

collected on all matters of interest to the country.

**Mr. Bailey** Mr. Chairman, I will support Mr. Bradley's amendment to the amendment because it supplies the missing link to this debate, and let us challenge this whole thing now until we are in a position to talk about it intelligently. I am not a confederate at the present time, but I would like to see all sides of the question brought out. There is no harm in putting the machinery in order, and if the proper machinery is set up I am sure we can make our own time as regards sending a delegation. I do not like the idea of setting up a committee today and going off tomorrow. I again say that I support the amendment of Mr. Bradley.

**Mr. Vardy** I feel I would be unreasonably prolonging this debate if I spoke lengthily, so my remarks shall be as brief as possible. Up to the present I am not a confederate. On the contrary, I have been accused very many times of being too much Newfoundland. But there is one thing I shall make clear and that is that I have always been big enough to avoid the use of personalities and to respect the opinions of all persons, irrespective of their political affiliations, although time and again I have been misquoted by some of my best friends. I support in all earnestness Mr. Bradley's amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. MacDonald** Mr. Chairman, speaking to the original motion here a few days ago I think I made a statement that I would support the motion. Since then there have been amendments offered by Mr. Penney and Mr. Bradley. The original motion made by Mr. Smallwood did not state any particular time when all these things were about to happen. Mr. Penney's amendment conveyed something like what was known in the old political days as giving the question the six months' hoist. If that amendment is carried there may never be a chance of getting this information now sought and this whole debate may have to be gone over again.... For that reason I cannot support Mr. Penney's amendment. I understand from some of the speeches that Mr. Bradley's amendment resembles to a certain extent the original motion, and it means that this Convention will still leave on record that it desires to be fully informed on all matters and provides that a delegation shall not proceed to Ottawa before January 1st, 1947. That gives us something definite and for that reason I will support it.

**Mr. Vincent** I support whole-heartedly the

amendment so ably proposed by Mr. Bradley, and in so doing I am not impugning any other person. I gave my support to Mr. Smallwood's motion and my reason therefor. Now the majority of delegates have expressed their willingness to have a delegation sent to Ottawa and the delegates who supported Mr. Penney's amendment, without supporting the main question, did so only because of the time factor provided; others have supported Mr. Bradley's amendment because it offers a compromise and because a definite time is set. It is highly desirable that we get back to discussions of committees and that can only be achieved by a prompt disposition of the whole subject matter now before the Chair, for my opinion is that this Convention has no right to refuse to examine any issue brought before it. Personally I am willing to explore every form of government, including representative, responsible and confederation. The people of Bonavista North want to know the terms, if any, that are going to be made with Canada. I cannot conceive how any delegate can stand on his feet and say we have no right to seek such and such terms from Canada. I very much regret, however, that there was no trip to Ottawa offered me. But this is not the time to discuss transportation or such like matters and I reaffirm my obligation to the people who sent me here. I am not prepared to say whether confederation is good or bad, and I resent the statement made that we are 100 years behind the times. I am prepared to examine any issue brought in here in the best interests of Newfoundland and its people....

**Mr. Hollett** Mr. Chairman, I rise to agree with my colleague from Grand Falls, and to show there is no collusion between us. The debate no doubt is amusing. First we have a man proposing a motion in which he already believed, in fact we know he believed in it because he has been fighting for it for years, and he believes in the principle of that motion which was foisted upon us. Mr. Higgins seconded the motion and in the next breath he does not agree with it at all. Then Mr. Burry stated last week that he agreed with the motion, although it was a little premature. This afternoon he was supporting the amendment to the amendment. My colleague supported Mr. Smallwood's motion; now he is supporting Mr. Bradley's. Then we have Mr. Ballam altering his mind. I think this issue is not one which