

presented. I am here to plead with the Minister of Justice and the government, that they refer this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada and thus give relief to a numerous class of the citizens of Canada.

Mr. L. D. TREMBLAY (Dorchester): I must express surprise at the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), who certainly has no mandate whatever to express the feeling of the province of Quebec, but who seems so much interested in something that has happened in that province. We in this house—quite a few of us—who have been elected by the citizens of the only French province in this confederation think we are authorized to speak in the name of our constituents. I realize perfectly well that I am just a young member of this house, elected for the first time in 1935. Before coming to this house I was aware that Winnipeg North Centre had a brilliant representative in parliament, but we never thought he was authorized to speak in the name of our province.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a question of privilege. I was not speaking in the name of the province of Quebec; I was speaking as a citizen of Canada.

Mr. TREMBLAY: I like to hear my hon. colleague say what he has just said, but I contend that we in the province of Quebec are certainly as much authorized to express our own feeling as is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so.

Mr. TREMBLAY: I am glad the hon. gentleman admits that, and he is only logical in doing so. I have my own personal opinion with regard to the "padlock" law, and the hon. member has a right to his own opinion. I say, however, that after his appeals to *bonne entente*, to good will among Canadians, he should not bring before the house a question that concerns exclusively the province of Quebec. If a majority of the citizens of my own province think they should oppose those who preach opinions which we do not approve in that province; if they think that we should have such a law, it is up to them because we are still living in a democracy, and while I do not think the majority should dictate, at the same time the will of the majority should prevail.

The hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) who is from the province of Quebec, should assume the responsibility. I know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre well enough to believe he will recognize that we in the province of

Quebec have reasons to be proud of the Minister of Justice. Personally I am proud of the fact that in the House of Commons the majority, to whatever party individual members may belong, have recognized the merits, the knowledge and the distinction of our leader in the province of Quebec, the Minister of Justice. Only on Saturday it was my privilege to witness the way in which the Minister of Justice is appreciated on all sides. That is a satisfaction to us. Every one will admit that he has done in the past, is doing now and in the future will continue to do his duty in attempting to unify the nine provinces of the Dominion of Canada. But, in my opinion, it is wrong for an hon. member of this house to rise in his place and discuss a question that concerns more particularly a minority, but an important minority in our great dominion.

In the province of Quebec we are different from our fellow citizens of the other provinces of this dominion. But surely no one in this house will forget that we love British institutions; we are attached to them; we owe our liberty to British institutions. But we do not like that someone outside the province should try to control the opinions of our province. I do not want to express my own opinion of the "padlock" law, but I say to this house, Please do not interfere with whatever the province of Quebec thinks. We still have more confidence in the Minister of Justice than in the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, although we appreciate him.

Mr. C. G. MacNEIL (Vancouver North): May I point out to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Tremblay) that the question of preserving our fundamental civil liberties is a question to be determined by this parliament. If we were asked what constitutes the civil liberties we are pledged to uphold in this parliament, we would probably say that in this country we have freedom of speech and expression, freedom of lawful assembly, a free press and generally complete freedom to do anything which is not a quite unreasonable interference with our fellows. An authority on constitutional law states, "The liberty of the subject results from the principle that he may do as he pleases, provided he does not commit breaches of the substantive law or infringe the legal rights of others." May I point out to my hon. friend the words of Mr. Justice Cannon, appearing in *Votes and Proceedings* of March 4 last, page 48:

Under the British system, which is ours, no political party can erect a prohibitory barrier to prevent the electors from getting information concerning the policy of the government.