

well explained to you by other members who have spoken. With regard to the base deals we did have a very extended conversation and it was admitted by the Chairman, "Yes, we made the base deals, we had to save our lives and keep our ships from sinking. We never would have done it but for that." In other words Lord Addison admits that these base deals would not have been made had it not been that they wanted to save their lives. We have no kick about the base deals as far as granting them to the United States at that time is concerned, but we do have a kick when Great Britain gives away our land for 99 years without any saving clause whatever. Go back to the Treaty of Versailles when most of our northern coast was given to France.¹ Go back to the time when concessions regarding our lobster fishery were given to USA,² and come down to this war and you get another piece given away. Why, for 70 years responsible government fought for that which Great Britain gave away freely and without concession.

Regarding Gander, that was explained and you are let in for a deficit of at least \$250,000, and that may be multiplied. Regarding debt and tariffs, that end of it was taken care of as far as we could. We pointed out that if they did not have the dollars over there, apart from the fact that we have \$9 million there, we pointed out that rather than let our fish industry go to the wall, the Commission government might be able to find it convenient to advance a credit to Great Britain to take care of the sale of fresh fish from this country. Well, that was not entirely turned down, we were simply told it was none of our business, which we knew. We replied to that by a memorandum on 7 May which has been read. I ask you to study it carefully, and then take a look at Lord Addison's reply. He replied, "I have studied your memorandum". After prolonged and careful study he arrives at his conclusions. Don't you think they are momentous conclusions? Listen: "In my view, it goes beyond the terms of reference of your delegation, and indeed of the National Convention itself." Just imagine

that! Forty-five men elected by a free people in this country have not the right to discuss trade and tariffs with the government. Why? Because it goes beyond the terms of reference of the Convention Act. If that's not an answer that would make anyone weep, I don't know what is. Let me quote you section 3 of the Convention Act: "To examine the position of the country". And yet we could not possibly talk about fish and iron ore. Now let me go on to his momentous answer to our memorandum: "Most of the items to which you refer have already been raised with the United Kingdom Government...." That is excellent news. I am proud of our Commission government to think that they raised all these points, probably before this Convention was ever thought of, according to that we have been berating the Commission of Government just a little too much. All matters you gentlemen have raised here, they have been taking over to Lord Addison and the Dominions Office, and they have been pressing them very hard for concessions for this country. I ask you gentlemen to reconsider your views on Commission of Government. I am sure Mr. Smallwood will agree with me on that. He says: "I have throughout been as helpful as I can be. 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 seek to negotiate trade arrangements between the United Kingdom government and the Government of Newfoundland." Now I want you to study and read that again, and if you can show me any criticisms of the Commission of Government or the government of Great Britain, then there is something wrong with my eyesight. We did say we could not understand the attitude of the Commission on the matter of interest-free loans, but if that's a criticism, I don't know what criticism means. We could not understand their attitude. Is that criticism? No. We wanted an explanation of why a thing that would save the people \$400,000 could not be put into effect.

I feel that your delegation did all it was

¹The French were granted the right to land and dry fish on much of Newfoundland's west and northeast coast by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. This was extended by the Treaty of Paris in 1763, and the French Shore, as it became known, was further defined by the Treaty of Versailles in 1783. These rights were effectively extinguished by the *entente cordiale* of 1904.

²Mr. Hollett was probably referring to the concession of the right to fish for lobster to the French in 1890, rather than to the USA.