

present administration. No logical person, viewing the economic and financial position in which the mother country presently finds herself, expected any handouts or favours. We are told that certain members of the delegation were highly dissatisfied....

It's time our people made an entirely new approach to their appraisal of Commission of Government: a new approach in this way, that each and every voter ask himself or herself this question — what assurance have I from the statements of Lord Addison that the British government will guarantee our economic stability should we fall upon mean times five or ten years from now? Or to put it plainer, what guarantee is there contained in this report that England will be in a position to help us with anything at any time? Now quite plainly the answer is just this: there is, there can be no such hard and fast guarantee.

I have no illusions as to what a large percentage of our people think of Commission government, but there are many whose apathy merely causes them to shrug their shoulders and say, "This is the best government we ever had. This government brought us prosperity, higher wages, and a better price for our fishery products". It's just as much a truth to say, "Adolf Hitler was the greatest man that ever lived. He was great because he created a world crisis that brought us unheard of wealth and prosperity." The London delegation brings us just this, my friends: "Any guarantee of financial and economic aid is definitely out of the question, and we, the Dominions Office, can actually guarantee Newfoundland nothing at all." I would emphasise this now, lest ten years hence Newfoundlanders, having made their decision, may once again have desperate reminders of their choice in the form of six cents per day guaranteed dole.

In concluding, I cannot altogether agree with the sentiments expressed so dramatically by my good friend Major Cashin.... Now I am more concerned with the welfare of my fellow-countrymen of 1947, than I am with the hopes and loves of my great ancestors who, perhaps more patriotic than practical, waved a flag when they might have been better employed. Whether we like it or not, from the dust of old beliefs, old customs, old loves; from the ashes of old traditions, political and otherwise, a new order is arising. Tradition, heritage are fast disappearing,

and with such disappearance is coupled a dissolution and decay of old values. We in Newfoundland are not unaffected by this historic dislocation. Only recently a motion was introduced suggesting an approach to a foreign power. A few shouted "upstart", "renegade", "secessionist", a few talked of kicking down any consideration of such a motion, but this will not, this cannot do away with the conflicting and convulsive sentiment that is slowly, in the minds of young Newfoundlanders, tearing down the dams of the past, and bringing a new thought and perhaps a new vision for our people.

Mr. Chairman, I am well content to let the matter of choice of government rest in the hands of my fellow countrymen. I care not if the majority view of things differs from mine, but I am concerned that they be not misled in their interpretations of the reports of this Convention. To this end I submit that I cannot find in the report of the London delegation sufficient guarantee for our future well-being as a people, should we ever need help, to justify my support of the retention of the present form of government.

Mr. Harrington Mr. Chairman, ... the delegation has not accomplished as much as similar missions in the past. Reference to one such occasion in the past was made here yesterday by Mr. Butt, when he quoted the famous Labouchere despatch of 1857, which has been referred to as Newfoundland's Magna Carta, inasmuch as it laid down the democratic principle "that the consent of the community of Newfoundland is regarded by Her Majesty's Government as the essential preliminary to any modification of their territorial or maritime rights". What a shame that our Newfoundland Commissioners of the 1940s did not recall the Labouchere despatch before they collaborated in "modifying" — or "impairing" as this report says — the territorial rights of Newfoundlanders for 99 years. Sir Hugh Hoyles and P.F. Little were the members of the delegation who were associated with this famous despatch; that achievement was one of many that illumine the pages of the history of responsible government from 1855 down to almost its very end. Another instance occurred in 1886 when the House of Assembly passed the Bait Act which was to sound the death-knell of French influence in this country. When the British government refused to ratify it,