

position to convert this \$16 million now owed us by the United Kingdom, when the records show us conclusively that Canada is on the hard dark road of austerity herself, and is at present, through the medium of Canadian banks operating in Newfoundland, taking advantage of our credit balance of American dollars to bolster up her own credit. In my opinion this whole matter is a matter of such serious importance that I consider that this Convention as a body is not competent to deal with it. It is a matter for proper negotiation between two governments elected by the people of both countries.

Again I state that this confederation issue has been deliberately engineered by both the Canadian government and the British government for the purpose of confusing the minds of our people in such a way as to convey to the world that we Newfoundlanders do not know what we want, what we really want in the form of government. People have come out from England during the past five or six years and went back, and said that we do not know what we want, and that is the way they want to keep us. It is a definite violation of the solemn pact made between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of the United Kingdom in 1933, and we as delegates to this National Convention have made ourselves parties to the violation of that agreement. Today, many of our people have forgotten about this agreement of 1933, but there are a great number of those who voted for that legislation in 1933 still in this country, several of whom now occupy positions of trust in the service of Newfoundland. I hold that these gentlemen who voted for that legislation in 1933 should now come forward in the interest of the country and give to our people the particulars of what happened at that time — what undertakings, if any, were given regarding the passing of this legislation. I say, sir, that these gentlemen should come forward now and make public what transpired, unless they also are prepared to see a solemn agreement to which they were a party, unless they too wish to witness that solemn pact being ground in the mud under the iron heel of the United Kingdom government...

**Mr. Chairman** You are drawing a conclusion. You are on thin ice.

**Mr. Cashin** That is my personal opinion as a Newfoundlander, and I am entitled to it. They

should come forward and tell the people what actually transpired and what was the understanding in 1933. I will go further and say that if they do not come forward, if they fail to do that, then they fail in their duty to the country and to the people of the country and will be considered as such.

As I have stated before, the Ottawa delegation brought back no report to this Convention. The Ottawa delegation has not been able to supply us with any definite or concrete replies to our numerous questions. There has been no effort by any other delegate of that delegation to enlighten us in any way with the exception of what we have been told by Mr. Smallwood. And even Mr. Smallwood has admitted to the Convention and to the people of the country that these various estimates of expenditures and revenues were prepared for the Newfoundland delegation months before they arrived in Ottawa.

**Mr. Smallwood** I have not. That is not true.

**Mr. Cashin** We have not received any explanation of this from any other member of the Ottawa delegation and we can only surmise that the Ottawa government had been supplied with various statistical information in advance by the Commission government. It is therefore apparent that the Ottawa delegation were acting more or less as a sort of international brokerage association on behalf of the Commission of Government.

**Mr. Smallwood** Point of order. The Ottawa delegation was sent to Ottawa by this Convention and acted for this Convention, not as agents of the Commission of Government. I ask him to take that back. If he is fair, he will retract that.

**Mr. Chairman** The actual position is this: this Convention ... appointed and sent a delegation to Ottawa.... Whether it did a good job or a bad one, two things are clear:

1. The Convention has to accept collectively the responsibility for sending the delegation to Ottawa; and
2. The delegation is open to criticism by this Convention.

But criticism should, of course, be limited and circumscribed within the limits of fair comment. The status of the delegation was as agent of this Convention. It was the created representative of this Convention and nothing else in fact and in law, no amount of argument can convert it into anything else.