

form of government they want? Would any member of this Convention say to those people of the southwest coast, "I do not care if you want confederation or not, I am not going to give you a chance to vote for it?" But that is exactly what you will be saying if you vote against this motion.

But it is not only the people of the southwest coast who want confederation to go on the ballot paper. There are thousands all around this country and in Labrador who want it; and right here in St. John's there are many people who would vote for it. Is any member of this Convention going to deny those people the chance to vote for what they want in the referendum?

If this motion is voted down in this Convention, it will only make confederation stronger in Newfoundland. Our people have a strong sense of fair play, and they will know what to think of members who vote to deprive them of a free choice in the referendum this spring.

The people of Newfoundland, sir, have learned a great many things in late years, and they have begun to realise that we are too small a country to stand alone. We have a small population scattered over a very large area. We do not have a large variety of natural resources. Our whole economy depends upon three industries—fishery, forestry and minerals. No doubt our fishery could stand further development, and we may some day see more mineral developments than we now have; but it is doubtful if we shall see any marked increase in our forestry development. Except for our paper mills, we have no highly developed industry. We are a country of primary production. We still have to depend too much on one industry, the fisheries, and when something happens to upset that industry our whole economy suffers. We still have too many eggs in one basket, so to speak. When one goes down, they all go down and our people are left penniless.

What we have to beware of, Mr. Chairman, is another depression. Some of our members here assure us that we need not fear another depression. They have told us that there are no shadows on the road ahead. Well, maybe they are right. I sincerely hope they are; but can we depend on our not having another depression? I do not think we can. That is one of the dangers we must keep in mind. For if another depression strikes us, and we are on our own trying to paddle our own canoe,

where shall we be? Back where we were in 1933. Then we would be wishing we were linked up with a larger country, and that is one of the things we must bear in mind when the vote is taken on this motion. We all know what conditions were like in 1933 and up until the last great war. We have very vivid memories of our people trying to exist on six cents a day, and many who were unwilling to accept relief, working for almost nothing, to keep their families alive.

You may ask, would confederation guarantee that these things would not happen again? Perhaps it would not. But as part of a larger country, with free trade with that country, the lower cost of living would better fit us to meet a depression if it came; and if under confederation a depression did come, the Canadian family allowance would see to it that our children under 16 years of age have something better than six cents a day to look forward to; and the increased old age pension would guarantee our old people who needed it a fair share of the necessities of life. I am afraid the answer to all these questions is already known to our people. Our people have already asked themselves these questions, sir, and they have already answered them as well. And that is why so many thousands of them have made up their minds to vote for confederation. There is not a member of this Convention who will deny that there are many thousands of confederates in our country today. That being so, it becomes the duty of every one of us here to vote for this motion.

Mr. ChairmanAgain I have to remind members of the time schedule which this House handed me the Friday before last, and unless I receive directions to the contrary, I am bound to remind members that the debate on the business now before the House is scheduled to terminate tomorrow afternoon or evening.

Mr. Hickman I do not want to be premature if anyone else wants to speak, but I move we adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow. I do not wish to put that motion if somebody else cares to speak.

Mr. Chairman Would members care to give me some indication as to who would care to speak on this motion now before the Chair, so that we would have some sort of idea as to where we are? I am not side-tracking your motion, Mr. Hickman, but I would point out that a motion to adjourn the debate, under standing order 35, to