

*Canadian Flag*

The knights who followed the emperor Frederick I Barbarossa, Philip II Augustus of France and Richard I of England copied the flag and the pennon from their opponents and the cross from each other, but they saw to it, in some instances, that their crosses should differ in shape and colour. Thus, the French adopted a scarlet flag with a white cross, the English and Germans a white flag with a scarlet cross. It is not clear to what extent other variants were adopted by other national groups; but it is known that the returning crusaders retained their uniform after their return to Europe and with it their "national" flag, associated with their respective patron saints. This was certainly the case in England, where the cross of St. George was firmly established in the 13th century.

Here of course we must recognize that the cross of St. George was a variant between the crosses adopted by the people of those three countries at that time. I continue reading this article:

It contrasted with the flags used by the king and the nobility to symbolize more personal and local loyalties. It was not entirely peculiar to England and was known as the cross of St. George in 13th-century Germany. The French cross in white on scarlet also remained in use and was revived on a national basis by Louis XI in 1479. In general, these flags rose or fell in esteem with the idea of nationalism which they symbolized.

With regard to the proposed flag, if it is adopted what other deduction can we make than that we are not proud of our Christian heritage, that we are not prepared to say that these things were in our past, that we are not prepared to accept the terms contained within the general meaning of heraldry and emblazon them on a flag which we intend to use for all time? I hope we will not have people turning on this flag and saying it is a flag of agnosticism. Certainly this should not be the case. However I implore the Prime Minister to make this change in regard to the flag, because I know that people of the Roman Catholic faith of the province of Quebec, whose Christian heritage is as near and dear to them as mine is to me—and it may be I am the poorest of the practitioners of religion, but nevertheless these things are equally near and dear to me—would wish such a change to be made. These things are dear to me because so it was that my forefathers came here from under the cloud of subjection of the United States in those dark days. They settled here in Canada, as today do immigrants to this country, to practise the religion of their choice. Let us not lose sight of the fact that even an agnostic can do as he chooses under the system we have established and under the advance Christianity has made into the western world through the years of history.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Winkler:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a few more moments in which to conclude.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** Does the house give unanimous consent to allowing the hon. member to complete his remarks?

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to finish the particular argument he is now making.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** Does the house agree?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten):** The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

**Mr. Winkler:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and all those who have seen fit to extend this courtesy to me. I will conclude in the way I determined to conclude and make my final remarks. I want to become very serious in the presentation of my final words. I believe we in this house would wish to deport ourselves in the proper manner. If I could look ahead and see that there will be—and I do not see this—a free vote in this house, in the way in which a free vote is understood, I would accept such a proposal at any time. But I fear there will not be a free vote, having regard to the words that have been spoken on the government side; and because of this I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the house that for this very reason I believe the members of this party constitute today what the party constituted in 1867, namely the party of confederation. One of the basic tenets of this party is national sovereignty, and inherent in national sovereignty is personal sovereignty. This is the reason that we feel, all things considered, that the people might well be consulted in this matter.

Therefore I say now, on a very personal note, that if the Prime Minister will consult parliament by placing this issue before a joint committee of both houses, before which committee all parties might assist in making a determination of this matter, I feel that it is not too late for all to participate in something which the Canadian people will desire. I feel very determined in this regard and am certain that a good result would occur. Some people do not feel this way but I am