

*Validity of Quebec Statute*

dominion. At that time he pleaded for a better understanding of the problems of the French-Canadian people, and made a noteworthy contribution toward allaying the bitterness which was in evidence at that time, arising from the conscription issue. I consider it to be quite consistent with the ideals which he championed at that time that he should now appeal to the Canadian people in terms of Canadian unity and in defence of the liberty of the subject.

May I quote from an editorial appearing in the Winnipeg Free Press, which says:

No recent visitor to Winnipeg has made so deep an impression upon the public mind as Mr. R. L. Calder, K.C., of Montreal; nor is it easy to remember a case pleaded with more cogent force than his plea for the federal disallowance of the infamous Quebec padlock law which—make no mistake about it—is a matter of deep concern to the whole dominion. . . . The padlock law strikes at the heart of those civil liberties without which Canada cannot exist; and without which, it is pertinent to point out, the guaranteed position of Quebec itself in confederation would become untenable. The principle of the padlock law is two-edged. Its present form may, or may not, command the admiration of the majority of the people of Quebec. But in another form it may take a shape which would be distasteful and repugnant to them who, having swallowed the first, would perforce accept the other also. . . .

Mr. Calder is not a communist or an atheist. He is a native of Quebec province, a Roman Catholic, a student of both Laval and McGill universities, a believer in capitalism, a distinguished member of the Quebec bar, a former crown prosecutor of the city of Montreal. He joined the C.E.F. in 1915, and won the military cross at Amiens when serving with the 13th Highlanders. . . . This is not the record of a fly-by-night agitator out to destroy the structure of Canadian society. It is the record of a Canadian citizen of whom this country has every reason to be proud. He has lived in Quebec province all his life, and it is because of this history that his argument commands very special attention.

Similar editorials appeared in practically all the principal dailies across western Canada. I submit, Mr. Speaker, on these grounds, that this action on the part of the Duplessis government is a direct challenge to the principles of Liberalism professed by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches. It is more than that; it is a direct challenge to our democracy and national unity. I submit further that there is only one appropriate answer which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) can give to our plea; that is, the

assurance of definite protection for those who have been deprived of those fundamental civil liberties guaranteed them under our constitution.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, coming from northern Ontario where we have had to deal sometimes with strikes and labour troubles, I must state at the outset that I am absolutely intolerant of intolerance. I have listened attentively to the previous speakers, and I must say that in some particulars I believe the padlock law now under discussion goes too far, while in other particulars it does not go far enough.

As far as I am concerned I shall never have any patience with communism, for a very simple reason. It is a poison which is absolutely foreign to the mentality of the great majority of the Canadian and British peoples. It is of no use for us to try to delude ourselves with the belief that communism is simply a political philosophy. It goes much deeper than that. I have not the intention of analysing the studies of Karl Marx as they were applied in the Russian revolution, nor have I any intention of discussing the causes of that revolution. If the leaders at that time had been satisfied to try their experiment in their own country, that would have been satisfactory to me. But the leaders of the Russian revolution made it a religion; they decided that they were going to spread that gospel into every section of the civilized world, and they have their apostles here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago a reference was directed to me. I should like to know whether or not this reference is also directed to me.

Mr. BRADETTE: During the twelve years I have been in this house, Mr. Speaker, I have never made a personal allusion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. BRADETTE: I repeat that communism was a virus that might have been satisfactory to a small minority of the Russian people—

Mr. SPEAKER: Eleven o'clock.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.