

National Centennial Act

restricted scope, I wonder if he would agree to postpone his remarks about centennial projects until we come to the estimates of the centennial administration?

Mr. Barnett: I had no intention of launching into any lengthy discussion of what I might consider to be appropriate centennial projects, but I was going to mention by way of illustration and by way of emphasis of the remarks made earlier by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that this is the kind of emphasis being placed by the government of Malaysia in building its new federation. This is the sort of thing which I would like to see us doing in Canada, when we enter upon the second 100 years of our existence as a nation. In deference to the point raised by the minister, I will now admit this was about the extent of the remarks I intended to make.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the committee and I certainly hope it will pass the resolution shortly. I believe there is only one speaker to follow, although I am not sure of this. However, as I read once again the terms of the resolution and the changes that are to be made, although they do not seem consequential there is still a slight fear that there is another meaning for the changes that are being proposed. This has been referred to by the President of the Privy Council and by other speakers, and I have had private conversation about it earlier this afternoon.

I wonder if there is not some significant meaning in the actual changes that are proposed. Is the government changing its attitude about Canada as a nation, and now thinking of it as a two nation state? This may be the case, but we do not know. Although there is no doubt we will accept, on division, the resolution as it stands, considering the statements that have been made so far I feel I have something worth while to add in the progress of debate.

The previous speaker indicated that, by comparison with what he has seen in recent weeks, Canadians would not be proud to be members of parliament if they could see the deportment of such a new nation as Malaysia. I say to you now, Mr. Chairman, if there is anything wrong with Canada we can find some of the ills right here in this parliament. One of them is the proliferation of parties in this house, and we have seen what this has meant to Canada and the Canadian people in recent weeks.

Pleas have been made for progress in parliament, but they have no relationship to the actual business that has been transacted inside the house, and the people of Canada must recognize this. If changes are to be

made it is entirely due to those people who have held up the work of parliament.

During the course of this debate references have been made to what transpired in our history, and in regard to who came here, what nations sent people, and the purposes of their coming. My colleague from Marquette made a noteworthy contribution yesterday afternoon, and my background induces me to tell the house my forefathers came here from the United States to seek the freedom of this country and to leave the area of conflict that existed in the United States at that time.

They came as a type of loyalists, loyalists to the British crown, loyalists to the Canadian flag, and loyalists to their faith. I believe that as we go on to celebrate the centennial of Canada we must remember the faith our forefathers had in coming here. We must remember the efforts that were put forth in order that we might enjoy the bounties of this country that exist today. If we forget those basic things, how can we go into the celebration of our centennial with the proper concept of what we should do?

With regard to the list of people being invited to the conference, and especially with regard to their political affiliations, surely it is not our intention to proceed to our hundredth anniversary on the basis of a political connotation such as that list had? I certainly hope that before the debate concludes the President of the Privy Council will table that list of names for all our people to see.

Listening to the statements made yesterday, seeing the parrying, the setting back and forth, the swaying made to our ideas, I could not help thinking of the effort that was put forth during two world wars. This was something which was mentioned by another of my colleagues. Surely these people, as they went to fight for Canada, did not think they belonged to this or that part of Canada, and did not care whether their comrades spoke this tongue or that tongue. Indeed, if I am to be honest with the committee, when I myself went into the second world war I left a section of the country which was bilingual. The other language used was German, but my comrades and I went to fight for Canada. We did not go to fight for any situation that was local, or any situation that would divide the country. Anyone with an ounce of common sense will know why we and others made this effort.

The crew with which I flew in the second world war—this is the second time I have mentioned this in the house, but I think it is more important this time—had a skipper who was French Canadian. I am sure he would be proud if he knew that today one of the members of his crew sat in this house, in the highest court of Canada; nor would he ask,