Little Macdonald (Richmond-West Cape Breton) Macdonald (Cardigan) MacLennan Marcotte McDonald (Shediac)

McRae Molloy Murdock Prévost Quinn Robinson Sinclair Sutherland Wilson-42.

NON-CONTENTS

The Honourable Senators

Beauregard Chapais (Sir Thomas) David Fafard

Paquet Robichaud St. Père Sauvé-9.

Hon. Mr. MORAUD: Honourable senators, I was paired with the honourable senator from De la Vallière (Hon. Mr. Raymond). Had I voted, I should have voted against the Bill.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: Honourable senators, I was paired with the honourable senator from Lunenburg (Hon. Mr. Duff). Had I voted, I should have voted against the Bill.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall this Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. KING: I move the third reading of the Bill now.

Hon. ATHANASE DAVID: Honourable senators, before the third reading takes place, may I be allowed to dispel any impression that after such a long discussion there is nothing more to be said, even though honourable members might be much better satisfied if no further speeches were made? I ask you to believe that I speak further on this subject only out of a sincere sense of duty, and because of what I believe to be a deep sentiment on the part of those who do not partake of the opinion of the majority.

Many of you, honourable senators, have, I know, taken into consideration the very special position which we occupy in this Dominion, and have been content, therefore, to hear expressions of opinion against coercion; and in saying this I do not wish you to think that I am aggrieved at the vote just given.

A majority has rights, and, unless British fair play is dead, a minority also has rights. In a recent issue of a paper I read this:

All men in a democracy are entitled to their opinions. They are entitled, if they like, to believe that the will of the majority may be wrong, but they are not entitled to oppose the will of the majority. When they do it is treason.

If that is true—I know that everyone here will not accept it as truth-and the will of Hon. Mr. HAIG.

the people has sent a large majority to the House of Commons, the minority, which is the Opposition, has no right to speak.

It is sometimes pretty hard to fight what we know in advance is a lost cause. You will readily admit that it is much easier to be right and satisfied in a majority than to be in a minority and continue to believe that you are right. It takes much more courage in life to say "No" than to say "Yes." It takes all the more courage when "No" is said by a minority to a large majority. But, like you, honourable senators of the majority, we believe that the accomplishment of a duty brings deep satisfaction.

Much has been said about the plebiscite. I should like to read a few extracts from a book entitled "The Commandments of Men," by William Henry Moore. This author, I may say, is not one of my race, and he does not come from the province of Quebec. He savs:

Now, if the basis of democracy is the right of each of the ruled to be an equal ruler, then of each of the ruled to be an equal ruler, then democracy is but a thing of ink and vapour. Nor is the situation altered by the service of a little god that is sometimes brought in to bolster up the worship of democracy. Like democracy it is of fair appearance, almost imposing; we call it, plebiscite.

However fair the plebiscite may appear in theory, in practice it is usually no fairer than the bully's rule in the playground of the country school.

country school.

No, the plebiscite has not brought democracy No, the plebiscite has not brought democracy back to what its early apostles believed it would be, and what its modern devotees seem to believe it is. If there ever was an equality among citizens in direction of common affairs, it has ceased to exist. Democracy never implied rule by All-Of-Us; under certain conditions it might have meant, and at times has meant, rule by Most-Of-Us, which is far from being entirely good: now it usually means rule being entirely good; now it usually means rule by Those-Of-Us who are strong enough to effect an organization that within its own field, municipal, provincial or federal, can control the channels of information: strong enough to reach into the streets, the back lanes, the highways and concession lines, and take to the polls the thousands of electors whose word is law.

Equal power to decide about anything naturally implies equal access to information. So far from the electors having two sides of a So far from the electors having two sides of a given issue, they very often have only one, and that of the side with material resources sufficient (and they may have to be enormous) to move thousands, if not millions of electors.

"It's black, all black, nothing but black"; that must be the continuous cry of the thing

opposed, and, as we shall see later on, it is an essential feature of "group" movements that something be opposed. Black! shout the bill-boards. Black! scream the posters in the boards. Black! scream the posters in the street-cars. Black! thunders the parson from his pulpit. Black! chatter voices over the afternoon's cup of tea. Black! clamours the Press day after day, until eyes that once saw it white, or at least drab, are, by sheer exhaustion, brought to see that it is indeed black all black. black, all black.