

at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Bracken, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Hansell.

Mr. ROLAND BEAUDRY (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I rise with some diffidence to undergo what might be termed the "baptism of speech" of a member new to this house, since the constituency I represent has nothing at first sight to single it out. It is a constituency of Canadians who believe in Canada as an entity achieved almost eighty years ago, and who have lived, thought, acted, and at the last election voted, as free men aware of the fact that living in a free country is one of their most precious prerogatives, and desirous above all of retaining their prerogatives and of taking pride in their citizenship.

When I say that St. James has nothing to single it out I am perhaps a bit inaccurate. St. James is the constituency which gave this house one of its finest exponents of the graces of parliamentary eloquence, and one of its outstanding former cabinet members, the late Fernand Rinfret. It is the constituency which recognized the qualities of heart of his successor, my predecessor in this seat, Eugene Durocher. His span of life, all short as it was, allowed him to endear himself to a good many in this house and to everyone for whose hopes, interests and wishes he stood in this chamber.

In one respect, Mr. Speaker, St. James stands out in almost paradoxical relief. By its very lack of singularity it becomes singular. In point of population it is one of the largest constituencies, if not the largest, in this dominion, and it is probably the most clearly outlined cross-section of this country's component elements. Representing as I do one of the largest bodies of people who may send a representative to this house, I am fully conscious of the responsibilities entailed, and fully aware of the hopes, desires and needs of these Canadians of various origins who make up the entity which, since the beginning of our political history as a nation, has been, with Quebec East, the bell-wether of Canadian Quebec's opinion. This I say, Mr. Speaker, fully cognizant of the fact that each constituency claims equal importance, but also mindful of history and tradition.

Through my voice, sir, St. James speaks its hope, its desire, its determination that Canada shall become the country which it was meant to be by the French settlers, to whom self-sacrifice was the means to an end; by the English conqueror, upon whom through the taking over of this vast territory devolved the

duty of meting out justice and of recognizing rights; the country which has been the promised land to so many new Canadians.

Of course—we on this side of the house, and I trust those on the other side, are aware of it—rights, prerogatives and their enjoyment entail duties—duties of understanding, duties of commission, duties, if I may so term them, of omission and remission, and duties stemming from divine law. Since the opening of this parliament there have been many statements on both sides of the house which hearten me in my belief that this country at large intends to discharge its duty of understanding—of understanding that in matters of language and of religious tolerance numbers do not necessarily imply right; that in matters of controversy arising from different viewpoints—viewpoints of necessity dissimilar because they spring from a dissimilarity of antecedents and precedents—both sides at times may be right; of understanding that abuse cast by either party at an ideological opposition will never bridge a flow of opposite thought; understanding that under the present circumstances the problems of government may often find a solution, not ideal perhaps to each individual but reasonably acceptable to all. This duty Mr. Speaker, the people of St. James, the French and English speaking, the Catholics and the non-Catholics, the old Canadians and the new Canadians of different origins, living together in harmony in the largest constituency in the largest city of our country, have lived up to and will continue to live up to. I am equally sure that they have noted the utterances of many in this house with a renewed assurance that we may yet achieve the unity of thought and purpose which this party has set as its goal, and for which the leader of this party stands out as a symbol.

The duty of omission and remission is perhaps not as easy to define, but certainly its performance can be far more of a daily occurrence and the opportunities for its discharge far more numerous. May I define what I term our duty of omission and remission as being: omitting to take offence at provocation, whether it be just or unjust in all spheres of thought, and, in such cases of provocation, as omitting to condemn before or without a full hearing; of refraining from verbal or factual behaviour such as may lead a fellow Canadian to believe that his rights to full citizenship are being disputed. May I suggest that we remember at all times that if we have reason to be spurred on to greater nationalism, or to become the nationalists which the new glory, the new opportunities,

[Mr. Abbott.]