

Business of the House

to me that it is the responsibility of the government to take action. They could do this by passing an order in council with a great deal more immunity from controversy than arose in respect of a lot of other things they did by this method. I do not think this is something we ought to raise such a fuss about.

Certainly we all have preferences in this field, but it does appear we are all united in wishing to have a Canadian flag, and I think this business of talking about it in five or six ways every year is not bringing us any closer but, rather, dividing us. It is up to the government of the day, or to the government which will replace it, to take responsibility. When they have gumption enough to take action we will end up with a flag. It will not be one which will satisfy everyone in Canada, but that is undoubtedly too much to hope. I hope this government will see fit to instigate proceedings which will result in a Canadian flag rather than in a lot of talk about what we would like to have in such a flag.

Mr. Grant Campbell (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, in any real sense Canada is a monstrosity. But Canada was not created by small, British, rational men; it was created by men of courage whose imagination stretched from sea to sea and from the coastal rivers to the ends of the earth. This country of Canada was created in defiance of geography. All the economic and geographic lines run north and south. The lobster fishermen from Peggy's Cove and Cape Cod suffer the same storms; the prairie farmers in Montana and Saskatchewan each suffer the effects of the hail that crushes their wheat; the people from beyond the mountains in British Columbia and in Oregon both suffer the same sense of claustrophobia. Only our history has held us together as a country, and it is to our history that we must look in order to remain a country.

I believe that next to the fundamental issue of war and peace and the survival of the species the issue of the greatest importance to this country in the next half century will be whether we can maintain a separate, independent and prosperous country in the northern half of this hemisphere. I think we should be ever conscious of and should cherish those things which give us an individual character. These things include our connection with the commonwealth, our common loyalty to the crown and our bilingual culture. These are the things on which we must concentrate as a bulwark against absorption by the great mass represented by the United States.

One of our greatest writers, Mr. Hugh MacLennan, has made what I think is a most cogent commentary on Canada. He looked around at our divergencies and conflicting

interests on the Canadian scene and asked this question: What do we have in common? Have we anything in common? He drew this one conclusion which has great relevance to our immediate situation. He indicated that the one common bond among all the significant groups that comprise our great country is the fact that at one time or other they have shared in suffering the experience of defeat.

The highland Scots in 1745, our French Canadians in 1759, our United Empire Loyalists in 1776, all went through the traumatic experience of defeat. These are the original and perhaps most significant groups that make up the mosaic of Canada. The others who came to Canada in later years were refugees in one sense or another from famine, war or persecution. The Irish came and later the Jewish people and then came others from many countries in Europe especially in the years following the last two wars. They came to our shores in search of peace, freedom and security.

This is the one thing we have in common, the one thing all Canadians share. Born of this is something else we all share, the determination that we will not expire, disappear, be absorbed but will somehow or other in our struggling, muddling way maintain a separate, independent and proud existence on this continent.

Like many of my neighbours in Stormont I am proud of the fact that members of my family have defended the independence of Canada under the union jack on three different occasions. I am proud that we have had this opportunity. However, I believe we are in the position referred to by Kipling in these words:

Daughter am I in my mother's house;
But mistress in my own.

I think we are very privileged to have enjoyed this honoured and respected position but I believe we have grown to maturity. We are no longer entitled to share in this honour or to enjoy the dignity and prerogatives with which it is associated. We must now build something of our own and we must stand or fall on the basis of what we have built.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

(Translation):

Mr. Chevrier: I am happy to notice that tonight, we have a new interim leader in the person of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Comtois). I congratulate him and would ask him to indicate what is the business for tomorrow and for Wednesday.