

*Newfoundland*

foundland sifted out the issues and used their franchise for the first time they demonstrated that they are an intelligent people who, with a half-decent break, can become a great asset to this country.

I am telling my hon. friend over here that I am going to vote against his subamendment. I am going to vote against the amendment of the leader of the opposition, because I want to get something done and not merely talk about it. We have said already we are bringing Newfoundland into confederation; we voted for it unanimously. I do not think any stop blocks should be put in the way of the legal steps necessary to back up our previous decision and amend our statutes so we can make available to the people of Newfoundland the things we have to give them.

That is my position in the matter. I am awfully sorry that in this day and age, living in the world as it is now, where there is trouble and misery, and where so often we find ourselves on shifting sands, this House of Commons has not given the people of Canada a demonstration that we are honest and truthful, and that regardless of where we sit in this house we are going to do the thing that is best for the Canadian people. I think the action taken by the government at this time is not only good for the Canadian people; it is also good for the people of Newfoundland because it will relieve human misery, and it should not be made a political football for election purposes by any section of this house.

**Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River):** I desire only two or three minutes, Mr. Speaker, in which to make a statement on the subamendment of my hon. friend, the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix). I do not desire to go into any lengthy refutation of the speeches that have just been made by my hon. friends of the C.C.F. In that regard, I will confine my remarks to the argument of my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), who has just spoken. Without question, it is another clear demonstration of the arguments one sees when someone tries to make the end justify the means; that is the old socialist, communist argument. It does not hold good within the boundaries of a free parliament. He may just as well carry it to its logical conclusion, as my hon. friend the member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) says. On the basis of his argument we should also bring into confederation India and China because the people of those countries are certainly suffering great hardships.

**Mr. Archibald:** They might be better citizens than you.

**Mr. Low:** Some more of my communist friends.

**Mr. Archibald:** If you are calling me a communist, you are stating what is not true.

**Mr. Irvine:** Amen.

**Mr. Low:** Mr. Speaker, it would be beneath my dignity to pay attention to my friend because those are exactly the tactics the communists use.

**Mr. Coldwell:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The group with which I am associated has no connection with communism. It has fought communism all through the years, and though I deprecate calling my hon. friend what he was called just now, I can understand why it was done. I feel this kind of thing should not be permitted.

**Mr. Low:** Well, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Cruickshank:** Let us have the vote.

**Mr. Low:** Yes, we will get to the vote. I do not intend to carry this particular question any further.

I should like to say the Social Credit party has given most earnest and careful consideration to the submissions of all the learned gentlemen who have spoken in this debate. We have weighed the arguments to the best of our ability and according to our lights. We have concluded that the procedure adopted by the government in this final step does, beyond any reasonable doubt, constitute an amendment to the British North America Act. This, therefore, introduces a new and tremendously important element into what, until yesterday, was nothing more than a clearly desirable objective, namely, the bringing of Newfoundland into confederation. In our view, that objective is still a desirable objective. We think it should be consummated at the earliest possible time. But, in the process of completing confederation, we do not propose to lend our hand to an amendment to the British North America Act by a simple majority vote of this house. We believe the constitution is much too sacred to be constantly subjected to the possibility of repeated changes by such means, particularly in this day when individual and minority rights and freedoms—yes, and human life itself—are valued so cheaply and are even held in utter contempt in many places in the world.

I said last night that it is our conviction that a satisfactory procedure for constitutional amendment should be formulated at the earliest possible time. It is a matter of urgency in my opinion because, as I view what has been taking place over the past few years, particularly since the beginning of the war, I find that the government has been laying down, piece by piece, a pattern of precedents which the government evidently