

Mr. Cashin Let them do it.

Mr. Harrington I started the ball rolling this afternoon in moving that you be overruled, because I want to vote for this motion. I agree that there is not much going to come out of it. We have already been told off by the Secretary of State as regards trade.... I do not think the motion is going to get anywhere, but if it gives the Commission the privilege of turning it down, so much the better.

Mr. Higgins I would like to draw your attention to the first paragraph of the final memorandum given to the delegation by Lord Addison:

I do not however regard it as the function of this Delegation to debate with me questions of the policy of the Newfoundland Government in current administrative and other issues, or to seek to negotiate trade arrangements between the United Kingdom and the Government of Newfoundland. In effect, the observations in your memorandum are criticisms of the conduct of the Commission of Government and the United Kingdom Government, and appear to me to be outside the proper purpose of this Delegation, nor are they likely to assist the National Convention in arriving at conclusions for their recommendations as to suitable forms of future Government in Newfoundland.

I take it that is the basis of your not agreeing?

Mr. Chairman No. Lord Addison may hold whatever views he likes. It was based on the contents of the Convention Act as I interpreted it — not as Lord Addison or anyone else told me.

Mr. Hollett I find myself on the horns of a dilemma. I knew the bird would come home to roost. I think it came home to roost when they told us we could send a delegation to Canada. I have never thought we had the right to send delegations anywhere, more particularly when it comes to affiliating us politically with some outside power. I want to refer you to the document of February 12, handed to the delegation which interviewed the Commission of Government, paragraph 4: "Upon the question raised in Clause 1 of the Resolution respecting steps for establishing economic or fiscal relationship between United States and Newfoundland, your Committee was informed that this question was one between Governments through the regular diplomatic channels." I think every man agrees

that that is perfectly normal and correct. In going to Canada you cannot discuss terms of confederation without bringing up these matters, or entering into negotiations with Canada relative to economic matters. They say it is a matter between governments. We all agree with that. That is one of the bases on which I form my opinion that we never had any right sending any delegation to Canada with regard to political union, because political union must be tied up with economic discussions. Further, they say it was doubtful whether the subject matter of the clause came within the terms of reference. Even the Commission of Government had a doubt as to whether or not the matter of sending the delegation to the USA came within the terms of reference. The Convention Act, 1946, definitely describes the duties of the Convention.... I hold that the exports of this country are tied up with any recommendation which any reasonable man in this Convention has to make in regard to forms of government. If we knew we could export so many tons of ore, or quintals of fish, to that or the other country, it would have a bearing on the form of government. We are to examine the position of the country — that is a broad statement. You cannot examine the position of the country if you do not examine its relations with outside countries. Now I am no longer on the horns of a dilemma. I support Mr. Penney's motion, at least it will afford the Commission of Government an opportunity to make up their minds as to the terms of reference.

Mr. Cashin I support Mr. Penney's motion and I want to say a word or two with regard to the future economy. When the delegation went to London, and when we brought up the matter of exports of fish and iron ore — which form the basis of our exports, and consequently have an effect on our economic position — we were told that Great Britain could not guarantee to buy any fish. They could not guarantee to buy any iron ore next year, or any year. They also told us, when we brought up the matter of the base deals, ... that they were not in a position to go to the US to make any deal regarding the taking of any fish in the future. If that is so, how can they expect us as a Convention to prepare an economic report on the future of this country? If, in the first place, they cannot guarantee to take any fish or iron ore, how can they expect us to prepare an economic