. Chairman, I am not at this point referring to everyone who has spoken against the resolution. I want to make myself quite clear on this point. There are members who have spoken very sincerely against the motion, because they feared that it was trying to rush them. Not to them do I refer, but to a certain willful minority whose only policy is responsible government or bust.

We have heard here some silly talk about selling the country. Smallwood is trying to sell the country, they say. Could political bankruptcy go lower? The fanatical opponents of this motion must be pretty hard-up for an argument when they descend to such old-time political clap-trap, the sort of tripe that brought responsible government into such contempt and disrepute before. Personal abuse, name-calling, charges of graft, bribery and corruption, accusations of selling the country and so forth, don't the gentlemen who stoop to such tactics see, don't they realise, that every time they get down to such depths, they're only reminding the people of the bad old days of responsible government? Don't they see that every such remark only makes the people more determined than ever never to touch responsible government again? Those people have a very poor opinion of our people's intelligence. They are gambling on the hope that our people have short memories. They are living in a world that is dead and past, that bad old world of playing politics, of playing politics as a game. Not ideas, but personalities; not policies, but name-calling; not great political principles, but accusations of graft, bribery, treachery and all the rest of the old time political ammunition-dump of trash and garbage. If you don't agree with a man, smear him. If you can't answer his arguments, try to draw attention away from his arguments by blackening his character. Accuse him of bribery, start a great

hullabaloo, a big noise, and maybe the public will forget the solid things he said. It's an old game, Mr. Chairman, but it doesn't work any more. Our people are on to that old trick of the political game.

But, sir, why should I complain because a few people say that I'm trying to sell the country? Better men than I, greater Newfoundlanders, higher patriots, have had the same charge hurled against them. That greatest patriot of all, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Bond, who occupied a seat only two or three feet from where I stand today, had the same charge made against him. Here's a printed pamphlet published in 1909, when he was prime minister. On the cover of this pamphlet, in heavy black type, are the words: "Bond's Awful Plot to Sell the Country." And what is this pamphlet about? It tells how our great Newfoundland patriot was a confederate who wanted to get Canada's terms of confederation in 1909. For wanting to get the terms of confederation Sir Robert Bond was accused of trying to sell his country, so why should I complain for having the same charge hurled at me when I propose to get the terms? Sir Edward Morris not only tried to get the terms in 1914 but got them — was he trying to sell the country? Were Sir William Coaker and Sir Michael Cashin traitors to Newfoundland because they were anxious, in 1915, to get the terms of confederation? Were Sir William Whiteway and Archbishop Howley traitors for believing in confederation? Was Sir Richard Squires, were Sir Ambrose Shea and Sir Frederick Carter? Were those great Newfoundlanders all trying to sell the country?

Mr. Chairman, someone said, I believe it was Mr. Hollett, that he didn't believe that the Government of Canada would receive a delegation from this Convention. In the House of Commons, the prime minister of Canada made this precise statement: "If the people of Newfoundland should ever decide that they wish to enter the Canadian federation and should make that decision clear beyond all possibility of misunderstanding, Canada would give most sympathetic consideration to the proposal."¹ That was in 1943. Coming down to late June of this present year, the Government of Canada made its position again very clear, in the words of Mr. St.

¹Canada, House of Commons Debates, 12 July 1943.