

*Canadian Flag*

people of his constituency by the brevity of his remarks, but I assure him that his views are not shared by everybody throughout the land. In that connection I quote further from the editorial:

—large sections of the population will be left aggrieved and rebellious.

I believe that will be so, largely because of the lack of consultation and the method of presentation. The article goes on to say:

They have every reason—

The people of Canada.

—to be resentful of Mr. Pearson's tactics in threatening them with an election unless they accept the design he has chosen, and plenty of ammunition with which to discredit him.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we must exercise extreme moderation in our approach to this matter, and if need be I hope that the right to move amendments will be made use of before the conclusion of debate so that, if possible, a solution will be reached.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse, I would point out that all one has to do is refer to the order paper, which shows that 41 pieces of legislation have been passed by the house. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of Canada that this does not indicate obstruction. I suggest that if the debate is lengthy because members choose to express themselves on the basis of the Prime Minister's invitation, neither does this indicate obstruction.

I believe that the question of the establishment of a flag was not mentioned in the throne speech. I may be wrong in this regard, but I do not think it was there even though it was an election promise. This is not our fault. It becomes the fault of the government if the business of the country and those things that Canadians want are obstructed. It is not the fault of the opposition.

I refer to the record again. We have been put in the position where there is no other legislative program before us at the moment. If obstruction is alleged by the Canadian press and parliament is denigrated by some newspapers putting such a view of the situation before the Canadian people, then I say they are doing parliament a disservice. If they allege that the opposition is obstructing parliament or the government, then I state categorically that they are wrong. Many references have been made in the past to indicate they are wrong.

I ask the Prime Minister to bear in mind the words of Sir Winston Churchill and apply

them in the present circumstances. I believe these words were spoken by him at the time of the debate on Indian independence. I may not have them exactly right, but I believe he said "I will not be the Queen's first minister to preside over the dissolution of the empire". I believe those words should be considered most seriously as applied to the situation confronting us today.

I believe there is enough common sense left in the two founding races of this great country to find a solution to our problems. Notwithstanding the words of politicians or anyone else seeking to divide us, I believe we can and will seek out the virtues of both the great founding races that complement one another rather than listen to the voices of dissension that are raised from time to time in an endeavour to divide us. Certainly this is a much better course to follow than to indulge in bitter words such as we hear from time to time. That is why I have asked today for that degree of moderation which we expect from elected representatives of the people in this house to be applied during the course of this debate.

Although I am young as a member of the House of Commons, I am sufficiently old fashioned to think and believe that as we all belong to our own communities in our own provinces, so we believe that as we contribute to the life in our communities we will derive benefit. I believe too, Mr. Speaker, that when we contribute to our nationality we receive benefits accordingly.

I believe that the areas of patience in Canada today are much larger than the areas of impatience. One of the reasons I have called for moderation in the course of the debate is that I would not care to see the larger areas of patience disintegrate and result in the destruction of what might finally be the unity that we all desire. One incident which has transpired since the present situation arose and which, in my humble opinion, might result in the disintegration of this area of patience was a speech delivered in Toronto and reported in the *Toronto Telegram*. I regret that I do not have the date, but I think it was June 15 of this year. I should like to read it into the record because I think it is an example of precisely what I have been saying. The article is entitled "Double Talk of P.C.'s Hit". I quote:

State Secretary Lamontagne has accused the Conservatives of hindering Canadian unity by making double talk on the flag issue.

"The Conservative party has two different voices, one from Quebec and one from the rest of