

almost every member of this assembly; not only what he said, but the way he said it. It got my goat and I shall have more to say on this matter at some future date. I am against confederation as I see it today. I came here with an open mind, with no preconceived ideas. I did not go to my district and preach confederation; I did not preach anything. Whatever government is best for the people, that is the government I would vote for and I will do it today regardless of resolutions brought in by Mr. Smallwood or by anyone else.

Mr. Butt I am not wholly in accordance with the amendment of Mr. Penney. It is too definite; two months' time would be better. Maybe it could be a little more elastic. My reason for speaking at this time is to introduce something which ought to be said at this time, and Mr. Smallwood's address gives me the opportunity — that is to ask ourselves, before we go any further, does the Convention know exactly where it is going, as a Convention? Have we given ourselves specific directions as to what we ourselves want to do? For example, we were presented with the Chadwick-Jones report and we more or less threw it out. We gave it scant attention although it was formally received. We were presented with a reconstruction report which we did not consider worthy of discussion, in spite of the fact that future policy is involved; and the implication covering the introduction of that report is that a programme of \$60 million be introduced, the funds for which would have to be found locally. We have not received that although it was laid on the table. Later on we were told that the Convention must not concern itself with government policy in spite of the fact we have, as part of the terms of reference, to recommend future forms of government. How any man can divorce the two in his mind, I do not know. We do not know what the national production is, the data is not available, how are we then to know if we are self supporting? Then we had the Fisheries Report. We got so far and had to leave it, as someone said, "in mid air", because we did not know what to do with it. We got into the bases deal and we did not know how to clarify our own position — we did not know what to do under the circumstances. Then we are presented today with the Education Report, for the first time. If I read aright the attitude of the Education Committee in this respect, they base their report solely on the

economic condition of Newfoundland insofar as education is concerned. We shall have to do more than that with our reports if we are going to finally make up our minds just exactly where Newfoundland is going in the future. I was expecting someone to answer questions like this....

Mr. Chairman Are you discussing the Education Report? If so, your remarks are not relevant.

Mr. Butt I am trying to show you that the committee's interpretation of our terms of reference were narrower than I think they should be, consequently we ought to clarify just what we can or cannot do. I am not discussing the Education Report, I am giving an indication of the way we have or have not interpreted our terms of reference. Lastly, when we are right in the midst of the gathering of facts and before we have made up our minds as to where we are going, we have a motion placed before us with a resolution of approaching another government with the question of union. Before we go any farther we ought to clarify our minds as to where we are going as a Convention. The chairman of the Forestry Committee tells us we did not get all the facts. If I have said anything that has not happened in this Convention so far, I would like to be brought up about it, but the point I am making is this: before we can discuss or even think about the question of confederation, or asking for the terms, we have to decide in our own minds what our terms of reference mean and where we are going. It is important, to me at least, that we do not interpret our terms of reference in too narrow a manner. I will support Mr. Penney's motion that the matter of confederation be deferred until we see fit to deal with it. I might add also that I too am looking for the welfare of Newfoundland and I would not rule out the possibility at some time or other, of going to Canada, but before I do that I want to know the facts of Newfoundland; I want to go to Canada with a sense of dignity; with the feeling that I am a Newfoundlander. I do not want to go when we do not know whether or not we are self-supporting. We must first of all decide where we are going in this matter.

Mr. Smallwood I want a ruling — at the moment there is a resolution and there is an amendment. Does the debate proceed on both simultaneously, or on two different debates? One is a resolution and the other an amendment and I ask whether a member may speak twice, once on