

*The Address—Mr. Hogarth*

when considering a minister's estimates. A civil servant, knowing he is going to get into a little hot water and knowing also that a member has only 10 minutes to ask questions, is very good at taking 10 minutes to give his first two names. You never do really find out who he is.

The real fear, however, and the real blame rests to a great extent on ourselves. We have to take a great deal of the blame. We also are afraid to abandon the baby blankets of the past. We are afraid to attack conventional wisdom. We are afraid of what political effect this is going to have in our ridings. That is what we are afraid of. We are afraid to stand up and make statements that we know might not be acceptable, even though we know they are morally and logically sound. We are terribly afraid of political introspection. We have too much pragmatism and compromise, and not enough principle. Compromise is a political device, not a principle at all. This brings about half-baked programs.

Look at what we did finally with the languages bill last year when we compromised. Section 11(1), as a result of a compromise made by this government with the western Attorneys-General, ended up by providing that in a bilingual district an accused person or a witness, has the right to speak either of these two important languages. However, when the accused is addressing the court or a jury, he has no such right. This is left to the discretion of the court. That was the result of the compromise. You can see what compromise can do to principle.

● (12:50 p.m.)

We act out of sentimentality fostered by public opinion that can be swayed and distorted by false and fraudulent facts promulgated by the mass media. A prize example of this sort of action was the cancellation of the seal hunt. It was so sentimental I am surprised it was not announced by Mickey Mouse or Smokey the Bear, because those of us who went into that problem in depth found there was no cruelty to animals. We found conservation was being practised and we found it was an economic thing for the people to be doing. I wonder if we will cancel all the trapping and killing of animals in Canada. If we were to follow that principle we would be in serious trouble in respect of many of the industries.

We are too parochial. We fail to see this country as a country which in the existential sense is in the process of "becoming". We lack healthy nationalism. Those of us on the back bench who advocated the proclamation

[Mr. Hogarth.]

of Arctic sovereignty last spring were, as reported in the press, referred to as ultra-nationalists. I am proud to be an ultra-nationalist if this results in the announcements that have been made recently on this subject.

Canadians have dealt for years somewhat harshly with their would-be activists and would-be reformers. We have always been very cautious of them. I was wondering the other day what Louis Riel, one of the great Canadian activists, would think if he were here now. He would say, "Today the scaffold, tomorrow the monument, the day after tomorrow the postage stamp".

**Mr. Baldwin:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since there has been some little doubt concerning what the procedure would be in connection with the order of the House I would propose at this time, if all parties agree, that the question be put, the yeas and nays taken, and if it should then appear from that a recorded vote would be taken, then the bells should ring once at two o'clock for 15 minutes. Thereafter, the recorded vote should be taken. I say this because there has been some doubt about the procedure and this would have the effect of apprising hon. members of precisely what would be done. There is hardly time for another speech to be made between now and one o'clock. If this is satisfactory, Your Honour might put the question and then after the vote has been taken of course the debate would proceed.

**Mr. Francis:** Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the proposal is. I should like to know upon what I am alleged to be voting. There was an agreement of the house that we would vote at two o'clock. I take it that some modification of that agreement is being proposed.

**Mr. Baldwin:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps I might make an explanation because the Chair was involved in the discussion. It is simply a proposal to overcome the difficulty about posing the question and to avoid ringing the bells twice. I understand that if there is agreement, the Chair would put the question now and the vote would not take place until 2.15.

**Mr. McIlraith:** My understanding is that it is simply a proposal to clarify the procedure in such a way that at two o'clock we can ring the bells once for the required 15 minutes and then proceed to the recording of the vote. If