

career ever since, especially as my successor in the Barreman radio programme. I believe he is a patriot, and I believe he loves this country every bit as much as I do. I am all the more sorry, therefore, that he has marred his political career, which I thought was a rather promising one, by his remarks aimed at me on Monday. I thought at first that I should put them down to naivety, to lack of experience in everyday affairs. I felt sorry that he should make such an almost unforgivable break. Yes, I told Mr. Harrington that I thought he would make a very good member of any delegation that might go to Canada to get the terms of confederation. I did not promise a seat on any such delegation from this Convention to Ottawa. I shall not appoint it. I suppose I would be lucky to be on it myself. I did tell Mr. Harrington that he would make a good member of the delegation, and I would say now again that he would make a good member, if I could feel sure that it was only an unfortunate break he made here on Monday last, and not a deliberate piece of double-crossing treachery, if it was not an unscrupulous attempt at political throat-cutting. Some day, I trust, Mr. Harrington will learn that in the circles in which men move and work and deliberate there is a line drawn, a well-known and well-established line, which men do not cross. It's simply not done to rush into a public assembly and blurt out what is said in private conversation.... Mr. Harrington will learn all this if he remains in the public life of our country. Maybe Mr. Harrington merely made an unfortunate and immature break — if he did I forgive him, and there are no hard feelings. Again, perhaps he fancied a perfectly sincere remark to be a foul attack upon his political virtue. In that case I could be sorry for his inexperience. But if it was a deliberate piece of throat-cutting, if it was part and parcel of a planned campaign to rivet responsible government on us, and to tune out everything but responsible government, then it's another situation altogether.

Now I turn to Mr. Hollett's remarks. I did not offer him a senatorship for two very sound reasons. First, because I have no senatorships to offer. Secondly, because if I were going to offer him any job it would be something on a very much lower level than a senatorship. I do Mr. Hollett the credit of not having accused me directly of offering him a senatorship.

**Mr. Hollett** Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The present speaker is indulging in personalities and refers to me as Mr. Hollett. I thought that was not allowed.

**Mr. Chairman** Do you rise to a point of parliamentary procedure?

**Mr. Hollett** Yes, sir.

**Mr. Chairman** During the House of Assembly era, members when addressing the Chair did not refer to other members by name, but by the districts they represented. But this Convention is not a parliament. Under the circumstances, I think Mr. Smallwood has the right to refer to you by name, rather than as the member for Grand Falls.

**Mr. Smallwood** And now I will refer to Mr. Hollett as the junior member for Grand Falls. Again I say I did not offer him a senatorship for the reasons I have already stated.

**Mr. Chairman** Here I have to call order. I do not propose to have personalities introduced, and I do not want to have aspersions cast upon any member of the Convention.

**Mr. Smallwood** I think that Mr. Hollett implied that it was I who offered him a senatorship. I have never exchanged more than 50 words with Mr. Hollett in my life and I trust to his honour to make it clear that it was not to me he referred. My friend Mr. Fudge's objection was to the holding of a little "side Convention" in my room at the Newfoundland Hotel. I notice that a local paper also referred to these meetings, so-called. It is perfectly true that many delegates — I might say two or three dozen delegates, have visited me in my room at the hotel, some by my specific invitation, some without any particular invitation. I have visited other delegates in their rooms. In my room and in their rooms, and in committee rooms in this house, and walking along the street, and in the streetcar, I have often discussed public affairs with delegates and with non-delegates. I am quite sure that other delegates have done likewise. It's a habit we have. It's a habit all public men have. You can't stop it. It isn't even sensible to want to stop it. It happens all over the world.... It's just the ordinary, practical, every day procedure for men to talk things over, to try to convince each other, or to try to find out what the other man is thinking, to canvass the situation generally. There is nothing improper or unusual about it.... It is just simple inexperience, immature unsophistication, to paint such meetings as sinister