

assembly. It will explain why, even if I were convinced of the regularity of this motion, I could not in conscience support it. For I would be left open at any time, and at Mr. Smallwood's pleasure, to a charge of complicity.

This may not be the time or place for a little sermon in morals or ethics, but it is the time and place, I think for a little speaking of minds on a matter that concerns both ethics and morals, especially when today's doctrine of materialism has crept, it seems, even into our own councils of state. "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." It's get what you can for yourself, and don't be bothered by scruples. Proponents of this doctrine always make one mistake. They forget the integrity of the individual conscience; that because they are clever in duplicity others may be just as wise in honour; are quite blind to the fact that some men will not barter that honour for a nice trip to Ottawa, the bait that was privately offered me, and goodness knows how many others, if we supported the motion now before the house. To put it even more clearly, I was told by Mr. Smallwood, that I was slated to be a member of the delegation and that I should play ball to see that this motion was carried.

The members of this Convention are supposed to have an open mind. They are supposed to first examine the country's position to see whether or not it is self-supporting, and having determined that to recommend a form or forms of government to the United Kingdom to be submitted to the people of this country at a national referendum. Making due allowance for every man's honest opinion, even at this stage, there is a limit that should be drawn nonetheless.

One member at the earlier public sessions of the Convention expressed himself rather strongly on forms of government and other things, and was unfavourably criticised. Yet another member, elected on a definite platform, has been as busy as the proverbial blue tailed fly propagandising the remainder of the Convention at every opportunity. Not content with that, he invited a majority of them to his hotel room, and endeavoured to talk them into supporting his resolution. That may be good politics from Mr. Smallwood's point of view, but when we consider the nature and purpose of this Convention and the present stage of its work, I think it is the lowest kind of political chicanery and that it

should be aired on the floor of this Convention. I am doing my honest best, whatever my personal opinions, to fairly appraise the situation, and I resent most strongly the obvious attempt that is being made to colour conclusions. Mr. Smallwood's antics may provide a great deal of humorous conversation, but it goes beyond a joke when even one individual is asked, cajoled or invited to sell his integrity, to further the cause of confederation, or any cause at this stage.

In view of Mr. Smallwood's activities, both inside and outside the Convention, I feel it's time that we had a show-down. I'd like to know, and a lot of other people would like to know, who Mr. Smallwood is acting for. Is it for himself or for the Canadian government, or simply for his constituents? He will be hard put to it to convince me it is simply and solely the latter.

For these reasons I do not believe that now is an opportune time for this resolution to be brought before this House and debated, and I would suggest that it be deferred to a date when the Convention, having themselves got the facts in relation to Newfoundland, are in a better position to receive it.

**Mr. Penney** Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to move an amendment to Mr. Smallwood's motion?

**Mr. Chairman** Certainly you have a right, Mr. Penney.

**Mr. Penney** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that I am opposed to Mr. Smallwood's motion at this particular time, and I agree with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Harrington, but to be short and sweet, or sour as the case may be, I will put it this way. Because this Convention is not yet fully informed on matters affecting the economy of Newfoundland I do not understand why we should take any action in connection with confederation at this time; may I therefore move as an amendment to Mr. Smallwood's motion that we defer any action on the subject of confederation with Canada for a period of say two months.

**Mr. Roberts** I second that motion.

**Mr. Hillier** Mr. Chairman, I have followed very closely the views expressed. I have not prepared any special address, but I do think before we discuss any forms of government, confederation, responsible, or anything whatsoever, that we should wait until we have completed the task on