

plot to rob this country of the unexpected wealth of our Labrador.

Mr. Chairman I do not think you are entitled to express that opinion.

Mr. Cashin I will go further and say that the parties to this plot are the Government of Great Britain, Canada and our own local Commission, and to show how recklessly eager they are to see this plot succeed, we find that they do not hesitate in throwing overboard the agreement of 1933.

Mr. Chairman Unless you can lay the foundation for that statement, I do not think you ought to go that far.

Mr. Cashin I make the statement, and I am convinced that time will bear me out.

Mr. Chairman That may be. None of us is omniscient; we cannot say whether time will bear you out or not. You are making a statement of fact. I do not think you are justified in doing that at this time.

Mr. Cashin I want to make it clear that I am not in the least afraid of discussing these so-called Canadian terms, for the simple reason that I am confident that when the people have been shown how worthless they really are, they will feel about them as I do. My principal objection to them is that I see in them only a camouflage, a deceit and a bait that is being used by those who plot against our country, to entrap and destroy us. I will show this Convention, and I will back it with the necessary proof, that this whole thing had its origin several years ago. And when the story is told, it will be a most inglorious one for all parties concerned.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go further into this matter at the present time. Nor do I intend to make any motion at the moment. My object is simply to impress on delegates the hidden significance of this latest move on the part of the premier of French Canada and to ask my fellow delegates to give the matter their serious consideration. Vigilance, it is said, is the price of safety. Let that then be our watchword.

Mr. Chairman I have read and studied that article, Major Cashin. I cannot help expressing the feeling that for Premier Duplessis it might be good politics; but in my judgement it is pretty bad law. How he or anybody else can depart from a judgement delivered by the Privy Council 20 years ago, I cannot begin to understand.

Mr. Cashin I agree from the legal standpoint,

but as I said a few minutes ago, "time will bear me out". You or I may not be here, but you will find if we go into confederation with Canada, that within five years Labrador will be taken from Newfoundland.

Mr. Smallwood I do not know if I am in order in speaking at this moment any more than Major Cashin was in order. If he was in order, I take it I am in order. I do not know what business is before the House. I do not know if there is any motion before the House.

Mr. Chairman There is no motion before the House.

Mr. Smallwood I take it that Major Cashin was out of order and I am equally out of order, not more so.

Mr. Chairman I allowed Major Cashin the latitude of going on; I must allow you the same latitude, out of order or otherwise.

Mr. Smallwood We were all interested on Saturday to read in the *Evening Telegram* a special despatch from its own correspondent in Quebec; and to read again this morning in the *Daily News* a Canadian Press despatch about the same matter, but with a significant difference. The story on Saturday said that Duplessis had declared that he had served notice on the governments of Canada and Newfoundland, and on the Privy Council, of intending to make a move to offset the judgement of the Privy Council 20 years ago. Whereas in the Canadian Press despatch in the *Daily News* not a single word is said about Quebec serving notice on the governments of Canada and Newfoundland and on the Privy Council. We do not know Quebec in this matter. Quebec has nothing to do with it, never did. We never had any dispute with the Province of Quebec.... This is a contemptible, completely contemptible effort, an effort beneath contempt, beyond contempt, to drag a red herring across the trail; to create a stink so heavy, so strong — that is what it is. We in Newfoundland have never had anything to do with the Province of Quebec or the Government of Quebec or the premier of Quebec in the Labrador boundary question.

Mr. Chairman Even if we did, they have been sleeping 20 years on their rights.

Mr. SmallwoodThere was a dispute between the governments of Canada and Newfoundland as to where the boundary of Labrador should lie. There was the dispute. That dispute came up 40