

The Address—Mr. W. J. Browne

it, might be the next government of Canada. So we did not tell them anything about it, and we are not going to tell the people either. What the people don't know won't hurt them". I have imagined that the right hon. gentleman was frank enough to tell the people what his conscience was pricking him about all the time. The right hon. gentleman, I think, has some ground to boast about his accomplishments, although there are many who would not say that. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this country would be more greatly honoured in the United Nations and everywhere else among right-thinking men if it would put respect for law and love of justice before its ability as a trading nation; it would be better for this country to have respect for the law so that rich and poor would be equal before the law. I ask hon. members who sit to my right and hon. members who sit on the other side of this house if they would not rather have Canada known as a country where the law was respected and justice was carried out by those entrusted with that duty, whether a man was rich or poor, than that it should have the greatest trade of any nation in the world.

At the last session of this house I drew attention to the fact that in negotiations leading up to confederation a principle which was considered at Charlottetown, at Quebec and at London and which found a place in the British North America Act, was thrust aside by the members of the Canadian government. I refer to the fact that Newfoundland, when she was negotiating a pact of union with Canada, had at the time a large surplus and a low per capita debt. That principle was enshrined in those documents which are so highly respected and which have become the law of this country. If hon. members would take the trouble some time to look at the Quebec conference resolutions they will find laid down in paragraphs 60 to 63, and especially in paragraph 63, the principles that I have outlined, that Newfoundland at that time, and Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, were to be given a credit of 5 per cent per annum on the difference between the total debt of the country and what it would be if it was the same per capita as the debt of Canada. If that had been done for Newfoundland we would have had a large annual allowance instead of what we have now as a diminishing transitional grant.

While I am on that subject I want to support what my hon. and learned colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Higgins), said about representation in the Senate. If hon. members will look at paragraph 14 in the Quebec resolutions and paragraph 15 in the London resolutions they

will find there the principle which I recommend to the Prime Minister and the members of the government. "The first selection of the members of the legislative council (as the Senate was called then), shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the legislative councils of the various provinces. Such members shall be appointed by the crown at the recommendation of the general executive government upon the nomination of the respective local governments, and in such nominations due regard shall be had to the claims of the members of the legislative council and the position in each province, so that all political parties as nearly as possible be fairly represented."

I ask if hon. members of the government feel that they own the Senate. Can they appoint members who are their supporters and nobody else from Newfoundland? So far we have four appointments; and four of those were supporters of the Liberal party and four of them were supporters of confederation. What about those representing the 48 per cent of the people who voted against confederation? What about the people who voted against the Liberal party? Have they no right to representation? When a province comes into this great dominion, is it fair that it should be without representation by parties in that chamber? I suggest to these hon. gentlemen, especially to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fournier), who is sitting there and doing me the honour of listening to what I have to say tonight—and he is a fair-minded man; he has told me he is a fair-minded man—

Mr. Fournier (Hull): And you believed it.

Mr. Gardiner: We were just discussing the matter of how few Liberals there were in the Senate when we came into power.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): Yes, maybe there were. But two wrongs don't make a right. If that was done in the past the Liberal party with its huge majority here and in the other place could now afford to be a little generous with that little province.

If the principle I mentioned, which is contained in the British North America Act, of the difference in the per capita debt, had been recognized it would have made a striking difference to the present government of the province of Newfoundland. They would have had a substantial annual allowance which they have not got at the present time.

After three years have expired, the grant that they are getting now of a little over \$6 million begins to diminish, and where are they going to find the revenue? At the fisheries conference the other day down in