

as to be outside the realm of possibility? Yet this is the very outrageous procedure which is taking place in this oldest dominion today. But, in spite of even this, some people do not yet recognise the rough hand of dictatorship even when it is thrust in their face. As every man and woman in this island knows, if we could make some arrangements with the United States for the free entry of our fish into the great markets of that country, Newfoundland could become unbelievably prosperous. Will any person disagree that this is a matter which should have been dealt with by the United Kingdom government on our behalf when these base deals were first discussed? But it is evident that the interests of Newfoundland were not even a secondary consideration. This is the error we would now like to correct, the blunder we would try to rectify, the national loss which we would attempt to make good. But when we try to make our future brighter and more prosperous, what do we meet? We come up against a wall of opposition and a denial of our rights to make any such effort on behalf of Newfoundland.

Incidentally, there is another matter which comes to my mind at this point. If my memory serves me right, in the early days of this Convention, the Chairman was asked if the Convention had the power to send a delegation from its membership to the United States. On that question being directed by the Chairman to Professor Wheare, that gentleman stated that this Convention had such powers. But today the Convention is informed through this report that we have no such power.

**Mr. Chairman** I have to correct you there. The ruling of the late Chairman and of Professor Wheare was that this Convention had a perfect right to send a delegation to the United States to consider the possibilities of joining up with that country, should the United States be so minded to receive any such delegation, but he gave no ruling on the question as to whether trade negotiations would be on the same basis.

**Mr. Cashin** If we have power to send a delegation to the United States to discuss our political and economic future, it would certainly involve tariff arrangements concerning our fish.

**Mr. Chairman** That is a question upon which I do not feel called upon to give a ruling at the moment.

**Mr. Cashin** I can understand that. I am sure if we sent a delegation to the United States, one of the first things we would discuss would be so much of our fish going into the market annually. However, what is the meaning of this divergent opinion? What lies behind these two contradictory statements? Is Professor Wheare right when he made that statement, or is the Commission right in denying his statement? What is the justification for subjecting this Convention to two such conflicting opinions? If Professor Wheare is right, and I am inclined to believe he is, then the Commission is guilty of an inexcusable act in ignoring his findings.

In the matter of all these proposed negotiations with outside countries, we are simply told that we cannot move unless and until we get the permission of the Dominions Office. If it suits the Dominions Office and the interests of the British government to let us bargain, they will do so. But, if our doing so interferes with their own bargaining, then we are out of luck. This is an extraordinary situation, above all in the country which witnessed the birth of the Atlantic Charter. We may be too close to the picture to see the full significance of this thing at the present time. But when our people look back and consider its implications, they will find it bears the same sinister marks as those things which killed the Bond-Blaine treaty, which gave the French the rights to our shorelines, which sacrificed our bases in the last decade. One thing these events have in common. In none of them were the interests of Newfoundland put first. In none of them did she get a square deal. And she is not getting a square deal now. I go further and say that she will never get a square deal. She will never know liberty, never know a real freedom, never know either happiness or prosperity until such time as she has her own free government appointed by her own free people.

Consider how different things would be today if we did have our own Newfoundland government. Would we, the representatives of the people, have to go on our knees and say, "Mr. Attlee, may we have your kind permission to do business on behalf of our country with the United States? May we ask this great country to give us some monetary return for the things which they got for nothing from you, the most precious asset in the keeping of any country — the sacred