

Newfoundland

wanted the people of Quebec, of Ontario, and of all the rest of Canada to believe that that was their attitude. They knew at that time the procedure that had to be taken to effect this union. They never gave any suggestion or any hint of wanting a different course taken. Had they done so they would naturally have been subjected immediately to criticism across the country—as they are now being subjected—of being either insincere or not candid. But yesterday the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) moved this amendment, and it needs to be examined carefully. The operative part reads as follows:

Now therefore be it resolved, that the government of Canada be required to consult at once the governments of the several provinces and that upon a satisfactory conclusion of such consultations a humble address be presented to His Majesty . . .

The remainder of the resolution would read in the same way as it appears on the order paper at the present time and which was moved by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Fraser: The leader of the Grits.

Mr. Gardiner: Proud of the name.

Mr. Ross (Souris): Who wrote his speech? Who wrote the speech? He is not reading it well.

Mr. Maybank: A little while ago I had to comment about something silly that had come out of Portage la Prairie, but I think it has now been topped by the question of the hon. member for Souris.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I take it that the hon. member has just referred to me as being something silly that has come out of Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Maybank: No, I did not mean that. As soon as I make it clear to the hon. member that I did not mean him personally, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, when I said that something silly has come from there—as soon as I tell him that I did not mean that—I am sure he will be satisfied. I would like to add that it is bound to cause a little amusement when one notices the speed with which he rose thinking that it had been applied to him, himself. My reference was to his own earlier point of order some time back.

Mr. Miller: On a question of privilege, the hon. member has no right to imply by indirection what he cannot by our rules say in straight out-and-out words. He is implying now what he cannot say by straight direction and I demand that he refrain from doing so.

Mr. Irvine: These gentlemen are going to spoil coalition in Manitoba.

Mr. Ross (Souris): Page the Minister of Justice; he ruined it.

[Mr. Maybank.]

Mr. Maybank: What a welcome interruption, to have helped us all to laugh at ourselves. Up until then I must admit that I was tempted to laugh a little at the hon. member for Portage la Prairie for taking umbrage at a remark which he thought was directed at him. I did not suggest that he was silly, I only said that his interruption a while back was silly, and of course that was true. He is now trying to make himself look worse, which is a rather difficult thing to do.

May I just proceed? Before the last interruption—I have just forgotten whose it was—I had read the operative part of the amendment offered by the Tories, and I stressed particularly the words, “satisfactory conclusion of such consultations.” What that means is, first, that before asking the British government to pass the necessary legislation to effect the jointure of the two countries there must be consultation with the provinces. Second, in consulting them there would have to be what the amendment calls “a satisfactory conclusion.” Third, if, as and when nine satisfactory conclusions have been reached at nine consultations, then and then only should there be presented by the Commons and Senate “a humble address to His Majesty” asking that the necessary legislation should be passed at Westminster. All of this would have to be done by March 31.

The amendment purports to have the provinces determine whether Newfoundland shall be taken into confederation. It must be patent to every thinking person from all that was said in the debate last week, as well as from all the other evidence, that such reference is entirely unnecessary. It is also completely without precedent. It must not be overlooked that the leader of the Tory party desires to introduce into our governmental system the veto of the security council of the united nations and no doubt he proposes to cast one of his Tory premier friends in the role of Joe Stalin in order to prevent anything being done. He would emulate the communists whom from time to time he affects to condemn.

I hope the people of Newfoundland appreciate just what is the attitude of the Tory party, typified not merely by its leader but by every man jack who is sitting around him. I hope the people of Canada fully appreciate the trick that is being attempted.

But even aside from his veto feature, take a look at the practical effect of this amendment. A serious reference of this question to the nine provinces could not be made unless the terms of union were still open. A reference that would be a serious one would have to be one that would give the provinces an opportunity of having some hand in the conduct of the actual negotiations. The proposed