

National Centennial Act

public, either by laying them on the table of the house or by incorporating them in *Hansard*, the names of the proposed new appointments at the earliest possible moment. I am speaking about the personnel of the conference.

Mr. Lamontagne: They have already been made public.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): There have been some misgivings about provincial representation on this conference, which will be composed of 60 members. Twenty are to be appointed by the provinces, two by each province. I am sure this is a most desirable situation.

Canadians have a habit of playing themselves down. The government has done us a disservice by playing down the nationhood of our country by the change which is contemplated in this resolution. It should not be so. The government should be furnishing leadership to the people of Canada in the process of building ourselves up rather than the opposite. That is what should have been done and that is why I view this resolution with misgiving. I hope my fears will prove not to be well founded. I travel, or used to travel, a good deal outside Canada. I found that the name of Canada is held in high esteem wherever I have gone outside the borders of this great country. I hope my misgivings concerning the result of the change contemplated by this resolution will be unfounded.

Finally, I hope the machinery provided by the new act will be effective and that it will produce results of which all Canadians can be proud.

Mr. Cowan: I heard the hon. member who has just resumed his seat attribute to Sir Wilfrid Laurier the lines: "Daughter am I in my mother's house but mistress in my own". Should this not have been attributed to Rudyard Kipling, from "Our Lady of the Snows" published in 1897?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): If the hon. member wants my opinion, I would say that Laurier probably quoted it.

Mr. Barnett: I listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) comes from one of the original provinces of confederation. I feel that those of us who come from other parts of the country, such as British Columbia, are happy to be joining the rest of Canada in celebrating this centennial even though we may not have been part of Canada for a hundred years by 1967.

I cannot say I was greatly impressed by the hon. gentleman's argument as it applied to

the major change which this resolution will effect. As to his misgivings on this subject, my only reaction is to suggest that a rose by any other name would smell sweet—and I doubt if that particular quotation originated with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, either.

I was one of the members of this house who was honoured to be present when Senator Donald Cameron on behalf of Canada extended an invitation to the commonwealth parliamentary association to visit this country in 1967. In these circumstances the prospect of our celebrations in that year came to my mind very often when we were touring the new commonwealth country of Malaysia, as guests of that country. If our centennial celebration is to be what many people hope it will be we could very well attempt to capture some of the zest and fervour which I found in the country of Malaysia, which has yet to celebrate its first anniversary let alone its one hundredth, in respect of their own federation and in respect of their feeling of belonging to the commonwealth of nations in which they feel parliamentary democracy is a vital thing. I found I had some rather strange reactions when I first entered their commons chamber, because if there was one single thing which struck me in Malaysia it was their endeavour to create the symbols of nationhood. Not the least of these is their new parliament buildings which those of us who were on the tour saw officially opened by the king of Malaysia.

This new building is a symphony in stone and glass, beautifully spacious and air conditioned from start to finish. In fact, I told one of the members of the Malaysian parliament I was beginning to wonder if we in Canada had constructed our parliament buildings 100 years too soon. I have always regarded our own Commons chamber as a rather beautiful room, and one that does in some ways symbolize the Canadian nationhood. However, I have to confess that when I came back after my trip to Malaysia I noticed for the first time how smoky and grimy our chamber is.

I must say I am wondering, as we approach our one hundredth anniversary, whether or not we might be getting a little shaky and decrepit in so far as some of our enthusiasm for the symbols of nationhood is concerned. If I might make a suggestion to the President of the Privy Council as a contribution to this debate, I would suggest that one of the things we should do, perhaps long before 1967, would be to restore a little brightness to this chamber.

The new nation of Malaysia, in my view, is going all out to do some things to make their first anniversary as worth while as our one