

have to enter into a study period. We entered into that last September.

**Mr. Hollett** I did not say that, Mr. Miller.

**Mr. Miller** Well you did, Mr. Hollett, and I think it is about time we got it over and not spend any further time in study on the matter. In presenting this report today without the least bit of information, I can only say that I can't think so highly of the Steering Committee. It is as well to be frank. It does not appear that our opinion on this thing is worth anything. As members, must look at it in this way: we know the Steering Committee has met several times and what did they do? Bring back the same thing as they went out with. As far as I can see they threw a smoke-screen around the whole thing. I don't think this should go through this afternoon. I think we would be very foolish to make a snap judgement. As I see it the thing is not even plain. "Interest-free loans" — what loans, those that we are going to look for in the future free of interest, or loans in the past? "Development loans" — what do we want them for? If we have no particular thing in mind we don't want it. Surely we are not going to go out and ask the world to support us. "The position arising out of the base deals." What can we gather out of that? Perhaps something, perhaps nothing. I would like to ask if there is a supplementary lease being applied for. I don't think I would get an answer to that, because I don't think the information is up to date. I don't think we entered into the financing of any airport except Gander, and I don't think the British government is in a position to make a statement on that even now. I don't intend to elaborate, I think the Steering Committee should have done that. The Steering Committee has presented this with the attitude of "Here's something, and it will go across without a word."

**Mr. Smallwood** Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House on this, but I think perhaps the key to the whole thing lies in a remark you made a moment ago yourself. This list has got to be read and considered in the light of Mr. Hollett's motion of a week ago. That motion said that this House desired to send a delegation to the United Kingdom for the purpose of discussing what possible fiscal and financial relationships there were to be in the future between Britain and ourselves, under:

1. Commission government (if we con-

tinued under Commission government);

2. Under responsible government, if we went back to that, or

3. Under some other form of government.

We want to send a delegation over to find out what relationships, financial relationships, might exist under these different forms of government. The same resolution went on to say that a detailed list of the points that the delegation would take up with the British government should be drawn up by the Steering Committee and brought into the Convention for confirmation. This is the detailed list. First, the public debt. Someone wants to know what were they trying to find out about that. This surely, that at the moment and since 1934 the British government is guaranteeing our public debt, the principal and the interest. Now the people of Newfoundland, before they vote in the referendum, surely need to know just what the position is and will be in regard to the public debt. Britain is now behind the debt. If we go back to responsible government will Britain be behind our public debt as to principal and interest? If we continue under Commission government, will Great Britain be behind the public debt? We do not know. Undoubtedly the delegation returning from London will know and will pass the information on to the Convention, and through the Convention to the people of Newfoundland. That is all there would be about the public debt.... The interest-free loans, that can only refer to one thing, the loans made to Great Britain in the last four or five years. They are over there in England now, not paying us any interest, what will happen to them? We know that there is a terrible dollar situation. If they cannot pay the loan in dollars, in what way will we get it back? Development loans. Since Commission of Government, Great Britain has made loans for development purposes. What is the position in regard to that? It may be that Britain cannot make any more loans, but the population of Newfoundland has got to know. With regard to the position arising out of the base deals. If there are some we are not concerned over, there is no harm in getting the details anyhow. But about control over Gander, let us have the story. There is no need to go into details under the different headings. I do not care what the Convention does, if they wish they can make the list ten times longer, but to my mind, the ground is covered. I believe