

Mr. Fogwill's question, it is this: is the Convention competent to recommend to the government of the United Kingdom that the form of government, confederation with Canada, be placed upon the ballot? The answer, in my opinion, is Yes, the Convention is competent to recommend the placing upon the ballot paper any form of government which, in their opinion, is worthwhile placing before the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Butt Does that hold for union with the United States?

Professor Wheare The opinion which I just gave admitted of no qualifications, except that the form of government is worthwhile, in their opinion. That includes union with the United States, but you know you have to get the consent of the Government of the United States and, of course, the consent of the Government of the United Kingdom for all these forms. I see nothing in the terms of reference which requires the Convention to consider or recommend only forms of government within the British Empire, there is nothing here which excludes that.

Mr. Fogwill My question is now answered. I beg leave to withdraw the motion, with the consent of my seconder.

Mr. Harrington Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if Mr. Wheare at the outset of this Convention had given us a little talk we might be further ahead, instead of floundering around in amendments and substantive motions. However, when we started we thought the best way to get at the facts was by breaking up into committees. With regard to Mr. Smallwood's statement I see no reason to change my stand from a week ago. I did not at any time tell Mr. Smallwood that I would support his motion and I wish that to go into the record. I did always lend a sympathetic ear to what he had to say. I am against the amendment to the amendment. The way I feel about the whole thing now is to see it thrown out. However, the position has been clarified somewhat, and there is nothing we can do about it. I do not see why we should rush this thing, which is premature anyway. We have been 14 years under one form of government and surely we can stand to wait for another form for a reasonable while. But I want to make it clear that I did not say at any time that I would support Mr. Smallwood's motion.

Mr. Bailey Mr. Chairman, as the last speaker remarked, we have been floundering along and I

am sure we can thank Mr. Fogwill and Professor Wheare for clarifying the situation regarding our status as a Convention.

Mr. Butt Mr. Chairman, it is rather strange, but the essence of the two questions before the Chair is simple. Do you or do you not want terms from Canada and do you or do you not want them now? In speaking thus I expect I am expressing the view of a great many people. Personally I do not want them now and I am voting against the motion.

Mr. Smallwood Mr. Chairman, just a few words in reply to Mr. Harrington. He says he did not promise to vote for the motion I introduced, and I do not think that I said this afternoon that he had so promised. What I did say this afternoon is that months ago Mr. Harrington told me that he would vote to get the terms of confederation, but he did not promise me with regard to this particular motion of mine. I would like to reply to other remarks made with regard to this rushing business of getting the terms. I wonder if rushing is quite the right term to use. For 13 years we have had Commission of Government; for 79 years we have had responsible government and for 23 years we have had representative government. Now the country has spent over 100 years under those three forms of government and I fail to see how the Convention would be rushing in this particular instance. It is true my motion had not specified the time with regard to the sending of a delegation to Canada but merely proposed that negotiations be held as soon as possible with the Canadian government relative to the terms of federal union. I realise some members voted against my motion as they were sincere in their belief that to accept it would be to taking a premature step, and in this connection Mr. Bradley's motion was for the primary purpose of meeting the objections of those who claimed that the original resolution was premature. Now my motion merely called for the accumulation of facts regarding possible confederation, whilst the amendment suggested that the collection of such facts be postponed for an indefinite period, so that the acceptance of the amendment would only leave the matter open for future and acrimonious debate which would not be the best interests of the Convention. My resolution was simply to procure facts relevant to confederation, but would in no way give a delegation power to