

Newfoundland

well as majorities. It will be a sorry day for this country if anything like that ever happens.

Mr. E. G. Hansell (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, to clarify my own position I desire to say a word or two on the amendment. Before doing so, however, I should like to refer to the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) when he attempted to show that this group was somewhat inconsistent in our vote upon the measure for redistribution some years ago, and our vote upon the amendment that was moved thereto. Perhaps my hon. friend thought he had a rather sound argument. I will not deny that he had some shred of legal argument on the point, but I think if we analyse the situation as it existed then in respect to redistribution we will find that what we in this group were actually doing then was to protect the interests of the provinces.

The measure requiring certain amendments to the constitution in order that redistribution might be deferred was introduced because there had been a shift in the population, and that shift in population left some of the provinces of Canada at a disadvantage. We voted for an amendment that was worded exactly as this one is worded because we desired that the matter should be referred to the provinces for consultation. The amendment was moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). We voted that way because we thought the provinces should be consulted in the matter.

When the main motion was put, realizing that it would protect the provinces because of the shift in population, we voted for it. We see no inconsistency there whatsoever. If the main motion had been in any way detrimental to the provinces we certainly would not have voted for it. May I also suggest that the redistribution measure was not something that was as important as this matter, for the reason that there was not really a principle involved in it. It was a matter of seats in the House of Commons here; and if we had carried out redistribution at the time it would not have been fair to the provinces by reason of the fact that their citizens were living temporarily in other parts of the country.

I favour the amendment, Mr. Speaker; and in doing so I do not look upon it as constituting a motion of non-confidence in the government. I say that because the bill ratifying the agreement and admitting Newfoundland into Canada as the tenth province has been passed, and all parties in the house evidently were in favour of it. If we had been against the measure and had voted

that it be referred to the provinces before ratifying the agreement, then such an amendment would have been a motion of non-confidence; but we voted for the admission of Newfoundland as the tenth province and now we are saying that, since we have ratified the agreement and have given our support to the action of the government, we would like to see it referred to the provinces for consultation. To my mind, all the amendment does is to show a desire on the part of this parliament to give the provinces an opportunity of expressing themselves in respect to a people who are to become partners with them in constituting a larger Canada. It seems to me that is a reasonable attitude to take. I think we may presume the provinces are quite willing to welcome this new partner; and if that presumption is correct would it not be pleasing to the people of Newfoundland to know that the nine provinces of Canada were in accord in welcoming them into confederation? I think that would be a good thing to do. If there are any misgivings that any of the provinces are not favourable to welcoming this tenth province, then perhaps the sooner we know it the better, because it may only create complications after we are finished with the matter.

I listened with some interest to the speech this evening by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson). He rather ridiculed any thought that there might be a principle of centralization opposing this amendment. I do not agree with him there. In this present day there is a constant urge the world over for the bringing in of this principle of centralization. I do not believe this is done by any casual series of happenings; there is no question in my mind but that it is done by design. There are two world philosophies. One is that of effective democracy, which leads to the freedom of the people. The other world philosophy is one of authoritarianism, which leads to world dictatorship. That is all there is to it, to my mind; that is the only great issue in the world today, notwithstanding all the various groups affiliated with political organizations. And there is a continual urge the world over to apply this principle of centralization.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a principle in this amendment; and principles do not change. Principles are either right or wrong; and the principle of centralization is the principle of authoritarianism which in the final analysis leads to world dictatorship and world stateism. That principle is right or wrong. Some people may believe it to be right, but that is the issue, right or wrong; and the defeat of this amend-

[Mr. Church.]