

Newfoundland

hopes will govern the procedure for all future attempts to change the constitution.

In our opinion, this is no safeguard to the rights and freedoms of the people. We believe that an immediate effort must be made to establish adequate safeguards. It is precisely because powerful and evil forces are at work attempting to break down our bastions and render us powerless to protect our liberties that we sound anew the warning uttered so many years ago by the apostle Paul to the Galatians when he said,

Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,—

Mr. Irvine: Hallelujah!

Mr. Low:

—and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

We propose to heed that warning. It is for that reason we must call a halt to the tampering with the British North America Act in the manner that has been followed so often in the past. For these reasons, we will vote for the subamendment. If that does not carry, we will vote for the amendment. Should that be defeated, we will vote against the resolution solely on the ground that it does involve an amendment to the British North America Act.

Mr. Jean-François Pouliot (Témiscouata): I spoke for five minutes yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I shall speak for two or three minutes today. In the first place, it is my intention to thank the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) for having said that the subamendment of my hon. friend the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) is something, and the amendment of the leader of the opposition is nothing. I hope I have correctly quoted the hon. member.

Mr. Gillis: That is correct.

Mr. Pouliot: I found the speech of the leader of the opposition yesterday rather nebulous and it was for that reason I expressed no opinion as to how I would vote. Naturally, I will vote for something, and I will vote for the subamendment of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. I will not vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition unless he agrees to amend his own amendment by incorporating in it the subamendment of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency.

The leader of the opposition has often been accused of being inconsistent. I do not know if that is true, but I shall give him the benefit of the doubt. If he wishes to be consistent with his last speeches, however, and if the Conservative members who have spoken about provincial rights want to be

[Mr. Low.]

considered consistent with the speeches they have made, they have only to make a gesture which will establish their sincerity. To establish their sincerity, they have only to vote for the subamendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Quebec-Montmorency. I am very happy to congratulate him on that subamendment.

I want to warn the leader of the opposition. From the very beginning, I have been a consistent defender of provincial rights in the house. He can read the speeches I have made against the succession duties act; what I have said about the Rowell-Sirois commission, and my denunciation of the bureaucrats who made that report. My votes have been consistent. I can compare myself favourably with anyone in the party of the hon. leader of the opposition. I will go further. I will tell the hon. leader of the opposition the real meaning of the subamendment. It is a desire to give the veto to the provinces in connection with this Newfoundland business, in the same way as San Francisco has given the veto to the major powers. If the veto is good enough for the Russians, it is good enough for the provinces. There is no reason why the provinces should not have it.

I therefore warn the leader of the opposition that when he votes for the subamendment of my hon. friend, which I was glad to support, he will vote to give a veto to the provinces. Thereby he will tell the country that his sincerity was real, that his sincerity was greater than it appeared in the first place from his amendment, and that he wants to show that he is the real defender of the rights of the provinces and, to refer to St. Paul, that he has found in this house his road to Damascus. That does not mean that the leader of the opposition is my favourite apostle, but I treat him with the same consideration as I treat any one of my colleagues; and I offer him an olive branch. That gesture shows the kindly spirit animating the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) and me. We do not desire any tribute for that act of generosity. Our idea is to save the face of the leader of the opposition so that he will not be ashamed of himself when he returns to Carleton county and when he shaves tomorrow morning.

It is therefore my great pleasure to support wholeheartedly the subamendment moved by my hon. friend. With regard to the leader of the opposition and his satellites I will use the great words of a great Englishman, "We will wait and see."

Similia similibus curantur—the same evils are cured by the same remedies. It was perhaps wrong to give the veto to the major powers at San Francisco. To apply that Latin proverb, *similia similibus curantur*, the only