

sending me over here to represent them in this National Convention. We had hardly begun to get those facts concerning Newfoundland when a red herring was thrown across our path to divert attention and interest from the job we were sent here to do. This attempt was made when so far we have received only three reports in public session; and with regard to these reports, whatever may be said of them during discussion, insofar as information will allow them, they are a great credit to the committees concerned.... Several members supporting the motion stressed the time factor, that is an important point. I may say that there is no one in this building more anxious to be through with his job and back home to his own environment than I, but I submit there is a better way of doing this. In view of the expense to this country, we should try and hold sessions mornings as well as afternoons. Moreover, we must remember that Commission of Government have been in control of this country for 13 years and it is going to take time to get acquainted with the problems, and if the result of our findings will have a bearing on the future welfare of Newfoundland for generations to come, I submit the time factor is not so important as it may appear. Nor does it matter materially if the Commission continues in office for another year or two as long as it keeps within budget estimates and does not give away Labrador. May I say that there are some weighty problems that affect the future and the economy of Newfoundland more so than any others, the national debt, and the entry of our fishery products into the United States under fair trading tariff conditions. If we could have concentrated study and efforts to even partially solve these fundamental things, then I would say emphatically any government of good honest men, call it what you may, will bring Newfoundland to a place of happiness and prosperity for all its people to a level yet unknown. God guard thee, Newfoundland!

**Mr. Hillier** I have been listening to debates since last Monday, and I am of the opinion that it has gone far enough. We are wasting valuable time and getting nowhere. I am confident as far as the district which I represent is concerned, that they want to learn facts about any government and the motion before this House at the present time is not a form of government, it is a fact

finding matter, it is to find out what Canada has to offer us for the future of Newfoundland. Things have been said which were on the boisterous side and that is not what we came here for. We came to go into the economic conditions of Newfoundland and we are doing that to the best of our ability. There would be nothing amiss in our getting from Canada facts as to what she has to offer us for the future, and we can go on with our work; and when we are finished we can go into those facts and I am sure we will be none the worse off.... I do not want to delay the House, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment to amendment to the motion made by Mr. Bradley.

**Mr. Hickman** I would like to refer first to the question to which Mr. Higgins referred, the time of the referendum. There is nobody in the House any more anxious than I am to get the job over, but I am not worried about spring or fall or any referendum at all, until we are ready for it. For that reason I feel as I did the other day on the amendment made by Mr. Penney. I will not go into a repetition as we have been long enough here now. I would like to refer to the amendment to the amendment made by Mr. Bradley. That can be very confusing, I am not suggesting that it was meant to be confusing. If I understood the motion correctly, the amendment is practically identical to the original motion in intent or in effect. The delegation when appointed would not leave before the 1st of January. I cannot see the similarity to the amendment of Mr. Penney's. Mr. Penney's amendment in part states the question of ascertaining the attitude of Canada be deferred for consideration until reports of committees are brought in. That is absolutely different from the amendment to the amendment. For that reason I do not see how I can vote for anything but the amendment of Mr. Penney.

**Mr. Jackman** It makes one feel rather nervous because I realise my inability to reply to the learned lawyers and learned politicians who have spoken, but before this vote is taken I would like to say a few words because I am very much concerned about the whole matter. As I stated here on different occasions, I am here representing people, the majority of whom are poor, and I feel it is my bounden duty to do everything in my power to see their interests are best protected and conserved. As a previous speaker