

Newfoundland

of minorities. Dictatorship denies that minorities have rights and, as far as minorities are concerned, those rights are determined by the simple process of coercion.

On June 19 of last year I asked the right hon. Prime Minister a number of questions in regard to the proceedings that led up to the question of confederation between Newfoundland and Canada. At page 5545 of *Hansard* for last year the right hon. gentleman used these words:

The British North America Act contemplated that there might be union between Canada and Newfoundland on a joint address of the houses of parliament of Canada and the legislature of Newfoundland. That principle could be resorted to; but it would require, in order to be resorted to, the restoration of self-government in Newfoundland, and then joint addresses under the terms of section 146 of the British North America Act. On those joint addresses, union could be consummated by order of His Majesty in council without legislation in the parliament at Westminster or legislation in the parliament of Canada. But if that method is not resorted to, the matter is not expressly provided for and would have to be accomplished by new legislation that could, I suppose, be adopted only by the parliament at Westminster if there were joint addresses from the houses of the Canadian parliament asking that it be done.

Then he goes on to set out in detail the usual processes. Once more I should like to point out that we in this parliament recognize with pride the fact that the hopes of the fathers of confederation are about to be consummated. The acquisition of Newfoundland will take its place, in strategic importance, with the acquisition by the United States of Alaska and Louisiana. It is actually the completion of that unity which caused Mr. Galt, as he then was, to say at the time of confederation:

Half a continent is ours if we have but the courage to take up the burden.

In taking up that burden, in welcoming those who heretofore have belonged to a sister dominion, above everything else we want to be sure that these new citizens who join us will do so in a spirit of amity and unity, thereby making their contribution to the strength, power and destiny of this confederation. For that reason I bring up these questions, because as I read the British North America Act the procedure followed here was never contemplated. Section 146 contemplated only one procedure, much different from that now being adopted.

With a view to ameliorating the causes of division and bringing into this confederation the people of Newfoundland in that spirit of dedication to our common destiny, I ask certain questions by way of explanation. I believe that the answers to these questions, properly given by the Prime Minister of this country, will go far to remove the causes of the discontent which now exists in New-

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

foundland, which cannot be denied and cannot be answered by a refusal to face the facts.

I ask, first, in view of the fact that under the Newfoundland Act, 1933, and the commission report at that time, it was contemplated that responsible government would be restored, why is it that the plan of confederation as provided for under section 146 of the British North America Act has not, in fact, been followed in this case? Secondly, what has the Canadian government done to remove the reasons for the objections that have been made by that very large minority that showed its strength in the vote on the two references? Thirdly, have any representations been received in opposition to the course followed by the Canadian government from groups of individuals in Newfoundland claiming to represent the seventy odd thousand who voted for the restoration of responsible government? If such representations have been made, would the Prime Minister table them and also table the replies given in reference thereto? Fourthly, and I think it is very important, the leader of the opposition has made clear that our responsibility as Canadians is to vote on this legislation and in no way to infringe upon the sovereignty of another dominion.

Recognizing that, I should like to ask this question. In view of the fact that Newfoundlanders will now become Canadians, and the desire of each of us must be to remove any possibility of disunity by reason of the fact that the government has not followed the scheme set forth in the British North America Act to cover possible union in the future, has this government made any representations to the British government regarding the question whether or not it would be preferable that responsible government be restored in Newfoundland prior to the matter of confederation being discussed in this house?

I think an answer to those questions would go a long way towards arousing the people of Newfoundland to a realization that we in Canada, in welcoming them, want them to realize that in no action we take are we endeavouring to control their destiny without a recognition of their rights.

Mr. Church: In passing Bill No. 11 you are passing on to the people of Newfoundland all the criminal law, the civil law, the law of patents, the law of trade-marks and many other matters. I do not wish to take any further part in the debate on the control bill, Bill No. 12, to amend the statute law to implement the terms of union of Newfoundland with Canada.

Last night I read a statement by the attorney general of England, Sir Hartley Shawcross, in an address at Lincoln's Inn, in