

Newfoundland

hon. member for Temiscouata showed yesterday that it was possible to wait until such consultation had been effected and the necessary consent obtained, I believe it is my duty to maintain in this house the attitude I have always held: that of stoutly defending the rights of Quebec and the respecting of its prerogatives and privileges.

I must add, however, that I will not vote in favour of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition. I consider it to be lacking in sincerity and like a man who would arrange a way out so as to apply—if he should ever become leader of the government—the policy of centralization he advocated on September 8 and January 26, 1939, and which is not likely to reassure Quebec.

Therefore I state my proposal very plainly and clearly. If the Progressive Conservative party will accept my amendment to the amendment, I shall support their amendment, but if they reject my own, I submit that theirs will forever go down in parliamentary history as an act of hypocrisy.

(Text):

Mr. Ralph Maybank (Winnipeg South Centre): I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that I am not able to follow the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Always, when I hear members from Quebec speaking in the tongue that is most familiar to them, I am envious. But, when I find them also conducting a quarrel with a non-French member of the house who is, himself, blessed with a knowledge of "the two tongues" my envy is still greater. I am unable to make any examination of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made, but perhaps that is just as well because, in the limited time at my disposal, what I really desire to do is to consider the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition.

What I should like to do before this debate comes to a close is to examine what I think is a superficially clever manoeuvre by the Tory party, and just see where we would get if we followed the procedure which the hon. leader of the Tory party has offered to this house. As a matter of fact, sir, I submit to you and to the members of this house that the amendment of the Tory leader shows something very important. It shows that he and all of his supporters are either inane or insincere. That is the proposition I put to the house at the present time with reference to the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Maybank: We observe that the claque clacks quite quickly.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maybank: The Tory leader has been well served by his claque and probably will

continue to be served well by them. We will find members of it moving from place to place and calling out remarks.

Mr. Miller: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, or on a question of privilege, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) has been in this house a good deal longer than some of the rest of us and he knows full well that when he refers to the leader of our party, or he should know—

Mr. Bryce: Why do you boys not go back to Manitoba where you can agree?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would suggest to the hon. member who has risen on a point of order or a question of privilege, that he state his point of order or question of privilege.

Mr. Miller: The hon. member has been referring to the leader of our party as the leader of the Tory party. I maintain that, according to the custom of this house, he should be referred to as the hon. leader of the opposition.

An hon. Member: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Maybank: Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many silly emanations from the opposite side of the house, but I think perhaps that takes the cake.

An hon. Member: Extremely clever.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maybank: I had remarked on the proposition that this amendment which is before us shows either inanity or insincerity, and it is difficult for an impartial observer to decide which of those terms is the right one to apply. One's love for his fellow men, particularly some of those who are calling out foolishly from time to time, would naturally incline him against believing that there is so great insincerity among them as their amendment seems to disclose. But when you consider the procedure that is offered us, it is extremely difficult to believe that these gentlemen and the leader of these gentlemen can actually be so foolish as this proposal shows them to be. Well, I have to say I do not know which description applies to them; that is, whether they are foolish or insincere.

But perhaps what this amendment says should be examined in the light of the record that we have before us; and I should like, just briefly, to set forth that record. Last week all of these gentlemen were indicating, by their various speeches, that just as soon as possible—and certainly by March 31—they wanted to get the commonwealth, shall I say, of Newfoundland into the confederation known as Canada. And tonight they would claim they still propose to do just that same