

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That covers it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is there agreement to this proposal?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Reid:** Then I so move, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** We have another difficulty. If we discharge the order from the order paper, it might be worth while either before or after to have agreement or unanimous consent to spend the balance of the hour discussing the subject matter of these three bills.

**Mr. Corbin:** I thought the question would be put at the end of this period.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I think all that is required now is to ask if there is unanimous consent for the discharge of these three bills and the making of the proposed motion by the parliamentary secretary. It is part of the unanimous consent that there will be debate until five o'clock, if we wish. But it would be understood that there is to be a House order that the motion be voted on not later than five o'clock.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The motion before the House is now debatable and it will be put at five o'clock.

**Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, I preface my comments by saying that we are progressing in a spirit of national unity this afternoon by bringing together three distinct bills for at least discussion and referral to committee for examination. After living in the United States for ten years I returned to Canada in 1965. This was shortly after the new Canadian flag—which now graces this chamber by being placed to Your Honour's right hand—was displayed for the first time in our country and raised on the Peace Tower. I must say that it was with emotion and gratitude that I viewed the new Canadian flag. I am wearing in my lapel this afternoon, as are many members of this House, a replica of that flag as a reminder of the country that we in this House have the honour to serve.

In our discussion on a way to commemorate that flag and honour it, we should concentrate less on the aspect of a holiday or mid-winter break, nice as that would be and to which I am not opposed, and more on the sense of history in our country that our flag symbolizes. I said that I lived in the United States. Three of my children were born there. Some began their education in that country. Any child educated in the United States quickly obtains a sense of appreciation for his country and a sense of history. Shortly after being exposed to school, or even the nursery television programs, every child knows that

### *Canada Flag Day*

George Washington was the founder of his country and Abraham Lincoln saved the union.

• (1620)

I was always impressed by the way in which the people of the United States carry with them through their lives an appreciation of their country. I wish that in our country we had had the same kind of appreciation. Of course, I found upon coming back that developments had taken place in the previous decade which helped to deepen our appreciation of Canada. Expo in 1967 was not only a memorable event but was probably the greatest event since confederation, one which brought together the Canadian people in a realization of what this country means, in a realization of the possibilities of this country in relating to the interdependent global society in which we live.

We are moving forward. This afternoon we are moving forward in trying to reconcile certain differences which occur in the presentation of the bills which are now before us, particularly Bill C-136 which deals specifically with the Canadian flag and Bill C-95 which deals with Sir John A. Macdonald and the third bill referred to this afternoon which concerns the whole question of recognizing the discoverers of this country.

I observed that on February 15 when we debated in this House the merits especially of Bill C-136 and tried to relate Bill C-95 to it, that there was, and let us be frank about it, a playing off of Lester Pearson against Sir John A. Macdonald. As I say, I came back to this country in 1965 when Lester Pearson was prime minister and the architect of the flag, and I noted with great joy the respect in which he was held throughout the world for his accomplishments not only domestically but internationally, for which, of course, he was awarded a Nobel Prize.

Mr. Pearson was a man who served his country nobly. As a matter of fact, he gave us a lesson in "togetherness," a lesson, unfortunately, which was revealed to us through the funeral of this great statesman, for we saw on television, those of us who were in other parts of the country, at the time, the leaders of the great faiths in this country, men and women from all walks of life, coming together to honour this man. I said to myself as I watched the ceremony, "Isn't it too bad that it takes the funeral of a great man to bring together Canadians from all religions and walks of life." This is perhaps part of the price we pay for the discordancy of the times in which we live.

I stand second to no one in this chamber, or even in the country in my appreciation of Lester B. Pearson. Indeed, just the other day I wrote a letter to his dear friend, Bruce Hutchison, who preached the eulogy at a service in Vancouver for the late Mr. Pearson and I recalled in my previous conversations with Mr. Hutchison the manner in which Mr. Pearson led this country into what might be called the modern era, the international era which Canada has now clearly entered.

I do not feel that if we celebrate Canada flag day as a way in which to mark our sense of appreciation of the national unity which is desired in this country, a sense of appreciation of our history, that we want necessarily to circumscribe the full meaning of this holiday, of this day on which we are going to emphasize our history, by identi-